

Communication from Public

Name: Sandy Hubbard

Date Submitted: 11/04/2023 11:26 PM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: The proposed Transportation Communication Network ordinance will allow Metro to erect up to 85 digital billboards on Metro owned property, where approximately 50-foot wide digital, moving image billboards with short refresh rates would be erected along freeways and surface streets. For very little gain financially or through major reduction of existing billboards, our neighborhoods will suffer from unnecessary blight (fought against for decades), and unsafe driver distractions. Therefore I strongly oppose the LA City Planning Department's ordinance to amend the LAMC allowing Metro to implement a Transportation Communication Network (CF 22-0392). 8-second refresh rates can only serve to distract a driver. If they are actually interested in the content being presented, they will be forced to take their eyes off the road in order to view it. If they are not interested, then it will create a level of glare that can only be distracted. We are currently attempting to build (yet again) center dividers on our local freeways to will help prevent glare from oncoming traffic. Why would we intentionally introduce it in another format? Los Angeles has been one of the few great examples of how to minimize visual blight in order to enjoy the wondrous nature we are fortunate enough to live with. It seems that we are now at a crossroads, where we are fighting to preserve the mountains and wildlife areas, while at the same time introducing destructive elements like these digital billboards (along with the increased electricity usage) which will further introduce glare in the nighttime environment. Please be consistent--preserve the best of our environment, and keep the billboard blight to a minimum. Please oppose the implementation of the TCN program.

Communication from Public

Name: Alejandro Costello-Vega

Date Submitted: 11/04/2023 04:27 PM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: The new sign at the Fairview heights station of the K Line is right next to a residential neighborhood. This is additional blight to a neighborhood that already has too many billboards and electronic signs. Will any trees or green spaces be removed for the sign? This neighborhood already has a sparse tree canopy. Also the sign style seems very futuristic, can it mold more to the neighborhood/place it's in?

Communication from Public

Name: Sarah J Hunt

Date Submitted: 11/04/2023 02:49 PM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: Digital billboards (TCNs) are intended to be a visual distraction, that's their purpose. Their bright electronic displays change messages typically every six to eight seconds, but for a motorist, taking one's eyes off the road for just two seconds doubles the chance of crashing. A study into the impact of 18 digital billboards along high-speed roadways in Alabama and Florida found crash rates to be 25 percent to 29 percent higher near the TCNs than at control sites along the same road - these accidents were predominantly sideswipes and rear-ending. Why would you deliberately place something that's designed to intentionally attract peoples' attention by the very road they should be concentrating on? Then there's the light pollution they create, the environmental disruption to local, nocturnal and migrating wildlife (two-thirds of migratory birds travel at night) and the energy impacts - TCNs are energy-intensive, using 11-15 times the electricity of the average US home in a 24-hour period. To be visible in daylight the digital billboards must burn brighter than non-digital billboards and they can be up to ten times brighter at night than traditionally lit billboards. Please do not vote yes on TCNs. Thank you for your attention.

Communication from Public

Name: Caroline Stack

Date Submitted: 11/04/2023 03:08 PM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: I am against the proliferation of billboards of any kind in Los Angeles. The studies are in and prove that billboards lower the quality of life and happiness for the communities around the billboards and for the people walking, biking or driving past the billboards. There's a direct correlation between removing billboards and an increase in a community's overall happiness and wellbeing.

Communication from Public

Name: Ann Dorsey

Date Submitted: 11/04/2023 05:04 PM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: I urge the Department of City Planning and City Council Members to reject the proposed Transportation Communication Network (TCN) ordinance for the legal and monetary reasons below. Before a billboard ban went into effect in 2022, the City of Los Angeles (LA) had to assign several lawyers just for billboard related litigation. This litigation was a significant expense, especially when the billboard company won its case and LA had to pay for their litigation costs. Also, LA only has limited control over billboards because of first amendment rights and not being able to select which entities get sign rights. In the past, litigation required LA to allow a greater number of billboards than intended. Approving the TCN ordinance will create a new land designation, “a non- contiguous Supplemental Use District.” Given the breadth of the TCN exception to a billboard ban, allowing the ordinance will effectively end the new billboard ban and open LA to years of litigation and loss of control over how many and where billboards are placed. Additionally, LA currently only allows parcels over a certain size to apply for a Supplemental Use District, which allows the adoption of zoning laws that vary from neighboring properties. The TCN zoning proposal would apply different zoning laws to dozens of publicly owned properties with varying characteristics. The idea that neighboring property owners would not demand similar rights is highly unlikely. Furthermore, the TCN Supplemental Use Districts could result in claims of illegal discriminatory “spot zoning.” If some current billboards are no longer allowed because of the concentration of billboards on property owned by the regional transportation authority, it could result in additional expenses for paying billboard companies and the land owners who rent the space for billboards compensation for loss of revenue. Finally, the provision in the TCN allowing billboards on property which is not commercially zoned will violate state and federal law designed to implement the Federal Highway Beautification Act. Also, many of the proposed billboards are on publicly owned property currently zoned for Public Facilities (PF) and thus would violate federal sign law and never qualify for Caltrans permits. Adoption of the Transportation Communication Network ordinance would be a mistake and cost the City of Los Angeles far more than any revenue from the billboards. Thus, the ordinance needs to be

rejected. Thank you, Ann Dorsey Northridge, CA 91325

Communication from Public

Name: susan beningfield

Date Submitted: 11/04/2023 10:53 AM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: I would like to see the skyline free from Digital Billboards. They are highly distracting and invasive. Beyond the safety and environmental impact they would have, I support people being able to move through the city without being sold to so vehemently.

