

Communication from Public

Name: Linda blank
Date Submitted: 12/07/2023 03:02 PM
Council File No: 22-0392
Comments for Public Posting: Please all additional time for the public hearing on the tcn proposal to give the community additional time to review and respond to the proposal

Communication from Public

Name: K. Boyarsky

Date Submitted: 12/09/2023 07:22 PM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: PLEASE do not authorize or permit the addition of any additional digital/electronic advertising boards ANYWHERE, but particularly not near freeway interchanges! Good grief. They are distracting, dangerous, glaring, ugly, and UNNECESSARY. We should be working to remove all unsightly billboards -- digital and otherwise -- not adding more. I've lived in West Los Angeles for 31 years: the encroachment and proliferation of ads works against beautifying our fair city. It startles wildlife, especially birds, needlessly, at a time when we should all be working towards darker skies at night to protect our flora and fauna. There is simply no reasonable reason to pollute our trafficked skylines further. PLEASE do not approve, authorize, or permit the "TCN." Thank you.

Communication from Public

Name: Terrie

Date Submitted: 12/09/2023 07:39 PM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: I think we should really limit the amount of digital billboards in Los Angeles. We have so many distracted drivers, and this is only going to add to the problem. Personally, I would like to see no digital big billboards little ones by bus stops would not be too bad. I have almost been hit three times crossing the street because people don't pay attention. When I was on the 405 I saw three cars nearly miss each other because two people I could see they were texting and drifting into another lane. We have people driving under the influence of marijuana and people texting so we don't need people watching huge digital billboards while driving.

Communication from Public

Name: Jann C Williams
Date Submitted: 12/07/2023 03:13 PM
Council File No: 22-0392
Comments for Public Posting: VOTE NO on the electronic billboards. They are pollutants to our public space.

Communication from Public

Name: Jeffrey Broderick

Date Submitted: 12/10/2023 02:17 AM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: We do not need any more neighborhood blight with these billboards, They will serve as deterrents to safe driving, distract drivers and take away from the beauty of our city.? They also have the possibility of making Los Angeles less attractive to the film industry, for what? Greed? Please reconsider

Communication from Public

Name: Matthew Pennington

Date Submitted: 12/08/2023 06:11 AM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: I strongly oppose the Metro TCN digital billboard advertising Program because of the impacts to housing, safety, historic-cultural, scenic, coastal, environmental and sensitive use resources. I ask the City Council to send the Metro TCN Program Ordinances back to the City Planning Commission for reconsideration per City Charter Sections 555 and 558, following substantive changes adopted by several motions introduced by Council Districts 1, 2, 5, 12, and 13. These changes include: PLUM restored freeway facing billboard FF-3 that was removed by CPC out of concern for saturation and public safety; PLUM reduced the CPC recommended distance of 2,640 feet to 1,500 feet between billboards on the same side of the freeway. This will set a negative precedent for all future signs, especially in the downtown area; PLUM expanded the hours of operation for freeway facing signs; PLUM reduced the number of existing static billboards to be removed prior to installation of new digital billboards from 125 to 50 initial removals + 4 signs after that (these numbers don't add up to the required 200 sign removals); PLUM lowered the minimum takedown square footage per sign from 300 square feet (minimum billboard size) to 200 square feet (poster board size); PLUM opened the door to extend the digital billboard program to a 30-year contract instead of the CPC recommended 20-year contact. I agree with Coalition for a Beautiful Los Angeles that the placement of offsite commercial advertising on Metro-owned and controlled property in partnership with the City subjects users of public spaces to unwanted sales pitches for goods and services and is antithetical to the idea that citizens should have public spaces/visual environment free of crass commercialization. Please send the Ordinances back to the City Planning Commission for reconsideration. Thank you,

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 12/10/2023 02:20 AM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: See attached



© RICK SMITH / YEHUDAMOON.COM / COMICS@YEHUDAMOON.COM

Bill

March 15, 2016, 3:50 pm | # | [Reply](#)

Digital billboards. The quintessence of driver distraction. Litter on a stick (now on steroids). The electronic version of highway spam. Sky trash television.

bicycler1951

March 16, 2016, 7:04 pm | # | [Reply](#)

Been to Maine, Vermont or New Hampshire? No billboards there at all. Would love to see that law everywhere.

