

THESE MINUTES ARE NOT OFFICIAL UNTIL APPROVED BY
THE CULVER CITY STANDING MOBILITY SUBCOMMITTEE

SPECIAL MEETING OF THE CULVER CITY
STANDING MOBILITY SUBCOMMITTEE
CULVER CITY, CALIFORNIA

May 12, 2026
6:00 p.m.

Call to Order & Roll Call

Mayor Puza called the special meeting of the Standing Mobility Subcommittee to order at 6:04 p.m. in the Dan Patacchia Meeting Room at City Hall.

Present: Freddy Puza, Mayor
 Bubba Fish, Vice Mayor

Staff Present: Andrew Maximous, Public Works Mobility & Traffic
 Engineering Manager
 Elizabeth Garcia, Community Development Project
 Manager
 Henry Phipps, Senior Transportation Planner
 Alicia Ide, Public Works Senior Management Analyst
 Wallis Nash, Public Works Senior Management Analyst
 Jeremy Marks, Transportation Management Analyst

o0o

Pledge of Allegiance

Mayor Puza the Pledge of Allegiance.

o0o

Community Announcements by Members

None.

o0o

Information Items from Staff

Andrew Maximous, Mobility and Transportation Manager, announced the Tri-School Mobility Study Workshop #3 on May 27 at the Senior Center; discussed parking under the 405 freeway; and retention of the protected bike lane.

Discussion ensued between staff and Subcommittee Members regarding the need to get the proper approvals for the bike lane under the 405 freeway; design recommendations; and staff agreement to research previously flagged safety concerns.

oOo

Public Comment - Items NOT on the Agenda

Mayor Puza invited public comment.

Alicia Ide, Senior Management Analyst, read the Culver City statement on hate speech and decorum; reminded everyone that speakers must sign up to speak before the agenda item is called; and discussed procedures to sign up.

The following members of the public addressed the Subcommittee:

Janet Hoult provided background on herself; reported serving on the Disability Advisory Committee (DAC); discussed sidewalk and street repair; she asked that staff ensure that changes do not make it harder for the elderly and the disabled to get around; and she provided a copy of her poem about speaking for the disabled to staff to be included in the record.

Monica Richardson discussed friends who have become injured due to falling in Culver City; reported that Glendale was removing their bike lanes; asserted that the road behind Rotary Plaza needed to be addressed; she asked the City to address issues as soon as possible; and, responding to inquiry, she indicated that she would provide the location where the person fell at the Car Show.

David Coles discussed Bus to School Day on April 17 put on by the Green Committee at La Ballona Elementary School; he reported that the bus drivers were incredibly kind to the students, some of whom were first-time riders; discussed the Go Pass program; and he requested a presentation on the Go Pass program indicating how many CCUSD students have registered.

Bryan Sanders expressed concern and surprise around the Tri-School Study; discussed efforts to revive the protected bike lane idea despite the fact that the consultants did not recommend it; assurances to residents that the process would be data-driven; the focus on preferred political outcomes rather than findings; concern with spending taxpayer money on consultants and studies when they are ignored if they conflict with ideology; and undermining public confidence with the appearance of a pre-determined outcome.

Joy Rodriguez discussed understanding what working families have to deal with; policies that affect how people do their shopping and get kids to school and activities; the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (BPAP); the percentage of people in Culver City who commute to work by driving vs. the percentage of people who ride a bicycle; the importance of street parking to families living in apartment buildings; and she asserted that taking away parking would not result in families taking the bus, rather they would circle the streets looking for parking.

Melissa Sanders echoed comments from the previous speakers; discussed concern that mobility in Culver City only means bicycles noting the many other modes of travel available; addressing options for the aging and disabled population; concern with promises made; the job of City Council Members to represent all residents; the need to look at mobility as a whole; and she asserted that the consultants had agreed that the bike lanes did not need to be protected.

Mary Daval discussed the parking inventory on Washington by the Arts District done by staff that did not take parking behind businesses into account; use of the same process to assess parking on Overland; concern with not getting the full picture of what parking is available; and buildings on Sepulveda with parking behind them.

Marta Valdez displayed photographs of cemented bike lanes going in; discussed accessible parking; the inability for an access van ramp to go over the curb; space provided in between; lack of a guarantee that parking will be available at the opening; and she asserted that the proposed changes were not safe.

