

THESE MINUTES ARE NOT OFFICIAL UNTIL APPROVED BY THE  
CULVER CITY GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
CULVER CITY GENERAL PLAN  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
CULVER CITY, CALIFORNIA

July 9, 2020  
7:00 P.M.

**Call To Order & Roll Call**

The regular meeting of the Culver City General Plan  
Advisory Committee (GPAC) was called to order at 7:05 P.M.

Members	Cicely Bingener, Member
Present:	Patricia Bijvoet, Member
	Peter Capone-Newton, Member
	Ken Mand, Member
	Wally Marks, Member
	Yasmine Imani McMorris, Vice-Chair
	David Metzler, Member
	Jeanne Min, Member
	Paavo Monkkonen, Member
	Freddy Puza, Member
	Denice Renteria, Member
	Frances Rosenau, Chair
	Claudia Vizcarra, Member (arrived 7:11 PM)
	Jamie Wallace, Member
	Noah Zatz, Member
Members	Diana Hernandez, Member
Absent:	Scott Malsin, Member
	Kristen Torres Pawling, Member
	Sierra Smith, Member
	Laura Stuart, Member
	Andrew Weissman, Member
Staff	Ashley Hefner, Advance Planning
Present:	Manager (Secretary)
	Sol Blumenfeld, Community Development
	Director
	Lisa Pangelinan, Senior Management Analyst
	Lauren Marsiglia, Associate Planner
Consultants	Matt Raimi, Raimi + Associates
Present:	Meghan McNulty, Raimi + Associates
	Jessica Medina, Raimi + Associates
	Amitabh Barthakur, HR&A Advisors
	Amelia Taylor-Hochberg, HR&A Advisors
	David Plettner-Saunders, CPG
	Lynda Flynn, CPG
	Jerry Allen, CPG

**Public Comment for Items NOT On the Agenda**

Secretary Hefner invited public comment. No speakers came forward and no cards were received.

oOo

**Consent Calendar Items**

There were no items on the Consent Calendar.

oOo

**Action Items**

Item A-1

**1. Presentation on and Discussion of Existing Socioeconomic and Market/Economic Conditions and the Arts, Culture, and Creative Economy in Culver City**

Matt Raimi thanked everyone for the discussion on public safety, policing, and equity during the last meeting and stated that the conversation will continue moving forward; discussed the meeting agenda; and introduced Amitabh Barthakur of HR&A Advisors, the economics subconsultant for the General Plan Update (GPU), to present on existing socioeconomic and market/economic conditions in the city.

Barthakur provided an overview of the presentation informed by the Socio-economic Profile and Market Analysis Existing Conditions Report (ECR); explained the ECR was written before the pandemic and that it is meant to project conditions in Culver City over the next 25 years; described and compared demographics, job market, and imbalanced job and housing growth in Culver City to Los Angeles County; discussed the city's household income distribution disaggregated by race and ethnicity; described the displacement risk for low-income renters and how it varies by race, ethnicity, and neighborhood; stated that rent in the Los Angeles area is so high that smaller or single person households may be rent burdened but not necessarily low-income; discussed the health of Culver City's fiscal revenues and the challenges ahead, including in the post-COVID-19 recovery; defined competitive market area and that

of Culver City; compared Culver City's multi-family housing growth to job growth; and discussed Culver City's retail and hospitality market, land use demand projections through 2045, key levers for Culver City's economic development including a vibrant local economy, the jobs/housing imbalance, shifting fiscal environment, COVID-19 stress points including unprecedented unemployment rates, diminished demand, and compromised fiscal health, an example of a proactive response to recovery, existing strengths the city can leverage to mitigate impacts from COVID-19 and assure a just and resilient recovery, examples of recovery levers such as strong service delivery, proximity to regional economic drivers, vibrant knowledge economy, redevelopment opportunities, and how to recover in a just and resilient manner by focusing on vulnerable populations, increasing accessibility, leveraging community capacity, realigning fiscal priorities, pursuing additional resources, and promoting infrastructure innovations.

Raimi invited public comment on the information presented by Barthakur. There were no public comments or requests to speak. Secretary Hefner invited the public to submit comments for staff to read if there is time before the meeting ends.