Communication from Public

Name: Lynzie Flynn

Date Submitted: 12/10/2023 07:35 PM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: WHAT? Are you kidding us? This is Los Angeles, not New York, not Times Square. Is this what you want to turn Los Angeles in to? This would destroy night skies, views around the city, yes we do have views here, distract motorists, disrupt the migration of birds that fly during the night and run film production out of the county and possibly the state when production companies can no longer film in strategic areas around our freeways. Think back when CA reduced tax breaks for production companies and other states gave large tax breaks We lost a great deal of production in L.A. and had a huge loss of tax revenue. Compare this ill conceived plan and a paltry gain of revenue with the loss of revenue from film production and all the supporting businesses. The city of L.A. is already losing residents due to the high cost of living. Do you want to run more people out because of loss of jobs. This is a lose, lose no matter how you look at it.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 12/08/2023 08:55 AM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: I'm strongly opposed to billboards. They look horrible and are as bad if not worse than texting and driving. Billboard companies are corrupting out city councils for their own interests at the cost of the public.

Communication from Public

Name: Mary Woodward

Date Submitted: 12/08/2023 09:17 AM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: WE DON'T NEED MORE VISUAL POLLUTION. These bill boards are visual trash which will distract drivers and cause light pollution. It is a wrong solution to fill coffers. Please vote this down. Mary Woodward

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 12/08/2023 09:32 AM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: I strongly oppose the pollution of my neighborhood with the digital billboards proposed for the Paseo Marina project. Home and the neighborhood should be a place to get away from the constant onslaught of money making endeavors. And, they are butt ugly. Please keep them out of my neighborhood.

Communication from Public

Name: Gary W Garland

Date Submitted: 12/08/2023 09:34 AM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: Dear City Council: I'm a lifelong citizen of Los Angeles and a resident in the Pacific Palisades. I'm writing today to voice my opposition to the Metro Digital Billboards. We have a lot of work to do to clean up our city and digital billboards are not adding value to our fair city. Let's all work together and move our city in the right direction.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 12/08/2023 09:39 AM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: Please do not produce more illuminated billboards, as they are hazardous for drivers and promote more light pollution.

Communication from Public

Name: Jay Weitzler

Date Submitted: 12/08/2023 09:57 AM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: I demand that the City Council completely cancel the idea of Digital Billboards as both unsafe and an environmental nightmare. The amount of income anticipated from the billboards is completely insufficient to do much for the City budget as well. There is no upside to the Boards except to the advertisers and the City is not in the advertising business as we already have signs alerting the public to traffic conditions.business

Communication from Public

Name: Dale Fernandez
Date Submitted: 12/08/2023 10:20 AM
Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: There has to be some sort of criminal wrong-doing to have a no-bid contract for such a large Metro undertaking. Metro touts this program will increase rides, but why not utilize these funds instead on making our transit vehicles more reliable, timely, and safe???? These are billboards that are targeting drivers. Statistics already show how distracted drivers are. I am a health care provider who has treats people injured in motor vehicle collisions. I have seen a significant number of injuries and an increased impact severity of these collisions due to distracted drivers. I strongly oppose the Metro TCN digital billboard advertising Program because of the impacts to housing, safety, historic-cultural, scenic, coastal, environmental and sensitive use resources. I ask the City Council to send the Metro TCN Program Ordinances back to the City Planning Commission for reconsideration per City Charter Sections 555 and 558, following substantive changes adopted by several motions introduced by Council Districts 1, 2, 5, 12, and 13. These changes include: PLUM restored freeway facing billboard FF-3 that was removed by CPC out of concern for saturation and public safety; PLUM reduced the CPC recommended distance of 2,640 feet to 1,500 feet between billboards on the same side of the freeway. This will set a negative precedent for all future signs, especially in the downtown area; PLUM expanded the hours of operation for freeway facing signs; PLUM reduced the number of existing static billboards to be removed prior to installation of new digital billboards from 125 to 50 initial removals + 4 signs after that (these numbers don't add up to the required 200 sign removals); PLUM lowered the minimum takedown square footage per sign from 300 square feet (minimum billboard size) to 200 square feet (poster board size); PLUM opened the door to extend the digital billboard program to a 30-year contract instead of the CPC recommended 20-year contact. I agree with Coalition for a Beautiful Los Angeles that the placement of offsite commercial advertising on Metro-owned and controlled property in partnership with the City subjects users of public spaces to unwanted sales pitches for goods and services and is antithetical to the idea that citizens should have public spaces/visual environment free of crass commercialization. Please send the Ordinances back to the City Planning Commission for

reconsideration. Thank you, Antonio Dale Fernandez Business
Owner 91607 Home Owner 91604

Communication from Public

Name: Thomas

Date Submitted: 12/08/2023 10:43 AM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: Digital signage is a public nuisance, invasive, and not natural. Digital signage has no place where drivers are distracted, and homeowners are victimized through diminished sight lines.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 12/08/2023 10:47 AM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: Electronic devices increase autoimmune diseases from constant exposure to EMFs. Now both bus riders waiting at bus stops and drivers will be exposed to additional EMFs from electronic signs. Digital signs also distract drivers and pedestrians and can cause accidents. Please limit the number of digital signs on our streets and freeways.

