

Sandstone Properties Jefferson Hotel Community Meeting Notes

April 16, 2019 7pm – 8:30pm

Applicant Representatives Present:

- Sandstone Properties – Eri Kroh, David Garcia, Lynn Beckemeyer, Andrew Murray, Michael Moore
- Nakada Partners Architects – Steve Nakada, Thomas Acosta
- ESA (environmental) – Alan Sako
- Crain and Associates (traffic) – Ryan Kelly

City Representatives Present:

- Jose Mendivil from Culver City Planning Division

Questions/Concerns from Attendees:

Views/Shade and Shadow:

- Residents asked applicant to explain the sightlines from the hotel. Won't hotel guests on their balconies be able to look down into the back yards of the residential neighborhood across the alley? **Applicant responded** with a diagram showing that sight lines do not allow guests on the balconies to see into the adjacent backyards due to the terracing and landscaping planned for that side of the hotel building.
- Resident asked whether the hotel building will block the solar panels on the homes of adjacent residents. **Applicant responded** that a shade and shadow study is being conducted and that, depending on the season, there may be some morning shade that reaches the adjacent residential properties.
- Resident asked whether the hotel building will block the sun from reaching adjacent homes and backyards. **Applicant responded** that a shade and shadow study is being conducted and that, depending on the season, there may be some morning shade that reaches the adjacent residential properties.
- Resident asked whether an analysis of the glare generated by the building materials would be part of the shade and shadow study. **Applicant responded** yes. Applicant added that reflective glass is limited to the Jefferson and Slauson elevations.
- Resident asked how much glass would face the neighborhood. **Applicant responded** using a rendering to show that very little, if any, glass would be facing the neighborhood and that special care was taken to design the building so that live landscaping is the predominant view from the adjacent homes.
- Resident suggested that, because residential homeowners adjacent to the site have the legal right to build up to two stories on their properties, the applicant should undertake a sight line study to determine impacts on homes that are two-stories tall.

Traffic:

- Residents expressed concerns that the project would increase traffic in the area and would create additional bottlenecks in the alley. **Applicant responded** that the project

will undertake a traffic study to assess potential impacts and develop optimal traffic flow patterns to have the least impact possible on the area.

- Residents asked what plans the project has for additional traffic mitigations. **Applicant responded** that the project will comply with any mitigations required as the result of the pending traffic study and is already working with the city to explore additional options (even though they may not be required) to address traffic issues on Segrell, Jefferson and the alley.
- Resident indicated that traffic is gridlocked at the corner of Jefferson and Slauson. **Applicant responded** that the project would explore the best traffic mitigations as part of its traffic study.
- Resident asked how the project would impact traffic on the nearby 405 freeway on-ramp. **Applicant responded** that the project will comply with any mitigations required as the result of the pending traffic study.
- Resident expressed concerns that e-scooters used by hotel patrons would get “dumped” within the Sunkist Park neighborhood.
- Resident asked how many cars would be queued on-site and wondered whether the available queuing space was enough to accommodate the project’s needs. **Applicant responded** that the project will undertake a traffic study with a specific queuing analysis that will review and evaluate that.
- Resident said taking a left turn from the alley onto eastbound Slauson Avenue is not legal because of an existing double yellow line. **Applicant responded** that all the proposed turning movements will be evaluated as part of the traffic study.
- Resident asked whether a gate would be erected at the end of Segrell to help alleviate cut-through traffic problems currently being experienced by the neighborhood. **Applicant responded** that the project is not proposing that as a mitigation measure. **Jose Mendivil** added that such a mitigation measure is something that would have to go through the Culver City public works traffic engineer. He added that he had not heard of that measure prior to the meeting.
- Resident expressed concerns regarding outbound traffic flow from the project site. **Applicant responded** that an analysis of circulation would be included in the traffic study.

Parking:

- Residents asked how many employees would be expected to work at the hotel and where they would park. **Applicant responded** that parking for hotel employees would be provided on-site in the hotel’s automated parking facility, but that an exact number of employees could not be determined until a hotel operator is selected.
- Resident wondered what would happen to the automated parking facility if power was lost. **Applicant responded** that the building will have an emergency power generator that will be able to power the automated parking in case of a loss of power.
- Resident indicated that a two-hour parking restriction exists only on part of Segrell Way with permit holders (residents) exempt and was concerned whether that would be enough to deter hotel visitors from parking in the neighborhood. **Applicant responded** that it will continue to work with residents and the city to look at ways to address parking issues in the neighborhood.

