SPECIAL COMMUNITY MEETING
OF THE CITY COUNCIL
CULVER CITY, CALIFORNIA

April 17, 2017
7:00 p.m.

Call to Order & Roll Call

Mayor Clarke called the special community meeting of the City Council to order at 7:01 p.m. in the Mike Balkman Chambers at City Hall.

Present: Jim B. Clarke, Mayor
Jeffrey Cooper, Vice Mayor
Göran Eriksson, Council Member
Meghan Sahli-Wells, Council Member
Thomas Small, Council Member

o0o

Invocation/Pledge of Allegiance

Mayor Clarke indicated that the City council would forego the invocation.

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by John Kuechle.

o0o

Joint Public Comment - Items Not on the Agenda

Mayor Clarke invited public comment.

The following member of the audience addressed the City Council:

Dr. CT Williams, resident, asked whether the City owned any sub-surface property rights or had received any oil or gas royalties or revenues, and he asserted there was more than one operator within the City.

o0o

Receipt and Filing of Correspondence

MOVED BY COUNCIL MEMBER SMALL, SECONDED BY COUNCIL MEMBER SAHLI-WELLS AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED, THAT THE CITY COUNCIL RECEIVE AND FILE CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED BY THE CITY CLERK'S OFFICE BEFORE 4:00 P.M. ON APRIL 17, 2017.

oOo

Action Items

Item A-1

CC - (1) Discussion and Consideration of a Temporary Hold on the Inglewood Oil Field Specific Plan Project and Related Environmental Impact Report for the Purpose of Considering a Request from the New Inglewood Oil Field Operator, Sentinel Peak Resources, to Participate in the Specific Plan Process as a Project Applicant; and (2) Direction to City Staff as Deemed Appropriate

Mayor Clarke reported that the Oil Drilling Subcommittee which he serves on with Council Member Sahli-Wells, had requested that the item be brought forward; they felt it important to brief the City Council and the public on the status of the release of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and Specific Plan for the Inglewood Oil Field; he discussed the reasons for the delays; consideration of options jointly discussed with staff, the consultant, the Subcommittee and the Oil Field Operator which would further delay the release of the EIR and the Specific Plan; he provided background on the goals and efforts of the Oil Drilling Subcommittee; the self-imposed moratorium by the Oil Operator; and options for City Council consideration.

Council Member Sahli-Wells expressed support for a healthy, open dialogue; discussed improving relationships; work to deliver regulations; resident concerns; oil releases in 2005; previous regulations; the need to protect the community; length of time for the process; state regulations; and the need for a fully vetted process with public involvement.

Heather Baker, Assistant City Attorney, explained the legal history of the item.

Melanie Doran Traxler, Project Manager, reported that City staff had been working to convert the draft drilling regulations to a Specific Plan and, with the assistance of a consultant team, an EIR to evaluate the environmental impacts

related to the draft plan and regulations; she discussed the request from Sentinel Peak Resources (SPR), the new owner of the Oil Field, to participate in the process; stakeholder interest in exploring broader based future beneficial land uses in conjunction with oil and gas operations; the meeting format; consideration of options on how to proceed with the plan, review and regulation of the oil field; she presented potential process options outlined in the staff report; the expected schedule; and the hearing process.

Christine Halley, SPR, provided background on her company and introduced her team; reviewed their efforts toward meeting the regulations for the Inglewood Oil Fields; discussed other land uses possible on the fields; and she asked the City to allow time to complete geological studies to answer the broader, long-term environmental land-use questions before them.

Nicki Carlsen, Alston and Bird, spoke on her experience in environmental land use; named other California cities whose codes have currently been revised; and stated they would need more time to work through the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process.

George Paspalof, SPR, reviewed their efforts to work with the City; discussed the importance of their geologic model to predict subsidence using data from existing oil wells, as well as providing efficient and effective extraction techniques; the need for more time to complete the model; he listed the neighboring communities they have worked in; and he discussed the importance of public input.

