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

May 13, 2021
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 7:20 P.M.

Members Present:	Bitania Beniam, Member Cicely Bingener, Member Peter Capone-Newton, Member Dominique DjeDje, Member Ken Mand, Vice Chair David Metzler, Member Denice Renteria, Member Frances Rosenau, Chair Claudia Vizcarra, Member Jamie Wallace, Member Noah Zatz, Member
Members Absent:	Patricia Bijvoet, Member Diana Hernandez, Member Scott Malsin, Member Wally Marks, Member Jeanne Min, Member Paavo Monkkonnen, Member Kristen Torres Pawling, Member Anthony Pleskow, Member Freddy Puza, Member Andrew Weissman, Member
Staff Present:	Ashley Hefner Hoang, Advance Planning Manager (Secretary) Lauren Marsiglia, Associate Planner Andrea Fleck, Planning Intern
Consultants Present:	Eric Yurkovich, Raimi + Associates Jimi Mitchell, Nelson\Nygaard Zach Zabel, Nelson\Nygaard

o0o

Public Comment for Items NOT On the Agenda

Secretary Hefner Hoang invited public comment. No attendees requested to speak. Secretary Hefner Hoang noted that the agenda includes another time towards the end of the meeting for attendees to speak on items not on the agenda.

o0o

Consent Calendar Items

Secretary Hefner Hoang stated that no one submitted questions or comments on the consent calendar item before the meeting and invited the GPAC Members to ask questions and discuss the item. No Members requested to speak.

Item C-1

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MARCH 11, 2021 GPAC MEETING

MOVED BY MEMBER METZLER, SECONDED BY MEMBER BINGENER AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED, THAT THE MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF MARCH 11, 2021 ARE APPROVED (ABSENT MEMBERS BIJVOET, HERNANDEZ, MALSIN, MARKS, MIN, MONKKONNEN, TORRES PAWLING, PLESKOW, PUZA, WEISSMAN, NO MEMBERS ABSTAINED)

o0o

Action Items

Item A-1

1. PRESENTATION ON AND DISCUSSION OF THE PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN UPDATE MOBILITY ALTERNATIVES

Secretary Hefner Hoang introduced the presenters, Jimi Mitchell and Zach Zabel of Nelson\Nygaard, the General Plan Update (GPU) transportation and mobility subconsultants and Eric Yurkovich of Raimi + Associates, the lead consultant. Secretary Hefner Hoang noted that public comment and GPAC discussion would occur after the Item A-1 presentation.

Mitchell discussed his background; the agenda; developing a multi-modal vision and transportation network to support the city's growing population and transportation needs; shifting away from an auto-oriented transportation network to a multi-modal network that is accessible to all;

including people with different abilities; addressing mobility needs with appropriate solutions; considering different travel markets, meeting a commuter's needs for regional and local residential trips; providing viable options and incentives for people to walk, bike, and take public transit for short, local trips; the GPU project's current phase in the process: refining land use and mobility alternatives; analyzing benefits and trade-offs of the various mobility scenarios to inform GPU recommendations; input from the community engagement process related to mobility, including feedback on mobility concerns and opportunities for improvement, improving urban design, planning for future growth, and improving health and equity, improving access to mobility for communities that have been underinvested in historically, and invited Members to discuss opportunities for future mobility.

A Member discussed the potential impact of population growth on schools, school-related traffic, and the potential for neighborhood shuttles to streamline traffic into schools. Mitchell noted that staff is considering school locations for mobility investments and creating safe routes to schools for all modes of travel, and invited Members to share ideas.

A Member discussed the Move Culver City project, considering quick-build opportunities for future design projects compared to the typical, multi-year project timeline; the importance of being adaptable in the design process; the new protected, block-long bike lane on Elenda Street that connects two protected and separated existing bike lanes; and focusing on connecting existing paths rather than creating new bike lanes that are disconnected from the existing network. Mitchell emphasized the importance of network continuity and noted that disconnection is a barrier to mobility.

