

Communication from Public

Name: Judith A A Esposito

Date Submitted: 07/12/2023 09:11 AM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: WRONG WRONG WRONG THINKING. What is your motivation ? To destroy further the livability of our beloved L.A. ? What a blight on our city !!! PLEASE DO NOT DO THIS !!! The franticness of the city now is horrific !!!! This would add to the INTENSITY of L.A. which is the LAST THING WE NEED !!! DO NOT ERRECT THESE HORRIFIC SIGNS !!!!

Communication from Public

Name: Raymond Goldstone

Date Submitted: 07/12/2023 10:20 AM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: I urge the Los Angeles City Council to reject the Los Angeles City Planning Department's version of Metro's approved Digital Billboard Advertising Program (Program) and to reject the three proposed City Ordinances to allow the advertising program to proceed. WHY? *****Sets a negative precedent: The draft Ordinance seeks to allow non-contiguous billboards to be erected under a Supplemental Use District, rather than follow COURT GUIDANCE directing the City to maintain its ban on new billboards by limiting billboards to contiguous areas within Sign Districts. This application of a Supplemental Use District risks opening the door to outdoor advertisers seeking their own non-contiguous sign districts, challenging the City's 2002 Sign Ordinance adopted to reduce visual blight and improve community aesthetics and traffic safety. *****It's really about ads... not improving traffic safety: Neither the City nor the public have been provided information to allow analysis of the purported benefits of a transportation communication network that is supposed to improve traffic safety. No evaluation mechanisms or measures for success have been defined. AllVision, the Program's contractor, is an advertising company. Seven out of every eight images on the digital signs would show advertising. *****Changing digital advertising is dangerous and distracting: The City has failed to conduct independent analysis or review available safety studies or consider the impact of the signs on the City's high injury network and Vision Zero, and has also failed to acknowledge the serious consequences of driver distraction on roadway safety, particularly on the most vulnerable roadway users: bicyclists and pedestrians. *****Rushed approvals hinder public participation: Neighborhood Councils and the public have not been given sufficient notice or time to review the proposed City Ordinances in time for the Hearing Officer and City Planning Commission hearings, in violation of the Planning Dept.'s own public participation policy. *****The City gets the short end of the stick: The City has yet to be provided with site plans and renderings of the locations of the signs making it difficult to evaluate the benefits and detriments of this Program. The City will NOT be operating the signs. *****Overrides local community planning documents: Sign types and locations were chosen by Metro without collaboration with the City, overriding the City's

existing Specific Plans and other land use overlays adopted after significant community engagement and input. *****Fails to deliver benefits: The program's removal of a small number (3:1 ratio) of old static billboards of limited economic value and impact on the community when compared to the recommended (10:1 ratio) takedown by the City's Planning Commission does not represent meaningful blight reduction. *****Freeway signs impact underserved communities disproportionately: Distribution of signs creates unequal burdens. Signs erected adjacent to freeways are more likely to impact underserved communities. No environmental justice analysis has been provided. *****NO resource impacts analysis: The City has failed to conduct its own environmental analysis to assess whether the digital ads will have significant impacts on important City resources, such as Bowtie State Park, Ballona Wetlands Ecological Reserve, Sepulveda Basin Wildlife Reserve, Grand Central Market, Mulholland Scenic Parkway, and others. *****May violate public privacy: Digital billboards have been shown to capture personal data from passers-by without permission. There has been no discussion as to the extent of data gathering and protections for the public or data storage security. *****Overrides impacts to Coastal Zone: Metro approved a sign at the Ballona Wetlands Ecological Reserve (along the I-90 Freeway) knowing it would have significant impacts on coastal resources. The City has included the Ballona Wetlands sign in its Ordinance. *****NO cumulative impacts analysis: After implementation of the Program, the downtown area will have a dozen signs within a three mile radius, all in the vicinity of the recently-established Lusk Children's Orthopedic Hospital sign district. *****Public gets the short end of the stick: The Program does NOT allow the community the right to appeal any of the freeway-facing signs. *****Unclear revenue-sharing: Under the terms of the contract, the City will receive a share of Metro's ad revenues after vendor expenses, yielding significantly less than if this were a City-operated program. The Program competes with and decreases the value of the City's other digital ad initiatives. Without the City's approval and participation, Metro cannot proceed with this Program. PLEASE WITHHOLD THIS APPROVAL! Thank you for your support,

Communication from Public

Name: Mariam
Date Submitted: 07/12/2023 10:21 AM
Council File No: 22-0392
Comments for Public Posting: No.