Communication from Public

Name: Melanie Mihal

Date Submitted: 12/08/2023 11:28 AM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: I strongly oppose the Metro TCN digital billboard advertising Program because of the impacts to housing, safety, historic-cultural, scenic, coastal, environmental and sensitive use resources. I ask the City Council to send the Metro TCN Program Ordinances back to the City Planning Commission for reconsideration per City Charter Sections 555 and 558, following substantive changes adopted by several motions introduced by Council Districts 1, 2, 5, 12, and 13. These changes include: PLUM restored freeway facing billboard FF-3 that was removed by CPC out of concern for saturation and public safety; PLUM reduced the CPC recommended distance of 2,640 feet to 1,500 feet between billboards on the same side of the freeway. This will set a negative precedent for all future signs, especially in the downtown area; PLUM expanded the hours of operation for freeway facing signs; PLUM reduced the number of existing static billboards to be removed prior to installation of new digital billboards from 125 to 50 initial removals + 4 signs after that (these numbers don't add up to the required 200 sign removals); PLUM lowered the minimum takedown square footage per sign from 300 square feet (minimum billboard size) to 200 square feet (poster board size); PLUM opened the door to extend the digital billboard program to a 30-year contract instead of the CPC recommended 20-year contact. I agree with Coalition for a Beautiful Los Angeles that the placement of offsite commercial advertising on Metro-owned and controlled property in partnership with the City subjects users of public spaces to unwanted sales pitches for goods and services and is antithetical to the idea that citizens should have public spaces/visual environment free of crass commercialization. Please send the Ordinances back to the City Planning Commission for reconsideration. Thank you, Melanie Mihal

Communication from Public

Name: Alex Fierro-Clarke

Date Submitted: 12/08/2023 12:06 PM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: I strongly oppose the Metro TCN digital billboard advertising Program because of the impacts to housing, safety, historic-cultural, scenic, coastal, environmental and sensitive use resources. I ask the City Council to send the Metro TCN Program Ordinances back to the City Planning Commission for reconsideration per City Charter Sections 555 and 558, following substantive changes adopted by several motions introduced by Council Districts 1, 2, 5, 12, and 13. These changes include: PLUM restored freeway facing billboard FF-3 that was removed by CPC out of concern for saturation and public safety; PLUM reduced the CPC recommended distance of 2,640 feet to 1,500 feet between billboards on the same side of the freeway. This will set a negative precedent for all future signs, especially in the downtown area; PLUM expanded the hours of operation for freeway facing signs; PLUM reduced the number of existing static billboards to be removed prior to installation of new digital billboards from 125 to 50 initial removals + 4 signs after that (these numbers don't add up to the required 200 sign removals); PLUM lowered the minimum takedown square footage per sign from 300 square feet (minimum billboard size) to 200 square feet (poster board size); PLUM opened the door to extend the digital billboard program to a 30-year contract instead of the CPC recommended 20-year contact. I agree with Coalition for a Beautiful Los Angeles that the placement of offsite commercial advertising on Metro-owned and controlled property in partnership with the City subjects users of public spaces to unwanted sales pitches for goods and services and is antithetical to the idea that citizens should have public spaces/visual environment free of crass commercialization. Please send the Ordinances back to the City Planning Commission for reconsideration.

Communication from Public

Name: Krista Michaels
Date Submitted: 12/08/2023 02:06 PM
Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: I am President of the Cahuenga Pass Property Owners Association. Thank you for allowing me to submit comments on this Digital Sign Ordinance. While I generally view billboards of all kinds as visual blight in this city, I have particular reasons for opposing this digital sign ordinance. We in the Cahuenga Pass (originally bisected from the Hollywood Knolls community when the 101 Freeway was built) are directly across the 101 from Universal Studios. Because of our extreme proximity, digital signage on the 101 Freeway poses an extreme danger, for the following reason: We have millions of tourists from out of state and out of the country, all year round coming to Hollywood to visit Universal Studios. To that end, our visitors are renting unfamiliar rental vehicles, driving in an unfamiliar city, seeing unfamiliar directional signage, and often do not know where they are going or how to get there. To distract their attention from watching the traffic around them and to cause these drivers to avert their eyes to digital signs (which has the express purpose of distracting attention TO watch their signs), especially as they are trying to deal with traffic speeding often up to 80 or 90 mph on the freeway -- this is a situation programmed for disaster. PLEASE DO NOT ADD DIGITAL SIGNS TO THE 101 FREEWAY THROUGH THE CAHUENGA PASS. It is dangerous to add digital signs anywhere near any freeway, because of the extreme speeds of the vehicles using the freeway, but in the Cahuenga Pass it is even more dangerous because of our visitors who flock to NBCUniversal to visit the studio. It is my understanding that at this time only one digital sign is planned for the 101 Freeway, located on the Metro lot across from NBCUniversal. Please do not add more signage!!! I am sensitive to the reason the Council is considering this ordinance -- to bring in more financial resources to the City of Los Angeles and we all understand that additional monies are desperately needed for housing, street repairs, additional parks, commercial revitalization and much more -- but this is a very dangerous way to do any of those things. I ask, most respectfully, that you think again about the risks to life and limb of not only the visitors, but our citizens (residential and commercial) who live their lives in the Cahuenga Pass. Again, thank you for giving me the chance to share my thoughts with you all. Again, my thanks for allowing me to address this Council. I