A Member asked for clarification on the GPU's next steps, and whether there is another GPAC meeting to discuss the land use and mobility alternatives in more detail. Secretary Hefner Hoang explained that there is an upcoming Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting on mobility, a GPAC meeting in June to review the land use alternatives again, and other upcoming opportunities for the GPAC to provide feedback on policy recommendations later in the GPU process. Mitchell noted that the timeline for policy development depends on timeline for the plan alternatives.

A Member discussed opportunities to integrate mobility solutions with land use alternatives and integrate triggers in the General Plan that allow for greater density when the city meets mobility goals; community concerns about higher density increasing traffic; considering mobility and multi-modal alternatives in land use and growth conversations to alleviate concerns about traffic; and considering mobility's relationship to other goals like equity, affordability, and housing to ensure the community accepts the GPU. Mitchell affirmed the importance of leveraging the connection between transportation and land use planning to achieve policy solutions and explained the team is considering integrating triggers into the GPU.

A Member discussed how alternative modes of transportation are inconvenient for some communities and for some trip types; incorporating mobility options for areas in Carlson Park, Veterans Park, and Fox Hills that are further from major corridors; and considering micro-transit as a solution when active modes of transportation such as walking or biking are not preferred (for example, going to the grocery store). Mitchell noted that staff is considering various shared mobility and micro-transit options in the mobility alternatives and how much to invest in those solutions. Zabel explained that GPU policies will consider how mobility affects other topics like public health outcomes, equity, and economic vitality.

Mitchell asked Members to discuss barriers to future mobility that the GPU should address and summarized barriers that Members listed already.

A Member discussed the role of policing in transit; ensuring transit is safe, equitable, and accessible for all; ensuring people are safe from police stops; how people of color have avoided coming to Culver City because of concerns that they would be stopped or harassed by police; and policing as a barrier to equity. Mitchell noted the importance of reducing the impact of policing on decision-making and behavior changes related to mobility.

A Member discussed how funding can be a barrier to mobility; developing a mobility and infrastructure bond and gaining community support for it; opportunities to increase mobility funding sources through value capture opportunities like offering developers height exemptions or

other development incentives to contribute to mobility projects or requiring developers to contribute a percentage of the value of their project to help create a mobility network that connects to jobs, the region, and accommodates future growth; implementing parking maximums; proactive ways to get funding; and the importance of timing. Mitchell clarified that timing is important to ensure mobility improvements are implemented before or at the same time as land use development rather than after.

A Member discussed overcoming car-centric history; how car-centric ideas have been engrained into City departments like Public Works, Planning, Police, in state and federal funding, and in our culture; assumptions that cars are a priority; the importance of changing thinking around cars (e.g. cars used to mean freedom but are now sometimes a liability because it can be difficult to get around in them); considering how construction impacts alternative modes of transportation and showing signage for alternative routes for all modes, not just cars; prioritizing all transportation modes equally, and gaining public support for that. Mitchell noted the importance of comprehensive wayfinding for all modes not just cars, the importance of accessible information and compelling alternatives. A Member emphasized the importance of shifting mode priority. Mitchell stated that the meeting would include questions specifically about priorities later.

Mitchell explained that the Mentimeter platform allows Members to provide interactive feedback on specific questions; asked Members about the most important types of long-term enhancements to make to the multimodal network so it is more convenient and accessible; and asked Members to select up to four of the choices listed on the platform to help identify priorities. Zabel noted that Members could write-in other options if their idea was not listed.

A Member asked what TDM programming stands for. Zabel explained that TDM stands for Transportation Demand Management programs designed to reduce trips. Zabel and Mitchell provided examples, including commuter programs, shuttle services, subsidies, transit pass programs, curb and parking management, partnerships with businesses and neighborhoods. A Member noted that developers are typically required to provide TDM programs.