Tamar Fuhrer expressed support for traffic calming in Sunkist Park as a condition for the Sepulveda Connects project; discussed the last design workshop; support for the safety mitigation provided; vacancies in the Transportation Department; the importance of ensuring that the department is fully staffed and funded in the budget; and she noted that the Beloit Gate was still locked though it was supposed to be opened when the Jackson Gate was opened to provide safer access for the elementary school.

Alicia Ide, Senior Management Analyst, noted that Los Angeles has jurisdiction and has indicated that they are not interested in opening the Beloit Gate.

Jack Galanty indicated being a disabled cyclist using the streets of Culver City; discussed curb protected bike lanes that provide

a feeling of safety; cars that drive too fast; a recent Ghost Bike event for cyclists who were killed by speeding drivers; encouraging older residents to use bicycles; and he expressed support for expanding access and ways to get around Culver City.

Ed Conway asked for the name of the agency funding the request noting that his goal is to stop the funding and to flood the committee with letters asking for a denial of the grant.

Discussion ensued between staff and Subcommittee Members regarding accessibility; City Council review of different options for the Overland project; the request for options for accessibility treatments and accommodations; the narrative being cited that the consultants did not recommend bike lanes; specific enhancements to be proposed at the next Committee meeting; and procedures for the public to submit maintenance requests for sidewalk displacement or maintenance issues.

o0o

Receive and File Correspondence

MOVED BY VICE MAYOR FISH, SECONDED BY MAYOR PUZA AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED, THAT THE STANDING MOBILITY SUBCOMMITTEE RECEIVE AND FILE CORRESPONDENCE.

o0o

Consent Calendar Items

Item C-1

Approval of Minutes for the March 31, 2026

MOVED BY VICE MAYOR FISH, SECONDED BY MAYOR PUZA AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED, THAT THE STANDING MOBILITY SUBCOMMITTEE APPROVE MINUTES FOR THE SPECIAL MEETING OF MARCH 31, 2026.

o0o

Action Items

Item A-1

- (1) Discuss the Town Plaza Use Policy and Mobility Signage; and**
- (2) Provide Direction to Staff**

Elizabeth Garcia, Economic Development Project Manager, discussed the Town Plaza Use Policy and current mobility signage; limiting operation of bicycles and non-motorized devices to the fire lane; encouragement for cyclists to dismount their bicycles outside of the fire lane; and the staff recommendation to remove current signage to provide consistency with current policy.

Discussion ensued between staff and Subcommittee Members regarding clarification on the location of the fire lane.

Mayor Puza invited public input.

The following members of the public addressed the Subcommittee:

David Coles noted the importance of having signage match policy; discussed confusion; security guards working there who follow the signage; children being reprimanded; and allowing people to use common sense to not ride in the area when there is a crowd.

Bryan Sanders urged care in using the signage to normalize a broader mobility agenda; discussed the space meant to balance public use; limits on bikes and non-motorized devices; he felt that signage should clarify existing rules on how to interact in public space not be a way to message for advocacy on various issues important to Council Members; and he expressed concern with ideological policy.

Mary Daval indicated that they had been waiting for years to get the signage to align with policy; discussed enforcement; the unmarked fire lane; consideration of the location of the bike racks in the middle of Town Plaza; and she acknowledged that while she had never had an issue it was important to look at potential problems.

Jack Galanty indicated speaking as an individual; noted the location of bike racks in the center of Town Plaza; discussed people who have difficulty dismounting; and the importance of ensuring that signage is clear so that security guards do not yell at people.

Discussion ensued between staff and Subcommittee Members regarding signage that encourages dismounting; location of the bike racks that signals people to ride to the bike racks; a suggestion to remove the signs, monitor and add new signage if issues are identified; collaboration with Steps management and security; rider confusion with out of date signage; ensuring that everyone can get around safely; ensuring against people being intimidated by speeding cyclists; the fancy Town Plaza bike racks; limited

space; ensuring sufficient space for activities; previous plans for mobility stations that did not come to fruition; support for not having signage and monitoring the situation with a report back in 6 months; allowing use of common sense; being mindful of use of public space; heavy summer usage of the space; City Hall courtyard signage; and staff agreement to provide an update with possibilities for signage at City Hall.

o0o

Item A-2

(1) Discuss a Ban on Drive-Thru Operations in Culver City; and (2) Provide Input to Staff

Peer Chacko, Senior Planner, provided presentation on a potential ban of drive-thru operations in Culver City.