Communication from Public

Name: mary Robinson

Date Submitted: 07/12/2023 03:44 PM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: City Planning Commission Case: CPC-2022-5401-CA, CPC-2023-3653-ZC; Environmental Case: ENV-2022-5286-EIR
NO TO DIGITAL BILLBOARDS!!!!!!!!!!!!!! As reported in a January 2023 LA Times article, L.A. could see nearly 100 new digital signs. (the author discloses information Metro withheld from the public,) “Under the plan, seven out of every eight images on the digital signs would show advertising.” Council President Paul Krekorian is the driving force behind this effort to monetize and commercialize our visual landscape, attempting to rush the Program through as quickly as possible, resulting in the expedited scheduling of the CPC hearing for August 17, 2023. In December 2021, Krekorian’s Budget and Finance Committee approved a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with Metro that was buried in an amended supplementary budget report, with no agenda posting or notice to the public. In June 2022, Krekorian removed an important paragraph from a PLUM motion that would have required an analysis of the Program’s consistency with the City’s Mobility Plan and pending Sign Ordinance. Until now, the biggest supporters of these types of digital advertising displays have been convicted City Councilmembers Mitch Englander and Jose Huizar. Curiously, one of the key lobbyists for AllVision (Metro’s single-source vendor for the project) is Areen Ibranossian, former Chief of Staff to Councilmember Krekorian who was lobbying for AllVision when Krekorian approved the MOA (as Chair of the Council’s Budget Committee) and continues lobbying the City on this Program to this day. These proposed billboard will obstruct views, distract drivers, consume energy, negatively affect quality of life, contribute to night sky pollution, and alter the City’s visual environment from Sylmar to Southeast Los Angeles and all points in between. Some of these structures will tower more than 50 feet over freeways, others will be built adjacent to proposed housing projects, and still others will shine into sensitive habitat areas (see link to maps. ? It's really about ads... not improving traffic safety: Neither the City nor the public have been provided information to allow analysis of the purported benefits of a transportation communication network that is supposed to improve traffic safety. No evaluation mechanisms or measures for success have been defined. AllVision, the Program’s contractor, is an advertising company. Seven out of every eight images on the

digital signs would show advertising. ? Changing digital advertising is dangerous and distracting: The City has failed to conduct independent analysis or review available safety studies or consider the impact of the signs on the City's high injury network and Vision Zero, and has also failed to acknowledge the serious consequences of driver distraction on roadway safety, particularly on the most vulnerable roadway users: bicyclists and pedestrians. ? Rushed approvals hinder public participation: Neighborhood Councils and the public have not been given sufficient notice or time to review the proposed City Ordinances in time for the Hearing Officer and City Planning Commission hearings, in violation of the Planning Dept.'s own public participation policy. ? City gets the short end of the stick: The City has yet to be provided with site plans and renderings of the locations of the signs making it difficult to evaluate the benefits and detriments of this Program. The City will not be operating the signs. ? Overrides local community planning documents: Sign types and locations were chosen by Metro without collaboration with the City, overriding the City's existing Specific Plans and other land use overlays adopted after significant community engagement and input. ? Fails to deliver benefits: The program's removal of a small number (3:1 ratio) of old static billboards of limited economic value and impact on the community when compared to the recommended (10:1 ratio) takedown by the City's Planning Commission does not represent meaningful blight reduction. ? Freeway signs impact underserved communities disproportionately: Distribution of signs creates unequal burdens. Signs erected adjacent to freeways are more likely to impact underserved communities. No environmental justice analysis has been provided. ? NO resource impacts analysis: The City has failed to conduct its own environmental analysis to assess whether the digital ads will have significant impacts on important City resources, such as Bowtie State Park, Ballona Wetlands Ecological Reserve, Sepulveda Basin Wildlife Reserve, Grand Central Market, Mulholland Scenic Parkway, and others. ? May violate public privacy: Digital billboards have been shown to capture personal data from passers-by without permission. There has been no discussion as to the extent of data gathering and protections for the public or data storage security. ? Overrides impacts to Coastal Zone: Metro approved a sign at the Ballona Wetlands