- Resident expressed concern that there will not be enough parking on-site for hotel guests, restaurant guests, employees, etc. **Applicant responded** that the city code provides calculations for all of those uses so that adequate parking spaces are required of the applicant. The applicant added that the proposed parking capacity exceeds code requirements.

Noise:

- Resident expressed concern that live music and/or noise from the pool deck would be problematic. **Applicant responded** that a noise study will be done, but that the pool deck was specifically located on the side of the building opposite the residential neighborhood, overlooking Jefferson Boulevard.
- Resident expressed concern that the noise from the roll-up doors and the automated parking facility would impact the neighbors. **Applicant responded** that the roll-up doors operate very quietly and the nature of an automated parking facility means there will be no revving engines, squealing tires, loud conversations or other loud noises typically found in traditional parking areas.

Access:

- Resident asked whether access to the alley would continue once the project was built. **Applicant responded** that the alley will continue to be a two-way alley accessible to the public.
- Resident asked whether access to the hotel would be available only off Slauson Avenue. **Applicant responded** that access would be available both off Slauson Avenue and off the alley.
- Resident indicated that the alley is only 20 feet wide and that it is difficult to get two cars to pass each other easily in that space. He suggested that the building be moved back away from the alley to create additional room. **Applicant responded** that the alley is actually 30-feet wide and that room exists for two-way traffic in the alley without moving the proposed building.
- Resident asked how the hotel will handle receiving deliveries that will effectively close the alley to other traffic. **Applicant responded** that there is a delivery bay off the alley that can be used by large trucks so that the alley is not blocked and remains available to two-way traffic at all times.

Operations:

- Resident asked where trash collection would take place. **Applicant responded**, using a site plan, that the location of the trash receptacles and access to the trash area would be off the alley.
- Resident asked how often trash would be collected from the site. **Applicant responded** that that has yet to be determined.
- Residents expressed concern about the existing homeless issue in the alley and wondered how the applicant would address the issue of homeless people at the site. **Applicant responded** that the hotel will have proper lighting and security designed to deter the homeless from gathering in the alley and added that it is willing to work with the city to develop a plan to keep the homeless from migrating into the residential neighborhood.

- Resident asked where service deliveries will be made. **Applicant responded**, using a site plan, that the service deliveries will be made either in the porte-cochere area in the main arrival area of the hotel or off the alley at the truck bay location.
- Resident asked whether there will be a hotel bar and what the hours of operation would be. **Applicant responded** that a hotel bar is being proposed but until a hotel operator is selected, the hours of operation could not be determined.

Project Design:

- Resident asked why the project is proposed to be five stories tall? **Applicant responded** that five stories fits within the city's 56-foot height limit and is required to deliver the kind of high-quality, four-star hotel the applicant is planning at the site.
- Resident asked whether elevator equipment and other rooftop appurtenances would piece the 56-foot height limit. **Applicant responded** that they might, but that such overruns are allowable under the city code and that this project will comply with Culver City's height limitations and will not require any variance in that regard.
- Resident asked how much of the project would be open to the public. **Applicant responded** that of the 122,000 square feet of hotel space, approximately 38,000 square feet, including the proposed restaurant, would be available for public use. Applicant added that the pool area would be for hotel guests only unless reserved/rent for a private function by a member of the public.
- Resident asked whether more landscaping could be put on the "wall" facing the alley at ground level. **Applicant responded** that the "wall" indicated by the resident is actually the roll-up doors to access the automated parking facility. However, the applicant indicated that special care has been given to assuring that as much of the building exterior facing the neighborhood as possible is covered in landscaping.
- Resident encouraged the applicant to position signage and lighting in such a way as to not impact the adjacent neighbors. **Applicant responded** that every effort will be taken to shield the neighbors from light and to have as small an impact as possible.
- Resident asked whether the project would be LEED certified. **Applicant responded** that the building will achieve, at minimum, the LEED Silver standard or equivalent through compliance with the California Green Building Code.
- Resident suggested that no hotel guest rooms look out toward the residential neighborhood and that all rooms look out onto either Jefferson or Slauson or to the interior courtyard. (Resident referenced Mayumi Hotel on Sawtelle Boulevard, a 35-room extended stay hotel).