Discussion ensued between Members and staff on the relationship between Culver City's job growth in high- and low-wage jobs and race, income, educational attainment levels; the equity implications of those factors on housing and who can live and work in the city; the racial data on employees who work and are expected to work in the city; and how low-wage jobs are growing in Culver City and where employees may be able to afford to live; reconciling traffic impacts on housing development to promote housing growth that brings people closer to job centers and how the GPU can support that goal; how the next GPAC meeting will focus on housing; housing and job growth rates compared to Los Angeles County; affordable housing; the need for alternatives to single-occupancy vehicles; how the GPU can improve mobility and public infrastructure in an equitable way that improves housing; what role employers play in addressing affordable housing issues; the City's responsibility to create housing, including affordable housing close to jobs; how housing linkage fees can support

affordable housing, the City's efforts with linkage fees, and how the GPU will address these issues; gender breakdown of incoming employees; the differences in demographic trends in Culver City compared to Los Angeles County; whether there is a correlation between jobs and the city's demographics; the difference in the data available for demographics and jobs; whether the city is diverse enough; the land use implications of balancing job sectors to ensure diversity and how those affect surrounding neighborhoods; and Culver City's opportunities and limitations for prospective employers; economic research the city can achieve given its small size; the hospitality sector; the factors driving Culver City's hospitality industry compared to those of neighboring cities; the city's fiscal base; the type of environment the city offers for small businesses and new entrepreneurs and how that affects who moves to the city; economic development approaches to support renters at high risk of displacement; the tools the GPU offers to address displacement; neighborhood stabilization funds that cities use; the difference between subsidized affordable housing and naturally-occurring affordable housing; the tools employers use to house their employees; Culver City's property tax rate compared to neighboring cities; and how Culver City's geographic size affects the economic research possible and how Culver City's housing and job situation affects neighboring cities.

A Member asked about the difference between high paying jobs and high-quality jobs and how to define desirable jobs in Culver City.

Discussion ensued between Members and staff regarding whether there is a way to guarantee jobs to residents and first source hiring programs that some cities offer.

Natasha Kumar stated that Amazon Studios is opening in Culver City, which brings production and technical jobs that may not require a college degree.

Discussion ensued between Members and staff about cities with a job and housing imbalance that is comparable to Culver City's; how municipal boundaries are artificial

constructs, which affects comparisons; how Culver City's jobs and housing imbalance is about as great as communities in Silicon Valley; the increased demand for the internet as people stay home during the pandemic; the opportunity to lease Culver City's fiber network; New York City's effort to achieve broadband equity; and Culver City's financial limitations towards broadband equity

Jeannine Wisnosky Stehlin entered the following comment on this discussion, which was not read aloud at the meeting, but is included here for the record: that the County is looking for ways to provide internet to areas that have poor service; how internet access is an equity issue; and how this has been discussed in conversations related to arts and culture.

George Montgomery asked if height limits and upzoning affect the city's housing inventory and discussed the relationship between rezoning and mixed-use. Secretary Hefner suggested that this question be addressed during the August GPAC meeting on housing and Raimi added addressing the land use and design aspect at the August meeting.

Raimi summarized the comments including the demographic and geographic breakdown of current and future jobs in the city, how traffic impacts job growth in the city, and how to fund projects.

Discussion ensued between Members and staff about being deliberate about attracting jobs that have diverse employees.

A Member thanked Barthakur for discussing micro-entrepreneur opportunities and business incubators; discussed how the competitive market area benefited Culver City's downtown revival, but not affordable housing; and suggested incentivizing growth with more mixed uses in existing and new buildings and encouraging local training and hiring.

Raimi introduced David Plettner-Saunders from The Cultural Planning Group (CPG), the arts subconsultant for the GPU, to present on existing arts, culture, and the creative economy in the city.

