

Communication from Public

Name: RAUL MACIAS

Date Submitted: 03/20/2024 01:17 PM

Council File No: 24-0011-S4

Comments for Public Posting: DEBEMOS DE BUSCAR LA OPCION CORECTA Y ENFOCARNOS EN APLICARLA SIN CAUSAR ESTRAGOS EN LA COMUNIDAD O AFECTAR PROPIEDADES,ES MUY IMPORTANTE TOMAR EN CUENTA LA OPINION DE TODA PERSONAS QUE SE SIENTA MOTIVADO PARA CREAR UNA DIFERENCIA OLVIDEMONOS DE LA GONDOLA COMO LA TIENEN PLANEADA Y ENFOQUEMONOS EN UN DESAROLLO MAS PRACTICO Y SENSIBLE.

Communication from Public

Name: Dina Kelberman
Date Submitted: 03/20/2024 03:01 PM
Council File No: 24-0011-S4
Comments for Public Posting: Please stop Frank McCourt's gondola project until a comprehensive and objective transit access study for Dodger Stadium is completed! Thank you! Dina Kelberman

Communication from Public

Name: Richard A Rojas

Date Submitted: 03/22/2024 08:33 AM

Council File No: 24-0011-S4

Comments for Public Posting: March 22, 2024 Councilmembers Los Angeles City Hall 200 N Spring Street Los Angeles, CA 90012 Re: LA City Council Meeting 3/22/24 Agenda Item #15- Motion to Approve Traffic Assessment Study Dear Councilmembers- My name is Richard Rojas, Sr. --- I am a volunteer/Director Emeritus for Latino Outdoors, a volunteer led national organization of over 200 members serving 30-regional teams across the United States. Our mission is to connect youth, young adults and families with the outdoors – celebrating familia and cultura, while also promoting outdoor education, responsible recreation and environmental stewardship. Los Angeles State Historic Park (LASHP) serves as a “gateway park” for our community to learn, appreciate and celebrate our cultural legacy, while also supporting the park’s unique access and equity programs. I am here today to urge you to support the motion described in Agenda Item #15 brought by Councilmember Hernandez (CD-1) to conduct a fair and objective traffic assessment for alternatives for Dodger Stadium and surrounding DTLA event venues that includes the suspension of any action approving advancements of the LA ART gondola project. In the nearly 20-years it took to create a vision for how LASHP would be named, classified and developed, not once did Frank McCourt or the LA Dodgers participate in the planning, development or operation of the park or its popular visitor serving programs. So, why allow McCourt a free pass at building a private gondola system that will forever change the historic character of Union Station, El Pueblo de Los Angeles, LASHP and Chinatown now? For too long, communities of color in Los Angeles have been displaced or negatively impacted by billionaires like McCourt whose only motives are personal gain and profit. If the true intentions of the LA ART project is to reduce vehicle traffic and harmful greenhouse gasses from our Chinese and Latino neighborhoods, then funding and completing a comprehensive traffic study should be embraced and not opposed. Your vote today is important. Your constituents are hopeful that you will do the right thing on their behalf. Respectfully, Richard Rojas, Sr., Director Emeritus Latino Outdoors – Advisory Board

Communication from Public

Name: D Sweetnam

Date Submitted: 03/22/2024 06:00 AM

Council File No: 24-0011-S4

Comments for Public Posting: I fully support the motion to conduct a traffic study before allowing the Gondola project to proceed. The developer asserts that the proposed Gondola is intended to help cure the mess that is traffic in and out of Dodger Stadium. It seems simple that we have a current traffic study in hand before we build a transit solution which imposes visual blight on the communities between the Stadium and Union Station, which is just one reason among many to kill the project. Once the study is complete, it will be clear that the Gondola is not the solution we seek and that we would be better served by improving pedestrian access from the Chinatown A Line station. A traffic study will provide more support for putting an end to the Gondola proposal.

Communication from Public

Name: Phyllis Ling

Date Submitted: 03/22/2024 07:43 AM

Council File No: 24-0011-S4

Comments for Public Posting: I urge the City Council to put the gondola project on hold. Do the fiscally responsible thing: demand a real funding plan for all to see. This is long overdue. We need real answers. How much would they need to charge tourists to ride it? How much can they expect to get in sponsorships? Is this project financially viable and sustainable, or is it a boondoggle moneypit? It's insane that this project has gotten this far based on Frank McCourt's "assurances" that the gondola project will be 100% privately funded. Please find the following attachments: (1) CityWatchLA article that estimates that the yearly revenue needed to support the financing of the project is \$55 million, (2) Section 4.0 of the Final EIR which has the Costs and Financing information for the gondola project, (3) Excerpt from Appendix N of the Draft EIR regarding ridership (4) Excerpt from Section 5.1.15 of the Final EIR, which defines tourist ridership and event fares. (5) Article about the London gondola titled, "London cable car will leave public high and dry, say critics" with the following text highlighted: "A project that was supposed to be delivered by private sponsorship has ended up being largely funded by the public purse after costs ballooned from an early estimate of £25m to more than £60m."

