



**Metro**

*One Gateway Plaza, Los Angeles, CA 90012,  
3rd Floor, Metro Board Room*

**Agenda - Final**

**Wednesday, November 20, 2024**

**11:00 AM**

Watch online: <https://boardagendas.metro.net>  
Listen by phone: Dial 888-978-8818 and enter Access Code:  
5647249# (English) or 7292892# (Español)

To give written or live public comment, please see the top of page 4

## **Planning and Programming Committee**

*Jacquelyn Dupont-Walker, Chair*

*Hilda Solis, Vice Chair*

*Lindsey Horvath*

*Holly J. Mitchell*

*Ara J. Najarian*

*Gloria Roberts, non-voting member*

*Stephanie Wiggins, Chief Executive Officer*

**METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY BOARD AGENDA RULES**  
(ALSO APPLIES TO BOARD COMMITTEES)

**PUBLIC INPUT**

A member of the public may address the Board on agenda items, before or during the Board or Committee's consideration of the item for one (1) minute per item, or at the discretion of the Chair. A request to address the Board must be submitted electronically using the tablets available in the Board Room lobby. Individuals requesting to speak will be allowed to speak for a total of three (3) minutes per meeting on agenda items in one minute increments per item. For individuals requiring translation service, time allowed will be doubled. The Board shall reserve the right to limit redundant or repetitive comment.

The public may also address the Board on non-agenda items within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Board during the general public comment period, which will be held at the beginning and /or end of each meeting. Each person will be allowed to speak for one (1) minute during this General Public Comment period or at the discretion of the Chair. Speakers will be called according to the order in which their requests are submitted. Elected officials, not their staff or deputies, may be called out of order and prior to the Board's consideration of the relevant item.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, and in accordance with the Brown Act, this agenda does not provide an opportunity for members of the public to address the Board on any Consent Calendar agenda item that has already been considered by a Committee, composed exclusively of members of the Board, at a public meeting wherein all interested members of the public were afforded the opportunity to address the Committee on the item, before or during the Committee's consideration of the item, and which has not been substantially changed since the Committee heard the item.

In accordance with State Law (Brown Act), all matters to be acted on by the MTA Board must be posted at least 72 hours prior to the Board meeting. In case of emergency, or when a subject matter arises subsequent to the posting of the agenda, upon making certain findings, the Board may act on an item that is not on the posted agenda.

**CONDUCT IN THE BOARD ROOM** - The following rules pertain to conduct at Metropolitan Transportation Authority meetings:

**REMOVAL FROM THE BOARD ROOM** - The Chair shall order removed from the Board Room any person who commits the following acts with respect to any meeting of the MTA Board:

- a. Disorderly behavior toward the Board or any member of the staff thereof, tending to interrupt the due and orderly course of said meeting.
- b. A breach of the peace, boisterous conduct or violent disturbance, tending to interrupt the due and orderly course of said meeting.
- c. Disobedience of any lawful order of the Chair, which shall include an order to be seated or to refrain from addressing the Board; and
- d. Any other unlawful interference with the due and orderly course of said meeting.

**INFORMATION RELATING TO AGENDAS AND ACTIONS OF THE BOARD**

Agendas for the Regular MTA Board meetings are prepared by the Board Clerk and are available prior to the meeting in the MTA Records Management Department and on the Internet. Every meeting of the MTA Board of Directors is recorded and is available at <https://www.metro.net> or on CD's and as MP3's for a nominal charge.

## DISCLOSURE OF CONTRIBUTIONS

The State Political Reform Act (Government Code Section 84308) requires that a party to a proceeding before an agency involving a license, permit, or other entitlement for use, including all contracts (other than competitively bid, labor, or personal employment contracts), shall disclose on the record of the proceeding any contributions in an amount of more than \$250 made within the preceding 12 months by the party, or his or her agent, to any officer of the agency, additionally PUC Code Sec. 130051.20 requires that no member accept a contribution of over ten dollars (\$10) in value or amount from a construction company, engineering firm, consultant, legal firm, or any company, vendor, or business entity that has contracted with the authority in the preceding four years. Persons required to make this disclosure shall do so by filling out a "Disclosure of Contribution" form which is available at the LACMTA Board and Committee Meetings. Failure to comply with this requirement may result in the assessment of civil or criminal penalties.

## ADA REQUIREMENTS

Upon request, sign language interpretation, materials in alternative formats and other accommodations are available to the public for MTA-sponsored meetings and events. All requests for reasonable accommodations must be made at least three working days (72 working hours) in advance of the scheduled meeting date. Please telephone (213) 364-2837 or (213) 922-4600 between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday. Our TDD line is (800) 252-9040.

Requests can also be sent to [boardclerk@metro.net](mailto:boardclerk@metro.net).

## LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY

A Spanish language interpreter is available at all Committee and Board Meetings. All other languages must be requested 72 hours in advance of the meeting by calling (213) 364-2837 or (213) 922-4600. Live Public Comment Instructions can also be translated if requested 72 hours in advance.

Requests can also be sent to [boardclerk@metro.net](mailto:boardclerk@metro.net).



**323.466.3876**

x2 *Español (Spanish)*

x3 *中文 (Chinese)*

x4 *한국어 (Korean)*

x5 *Tiếng Việt (Vietnamese)*

x6 *日本語 (Japanese)*

x7 *русский (Russian)*

x8 *Հայերէն (Armenian)*

## HELPFUL PHONE NUMBERS AND EMAIL

Copies of Agendas/Record of Board Action/Recordings of Meetings - (213) 922-4880 (Records Management Department) - <https://records.metro.net>

General Information/Rules of the Board - (213) 922-4600

Internet Access to Agendas - <https://www.metro.net>

TDD line (800) 252-9040

Board Clerk Email - [boardclerk@metro.net](mailto:boardclerk@metro.net)

**NOTE: ACTION MAY BE TAKEN ON ANY ITEM IDENTIFIED ON THE AGENDA**

### **Live Public Comment Instructions:**

Live public comment can be given by telephone or in-person.

The Committee Meeting begins at 11:00 AM Pacific Time on November 20, 2024; you may join the call 5 minutes prior to the start of the meeting.

Dial-in: 888-978-8818 and enter  
English Access Code: 5647249#  
Spanish Access Code: 7292892#

***Public comment will be taken as the Board takes up each item. To give public comment on an item, enter #2 (pound-two) when prompted. Please note that the live video feed lags about 30 seconds behind the actual meeting. There is no lag on the public comment dial-in line.***

### **Instrucciones para comentarios publicos en vivo:**

Los comentarios publicos en vivo se pueden dar por telefono o en persona.

La Reunion de la Junta comienza a las 11:00 AM, hora del Pacifico, el 20 de Noviembre de 2024. Puedes unirte a la llamada 5 minutos antes del comienso de la junta.

Marque: 888-978-8818 y ingrese el codigo  
Codigo de acceso en ingles: 5647249#  
Codigo de acceso en espanol: 7292892#

***Los comentarios del público se tomaran cuando se toma cada tema. Para dar un comentario público sobre una tema ingrese # 2 (Tecla de numero y dos) cuando se le solicite. Tenga en cuenta que la transmisión de video en vivo se retrasa unos 30 segundos con respecto a la reunión real. No hay retraso en la línea de acceso telefónico para comentarios públicos.***

### **Written Public Comment Instruction:**

Written public comments must be received by 5PM the day before the meeting.

Please include the Item # in your comment and your position of "FOR," "AGAINST," "GENERAL COMMENT," or "ITEM NEEDS MORE CONSIDERATION."

Email: BoardClerk@metro.net

Post Office Mail:

Board Administration

One Gateway Plaza

MS: 99-3-1

Los Angeles, CA 90012

**CALL TO ORDER**

**ROLL CALL**

5. **SUBJECT: MEASURE M MULTI-YEAR SUBREGIONAL PROGRAM ANNUAL UPDATE - NORTH COUNTY SUBREGION** [2024-0966](#)

**RECOMMENDATION**

CONSIDER:

A. APPROVING:

1. Programming of \$2,049,073 within the capacity of Measure M Multi-Year Subregional Program (MSP) - Active Transportation Program, as shown in Attachment A;
2. Deobligating \$1,960,567 in Measure M MSP - Transit Program, as shown in Attachment B;
3. Inter-program borrowing and programming of \$17,752,182 from Measure M MSP - Transit Program to Measure M MSP - Highway Efficiency Program, as shown in Attachment C; and

B. AUTHORIZING the CEO or their designee to negotiate and execute all necessary agreements and/or amendments for approved projects.

**Attachments:** [Attachment A - Active Transportation Program Project List](#)  
[Attachment B - Transit Program Project List](#)  
[Attachment C - Highway Efficiency Program Project List](#)  
[Attachment D - Subregional Equity Program Project List](#)  
[Presentation](#)

6. **SUBJECT: MEASURE M METRO ACTIVE TRANSPORT, TRANSIT AND FIRST/LAST MILE (MAT) PROGRAM UPDATE** [2024-1030](#)

**RECOMMENDATION**

DEOBLIGATE \$434,969.47 of previously approved MAT funding and returning those funds to the MAT Program.

**Attachments:** [Attachment A - Culver City Council Regular Meeting Official Minutes 4/24/2023](#)  
[Presentation](#)

(CARRIED OVER FROM OCTOBER'S COMMITTEE CYCLE)

**SUBJECT: GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT**

[2024-1050](#)

RECEIVE General Public Comment

Consideration of items not on the posted agenda, including: items to be presented and (if requested) referred to staff; items to be placed on the agenda for action at a future meeting of the Committee or Board; and/or items requiring immediate action because of an emergency situation or where the need to take immediate action came to the attention of the Committee subsequent to the posting of the agenda.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC ON ITEMS OF PUBLIC INTEREST WITHIN COMMITTEE'S  
SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION

**Adjournment**



**Board Report**

**File #:** 2024-0966, **File Type:** Program

**Agenda Number:** 5.

**PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 20, 2024**

**SUBJECT: MEASURE M MULTI-YEAR SUBREGIONAL PROGRAM ANNUAL UPDATE - NORTH COUNTY SUBREGION**

**ACTION: APPROVE RECOMMENDATION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

CONSIDER:

A. APPROVING:

1. Programming of \$2,049,073 within the capacity of Measure M Multi-Year Subregional Program (MSP) - Active Transportation Program, as shown in Attachment A;
2. Deobligating \$1,960,567 in Measure M MSP - Transit Program, as shown in Attachment B;
3. Inter-program borrowing and programming of \$17,752,182 from Measure M MSP - Transit Program to Measure M MSP - Highway Efficiency Program, as shown in Attachment C; and

B. AUTHORIZING the CEO or their designee to negotiate and execute all necessary agreements and/or amendments for approved projects.

**ISSUE**

Measure M MSPs are included in the Measure M Expenditure Plan, attached to the Measure M Ordinance. All MSP funds are limited to capital projects. The annual update approves additional eligible projects for funding and allows the North County subregion and implementing agencies to revise the project scope of work, project budgets, and schedule for previously funded projects.

This update includes changes to projects that have received Board approval and funding allocation for new projects. Funds are programmed through Fiscal Year (FY) 2027-28. The Board's approval is required to update the project lists (Attachments A, B, and C), which serve as the basis for Metro to enter into agreements and/or amendments with the respective implementing agencies.

**BACKGROUND**

---

At its February 2019 meeting, the Board approved North County subregion's first MSP Five-Year Plan and programmed funds in: 1) Measure M MSP - Active Transportation Program (expenditure line 52); 2) Measure M MSP - Transit Program (expenditure line 64); and 3) Measure M MSP - Highway Efficiency Program (expenditure line 81). At its May 2023 meeting, the Board approved programmed funds in the Measure M MSP - Subregional Equity Program (expenditure line 68). Since the first Plan, staff updated the Metro Board in April 2020, April 2021, and May 2022 and 2023.

Based on the amount provided in the Measure M Expenditure Plan, a total of \$132.37 million was forecasted for programming from FY 2017-18 to FY 2027-28. In prior actions, the Metro Board approved programming of \$90.71 million. Therefore, \$41.66 million is available to the Subregion for programming as part of this annual update.

## **DISCUSSION**

Staff worked closely with the North County Transportation Coalition Joint Powers Authority (NCTC JPA) and the implementing agencies on project eligibility reviews of the proposed projects for this annual update. The jurisdictional requests are proposed by the cities and approved/forwarded by the subregion. In line with the Metro Board adopted guidelines and June 2022 Objectives for Multimodal Highways Investments, cities provide documentation demonstrating community support, project need, and multimodal transportation benefits that enhance safety, support traffic mobility, economic vitality, and enable a safer and well-maintained transportation system. Cities lead and prioritize all proposed transportation improvements, including procurement, the environmental process, outreach, final design, and construction. Each city and/or agency, independently and in coordination with the subregion undertakes their jurisdictionally determined community engagement process specific to the type of transportation improvement they seek to develop. These locally determined and prioritized projects represent the needs of cities. To date, \$90.71 million has been programmed, of which \$32.03 million has been expended.

During staff review, Metro required a detailed project scope of work to confirm project eligibility, reconfirm funding eligibility for those that request changes in the project scope of work, and establish the program nexus during project reviews, i.e. project location information and limits, length, elements, phases, total estimated expenses and funding request, schedules, etc. Final approval of funds for the projects shall be contingent upon the implementing agency demonstrating the eligibility of each project, as required in the Measure M Master Guidelines. Staff expect the collection of the project details in advance of Metro Board action to enable the timely execution of project Funding Agreements for approved projects. Additionally, all projects are subject to a close-out audit after completion, per the Guidelines.

This recommendation also includes an inter-program borrowing of funds. This type of inter-program borrowing was approved in 2019, 2020, and 2022 for the North County Subregion and other Subregions in LA County. This is acceptable under the Metro Board-adopted Measure M Master Guidelines, as long as the projects meet the Measure M MSP funding eligibility, have consent from the affected subregion, and obtain Metro Board approval. In October 2024, the NCTC JPA Board approved the inter-program borrowing from the Measure M MSP Transit Program to the Highway Efficiency Program.



---

The updates in this annual update include funding adjustments for 12 previously approved projects and four new projects. Attachments A, B, and C indicate the changes in project funding allocations since the last update to the Board. Two projects have been completed and closed, and one other completed project is currently pending a project close-out audit process.