wish you all a lovely holiday season and a safe New Year's.

Communication from Public

Name: LUCINDA PHILLIPS

Date Submitted: 12/08/2023 02:50 PM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: I strongly oppose the Metro TCN digital billboard advertising Program. Please send this proposal back to City Planning Commission, as required, because of the major changes to the program.

Communication from Public

Name: Sharon E. Blunk
Date Submitted: 12/08/2023 03:41 PM
Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: I strongly oppose the Metro TCN digital billboard advertising Program because of the impacts to housing, safety, historic-cultural, scenic, coastal, environmental and sensitive use resources. I ask the City Council to send the Metro TCN Program Ordinances back to the City Planning Commission for reconsideration per City Charter Sections 555 and 558, following substantive changes adopted by several motions introduced by Council Districts 1, 2, 5, 12, and 13. These changes include: • PLUM restored freeway facing billboard FF-3 that was removed by CPC out of concern for saturation and public safety; • PLUM reduced the CPC recommended distance of 2,640 feet to 1,500 feet between billboards on the same side of the freeway. This will set a negative precedent for all future signs, especially in the downtown area; • PLUM expanded the hours of operation for freeway facing signs; • PLUM reduced the number of existing static billboards to be removed prior to installation of new digital billboards from 125 to 50 initial removals + 4 signs after that (these numbers don't add up to the required 200 sign removals); • PLUM lowered the minimum takedown square footage per sign from 300 square feet (minimum billboard size) to 200 square feet (poster board size); • PLUM opened the door to extend the digital billboard program to a 30-year contract instead of the CPC recommended 20-year contact. I agree with Coalition for a Beautiful Los Angeles that the placement of offsite commercial advertising on Metro-owned and controlled property in partnership with the City subjects users of public spaces to unwanted sales pitches for goods and services and is antithetical to the idea that citizens should have public spaces/visual environment free of crass commercialization. Please send the Ordinances back to the City Planning Commission for reconsideration. Thank you, Sharon Blunk

Communication from Public

Name: Julia Keplinger

Date Submitted: 12/09/2023 03:19 PM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: These Digital Billboards are a nuisance and an eyesore. There have got to be studies done on the impact on traffic flow and accidents around these sites. I strongly oppose the Metro TCN digital billboard advertising Program because of the impacts to housing, safety, historic-cultural, scenic, coastal, environmental and sensitive use resources. I ask the City Council to send the Metro TCN Program Ordinances back to the City Planning Commission for reconsideration per City Charter Sections 555 and 558, following substantive changes adopted by several motions introduced by Council Districts 1, 2, 5, 12, and 13. These changes include: PLUM restored freeway facing billboard FF-3 that was removed by CPC out of concern for saturation and public safety; PLUM reduced the CPC recommended distance of 2,640 feet to 1,500 feet between billboards on the same side of the freeway. This will set a negative precedent for all future signs, especially in the downtown area; PLUM expanded the hours of operation for freeway facing signs; PLUM reduced the number of existing static billboards to be removed prior to installation of new digital billboards from 125 to 50 initial removals + 4 signs after that (these numbers don't add up to the required 200 sign removals); PLUM lowered the minimum takedown square footage per sign from 300 square feet (minimum billboard size) to 200 square feet (poster board size); PLUM opened the door to extend the digital billboard program to a 30-year contract instead of the CPC recommended 20-year contract. I agree with Coalition for a Beautiful Los Angeles that the placement of offsite commercial advertising on Metro-owned and controlled property in partnership with the City subjects users of public spaces to unwanted sales pitches for goods and services and is antithetical to the idea that citizens should have public spaces/visual environment free of crass commercialization. Please send the Ordinances back to the City Planning Commission for reconsideration. Thank you,