Section 4.0 | Costs and Financing

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This section summarizes the capital, operating, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding for the proposed Project. This analysis is intended to assist the lead agency and responsible agencies, as well as stakeholders and the general public, in understanding the costs of the proposed Project, as well as proposed funding sources.

4.2 COSTS AND FUNDING

This section presents the cost of the proposed Project as well as the proposed funding and financing sources for the proposed Project. The capital costs for the proposed Project are presented in 2021 dollars.

4.2.1 Capital Costs

Capital cost estimates for the proposed Project are based on conceptual engineering drawings. Further technical refinements to the proposed Project and the potential selection of alternative designs during the approval process may impact capital costs. The capital costs are estimated at \$385 - 500 million. Construction of the proposed Project assumes prevailing wages pursuant to a Project Labor Agreement.

Table 4-1 Capital Cost Estimates for the Proposed Project

Cost Category	Cost Estimate
Construction	\$275 – 325 million
Gondola System Equipment and Cabins	\$75 - 100 million
Soft Costs	\$15 – 25 million
Contingency	\$20 - 50 million
Total	\$385 - 500 million

4.2.2 Operating and Maintenance Costs

Based upon the proposed service levels, the proposed Project operations and maintenance costs are projected at approximately \$8 - 10 million per year (inclusive of capital reserve funds). Operation and maintenance costs are proposed to be fully funded out of Project revenues. Operations and maintenance costs assume prevailing wages. These costs are estimated in 2021 dollars.

4.2.3 Capital Funding Sources

The primary source of capital funding for the proposed Project would be bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. The revenue available for bond servicing is net of the costs of operation and maintenance costs represented in the above section. The primary sources of revenue for the proposed Project are farebox revenues and naming rights sponsorship revenue,¹ after which operating costs are deducted. The bond financing for the proposed Project assumes the independent credit rating of the proposed Project. The proposed Project is not seeking Metro funding. In addition, no other sources of public funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project.

¹ Refer to Topical Response K, Signage and Lighting.

This page intentionally left blank.

Frank McCourt's Gondolas: What is His Overall Plan?

JACK HUMPHREVILLE / FEBRUARY 01 2024



Comments

OPEN AN ACCOUNT
with no minimum.
GET UP TO \$1000.



E*TRADE
from Morgan Stanley

[Open an account](#)



LA WATCHDOG - Frank McCourt, the former owner of the Dodgers and the 50% owner of the Dodgers parking lot, Climate Resolve, a respected environmental oriented non-profit, and Zero Emissions Transit, a newly formed non-profit, are planning to construct and operate the 1.2-mile Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit system that will use gondolas to ferry 5,000 baseball fans an hour from Union Station to Dodger Stadium with an intermediate stop in the Los Angeles Historic State Park.

As part of the approval process, Metro, acting as the lead agency, has prepared an Environmental Impact Report (at McCourt's expense) that will be presented to the Metro Board at an upcoming meeting. Hopefully, the 13 members of the Metro Board, including Mayor Bass who is the Chair and her three appointees, will have reviewed and analyzed the 100-page Executive Summary and the impact on the surrounding communities. (See below.)

According to the EIR, the capital cost of the Aerial Rapid Transit system is expected to be in the range of \$500 million. Operating costs are projected to be \$8 to \$10 million a year.

Importantly, the sponsors have said that LA-ART will be privately financed and will not rely on any cash or credit support from Metro or any other public entity. This, however, will require the operation to generate at least \$55 million of cash a year, an amount necessary to cover operating expenses of \$10 million, capital costs (principal and interest) of \$35 million to service the \$500 million of bonds, and a cushion demanded by the lenders or investors of at least \$10 million.

To generate this level of revenue will require an extraordinary number of full pay riders (Dodger ticket holders ride for free), not only to visit Dodger Stadium and its many events, but to view the many sponsorships envisioned by the promoters. At best, this level of revenue is problematic.

The real payoff will be the development of the open space at Dodger Stadium, an idea that was proposed by Frank McCourt when he owned the Dodgers and is most likely part of his game plan now that he owns 50% of the open space.

If so, the development of Dodger Stadium adds a level of complexity to the proposed LA-ART that needs to be addressed in an open and transparent manner, including in the EIR.