Communication from Public

Name: Sarah Peterson

Date Submitted: 11/04/2023 11:45 AM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: Please vote against electronic billboards. There are already enough distractions and unsafe situations for drivers. Electronic billboards are terrible for the environment, local energy consumption, and safety.

Communication from Public

Name: Donald A Seligman

Date Submitted: 11/04/2023 12:04 PM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: For over 10 years, I and the organization of which I have been an officer, the Los Feliz Improvement Association, have strongly opposed any expansion of the current billboard policies. This in particular pertains to my total opposition to any expansion of digital billboards over the current regulations. This proposal has been periodically reintroduced and the same reasons for objecting remain: dangerous distractions for drivers, and unsightly environmental change. I am strongly opposed to the current initiative. Donald Seligman, D.D.S.

Communication from Public

Name: Eva Greene

Date Submitted: 11/04/2023 01:10 PM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: Again??? Don't you have anything better to do that to come up with terrible ideas for Los Angeles and your constituents? This council is majority Democrat. You have a super majority to pass anything and all you can if you'd like to make Los Angeles better. And yet you come up with this? How do you think you're doing so far? I'd give you a consistent FFFFFFFF for the consistency of your failures on full throttle. Who is guiding you? And why are you making such utterly terrible decision and coming up with such immensely awful motions? PLEASE DO BETTER, and watch the film "IT'S A WONDERFUL LIFE" with Jimmy Stewart for some good inspiration. Because it seems that most LA leaders have sold their souls and have created housing developments of overpriced slums, and Las Vegas style billboards that arouse no one except the streetwalkers and hustlers. You've created a "Pottersville" (referencing the movie) "an unsavory town occupied by sleazy entertainment venues, crime, and callous people (from Wikipedia). So sorry you're not making wiser decisions and proposing wiser motions.

Communication from Public

Name: Barbara L heil

Date Submitted: 11/03/2023 06:26 PM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: Please don't add more digital billboards to our landscape. They are too bright, and hurt my eyes enough that I have to look away. This obviously is a traffic hazard as well as an additional visual blight. They use up precious resources and add nothing to the driving and visual experience. They are unwanted and unnecessary.

Communication from Public

Name: Michael Gross

Date Submitted: 11/04/2023 09:03 AM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: Do not allow more light pollution. It endangers migratory birds. It causes traffic accidents and injuries. It degrades the quality of life in general. Profiting the advertising industry does not justify penalizing the public and the planet.

Communication from Public

Name: Judith A A Esposito

Date Submitted: 11/04/2023 09:45 AM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: FLASHING BILLBOARDS ARE A MISTAKE. DRIVERS ARE SO DISTRACTED AS IT IS THEY DON'T NEED ANOTHER ATTENTION GETTER. AND..... THEY ARE A VISUAL BLIGHT ON OUR AS IN OUR CITY. TAXPAYERS NEED TO BE HEARD AND RESPECTED. IT SEEMS THE CITY WILL DO ANYTHING FOR MONEY, NO MATTER THE HARM IT DOES TO RESIDENTS AND TO OUR CITY ITSELF. NO NO NO TO DIGITAL BILLBOARDS

Communication from Public

Name: Kate Scanlon-Double

Date Submitted: 11/04/2023 09:56 AM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: Please vote against permitting digital billboard in Venice and in the city of LA. Let's try to promote a calming, not distracting, urban environment and not add more light to the night sky. If this is the desire of commercial entities please instead stand with your everyday citizens so we won't have to endure or be more a part of sales pitches than we already are. This is not an essential service. Vote no on digital billboards.

Communication from Public

Name: Hilary Young
Date Submitted: 11/04/2023 10:37 AM
Council File No: 22-0392
Comments for Public Posting: PLEASE, PLEASE DON'T put up these awful and dangerous billboards !!!

Communication from Public

Name: Barbara KOHN

Date Submitted: 11/04/2023 10:47 AM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: OPPOSITION TO: The proposed ordinances, known collectively as the Metro TCN Ordinance, which will create a new Supplemental Use District (SUD) and include a Zone Change to apply the TCN SUD and its regulations to specific parcels owned by Metro. OPPOSITION to this proposed ordinance based on hazard to drivers; light pollution; disruption both visually and environmentally to residents of the city -- REQUEST DENIAL OF ORDINANCE