

Communication from Public

Name: Barbara Broidety.
Date Submitted: 01/12/2026 04:51 PM
Council File No: 15-0989-S47

Comments for Public Posting: It is completely unacceptable to use the Olympics Games as a vehicle to override the City's off-site signage rules to allow digital billboards to invade our city. The effort to allow digital billboards to be erected as essential to the games success by bypassing all planning rules and code is criminal. It is offensive and suggests that the legacy of these games will be blight, invasion of privacy, commercialization of our city's views, degradation of our shared open space and more. All bad things. Greed personified. The original draft of the streamlining ordinance specifically exempted signs from being considered under the measure. But, special interests prevailed and saw a great opportunity to bust through decades of efforts to reduce commercial ad billboards in the City. Not only would new digital billboards be permitted, but they could be virtually anywhere -- blowing through community ordinances that ban such installations, ignoring the provisions of the Sign Ordinance that allow new billboards only in designated and contiguous sign districts. THIS IS NOT THE LEGACY THESE GAMES SHOULD ASPIRE TO INFLICT UPON THE CITY. No amount of ad revenues can erase the long-term blight and intrusion such signs deliver on a daily (and nightly basis). Amend the measure to return to the original intent. On-site signage may be exempt to support wayfinding. New off-site billboards masquerading as essential to the Games success are bogus. They are just another attempt to get around the city's hard fought for Sign Ordinance. The public does not want digital billboard proliferation. Polls and public comment records reflect this. Yet, special interests persist in looking for ways to create new and distracting and dangerous visual blight. Stop. Enough is enough. P.S. Remember that the STAP program and its commitment to generate ad revenues is dependent upon outdoor advertising dollars to succeed and meet its goals and what are meant to be the City's goals and commitments to transit riders to provide shade and shelter. New off-site signage steals revenues from that program. Digital billboards will compete for the same out-of-home ad dollars as the STAP program.

Communication from Public

Name: Robin Rudisill

Date Submitted: 01/12/2026 08:51 PM

Council File No: 15-0989-S47

Comments for Public Posting: Dear PLUM Committee Members, At tomorrow's (January 13) PLUM meeting, you will hear the Olympics Streamlining Ordinance. As amended and approved by the City Planning Commission—it now appears to allow OFF-SITE advertising structures (billboards, including digital) to bypass existing code, overlays, zoning, and community protections, with little to no opportunity for meaningful community input. Please amend the ordinance to restore the original intent to keep OFF-SITE billboards out of this streamlining program. If the City wants to streamline ON-SITE, temporary, directional/wayfinding signage tied directly to Games operations, that is a different conversation—and those signs should be temporary only and not convertible to permanent advertising. The Olympics and Paralympics should not be used as a vehicle to override Los Angeles' hard-fought signage rules and invite a new wave of digital billboard blight across the City—especially in areas where billboards are prohibited and where communities have spent decades protecting their neighborhoods, views, historic resources, and open space. If additional visitor messaging is needed, the City should use existing, already-permitted digital signage and coordinate public service messaging through those channels—not create a new exemption for off-site advertising. Finally, please consider the City's transit shelter commitments: expanding off-site advertising competes for the same out-of-home ad dollars that help fund programs intended to deliver shade and shelter for transit riders. New off-site signage risks undermining those goals. Respectfully, Robin Rudisill, Venice

Dear PLUM Committee Members,

At tomorrow's (January 13) PLUM meeting, you will hear the Olympics Streamlining Ordinance. As amended and approved by the City Planning Commission—it now appears to allow OFF-SITE advertising structures (billboards, including digital) to bypass existing code, overlays, zoning, and community protections, with little to no opportunity for meaningful community input.

Please amend the ordinance to restore the original intent to keep OFF-SITE billboards out of this streamlining program. If the City wants to streamline ON-SITE, temporary, directional/wayfinding signage tied directly to Games operations, that is a different conversation—and those signs should be temporary only and not convertible to permanent advertising.

The Olympics and Paralympics should not be used as a vehicle to override Los Angeles' hard-fought signage rules and invite a new wave of digital billboard blight across the City—especially in areas where billboards are prohibited and where communities have spent decades protecting their neighborhoods, views, historic resources, and open space.

If additional visitor messaging is needed, the City should use existing, already-permitted digital signage and coordinate public service messaging through those channels—not create a new exemption for off-site advertising.

Finally, please consider the City's transit shelter commitments: expanding off-site advertising competes for the same out-of-home ad dollars that help fund programs intended to deliver shade and shelter for transit riders. New off-site signage risks undermining those goals.