Construction:

- Residents asked how long construction would take and when construction would commence. **Applicant responded** that construction would begin as soon as possible after the project was approved and would take 22-24 months to complete.
- Residents asked what construction hours would be. **Applicant responded** that construction would be conducted pursuant to the city's ordinances. **Jose Mendivil** added that the city code allows for construction 7 days a week, but that the city has the discretion to limit hours and prohibit construction on Sundays and holidays, etc. Applicant added that construction is not anticipated to occur 7 days a week.

- Resident asked who the project contractor will be. **Applicant responded** that the contractor has not yet been selected.
- Resident asked where construction workers would park during construction. **Applicant responded** that arrangements acceptable to the city would have to be agreed upon to rent parking space at a nearby business or to shuttle workers to the site from a remote location.
- Resident asked whether construction operations would close streets or limit access to the alley. **Applicant responded** that a construction parking, staging and haul route plan will be negotiated with the city before construction begins.

Miscellaneous Questions/Concerns:

- Resident asked what a “green wall” was. **Applicant responded** that a green wall, or living wall, is composed of live plant material and will be situated on the hotel wall facing the residential neighborhood to provide a more pleasing view for the neighbors.
- Resident asked what kind of environmental documentation Culver City will require. **Jose Mendivil** responded that such a determination will be made once all the technical studies are completed and the city can evaluate whether there are any impacts that cannot be mitigated as part of the initial study. He added that, based on his experience, he believes this project would likely require only a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND).
- Resident (jokingly) asked how many free nights local residents will get to stay at the hotel. **Applicant responded** that a hotel operator has not yet been selected, but that the applicant is very open to discussing opportunities for the community to use some hotel amenities free or at a reduced cost.
- Resident asked whether development will continue along Jefferson Boulevard to the Winchell’s and The Honey Baked Ham locations. **Applicant responded** that it owns only the parcel currently being discussed, but hopes to be a catalyst for future positive redevelopment of the area.
- Residents asked why not everyone in Sunkist Park received notices of the meeting. **Applicant responded** that it complied with the city’s noticing requirements to notify property owners and residents within a 500-foot radius surrounding the site and approved by the city. Applicant further encouraged residents to sign in so that they can be added to a mailing list in order to receive any future meeting notifications.
- Resident asked whether the public would get a list of all the proposed conditions of approval, traffic and technical studies and other documents related to the project. **Jose Mendivil** responded that the staff report to the Planning Commission, available 72 hours prior to the Planning Commission meeting, would include the proposed conditions of approval, the MND and the traffic study. He said he would inquire with the city to see if various studies and other documents could be made available to the public on-line at an earlier date.
- Resident asked how this project will impact property values. **Applicant responded** that there is no way to predict whether property values will go up or down.
- Resident expressed concern that no drawing or renderings of the project were available for the public to review prior to the community meeting.

- Resident suggested that those neighbors outside the 500-foot radius for noticing be allowed to sign up to receive future notifications. **Applicant** agreed and collected contact information from those who wanted to be notified in the future.
- Resident asked whether the applicant was aware of an oil pipeline that runs beneath the alley and expressed that that would be a concern during construction. **Applicant responded** that it will work with the city to review any and all utilities in the alley and on or near the project site to assure that construction is done safely. The applicant added that no construction, above or below grade, is being proposed for the alley.
- Will the project create its own website to provide the public with renderings, traffic studies and other documentation as well as provide the public with a venue to get questions about the project asked and answered. **Applicant responded** that it will consider creating such a site.
- Resident said that the building is beautiful, but she believes it is being proposed in the wrong place.
- Resident asked whether the project will be union or non-union. **Applicant responded** that a determination has not yet been made as to whether union labor will be used for construction and that a determination about whether the hotel will employ union employees will not be made until after a hotel operator is selected.

If you have any questions regarding these notes, please contact Geoff Maleman at gmaleman@aol.com or at (310) 645-2295. Thank you.