Discussion ensued between the speakers, staff and Council Members regarding similar discussions with Los Angeles County; the Community Standards District (CSD); whether the operator had known Culver City had an EIR in the works when they took over the fields; regular updates to the EIR timeline on the City website; communication; efforts to expedite the schedule; whether the operator would agree to a moratorium on additional drilling if the City Council agrees to the request for more time; creating an operating agreement; defining what would happen during the timeline; pulling a permit application for preliminary consideration; documenting plans for new wells vs. existing wells; whether the operator would agree to make this agreement part of a purchase agreement if they sell the fields; future land-use; the importance of collaboration; differences in costs to the

City depending on actions taken; estimate of costs incurred by the City to date on the EIR and draft regulations related to the item; revenue from oil and gas as not significant compared to the size of the City budget; operator intentions for the oil field depending on the geologic model outcome; efficiency; hydraulic fracturing; and whether issues of land-use could be addressed after the EIR is completed.

Mayor Clarke invited public comment.

Patrick Vowell, SPR, supported approval of the proposal to allow more time for the Specific Plan process.

Ivan Tether, California Independent Petroleum Association, provided background on the organization and voiced support for SPR's proposal to provide more time for their comprehensive assessment.

Dr. CT Williams, resident, noted that CEQA allows for changes to the EIR; discussed monitorization of surface land; housing developments on top of the oil fields; oil wells operating within 60 feet of multi-family dwellings; enclosed wells; he noted that an EIR could be issued now with any necessary changes made later; and he urged public participation.

Al Lobos reported working for SPR and he asked that SPR be given the time they need for the study noting that he had a family to support.

Eric Peterson, Petroleum Engineer for SPR, discussed his experience working in the Inglewood Oil Fields and he asked that the City Council approve the request from SPR.

Matthew Cardona reported working in the Inglewood Oil Field and asked that the City Council consider the proposal and the families that work there.

Thomas Cruise reported working for SPR and asked for support of the temporary hold requested to allow the company time to complete the technical work underway and to allow for participation.

Mike Fernandez indicated that he is a member of the technical staff of SPR and he asked that the City Council support the proposal put forward by SPR.

Tiffany Johnson, Human Resource Clerk, read comments

submitted by:

Jesus Valdez

Jason May reported working as an electrician in the Inglewood Oil Field; discussed CSD training; the new company that started in January; and he expressed support for allowing additional time to complete the needed research.

Douglas Spacht, Field Foreman, provided background on himself; acknowledged public concerns; discussed his desire to do the right thing for the public and for the company; and he asked that the City Council support the SPR proposal.

Tony Heim, Foreman for SPR, discussed the reverence many workers have for the oil field and the positive environment, noting that he had raised his family there; pointed out that it is the largest urban oil field in the country; expressed support for the job done; discussed changes over the years; the way business is done in the oil field; and he was looking forward to doing things better and continuing the progress made over the years.

Harry Barnum, Geologist, provided background on himself; discussed the importance of safety and compliance; integrating the oil field with the community; the Coastal ATI; and he asked for support of the SPR proposal.

Keven Young, SPR, provided background on himself; discussed the importance of safety; their programs; and he expressed support for the SPR proposal.

Logan Allen reported starting TYP, a young professional group; he felt it important to create well informed public policy; he wanted to see valuable input from technical experts to create better policy; he discussed subsidence; and he wanted to see decisions made based on high quality information and modern technology available today.

Charles Henderson, Foreman, discussed the importance of awareness; expressed support for the extension requested by SPR; wanted to see a comprehensive plan that everyone can stand by; noted that he has a family to support; and he discussed the importance of safety.

Tom Camarella discussed the safety of Culver City residents; the need to study air, water, runoff, and off gases; he noted

that jobs were not the issue; discussed the importance of health, safety and City finances; he requested a $150 million bond to protect residents; discussed clean-up costs; asked for a moratorium while studying and the promised EIR and recommendations; discussed global warming and asked for a solar collection station on the hill; and he asserted that more forms of drilling should not done in the fragile subsurface.