A Member asked for examples of bike facilities, and if they include bike lanes and bike repair stations. Zabel explained that off-street, multi-use facilities includes bike paths separated from the roadway and that on-street bike facilities includes bike lanes. Mitchell noted that mobility hubs are opportunities to consider bike repair and pumping stations.

A Member discussed how multimodal transportation benefits business, concerns from the business community that shifting away from cars will hurt business, showing analysis of how multimodal options spur economic development could ease community concerns, and the importance of gaining business and community support, perhaps through economic development education. Mitchell noted that the business community is influential in the municipal decision-making process, and that activating space and increasing foot traffic are persuasive arguments.

A Member discussed how Downtown Culver City is currently prospering through Move Culver City even though west-bound lanes along a portion of Culver Boulevard are closed to cars, but that businesses remain concerned that cars cannot conveniently access their business. Mitchell noted that educating the public on the benefits of multimodal options requires a concerted effort, and how multimodal transportation activating public space may resonate with business owners.

Zabel asked Members to rank how we should prioritize mobility investments. Mitchell explained that the question was about what factors to prioritize when determining in which projects to invest.

Mitchell summarized the Mentimeter results: Members ranked factors relating to access and accessibility highly. Zabel noted that the highest ranked factors are connected to other General Plan Elements. Mitchell discussed how the factors are interdependent, and how the General Plan should have policies that recognize that mobility is interconnected to land use, safety, and capital investments so that mobility is part of the decision-making process as Culver City grows. Zabel explained that staff would download Members' rankings and compare priorities with community input and discussions with the TAC.

Mitchell asked Members to identify up to five neighborhoods that have the greatest need for transportation network improvements and investments.

Zabel asked if any Member who selected Sunkist Park could explain their rationale and noted that this was a good opportunity to discuss improvements outside of the Downtown and Fox Hills neighborhoods.

A Member explained that the questions were tricky because they are open-ended, and asked how staff will use these data. Mitchell explained that staff would use the data to inform where priority areas might be and what the level of investment might be, but that the data would not determine a specific solution; the context for why Members identified Fox Hills as having a great need for transportation network improvements; and that staff is trying to understand where Members want to see future investments.

A Member asked about the difference between the Mclaughlin and Culver West neighborhoods. Mitchell explained that McLaughlin consists of a dense residential area west of the 405 freeway, whereas Culver West consists of the retail corridor further West along Washington Blvd.

Mitchell discussed trip generation and reduction analyses; coordinating mobility analyses with other GPU efforts, like land use planning and the vehicle miles traveled (VMT) mobility impact fee study which generates revenue for capital projects by charging developers based on the VMT the project is expected to produce; how the study is separate from the GPU process, but uses complimentary data sources and analysis tools; how the VMT models focus on regional networks and auto trips, roadway capacity, and changes to fixed-routes like bus and rail investments, and do not account for the impacts of other mobility options like bike-share, scooter-share, car-share, and other services; that that the GPU will analyze additional trip reduction potential of multimodal and emerging mobility components that the VMT model does not capture; using the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) template to measure trip reduction potential; the different factors that CAPCOA established to estimate additional trip reduction potential of multi-modal investments beyond changes to roadway and fixed route bus and rail networks.

A Member asked how trip reduction models relate to affordable housing. Mitchell explained that affordable housing and land use are factors considered in regional travel demand forecast models and the CAPCOA analysis to estimate trip generation and reduction.