Sandstone Properties Jefferson Hotel Community #2 Meeting Notes

June 6, 2019 7pm – 8:30pm

Applicant Representatives Present:

- Sandstone Properties – Eri Kroh, David Garcia, Lynn Beckemeyer, Andrew Murray, Michael Moore
- Nakada Partners Architects – Steve Nakada, Thomas Acosta
- ESA (environmental) – Alan Sako
- Crain and Associates (traffic) – Ryan Kelly

City Representatives Present:

- Lisa Edwards and Michael Allen from Culver City Planning Division

This meeting was conducted in an Open House format where the public could visit any of three stations focusing on specific aspects of the project: Architecture/Design, Traffic and Environmental. At each station, the applicant provided experts in that area to answer in-depth questions from the public and engage in discussions about subject-area details that would not be possible in a Presentation/Open Mic format. The Open House format allowed for numerous conversations to go on at the same time and allowed for the public to engage in every aspect of the project or just the one(s) that interested them the most.

Because of this format, capturing individual questions from the audience is difficult. To more effectively capture public comments, public comment cards were available to all attendees and those have been provided to the city. In addition, the following recaps of the discussion points each Open House station provide an overview of the comments made by the public during the meeting:

Architecture/Design:

- The project should consider creating a new "alley" along side the dollar tree to eliminate the need to use the existing alley for ingress and egress into the parking garage.
- There should be no blank walls facing the neighborhood.
- There were also general concerns about the noise that would be generated by delivery vehicles servicing the project.

Traffic:

- Request for the addition of a camera at the intersection of Jefferson/Slauson;

- Installation of roundabouts instead of all-way stops at intersections along Culver Park Drive and Segrell Way, to further slow down cut-through traffic (given that vehicles can roll through the stop signs)
- Concerns regarding morning traffic associated with the El Marino Language School, especially on Coolidge Avenue.
- Cut-through traffic concerns on various Sunkist Park roadways, including McDonald Street, Slauson Avenue (west end), and Mesmer Avenue.

Environmental:

- Concerns about the building being too tall after looking at the Shade/Shadow diagrams (specifically from the owner of one of the five houses across the alley from the site, who expressed concerns about shading that would reduce his access to sunlight).
- Concerns over construction noise and vibration for the homes directly behind the project site. It was discussed that the General Contractor would put together a plan for this and would provide hotlines for concerns during construction.
- Concerns with rooftop bar noise to the neighborhood behind the project. Discussed that the rooftop bar area is now on the opposite side and the building itself will shield the neighborhood from noise impacts.
- Concerns with increased drug-use and prostitution by actual patrons of the project, not of transient population around the project.

If you have any questions regarding these notes, please contact Geoff Maleman at gmaleman@aol.com or at (310) 645-2295. Thank you.

Sandstone Properties Jefferson Hotel Community 3 Meeting Notes

November 19, 2019 7pm – 8:30pm

Applicant Representatives Present:

- Sandstone Properties (owner & developer) – Eri Kroh, David Garcia, Lynn Beckemeyer
- OLS Hotels (hotel operator) – Benjamin Rafter, Ira Kleinrock, Martti Mannoja, Jennifer Hagenbuch
- Maleman Ink Public Relations (public relations) – Geoff Maleman
- Nakada Partners Architects (architect) – Steve Nakada, Thomas Acosta, Rodrigo Zayas, Ryan Nakada
- Studio-MLA (landscape architects)
- Oculus Light Studio (lighting)
- ESA (environmental) – Alan Sako
- Crain and Associates (traffic) – Ryan Kelly, Hilary Mau

City Representatives Present:

- Lisa Edwards and Michael Allen from Culver City Planning Division

This meeting was conducted with an initial presentation that included a project overview, a recap of the project changes that have been made as the result of community feedback and an introduction of the recently selected hotel operator – OLS Hotels and Resorts. Following the initial presentation and Q&A from the audience, the meeting shifted to an Open House format where the public could visit any stations focusing on specific aspects of the project: Architecture/Design, Traffic, Operations and Environmental. At each station, the applicant provided experts in that area to answer in-depth questions from the public and engage in discussions about subject-area details.