Active Transportation Program (expenditure line 52)

This update includes funding adjustments to eight existing projects and two new projects as follows:

*Palmdale*

- Deobligate \$550,000 and cancel MM4501.20 - SR-138 (Palmdale Blvd.) Sidewalk Gap Closure Phase II Project. The City requested the deobligated funds to be reallocated to other priority MSP projects.
- Program \$10,613,804 as follows: \$1,843,800 in FY 26, \$2,312,500 in FY 27, and \$6,457,504 in FY 28 for MM4501.21 - Avenue Q Corridor Improvements (Sierra Hwy. to 35th St. East) project. This is a 1.4-mile segment of Avenue Q between Sierra Highway and 20<sup>th</sup> Street East, installing a Class I Bike Path, continuous sidewalk improvements, center landscaped median, and street furniture. The funds will be used to complete the Project's Plans Specification and Estimates (PS&E), right-of-way (ROW), and construction phases.

*Santa Clarita*

- Deobligate \$738,000 and cancel MM4501.09 - Santa Clara River Trail Gap Closure Design: Five Knolls to Discovery Park. The City requested the deobligation of funds as the project is no longer the City's priority for the next five years.
- Deobligate \$332,057 and cancel MM4501.11/MM4501.14 - Valencia Industrial Center Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements. The City requested the deobligation of funds as the project is no longer the City's priority for the next five years.
- Deobligate \$1,030,707 and cancel MM4501.17 - Newhall Area Bicycle Facility. The City requested the deobligation of funds as the project is no longer feasible due to numerous utility conflicts.
- Reprogram previously approved \$1,129,130 as follows: \$141,418 in FY 22, \$500,000 in FY 24, and \$487,712 in FY 25 for MM4501.18 - Saugus Phase I: Bouquet Canyon Trail to Central Park. This project is a 0.8-mile Class I Bike facility improvement including pavement rehabilitation and barrier fencing along the top of the channel wall adjacent to the flood control facility and minor grading and trail construction. The funds will be used to complete the Project's PS&E, ROW, and construction phases.
- Deobligate \$683,600 and cancel MM4501.19 - Saugus Phase II: Bouquet Canyon Trail Central Park to Haskell Canyon Project. The City requested the deobligation of funds as the project is

no longer the City's priority for the next five years.

### *Los Angeles County*

- Deobligate \$4,000,000 for MM4501.13 - Lake Los Angeles Pedestrian Plan Implementation Phase 1 Project. The County requested the deobligated funds to be reallocated to other priority MSP projects. The remaining \$1,000,000 project funds are reprogrammed as follows: \$50,000 in FY 20, \$300,000 in FY 21, \$300,000 in FY 22, \$100,000 in FY 23, \$100,000 in FY 25, and \$150,000 in FY 26. The project installs a Class I bike path on 17<sup>th</sup> Street East and a new parking lane, curb, gutter, and sidewalk on Avenue Q. Additionally, it includes street crossing improvements such as ADA-compliant curb ramps, pedestrian-activated warning systems, etc. The funds will be used to complete the Project's PS&E phase.
- Program \$8,700,000 as follows: \$6,000,000 in FY 27 and \$2,700,000 in FY 28 for MM4501.22 - The Old Road over Santa Clara River Phase II - ATP project. The project will include installing Class IV bikeways and the addition of new sidewalks on the Old Road. The project will also include the extension of a Class I multipurpose trail that connects to the Santa Clara River Trail. The funds will be used to complete the Project's construction phase.

### *Los Angeles County/Lancaster*

- Deobligate \$9,930,367 for MM4501.16 - 30th Street West Active Transportation Improvements Project. The agencies requested the deobligated funds to be reallocated to other priority MSP projects. The project includes the installation of Class IV buffered bikeways and sidewalks along 30<sup>th</sup> Street West between Avenue H and Avenue N-8. The remaining \$600,000 project funds are programmed in FY 24 and will be used to complete the Project's PS&E phase.

### Transit Program (expenditure line 64)

This update includes funding adjustments to two existing projects as follows:

#### *Santa Clarita*

- Deobligate \$870,567 and cancel MM4502.02 - Valencia Industrial Center Bus Stop Improvement. The City requested the deobligation of funds as the project is no longer the City's priority for the next five years.
- Deobligate \$1,090,000 for MM4502.03 - Vista Canyon Bus Service Expansion. The City requested the deobligated funds to be reallocated to other priority MSP projects. The remaining \$1,090,000 is reprogrammed to FY 26. This project would help the city update its fleet of micro vehicles. The funds will be used to purchase vehicles and charging infrastructure.

### Highway Efficiency Program (expenditure line 81)

This update includes funding adjustments to two existing projects and two new projects:

*Palmdale*

- Deobligate \$2,400,000 and cancel MM5504.04 - SR-14/Avenue S Interchange Improvement. The City requested the deobligated funds to be reallocated to other priority MSP projects.

*Santa Clarita*

- Program \$7,182,000 as follows: \$3,500,000 in FY 25, and \$3,682,000 in FY 26 for MM5504.05 - Vista Canyon Road Bridge, an existing Measure R (MR501.03) funded project. This project will construct a new two-lane bridge, bike lane, and bike trail to provide connectivity to the Vista Canyon Metrolink and Bus Transfer Station. The funds will be used to complete the Project's PS&E and construction phases.

*Lancaster*

- Program an additional \$970,182 and reprogram all funds to FY 28 for MM5504.03 - SR-138 Avenue G Interchange Project, an existing Measure R (MR330.03) funded project. This project will improve the intersection by adding center turn lanes, bike lanes, and sidewalks to address multimodal elements. The funds will be used to complete the Project's ROW and construction phases.
- Program \$12,000,000 as follows: \$10,280,790 in FY 26, \$651,420 in FY 27 and \$1,067,790 in FY 28 for MM5504.06 - Avenue K and SR-14 Interchange, an existing Measure R (MR330.02) funded project. This project is improving the geometrics by removing high-speed ramp connections and squaring up ramp connections to improve bike and pedestrian safety. The funds will be used to complete the Project's construction phase.

**DETERMINATION OF SAFETY IMPACT**

Programming of Measure M MSP funds to the North County subregion projects will not have any adverse safety impacts on Metro's employees or patrons.

**FINANCIAL IMPACT**

In FY 2024-25, \$15.3 million is budgeted in Cost Center 0441 (Subsidies to Others) for the Active Transportation Program (Project #474401), \$5.02 million is budgeted in Cost Center 0441 (Subsidies to Others) for the Transit Program (Project #474102), and \$500,000 is budgeted in Cost Center 0442 (Highway Subsidies) for the Highway Efficiency Program (Project #475504). Upon approval of this action, staff will reallocate necessary funds to appropriate projects within Cost Centers 0441 and 0442. Since these are multi-year projects, Cost Centers 0441 and 0442 will be responsible for budgeting the cost in future years.

**Impact to Budget**

---

The source of funds for these projects are Measure M Highway Construction 17% and Measure M Transit Construction 35%. These fund sources are not eligible for Metro bus and rail operations expenses.

### **EQUITY PLATFORM**

The North County subregion comprises three cities and the adjacent unincorporated area of Los Angeles County. Four percent of census tracts are defined as Equity Focus Communities (EFCs) in the Subregion, and these are located in Lancaster, Santa Clarita, and Palmdale.

The North County Subregion proposed active transportation projects have a range of potential equity benefits for non-drivers. For example, the County of LA's Old Road over Santa Clara River Phase II - ATP project will implement new Class IV bikeways, new sidewalks, an extension of a Class I multipurpose trail that connects to the Santa Clara River Trail, an existing regional river trail connecting to a larger network of trails within the City of Santa Clarita.

### **IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS**

The recommendation supports the following goals of the Metro Vision 2028 Strategic Plan:

Goal 1: Provide high-quality mobility options that enable people to spend less time traveling by alleviating the current operational deficiencies and improving mobility along the projects.

Goal 4: Transform LA County through regional collaboration by partnering with the Council of Governments and the local jurisdictions to identify the needed improvements and take the lead in the development and implementation of their projects.

### **ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED**

The Board can elect not to approve the additional programming of funds or scope of work and schedule changes for the Measure M MSP projects for the North County subregion. This is not recommended as the Subregion developed the proposed projects in accordance with the Measure M Ordinance, Guidelines, and Administrative Procedures which may delay the development and delivery of the projects.

### **NEXT STEPS**

Metro staff will continue to work with the subregion to identify and deliver projects. Funding Agreements will be executed with those who have funds programmed in FY 2024-25. Program/Project updates will be provided to the Board annually.


### **ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment A - Active Transportation Program Project List  
Attachment B - Transit Program Project List  
Attachment C - Highway Efficiency Program Project List

Attachment D - Subregional Equity Program Project List

Prepared by: Fanny Pan, Executive Officer, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 418-3433  
Craig Hoshijima, Executive Officer, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 547-4290  
Laurie Lombardi, Senior Executive Officer, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 418-3251

Reviewed by: Ray Sosa, Chief Planning Officer, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 547-4274



Stephanie N. Wiggins  
Chief Executive Officer

**North County Subregion  
Measure M Multi-Year Subregional Plan - Active Transportation Program (Expenditure Line 52)**

	Agency	Project ID No.	Project/Location	Funding Phases	Note	Pror Alloc	Alloc Change	Current Alloc	Prior Year Prog	FY 2023-24	FY 2024-25	FY 2025-26	FY 2026-27	FY 2027-28
1	Lancaster	MM4501.05	Sierra Hwy: Avenue J to Avenue L	Construction		\$ 1,240,486		\$ 1,240,486	\$ 1,240,486					
2	Palmdale	MM4501.06	Avenue R Complete Street & Safe Routes to School Proj	PS&E, ROW Construction		2,695,140		2,695,140	2,695,140					
3	Palmdale	MM4501.20	SR-138 (Palmdale Blvd) Sidewalk Gap Closure Phase II	PID, PAED PS&E	Deob	550,000	(550,000)	-	-					
4	Palmdale	MM4501.21	Avenue Q Corridor Improvements (Sierra Hwy. to 35th St. East)	PS&E, ROW Construction	New	-	10,613,804	10,613,804				1,843,800	2,312,500	6,457,504
5	Santa Clarita	MM4501.09	Santa Clara River Trail Gap Closure Design: Five Knolls to Discovery Park	PS&E ROW	Deob	738,000	(738,000)	-	-					
6	Santa Clarita	MM4501.10	Sierra Highway Sidewalk Improvements: Scherzinger Lane to Skyline Ranch Road	PS&E Construction	COMPL	624,000		624,000	624,000					
7	Santa Clarita	MM4501.11/ MM4501.14	Valencia Industrial Center Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements	PS&E	Deob	450,000	(332,057.36)	117,942.64	117,942.64					
8	Santa Clarita	MM4501.17	Newhall Area Bicycle Facility	PS&E Construction	Deob	1,157,470	(1,030,707.11)	126,762.89	126,762.89					
9	Santa Clarita	MM4501.18	Saugus Phase I: Bouquet Canyon Trail to Central Park	PS&E, ROW Construction	Chg	1,129,130		1,129,130	141,418	500,000	487,712			
10	Santa Clarita	MM4501.19	Saugus Phase II: Bouquet Canyon Trail Central Park to Haskell Cyn	PS&E	Deob	683,600	(683,600)	-	-					
11	LA County	MM4501.12	Elizabeth Lake Road Bikeways	PS&E ROW	COMPL	20,741		20,741	20,741					
12	LA County	MM4501.13	Lake Los Angeles Pedestrian Plan Implementation Phase 1: 170th St. E, Avenue N, 165th St. E, Avenue N-8, 180th St. E, Avenue P-8, 160th St. E, Avenue Q	PS&E	Chg	5,000,000	(4,000,000)	1,000,000	750,000		100,000	150,000		
13	LA County/ Lancaster	MM4501.16	30th Street West Active Transportation Improvements	PS&E	Chg	10,530,367	(9,930,367)	600,000		600,000				
14	LA County	MM4501.22	The Old Rd over Santa Clara River Phase II - ATP Project *	Construction	New	-	8,700,000	8,700,000					6,000,000	2,700,000
<b>Total Programming Amount</b>						<b>\$ 24,818,934</b>	<b>\$ 2,049,073</b>	<b>\$ 26,868,006</b>	<b>\$ 5,716,490</b>	<b>\$ 1,100,000</b>	<b>\$ 587,712</b>	<b>\$ 1,993,800</b>	<b>\$ 8,312,500</b>	<b>\$ 9,157,504</b>

\* Conditional programming approval as only high level scope of work was developed and reviewed. Future annual update process will reconfirm the programming.