Mitchell discussed the CAPCOA trip reduction factors that the GPU will focus on, including neighborhood/site enhancement, e.g., pedestrian and bike networks, car-share programs, etc.; transit system improvements, e.g., bike parking at transit stations, local shuttles, improving access to transit stops, etc.; and commute trip reduction measures, e.g., rideshare and bike-share programs and end of trip facilities; how the CAPCOA analysis shows the aggregate impacts of all multi-modal solutions and networks on trip generation and trip reduction; how the study and the CAPCOA analysis estimates how many more trips the different growth scenarios generate, and how we can mitigate those added trips and traffic impacts by investing more in the multi-modal system; how the analyses will inform mobility recommendations and policies for the General Plan; different scenarios for multimodal programs including catalytic investments, e.g., transportation infrastructure, new services, integrating mobility investments with land use changes and supportive investments, e.g., programming, including TDM policies, financial incentives, business community partnerships, and other community-based solutions; the components of the mobility scenarios, including fixed route transit, multimodal pathways including on- and off-street pathway networks, mobility hubs, and emerging mobility; potential priority areas for mobility investments along major roadways, intersections, and at key destinations; future land use scenarios compared to existing transit facilities; existing trip generators compared to expected trip increases in 2045 established by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) and which locations are generating trips; how all of Culver City is expected to generate more trips in the future, but that some areas will see a greater increase than others; potential trip generation under a land use scenario that allows for much more housing and employment growth; comparing development scenarios against potential trip reduction benefits at different levels of mobility investment; how the goal of the discussion and data collection is to understand where the biggest needs are to inform policy development and how to implement projects effectively; how the goal of the

General Plan is not to determine the specific mobility projects to implement over the next 20 years, but to set priorities, policies, and goals to guide future development.

Mitchell asked Members to discuss what is most important to them when considering potential trade-offs in multimodal investments and discussed examples of trade-offs and the importance of establishing priorities when faced with funding constraints.

A Member discussed eliminating cut-through traffic, prioritizing moving people efficiently through Ballona Creek, and how this will improve business. Mitchell noted that the mobility alternatives will compare impacts of different levels of investment, and that analyzing the impact to Ballona Creek facilities and connectivity will be one of the indicators, but that the alternatives will not study trip reduction impacts of specific projects.

A Member asked for the definition of trip generators. Mitchell explained that trip generators are destinations that draw people in, not where trips begin. Discussion ensued on prioritizing internal circulation, making it easier to complete short trips without a vehicle, non-work commute trips and increasing availability of end-of-trip facilities for alternative modes (e.g., bike parking). Mitchell noted that non-work commute trips make up a large portion of total trips, that traditional planning focuses most on peak commute trips, and that it is important to plan for off-peak non-commute trips.

A Member discussed mobility challenges for persons in wheelchairs and persons with limited mobility and improving accessibility. Mitchell noted that the mobility network should be designed so that all people can use it effectively.

A Member discussed learning from the pandemic, particularly the shifting travel schedules, non-peak hour deliveries, and adaptability; transitioning out of the pandemic but not continuing old habits; how affordable, on-demand delivery options can shift trips to non-peak hours. Mitchell noted that there are policies and incentives for operators to provide delivery services.

Mitchell asked what roadways like primary arterials, secondary streets, and neighborhood streets, Members want to prioritize for conversion of parking or travel lanes into bicycle facilities.

Marsiglia read a comment that a Member submitted about encouraging bike facilities away from main roads to reduce pollution and reduce risk of collisions. Mitchell noted that it is safer for cyclists to be off major thoroughfares, and that reserving space for bicycles on secondary streets can help discourage cut-through traffic.

A Member discussed how roads should prioritize moving people rather than vehicles, and that every street should accommodate all transportation modes. Mitchell noted that it is necessary to set priorities to inform policy implementation to achieve that goal.

A Member discussed how closing a lane along Culver Boulevard to accommodate outdoor dining converted a Downtown street lane that used to experience high levels of traffic into a space for community and social connection. Mitchell noted that the community has embraced the outdoor dining Downtown, and that there are opportunities to build on the benefits and success of tactical solutions from the pandemic and make aspects of those strategies permanent.

Mitchell asked about roadways Members would like to prioritize for conversion of travel lanes into transit-only lanes, and explained that transit-only lanes allow higher frequency service without adding more buses to the fleet.

A Member discussed how it is more equitable to redesign major roadways to safely accommodate bicyclists than to separate bicyclists from those major thoroughfares; that the Move Culver City project prioritizes both transit and bicycles; that prioritizing vehicles on major roadways encourages cut-through traffic; that lane closures (like existing lane closures along Culver Boulevard between Sepulveda Boulevard and Elenda Street) impact travel behavior and push traffic elsewhere. Mitchell noted that as soon as you build road capacity, it fills up. A Member stated that the roads should be filled with equitable modes of transportation.

