

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

November 12, 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 7:04 P.M.

Members            Patricia Bijvoet, Member  
Present:           Cicely Bingener, Member  
                     Peter Capone-Newton, Member  
                     Diana Hernandez, Member  
                     Ken Mand, Member  
                     Yasmine Imani McMorris, Vice-Chair  
                     David Metzler, Member (left by 8:52 P.M.)  
                     Freddy Puza, Member  
                     Denice Renteria, Member  
                     Frances Rosenau, Chair  
                     Claudia Vizcarra, Member (arrived at 8:35 P.M.)  
                     Noah Zatz, Member

Members            Scott Malsin, Member  
Absent:            Wally Marks, Member  
                     Jeanne Min, Member  
                     Paavo Monkkonen, Member  
                     Kristen Torres Pawling, Member  
                     Laura Stuart, Member  
                     Jamie Wallace, Member  
                     Andrew Weissman, Member

Staff                Lauren Marsiglia,  
Present:            Associate Planner (Secretary)  
                     Sol Blumenfeld,  
                     Community Development Director  
                     Lisa Pangelinan, Senior Management Analyst  
                     Todd Tipton, Economic Development Manager  
                     Rolando Cruz, Transportation Director  
                     Charles Herbertson, Public Works Director  
                     Heba El-Guindy, Mobility and Transportation  
                     Engineering Manager  
                     Andrea Fleck, Administrative Intern

Consultants        Eric Yurkovich, Raimi and Associates  
Present:            Monique Ho, Nelson\Nygaard  
                     Carley Markovitz, Nelson\Nygaard  
                     Zachary Zabel, Nelson\Nygaard

o0o

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

Secretary Marsiglia invited public comment. No attendees requested to speak.

o0o

**Consent Calendar Items**

Secretary Marsiglia invited questions and discussion by GPAC Members on consent calendar items. No Members requested to speak.

Item C-1

**1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 10, 2020 GPAC MEETING**

MOVED BY CHAIR ROSENAU, SECONDED BY MEMBER MAND AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED, THAT THE MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 10, 2020 ARE APPROVED (ABSENT MEMBERS MALSIN, MARKS, MIN, MONKKONNEN, TORRES PAWLING, STUART, VIZCARRA, WALLACE, WEISSMAN; NO MEMBERS ABSTAINED).

Item C-2

**1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 17, 2020 GPAC MEETING**

MOVED BY MEMBER ROSENAU, SECONDED BY MEMBER MAND AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED, THAT THE MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 17, 2020 ARE APPROVED (ABSENT MEMBERS MALSIN, MARKS, MIN, MONKKONNEN, TORRES PAWLING, STUART, VIZCARRA, WALLACE, WEISSMAN; NO MEMBERS ABSTAINED).

o0o

**Action Items**

Item A-1

**1. PRESENTATION ON AND DISCUSSION OF EXISTING  
TRANSPORTATION AND MOBILITY CONDITIONS IN CULVER CITY**

Secretary Marsiglia introduced the presentation on existing transportation and mobility conditions in Culver City, led

by Nelson\Nygaard, the City of Culver City's General Plan Update (GPU) mobility consultants.

Carley Markovitz of Nelson\Nygaard asked Eric Yurkovich from Raimi and Associates if he had any comments before the presentation. Yurkovich responded that he did not have comments and thanked Markovitz.

Markovitz explained that Monique Ho from Nelson\Nygaard would share her screen for the presentation; and presented on the goal of having a collaborative talk with GPAC Members; the presentation structure; her role as Principal and Los Angeles office leader at Nelson\Nygaard; her excitement to be joining the GPAC Members and speaking on their work; that her colleagues would introduce themselves during their sections in the presentation; the role of Nelson\Nygaard and mobility in the GPU process; City staff collaboration; that Zachary Zabel from Nelson\Nygaard would present key issues and opportunities; that the existing Circulation Element was last updated in 1995 and the goals, policies, and priorities reflect that time period; the need for the updated Mobility Element to reimagine mobility, create multi-modal networks for safe, local streets, and ensure congestion is reduced as Culver City grows; that the Mobility Element would build off existing policies and design guidelines, incorporate new legislative requirements while ensuring that policies and regulations are progressive, and recognize best practices and input from City staff, GPAC Members, and broader community; and invited Zabel to speak on the findings in the existing conditions summary.