**North County Subregion  
Measure M Multi-Year Subregional Plan - Transit Program (Expenditure Plan 64)**

	Agency	Project ID No.	Project/Location	Funding Phases	Note	Pror Alloc	Alloc Change	Current Alloc	Prior Year Prog	FY 2023-24	FY 2024-25	FY 2025-26	FY 2026-27	FY 2027-28
1	Palmdale	MM4502.01	Palmdale Transportation Center Transit and Infrastructure Design Project	PS&E		\$ 2,000,000		\$ 2,000,000	\$ 2,000,000					
2	Santa Clarita	MM4502.02	Valencia Industrial Center Bus Stop Improvement	PS&E, ROW Construction	Deob	892,000	(870,567.49)	21,432.51	21,432.51					
3	Santa Clarita	MM4502.03	Vista Canyon Bus Service Expansion	Vehicles/ Equipment	Chg	2,180,000	(1,090,000.00)	1,090,000				1,090,000		
4	Santa Clarita	MM4502.04	Vista Canyon Transportation Center	ROW Construction		3,216,000		3,216,000	3,216,000					
5	LA County	MM4502.04	Vista Canyon Transportation Center - Transit Capital Jurisdictional Share	Construction		2,000,000		2,000,000	2,000,000					
6	LA County	MM4502.05	North County Bus Stop Improvements: Santa Clarita and Antelope Valley	PS&E Construction		2,855,260		2,855,260	2,855,260					
7	LACMTA (NCTC)	MM4502.06A	Metrolink Antelope Valley Line	Environmental	COMPL	3,060,419		3,060,419	3,060,419					
8	SCRRA (NCTC)	MM4502.06	Metrolink Antelope Valley Line Capital and Service Improvements Program	PS&E		31,037,581		31,037,581	9,689,581	3,425,000	3,449,000	7,074,000	7,400,000	
<b>Total Programming Amount</b>						<b>\$ 47,241,260</b>	<b>\$ (1,960,567)</b>	<b>\$ 45,280,693</b>	<b>\$22,842,693</b>	<b>\$3,425,000</b>	<b>\$3,449,000</b>	<b>\$8,164,000</b>	<b>\$7,400,000</b>	<b>\$ -</b>

**North County Subregion  
Measure M Multi-Year Subregional Plan - Highway Efficiency Program (Expenditure Line 81)**

	Agency	Project ID No.	Project/Location	Funding Phases	Note	Pror Alloc	Alloc Change	Current Alloc	Prior Year Prog	FY 2023-24	FY 2024-25	FY 2025-26	FY 2026-27	FY 2027-28
1	Palmdale	MM5504.01	SR-138 Palmdale Blvd. SR-14 Ramps	Construction		\$ 3,351,220		\$ 3,351,220	\$ -	\$3,351,220				
2	Palmdale	MM5504.04	SR-14/Avenue S Interchange Improvements	PID PA/ED	Deob	2,400,000	(2,400,000)	-	-					
3	Santa Clarita	MM5504.05	Vista Canyon Road Bridge (Supplement #MR501.03)	PS&E Construction	New		7,182,000	7,182,000			3,500,000	3,682,000		
4	LACMTA (NCTC)	MM5504.02	SR-14 Safety Improvements	PA/ED		4,700,000		4,700,000	3,350,000	1,350,000				
5	Lancaster	MM5504.03	SR-138 Avenue G Interchange Project (Measure R #MR330.03 shortfall)	ROW Construction	Chg	4,350,143	970,182	5,320,325						5,320,325
6	Lancaster	MM5504.06	Avenue K and SR-14 Interchange (Supplement MR330.02)	Construction	New	-	12,000,000	12,000,000				10,280,790	651,420	1,067,790
<b>Total Programming Amount</b>						<b>\$14,801,363</b>	<b>\$ 17,752,182</b>	<b>\$32,553,545</b>	<b>\$3,350,000</b>	<b>\$4,701,220</b>	<b>\$3,500,000</b>	<b>\$13,962,790</b>	<b>\$ 651,420</b>	<b>\$6,388,115</b>



**North County Subregion  
Measure M Multi-Year Subregional Plan - Subregional Equity Program (Expenditure Line 68)**

	Agency	Project ID No.	Project/Location	Funding Phases	Note	Pror Alloc	Alloc Change	Current Alloc	FY 2023-24	FY 2024-25	FY 2025-26	FY 2026-27	FY 2027-28
1	SCRRRA (NCTC)	MM4502.06	Metrolink Antelope Valley Line Capital and Service Improvements Program	PS&E		\$ 2,884,614		\$ 2,884,614		\$961,538	\$961,538	\$961,538	
2	LACMTA (NCTC)	MM5504.02	SR-14 Safety Improvements	PA/ED		961,538		961,538	961,538				
<b>Total Programming Amount</b>						<b>\$ 3,846,152</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 3,846,152</b>	<b>\$ 961,538</b>	<b>\$ 961,538</b>	<b>\$ 961,538</b>	<b>\$ 961,538</b>	<b>\$ -</b>

A large, stylized letter 'M' is positioned at the top of the page. The 'M' is composed of several white, rectangular blocks with a slight 3D effect, set against a dark green circular background. This green circle is partially overlaid by a larger, vibrant orange-red curved shape that sweeps across the middle of the page.

# Measure M Multi-year Subregional Program North County Subregion

Planning and Programming Committee  
November 20, 2024

# North County Subregion

- Four Multi-Year Subregional Program (MSP)
  - Active Transportation Program (expenditure line 52)
  - Transit Program (expenditure line 64)
  - Highway Efficiency Program (expenditure line 81)
  - Subregion Equity Program (expenditure line 68)
- Limited to Capital projects
  - Environmental Phase and forward

## Los Angeles County Transportation Expenditure Plan

(2015 \$ in thousands)

## ATTACHMENT A

Groundbreaking Sequence  
(Exceptions Noted)

For Reference Only	Project (Final Project to be Defined by the Environmental Process)	Notes	Schedule of Funds Available		Subregion*	2016 - 2027 Local, State, Federal, Other Funding 2015\$	Measure M Funding 2015\$	Most Recent Cost Estimate 2015\$**	Modal Code
			Ground- breaking Start Date†	Expected Opening Date (3 year range)					
	<b>Multi-Year Subregional Programs</b>								
47	Metro Active Transport, Transit 1st/Last Mile Program	p	FY 2018	FY 2057	sc	\$0	\$857,500	\$857,500	H
48	Visionary Project Seed Funding	p	FY 2018	FY 2057	sc	\$0	\$20,000	\$20,000	T
49	Street Car and Circulator Projects	k,p	FY 2018	FY 2022	sc	\$0	\$35,000	\$35,000	T
50	Transportation System and Mobility Improve. Program		FY 2018	FY 2032	sb	\$0	\$293,500	\$293,500	H
51	Active Transportation 1st/Last Mile Connections Prog.		FY 2018	FY 2057	w	\$0	\$361,000	\$361,000	H
52	Active Transportation Program		FY 2018	FY 2057	nc	\$0	\$264,000	\$264,000	H
53	Active Transportation Program		FY 2018	FY 2057	gc	\$0	TBD	TBD	H
54	Active Transportation Program (Including Greenway Proj.)		FY 2018	FY 2057	sg	\$0	\$231,000	\$231,000	H
55	Active Transportation, 1st/Last Mile, & Mobility Hubs		FY 2018	FY 2057	cc	\$0	\$215,000	\$215,000	H
56	Active Transportation, Transit, and Tech. Program		FY 2018	FY 2032	lvn	\$0	\$32,000	\$32,000	T
57	Highway Efficiency Program		FY 2018	FY 2032	lvn	\$0	\$133,000	\$133,000	H
58	Bus System Improvement Program		FY 2018	FY 2057	sg	\$0	\$55,000	\$55,000	T
59	First/Last Mile and Complete Streets		FY 2018	FY 2057	sg	\$0	\$198,000	\$198,000	H
60	Highway Demand Based Prog. (HOV Ext. & Connect.)		FY 2018	FY 2057	sg	\$0	\$231,000	\$231,000	H
61	I-605 Corridor "Hot Spot" Interchange Improvements @		FY 2018	FY 2057	gc	\$240,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,240,000	H
62	Modal Connectivity and Complete Streets Projects		FY 2018	FY 2057	av	\$0	\$202,000	\$202,000	H
63	South Bay Highway Operational Improvements		FY 2018	FY 2057	sc	\$600,000	\$500,000	\$1,100,000	H
64	Transit Program		FY 2018	FY 2057	nc	\$500,000	\$88,000	\$588,000	T
65	Transit Projects		FY 2018	FY 2057	av	\$0	\$257,100	\$257,100	T
66	Transportation System and Mobility Improve. Program		FY 2018	FY 2057	sb	\$0	\$350,000	\$350,000	H
67	North San Fernando Valley Bus Rapid Transit Improvements	p,s	FY 2019	FY 2023	sc	\$0	\$180,000	\$180,000	T
68	Subregional Equity Program	p,s	FY 2018	FY 2057		TBD	TBD	\$1,196,000	T/H
69	Countywide BRT Projects Ph 1 (All Subregions)	l,p	FY 2020	FY 2022	sc	\$0	\$50,000	\$50,000	T
70	Countywide BRT Projects Ph 2 (All Subregions)	l,p	FY 2030	FY 2032	sc	\$0	\$50,000	\$50,000	T
71	Active Transportation Projects		FY 2033	FY 2057	av	\$0	\$136,500	\$136,500	H
72	Los Angeles Safe Routes to School Initiative		FY 2033	FY 2057	cc	\$0	\$250,000	\$250,000	H
73	Multimodal Connectivity Program		FY 2033	FY 2057	nc	\$0	\$239,000	\$239,000	H
74	Countywide BRT Projects Ph 3 (All Subregions)	l,p	FY 2040	FY 2042	sc	\$0	\$50,000	\$50,000	T
75	Arterial Program		FY 2048	FY 2057	nc	\$0	\$726,130	\$726,130	H
76	BRT and 1st/Last Mile Solutions e.g. DASH		FY 2048	FY 2057	cc	\$0	\$250,000	\$250,000	T
77	Freeway Interchange and Operational Improvements		FY 2048	FY 2057	cc	\$0	\$195,000	\$195,000	H
78	Goods Movement (Improvements & RR Xing Elim.)		FY 2048	FY 2057	sg	\$0	\$33,000	\$33,000	T
79	Goods Movement Program		FY 2048	FY 2057	nc	\$0	\$104,000	\$104,000	T
80	Goods Movement Projects		FY 2048	FY 2057	av	\$0	\$81,700	\$81,700	T
81	Highway Efficiency Program		FY 2048	FY 2057	nc	\$0	\$128,870	\$128,870	H
82	Highway Efficiency Program		FY 2048	FY 2057	sg	\$0	\$534,000	\$534,000	H
83	Highway Efficiency, Noise Mitig. and Arterial Projects		FY 2048	FY 2057	av	\$0	\$602,800	\$602,800	H
84	ITS/Technology Program (Advanced Signal Tech.)		FY 2048	FY 2057	sg	\$0	\$66,000	\$66,000	H
85	LA Streetscape Enhance. & Great Streets Program		FY 2048	FY 2057	cc	\$0	\$450,000	\$450,000	H
86	Modal Connectivity Program		FY 2048	FY 2057	lvn	\$0	\$68,000	\$68,000	H
87	Public Transit State of Good Repair Program		FY 2048	FY 2057	cc	\$0	\$402,000	\$402,000	T
88	Traffic Congestion Relief and Improvement Program		FY 2048	FY 2057	lvn	\$0	\$63,000	\$63,000	H
89	Traffic Congestion Relief/Signal Synchronization		FY 2048	FY 2057	cc	\$0	\$50,000	\$50,000	H
90	Arroyo Verdugo Projects to be Determined		FY 2048	FY 2057	av	\$0	\$110,600	\$110,600	H
91	Countywide BRT Projects Ph 4 (All Subregions)	p	FY 2050	FY 2052	sc	\$90,000	\$10,000	\$100,000	T
92	Countywide BRT Projects Ph 5 (All Subregions)	p	FY 2060	FY 2062	sc	\$0	\$100,000	\$100,000	T
93	Multi-Year Subregional Programs Subtotal					\$1,430,000	\$10,253,700	\$12,879,700	
94	<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>					<b>\$21,011,027</b>	<b>\$31,243,641</b>	<b>\$53,450,669</b>	

# November 2024 Recommendation

## CONSIDER:

### A. APPROVING:

1. programming of \$2,049,073 within the capacity of Measure M Multi-Year Subregional Program (MSP) - Active Transportation Program, as shown in Attachment A;
2. deobligating \$1,960,567 in Measure M MSP - Transit Program, as shown in Attachment B;
3. inter-program borrowing and programming of \$17,752,182 from Measure M MSP - Transit Program to Measure M MSP - Highway Efficiency Program, as shown in Attachment C; and

- B. AUTHORIZING the CEO or their designee to negotiate and execute all necessary agreements and/or amendments for approved projects.

# Next Steps

- Execute Funding Agreements with the implementing agencies to initiate projects
- Continue working with the Subregion to identify and deliver projects
- Return to the Board annually for Program/Project updates



---

File #: 2024-1030, File Type: Program

Agenda Number: 6.

---

**PLANNING & PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 20, 2024**

**SUBJECT: MEASURE M METRO ACTIVE TRANSPORT, TRANSIT AND FIRST/LAST MILE  
(MAT) PROGRAM UPDATE**

**ACTION: APPROVE RECOMMENDATION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

DEOBLIGATE \$434,969.47 of previously approved MAT funding and returning those funds to the MAT Program.

**ISSUE**

Staff recommends the deobligation of \$434,969.47 in funding from the MAT Funding Agreement Project #C1201 "Culver City Project" due to the removal of project elements previously installed and funded through the MAT grant. These project elements have not reached the end of their useful life, and their removal will impact the level of protection and prioritization of non-motorized road users.

**BACKGROUND**

On January 28, 2021, the Metro Board approved project selection and programming for Cycle 1 of the MAT Program . Through this action, the City of Culver City and the Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) were awarded \$2,281,529 for two related projects that improve bicycle and pedestrian safety and access to the Culver City E Line station. The City of Culver City was awarded \$1,956,529 for its portion, which funded portions of the MOVE Culver City project. Metro entered into a Funding Agreement (FA) with the City of Culver City on December 31, 2021. The agreement Scope of Work describes several project elements, including:

- *A Class IV separated bikeway along Washington Boulevard between Landmark Avenue and Helms Avenue (0.3 miles)*
- *Bus-only lanes along Robertson Boulevard and Washington Boulevard*
- *Establishment of bus boarding islands*

On April 24, 2023, the City of Culver City voted to modify the project (Attachment A) including removal of the protected Class IV bikeway and bus-only lanes to create one shared bus/bike lane in both directions. The action also directed the removal of bus boarding islands. Construction to make these modifications began on September 16, 2024. This action deviates from the project elements specified in the executed FA and original Letter of Intent (grant application). Following the City's

---

approval to modify the project, Metro staff communicated with City staff to indicate that the MAT funding for these elements may be subject to deobligation.

## **DISCUSSION**

MAT funds in the amount of \$434,969.47 were used in the installation of the MOVE Culver City Class IV bikeway, bus-only lanes, and bus boarding islands that were described in both the Letter of Intent and the project Scope of Work. The executed FA between Metro and the City of Culver City contains the following provision regarding grant-funded improvements removed from use:

*“If a facility, equipment (such as computer hardware or software), vehicle or property, purchased or leased using the Funds, ceases to be used for the proper use as originally stated in the Scope of Work, or the Project is discontinued, any funds expended for that purpose must be returned to LACMTA as follows: GRANTEE shall be required to repay the Funds in proportion to the useful life remaining and in an equal proportion of the grant to GRANTEE Funding Commitment ratio”.*

Therefore, staff is recommending to deobligate \$434,969.47 in MAT funds, which were specifically used for the purchase and installation of the Class IV bikeway, bus-only lanes, and bus boarding islands along Washington Blvd between Landmark Ave and Helms Ave. The remainder of the total MAT funds for this project will remain intact.