Respectfully,
Robin Rudisill, Venice

Communication from Public

Name: John Given

Date Submitted: 01/12/2026 08:36 PM

Council File No: 15-0989-S47

Comments for Public Posting: Honorable Chair Councilmember Blumenfield and Committee Members - Attached please find a letter submitted to the City Planning Commission on January 7 with respect to this item noting that the cited statutory exemption to CEQA upon which the City relies is inapplicable, because the ordinance proposed to be adopted exceeds the scope of that exemption. Sincerely, John Given

LAW OFFICE OF JOHN P. GIVEN
2309 Santa Monica Blvd., #438
Santa Monica, CA 90404
john@johngivenlaw.com
(310) 471-8485

January 7, 2026

By Email Only to cpc@lacity.org

Los Angeles City Planning Commission
Monique Lawshe, President
200 N. Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: 2028 Olympic and Paralympic Planning and Zoning Exemption Ordinance
January 8, 2026 City Planning Commission Meeting, Agenda Item 6
Objection to Statutory CEQA Exemption
CPC-2025-6189-CA // ENV-2025-6190-SE

Honorable President Lawshe and Commissioners:

Before the City Planning Commission is a proposed code amendment to adopt the 2028 Olympic and Paralympic Planning and Zoning Exemption Ordinance, which would “exempt certain 2028 Olympic and Paralympic Games (Games) related projects from planning and zoning requirements of the Zoning Code in preparation for the Games.” (Recommendation Report, p. 1.) The proposed exemptions are for both temporary *and permanent* projects. (*Id.*, pp. A-5) The Recommendation Report suggests that the proposed ordinance is itself exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) on the basis that it is statutorily exempt under Public Resources Code section 21080, subdivision (b)(7) and CEQA Guidelines section 15272, as both amended in 2025 by Assembly Bill 149.

The ordinance as proposed grossly exceeds the scope of the statutory exemption, which does not extend to permanent projects. Original Public Resources Code section 21080, subdivision (b)(7) clearly did not exempt the construction of facilities, whether temporary or permanent. As amended by AB 149, a new paragraph, subdivision (b)(7)(B) provides an exception to the construction exception, and now allows *temporary* facilities to be constructed:

Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), [CEQA] does not apply to the construction of temporary facilities for the 2028 Olympic Games and Paralympic Games. For purposes of this subparagraph, “temporary facility” means a facility that will be completely removed and the area restored to a clean and safe condition within six months after the end of the 2028 Olympic Games and Paralympic Games.

The (b)(7)(B) exception clearly does not extend to *permanent* facilities, which the ordinance allows. The ordinance as proposed is thus not exempt from CEQA, because it exceeds the scope of the statutory exemption. The draft Notice of Exemption and justification for the exemption included as Exhibit C in the Recommendation Report makes this abundantly clear

when it opines: “Any permanent physical development or construction of facilities needed for the Games would remain subject to CEQA review unless separately exempt under other provisions of the CEQA Guidelines.”

An additional concern is that the ordinance not only permits permanent facilities, but also permits projects first approved as temporary facilities to later apply for permanent facility status, meaning temporary facilities may not really be temporary. (Recommendation Report, p. A-6: “This permanent pathway could be utilized by projects that have previously received temporary relief, as well as those making an initial request for permanent relief.”¹ As drafted, even the temporary facilities portion of the ordinance could be subject to legal challenge under CEQA—if a temporary construction project can later become permanent, it is not truly temporary, and the statutory exemption should not apply to it.

The obvious solution that would allow the proposed ordinance to use the CEQA exemption found in Public Resources Code section 21080, subdivision (b)(7), is to strip permanent projects from the ordinance and remove any pathway that would allow temporary projects to later become permanent without having first undergone an appropriate level of environmental review. As proposed the ordinance is clearly not lawful as it does not meet the construction exemption requirements created by AB 149 which allow only temporary projects. Moreover, if the City adopts the ordinance as proposed, all projects approved under the ordinance, including those that might have benefited from the AB 149 temporary construction exemption either individually or through a lawfully adopted ordinance, will be in significant legal jeopardy.

I am agnostic as to whether the ordinance represents good planning policy, but if the City Planning Commission decides to support the ordinance and recommend approval, it should condition that recommendation on the changes suggested above.

Sincerely,



John P. Given

Cc:

Vincent P. Bertoni, AICP, Director of Planning

¹ See Dec. 30 draft ordinance, p. 6 (proposed LAMC section 12.22 A, subd. (h)(3)) and p. 13 (proposed LAMC section 1.7.1, subd. (G)(2)(c)): “For Temporary Projects seeking Permanent Project relief, a building permit modification shall be filed with the Department of Building and Safety.”