Zabel thanked Markovitz and introduced himself as Nelson\Nygaard staff from the Los Angeles office; noted that he would discuss initial findings from the existing conditions review and encouraged engagement from GPAC Members, that the full report and supplementary video would be posted on the project website, and that the consultant team reviewed previous transportation plans and studies and conducted analysis on the existing transportation network systems, and presented on the city's existing bicycle network; high stress bike riding environments; changes in bike lane class designations along Washington Boulevard; the difficulty of accessing the Ballona Creek bike path and that it currently serves recreational users more than local trips that begin and end in the city; the existing pedestrian network; existing sidewalk conditions and the

City's Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) self-evaluation and transition plan; recent city traffic collision data, including vehicle-involved collision hotspot locations and the high-injury network; the City's Vision Zero response; the Public Works Department's Local Road Safety Plan; the benefits and negative effects from the 405 Freeway, which passes through the city and is under Caltrans jurisdiction; existing on- and off-street parking conditions; parking patterns; existing public mobility services; the differences between CityBus, CityShare, and CityRide mobility services; trip reduction programs and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs; existing transit service; data on the Culver CityBus service area, annual ridership, and top usage stops before the COVID-19 pandemic, and Culver CityBus's role as a critical regional transit service; the Transportation Department's plan to develop a Comprehensive Mobility Service Plan that shows surrounding bus routes other transit agencies operate; travel pattern data; key findings from the existing conditions summary;; opportunities identified in the existing conditions summary; how mobility solutions are key to achieving wider community goals of social equity, environmental sustainability, economic development, public safety, and public health; the need to better integrate transportation and land use planning; recommendations from the 2017 TOD Visioning Study; how strategies like congestion pricing and micro-transit could improve first and last mile connectivity; and invited Markovitz to continue the presentation.

Markovitz thanked Zabel and presented on key legislation and policies related to mobility; how those policies relate to Culver City's current and planned initiatives; the Complete Streets Act and Culver City's Complete Streets Policy; recent California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) legislation, and the California Electric Vehicle executive order Governor Newsom issued; and asked Members to consider: Are there any key legislation updates you think the Mobility Element should address?

Discussion ensued between Members and staff on Paris' 15-minute city strategy; the balance between changing physical infrastructure and relying on law enforcement to manage traffic enforcement issues; possible legal restrictions on using analogous technologies for traffic enforcement; using non-police-based traffic management techniques and possible

legislative changes needed; the intersection between mobility and other elements of the General Plan like public safety and housing; how the Mobility Element can provide a framework to shape other policies; the tension between projected growth, existing congestion, and cut-through traffic issues; opportunities to integrate density triggers for development within the GPU when mobility milestones are achieved; the housing-jobs imbalance; congestion pricing; and parking minimums and maximums.

Markovitz asked Members if there were other legislative updates to discuss before continuing the presentation and thanked Members for their comments.

Zabel continued the presentation on how the Mobility Element interacts with other GPU Elements and guiding principles; the links between mobility and infrastructure, urban design, community health, public safety, and climate action planning; asked Members to close their eyes and imagine how they see themselves and others getting around the city in 5, 10, and 20 years, and how that might look different from today; and asked Members to share their one big idea for future mobility in Culver City.

Discussion ensued between Members and staff on ending cut-through traffic, reclaiming public space for the public, and increasing multi-modal options.

Zabel asked Ho to type Members' comments in PowerPoint in real-time and noted that they would post the slides to the project website after the meeting.

Discussion ensued between Members and staff on improving Ballona Creek as a safe community gathering destination and transit corridor, prioritizing active modes of transportation locally, implementing curbless streets, and keeping automobiles at the periphery.