Bobbi Gold, resident, asked that the delay of implementation of regulations not delay the completion of the Park to Playa Trail.

Jon Melvin expressed support for the study; he pointed out that the jobs of the oil field workers were not in jeopardy; expressed concern with a potential hidden agenda in pushing for a delay; noted that Culver City only represented 10% of the oil field; he discussed the Citizens Advisory Panel (CAP) process; oversight and inspection of the plans but no guarantees; and he expressed concern with impacted homeowners.

John Kuechle, Co-Chair, Citizens Advisory Panel (CAP), expressed support for the takeover by SPR; felt the request for the extension was reasonable; discussed the need for SPR to agree to a formal moratorium while the extension is in place and to cover additional costs that come with that; he expressed concern with the request for expanding the process for ultimate land use and the potential for an increased number of contentious issues on the table; and concern with diverting the focus away from the issue.

Charles Moore spoke on behalf of one of the substantial land owners noting that he felt that the City Council was compelled to grant the request for additional time.

Liz Gosnell asked the City Council to fix the lights in Council Chambers; indicated that she is a trust agent for one of the landowners in the Inglewood Oil Field bordering Culver City and serves on the CAP; discussed available technology; was pleased with the new operator; and she asked that the City Council support the extension.

J.E. Brockman felt it important to move forward in the process and wanted to see an EIR completed with changes made as needed; discussed improvements to technology and jobs provided by the oil fields; she noted the importance of

protecting people living around the oil field; asked for a bond; discussed new drilling; she felt the industry was dying and workers should be retrained; and she suggested that the City Council encourage SPR to use the oil field in a way that would not poison residents.

Jessica Cattelino discussed the importance of transparency and deliberation; the public process; risks and uncertainty assumed by the buyer; she expressed support for further studies and reports; and she indicated that changes could be made after the Specific Plan and the EIR are issued.

Michelle Weiner expressed appreciation for the public, transparent process, and hearing the point of view of industry workers; expressed concern that the operator might become one of the primary drivers of what happens going forward; discussed the time to create the working agreement; public input on the agreement; and she wanted to see the process move forward, noting the opportunity for the operator to have input and make changes to the EIR and Specific Plan.

Paul Ferrazzi, Citizens' Coalition for Safe Community, questioned whether the operator had divulged the location of the 46 bottom holes under Culver City that were not noticed to the City under previous operators; he felt it would be disingenuous to delay something that was about to be realized; he expressed support for going forward with the original plan; discussed the survey by PXP in 2002; additional oil reserves discovered; efforts to secure land leases by PXP; existing subsidence and uplift; Ballona Creek; and the original plan submitted by PXP from 2005.

Gary Gless discussed the different operators over the years; noted that the study would be done whether there was an extension or not; discussed the Division of Oil and Gas analysis; property damage in the community; the need to protect the City with regulations; and he urged the City to move forward.

David Haake indicated that he had been waiting a long time for the EIR and the plan to protect the public safety; he questioned why the geological study is necessary before the EIR is released; he asked for public transparency noting the amount of tax payer money spent to prepare the EIR; discussed the conflict of interest between the operator and land owner with the residents of Culver City; and he observed that regulations would lower their profit but protect public

safety and public health.

Ken Mand praised staff for their efforts which he did not want to see go to waste; observed that not one member of the community had asked that the process be put on hold while revenue opportunity is identified; he wanted to see the EIR completed and the investment by the City realized; and he echoed previous comments made by J.E. Brockman, Jessica Cattelino, Dr. CT Williams and David Haake.

Rebecca Rona Tuttle asserted that SPR should provide the City with whatever data it now has regarding the oil field as a good faith effort noting that SPR had acquired data from the previous owner; she discussed City engagement of a consultant; allowing SPR to comment on the draft EIR and draft specific plan, rather than engaging in the process of creating those documents and policies; she noted that the regulations were supposed to be protections for residents and those around the City and she felt it made no sense to involve the company being regulated; she asked that the process go forward according to the most recent timeline; and she wanted SPR to be allowed to submit comments just as residents do.