Mayor Puza invited public comment.

The following members of the public addressed the Subcommittee:

Vanessa Martin expressed appreciation for the leadership in consideration of the ban; discussed economic modeling indicating that drive-thrus bring little revenue into cities; concern with causing more economic harm than money generated; and people with disabilities who cannot drive and usually walk.

Alicia Ide, Senior Management Analyst, indicated that speakers could submit their comments to Council Members.

Paul Hewitt expressed strong support for a drive-thru ban on any new restaurants in Culver City; discussed General Plan 2045; the number of drive-thrus in Culver City and In-N-Out Burgers in the area; concern with traffic and undermining Culver City's climate and air quality goals; and he wanted to know reasons why any elected or appointed officials might oppose a ban.

Morgan Schwartz expressed support for a ban; felt that Culver City did not need any more drive-thrus; noted that promoting car culture would be contrary to goals of being a walkable city; asserted that drive-thrus were pollution machines; discussed negative impacts to having drive-thrus near schools; and he proposed that if there is not an outright ban, that limitations be imposed to ensure they are a certain distance from schools.

Bryan Sanders encouraged the Subcommittee not to move forward with a blanket ban; asserted that not every drive-thru proposal created

the same impacts; discussed situations where nearby residents have legitimate concerns; the need for a thoughtful case-by-case review; preserving optionality and local discretion; projects that could work with proper circulation planning, buffering, operational limits or conditional approvals; and Council Members that move forward toward broad ideological transportation policy rather than balanced planning.

Melissa Sanders did not feel that all drive-thrus had the same impact; expressed support for a blanket ban on large fast-food retailers in Culver City; discussed the need to examine benefits and negatives; looking at long-term impacts of changes; and she did not want to see one-size-fits-all planning.

Juliet Chang expressed support for the City's vision to create more walkable neighborhoods and orienting toward more public transit; discussed building additional higher density housing; being a transit oriented community; support for some version of a drive-thru ban; drive-thrus as creating pedestrian flow and safety issues; she proposed a walk-up window instead; discussed land near transit hubs that could be used for additional housing units, stores, outdoor dining or wider sidewalks; money spent on transit infrastructure; concern with undermining investment by signaling that the area is primarily oriented toward drivers; support for a school adjacency ban; and plentiful access to drive-thrus around Culver City.

Leah Pressman expressed support for a blanket ban; discussed the 2026 State of the Air Report; unhealthy air that affects everyone; smog from idling vehicles; wasted fuel; and she shared figures for saving fuel and reducing emissions.

Tamar Fuhrer voiced support for the second option to designate specific areas for no drive-thrus rather than a blanket policy; discussed land use; use of drive-thrus in the City of Los Angeles with no benefit to Culver City; concern with putting in more restrictions that could impact revenue sources and the budget; and traffic impacts of places with more parking.

Jack Gallanty proposed examination of requiring the addition of walk-up windows and trees planted for new builds to help offset environmental concerns.

Jennifer Barbot indicated speaking on behalf of other families in her neighborhood in opposition to the In-N-Out being proposed for Jefferson and Sepulveda; noted the availability of other fast food in the area; asked that something healthy be put in the location instead; she indicated being part of the Walk 'n Rollers; and her

son stated that he did not want to see another fast food restaurant in the community as it is not good for their health.

Alicia Ide, Senior Management Analyst, reported an additional request to speak received after the Item had commenced.

Mayor Puza indicated that he would allow the speaker to provide comment noting that it was not usually permitted and would not be allowed in the meeting after this.

Anthony Burnett expressed support for a ban on drive-thrus in Culver City; discussed drive-thrus that spill into the street and create traffic; dangers posed by adjacency to the elementary school; the sales pitch that there will be no spillage of traffic that is not an accurate representation of the product being sold; maintaining financial liquidity; drive-thrus that create hotspots of pollution that are not measured on busy roads; and arguments about cleanliness.