Secretary Marsiglia noted that an attendee requested to speak and that the public comment period would occur after the presentation and requests to speak could be made to the host at that time.

Discussion ensued on intentional safe bike routes from all residential neighborhoods to schools and examples of neighborhoods that do not have existing safe bike routes to schools.

Zabel thanked the Members for their comments and asked Members to discuss: What are your biggest concerns about mobility in Culver City?

Discussion ensued between Members and staff on safety.

Secretary Marsiglia read a comment submitted by Heba El-Guindy, Culver City's Mobility & Transportation Engineering Manager, about improvements scheduled for January 2021 along the Ballona Creek Path between Duquesne and National, including lighting, permeable pavement, and shade trees.

Discussion ensued between Members and staff on safety concerns and difficulty of traveling by bicycle.

Zabel read a comment mentioning the domination of car culture in Los Angeles; presented on integrating complete streets into the General Plan; the relationship between complete streets and the Bicycle and Pedestrian Action Plan (BPAP); hurdles to implementation that previous projects have faced; the role of the GPU in increasing understanding among residents about the benefits of complete streets; the UCLA Master of Urban Planning capstone project (UCLA Report) that developed a prioritization matrix based on community feedback to identify areas most in need of complete streets interventions and associated recommendations for the GPU; current development and implementation of complete streets design guidelines in Culver City; implementation goals and recommendations established in the BPAP; strategies to prioritize transit on roadways to enhance speed, reliability, and improve the user experience, including dedicated rights-of-way, transit signal priority, queue jump lanes, cashless opportunities for barrier-free fare payment through the Culver City NextBus Application, and level boarding; implementing dedicated lanes for active and public transportation through the "Move Culver City" pilot project, circulator service using open-air trolley type vehicles, and mobility hub at the Metro E Line Culver City Station; changes to vehicle ownership trends and parking demand; implementing autonomous vehicles (AVs) and how that will affect mobility, parking demand, and parking revenue; strategies to effectively manage on-street parking; dynamic parking pricing, shared parking, and opportunities to adaptively reuse parking structures; and asked Members how they would

prioritize investments between active transportation, transit, and parking.

Discussion ensued between Members and staff on investing in all three modes, dynamic parking pricing, connections between active transportation and transit to perimeter parking, and AVs.

Secretary Marsiglia noted that attendees may be sending comments to the host and asked Lisa Pangelinan whether any had been received. Pangelinan responded none were received.

Discussion ensued between Members and staff on the different mobility investment priorities between various neighborhoods within the city, how those different priorities would be factored into the GPU, and aligning future transportation networks with future growth.

Zabel introduced the next topic of urban design and how mobility and transportation interplay with land use and place-making.

Markovitz re-introduced the topic of the intersection of urban design and mobility and presented on intersectional opportunities fostering social connections through urban design; revitalizing the public realm and creating gathering places, promoting public safety, and how mobility decisions dictate urban design decisions and the feel of the public realm; managing the public right-of-way for the public good; dedicating space for efficient travel modes; facilitating opportunities to co-create, and lead with community design that offers, spaces for the most vulnerable populations using the right-of-way regardless of ability or means; supporting diverse land uses to create a vibrant and resilient city; the need for a networked approach when thinking about multi-modal infrastructure to create a vibrant public realm; the City's response to COVID-19 and the resulting tactical urban design solutions; City efforts, including the Economic Recovery Task Force, to advance economic recovery like safely reopening businesses in phases, free temporary public right-of-way permitting for outdoor dining and retail sales, and guidelines for installing parklets in designated rights-of-way; how tactical solutions locally and abroad have prioritized public space for people and diverse uses; the potential for temporary solutions to become permanent spaces; benefits of mobility hubs and opportunities to integrate context-

specific multi-dimensional amenities; the role of transportation technology and digital policy in informing solutions and increasing user information; practices around mobility data and standards for sharing that data; the UCLA Report goals and recommendations for reimagining the Transit Gateway and surrounding area; how infrastructure investments can help shape land use policy; and asked Members: What programs, policies, or strategies that were introduced during COVID-19 pandemic do you feel should be continued or made permanent?