On January 24, local Councilwomen Eunisses Hernandez introduced a motion requesting an updated traffic study for Dodger Stadium. She also requested that the “City Council suspend any action on approving advancements to the LA-ART project contingent upon the results and recommendations of the updated results and recommendations of the updated Dodger Stadium Traffic Assessment.” This project also needs to be approved by the City, County, and the State.

This project is expected to reduce traffic on games days and cut the emission harmful greenhouse gases. It has been endorsed by many environmental organizations. It has also generated considerable controversy from residents who will be impacted by the noise and loss of privacy because of five-ton gondolas passing overhead every thirty seconds on game nights. The Friends of Elysian Park discussed their opposition in a recent Op-Ed column in the Los Angeles Times, If the Dodger Stadium Gondola is Only the Beginning, What Becomes of Elysian Park as has the Neighborhood Council Sustainability Alliance.

(Jack Humphreville writes LA Watchdog for CityWatch. He is the President of the DWP Advocacy Committee, the Budget and DWP representative for the Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council, and a Neighborhood Council Budget Advocate. He can be reached at: lajack@gmail.com.)

Tourism Rider Estimate Methodology

Tourism ridership would be driven by the proposed Project capturing a share of the existing tourism market in Los Angeles, particularly for tourists to downtown Los Angeles visiting other attractions.

Based on HR&A's evaluation of comparables, attached to this appendix memorandum, with the most similarity to the context of the proposed Project and an evaluation of the tourist market of Los Angeles County, they estimate that the proposed Project would capture they estimated an annual tourist ridership of 915,000.

Tourism ridership would not be consistent on a daily basis and would be variable depending on the seasonality of tourism in Downtown Los Angeles. However, in a tourism market as large as Los



Angeles, the variation is not expected to be substantial, so in order to estimate average daily tourist riders, Fehr & Peers divided the annual number by 365 since the proposed Project would operate every day of the year. On game days, riders destined for Dodger Stadium would receive priority boardings, and so tourist related riders were factored down on game days to account for the hours of Stadium attendee focused service.

...more projects,

4. The Project will not benefit from or compete against Metro, the County, City, or any other local jurisdiction within the County for state, federal, or other public funds to design, build, or operate the Project or otherwise fulfill Community Benefits Agreement requirements without the written consent of the competing jurisdiction, the Project will not seek or benefit from direct appropriations, and the Project will not seek or benefit from a bond issuance from Metro, the County, City, or any other local jurisdiction within the County;

5. ZET adopts and adheres to an advertising display content policy that is consistent with Metro, City, County, Caltrans, and State Park's respective advertisement policy, including any future updates to such policies, and will abide by the pertinent local jurisdiction's digital display and lighting policies for outdoor advertising signs;

London

🕒 This article is more than 11 years old

London cable car will leave public high and dry, say critics

Opponents claim Emirates Air Line hands prime advertising to corporation while taxpayers pay for 'impractical' transport link



📷 The Emirates Air Line rises across the Thames from north Greenwich. Photograph: Lewis Whyld/PA

Gwyn Topham and Marishka Van Steenberg

Thu 19 Apr 2012 06.44 EDT

The metallic booms across Greenwich this week signalled that work was almost complete on the three towers of London's newest landmark, sounding out over the Thames like futuristic minarets. At the base of one of the white steel edifices traversing the river from north Greenwich, a protective brace was being fitted to guard Boris Johnson's latest transport conceit - the [Emirates Air Line](#) - from errant boats.

According to the [London](#) mayor this grandly titled cable car, looming up to 90 metres over the O₂ car parks and decaying industrial estates of Silvertown, is another step to regenerating the area. Beyond the yuppie

flats that flank the docks are boroughs where more than 50% of children live in poverty. But critics fear it may prove a white elephant to rival the ill-fated Millennium Dome.

A project that was supposed to be delivered by private sponsorship has ended up being largely funded by the public purse after costs ballooned from an early estimate of £25m to more than £60m. Meanwhile the sponsors, Emirates, have made their way on to London's tube map - breaking, opponents say, pledges to keep the capital's transport infrastructure free from such indignity - while footing barely half the bill.

The cable car has bagged two prestigious names in the capital for its money. Passengers can leave Emirates North Greenwich to land at Emirates Royal Docks - with no mention of Queen Victoria, who usually gives her name to the area.

Mindful of the embarrassment a failure to deliver would bring, [Transport](#) for London continues to refrain from any pledge that the cable car will be ready for the 2012 Games, despite the bulk of the infrastructure being in place. Weeks of testing will be needed before the cabins are attached.