## **DETERMINATION OF SAFETY IMPACT**

The removal of the Class IV bikeway, bus-only lanes, and bus boarding islands along Washington Blvd between Landmark and Helms Avenues will decrease the level of protection and space prioritization for active transportation users. The Class IV bikeway provided a fully separated route for bicyclists away from vehicle traffic. The shared bus/bike lane will place bicyclists and buses in the same lane, decreasing the safety of the bicyclists. The removal of the bus boarding islands negatively impacts the level of protection and access provided to transit users and active transportation users.

## **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

Deobligating the \$434,969.47 in project funds will have no impact on the Metro budget. Culver City will return the deobligated funds to Metro. Once received, these funds will be made available to supplement previously awarded MAT projects or for a future MAT funding cycle.

## **EQUITY PLATFORM**

MAT Cycle 1 projects were evaluated using a screening and ranking process intended to target high-need locations based on indexes of socio-economic and environmental disadvantage, including equity, safety, and connectivity/mobility indicators. Projects within Equity Focus Communities (EFCs) were assigned additional points as part of the evaluation process. There are no designated EFCs within the boundaries of Culver City, and therefore the project did not receive EFC points during the evaluation process.

---

The project as referenced in the Letter of Intent is to create infrastructure to increase safety for vulnerable road users, pedestrians, and bicyclists. The removal of MOVE Culver City project elements impacts the safety of these vulnerable road users.

### **IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS**

The recommended action supports the following Strategic Plan Goals:

- *Deliver outstanding trip experiences for all users of the transportation system (Goal 2) by improving the safety, accessibility, and comfort for Metro users getting to and from the transit station*
- *Provide responsive, accountable, and trustworthy governance within the Metro organization (Goal 5) by providing fiscal stewardship for Measure M funds.*

### **ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED**

The Board could decide not to approve the deobligation of funds. This is not recommended because the removal of these project elements is inconsistent with the grant letter of intent, scope of work, and Funding Agreement terms.

### **NEXT STEPS**

Upon Board approval, the City of Culver City will be formally notified of the action. Staff will revise the existing Funding Agreement with an amendment to indicate the revised funding amount.


### **ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment A - Culver City Council Regular Meeting Official Minutes April 24, 2023

Prepared by: Mariko Toy, Senior Transportation Planner, First/Last Mile Planning, (213) 547-4330  
Neha Chawla, Senior Manager, First/Last Mile Planning, (213) 922-3984  
Jacob Lieb, Senior Director, First/Last Mile Planning, (213) 547-4272  
Avital Barnea, Senior Executive Officer, Multimodal Integrated Planning, (213) 547-4317  
Allison Yoh, Deputy Chief Planning Officer (Interim), Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 922-4812

Reviewed by: Ray Sosa, Chief Planning Officer, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 547-4274





Stephanie N. Wiggins  
Chief Executive Officer

OFFICIAL MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
CITY COUNCIL, CULVER CITY  
HOUSING AUTHORITY BOARD,  
REDEVELOPMENT FINANCING AUTHORITY, AND  
SUCCESSOR AGENCY TO THE CULVER CITY  
REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY BOARD  
CULVER CITY, CALIFORNIA

April 24, 2023  
7:00 p.m.

**Call to Order & Roll Call**

Mayor Vera called the regular meeting of the City Council, Culver City Housing Authority Board, Redevelopment Financing Authority, and Successor Agency to the Culver City Redevelopment Agency Board to order at 5:31 p.m. in the Mike Balkman Chambers at City Hall.

Present: Albert Vera, Mayor  
Yasmine-Imani McMorris, Vice Mayor  
Göran Eriksson, Council Member  
Freddy Puza, Council Member  
Dan O'Brien, Council Member

o0o

**Closed Session**

Jeremy Bocchino, City Clerk, reported no requests to speak on Closed Session items.

MOVED BY COUNCIL MEMBER O'BRIEN, SECONDED BY MAYOR VERA AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED, THAT THE CITY COUNCIL, CULVER CITY HOUSING AUTHORITY BOARD, REDEVELOPMENT FINANCING AUTHORITY, AND SUCCESSOR AGENCY TO THE CULVER CITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY BOARD ADJOURN TO CLOSED SESSION.

At 5:32 p.m. the City Council, Culver City Housing Authority Board, Redevelopment Financing Authority, and Successor Agency to the Culver City Redevelopment Agency Board adjourned to Closed Session to consider the following Closed Session Items:

**CS-1** CC - Conference with Legal Counsel - Anticipated Litigation  
Re: Significant Exposure to Litigation (1 Item)  
Pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.9(d)(2)

**CS-2** CC - Conference with Real Property Negotiators  
Re: 9415-9425 Venice Boulevard, Los Angeles  
City Negotiators: John M. Nachbar, City Manager; Jesse Mays, Assistant City Manager; Tevis Barnes, Housing and Human Services Director; Arames White-Shearin, Assistant to the City Manager on Homelessness  
Other Parties Negotiators: City of Los Angeles  
Under Negotiation: Both Price and Terms of Payment  
Pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.8

o0o

#### **Reconvene**

Mayor Vera reconvened the meeting of the City Council at 6:51 p.m. with all Council Members present.

o0o

#### **Recognition Presentations**

Item R-5  
(Out of Sequence)

#### **Presentation of a Commendation to James Smith for his Dedication to Culver City Youth as the Lead Advisor and Co-Program Director for the Culver Palms Family YMCA Youth and Governor Program**

Dr. Janet Hoult discussed the scholarship in honor of Louise Coffey Webb by the Culver Arts Foundation; MOVE Culver City; Earth Day; support for Autism Awareness; Municipal Clerks' Week; the dedication of her grandson James Smith at the Culver Palms YMCA; and she shared a poem.

Council Member O'Brien presented the Commendation noting that James Smith had mentored his daughter.

James Smith expressed appreciation for the honor and for his family, the delegates, the City, and everyone who showed up to support him.

o0o

Item R-1

**Presentation of Proclamation Declaring the Month of April as Autism Awareness Month in Culver City**

Vice Mayor McMorris presented the proclamation declaring the month of April as Autism Awareness Month in Culver City.

Pamela Wiley, Los Angeles Speech and Language and Therapy Center, expressed appreciation for the proclamation; provided background on the organization; discussed their work with the City; the intent to continue to be a vital part of the community; and she acknowledged the work of her daughter.

o0o

Item R-2

**Presentation of a Proclamation Designating April 30 - May 6, 2023 as Municipal Clerk's Week**

Council Member Puza presented a proclamation designating April 30 - May 6 as Municipal Clerk's Week.

Jeremy Bocchino, City Clerk, noted that the proclamation was more of a Public Service Announcement to highlight the work done to keep accurate records for the City, and she thanked staff for their efforts to make the City as good as it can be.

o0o

Item R-3

**Presentation of a Certificate of Appreciation to Public Works Staff Member Zach Grant for Exceptional Service to the Leake Family**

Mr. Leake reported that his son was a huge trash truck fan; discussed cheering on the trash truck during the pandemic; the gift from truck driver, Zach Grant to the family; the friendship that grew between the family and Mr. Grant; the chalk mural he dedicated to Zach and Culver City Sanitation; and he proposed that workers be celebrated all the time, not just during a pandemic.

Mayor Vera presented a Certificate of Appreciation to Public Works staff member Zach Grant for his exceptional service to the Leake family.

Zach Grant thanked the Leake family; noted that he looked forward to seeing the Leake family every week; and he thanked Culver City for the recognition.

o0o

Item R-4

**Presentation of Certificates of Appreciation to Public Works Staff Members Mauricio Alvarenga, Raul Ceron, and Wagner Blanco for Extraordinary Assistance to the Baughan Family**

Mr. Baughan discussed their positive experience with Culver City Sanitation retrieving rings that were accidentally thrown away in their trash.

Mauricio Alvarenga indicated that credit should go to Raul Ceron and Wagner Blanco who worked to find the rings.

Mayor Vera presented Certificates of Appreciation to Public Works staff members Mauricio Alvarenga, Raul Ceron, and Wagner Blanco for Extraordinary Assistance to the Baughan Family.

o0o

**Regular Session**

Mayor Vera reconvened the regular meeting of the City Council, Successor Agency to the Culver City Redevelopment Agency Board, Redevelopment Financing Authority, and Culver City Housing Authority Board at 7:19 p.m. with all Council Members present.

o0o

**Pledge of Allegiance**

Mayor Vera led the Pledge of Allegiance.

o0o

**Report on Action Taken in Closed Session**

Heather Baker, City Attorney, reported that the City and Sentinel Peak Resources (SPR) had made significant progress toward a final settlement agreement in response to the City's Oil Termination Ordinance calling for the phase out of oil operations in the Culver City portion of the Inglewood Oil Field (IOF); she provided a brief history of the process; discussed the extension of the existing Tolling Agreement to allow additional time for the parties to complete documentation of the settlement; provisions included in the settlement; performance schedule dates; termination; and she indicated that the statement would be distributed via the City email notification system and posted on the City website.

o0o

**Community Announcements by Members/Information Items from Staff**

Council Member Puza discussed attending the opening of the California Center for Climate Change; Earthfest at El Rincon; the Tri-City SELPA (Special Education Local Plan Area) event hosting the resource fair for students with disabilities; and Denim Day on April 27.

Council Member Eriksson reported attending the event at West Los Angeles College; discussed becoming a member of the Community Emergency Response Team (CERT); and the Annual Culver City Car Show at West Los Angeles College on May 13.

Council Member O'Brien reported attending the event at West Los Angeles College and Earth Fest at El Rincon; expressed disappointment at missing the Ballona Creek Clean Up; and he received clarification that work on a Juneteenth celebration is in progress.

Vice Mayor McMorris discussed recent Earth Day events; the Tri-City SELPA event; the theme for Sexual Assault Awareness Month;

Armenian Genocide Day; Independent Bookstore Day; and the theme for Earth Day.

Mayor Vera expressed appreciation for being able to donate food to several recent events that he was unable to attend.

T'Ana Allen, Deputy City Clerk, discussed the annual recruitment to fill vacancies on Committees, Boards, and Commissions (CBCs) acceptance of applications online at [www.culvercity.org/serve](http://www.culvercity.org/serve) up until May 15; youth outreach; available positions; opportunities to serve; and she indicated that information was available on the website or by calling (310) 253-5851.

o0o

### **Information Items**

Item I-1

#### **CC - Update on Homelessness Emergency (Including Project Homekey, Safe Camping, and Other Housing Programs)**

Tevis Barnes, Housing and Human Services Director, discussed the Emergency Declaration on Homelessness; progress on the Safe Sleep program; recruitment efforts for the Mobile Crisis Intervention Team; Project Homekey; the Motel Master Leasing program; the By-Name list; long-term leasing agreements; and the nutrition program.

Discussion ensued between staff and Council Members regarding collaboration with Southern California Hospital; Exodus Recovery; and accountability metrics.

o0o

#### **Joint Public Comment - Items NOT on the Agenda**

Mayor Vera indicated that public comment would be taken for 20 minutes with anyone who was not able to be heard during that time called to speak at the conclusion of the meeting agenda.

The following members of the public addressed the City Council:

Michael Monagan expressed appreciation for the dedication of Council Members; spoke in support of MOVE Culver City Option 1; discussed frustration with delays to getting approval for their plans for an ADU (Accessory Dwelling Unit); others having a

similar experience; he asked for help in addressing the situation; and he agreed to email the Mayor regarding the matter.

Jeannine Wisnosky Stehlin indicated being a Cultural Affairs Commissioner but speaking on behalf of herself; asked about the status of a request she previously made about lobbyist registration in the municipal code; discussed other cities with lobbyist registration; lobbyists speaking at meetings and creating policy; the definition of lobbyist; and she hoped that the City Council would address the issue soon.

Discussion ensued between staff and Council Members regarding previous agreement to discuss the issue and staff efforts to bring the item forward.

Stephen Jones discussed disturbing racist patterns identified in the RIPA (Racial and Identity Profiling Act) Report; use of force by the Culver City Police Department (CCPD) during traffic stops for Black individuals vs. for white individuals; statewide rates vs. City-wide rates; less evidence of contraband found for Black individuals searched vs. white individuals searched; the CCPD Community meeting on April 27; the CCPD report vs. the state report; clear recommendations from the state to undo racist practices; and he asked the City Council to take the state recommendations and findings seriously noting that CCPD wants to pretend they do not exist.

Bryan Sanders discussed the statement regarding antisemitic events adopted by the Equity and Human Relations Advisory Committee (EHRAC) in December; requests that the Committee adopt a definition of antisemitism; and he asked that an update be provided.

Marci Baun discussed a sexual assault on the Culver City High School (CCHS) campus; the portrayal of the victim as a liar by a teacher; bullying; excuses being made about the pool; Arbor Day; and she stated that there had to be a better way to create a bike path than the removal of trees along Elenda being proposed by the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC).

Mary Daval discussed National Bike month in May and events planned by Bike Culver City and Women on Bikes.

Janeé Lennox discussed protests to mandate that police are held accountable and ensure that there is not another George Floyd in the community; the lack of accountability for the shooting



of Guillermo Medina by CCPD in December 2022; she asserted that police should not handle mental health calls; discussed the family who lost a loved one; calls to defund the police; and providing care for the community rather than having them fear for their lives.

Mayor Vera reported multiple independent investigations in process.

Jeff Schwartz echoed comments made by Stephen Jones objecting to the CCPD report on RIPA data scheduled for April 27; discussed a letter he sent to the City Council regarding RIPA data documenting severe and pervasive racism in CCPD; large disparities between who is pulled over, searched, and who is subject to police violence; similar findings in the 2020 Million Dollar Hoods Study analyzing CCPD data from 2016-2018; failure of reforms; the indictment of the status quo all throughout the system; systemic racism; concern with putting those most responsible for racism in charge of the discussion; he asked that the Thursday meeting be cancelled and instead that recommendations from the Million Dollar Hoods Study, the Solidarity Consultants Report, and the RIPA Board be implemented immediately; discussed accountability; removing police from as many situations as possible; and he noted that a few bad apples do not result in a 10 to 1 imbalance.