Discussion ensued between Members and staff on continuing outdoor dining in the public right-of-way and expanding that to other corridors and neighborhoods, opportunities to improve street furniture used for outdoor dining, legislation affecting restaurant food and the public-right-of-way, 2020 election anxiety and how COVID-19 has brought different groups and communities together in a relief-effort, and continuing to build community beyond COVID-19 rescue efforts into a recovery period and further.

Markovitz asked Members for any last comments, summarized the topics, transitioned to longer-term visioning beyond COVID-19, and asked Members a second discussion question: How do you want to see Culver City allocate the public realm to mobility in the future?

Discussion ensued between Members and staff on the term mobility and whether it refers to public space for everybody, inclusivity and free use of public space, addressing climate and heat islands, using city park space for mobility hubs and accommodating the city's aging population, locations for potential mobility hubs along Metro rail lines throughout Los Angeles, the 2028 Olympics, and intermodal connections and opportunities related to mobility hubs.

Markovitz read a comment a Member submitted on future bike mobility lanes being protected and separated Class IV lanes over Class II and III lanes and discussed safety and infrastructure investments that promote active transportation.

Discussion ensued between Members and staff on inclusive and accessible bike and mobility lanes; rebranding lanes to remove the focus on bicycles and encourage other users, including vulnerable users, and micro-mobility modes to use



the space; stigmas surrounding bicyclists; networked alternatives analysis to inform where to channel investments; creating a more sustainable ecosystem of mobility services.

Secretary Marsiglia reminded Members to state if they are going to leave early, and noted that if one more Member leaves, the meeting would lose its quorum and the meeting would be continued to a later date.

Markovitz thanked Secretary Marsiglia and invited Zabel to continue the presentation.

Zabel introduced the next topic of community health and presented on the link between mobility and the social determinants of health; how transportation strategies can improve health outcomes, particularly for low- and moderate-income households; facilitating multiple mobility options, enhancing economic opportunities and improving safety, air quality, access to healthy foods, childcare, recreation, and accessibility of mobility; community health's relevance to the GPU and recommendations for how to integrate it into the Mobility Element; the concept of "8 to 80" cities as it relates to mobility and public safety; the concept of the 15-minute city from Paris; and asked Members two discussion questions: 1) What do you think are the top public health issues related to mobility that Culver City should focus on? 2) Where should we focus mobility investments that improve outcomes related to social determinants of health?

Discussion ensued between Members and staff on the "8 to 80" concept, the pandemic, children walking to school, addressing accessibility and the experience of pushing someone in a wheelchair around the city, individual experiences informing top public health issues related to mobility, engaging people with health and mobility challenges into the conversation, the role of physical activity and active modes in improving public health, street infrastructure to support active modes, health benefits of being outdoors, how active modes can combat social isolation, reducing exposures to adverse environmental health impacts of pollution, focusing on populations that have been adversely affected historically, the benefits of cutting car usage, including social connections and physical activity; the shortcomings of electric and autonomous vehicles; car dependency and

elimination; equitable connectivity and access to resources and amenities that Culver City has to offer; how Fox Hills is disconnected from other areas of the city; areas within Culver City that have been historically invested in or not and how to address that; the city's carbon-footprint; differences in air quality impacts on people using different modes of travel; and street-cleaning.

Zabel introduced the next topic of public safety.

Markovitz noted that she would try to move through the section quickly given the time, and presented on how public safety and mobility are linked; the goal of Vision Zero to eliminate traffic fatalities; data on traffic injuries, fatalities, and other measures of public safety related to mobility; how Vision Zero can set equitable outcomes; alternatives to traditional traffic enforcement; Culver City's task force to review Public Safety Services; broader considerations for reevaluating public safety in light of recent protests; and asked Members: How can we capitalize on existing efforts around Vision Zero and complete streets to improve community relations.

Secretary Marsiglia read a comment a Member submitted on a previous discussion question about planting trees as mobility barricades to help with air quality.