Khin Khin Gyi noted that residents had been waiting for regulations since the release of methane and hydrogen sulfide in 2006; she reported that at the January CAP meeting they learned that there were 230 injections wells being acidized; and she asked that the new regulations be rolled out in May as originally planned.

Aura Walker, Citizens Coalition for a Safe Community, asked the City Council to put people before corporations and rule on the side of caution; reported that studies indicate there is no safe way to frack; she discussed risks associated with acidization; reported circulating a petition to ban fracking in California; expressed concern with earthquakes caused by fracking; and she asked the City Council to move forward with the EIR to protect residents and the infrastructure of the City.

Dr. Suzanne Benedittis asked SPR to take SB 4 seriously noting that millions of dollars of taxpayer money had been spent; discussed study recommendations; she questioned whether setbacks of ½ mile from vulnerable populations would be put in writing; she asked SPR to bond Culver City to accept responsibility for probable cause as the field is

located on fault lines; she questioned how many of the workers live in the City; she felt that the land owners and the public had time to weigh in; she asserted that SPR knew what it was buying into; and she wanted to see the EIR and Specific Plan move forward in May as promised.

Daryl Gale reported that the California Public Utilities Commission is currently holding hearings to shut down the Aliso Canyon facility; indicated that Stand LA would be asking the Los Angeles City Council for a 2500 foot set back from all urban drilling; she discussed information available from Physicians for Social Responsibility; alternative energy; jobs; and she asked that the City Council consider other actions being taken as they make their decision.

Daniel Lee emphasized previous points made including the responsibility of the company to do due diligence, not the City or residents; he noted that altering the process of making regulations to accommodate a company is unconscionable; stated that regulations are to protect the health and safety of a community; he asserted that it is imperative to have regulations in place while oil is being taken out of the ground; and he clarified that there is nothing in the proposal that would negatively affect jobs.

Sullivan Barth noted that regulations should not be placed in the hands of the people being regulated; he wanted to continue with the process and Specific Plan; expressed concern that the study would be dragged on in order to maximize profits before it is in place; and he felt the EIR should be released as soon as possible.

Karim Sahli felt that the City should stick with the established plan; noted that the process had cost a lot of money; discussed the moral compass of the new owner; noted that none of the employees live in Culver City; expressed concern for the health and safety of his family and neighbors; reported that the new owner had acknowledged that their job is to look for the most efficient way to extract oil; and he reminded the City Council that the job of the City is to look for the best way to protect residents.

Deborah Weinrauch commended staff on their excellent work preparing the Specific Plan and the EIR; referenced a letter from SPR dated April 6, 2016; she proposed establishing a citizen oversight committee in addition to the subcommittee and she volunteered to serve; she reported living in

Raintree, bordering the oil field, noting that she had been diagnosed with cancer as have several of her neighbors; and she asked that the release be done of the draft Specific Plans and the EIR in May.

Paula Amezola, public health professional, thanked the City Council for engaging in the democratic process; discussed the impacts of fossil fuels on health; expressed concern with the health and safety of the children in the City; and she wanted to see a science-based environmental impact report that did not take into the account the influence of someone who would profit from the process.

Michael Zucker thanked the workers who spoke; reiterated that nothing that was proposed was intended to impact their jobs; he asserted that SPR would benefit from a delay to the EIR and Specific Plan, not Culver City and its residents; he acknowledged the work of the City to develop the set of regulations governing drilling on the Culver City portion of the oil field to protect residents and the community; he discussed the purpose of the regulations; he felt that moving forward with the regulations did not prevent revisions later if appropriate; and he urged the City Council to release the Specific Plan and EIR now.

Juan Carlos Moreno observed that recent cuts to the Environmental Protection Agency had made people more reliant on local government; he noted that Huntington Beach has being used as an example but area residents, and even pets were contracting cancer; and he expressed concern with the growing number of children in the Culver Crest neighborhood and potential effects to their health.

