

Communication from Public

Name: Phyllis Ling

Date Submitted: 02/05/2024 09:59 PM

Council File No: 24-0011-S4

Comments for Public Posting: Dear LA City Council, I'm a resident under the route of the proposed LA ART gondola. The gondola's path would be 49 ft over the ground and less than 25 ft over the roof of my 128-yr-old 1-story home. I urge the City Council to approve the motion to put the gondola project on hold while the city does a comprehensive study of options to improve access to Dodger Stadium. It makes perfect sense to take a serious look at all options. The LAART gondola is a massive, \$500 million infrastructure project without a real funding plan. Not only does it impact residents with invasion of privacy, noise, safety, and security risks, but it also dramatically alters LA State Historic Park and harms the character of our historic districts. Many alternatives could potentially be implemented faster, for far less money, and with far fewer impacts. LAART tries to minimize the gondola's impacts by deferring analysis and mitigation to other agencies besides Metro. Just take for example the invasion of privacy for residents, which is barely discussed in the EIR. LAART claims that the mitigation will be approved by the City of LA prior to issuing permits to begin operations. In the Final EIR, LAART only says that they "can" use smart glass to fog up the windows to protect residents' privacy, not that they "will" use it, nor do they offer any criteria for when it should be activated to protect residents' privacy. The choice of wording of "can" and "will" is deliberate and telling, especially when in another portion of the report, the wording was changed from "can" in the draft EIR, to "will" in the Final EIR in relation to LAART's plans to build a mobility hub at Dodger Stadium. Their handling of privacy concerns is just one of many examples in which LAART has provided vague assurances to residents rather than addressing our concerns in a meaningful way. Think about it. Who would want to live under a constant stream of looky-loos floating over their home, invading their privacy both indoors and out? How can Metro approve this project without any evaluation of privacy impacts? The compatibility of this project with existing land use is absolutely relevant to the environmental review, but LAART would have the city evaluate this impact later, likely when it's too late to make significant changes to the project. What Metro and LAART are doing is forcing residents into expensive lawsuits to defend our right to the peaceful enjoyment of our homes. My neighbors and I can't afford

expensive lawsuits, which is exactly the point. The gondola proponents minimize the impacts, while claiming that gondolas are the future of zero emissions transit. They claim that with its minimal footprint, this project won't displace anyone, but the assumption they're making is that residents can be built over and forced to live with the impacts that they (LAART and Metro) choose to ignore. It's history repeating itself, but instead of dragging residents out of our homes and forcing us out by eminent domain, they would displace us in a more "civilized" and hands-off manner – by ignoring our concerns and making it unbearable for us to live in our own homes. Please approve this motion and put a hold on all work on the gondola project at the city-level until there is a comprehensive and objective study of transit alternatives for Dodger Stadium. We need to approach our transportation problems in a thoughtful manner, and not impose this ill-conceived urban gondola experiment on residents who didn't ask for it. Sincerely, Phyllis Ling

Communication from Public

Name: Phyllis Ling

Date Submitted: 02/06/2024 01:08 PM

Council File No: 24-0011-S4

Comments for Public Posting: I'm a resident under the route of the proposed LA ART gondola. I previously sent a comment letter, but wanted to add additional comments specific to what I hope would be studied and addressed by an independent transportation study conducted by the City. Regardless of Metro's decision on the LAART project, the city needs to do its own traffic study that includes the following alternatives that were not considered in the EIR: (1) Better pedestrian access with improved sidewalks and new bike lanes; (2) improvements to the Dodger Stadium Express (DSE) bus lanes, which currently don't extend all the way into the parking lots and are removed post-game (3) Expansion of the DSE bus system, such as adding direct routes from points throughout LA county using existing and planned bus-only lanes. All of these options should be seriously considered before the City devotes resources towards implementing a project as extensive as the LAART gondola, especially when the gondola could interfere with these common sense alternatives. We also need to mitigate the impact of rideshare services, which use the neighborhoods around Dodger Stadium as staging areas. Another reason that the City needs to do a transportation study is to provide an objective evaluation of the gondola project. The transportation study in the EIR included many overly optimistic and questionable assumptions about gondola ridership, including the following: (1) Assumption that 68% of gondola riders would take transit for their entire journey. This number is based on a Metro survey of Dodger Stadium Express riders in 2014, which was before the widespread use of rideshare services. The survey found that 75% of DSE riders took transit for their entire journey. All LAART did was reduce this number arbitrarily by 10% to estimate the transit use by those accessing the gondola system. Why not reduce that number by 25% or 50%, especially when the gondola is touted as a mode that would attract new people to try transit. (2) Assumption in that the maximum wait time in line for the gondola is 7 minutes. Supposedly a ticket reservation system would space people out over the 2 hours before and after Dodgers games, but no details are provided about how it would be implemented. (3) Assumption that the gondola stations can accommodate the crowds at 100% capacity, and that there won't be bottlenecks in queuing that reduce the maximum operating capacity. With all of

these questionable assumptions and unanswered questions, how can we accept at face value LAART's overblown claims about ridership and environmental benefits? The lack of a real funding plan is also a huge concern for the longterm viability of this project. We should all be concerned about this \$500 million project running out of money and being abandoned or needing a taxpayer bailout. Just look at the graffitied towers across the street from Crypto.com Arena. But in the case of the gondola project, it's not only an empty high rise building on private property; it's infrastructure over our streets, parks, and homes that needs constant security and maintenance. The gondola project would be a safety risk for everyone below it, including drivers, pedestrians, park visitors, and residents who shouldn't have to live in fear, wondering if the private operator is cutting corners on maintenance and security due to budget shortfalls. We need real solutions ASAP. Even if the dreadful gondola is built and even if folks want to believe the farfetched claims about it relieving traffic, it wouldn't be completed for another 4 years. Construction of a gondola would take at least 2 years and require road closures and detours that would worsen traffic in the meantime. Clearly we need improvements to Dodger Stadium access before any construction of a gondola happens. Please approve this motion to initiate a comprehensive and independent traffic study for Dodger Stadium, and put a hold on the gondola project if it is approved by Metro. We need to approach our transportation problems in a thoughtful manner, rather than hastily imposing this ill-conceived urban gondola experiment on residents who didn't ask for it.

Sincerely, Phyllis Ling