Discussion ensued between Members and staff on shifting away from traffic enforcement and toward using physical infrastructure that can influence roadway behavior and automated safety enforcement, addressing racial disparities in traffic collisions, historic underinvestment in communities of color and low-income communities, using Vision Zero data to channel and prioritize mobility and safety investments into those communities, personal experiences with traffic collisions in Culver City, enhancements to traffic lights and crosswalks to reach every modality, designing streets to consider vulnerable populations' needs, and integrating a streamlined permitting and implementation process for street closures into the General Plan to facilitate events and non-car uses in the public-right-of-way.

Markovitz noted the time and asked Secretary Marsiglia whether to continue the presentation.

Secretary Marsiglia asked whether Members could stay longer and opened the meeting to public comment.

Michelle Weiner wants staff to address noise pollution through the General Plan, expressed that noise can be overwhelming for non-car users of the public right-of-way, and discussed creating no-noise-pollution-areas to make it tolerable for people to get out of their cars.

Eric Shabsis wants conversations about the intersection of safety and mobility to continue; fears underlying assumptions that Culver City is only Downtown Culver City and thinks it is easy to discuss mobility in that context; explained that other parts of the city like Blanco Park do not have the same underlying issues, challenges and opportunities; and would like there to be more discussion about reducing cut-through traffic on Sepulveda and other parts of the city besides the Downtown area.

Natasha Kumar requested to speak but was unavailable during the public comment period.

Secretary Marsiglia closed the public comment period and reminded Members to let her know if they needed to leave to ensure quorum.

Zabel continued the presentation, introduced the topic of climate action planning in relation to mobility, and presented on the City's steps to incorporate sustainability measures within its systems; the link between automobile-dependent transportation and greenhouse gas emissions and climate hazards; land use patterns and negative externalities associated with drive-alone travel; strategies to meet the GPU's climate and sustainability goals, such as decreasing vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and shifting travel mode-share to reduce drive-alone trips; current and proposed use of transportation demand management (TDM) measures; recommendations that Donald Shoup and UCLA students proposed to improve parking requirements in Culver City; Transportation Management Associations (TMA); congestion pricing as a strategy to reduce cut-through traffic; mobility options, including Metro Bike Share; best practices to implement shared mobility including those that consider equity, deploy shared mobility in historically underinvested communities, and collect data; and asked Members: How should Culver City

balance the desire for job growth with housing and congestion?

Discussion ensued between Members and staff on what the results of congestion pricing implementation have been. Zabel responded that outside of North America, public perception of congestion pricing has improved after implementation.

Discussion ensued between Members and staff on homelessness; increased housing prices in Venice because of large tech employers incentivizing employees to use alternative modes of transportation; balancing all community values and priorities while ensuring they do not cancel each other out; job growth, land use, and housing; creating jobs for Culver City's residents rather than for the rest of the region; housing to accommodate new jobs; building more housing and the housing-jobs imbalance; whether the jobs coming into the city are meeting the needs of Culver City residents; strategic location of new jobs; and local hire requirements.

Zabel discussed next steps for mobility and the GPU process, and for addressing the unique needs of distinct neighborhoods across the city.

Secretary Marsiglia thanked Markovitz, Zabel, and Ho for preparing the presentation and Members and attendees for staying late.

o0o

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

Secretary Marsiglia invited public comment. No attendees requested to speak.

o0o

#### **Receipt of Correspondence**

Secretary Marsiglia stated that none was received.

o0o

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

Eric Yurkovich (Raimi and Associates) thanked Zabel, Markovitz, and Ho for the presentation and notes; asked Members and attendees to take the Vision and Guiding Principles survey on the GPU website; briefly described the next meeting on sustainability and climate change scheduled for December; noted upcoming TAC meetings; and thanked Members.

Secretary Marsiglia told attendees to enjoy the holidays and stay safe.

o0o

### **Adjournment**

There being no further business, at 9:32 P.M., the General Plan Advisory Committee adjourned to a special meeting on December 10, 2020, at 7:00 P.M.

o0o

---

Lauren Marsiglia for 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