Armando Padua expressed concern with costs for alternative energy; the U.S. power grid and alternative forms of power; reliance on oil and gas; hazards involved; and safety measures taken.

Dan Taimuty, operator representative, reported working in the oil field for 35 years; discussed the safety of the environment; the CAP meetings; efforts to be transparent; and he felt that everyone would be happy with the outcome given additional time for the EIR.

Ken Palmer noted that residents were already suffering from overflights and pollution; Culver City doesn't have jurisdiction over the air but does have jurisdiction over the

land; he expressed appreciation for efforts of the City Council to protect residents; and he expressed support for moving forward with Option A.

Tiffany Johnson, Human Resource Clerk, read written comments submitted by:

Scott Kecken
Buck Grayson
Bill Buterbaugh
Angus Alexander
Harvey Loya
Manuel Ramos
Victoria Rosenfeld

Discussion ensued between applicant representatives; consultants, staff and Council Members regarding the request for a $150 million bond; provisions for insurance and bonding; potential delays to the Park to Playa project; potential additional time and dimension added to the inclusion of land use outcomes in the process; information on bottom hole locations; inconsistencies with information provided by DOGGR; concern with a refusal to provide understandable information; the request by SPR to delay the EIR; clarifying what is proposed; the need for more information and specificity for the project put forth for review; assumptions in the City document; the technical study; current acidization on wells in the oil field; clarification that acidization is not fracking; requested increases to setbacks; clarification that an EIR would not prevent existing pumping; an observation that regulatory documents generally preceed development; concern with delaying baseline regulations; the need for follow through on promises to the community; public expectation; whether it is in the public interest to move forward; concern with limited information provided; the process for making assumptions; determining what could reasonably occur within the parameters of the plan; length of time for the Specific Plan; whether there would be a different use of the oil field at the end of 15 years; clearly defining the timeline of implementation; clarification that the Specific Plan establishes a 15 year timeline for new drilling and once the timeline ends, normal operations and production can continue for the life of the wells; the intent that the initial 15 year period was meant to parallel the span of the CSD; whether the City Council chooses to grant an extension to the 15 year term; whether the options available are legally challengeable due to the

generalizations the City has had to use due to the lack of information; review of how operations have been done in the past; ways to utilize other technologies for accessing the reserves that could change aspects of the project description; whether or not the issue is challengeable; clarification that the EIR addresses the issues in a comprehensive and defensible manner; the legally acceptable approach used; tools that the City has to make the oil field a park; the overlay for special focus study area; the need for a comprehensive analysis for long-term use; oil drilling as an interim use; the process to update the General Plan; evaluation of land uses; comprehensive land use planning; community involvement; the comprehensive study done on the oil reserves; history on the proposal to make the "Central Park of the West"; creating a baseline of codes for any oil drilling; the ability to make variances and exceptions; the request to hold off on ratifying the code to benefit the oil operations; the implication that holding off will save the City money as the operator would bear the costs; taking 60 days for a collaborative negotiation; and how best to move forward.

Christine Halley, SPR, discussed the existing municipal code section; challenge points in the City plan; commentary released back to the City; concern that the City did not make changes after commentary was made; willingness of SPR to collaborate with the City; and the financial burden SPR agrees to bare.

Nicki Carlsen, Alston and Bird, spoke to the land use planning component; the Specific Plan vs. regulations; whether land use be different than what it is now; the special study area; and existing CSD rules.

Additional discussion ensued between consultants, staff and Council Members regarding incorporation of comments from the previous operator; review of public comments; revisions to draft regulations as part of the Specific Plan; process issues to streamline report submission; and clarification that there had not been substantive changes made.