Communication from Public

Name: mary Robinson

Date Submitted: 07/12/2023 03:51 PM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: City Planning Commission Case: CPC-2022-5401-CA, CPC-2023-3653-ZC; Environmental Case: ENV-2022-5286-EIR
NO TO DIGITAL BILLBOARDS!!!!!!!!!!!!!! As reported in a January 2023 LA Times article, L.A. could see nearly 100 new digital signs. (the author discloses information Metro withheld from the public,) “Under the plan, seven out of every eight images on the digital signs would show advertising.” Council President Paul Krekorian is the driving force behind this effort to monetize and commercialize our visual landscape, attempting to rush the Program through as quickly as possible, resulting in the expedited scheduling of the CPC hearing for August 17, 2023. In December 2021, Krekorian’s Budget and Finance Committee approved a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with Metro that was buried in an amended supplementary budget report, with no agenda posting or notice to the public. In June 2022, Krekorian removed an important paragraph from a PLUM motion that would have required an analysis of the Program’s consistency with the City’s Mobility Plan and pending Sign Ordinance. Until now, the biggest supporters of these types of digital advertising displays have been convicted City Councilmembers Mitch Englander and Jose Huizar. Curiously, one of the key lobbyists for AllVision (Metro’s single-source vendor for the project) is Areen Ibranossian, former Chief of Staff to Councilmember Krekorian who was lobbying for AllVision when Krekorian approved the MOA (as Chair of the Council’s Budget Committee) and continues lobbying the City on this Program to this day. These proposed billboard will obstruct views, distract drivers, consume energy, negatively affect quality of life, contribute to night sky pollution, and alter the City’s visual environment from Sylmar to Southeast Los Angeles and all points in between. Some of these structures will tower more than 50 feet over freeways, others will be built adjacent to proposed housing projects, and still others will shine into sensitive habitat areas (see link to maps. ? It's really about ads... not improving traffic safety: Neither the City nor the public have been provided information to allow analysis of the purported benefits of a transportation communication network that is supposed to improve traffic safety. No evaluation mechanisms or measures for success have been defined. AllVision, the Program’s contractor, is an advertising company. Seven out of every eight images on the

digital signs would show advertising. ? Changing digital advertising is dangerous and distracting: The City has failed to conduct independent analysis or review available safety studies or consider the impact of the signs on the City's high injury network and Vision Zero, and has also failed to acknowledge the serious consequences of driver distraction on roadway safety, particularly on the most vulnerable roadway users: bicyclists and pedestrians. ? Rushed approvals hinder public participation: Neighborhood Councils and the public have not been given sufficient notice or time to review the proposed City Ordinances in time for the Hearing Officer and City Planning Commission hearings, in violation of the Planning Dept.'s own public participation policy. ? City gets the short end of the stick: The City has yet to be provided with site plans and renderings of the locations of the signs making it difficult to evaluate the benefits and detriments of this Program. The City will not be operating the signs. ? Overrides local community planning documents: Sign types and locations were chosen by Metro without collaboration with the City, overriding the City's existing Specific Plans and other land use overlays adopted after significant community engagement and input. ? Fails to deliver benefits: The program's removal of a small number (3:1 ratio) of old static billboards of limited economic value and impact on the community when compared to the recommended (10:1 ratio) takedown by the City's Planning Commission does not represent meaningful blight reduction. ? Freeway signs impact underserved communities disproportionately: Distribution of signs creates unequal burdens. Signs erected adjacent to freeways are more likely to impact underserved communities. No environmental justice analysis has been provided. ? NO resource impacts analysis: The City has failed to conduct its own environmental analysis to assess whether the digital ads will have significant impacts on important City resources, such as Bowtie State Park, Ballona Wetlands Ecological Reserve, Sepulveda Basin Wildlife Reserve, Grand Central Market, Mulholland Scenic Parkway, and others. ? May violate public privacy: Digital billboards have been shown to capture personal data from passers-by without permission. There has been no discussion as to the extent of data gathering and protections for the public or data storage security. ? Overrides impacts to Coastal Zone: Metro approved a sign at the Ballona Wetlands