The following recap includes both the Q&A during the initial presentation as well as the discussion points at each Open House station:

Architecture/Design:

- Resident asked how will the project deal with the existing cut-through traffic? N+A responded: NTMP process required before any changes can be made to current cut through traffic
- Resident asked will the hotel parking capacity (150-spaces) cover all employee parking? N+A responded: Yes, 150 includes employee parking.
- Resident asked what is NTMP, how long is the process? Is it a pilot program? Michael Allen responded: The NTMP process is managed by public works. Using Culver Studios as a point of reference; The NTMP included studies (1.5 yr to 2 years until pilot program). Council decision on what actions to take as funding becomes available. Applicant (Project)

contributed funds for improvements in study. Traffic studies were concurrent with construction at the Culver Studios project.

- Resident asked when is construction start date and opening date of the hotel? N+A responded: Opening is anticipated for 2022.
- Resident asked how can traffic be mitigated? Close the Jefferson Blvd on-ramp & offramp? N+A responded: The NTMP is necessary to determine which traffic mitigation measures might work and which ones the community wants to implement.
- Resident asked can we get a camera light? Red light camera? Signal at the alley? N+A responded: The alley is too tight for full signal light. Michael Allen responded: Implementation of a red-light camera can be studied.
- Resident asked how will the community be notified about NTMP? Michael Allen responded: Culver City Public Works Department goes door-to-door, needs 50% participation of residents to move forward and added that the project is not responsible for existing traffic conditions.
- Neighbor Comment: In favor of the project closing the outbound driveway from the site onto Slauson.
- Neighbor Comment: In favor of traffic restrictions; however, does not want traffic restrictions placed on them personally.
- Resident asked what is being planned for the North Elevation adjacent to the Sunkist Park neighborhood? (Resident informed N+A this was his first time attending a Community-Outreach meeting for this project, also disclosed he lives in the 5th house from the corner of Slauson/Segrell.) N+A provided the resident with a presentation of the project, with emphasis on the balcony design and sightline diagrams. N+A also provided a presentation of the revised project renderings.

Traffic:

- A Resident expressed concern about e-scooters as they would get strewn on sidewalks and within the neighborhood.
- A Resident asked if exiting vehicles could only turn left from the Project site driveways along the alley. Crain & Associates (C+A) responded that drivers could turn left or right down the alley. The Resident asked what will happen for vehicles turning left down the alley to Slauson Avenue. C+A noted based on the traffic study conducted there are no significant impacts at the intersection of Jefferson Boulevard & Slauson Avenue. Additionally, the team worked with the City to develop an intersection improvement for the northeastbound left-turn. This improvement would provide dual left-turns from Jefferson Boulevard to Slauson Avenue. This will change the traffic flow providing more capacity for these left-turning vehicles.
- Several Residents complained about traffic at the intersection of Jefferson Boulevard & Slauson Avenue at all four approaches, especially for vehicles making a westbound left-turn from Slauson Avenue to Jefferson Boulevard blocking the intersection. They mentioned that the City should consider putting up a red light camera at the intersection to dissuade people from blocking the intersection and running red lights.
- Residents expressed concern about existing congestion along Slauson Avenue that affect Segrell Way and Culver Park Drive. C+A informed the Residents that in order to study and

decide on mechanisms for change, the community would need to go through a Neighborhood Traffic Management Program (NTMP) which requires neighborhood consensus. Issues related to cut-through traffic or turning issues would need to be dealt with through the NTMP process along with City enforcement. As noted in the queuing/delay study conducted along Slauson Avenue between Culver Park Drive and Jefferson Boulevard, drivers are not following the traffic laws and are not making full stops at STOP-controlled approaches. Residents hoped the Project could take a look at the intersections. C+A mentioned that based on Community Meeting #1, the Project looked at queuing on Slauson Avenue, Culver Park Drive, Segrell Way, and the alley. The Project could consider working with the Residents on the NTMP process. A Resident inquired how long does the NTMP process take to implement. Michael Allen (M. Allen) explained that the NTMP is managed by the City Public Works Department. Based on his most recent experience, the City worked with the Amazon development on an NTMP in the Higuera neighborhood. The process took approximately 1.5-2 years to complete. Generally, NTMPs are based on the funding the City has available. Funding for the Higuera NTMP was part of the Amazon project's Conditions of Approval.