Mayor Clarke distributed a proposed motion to Council Members:

That the City Council authorize the Oil Drilling Subcommittee, in concert with the City staff and consultant, to enter into renegotiations with the oil operator - Sentinel

Peak Resources - for the purpose of drafting up a written agreement between the City and SPR for a period not to exceed 90 days which would contain certain mutually agreeable guiding principles, action items and other points of agreement, and;

If at the end of the 90 days there is compliance between the City and SPR on the adoption of those guiding principles and action items, the City Council further authorizes the Oil Drilling Subcommittee to continue to work with the City staff and consultant and SPR on the extension of the written agreement with additionally mutually agreeable guiding principles and action items for 90-day increments so long as there is compliance. And;

Further the City Council directs the Oil Drilling Subcommittee if at any time there is an inability to arrive at mutually agreeable guiding principles or action items or a failure of SPR to comply with the terms of the agreement, the Oil Drilling Subcommittee is to bring the matter forward to the full City Council to consider whether a further extension is warranted or whether to instead proceed with the City's current Specific Plan process, including the release of the Draft EIR.

Mayor Clarke moved the proposed motion and Council Member Eriksson seconded the motion.

Council Member Eriksson proposed amendments to the motion to require that SPR reimburse the City for costs in the process so far; agreement from SPR not to file any applications for new drilling while the discussions are in process; and if SPR sells, the agreement would be binding on the new owner.

Mayor Clarke accepted the proposed amendments to his motion.

Further discussion ensued between staff and Council Members regarding outdated regulations in place; application of a permit to drill a new well; the need for an EIR for each new well; clarification that there has not been an application in Culver City in a decade; the fact that the City prevailed in the challenge against the previous moratorium; clarification that a moratorium is not currently in place; clarification that regulations require a separate environmental review if new drilling is to take place; requirement of an initial study under CEQA; how binding the annual drilling plan is; assurances that the operator will not apply during the

extension; and concern that the City is not getting much back for the extension.

Nicki Carlsen, Alton and Bird, indicated that the operator is open to not submitting any applications but needs to know specifics as to what they would be able to do; actions necessary to maintain wells in operating order; and potential new owners.

Discussion ensued between project representatives, staff and Council Members regarding concern with starting the process and having a new owner not abide by agreements made; the process in place with two other operators; special requests; what the advantage is to allowing an extension; the ability of the City to bind a future owner; content of the work plan; conditioning a sale on pre-existing agreements; the inability to bind the successor in perpetuity; including a term; costs from this point forward to be borne by Sentinel; things to be done moving forward; technical reports; the baseline EIR; the Brown Act and public forum; discussion points and answers in the first 90 days; guiding principles; integrating a commitment to long term uses; discussion points; uses that are economically beneficial to the City; the overall timeline; clustering drill sites as a mechanism for maximizing the setback opportunity, better integration with other land uses, or areas to phase out; new technology around sensitive residential areas; air quality issues; electric drilling; thresholds; things to be done in the first 30 days of a proposed extension in order to get to the substantive part within 90 days; processing the EIR and the specific plan; the staff intensive nature of the process; whether the owner would sell the oil field before the study is done; and whether not granting the extension would sour the relationship with the operator.

Christine Halley, SPR, indicated that if an extension is not granted, SPR would have to speak into the process rather than having a dialog; she discussed forward thinking; a common end goal rather than having an adversarial relationship; and she asserted that an EIR is rooted in the project upon which it is based.

Further discussion ensued between representatives, staff and Council Members regarding clarification that no EIR has been seen by anyone yet; clarification that the project description is separate from the draft regulations; acknowledgement that no one wants to be regulated; the threat

of litigation and previous successful outcome; litigation from environmental organizations; the ability of the City to stand up for residents; the willingness of the City to collaborate whether an extension is granted or not; pursuing the dual track of moving forward with the EIR at the same time there is discussion; increased costs; the need for another public meeting if an extension is granted; determination as to whether the process is being done in good faith; the observation that the City is taking all the risk; clarification that the item would return to the full City Council if the subcommittee deems it necessary, otherwise the subcommittee can grant the extension; if there is not a mutually agreeable process within 60 days then there is no reason to continue for the full 90 days; establishing the guiding principles; the importance of flexibility; changing the process; the potential to lose any leverage the City has; the challenging nature of achieving the parallel track; the different people involved in the process; guiding principles and defining objectives; proper documentation; the time necessary to achieve the goals; and proper review.

