

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Stacey Travis

**Date Submitted:** 07/30/2023 01:04 PM

**Council File No:** 22-0392

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Planning Commission, I am writing to express my concerns about the proposed TCN metro digital signs project for Los Angeles. I believe that this project has several issues that need to be addressed before it can be approved. First, the rushed approvals hinder public participation and transparency. The City's staff report will be issued after the deadline for comments, leaving insufficient time for the public, organizations, or Neighborhood Councils to review and provide meaningful input. Second, the project is really about ads, not improving traffic safety. There is no information provided to allow analysis of the purported benefits of a transportation communication network, and no evaluation mechanisms or measures for success have been defined. Third, changing digital advertising is dangerous and distracting. The City has failed to conduct independent analysis or review safety studies, and has not considered the impact of these signs on roadway safety, particularly for vulnerable roadway users such as bicyclists and pedestrians. Fourth, the City gets the short end of the stick. The City has not been provided with site plans and renderings of the locations of the signs, making it impossible to evaluate the benefits and detriments of the Program. Metro will be in control of operating the signs. Fifth, the project overrides local community planning documents. Sign types and locations were chosen by Metro without collaboration with the City, overriding existing Specific Plans and other land use overlays adopted after significant community engagement and input. Sixth, the Program fails to deliver benefits. The removal of a small number of old static billboards does not represent meaningful blight reduction when compared to the recommended takedown ratio by the City's Planning Commission. Seventh, freeway signs impact underserved communities disproportionately. Distribution of signs creates unequal burdens and no environmental justice analysis has been provided. Eighth, there has been no resource impacts analysis conducted. The City has failed to assess whether the digital ads will have significant impacts on important City resources. Ninth, there is a potential violation of public privacy. Digital billboards have been shown to capture personal data from passers-by without permission. Tenth, the presence of digital signs could hinder filming in Los Angeles, as it will be much harder to make the city look like other locations. Productions may

not want to cover the cost of CGI to remove the signs, and this could have a negative impact on jobs and revenue from filming. With WGA and SAG-AFTRA on strike, LA is already losing millions, and these signs could make those losses permanent. This could negate any money the signs bring into the city. It's important to consider the potential impact on the film industry when evaluating this project. No reach outs have been done to the relevant unions and yet the Mayor and City Council have commented on the impact economically that the film and television business brings into the City. We just passed a California Tax Incentive to try and keep work in CA of our 115-year-old signature industry. Most of the film work happening in CA right now is in LA. So this will undercut the renewal by the CA Senate and CA Assembly signed into Law by Gov Newsom to try and retain production in CA. The shows that will move elsewhere if they cannot shoot in LA without these giant signs can bring in a million dollars a week to the area where they shoot. Will these signs bring in that much? They should not be approved in this current form without pausing to consider the massive potential job losses and economic damage from losing film production in LA. This has much bigger implications than Metro has acknowledged and the City Council should be very careful this will kill any filming that is not on a soundstage and be prepared to answer why they did so. To remove some of the signs from frequently used locations would need to happen and this is being shoved through so fast that if they are not removed filming will find somewhere else to shoot. In light of these concerns, I urge you to carefully consider these issues before approving this project. Sincerely, Stacey Travis Co Chair National Govt Affairs of SAG-AFTRA Government Affairs Committee Westchester Playa Del Rey Neighborhood Council Community Member

## Communication from Public

**Name:** sara kay

**Date Submitted:** 07/30/2023 02:30 PM

**Council File No:** 22-0392

**Comments for Public Posting:** Let's be honest, these signs are not about giving important alerts to the community. Reading blinking signs while driving is dangerous, not informative. This is only about creating revenue through advertising. And revenue for what? The public transportation that fewer and fewer people use because the city & county refuse to keep it safe and clean? Or a brand new build of something that non one will use except people who want to get high on meth and fentynal? Please stop making this city more stressful, unattractive, and chaotic. The last thing we need are more invasive billboards