- A Resident asked when the Project was expected to be completed. Nakada responded that the Project opening is anticipated for 2022.
- Residents noted their concern about Project traffic traveling south on the alley to exit onto Slauson Avenue. They asked if it would be possible to signalize the alley. C+A noted that such signalization would be unlikely because of the close proximity to the intersection of Jefferson Boulevard & Slauson Avenue. Residents inquired about putting up flashing red lights at the alley so drivers know to stop because there have been several accidents at that location. The C+A and M. Allen noted the Project could work with the City to discuss the ideas.
- Nakada noted that the Project team has been aware of the existing traffic problems since the start of the Project. As part of the NTMP, an area would have to be defined and consensus would need to be built on problems/improvements. Sandstone Properties, the owner of the property, are also neighbors. A Resident expressed the fact that Sandstone does not have to walk their kids or dogs in the neighborhood and that increased traffic is a big concern. Nakada emphasized that Sandstone wants to be a good neighbor.
- A Resident asked what could be done to alleviate traffic in the area. Another Resident responded that the problem is the I-405 Freeway ramps, and that in order to see an appreciable improvement to traffic the freeway ramps would need to be closed.
- Several Residents mentioned they like the Project and if it is dog-friendly they would like it even more and they are likely to frequent the restaurant and bar.
- A Resident raised their concern regarding parking and whether employees would be accommodated onsite or would they be parking elsewhere. C+A confirmed that the parking garage, with a parking supply of 150 vehicles, would be able to accommodate all employees on-site and they would not park in the residential neighborhood. The Resident acknowledged knowing that employees would be parking on-site and not in the neighborhood alleviated his concern. Nakada mentioned that at Community Meeting #1 employee parking was not properly addressed partly because the hotel operator was not decided. One reason OLS Hotels was brought on board as the operator was related to their extensive experience with parking.

- A Resident remarked that the reason there is so much traffic is a result of Waze and Google Maps and asked if these apps increase traffic on roadways. C+A agreed that driver apps can contribute to additional neighborhood traffic. C+A pointed out that the Project would eliminate drivers illegally turning left out of the existing shopping center driveway and vehicles would instead be directed to the alley. The Resident pointed out that traffic would increase along the alley and because of driver apps would likely increase on nearby roadways.
- The Residents asked what were the findings and recommendations regarding the existing conditions. C+A explained that a queuing/delay analysis was conducted on Slauson Avenue between Jefferson Boulevard and Culver Park Drive, and on the Culver Park Drive, Segrell Way, and alley approaches to Slauson Avenue. Queuing is occurring along Slauson Avenue and vehicles are turning left onto Slauson Avenue from Culver Park Drive, Segrell Way, and the alley. The NTMP process would allow the community to determine what measures to implement in the neighborhood. This would include a study, pilot program, and ultimately neighborhood consensus on the traffic measures that could include turn restrictions, signage, and traffic control improvements.
- A Resident asked how the Sunkist Park neighborhood know about the NTMP process. M. Allen explained it would be up to the City. It was also explained that the traffic analysis is evaluating Project-related traffic impacts. It is not the responsibility of the Project to look at existing or past traffic issues. More specifics about the NTMP process include that it is a long-term process that includes going door-to-door and would require approximately 50% response rate by number of doors, and then a percentage would need to be in favor of the improvement.
- The Residents are not necessarily in favor of turn restrictions since it would affect them too. Some mentioned they do not like the turn restrictions on Sawtelle Boulevard. C+A mentioned again that the problem with making changes through the NTMP process is getting neighborhood consensus because not everyone agrees with the changes. C+A asked if the Residents noticed the turn restrictions being enforced. The Residents responded they have never seen it being enforced.
- C+A mentioned that there is one intersection in West LA that includes signage that states the intersection is under surveillance 24 hours a day, along with flashing signs. Maybe this could be considered under the NTMP.
- Nakada mentioned that a statistic from the Police Department was that Culver City has nighttime population of 40,000 and a daytime (employment) population of around 250,000. Culver City is a desirable City.
- M. Allen stated the Project is focused on Project-specific impacts and that many of the issues the Residents brought up were bigger picture issues.
- A Resident asked how large of an area was the meeting notice mailed out to. Maleman answered that the Project was required to send out flyers to all addresses within a 500-foot radius of the Project. Once the radius touches a block, the entire block needs to be mailed to. Additionally, all the people outside of the radius who signed up for Project updates through the website or who attended the first and second community meetings received notification of the third community meeting.
- A Resident that lives in one of the houses directly behind the Project asked how the Project was going to affect privacy. The City Representative mentioned the Project includes green

walls to provide privacy and noted that the architect can provide the information at the architecture station.