Council Member Small asked that the item be brought back to the public in 90 days to discuss and justify to the public what has been done and why there is a need for additional extension.

Mayor Clarke and Council Member Eriksson accepted the amendment to the proposed motion.

MOVED BY MAYOR CLARKE AND SECONDED BY COUNCIL MEMBER ERIKSSON THAT THE CITY COUNCIL:

1. AUTHORIZE THE OIL DRILLING SUBCOMMITTEE, IN CONCERT WITH THE CITY STAFF AND CONSULTANT, TO ENTER INTO DISCUSSIONS WITH THE OIL OPERATOR - SENTINEL PEAK RESOURCES - FOR A PERIOD OF UP TO 90 DAYS FOR THE PURPOSE OF DRAFTING UP A WRITTEN AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY AND SPR FOR A TERM NOT TO EXCEED 90 DAYS WHICH WOULD CONTAIN CERTAIN MUTUALLY AGREEABLE GUIDING PRINCIPLES, ACTION ITEMS AND OTHER POINTS OF AGREEMENT, WHICH SHOULD INCLUDE, BUT NOT BE LIMITED TO:

A. SPR'S REIMBURSEMENT OF CITY'S COSTS IN THE PROCESS OR ASSISTANCE WITH FUNDING OF OTHER CITY PROJECTS WITH A CONNECTION TO THE OIL FIELD;

B. SPR'S AGREEMENT NOT TO FILE ANY APPLICATIONS FOR NEW WELLS WHILE DISCUSSIONS ARE IN PROCESS; AND

C. SPR'S AGREEMENT THAT IF THE OIL FIELD IS SOLD, THE AGREEMENT WOULD BE BINDING ON THE NEW OWNER, AND;

2. THE MATTER IS TO BE BROUGHT BACK FOR PUBLIC CONSIDERATION AT THE END OF THE INITIAL 90-DAY DISCUSSION PERIOD, AND;

3. FURTHER THE CITY COUNCIL DIRECTS THE OIL DRILLING SUBCOMMITTEE IF AT ANY TIME THERE IS AN INABILITY TO ARRIVE AT MUTUALLY AGREEABLE GUIDING PRINCIPLES OR ACTION ITEMS OR A FAILURE OF SPR TO COMPLY WITH THE TERMS OF THE AGREEMENT, THE OIL DRILLING SUBCOMMITTEE IS TO BRING THE MATTER FORWARD TO THE FULL CITY COUNCIL TO CONSIDER WHETHER A FURTHER EXTENSION IS WARRANTED OR WHETHER TO INSTEAD PROCEED WITH THE CITY'S CURRENT SPECIFIC PLAN PROCESS, INCLUDING THE RELEASE OF THE DRAFT EIR.

THE MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: CLARKE, ERIKSSON, SMALL
NOES: COOPER, SAHLI-WELLS

o0o

Public Comment - Items Not on the Agenda

Mayor Clarke invited public comment.

No cards were received and no speakers came forward.

o0o

Items from Council Members

MOVED BY VICE MAYOR COOPER, SECONDED BY COUNCIL MEMBER SAHLI-WELLS AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED, THAT THE MEETING BE ADJOURNED IN MEMORY OF LONG-TIME CITY EMPLOYEE, CATHERINE OLIVER.

o0o

Adjournment

There being no further business, at 11:15 p.m., the City Council adjourned its meeting in memory of Catherine Oliver to Tuesday, April 18, 2017 at 7:00 p.m.

oOo

Jeremy Green
CITY CLERK of Culver City, California
EX-OFFICIO CLERK of the City Council
Culver City, California

JIM B. CLARKE
MAYOR of Culver City, California