Plettner-Saunders introduced Lynda Flynn and Jerry Allen—other CPG team members present; provided an overview of the Arts, Culture & Creative Economy ECR; discussed Culver City's history with the film industry, the city's high creative index rate within a national context and the concentration of creative jobs in city, the earnings of creative workers, the large sales amount the creative economy generates compared to the city's scale, how creative jobs in the city affect the region and nation, that the ECR was drafted before the pandemic, the concerns among the arts community related to COVID-19, the support arts programs have received during the pandemic, how artists are adapting to COVID-19 and the racial justice movement, historical examples of art and social justice, an example of a municipal response to art and social justice in Oakland, art districts in the city: Culver City Arts District, Hayden Tract, Helms Bakery, and Cultural Corridor; performing arts venues; the City's Art in Public Places Program and the distribution of public art in the city with a concentration in the Downtown; the City's Cultural Affairs Division programming; funding and issues and opportunities for arts and culture; cultural case studies that respond to three major themes: COVID-19, organizational structures, and leveraging private development; and how to support artists when the economy is disrupted.

Secretary Hefner invited public comment on the information presented by Plettner-Saunders.

George Montgomery described examples of how to use public and private funding to support arts such as the United Kingdom dedicating £1.6 billion to cultural arts and Netflix offering \$600 million to support theaters. Plettner-Saunders stated that the United Kingdom example shows a potential partnership that the GPU can explore.

Jeannine Wisnosky Stehlin stated that Culver Arts (a local non-profit foundation, also referred to as Culver City Arts Foundation) partners with the City's Cultural Affairs Commission.

Discussion ensued between Members and staff about ensuring that companies do not drive the city's arts and culture; how to support existing and not just emerging small businesses; how to protect diverse artists without using a profit model; and policy alternatives to address these issues.

A Member discussed the boundaries for the arts districts; whether the amount of money in the City's General Fund dedicated to the arts is enough; the proportion of residents in Culver City who have creative jobs; tax revenue the city gets from the creative industry's profits; and transparency in the city's tax structure.

A Member thanked Plettner-Saunders for the presentation and discussed The Actors' Gang's outdoor theatre summer programming.

Discussion ensued between Members and staff about the relationship between arts, culture, and the creative economy; how to measure who is employed broken down by race, ethnicity, and educational attainment; how to provide jobs that attract diverse populations; how to improve Culver City's arts and culture programming through policy; how much the city benefits from the earnings that the film and entertainment industry generates compared to other geographies that may also benefit from those earnings; the earnings that creative workers generate compared to the sales that the production industry generates; and data on the tax revenue the City generates from these earnings.

Jeannine Wisnosky Stehlin shared the following resources from Los Angeles County:  
[https://www.lacountyarts.org/sites/default/files/cultural\\_policy\\_final.pdf](https://www.lacountyarts.org/sites/default/files/cultural_policy_final.pdf) and  
<http://file.lacounty.gov/SDSInter/bos/supdocs/146502.pdf>

Discussion ensued between Members and staff regarding the City's attempts to generate funds for the arts through bonds, community benefit assessments, charter changes to alter the amount the General Fund allocates to cultural arts programming, and asking residents to require a certain percentage of the City budget toward the arts similar to what the City of Los Angeles did for their libraries and Department of Recreation and Parks; leveraging existing

arts nonprofits; the relationship between the Culver City Arts Foundation and the City; the challenges the Culver City Arts Foundation experiences; and funding opportunities for arts and culture.

Len Dickter confirmed that the film production industry generates total revenue of \$2.7 billion, which does not represent the economic benefit the City derives from film-related businesses in Culver City.

o0o

#### **Public Comment for Items NOT On the Agenda**

Secretary Hefner invited public comment. No speakers requested to speak or submitted comments.

o0o

#### **Receipt of Correspondence**

Secretary Hefner stated that staff received correspondence from Jeff Schwartz on item A-1, noted the correspondence was provided to the GPAC Members in advance of the meeting, and stated that it is available to the public upon request.

o0o

#### **Items from Members/Staff/Consultants**

There were none.

o0o

#### **Adjournment**

There being no further business, at 9:21 P.M., the General Plan Advisory Committee adjourned to a special meeting on August 13, 2020, at 7:00 P.M.



o0o

---

Ashley Hefner  
SECRETARY of the Culver City General Plan Advisory Committee  
Culver City, California

APPROVED \_\_\_\_\_

---

Frances Rosenau  
CHAIR of the Culver City General Plan Advisory Committee  
Culver City, California

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that, on the date below written, these minutes were filed in the Office of the City Clerk, Culver City, California and constitute the Official Minutes of said meeting.

---

Jeremy Green  
CITY CLERK

---

Date