Official projections are that 2 million people will use the cable car each year. The 1,150-metre journey along the cables across the Thames will take five minutes, potentially carrying about 2,000 people an hour in both directions, with a 10-person cabin leaving every 30 seconds. That, reckon TfL, is roughly equivalent to 30 buses an hour, and flying ones at that.

According to Danny Price, TfL's operations manager for Emirates Air Line, it is by no means mainly for tourists. "It's very much an integrated part of the London transport network - a key interchange for two key London locations, and born of the need to transfer people over the river - particularly on the east side," he said. "The O₂ is the most popular entertainment centre in the UK and Excel is the busiest conference centre venue in Europe."

Opponents disagree. Caroline Pidgeon, leader of the Liberal Democrats in the London assembly and chair of the committee scrutinising transport in the capital, said: "While the cable car will be an attractive addition to London's skyline I question whether it will provide a practical transport link for many people on a daily basis."

While it will briefly link two Olympic venues this summer - gymnastics and basketball at the O₂ (renamed North Greenwich Arena for the Games),

and combat sports at the Excel exhibition centre - it was, on a spring weekday in the sparsely populated docks, hard to spot much potential traffic.

Near the O₂, Samantha Dissanayake, 31, a financial adviser from Woolwich, said: "We've got plenty of ways to get across the river so if its going to cost loads of money I think that money could be used elsewhere."

Andrei Ciobana, 28, a pharmacist from Shooters Hill, said: "I don't think a lot of people will use it, but tourists are definitely going to use it, everyone wants to see the new thing. But I'm not sure if people who work here are going to. People might use it if the tube has problems."

Necessary or not, the Air Line has already been bracketed as another mayoral transport project whose optimistic promises of private funding have failed to match spiralling costs, alongside Boris bikes and [neo-Routemasters](#) that are still tantalisingly absent from most London bus routes.

Pidgeon said: "When fare rises have been hiked up so much by [Boris Johnson](#) many people will now question why he has failed to deliver on his pledge not to pour public money into the cable car."

Price, though, said it was a neat solution to the challenge of how to move people across the river. "TfL realised this could be delivered in a very short amount of time compared to other modes - construction started only 12 months ago."

Fares are yet to be set. TfL says ticketing will be compatible with Oyster travel cards and comparable to the riverboat model, which suggests it will cost between £3-5 for a single, with possible discounts for regular users.

"It is a completely unique and exciting travel experience for London. People will take it to heart as a new iconic and dynamic landmark," said Price. "At 90 metres you're going to have stunning views of London - right over to the arch of Wembley." He recommends timing a visit with the sun going down for maximum effect. For sunsets, at least, few should argue it beats the tube.

Communication from Public

Name: Coalition for a Beautiful Los Angeles
Date Submitted: 03/22/2024 05:41 AM
Council File No: 24-0011-S4
Comments for Public Posting: Please submit the attached letter on behalf of Coalition for a Beautiful Los Angeles in support of Councilmember Hernandez's motion; Council File 24-0011-S4.

Coalition for a Beautiful Los Angeles

Defend our Public Spaces • Protect Our Visual Environment

March 22, 2024

Los Angeles City Council
Los Angeles City Hall
200 North Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Submitted via Council File Public Comment Portal:

<https://cityclerk.lacity.org/publiccomment/?cfnumber=24-0011-S4>

RE: CF 24-0011-S4 / Council Agenda March 22, 2024 – Item number 15
SUPPORT Motion to study alternatives to the LA ART Gondola project

Dear Councilmembers:

The Coalition for a Beautiful Los Angeles (Coalition), established in 1986, is a non-profit organization dedicated to preserving, protecting and enhancing the scenic beauty and visual character of Los Angeles through education, outreach, and advocacy. We ask that you vote in support of Councilmember Hernandez's motion to study alternatives to the Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit (LA ART) project (Project) and suspend any action on approving advancements to the Project contingent upon those results.

Coalition board members testified at the recent Metro Board meeting when the Project's environmental document was certified without acknowledgement of Councilmember Hernandez' request that action be deferred pending the completion of the traffic alternatives analysis currently before Council.

In addition for the need to study alternative transit options and traffic mitigation measures, the Coalition is concerned about the Project's negative impacts on our City's visual environment as seen in the projected loss of hundreds of trees, the installation of Gondola supports and stations with "naming opportunities," which are visual blight in the form of advertising messaging, and for its impact on State historic parkland and the residential communities nearby. As proposed, many of the negative impacts cannot be mitigated and if the Project is implemented will be experienced for decades to come.