Communication from Public

Name: Ms. Ruth Yannatta Goldway

Date Submitted: 07/12/2023 12:10 PM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: I strongly oppose the Metro's Digital Billboard Advertising Program and urge the L.A. City Planning Commission to reject the Program in its entirety. These new, huge, garish bill boards will obstruct views, distract drivers, consume energy that should be conserved, negatively effect quality of life in Los Angeles, contribute to night sky pollution, and alter the City's visual environment from Sylmar to Southeast Los Angeles. Some of these structures will tower more than 50 feet over freeways, others will be built adjacent to proposed housing projects and still others will shine into sensitive habitat areas. The billboards will lessen traffic safety. Rushed approval hinders public participation and suggests undue influence by Allvision, the company pushing for these billboards. L.A. has had enough examples of business interests paying off City staff and City appointees. No more corruption. The City Planning Commission had recommended that 10 signs be taken down for every new one added but this porgram has a three for one ration and we don;t know which signs will be removed - probaly the smallest least intrusive will be removed and the biggest ones will stay along with the huge, bright, garish new ones. The Program overrides impacts to the Ballona Wetlands Ecological Reserve by including the Ballona Wetlands sign in its ordinace. The public is not given any right to appeaal any of these freeway facing signs. Very anti-democratic, anti- community participation. The City will get far less of the revenue generated from this program than if the City were the lead agency. Please STOP THIS PROGRAM NOW. Everyone in our City will be healthier and have a better quality of life if we are rid of this urban blight. In a beautiful city, the economy will thrive as well. Making short-term money off of billboards reduces the chances for neighborhoods to improve their value and for citizens to build the economy with small businesses. Ruth Goldway, More than twenty-year homeowner in Venice.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 07/12/2023 12:28 PM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: Re: City Planning Commission Case: CPC-2022-5401-CA, CPC-2023-3653-ZC; Environmental Case: ENV-2022-5286-EIR
I strongly oppose the Digital Billboard Advertising Program, which will obstruct views, distract drivers, consume energy, negatively affect quality of life, contribute to night sky pollution, and alter the City's visual environment from Sylmar to Southeast Los Angeles and all points in between. Some of these structures will tower more than 50 feet over freeways, others will be built adjacent to proposed housing projects, and still others will shine into sensitive habitat areas. ? It's really about ads... not improving traffic safety: Neither the City nor the public have been provided information to allow analysis of the purported benefits of a transportation communication network that is supposed to improve traffic safety. No evaluation mechanisms or measures for success have been defined. AllVision, the Program's contractor, is an advertising company. Seven out of every eight images on the digital signs would show advertising. ? Changing digital advertising is dangerous and distracting: The City has failed to conduct independent analysis or review available safety studies or consider the impact of the signs on the City's high injury network and Vision Zero, and has also failed to acknowledge the serious consequences of driver distraction on roadway safety, particularly on the most vulnerable roadway users: bicyclists and pedestrians. ? Rushed approvals hinder public participation: Neighborhood Councils and the public have not been given sufficient notice or time to review the proposed City Ordinances in time for the Hearing Officer and City Planning Commission hearings, in violation of the Planning Dept.'s own public participation policy. ? City gets the short end of the stick: The City has yet to be provided with site plans and renderings of the locations of the signs making it difficult to evaluate the benefits and detriments of this Program. The City will not be operating the signs. ? Overrides local community planning documents: Sign types and locations were chosen by Metro without collaboration with the City, overriding the City's existing Specific Plans and other land use overlays adopted after significant community engagement and input. ? Fails to deliver benefits: The program's removal of a small number (3:1 ratio) of old static billboards of limited economic value and impact on the community when compared to

the recommended (10:1 ratio) takedown by the City's Planning Commission does not represent meaningful blight reduction. ? Freeway signs impact underserved communities disproportionately: Distribution of signs creates unequal burdens. Signs erected adjacent to freeways are more likely to impact underserved communities. No environmental justice analysis has been provided. ? NO resource impacts analysis: The City has failed to conduct its own environmental analysis to assess whether the digital ads will have significant impacts on important City resources, such as Bowtie State Park, Ballona Wetlands Ecological Reserve, Sepulveda Basin Wildlife Reserve, Grand Central Market, Mulholland Scenic Parkway, and others. ? May violate public privacy: Digital billboards have been shown to capture personal data from passers-by without permission. There has been no discussion as to the extent of data gathering and protections for the public or data storage security. ? Overrides impacts to Coastal Zone: Metro approved a sign at the Ballona Wetlands Ecological Reserve (along the I-90 Freeway) knowing it would have significant impacts on coastal resources. The City has included the Ballona Wetlands sign in its Ordinance. ? NO cumulative impacts analysis: After implementation of the Program, the downtown area will have a dozen signs within a three mile radius, all in the vicinity of the recently-established Lusk Children's Orthopedic Hospital sign district. ? Public gets the short end of the stick: The Program does not allow the community the right to appeal any of the freeway-facing signs. ? Sets a negative precedent: The draft Ordinance seeks to allow non-contiguous billboards to be erected under a Supplemental Use District, rather than follow court guidance directing the City to maintain its ban on new billboards by limiting billboards to contiguous areas within Sign Districts. This application of a Supplemental Use District risks opening the door to outdoor advertisers seeking their own non-contiguous sign districts, challenging the City's 2002 Sign Ordinance adopted to reduce visual blight and improve community aesthetics and traffic safety. ? Unclear revenue-sharing: Under the terms of the contract, the City will receive a share of Metro's ad revenues after vendor expenses, yielding significantly less than if this were a City-operated program. The Program competes with and decreases the value of the City's other digital ad initiatives. Thank you for your support,

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 07/12/2023 10:18 PM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: Please oppose more visual blight. LA looks bad enough why make it look worse. Special interests are behind promoting this. Many of the "call in" comments were from out side LA county. They call LA residents names, why allow biased people to ruin our city even more. More trees, more walkable sidewalks before more advertising. We already have digital billboard districts, we don't need to pollute the whole city. I support removing all billboards. Please oppose adding more visual blight.