Discussion ensued between staff and Subcommittee Members regarding appreciation for the presentation; metrics for drive-thru restaurants vs. non drive-thru restaurants; the study conducted before and after the pandemic; habits that changed during the pandemic; application of a city-wide vs. a focused approach to all new development; grandfathering existing uses; the ability to have a retroactive policy; the intent to focus policy on new builds; the actions of Minneapolis to pass a city-wide ordinance because it did not match their 2040 plan; goals around emissions, safety, and creating an accessible Culver City that are in conflict with drive-thrus; concern with over-complicating things in City government; sweeping impacts of car-centric design on health and wellness; projects that exacerbate fossil fuel emissions and create dangerous pedestrian zones; creating a future that goes beyond car-dependency and does not include drive-thrus; creation of a 15-minute City; and appreciation for the public comment received.

Additional discussion ensued between staff and Subcommittee Members regarding number of applications for drive-thrus received; places in Culver City that are not residential or near schools; the question of what kind of urban environment Culver City is planning for in the next 20-30 years; climate goals; efforts to build a walkable City; public health concerns; support for moving a ban forward; next steps; and a potential timeline to move the item forward.

o0o

Item A-3

(1) Receive a Presentation on the Rancho Higuera NTMP (Neighborhood Traffic Management Program); and (2) Provide Input to Staff

Andrew Maximous, Mobility and Transportation Manager provided a presentation on the Rancho Higuera NTMP (Neighborhood Traffic Management Program); discussed the history of the project; goals outlined for Phase 2; the plan for the study; existing conditions; strategies for Phase 2 including vehicle traffic calming, pedestrian, and bicycle safety; different scenarios proposed; the unique neighborhood layout; the goal to keep people in the periphery; the resident-driven process; resident requests for a full closure; the current diverter; current signage; and next steps.

Discussion ensued between staff and Subcommittee Members regarding clarification on the ability to have a full or half-closure at Lindblade; neighborhood impact; addressing peak traffic times; type of signage for turn restrictions; the intent to not make any of the streets one way; concern with the closure on Lucerne causing backup into the neighborhoods; preventing intrusion; integration into navigation apps; the "nuclear option" that cuts the neighborhood in two with a physical restriction for cars at Lucerne and Higuera; provisions for emergency vehicles to get through; increased driving time; addressing increased backup onto Duquesne; concern with not having a light on Duquesne with the proposed scenario; and availability of maps and all presentations on the website.

Mayor Puza invited public comment.

The following members of the public addressed the Subcommittee:

Bryan Sanders expressed support for allowing residents to have a voice with neighbor-driven planning; discussed residents' lived experiences; the Rancho Higuera discussion; neighborhood quality of life issues; the Tri-School Study; and he asked that the Elenda neighborhood be treated like the residents in Rancho Higuera are being treated.

Melissa Sanders was called to speak but was not present in person or online.

Jack Galanty indicated speaking as an individual; expressed support for scenario B1 or B2; opposed scenario B3 as he felt it was too restrictive; discussed the importance of providing access for future development in the area; improving safety; traffic

calming tools; allowing bicycle access while limiting vehicle movements; effective use of physical infrastructure to make a meaningful difference in the area; and use of similar measures in other cities.

Eric Lifshiz indicated living in the neighborhood; expressed support for scenario A; questioned who the residents in support of option B were; proposed mailers to get real resident feedback; discussed gridlock concern with closing off cut-through traffic; the line extending into the freeway for people getting off; and he wanted to ensure the neighborhood is truly consulted before something more drastic is implemented.

Beth Lane, Rancho Higuera Neighborhood Association, provided background on the process; discussed appreciation for funding the consultants; the presentation provided on April 30; echoed previous comments about the need to canvas the community; support for sending a mailer to every household; concern with blocking off Wesley, Schaeffer and Helms that was not a part of Phase 2; refinements being made to Phase 1; emergency services; concern that the fire lane off of Higuera has been overlooked; and resident support for bollards at the cul de sac at Hayden and Higuera in Phase 2 since 2016.

Alicia Ide, Senior Management Analyst, indicated that written comments were provided to Council Members.

Discussion ensued between staff and Subcommittee Members regarding appreciation for the resident-driven process; plans for additional outreach; making options as clear as possible; submission of comments; options to address issues that residents raised; the 10 year process; ensuring safety is a priority over convenience; understanding resident sentiment; data for certain intersections; examination of the larger area to see how traffic would be dispersed; allowing time for people to make adjustments; and surveys vs. outreach meetings.

o0o

Item A-4

(1) Receive and Discuss a Presentation on the Proposed Renewal of a Temporary Use Agreement with Lux Bus American Co. for the Temporary Use of a Shared Bus Stop by Apple's Commuter Shuttle; and (2) Provide Direction to Staff

Jeremy Marks, Transportation Planner, introduced Senior Transportation Planner, Henry Phipps and provided a presentation

on the proposed renewal of a Temporary Use Agreement with Lux Bus American Co. for the temporary use of a shared bus stop by Apple's commuter shuttle; discussed providing a forum to address questions and concerns; incidental use of the shared mobility lane for active loading; verified data indicating that most stop events last about 45 seconds; a provision allowing the City to cancel the agreement at any time; continuation of the initial limited-scope agreement; and changes in the proposed agreement.