The City has acknowledged the importance of our urban forest and its role in diminishing the heat island effect, in providing much needed shade and refuge from the growing impacts of climate change, and for the many additional contributions that mature trees provide our city, including critical habitat for biological resources – from tiny insects to birds large and small and ground dwelling animals that seek refuge in our trees.

UCLA's Mobility Lab Study of October 24, 2022 provided evidence that the Project as proposed would not accomplish its stated goals of reducing greenhouse gas emissions associated with the event-focused traffic demands related to Dodger Stadium. It is extremely fortunate that Councilmember Hernandez has offered to provide funding for a comprehensive traffic assessment of the area surrounding Dodger Stadium. It is incumbent upon the City to ascertain the environmental viability of the Project and specifically whether there are feasible alternatives to an aerial transit system.

*200 S. Barrington Ave., Box 49583, Los Angeles, CA 90049
losangelesbeautiful@gmail.com*

As the organization leading the fight against billboard blight in Los Angeles, the Coalition is particularly concerned about the lack of evidence to demonstrate the financial viability of the Project. The City cannot overlook the fact that “naming opportunities” have been incorporated into the Project. “Naming opportunities” are another way to create advertising blight that will be plastered on support structures, transit stations and on the gondola cabins themselves as they fly over City streets, residences and historic parkland.

For the reasons stated in this letter, the Coalition fully supports CF 24-0011-S4 and its proposed study of transportation alternatives to Dodger Stadium from Union Station. No additional actions should be taken to advance the Project until an independent and comprehensive traffic assessment has been completed.

Thank you for your consideration,



Barbara Broide
Co-President



Wendy-Sue Rosen
Co-President

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 03/22/2024 12:27 AM

Council File No: 24-0011-s4

Comments for Public Posting: Is there a need for more transportation, where we have our feet, as well as other vehicular means to get from one place to another? If a person wishes to view a place, then they truly should see it in person by, well, walking to it. It is very much possible— the gondola will only act as an invasion of privacy to areas in which privacy is much preferred. Is my neighbor to be treated as just a site to see? I wholeheartedly support council member Hernandez's decision. Please, do not make our neighborhood increasingly expensive to live in— it is a struggle, especially for the elders, to make do with increasing prices. This project will undoubtedly increase costs of living, and we cannot afford for this to happen to our residents.

Communication from Public

Name: Diane Tan

Date Submitted: 03/22/2024 12:47 AM

Council File No: 24-0011-S4

Comments for Public Posting: I am Diane Tan, a long-time community and civil rights advocate, especially in L.A. Chinatown. I fully support the Motion in Item #15 of allocating the necessary funds to contract a consultant in order to require a traffic assessment on the community impact zones around Dodger Stadium in Council District One, and the suspension of any action approving advancements to the proposed LA ART Gondola Project contingent upon the results and recommendations from the updated Dodger Stadium Traffic Assessment and any other subsequently needed action. An over \$500 million 1.2 mile aerial gondola system between Union Station and the Dodger Stadium property clearly is not an effective means of reducing traffic congestion or pollution, as contended by the proponents of the LA ART Gondola Project. It will permanently create more environmental problems by diverting traffic and parking needs to Chinatown and nearby areas. This massive and obtrusive system for such a short distance is not essential, extremely costly, invasive, and will significantly and permanently harm the historic cultural neighborhoods along its route, and the environment. It also sets a bad precedent to allow this private entity to privatize and usurp public air space and property for their own personal gain under the guise of being a solution, instead of the instigator of greater present and future harm and problems. There still exists many significant and unresolved issues and concerns regarding this project's substantial negative impact on the environment and the public's health, safety, and welfare. An updated Dodger Stadium Traffic Assessment and less costly and more viable alternative solutions that will not seriously or significantly harm the environment or adversely affect the various historic cultural neighborhoods must be explored and considered. This motion in Item 15 should be approved.

Communication from Public

Name: Sophat Phea

Date Submitted: 03/22/2024 12:50 AM

Council File No: 24-0011-s4

Comments for Public Posting: I'm voting in support of the motion to complete the traffic study. I grew up here in Chinatown. My mom also has a small shop in Chinatown for just over 20 years, and we both came to the recent Metro Board Meeting in opposition of the Gondola in Chinatown but unfortunately didn't get called up to speak. So many small businesses aren't doing so well in Chinatown including my mom. One of the biggest reason is the horrible parking situation. The Gondola will only make it worst, taking up parking space, and increase traffic. Recently, over 20 small businesses in Chinatown have signed a petition against the Gondola project. As Chinatown continue to be targeted by developers and continue to be gentrified, adding a Gondola will also increase homelessness, displace small businesses, and unhoused residents. So many are at risk already.