Aidan Nascimento expressed support for incremental infill; discussed opposition from Council Member Eriksson; SB 9; state housing law; issues with the three-year ownership requirement; discouraging developers; the original design of the City by developers; and he asserted that state law would not help the City, but incremental infill would.

Melissa Sanders commended the City on the presentation recognizing the friendship between the sanitation worker and the child; discussed large amounts of available commercial space in the City; the need to provide housing in large quantities; rezoning and repurposing to allow for development of below-market rate housing; and she noted the large amount of luxury housing in the City.

Ron Ostrin with one minute ceded by Leslie Ostrin, discussed preservation of a lifestyle that includes lower density; the request for infill and higher density; concern with an environmental disaster; creation of heat islands; strident environmentalists; ideas vs. real world consequences; the importance of dealing with reality rather than ideology; absurd

results; blaming CCPD for mental health crises; the call from the wife of the person who was killed by CCPD; the inability to find simple answers; and he felt the answer was to get mental health services for those who need it.

Steve Siegel was called to speak but did not respond.

Michelle Weiner questioned when the cell tower adjacent to the Safe Sleep area was installed; whether there was danger to people or pets sleeping in the area; and the amount of annual revenue received by the City from the cell tower.

Till Stegers expressed support for those who highlighted racial disparity and transgressions by CCPD and he expressed severe disappointment with comments from the speaker who blamed the family member of the person killed by CCPD.

The time limit for public speaking was reached and the Mayor indicated that the remaining speakers would be heard at the conclusion of the agenda.

Discussion ensued between staff and Council Members regarding postponing the CCPD meeting scheduled for Thursday in order to allow for additional perspectives to be heard; the purpose of the meeting to hear different perspectives on the RIPA Report; community feedback; willingness to discuss the state report and any other topics the community would like to discuss; the UCLA Million Dollar Hoods Project, and the Solidarity Consulting Report; and outreach and engagement.

o0o

### **Order of the Agenda**

Item R-5 as considered before Item R-1; Receipt and Filing of Correspondence was done after the Consent Calendar; and Items C-3, C-12 and C-13 were considered separately at the beginning of the Consent Calendar.

o0o

### **Consent Calendar**

Item C-3  
(Out of Sequence)

**CC - Adoption of a Resolution (1) Approving the Engineer's Report for Higuera Street Landscaping and Lighting Maintenance District; (2) Declaring the Intention to Order the Levy of Annual Assessments for Fiscal Year 2023/2024; and (3) Setting the Date, Time, and Place of the Public Hearing**

Discussion ensued between staff and Council Members regarding the scope of the landscaping; the roundabouts; the routine nature of the item to maintain the landscaping and streetlights within the assessment district; ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) curb ramps and walkways; and repairs.

THAT THE CITY COUNCIL:

ADOPT A RESOLUTION (1) APPROVING THE ENGINEER'S REPORT FOR THE HIGUERA STREET LANDSCAPING AND LIGHTING MAINTENANCE DISTRICT, (2) DECLARING THE CITY COUNCIL'S INTENTION TO ORDER THE LEVY OF ANNUAL ASSESSMENTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2023/2024, AND (3) SETTING THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR MAY 22, 2023.

o0o

Item C-12  
(Out of Sequence)

**CC - Adoption of a Resolution Determining the Main Street Weekend Reopening Project (Reopening of Main Street between Culver Boulevard and the City Limit Every Weekend) is Categorically Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)**

Vice Mayor McMorris asked that the Item be considered separately as she did not support the reopening of Main Street and she requested clarification on the title of the Item.

Discussion ensued between staff and Council Members regarding the weekly weekend closure; the CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) Notice of Exemption; and reopening the street fully except for Tuesday closures for the Farmers Market.

Mayor Vera invited public comment.

The following members of the public addressed the City Council:

Stephen Jones discussed the CEQA exemption; efforts by the City to incrementally reintroduce automobile capacity on Main Street without engaging in a CEQA analysis of the effects of creating

additional automobile lanes; plans for City mitigation of the impact of increased CO2 emissions; and he asked that Council Members vote no on the Item until questions could be answered.

Jeff Schwartz asked that the City Council vote against the Item on material and legal grounds; discussed the premise of the exemption; feeding traffic onto Culver; bus and bike lanes; the driveway into the underground garage for Culver Steps; money spent by Hackman to elect Council Member O'Brien; bollards; the difficulty of undoing harm caused by cars; pedestrians struck by cars; dangers posed by the use of fossil fuels; the inability of a city to exempt itself from the state; preemption; and he asked that the City Council reject the Consent Item.

Alex Fisch discussed the definition of CEQA projects; concern with the piecemeal consideration of MOVE Culver City; lack of analysis of the impacts of road widening; and concern with increased greenhouse gases, particulate matter, and severe injuries and death for pedestrians and cyclists.

Karim Sahli discussed the classification of the project as a minor alteration; lack of analysis of the environmental impact; inability to meet the categorical exemption under CEQA guidelines; he asserted that a full environmental review was necessary; and he asked the City Council to vote against the project noting that no cars should be allowed on Main Street anymore.

Heather Baker, City Attorney, indicated that the memo from the consultant attached to the resolution laid out the findings for the exemption and she felt that it was not appropriate to debate the legal issues in the venue.

THAT THE CITY COUNCIL:

1. ADOPT A RESOLUTION DETERMINING THE MAIN STREET WEEKEND REOPENING PROJECT (REOPENING OF MAIN STREET BETWEEN CULVER BOULEVARD AND THE CITY LIMIT EVERY WEEKEND) ("PROJECT") IS CATEGORICALLY EXEMPT UNDER CEQA; AND,

2. AUTHORIZE THE PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR/CITY ENGINEER TO FILE A NOTICE OF EXEMPTION WITH THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY CLERK'S OFFICE.

oOo

Item C-13  
(Out of Sequence)

**CC - Receipt and Filing of (1) the Fiscal Year 2021-2022 Year-End Report and Audit Summary; (2) the Fiscal Year 2021-2022 Annual Comprehensive Financial Report (ACFR); and (3) the Fiscal Year 2021-2022 Popular Annual Financial Report (PAFR)**

Mayor Vera invited public comment.

The following individuals addressed the City Council:

Margaret Peters pointed out how much of the budget goes to CCPD vs. the amount that goes to the parks; discussed insufficient camp space; and the need for more support for children in Culver City.

Janeé Lennox noted that a large amount of the budget was allocated to CCPD who were not going to be able to fix the houseless crisis, the mental health crisis, or the homeless emergency, and she felt that the budget needed to be reimaged and the police defunded.

THAT THE CITY COUNCIL: RECEIVE AND FILE THE ATTACHED (1) FISCAL YEAR 2021-2022 YEAR-END REPORT AND AUDIT SUMMARY; (2) THE FISCAL YEAR 2021-2022 ACFR; AND (3) THE FISCAL YEAR 2021-2022 PAFR.

o0o

Item C-1

**CC:HA:SA - Approval of Cash Disbursements for April 1, 2023 to April 14, 2023**

THAT THE CITY COUNCIL, HOUSING AUTHORITY BOARD, AND SUCCESSOR AGENCY TO THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY BOARD: APPROVE CASH DISBURSEMENTS FOR APRIL 1, 2023 TO APRIL 14, 2023.

o0o

Item C-2

**CC:HA:SA - Approval of Minutes of the Regular City Council Meeting on April 10, 2023**

THAT THE CITY COUNCIL, HOUSING AUTHORITY BOARD, AND SUCCESSOR AGENCY TO THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY BOARD: APPROVE MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR CITY COUNCIL MEETING ON APRIL 10, 2023.

o0o

Item C-4

**CC - Adoption of a Resolution (1) Approving the Engineer's Report for Landscape Maintenance District Number 1; (2) Declaring the Intention to Order the Levy of Annual Assessments for Fiscal Year 2023/2024; and (3) Setting the Date, Time, and Place for the Public Hearing**

THAT THE CITY COUNCIL: ADOPT A RESOLUTION (1) APPROVING THE ENGINEER'S REPORT FOR LMD #1; (2) DECLARING THE CITY COUNCIL'S INTENTION TO ORDER THE LEVY OF ASSESSMENTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2023/2024; AND (3) SETTING THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR MAY 22, 2023.

o0o

Item C-5

**CC - (1) Award of Construction Contract in the Amount of \$323,165 to Concept Consultant, Inc., as the Lowest Responsive and Responsible Bidder, for the Construction of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Sidewalk Uplift Replacement and Curb Ramps Project (CDBG Project Nos. 602297-21 and 602467-22), PS011 and PZ428; and (2) Authorization to the Public Works Director/City Engineer to Approve Change Orders in an Amount Not-to-Exceed \$80,791**

THAT THE CITY COUNCIL:

1. AWARD A CONTRACT TO CONCEPT CONSULTANT, INC. RESPONSIBLE BIDDER, FOR THE CDBG SIDEWALK UPLIFT REPLACEMENT AND CURB RAMPS PROJECT (CDBG PROJECT NO. 602297-21 & 602467-22), PS011 AND PZ428 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$323,165; AND,

2. AUTHORIZE THE PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR/CITY ENGINEER TO APPROVE CHANGE ORDERS AMOUNT NOT-TO-EXCEED \$80,791; AND,

3. AUTHORIZE THE CITY ATTORNEY TO REVIEW/PREPARE THE NECESSARY DOCUMENTS; AND,

4. AUTHORIZE THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE SUCH DOCUMENTS ON BEHALF OF THE CITY.

o0o

Item C-6

**CC - Adoption of a Resolution Accepting \$3,000 in Homeland Security Grant Program Urban Area Security Initiative Funds Awarded to the City of Culver City for Fire Ground Survival Training and Providing Proof of Authority of the Governing Body as Required by the California Office of Emergency Services; and 2) FOUR-FIFTHS VOTE REQUIREMENT: Approval of a Budget Amendment to Record the Revenue of \$3,000 and Appropriation of \$3,000 in Fiscal Year 2022/2023 for the UASI Grant Program**

THAT THE CITY COUNCIL:

1. ADOPT A RESOLUTION ACCEPTING \$3,000 IN 2022 HOMELAND SECURITY GRANT PROGRAM URBAN AREA SECURITY INITIATIVE FUNDS AWARDED TO THE CITY OF CULVER CITY FOR FIRE GROUND SURVIVAL TRAINING, AND PROVIDING PROOF OF AUTHORITY OF THE GOVERNING BODY AS REQUIRED BY THE CALIFORNIA OFFICE OF EMERGENCY SERVICES; AND,

2. APPROVE A BUDGET AMENDMENT TO RECORD THE REVENUE OF \$3,000 AND APPROPRIATE \$3,000 IN FISCAL YEAR 2022/2023 FOR THE UASI GRANT PROGRAM (REQUIRES A FOUR-FIFTHS VOTE); AND,

3. AUTHORIZE THE CITY ATTORNEY TO REVIEW/PREPARE THE NECESSARY DOCUMENTS; AND,

4. AUTHORIZE THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE SUCH DOCUMENTS ON BEHALF OF THE CITY.

o0o

Item C-7

**CC - Approval of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the City of Los Angeles and the County of Los Angeles, the Los**

**Angeles County Flood Control District, and the Cities of Beverly Hills, Culver City, Inglewood and West Hollywood Regarding the Cost Sharing and Implementation of the Ballona Creek Bacteria TMDL Project**

THAT THE CITY COUNCIL:

1. APPROVE A MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES AND THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT, AND THE CITIES OF BEVERLY HILLS, CULVER CITY, INGLEWOOD AND WEST HOLLYWOOD REGARDING THE COST SHARING AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE BALLONA CREEK BACTERIA TMDL PROJECT; AND,
2. AUTHORIZE THE CITY ATTORNEY TO REVIEW/PREPARE THE NECESSARY DOCUMENTS; AND,
3. AUTHORIZE THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE SUCH DOCUMENTS ON BEHALF OF THE CITY.

o0o

Item C-8

**CC - Approval of the Citywide Recruitment and Referral Incentive Program to Miscellaneous Labor Groups to Advance the Recruitment and Retention Efforts of the City**

THAT THE CITY COUNCIL:

1. APPROVE THE RECRUITMENT AND REFERRAL INCENTIVE PROGRAM; AND,
2. DIRECT THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE A SIDE LETTER AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF CULVER CITY AND THE CULVER CITY MANAGEMENT GROUP (CCMG) AND BETWEEN THE CITY OF CULVER CITY AND THE CULVER CITY EMPLOYEE'S ASSOCIATION (CCEA).

o0o

Item C-9

**CC - (1) Adoption of a Resolution Approving Salary Schedules for Fire Safety Employees Effective July 1, 2022; (2) Adoption**



**of a Resolution Approving Revised Salary Schedules for Fire Safety Employees Effective January 1, 2023**

THAT THE CITY COUNCIL:

1. ADOPT A RESOLUTION APPROVING SALARY SCHEDULES FOR FIRE SAFETY EMPLOYEES RETROACTIVELY EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2022, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE SALARY INITIATIVE ORDINANCE; AND,
2. ADOPT A RESOLUTION APPROVING REVISED SALARY SCHEDULES FOR FIRE SAFETY EMPLOYEES RETROACTIVELY EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 2023, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE SALARY INITIATIVE ORDINANCE.

o0o

Item C-10

**CC - Approval of Proposed Mid-Year Budget Amendments for Cultural Affairs (Fund 413)**

THAT THE CITY COUNCIL: APPROVE THE BUDGET AMENDMENTS AS PROPOSED IN ATTACHMENT 1 (REQUIRES A FOUR-FIFTHS VOTE).

o0o

Item C-11

**CC - Approval of a Lease Agreement between the Culver City Transportation Department and the City of Culver City for a Portion of 4343 Duquesne Avenue, California 90232**

THAT THE CITY COUNCIL:

1. APPROVE A LEASE BETWEEN THE CULVER CITY TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT AND THE CITY OF CULVER CITY FOR A PORTION OF 4343 DUQUESNE AVENUE, CALIFORNIA 90232 FOR A PERIOD OF FIVE YEARS BEGINNING JULY 1, 2023 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2028 WITH A BASE AMOUNT OF \$141,600 PER YEAR THAT SHALL BE INCREASED BY 3% ANNUALLY STARTING JULY 1, 2024; AND,
2. AUTHORIZE THE CITY ATTORNEY TO REVIEW/PREPARE THE NECESSARY DOCUMENTS; AND,
3. AUTHORIZE THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE SUCH DOCUMENTS ON BEHALF OF THE CITY.