Marsiglia read a comment a Member submitted suggesting to convert travel lanes into transit-only lanes along Slauson Avenue and Jefferson and Sepulveda Boulevards.

Mitchell discussed the mobility alternative scenarios, including a financially constrained alternative, and an aspirational alternative; considerations and assumptions associated with each alternative, and key differences between them; how levels of investment in various mobility components differ between the alternatives; mobility components including fixed-route and high capacity transit, bicycle facilities, pedestrian and multi-use facilities, mobility hubs, and micro-transit and shared mobility services; and types of possible investments into each mobility component.

A Member discussed how the presentation provided a high-level perspective of mobility, and that the presentation did not discuss Transit Oriented District (TOD) Visioning efforts; how Move Culver City leveraged TOD Visioning; how staff should analyze policy and the TOD Visioning and discuss it at the next meeting. Mitchell noted that the TOD Visioning is related to capital projects, but that quantitative analysis of potential TOD Visioning impacts is not part of the scope of work at this stage in the GPU process because of the level of detail needed about future project development; that Move Culver City is an example of a type of solution; and how TOD Visioning fits into the GPU. Secretary Hefner Hoang noted that staff will ensure that the GPU's policies and implementation plan consider the recommendations from the TOD Visioning study throughout the policy development phase of the GPU.

A Member suggested including a mobility narrative in each General Plan element explaining how mobility fits in with the goals and objectives. Secretary Hefner Hoang noted that we can think about how to incorporate a narrative linking the various elements. Mitchell discussed the importance of addressing interconnectivity between the General Plan elements; and that integrating mobility within the entire General Plan is necessary.

Mitchell described how the Transportation and Public Works Departments are reviewing a draft list of mobility projects for GPAC Members to review and discuss later; the multimodal strategies proposed in the mobility alternatives; and why it is easier to implement bike lanes

on secondary streets and neighborhood streets than on primary arterials.

A Member discussed reclassifying major arterials. Mitchell noted that the roadway table is a major tool that the City can use to implement mobility projects. Zabel mentioned that other cities are in the process of reclassifying their roadway tables as part of their GPUs.

Marsiglia asked Mitchell to explain to Members what a roadway table is. Mitchell explained that a roadway table classifies streets into standardized categories; that each roadway category has specific requirements for speed limits, lane widths, signalization, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and other guidelines; and how modifying the roadway table impacts mobility planning and implementation.

Secretary Hefner Hoang noted that a Member needs to leave at 9:30 PM, that quorum will be lost, that she had announcements to make, that the public comment period was upcoming, and that members of the public had been patiently waiting to speak.

Mitchell noted he was almost done presenting, and discussed levels of investment in fixed transit and emerging mobility in both the fiscally constrained scenario and aspirational scenarios; that the scenarios have building blocks of increasing investments; that the team will measure how much added benefit projects in the aspirational scenario bring compared to the fiscally constrained scenario; that an interactive map exercise will be available for Members after the meeting; that staff would send a PDF version of the presentation to Members with the link to the exercise; and that Members could identify locations on the map and leave comments about the specific mobility improvements they want to see in those areas; and the team will use these suggestions to create a list to share with everyone after.

Secretary Hefner Hoang noted that that was the end of the presentation; that there would not be time for further discussion, but that Members could email her with questions or comments after the meeting.

Secretary Hefner Hoang invited public comment on the agenda item, asked speakers to keep their comments under a minute

long, and noted that speakers could email her with additional comments that staff would document.