Mayor Puza invited public comment.

The following members of the public addressed the Subcommittee:

Bryan Sanders discussed neighborhood engagement and consistency with the City's approach to mobility issues; repeated attempts to install a bike lane on Elenda; the proposal to remove mature trees; and he asked for the same high-level nuanced engagement with residents and ongoing dialogue with stakeholders to be extended to the Elenda neighborhood.

Mary Daval expressed appreciation for the report that answered many questions; observed that the renewal did not specifically mention the fee; noted increased costs for everything overall; and felt that Apple could afford to pay more as well.

Jack Galanty discussed concern with a private company using restricted public streets; the annual fee that he felt should go directly to the Mobility Fund; asserted that the fee should grow, noting increased pavement stress and degrading pavement coloring and paint with the heavy buses; and accelerating the frequency of painting of the lanes.

Discussion ensued between staff and Subcommittee Members regarding appreciation to staff for their work on the item; clarification that the shuttles are limited to pulling into the shared lane for the bus stop; the agreement that clarifies that they are not permitted to use the bus lane for anything other than the bus stop at the specified location; the redesign of MOVE Culver City; shared space; cyclists that can be stuck behind buses and buses that can be slowed down by bicycles; scrutiny for usage by a private company; partnership with a large job provider in Culver City; concern with the low fee currently being charged; exploration of other solutions; negative response from the Shay Hotel; and reports from Apple of previous opposition from the City to the original Apple proposal of a bus/bay on National.

Additional discussion ensued between staff and Subcommittee Members regarding the new fee being proposed; retroactive

implementation; procedures for earmarking funding; support for finding another space; amount of the fee for use of the bus stop; instructions to shuttle drivers to pull over and allow use of the active transportation lane by other users; complaints or concerns related to use of the facility; understanding frequency of the two shuttles being run in the system; concern with blocking buses from using the stop; the ability to gather data through the ABLE (Automated Bus Lane/Stop Enforcement) Program; the current agreement that includes a provision for Apple to compensate for any kind of damage to City infrastructure; exploration of options for alternative locations; negotiations with Apple; and staff agreement to provide additional information to the Subcommittee.

oOo

Item A-5

(1) Receive a Presentation and Discuss the Automated Bus Lane/Stop Enforcement (ABLE) Program's First Year of Operation; and (2) Provide Direction to Staff

Jeremy Marks, Transportation Planner, provided a presentation on the ABLE Program.

Discussion ensued between staff and Subcommittee Members regarding net revenue; AB 1837; state legislation regarding enforcement of parking violations in bike lanes; City Council approval to expand the program; and potential revenue generated.

Mayor Puza invited public comment.

The following members of the public addressed the Subcommittee:

David Coles indicated that he had not seen much change in driver behavior; expressed appreciation for the transparency to see that enforcement is happening; discussed lack of a change in driver behavior; the goal of compliance; questioned whether there were repeat violators; and he indicated that he still sees a lot of violations.

Bryan Sanders expressed support for keeping bus stops clear and ensuring that transit riders can safely access public transportation; discussed high concentrations observed in the areas with dramatic changes to circulation patterns and roadway configurations over the past several years; questioned the goals in designing systems; and he noted that some projects received a hands-on, nuanced, cooperative approach while others did not.

Tamar Fuhrer indicated being a former employee who worked on the ABLE project; expressed appreciation for the data; discussed lack of a change to behavior; disappointment that the primary goal of the program was not being met; engineering, education, and enforcement; use of revenue generated to help behavior change; appreciation for the work done; and she hoped that the next update would reflect fewer violations.

Jack Galanty indicated speaking as an individual; felt that clear signage should be posted in the ABLE sections of the bus/bike lanes reflecting the amount of the penalty; and he proposed expansion of automated enforcement.