MOVED BY MAYOR VERA, SECONDED BY COUNCIL MEMBER ERIKSSON AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED, THAT THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVE CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS C-1 THROUGH C-11 AND C-13.

MOVED BY COUNCIL MEMBER O'BRIEN AND SECONDED BY COUNCIL MEMBER ERIKSSON, THAT THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVE CONSENT CALENDAR ITEM C-12.

THE MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: ERIKSSON, O'BRIEN, VERA  
NOES: MCMORRIN, PUZA

o0o

This Item was considered out of Sequence.

**Receipt and Filing of Correspondence**

MOVED BY MAYOR VERA, SECONDED BY COUNCIL MEMBER O'BRIEN AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED, THAT THE CITY COUNCIL RECEIVE AND FILE CORRESPONDENCE.

o0o

**Action Items**

Item A-1

CC - (1) Presentation by Staff on the MOVE Culver City Downtown Corridor (Downtown Corridor) Post-Pilot Evaluation Report; (2) Discussion of the Approaches and Design Adjustment Options for the Next Phase of the Downtown Corridor and Direction to Staff; (3) Authorization to Proceed with the Design and Implementation of the Next Phase of the Downtown Corridor; (4) Approval of the Update to the Design Guidelines, as Appropriate; (5) Authorization to the City Manager to Negotiate and Approve Amendment(s) to the Professional Services Agreement with Sam Schwartz Engineering for the MOVE Culver City Project in an Amount Not-to-Exceed \$275,000 for the Additional Scope of Service; (6) Authorization to the Chief Transportation Officer to Approve Amendment(s) to the Sam Schwartz Engineering Agreement in an Amount Not-to-Exceed \$125,000 to Cover Contingency Costs; and (7) Direction to the City Manager as Deemed Appropriate

Diana Chang, Chief Transportation Officer, provided a summary of the material of record.

Joe Iacobucci, Sam Schwartz Consulting, discussed key findings from the post-pilot evaluation report; sustainable mobility; CityBus; pedestrian activity; cycling and micro-mobility; bicycle and pedestrian crash data; vehicle impact analyses; travel time; pass-through trips; on-street parking; off-street parking; the business evaluation; and sales tax receipts.

Tony Garcia discussed public engagement; quality of feedback; timing; and the survey.

Diana Chang, Chief Transportation Officer, discussed next steps; ongoing efforts; decision points; award of a competitive grant for the capital costs of micro-transit and another circulator service on Jefferson Boulevard; the comprehensive service analysis; expansion of bike connectivity; creation of a pedestrian scramble intersection; the need for direction from the City Council with regard to proceeding with the Downtown mobility lanes beyond the pilot; and potential options.

Discussion ensued between staff and Council Members regarding the Venice infrastructure; research that removing car lanes helps congestion; lack of research indicating that adding travel lanes increases roadway capacity; the ability to process more cars; studies on cities with dedicated bus lanes and bike lanes; whether there is a correlation that increased traffic increases business; resident feedback indicating not wanting to come to the City due to being unable to find parking; attitudes and perceptions; traffic volume from 2019 to now; impacts of additional employees in the City to traffic volumes and current design; the dynamic nature of traffic patterns; levelling off of traffic; identification of additional capacity; staggered commuting; neighborhood incursion; data measuring the volume on Lucerne; information about Higuera; anecdotal evidence; sales tax data; increased storefront capacity; feedback from Downtown business owners; impacts of the pandemic; continued growth of businesses; metrics used for analysis; adjustments made for inflation; businesses who are suffering; outreach to businesses in the City; and thoughtful commentary received.

Jeremy Bocchino and T'Ana Allen from the City Clerk's office discussed procedures for public speaking.

Mayor Vera invited public comment.

The following members of the public addressed the City Council:

Aidan Nascimento noted that the many reasons for supporting MOVE Culver City depended on what people cared about; discussed positive affects to Downtown businesses, safety, sustainability, children, and pollution; and he asserted that if they cared about Culver City, they should keep MOVE Culver City.

Mille Reed expressed support for Option 1 of MOVE Culver City due to the positive effects on her life; discussed her usage of the lanes; usage by her friends; and she asked that the City not take a step backwards, away from a greener and less car-centric community.

Wilder Hansen, second grade, discussed riding in the bike lanes with family; feeling safer in bike lanes; and requested that MOVE Culver City be saved.

Ben Heverly spoke along with 32 organizations in support of Option 1; he felt that MOVE Culver City was a model for making healthy, more sustainable, and livelier communities across Los Angeles; discussed data shared; benefits to homeowners; Zillow ads; investment in the City; and he indicated that he and his wife hoped to own a home in the City one day.

Mari Harwood-Jones indicated that she loved riding her bike and did not want the lanes taken away.

Christian Israelian was called to speak but did not respond.

Robert Boerner was called to speak but did not respond.

Pictures from five year old Benjamin Goodwin were shared with the City Council.

Jack Moreland, Culver Palms, YMCA Youth in Government Delegation, indicated that Charlie Sisk, who would be called to speak next, was not present at the meeting; expressed full support for MOVE Culver City; felt that increased sales tax figures were the largest indicator of success; discussed traffic congestion; lack of signal synchronization; and he expressed support for the removal of pedestrian recall.

Dionysious Kalofonos, Culver City Middle School (CCMS), expressed support for MOVE Culver City to ensure safety;

indicated riding a bicycle to school; and presented a banner signed by students in favor of MOVE Culver City.

Ava Frans, Culver City High School (CCHS), advocated for the adoption of Option 1 on behalf of CCHS students; discussed creating a sustainable future for Culver City; climate anxiety; creation of actionable change; CCHS organizations in support of expanding MOVE Culver City; reliance of students on MOVE Culver City to get to school; felt that watering down MOVE Culver City would be in direct opposition to the wishes of CCHS students and a regression into an unsustainable past; and asserted that the expansion of MOVE Culver City was imperative to ensure Safe Routes to School and a healthy future for students.

Max Weiner urged the City Council to adopt Option 1 to keep Downtown Culver City a place people want to be in rather than a place people want to drive through; discussed the bike and bus infrastructure that help those who cannot afford cars and reduce pedestrian fatalities; fostering healthy lifestyles; supporting local businesses; appreciation for being able to walk around without being hit by a car; serving as an example for other cities; improved air quality since the implementation of MOVE Culver City; minimal impact to travel times; induced demand with the addition of car lanes; and he noted that the area felt designed for people rather than for cars.

Dexter LaViolette discussed people who take mass transit and use bicycles; those who complain about children staying indoors, but do not support providing a safer place for them to go out in; the dangers of biking in the area; and disappointment in taking away progress made.

Janeé Lennox expressed support for Option 1; wanted to expand the program to include areas with a higher demographic of Black and Brown residents; she indicated that because of where she lives in the City, she is not able to make use of the bike lanes; and she hoped that Council Members would listen to their constituents.

Olga Lexell provided background on herself; discussed her use of MOVE Culver City; full bike racks; she indicated that MOVE Culver City was the reason she stopped driving; and she read an excerpt from Supervisor Holly Mitchell and Lindsay Horvath in support of making MOVE Culver City permanent and expanding it.

David Coles expressed concern that Council Members had already made up their mind to bring back a car lane in each direction;

discussed timing; the Venice Boulevard Road Diet; inviting pass-through traffic back to the City; and making the choice to add car lanes rather than improving the City.

Yotala Oszkay Febres-Cordero empathized with those opposing the project; discussed convenience; concern with solving the problem by adding car lanes; choosing more emissions, collisions, and fatalities over the well-being of the community; and prioritizing a mode of transport that brings anger and isolation rather than joy and social connection.

Christopher Michel urged the City to expand and invest in the critical infrastructure; noted that adding another car lane would not solve problems, but rather would make the corridor worse for everyone; discussed providing infrastructure in more neighborhoods in the City; the combined bus/bike lane; use of the combined lanes by CCPD and emergency vehicles; asserted that the separated bus and bike lanes make MOVE Culver City the success that it is; and he asked that the lives of pedestrians, cyclists, and transit riders be valued over the lives of those who want to drive around town very fast.

Jeannine Wisnosky Stehlin with one minute ceded by Jack Stehlin, indicated being a Cultural Affairs Commissioner speaking on behalf of herself; provided background on herself; discussed providing safe streets for cyclists, pedestrians, cars, and buses to move through quickly; indicated being an early advocate of MOVE Culver City and supporting protected bike lanes; pointed out that only 13% of residents want the project as it stands; wanted to see solutions figured out together without destructive rhetoric; discussed being mindful of those who cannot ride bikes or take a bus; diversity, equity, and inclusion; Latinos, women, and senior citizens surveyed who oppose the project in its current form; Downtown businesses and hourly employees who indicate that MOVE is doing harm; and lack of incidents and a safety study related to shared bus/bike lanes.

Lindsay Carlson expressed appreciation for efforts to improve mobility; wanted to see the City look at other neighborhoods neglected by the previous City Council; discussed concern about the tenor of the public discourse around the issue; dismissing feedback from small businesses; and finding ways for everyone to reduce their carbon footprint.

Luka Sklizovic indicated that he had moved to Culver City largely because of what MOVE Culver City has done for the City; discussed his use of MOVE Culver City; safety provided by the

separated bike lanes; creating a feeling of safety for commuters; the need for further expansion of bike lanes; those looking to replace their short commutes with other forms of transportation; and he encouraged the City Council to vote for Option 1.

Caro Vilain indicated that she rides a bike as she does not have the ability to drive and never will; discussed spending money at Culver City businesses as a result of MOVE Culver City; asserted that the issue was not drivers vs. cyclists or conservatives vs. progressives, but rather safety, equity, inclusivity, and sustainability vs. recklessness and personal interests; and she noted that the whole country was watching to know what the City's priorities were.

Darrell Menthe with one minute ceded by Eric Sims, Downtown Business Association (DBA), discussed reasons that the pilot project should be adjusted; the recent survey indicating that 85% of respondents wanted MOVE Culver City changed or removed; the failure of the project to bring people Downtown; the need to be flexible rather than dogmatic with multi-modal transportation; he read a list of businesses that had signed a statement requesting that the project be changed; noted the difficulty of getting businesses to speak out; he asserted that the project had not worked; and he discussed the need to restore two lanes of automobile traffic and loading zones to make it easier for people to get on and off the street.

Amanda McDaniel expressed support for Option 1; discussed increased bus ridership, cycling, pedestrian activity, and sales taxes revenue; the small increase to travel times; the biased and poorly administered survey; ill-informed residents who do not utilize the project; the exclusion of input from those who work in the City or who visit and spend money in the City; the opportunity for the City to be a champion of safe and sustainable transportation for the region; and she wanted to see the project made permanent and expanded.

Jamie Wallace with one minute ceded by Ken Niles, Culver City Neighbors United, discussed the quiet majority of Culver City Neighbors who support safety for all with Option 3; questioned whether changes in the numbers were attributable to the pandemic or to MOVE; discussed the opening of Culver Steps and the Ivy Station; results of the FM3 survey indicating that people want the project removed or modified; demographics of those who support and oppose the project; she wanted a new study with things changed when needed and traffic lanes restored; she

proposed shared bus/bike lanes; and asked that the City Council listen to residents and support Option 3.

Nancy Barba discussed framing the issue about education and information and having the right data; the presentation indicating that the data and information supports retaining MOVE Culver City; she expressed support for Option 1; asserted that the issue was about the power to set policy and what the policy centers; stated that if the City Council chose to go with anything other than Option 1, they were choosing to center cars and people with access; and she questioned who the City Council was going to choose to center since 57% of bus passengers have a median household income below the poverty line and 81% identify as Latino and Black.

Eric Dasmalchi stated that buses provide riders with a reliable, dignified experience that does not feel like a second-class option; discussed designing a transit system that is no longer the leading contributor to climate change in California; reported pride and hope that the City was addressing issues with the opening of MOVE Culver City; noted increased sales receipts; expressed concern that adding two more car lanes would make the City less pleasant; he asked the City Council not to backtrack, but to listen to the data and continue to shape a system that prioritizes safety, advances equity, and addresses the climate crisis; and he asked the City Council to support Option 1.

Jenny Hontz discussed the Livable Communities Initiative (LCI); future housing growth; climate change; concern with increased car traffic; LCI plans for car-lite housing; new homes along the MOVE route to meet the RHNA (Regional Housing Needs Assessment) target; the importance of planning for housing that is less car-centric; studies indicating that when housing is built without parking, people drop their cars; and she asked that the City Council support Option 1 for current and future residents.

Bubba Fish with one minute ceded by Aaron Lieberman, congratulated the Council for creating a project that inspires a lot of love; discussed the letter sent by a coalition of 32 community organizations in support of Option 1; support from businesses along the MOVE corridor; support from elected officials for not rolling back progress; support for installing the first Complete Street in Culver City history; and a letter from NRDC (National Resources Defense Council) requesting that the City fully comply with CEQA.



Adrian Killigrew with one minute ceded by Nathaniel Woiwode, provided background on himself; acknowledged the task of making tough decisions for the City; discussed benefits of MOVE Culver City to residents, employees, transit riders, and clean air; asserted that the survey should not be used as the main source for statistics as it did not include transit users, workers, or children and teenagers; discussed the reputation of Los Angeles with traffic, road rage, and pollution; MOVE Culver City as an important asset; negative news if the project is taken out; being a modern, connected, human City vs. being a highway City; concern with accommodating cars; encouraging people to get out of their cars; he indicated being a car owner but changing his ways and using bicycles and buses to get around whenever possible; he wanted to see MOVE Culver City progress to phases 2 and 3 and then be reevaluated; felt that Los Angeles was becoming a more accessible area to navigate and that taking away the bus lanes would be good for a minute for car users, but would then revert to gridlock; and he presented a photograph of a friend who died while riding in an unprotected bike lane.