- Nakada introduced a neighborhood watch member to the M Allen. M. Allen noted that he would reach out to the Public Works Department regarding discussion of the NTMP process with the community.
- Another Resident who lives on Culver Park Drive mentioned that he picks up his son at school and he is concerned about safety. He did not think it was a good idea unless some of the streets were closed off to create cul-de-sacs.
- A Resident located in the second house behind the alley noted concern regarding shade issues.
- A Resident noted that she was not concerned about traffic but more about height. She was in favor of the Project.
- A Resident asked about how vehicles would be entering the Project site. C+A explained that the only access to enter the Project site is off Slauson Avenue and it would only allow inbound right-turns only. There will be no entrance from off the alley and no left-turns into the site from Slauson Avenue.

Environmental:

- Resident asked when will the project break ground? ESA responded: Could be approximately in late 2020, depending on City review and approvals.
- Resident asked when will the project be completed? ESA responded: Could be approximately late 2022, depending on City review and approvals, and construction scheduling.
- Resident asked what is the estimated completion of studies? ESA responded: The environmental study/MND is projected to be released to the public for review sometime in January 2020, depending on City review.
- Resident asked is this environmental study funded by Sandstone? ESA responded: The effort to analyze the project's environmental impacts as part of the CEQA process is a collaborative effort between the Sandstone, the City, and ESA, the environmental consultant, as part of a three party contract; however, Sandstone pays ESA, the environmental consultant, directly.
- Resident asked are studies required? ESA responded: Some studies are required as part of the CEQA process, including studies such as the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment and Geotechnical Report; however, other studies are required by the City of Culver City specifically, including the shade/shadow diagram.
- Resident asked ESA to explain the shade/shadow diagram board. ESA provided an explanation as to what the shade/shadow diagram depicted and the various hours that were modeled.
- Resident asked "if I was a family member who was living near a proposed new development and asked you, an environmental consultant, what I should look at in the environmental document, what would you recommend I focus my time on reviewing?" ESA responded: This would be based on your personal concerns. Generally, the public is interested in how developments affect traffic, noise, and air quality. If you have a personal interest in the sustainable measures a project would be implementing, we would suggest looking at the

greenhouse gas emissions topic or if you had a personal concern regarding hazardous materials that may be on site or near the project site, we would suggest looking at the hazards and hazardous materials topic.

- Resident asked would the environmental document address concerns regarding dust? ESA responded: There are standard regulations enforced by the South Coast Air Quality Management District that the project would have to abide by that enforces dampening dust that is produced during construction of the project.
- Resident asked at what stage would I be able to submit my concerns regarding the environmental document? ESA responded: That would be once the environmental document is released, which is projected to occur sometime in January 2020. As part of the CEQA process, the public would have 30 days to review the environmental document and submit comments to the City that would then be addressed in a response to comments document.
- Resident asked what is my goal or duty when I am reviewing the environmental document? Do I need to alert the City when an impact seems too high? ESA responded: The City and regional entities have thresholds to help determine impacts for environmental topics. If something is above a threshold, it is the duty of the environmental document to provide mitigation measures that would reduce the project's impact to a level of significance below the threshold.
- Resident asked what is an MND and what does CEQA stand for? ESA responded: A mitigated negative declaration is one type of environmental document required to be produced during the CEQA process and is an informative public document that analyzes various topics and finds that the project, for some topics, would require mitigation to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. This differs from an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) which may find that some topics would have a significant and unavoidable impact on the environment. CEQA standard for the California Environmental Quality Act and is a requirement unique to the State of California.
- Resident asked what about energy; would the Project be LEED certified? ESA responded: The Project has committed to LEED Silver Equivalent – they may not obtain official certification, but would meet the requirements.

If you have any questions regarding these notes, please contact Geoff Maleman at gmaleman@aol.com or at (310) 645-2295. Thank you.