Discussion ensued between staff and Subcommittee Members regarding repeat violators; delivery trucks that treat the violations as the cost of doing business; Uber and Lyft drivers dropping people off who are one-time visitors; hot spots; placement of revenue generated in an operating fund for the Culver City Police Department (CCPD) as any traffic ticket fine would be; SB 720; transferring red light camera violations and ABLE violations to the Transportation Department; no parking signs and red curbs; outreach to One Culver which is a hot spot; support for signage indicating that cameras are being used and reflecting the fine amount; and use of money for Safe Streets infrastructure in the area.

Additional discussion ensued between staff and Subcommittee Members regarding expected timeframe to see a change in driving behavior; looking at other education opportunities; outreach and the grace period during the initial roll out of the program; timeframe to receive another update; state legislation; lack of an update if the governor's program sunsets; receipt of an update twice annually if the program continues; increased costs with the use of additional cameras; money already budgeted for additional cameras; doubling the workload of the analysts; and City Council consideration of SB 720.

o0o

Item A-6

(1) Receive a Presentation, Discuss and Make Recommendations for Proposed Regulations and Processes to Facilitate the Operation of Robotic Delivery Devices in Culver City; and (2) Provide Direction to Staff

Wallis Nash, Senior Management Analyst, provided a presentation on proposed regulations and processes for personal delivery devices.

Discussion ensued between staff and Subcommittee Members regarding revenue sharing for advertising on the units; clarification that there would not be an RFP (Request for Proposals); keeping the process open to as many vendors as want to participate while regulating the number of units in the City; application for a use agreement; and use of the public right of way.

Mayor Puza invited public comment.

The following members of the public addressed the Subcommittee:

Kelly Jones, Serve Robotics, expressed gratitude to staff and the Subcommittee for their efforts, partnership and consideration to move things forward.

Carl Hansen, Coco, thanked the Subcommittee and staff for their efforts; provided background on the company; discussed their vision; using advertising to keep costs competitive; usage in other cities; addressing the unique municipal boundaries of Culver City; keeping insurance comparable to what other area cities have; and he proposed allowing staff authority to keep vehicle caps flexible if things are going well.

Discussion ensued between staff and Subcommittee Members regarding use of administrative regulations rather than a policy or ordinance due to quickly changing technology; and possible need for an ordinance change related to allowing advertising.

Bryan Sanders felt that Culver City should pause and consider priorities before moving forward with a robotic delivery program to use the sidewalks; discussed requirements for well-maintained roadways, ramps, and sidewalks to operate properly; residents struggling with deteriorating walking conditions in Culver City; and he expressed concern with allowing an operational easement for robots on the same infrastructure that human beings already cannot safely use.

Melissa Sanders felt the robots would get damaged by sidewalks needing repair; discussed concern with the Subcommittee's lack of prioritizing sidewalk maintenance and repair; introducing more hazards to cars and pedestrians; and she proposed that if a program is introduced that it be limited to downtown Culver City.

Jack Galanty expressed support for the program with annual operating fees and advertising revenue going directly to the Mobility Fund; discussed the funding opportunity to fix sidewalks; he felt that companies benefitting from the use of sidewalks should

be required to maintain and improve them; and he discussed the policies of West Hollywood.

Tamar Fuhrer reported seeing the robots on a daily basis as an employee of West Hollywood; discussed the compounded impact of modest improvements; administrative burden on staff; and she indicated that their department would be happy to share information with Public Works staff noting that Santa Monica would likely be willing to do the same.

Discussion ensued between staff and Subcommittee Members regarding prior consultation with West Hollywood and Santa Monica; general support for the program; initial issues; required staff management; complaint-driven enforcement of regulations; standard requirements for operations in Culver City; the per hour, per staff person placeholder fee for the new permit; the business license fee; concern with pricing the service out of the market if high fee imposed; data sharing with cameras that document sidewalk quality; revenue-sharing with advertising; allowing the pilot program to get up and running; tying fees to staff time; the special permit for the regulations specific to the industry; insurance requirements; review by Risk Management; regulation issues items taken on a case-by-case basis; transport of restricted items; and City liability.

Additional discussion ensued between staff and Subcommittee Members regarding device regulations; ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) compliance; establishing a timeframe to attend to malfunctions; storage of devices out of the way of sidewalks; restaurants that will have to come up with an alternate storage and/or loading location; the limited travel radius; standard speed and size; providing contact information for reporting violations on the bots; and device size.