Philip Lelyveld submitted an e-comment that he hoped people would read; discussed comments made by Jamie Wallace regarding the FM3 study; the 60% of residents angry about the program; the initial negative reaction to the project; revisiting the project; and he encouraged the City to post signage on the route to allow people to rediscover and reevaluate the program.

Stephen Schaller with one minute ceded by Toba Schaller, discussed climate scientists who emphasize the importance of reducing greenhouse gas emissions; concern with increasing traffic in the City; safety; data indicating that traffic accidents are the leading cause of death for children 14 and under; studies indicating increased safety with protected bike lanes; concern with the methodology of the thoughts and feelings survey; the majority surveyed who want to see MOVE Culver City stay, but with changes that do not include ripping out the dedicated bus lane, adding another lane of car traffic, or endangering the lives of children; he asserted that they wanted permanent bike lanes with concrete barriers extended past Downtown to connect a real network of bikeable streets and more frequent bus services; discussed complaints about increased traffic travel times, parking, and loading zones; and he indicated that Option 1 was the only choice for those who care about the climate, safety, and CEQA compliance.

Stephen Jones discussed the voting base; political backbone; safety; collision data; making people less safe to allow traffic

flow through Downtown two minutes faster; concern with changes that would make his family less safe; adding traffic; filling a pedestrian area with a right turn lane; data indicating that additional car lanes provide negligible improvement; reduced collisions, severe injuries, and death in those areas with protected bike lanes; Council Members afraid of losing votes; and he asserted that a vote for Option 3 was a vote for more injuries and more death.

Annika Furman indicated pride in living in a City with protected bike lanes where she can bike everywhere; discussed Copenhagen; and she spoke in Swedish.

John Buuck provided background on himself; indicated being a part of the super majority opposed to MOVE Culver City; wished there were more than the three options available; asserted that prior to MOVE Culver City Downtown worked, but now it is a disaster; indicated that due to a disability, he can no longer ride a bike and no longer goes Downtown; discussed gridlock; and he stated that climate change would not be solved by making it harder to drive.

Jeanne Black noted that MOVE Culver City had become a scapegoat for the large, fast changes taking place in the City; pointed out that longtime residents can barely recognize the City and feel disregarded and disrespected by the younger generation and activists; discussed the perception of huge increases to travel time, while data indicates negligible changes; minimal impacts to side street traffic travel; the 2017 traffic study for Culver Studios; she quoted Rosalind Carter; and asserted that the City had a moral obligation to avoid climate disaster.

Dylan Gera was called to speak but did not respond.

Jett Galindo urged Council Members to choose Option 1 to expand MOVE Culver City; discussed progress made toward safety and equity; making the City a place to get to rather than drive through; her bike commute; she felt that Culver City should not feel like a risky undertaking for those who cannot commute by car; wanted the City to be a place for families to explore their neighborhoods by foot, public transit, or bicycle, and for those who care about climate change; and she asserted that making alternative modes of travel more accessible was the answer to traffic congestion.

Conor Proffitt expressed support for Option 1 noting that anything else would be a step backward; concern that the

modernization of Venice would make Culver City a throughput; wanted Culver City to be a city rather than a traffic processing facility; discussed having trees, al fresco dining, and having a nice place to live; and he asserted that the project would happen regardless of whether it is now, or when those opposing it are voted out.

Michelle Weiner indicated being a member of the BPAC, though she was speaking on her own behalf; reminded the City Council that in February, the BPAC had recommended that MOVE Culver City be made permanent and expanded; noted that there were three unsuccessful recall efforts to remove a Council Member who implemented protected bike lanes on Venice Boulevard; she noted that bike lanes were the way of the future and Council Members would not be successful if they voted to take the lanes away; she expressed support for Option 1 as a vote for mobility, equity, and safety; and she stated that motorists were not being put out.

Laura Michet provided background on herself; urged the City Council to adopt Option 1; asserted that the issue was not travel time but public safety; expressed concern for those who want to trade two minutes of travel time for her life; wanted to see the issue treated as the public safety issue that it is; and indicated that people would remember whether Council Members voted to put people in danger or if they were brave enough to put people first.

Bryan Sanders asserted that a bully group had been created by former Council Members made up of non-residents and a trumped up list of organizations with the same members; discussed the Sierra Club, Los Angeles Times, and the NRDC; creation of a bogus lawsuit; social justice, eco-friendly democrats; he expressed support for Option 3; noted that Culver City was a majority democrat town; and he indicated being a democrat like four of the Council Members.

Mark Chaisson discussed his commute; noted that the four lane roads were either congested with cars, or deadly speedways; indicated that MOVE Culver City provided space for bikes and discouraged cars from speeding; felt that forced reduction of speed was necessary; discussed working with neighbors to improve the MOVE program by expanding to Palms, Venice, and other areas to reduce congestion; noted that increasing lanes did not reduce traffic; and he indicated that the 6,000 workers needed alternative transit.

Monica Richardson expressed support for Option 3; noted that a lane of traffic was not being added, but was being taken back; discussed senior citizens; people hit by cyclists; and lack of access for the disabled.

Michael Trinh was called to speak but did not respond.

Gary Zeiss discussed the organized bike ride, but lack of an organized bus ride; those who drive to USC rather than using Expo; questioned why the bike lane stopped at Duquesne and did not connect with Elenda; asserted that the bus lane was not used; noted that the number of buses was not going to be reduced; discussed equity issues; reduced wait time for buses; virtue signaling for progressive green candidates; and he asked that the City Council listen to residents.

Leah Pressman, Culver City Democratic Club (CCDC), reported that CCDC had sent Council Members a copy of their unanimously adopted resolution in favor of making MOVE Culver City permanent; discussed effectiveness of MOVE Culver City in meeting goals of the City's Pedestrian Action Plan and Complete Streets policy; making it safer and faster to use alternatives to cars; reductions to Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT); and she asked the City to respect their own policies by approving Option 1.

Marci Baun reported that she used to use the Venice Corridor Bike Path; indicated that she could not support the MOVE project; felt that many of the numbers were not accurate; noted that the only reason she goes Downtown is to support the businesses; discussed congestion; increased travel time; asserted that many people speaking were not from Culver City; and she asked that Council Members not allow themselves to be bullied.

Mary Daval, Bike Culver City, spoke on behalf of a coalition of 32 organizations urging the City Council to support Option 1 and expand the project to more neighborhoods; discussed the transformation of streets to enable safe, sustainable, and affordable access; and the project as a region-wide amenity.

Patricia Bijvoet expressed support for Option 1; noted that she was not a resident but that Culver City was her day urban system; thanked the former City Council for their execution of the pilot program which was a great indicator of what they had hoped to achieve; discussed the thriving Downtown area and continued growth; growing pains; she asked that the City Council clarify

to constituents how MOVE Culver City sets up for a livable community and a robust future for all; and she did not want the City to cure growing pains by bringing back car lanes at the cost of climate change, equity, and growth potential.

Phil Olson asserted that MOVE Culver City was working and he asked the City Council not to add vehicle lanes, but to make the project permanent and expand it throughout the City; discussed data indicating the success of the project; increased sales tax revenue, biking, and pedestrian activity; pass-through traffic; concern that adding a vehicle lane would invite more traffic; looking ahead to 2028; and being on the right side of history.

Jeff Schwartz discussed the Los Angeles Times' editorial Board's condemnation of plans to cut back MOVE Culver City; his column entitled *The Whole World is Watching* in the March issue of Culver City Democratic Club Newsletter; staff reports indicating the success of MOVE Culver City; independently verified data; Council Member disrespect of City staff; ignoring thorough research in favor of unsupported anecdotes and unexamined assumptions; he invited people to Google "induced demand"; and he asserted that Option 1 was the minimal reasonable choice and the only choice before the City Council not based on science denial.

Edwin Sun reported frequenting local businesses; discussed his transportation habits; the fact that drivers can also be pedestrians; drivers who do not oppose MOVE Culver City; choosing different modes of transportation based on what is convenient; and he urged the City Council to prioritize providing alternatives.

Devin Gladys indicated that since the implementation of MOVE Culver City it had been much safer to ride to work; he encouraged the City to retain the MOVE project and expand it to other neighborhoods; and he noted that the project helped those who commute into the City and those who live in it.

Hector Garcia was called to speak but did not respond.

Steven Zimelman was called to speak but did not respond.

Kathryn Lundeen was called to speak but did not respond.

Patrick Meighan discussed the amazing opportunity to support Option 1 to get more people into sustainable transit and change

climate history; noted that the City Council was being watched and would be judged by future generations; and he emphasized the importance of doing everything possible to reduce climate impact, build a greener region, and give the future a fighting chance.

Kathryn Lundeen, Lundeen's Gift Store, discussed impacts of MOVE Culver City to her store; daily complaints from customers about how difficult it is to get to the store; she hoped that the City would restore things to the way they were so that people would come back; she feared that customers had been lost for good; and she felt worried that she would not make it through MOVE.

David Metzler with one minute ceded by Chimin Lee Metzler, presented a video of Downtown Culver City with one more lane of traffic; discussed what draws people to the City; providing a pleasant, walkable, outdoor experience; the need to focus on expanding and improving what people love about Downtown Culver City; concern with threatening the growing foot traffic critical to a vibrant Downtown; worsening the pedestrian experience by adding one more lane of traffic that would not fix rush hour; the need for leadership; providing a network of options to give people a choice; comparing traffic lanes to customers; and he noted that cars could not provide what the community wants which is a great experience walking, dining, and hanging out.

Cindy Bailey discussed her involvement in environmental issues since the 1970s; her opposition to MOVE Culver City in its current form; lack of evidence based on the statistical analysis to support claims; pre-pandemic vs. post-pandemic conditions; support for protecting cyclists; and she indicated that a bus lane was not needed if there would be one on Venice.

Kyle Ribordy expressed support for Option 1; indicated that he is a Culver City resident and customer who visited Lundeen's because he was walking by; felt that the post-pilot report reflected his experience that the City was a safer place to walk and bike and spend leisure time in; discussed handling the growth of the City; making the case to forego driving more compelling; work put into making Downtown Culver City a destination; and he felt it would be a mistake to prioritize the people who drive through the City over the people who come to the City.

Astrid Theeuwes provided background on herself; expressed support for Option 1; discussed her experiences with MOVE Culver City; she stated that MOVE Culver City helped her educate her

children about shared streets, protected bike lanes, traffic rules and safety, sustainable transportation, clean energy, and equitable transportation; and she indicated she did not forget to acknowledge respectful drivers.

Carolyn Allport was called to speak but did not respond.

Ronald Ostrin with one minute ceded by Leslie Ostrin, discussed use of data by MOVE Culver City and the consultants; biased interpretation; those who want MOVE Culver City removed or changed; relevant statistics; observation and reports; carbon emissions caused by the project; he asserted that the current project was killing Downtown businesses and causing people not to want to come into the City; and he discussed email he sent to Council Members about people who live Downtown and their difficulties getting out of the area.

Christie Gaynor with one minute ceded by Jillian Gotlib, expressed support for public transportation; indicated that she moved to Los Angeles county, not just Culver City; discussed her experience getting her children to various activities; people who avoid the area and those who cannot avoid the area; the Venice bus lane; and ridership levels.

David Siegal asked the City Council to choose Option 1; wanted any new development to adhere to CEQA; and noted that cyclists are good for business as they order more food and drinks.

Beverly Siu expressed support for Option 1; reported that when her business moved, she learned how much urban planning could change things; discussed making walking more people friendly; and induced demand.

Kelli Estes discussed actions of the previous City Council; inclusivity rather than exclusivity; pass-through traffic; people who stop to visit; the inability to grow by providing access for only a few; Culver CityBus; and repurposing the Circulator to shuttle the homeless to appointments.

Ben Parnas expressed support for Option 1; discussed an early memory riding on the back of his father's bike; the importance of providing multiple transportation options and a center for people to get to; and he was looking forward to the Car Show on May 13.

Megan Oddsen Goodwin provided background on herself; expressed support for Option 1 as an example of mobility progress;

discussed consideration of climate change; challenged the City to weather the growing pains to do what's right; recognized that the pilot was geographically abrupt at certain points; asked that the project be expanded with a focus on interconnectivity; discussed cultural impact; negative impacts of removing the project and reverting to car culture despite scientific warnings simply because it is an adjustment and people are set in their ways; and inspiring and promoting more changes to address climate change.

Ali Lexa presented a petition signed by 1,700 residents and business owners who wanted the dedicated bus lane restored to a multi-use lane noting that it could be found at [change.org/removeculvercity](https://change.org/removeculvercity); he encouraged people to read comments reflecting concerns with traffic congestion and difficulty navigating the area and reaching local businesses; discussed additional idling that hurts the environment; and he felt the best compromise would be to return the lane to multi-use while improving traffic light sequencing and bike and pedestrian infrastructure.

Jack Ettinger expressed support for Option 1; discussed rhetoric and respectful debate; increased safety with the infrastructure; benefits of cycling; the difficult transition from a car-centric to LA to a people-centric LA; building upon progress made; and he noted that elected officials had been elected to lead, not follow.

Jack Galanty provided background on himself; expressed support for Option 1; discussed his experiences getting around on the City on his adapted bike; stated that the project had provided a sense of safety; and he wanted to see MOVE Culver City retained and expanded.

Elliott Lee urged the City Council to expand and promote Culver City by choosing Option 1; discussed vulnerable road users; prioritizing space for people, not cars; sales tax receipts indicating that the Downtown corridor is more vibrant than ever; scientists indicating the need to reduce car-dependency; he asserted that the public comment was not theater or bullying; and he asked the City Council to believe the data and set policy accordingly.

Daniel Haskell was called to speak but did not respond.

Allison Casey indicated that she had grown up hearing that one more lane of cars would fix traffic, but it never had; discussed



her asthma and hearing damage; traffic violence as a leading cause of death; and she asked the City Council to listen to input from children indicating MOVE Culver City is necessary for their future and choose Option 1.

Austen Royer provided background on himself; expressed support for Option 1; discussed anecdotal and safety evidence; the experience of his family visiting from a rural community; and he indicated that MOVE Culver City had made the City a lovely place.

Scott Gruber was called to speak but did not respond.

Sean Pawling urged the City Council to expand MOVE Culver City; reported being struck by a car; discussed the importance of separated bike lanes; support for creating more permanent bike infrastructure; moving from pylons to concrete barriers; and he noted that he and his family expected traffic when they use their car to get around the City 50% of the time.