Bonnie Wacker thanked staff for the presentation and discussed her concerns about people and children's safety on bike paths; that children biking to school may have dangerous interactions with persons experiencing homelessness along Ballona Creek; that a person experiencing homelessness pursued her grandson on the way to a 7-Eleven in Sunkist Park; that there was a robbery in her neighborhood; that she does not feel safe walking to the grocery store along sidewalks where there are encampments; and that the presence of persons experiencing homeless makes her feel unsafe and makes her worry about the safety of older individuals while walking and using parks.

Eric Shabsis discussed how there have been many conversations about cut-through traffic compared to origin and destination traffic, especially in the Downtown area; that when the Culver Studios project was in the entitlement process, residents were aware that there would be an increase in origin and destination trips associated with the new jobs being created; that major companies like Sony, Amazon, and Apple have added about 10,000 new jobs in the last 10 years in the Downtown area, and that those companies all have TDM programs; that TDM programs will not completely eliminate vehicle trips; and that he believes that some mobility infrastructure for cars should be preserved for employees who continue to commute by car.

Nancy Barba thanked staff for the presentation; wants the City to be bold and think big and think about closing down streets to cars and creating bus only lanes; and noted that countries in South America have had bus-only lanes for decades and that Culver City should get on board and be a leader in mobility.

o0o

Public Comment for Items NOT On the Agenda

No attendees requested to speak.

o0o

Receipt of Correspondence

None was received.

oOo

Items from Members/Staff/Consultants

Marsiglia asked Members if they had items to share. No Members requested to speak. Marsiglia noted that the City Council approved the Housing Element Guiding Principles on April 12, 2021, and that staff would upload the final resolution online for Members to review; that the resolution language may be complicated because it deals with state law technicalities, and that Members could reach out to Marsiglia or Secretary Hefner Hoang to review the document one-on-one or in small groups; and invited Secretary Hefner Hoang to announce the remaining updates.

Secretary Hefner Hoang noted that there are many upcoming meetings over the next few months; that the City Council agreed to discuss exclusionary zoning related to single family zoning, and that the discussion will likely be added to a June 2021 meeting agenda but we are waiting for final confirmation on the date; that the mobility alternatives workshop would take place on May 27, 2021 at 4 PM; that the mobility TAC meeting would take place on May 28 at 3 PM; that the next GPAC meeting on June 10 would provide an update on land use alternatives, the preferred alternative, and the development program; that on June 14, staff will update City Council on the GPU process; that the City Council will soon consider a Mobility Impact Fee, the updated Transportation Study Criteria and Guidelines document, and VMT mobility improvements project list at an upcoming meeting, and that she could provide more information to interested Members once the City Council meeting agenda is posted; that a Policing and Public Safety TAC meeting would occur in August; that the Planning Commission and City Council will consider the preferred land use map at a joint session on June 23; that after selecting the preferred land use map, the Housing Element sub-consultant will begin the Housing Element site inventory; that Members would review the draft Housing Element and site inventory at the July 22 GPAC meeting before the Planning Commission reviews it; and asked if Members had any last comments.

Ken Mand noted that if the land use map is getting approved by the end of June, there is a lot more mobility work to do

before then. Secretary Hefner Hoang clarified that the land use map would not be approved, but that Planning Commission and City Council would select a preferred alternatives map to study for the Environmental Impact Report; that the preferred alternatives map would inform the Housing Element site inventory; and that the map is subject to additional changes before adoption next fall; that there will be more opportunities to provide input on the mobility alternatives at the upcoming mobility TAC meeting and mobility workshop before the June land use meeting.

Mand stated that Members should see a draft land use map before the final version goes before the City Council. Secretary Hefner Hoang noted that Members will see the draft plan at the June 10 GPAC meeting. Eric Yurkovich noted Members will review community input on the land use alternatives and community input, the preferred alternative; and that staff will request additional feedback from Members on June 10 before the map goes before City Council.

oOo

Adjournment

There being no further business, at 9:34 P.M., the General Plan Advisory Committee adjourned to a special meeting on June 10, 2021, at 7:00 P.M.

oOo

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

APPROVED August 22, 2021

8.22.21

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

27 SEP 2021
Date