Further discussion ensued between company representatives, staff, and Subcommittee Members regarding privacy issues; current data storage policy; insurance and liability claims; overnight storage; location and number of drop-off locations; the ability for businesses to opt in and opt out; putting a plan in place for operational review by fire and police; the ability to restrict device use during filming; geofencing; the special permitting process; penalties for non-compliance; geography; the desire to operate through Culver City to get to surrounding areas; company assessment of what areas in Culver City work for them; the ability to narrow down use locations if complaints are received; vendor mapping of areas before operation for viability; real time updated data on sidewalk quality; recommendations vs. receipt of data; liability; making plans to address issues; anonymous data shared

in an application used by the visually impaired community navigating the public realm; audible noise from the device for the those seeming confused or impaired around the device; and the increased City budget for sidewalk repair.

Discussion ensued between company representatives, staff, and Subcommittee Members regarding possibly limiting the number of robots that serve Culver City; allowing businesses in surrounding areas to have their bots cross through Culver City; the number of bots allowed in other cities; dispersal of units throughout Culver City; delivery to the property line; determining the number of units for the pilot; limiting the number of robots that can be within Culver City at a time; reducing the availability of robots; the ability to put in restrictions if complaints are received; the ability to set a cap if too many robots are coming in; addressing issues in real time; and allowing staff to enact potential regulations without having to come back to the City Council.

Additional discussion ensued between company representatives, staff, and Subcommittee Members regarding revenue-sharing; the need to authorize the City Attorney to make potential changes in the current code; changes authorized for the kiosks; creation of an ordinance exemption; potential advertising regulations; understanding the financial benefit of the ads to Culver City; restricting ads to Culver City businesses; consideration to not allow ads for the first year and monitor; concern with limiting service in Culver City; clarification that not every robot has an ad on it; other cities that limit or do not allow advertising; potential amount of ad revenue; information coming back when the item is considered by the City Council; promotion when the robots roll out to alert the community to the program; and agreement that staff can make decisions about potential limits to the number of robots and locations.

o0o

Public Comment for Items NOT on the Agenda (Continued)

Mayor Puza invited public participation.

The following member of the public addressed the Subcommittee:

Bryan Sanders was called to speak but was not present in person or online.

Jack Galanty indicated speaking as an individual; applauded Public Works for potentially upgrading bike protections on the Elenda Street bikeway; discussed meaningful safety improvements; he hoped

that the improvements could be extended south; and he was eager to attend the Tri-School Safety meeting to see the traffic calming infrastructure proposed for Elenda Street.

o0o

Items from Staff

Andrew Maximous, Mobility and Transportation Manager, announced the ribbon-cutting for MOVE 2.0 extension on May 22; construction at signalized intersections; flashing yellow arrows installed around town based on the Local Road and Safety Plan; and implementation of increased efficiencies with Leading Pedestrian Intervals (LPIs).

Discussion ensued between staff and Subcommittee Members regarding potential meeting dates.

o0o

Items from Members

Discussion ensued between staff and Subcommittee Members regarding upcoming agenda items including parking maximums, bus yield signs; SB 720; examination of wayfinding signage around town; consideration of project processes by the Standing Governance Subcommittee; adding a scramble to Buckingham/Green Valley Circle; continued work on parking fee increases for a potential presentation in the fall; staff agreement to check on the status of Ohmio/Circuit/Ting; the parking revenue tax; changes in the Finance Department; consideration of parking inventory and parking maximums in June; consideration of robot delivery by the City Council; staff agreement to provide an update on moving bike racks in Town Plaza and investigate removal of signage; understanding usage of money set aside in the budget for Safe Streets projects funded by JPA (Joint Powers Authority) bonds; allowing Public Works time to figure out most effective spending; the intent to expedite and fill in the gaps of projects; funds earmarked for upcoming phases of the Better Overland project; funding for other amenities; information coming back on Lease-A-Bike; and funding for a potential e-bike giveaway or rebate.

o0o

Adjournment

There being no further business, at 10:08 p.m., the Standing Mobility Subcommittee adjourned its meeting to June 30, 2026.

o0o

Alicia Ide
SECRETARY of the Culver City Standing Mobility Subcommittee,
Culver City, California

APPROVED

Freddy Puza
MAYOR, Standing Mobility Subcommittee
Culver City, California