

Communication from Public

Name: Barbara Broide

Date Submitted: 01/30/2026 11:45 AM

Council File No: 15-0989-S47

Comments for Public Posting: The ordinance as presented to and amended at the Council's Ad Hoc Games Committee does not yet provide the language needed to protect Angelenos from the threat that so-called "temporary" signage could become permanent. That statement must clearly be made. Temporary signs permitted under the Olympics Streamlining Ordinance are not eligible to be considered for permanent status under provisions of the ordinance that allow for temporary installations to become permanent. In addition, there must be a permitting fee that will provide adequate funds to ensure enforcement of the measure and for the removal of illegal and unpermitted signage by the installer or by the City at the installer's expense if the installer fails to remove. The signs should not be allowed to remain and delay is not to be tolerated. Finally, there must be the adoption of a set of fines or penalties that the City must adopt at the same time to be utilized against any unpermitted existing signage AND against any temporary signs that remain up after the post-Olympics games deadline passes. They should be part of the City's ongoing efforts to keep illegal and unpermitted signage off of our streets. Fines/penalties must be significant such that they are not considered to be the cost of doing business and should reflect the earnings generated by any illegal or unpermitted signage which should be categorized as "ill-gotten gains." IF the City's intention is to permit temporary signage to raise funds that are said to be needed to pay for the Olympics, then the signs should be temporary and focused on event locations. In addition, the Ordinance must specifically state that in no case may static billboards be "modernized" or changed to digital format. Any alterations of existing off-site signage must remain as currently permitted and it should be stated that any current billboards altered under this measure will be deemed illegal and subject to orders for immediate removal with significant fines that increase daily. (Such language is part of the City's Sign Ordinance but will be overridden by the Olympics streamlining measure.)

Communication from Public

Name: United Neighborhoods for Los Angeles/Casey Maddren
Date Submitted: 01/30/2026 10:39 PM
Council File No: 15-0989-S47
Comments for Public Posting: United Neighborhoods for Los Angeles (UN4LA) submits the attached additional comments to the City Council regarding the Olympics Zoning Exemption Ordinance. Casey Maddren, UN4LA



United Neighborhoods for Los Angeles

www.un4la.com

UN4LA Board

Casey Maddren, President

Gina Thornburg, Vice-President

Cherilyn Smith, Treasurer

David Ewing

Annie Gagen

Jack Humphreville

Dick Platkin

Grace Yoo

January 30, 2026

Los Angeles City Council
Los Angeles City Hall
200 N. Spring St.
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: 2028 Olympic and Paralympic Games, Olympics Exemption Ordinance
Council File Number: 15-0989-S47
Additional Comments to Council

Members of the LA City Council,

United Neighborhoods for Los Angeles (UN4LA) submits these additional comments on the proposed Olympics Exemption Ordinance, CF 15-0989-S47. We are deeply troubled by this sweeping effort to override both local planning regulations and State law. The fact that the ordinance does not include a defined list of projects, but only a list of categories, still leaving the door open for other possibilities, is also disturbing. To summarize some of our objections....

Conflicting Accounts of What Is Allowed under the Ordinance

City Planning staff have stated that the ordinance only applies to privately owned land, and does not cover parks or the public right-of-way. However, at the PLUM meeting,

Karo Torossian, of the Office of Major Events, seemed to state that it could apply to projects being considered for the Sepulveda Basin, including roads that are planned for the Basin. We also note that under the definition of an Olympic/Paralympic Project, one of the categories listed is transit infrastructure. Generally speaking, transit infrastructure is built in the public right-of-way.

Potential Impacts to Communities

Since the ordinance is designed to include an open-ended list of possible projects, we're concerned about the impacts this could have on LA's communities. The terms "live sites" and "fan zones" are vague and could include many things. If these venues offer live music or DJs, there could be serious noise impacts to surrounding communities, especially if these spaces are not enclosed. The possibility that they could also be allowed to serve a full-line of alcohol is concerning, especially in communities that already have a high alcohol density.

Potential for Removal of Trees and/or Habitat

Even if the ordinance does indeed only apply to privately owned land, we still fear the potential for the removal of trees and/or habitat without normally required environmental review. This is a serious concern.

CEQA

The City of LA claims that this Ordinance is exempt from CEQA review and has already published a Notice of Exemption. Apparently this is intended to make any project approved under the Ordinance exempt as well. Unfortunately, the justification cited in the Notice of Exemption does not support the City's assertion. CA PRC Sec. 21080(b)(7) only grants exemptions for temporary structures needed for the Olympics. The NOE also cites CEQA Guidelines Sec. 15272 which echoes the language of Sec. 21080(b)(7). But the Ordinance states that permanent structures will also be exempt. This is clearly in conflict with the sections cited.

But we also have to ask if the Ordinance is even eligible for CEQA review. We know of no applications that have been filed for the projects that the Ordinance alludes to. We have not seen any project description, let alone an accurate, stable, and finite project description. City Planning staff has said that there is no comprehensive list of projects, and that any list will continue to evolve. While the Ordinance does include a list of projects that will not be permitted, it offers only general categories of qualifying projects and seems to indicate that other unidentified projects will be included as well. We have almost no information as to the actual locations of possible projects, nor do we know the number of projects that may be considered eligible, since the City apparently does not know itself.

For this reason, we have to ask if the NOE is valid. Because there is no actual project description, we have to ask how the Ordinance can be considered exempt. It seems to us likely that the law would require the City to wait until it had developed a more or less stable and finite list of projects before commencing with review under CEQA.

Digital Billboards & Wayfinding Kiosks

Concerns have also been expressed about the fact that the ordinance expressly allows digital signage. While the ordinance does seem to include language stating that such signage will be temporary, we have to wonder if advertising companies that have invested in signage will be willing to remove it after the Games. Also, as one of the members of the Ad Hoc Olympics Committee stated, the City does not have a good record when it comes to requiring the removal of illegal signs. There are currently illegal billboards all over LA's landscape. Whatever the ordinance says, it seems naive to think that advertisers will be willing to remove digital signage and/or wayfinding kiosks after the Games are over, and given the City's track record, it's hard to believe they'll be required to do so.

We urge you to reject this ordinance.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Casey Maddren, President
United Neighborhoods for Los Angeles