Melissa Sanders indicated her dislike of the job done by Sam Schwartz consultants; discussed lack of study or data before implementation; manipulated data; she did not want any more money spent on the consultants and proposed finding a more objective company; expressed concern with people ignoring the Downtown businesses; denial by bike enthusiasts; and tax implications.

Greg Maron, BPAC Member, indicated speaking on behalf of himself; expressed strong support for Option 1; and he observed much concern expressed about impacts to the business community but very little concern about impacts to children.

Kristen Torres Pawling spoke on behalf of Los Angeles City Councilwoman and Metro Director Katy Young Yaroslavsky expressing support for MOVE Culver City; discussed shared climate and equity goals; the Venice Boulevard project; she thanked the City Council for showing the region that local government can materially improve the lives of residents, employees and visitors; and she was looking forward to making a connected network between the two cities.

Scott Moon discussed soul crushing traffic; money spent by other cities researching solutions; the need for access to multi-modal transit; equity issues; comparisons with Copenhagen; and he expressed support for Option 1.

Richard Eilbeck discussed the important decision before the City Council; the opportunity to make Culver City a model for other urban centers; expanding access for all; he questioned how many children at the El Rincon Earth Day Festival thought that a solution to issues was adding back car lanes; he wondered how many other urban centers were contemplating how to increase private vehicle flow through downtown streets; felt it was madness to contemplate rolling back MOVE Culver City; noted that the future was coming; and he asked that bike and bus lanes be kept and expanded.

Jeff Cooper was called to speak but did not respond.

Kevin Lachoff, DBA and the Chamber of Commerce, indicated speaking on behalf of himself; observed that if MOVE Culver City had helped businesses, they would be present to support it; discussed harm done to businesses; sales tax revenue; increased costs; support for Option 3; and he asserted that studies did not show that VMT had been reduced.

John Aguilar was called to speak but did not respond.

Jesse Nuñez, Culver City Chamber of Commerce, agreed with comments from Kevin Lachoff that sales tax revenue was not indicative of profitability; discussed being part of the process of restoring economic vitality to the City post-pandemic; the funding forward-thinking social programs; the need for a robust mobility plan; collaboration with the City on the next chapter of mobility; support for combined protected bus/bike lanes and the return of loading zones on Culver Boulevard; electric vehicles; and the return of two lanes of automobile traffic.

Danny Young thanked City staff for their work to compile information that would be relied upon to make a decision benefitting the most vulnerable in the City, not just large campaign contributors; discussed increased bus ridership, pedestrian, cycling, and business activity, and tax revenue along the corridor, outpacing the rest of the community; and he expressed support for Option 1.

Disa Lindgren with one minute ceded by Nicholas Gardener, continued reading the letter from Supervisors Holly J. Mitchell and Lindsay Horvath in support of the region-wide amenity; discussed further investment in safety and mobility; making use of every lane type safer and more user-friendly; consistent positive results of the project; increased transit ridership and cycling; benefits to those who rely on efficient transit

and safe cycling routes; significant equity impacts; average household income; active harm to working class people with removal of the lanes; increased safety for cyclists and pedestrians; vehicle collisions as the leading cause of death for children age 5 to 14 years old in Los Angeles county; the importance of reducing speed of cars through street design; the importance of retaining MOVE Culver City; and speaking on behalf of herself, she expressed support for Option 1.

Alex Fisch discussed objective data; the obligation of the City Council to do their best; concern with deeming data compiled by staff as irrelevant and instead relying on bias and opinion; CEQA as designed to prevent undertaking a governmental project with an environmental impact based on feelings and prejudices; and interest in funding litigation if the City decides to move forward without adequate data.

Marta Valdez was called to speak but did not respond.

George Dougherty provided background on himself; discussed the number of bikes and scooters in the dedicated lane; more democratic use of space as a combined bus/bike lane; public land and public usage; and traffic before MOVE Culver City.

Larry Loughlin provided background on himself; expressed support for the protected bike lane on Venice Boulevard without taking away a traffic lane and still providing parking spaces; discussed parking easily in Downtown Culver City in the past; near traffic accidents; and impacts on his residential street.

Elias Platte-Bermeo was called to speak but did not respond.

Caitlin Reed provided background on herself; expressed support for Option 1; discussed the feeling of increased safety; research indicating increased use of protected bike lanes by women and families; felt the additional two minutes of travel time in one direction was a small price to pay for increased safety and improvements to transit access and reliability; and she urged the City Council to vote for Option 1 without adding more car lanes.

Brad Herman provided background on himself; confessed that he was a doubter when MOVE started; indicated that they stopped driving through Downtown and instead started to bike to Downtown; discussed increased patronage of Downtown businesses; and he noted that his kids rode their bikes to school.

Samuel Shapiro-Kline was called to speak but did not respond.

Tajairi Neuson provided background on himself; indicated that he loved the MOVE project and he felt safe riding in the protected bike lanes; appreciated the dedicated bus lane; discussed other areas without bike or bus lanes and without bus stop shelters; Culver City as one of the most forward-thinking parts of Los Angeles; he felt that Option 3 would make it harder for those who bike and take the bus; and he expressed support for Option 1.

Alan Schulman discussed rhetoric about riding buses and bikes; costs; support of bikes by the business community; outdoor dining; the importance of access to the business community; and he indicated that there would be 6,000 more people coming into the City.

Margaret Peters discussed data from 2019, not 2020; data indicating positive impacts of MOVE Culver City; the negligible impact to traffic times; the need for policy to be made for the many, not the few; decreased business revenue due to inflation not the MOVE Culver City project; other businesses increasing revenue; and data indicating that the project had made life Downtown nicer.

Jeff Morrical was called to speak but did not respond.

Jake Whitney indicated being drawn to Culver City due to the dedication to mobility options; echoed previous comments in support of MOVE Culver City; he provided an audio representation of what it would mean to return to previous traffic levels; and he encouraged Council Members to vote for Option 1.

Christopher Boscamp asserted that Council Members voting against Option 1 would be removed at the next election; he reported purchasing an expensive investment property in 2021 due to MOVE Culver City noting that if the project is removed he and others would divest themselves from the City; discussed people who are car-free because of MOVE Culver and similar projects; business impacts; he asserted that the business climate was the cause of hardship to businesses, not MOVE Culver City; discussed gas prices; and noted that money saved on Uber meant more money available to spend in restaurants.

Felipe Coundouriotis expressed support for Option 1; discussed his travel habits; MOVE Culver City as improving public transit, biking, and walking as well as making the Downtown area a more

pleasant place to be; reminded everyone that car traffic has always been bad during rush hour, but now all other methods of transportation have been improved; discussed the choice of continuing to be a model of equitable, accessible, efficient and environmentally friendly transportation and a place where people can walk around safely and attract younger generations; and he encouraged the City Council to vote for Option 1.

Monika Mallick was called to speak but did not respond.

Dylan Gottlieb discussed people who discredit data which they do not agree with; data indicating that businesses along the corridor are thriving in comparison to the rest of the City and that there are more pedestrians and more bikers with less accidents; support for making the City a destination; he wanted to see less bollards, more trees and landscaping, additional fully protected bike lanes, and dedicated bus lanes; he noted that the City was growing and needed a fully functioning multi-modal transit system; and he asserted that adding two lanes of cars was a step backwards and not good for the City and its future.

Amy Penchansky with one minute ceded by Oliver Penchansky, indicated that there was a campaign based on ideology, not public service; discussed climate change activists; private planes; data around sales tax numbers; feedback from the owner of Lundeen's; struggling small businesses; necessary critical thinking; opposition by 6 out of 10 people; residents who elected the Council majority; the previous Mayor who was voted out; cheerleaders organized to participate; she wanted to see the restoration of Main Street; and she encouraged people to look into scientists who refute climate change and are not in the mainstream.

Khin Khin Gyi, Advisory Committee on Housing and Homeless (ACOH) Member, indicated that she was speaking on behalf of herself; discussed contributing factors to bicycle fatalities as analyzed by Bike LA; Vision Zero; and the need for dedicated bike lanes similar to what is behind Syd Kronenthal Park that connects the subway at Jefferson and La Cienega with the E Line station in Culver City.

Eileen Pottinger provided background on herself; expressed support for Option 1 and expansion to other areas; discussed the survey; preservation of the planet for future generations; she read a letter from her 8 year old expressing support for more bus and bike lanes; acknowledged that change is hard but

inevitable; expressed support for LCI's plan for more car-lite housing along the MOVE route; and she hoped that the City would embrace a wholistic plan to keep bus and bike lanes on commercial streets and add car-lite housing.

John Christopher provided background on himself; discussed confusion with the intersection of Culver and Main; reduced safety walking; support for making a continuous bike lane Downtown; opposition to Option 1; he disagreed with making conditions worse to force a behavior; and he felt there was a need for better answers to attract riders.

Abby Wood expressed support for Option 1; provided background on herself; discussed safety arguments; and noted that because of MOVE Culver City they had not had to buy a second car and had also made the decision to move business they were doing elsewhere into the corridor including date nights in the Downtown area.

Brad Fi was called to speak but did not respond.

Eric Weinstein was called to speak but did not respond.

Ryan Fiore discussed lack of faith in American democracy and leaders; acting in favor of the wealthy elite and campaign donors; the majority of people speaking in favor of the project; and he noted the opportunity to listen to the people.

Sophie Nenner discussed those who expressed support for the project; she and her family's use of the MOVE Culver City; allowing more people to feel safer with the extension of protected bike lanes; and she wanted a safer and better future for everyone with reduced car speed and traffic, and safer infrastructure with Option 1.

Till Stegers expressed support for Option 1; wanted to see bike and bus lanes made permanent and extended; discussed his bike usage; increased safety and convenience; al fresco dining; the beginnings of a new network with the Venice Boulevard project; the probability of a CEQA challenge with adding a new car lane; and he asserted that it was time to lead by making the project permanent with Option 1.

Joseph Geumiek recognized the dedication and of those staying around to speak; expressed support for civic engagement; provided background on himself; he asked the City to support Option 1 to make MOVE Culver City permanent with changes for

the future; discussed investing in changes that people want to see; expansion of businesses along the corridor vs. others in the City; increased safety; success of the project; and he asked for leadership in making MOVE Culver City a permanent vision.

Meghan Sahli-Wells discussed growth of the City and the region; Culver City as a key crossroad and a regional cut-through; determining the vision of the City; she wanted to see Culver City prioritized as a destination; discussed the opening of the Expo line; years of studies that point to MOVE Culver City as the solution; she noted that adding lanes of traffic just added traffic, while adding transportation lanes removed cars from the road and reduced traffic; and she asked the City Council to follow the data and support Option 1.

John Wacker was called to speak but did not respond.

Cedric Joins asked that the City Council support Option 3; discussed his reduced patronage of local businesses due to congestion in the area since implementation of MOVE Culver City; he indicated that the project was confusing and dangerous to navigate; he asserted that there was plenty of greenspace in the City to ride bikes without discouraging people from visiting the area by car; and he asked that the traffic lanes be reopened to allow businesses to thrive.

Albert Medina was called to speak but did not respond.

Aaron Wais was called to speak but did not respond.

Alex Hedbany provided background on himself; indicated being part of a voluntary one-car household; noted that business was not exploding around Sepulveda and the 405, a maximum volume car-centric area; and he asserted that if Culver City was to continue its growth trajectory without more traffic, Option 1 was necessary.

Kenny Stevenson provided background on himself; read a statement from the Culver City Unified School District (CCUSD) Environmental Sustainability Committee in support for the continuation and expansion of MOVE Culver City Option 1; discussed transitioning to buses, trains, walking, bicycling, and cars; building a sustainable world; those in the community who find the changes inconvenient; challenges children face in the future if no changes are made; and he noted that 20% of residents in the City were allowed no direct input in the decision.

Michael Khalil expressed support for MOVE Culver City; discussed his use of transit since the project was implemented; reduced stress; easier commutes; providing opportunities to get cars off the road with access to the same kind of infrastructure for others; and he expressed support for the 32 organizations advocating for Option 1 to make the existing MOVE Culver City configuration permanent without adding lanes for cars.

Patrick O'Rourke was called to speak but did not respond.

Luke Rodriguez was called to speak but did not respond.

Joanna Brody provided background on herself; discussed Earth Day; riding the new Venice bike lanes; the Expo bike lane; and she expressed support for the options available.

Thistle Boosinger with one minute ceded by John Chigas, encouraged the City Council to approach the decision with an open mind; discussed nuanced options to consider; City Council responsibility for the fate of one of the most progressive, comprehensive infrastructure projects in the country; allowing the public one minute to speak on a decision that has already been made; financial backing of a mega-corporation; 100s of people who spent personal time and energy fighting for MOVE Culver City because they care; the small number of businesses that came to support or to oppose the project; the immense potential of the City; fresh air; pass-through traffic; empowering people to walk around and use transit; thriving trees and native plantings; allowing disabled people to take up space and participate in the community; not requiring that people spend tens of thousands of dollars on maintaining a car; the resounding success of the project demonstrated in the post-pilot report; she indicated that she loved the City; and she stated that not going with Option 1 would be sabotage and an embarrassment.

Lorri Horn discussed kids who were parroting what they were told to say; advocacy groups who do not live in the City; locals who resort to name calling of people they do not agree with; appeals to emotions; either/or fallacies; unbecoming ad hominem attacks and swearing; and democrats who care about climate change but still think that MOVE Culver City does not work.

Daniel Haskell provided background on himself; discussed being an outlier in a car-centric society; and the importance of



making a difference to improve air quality and protect human health and the environment in the area.

Andrew Flores was called to speak but did not respond.

Francesco Sinatra with one minute ceded by Rebecca Sinatra, indicated being a restaurant owner in the Arts District; felt that while MOVE Culver City was a good idea, it was not sustainable and hurt businesses on Washington Boulevard; he felt that Culver City had implemented the project backwards noting similar actions in Padua, Italy where traffic lanes were reduced once everything else was already in place; discussed unbearable traffic; indicated being a member of the Culver City Arts District Board and reported that many businesses were closing because of MOVE Culver City; noted lack of parking for customers; discouraging traffic; and he asked the City Council to choose Option 3 and make MOVE Culver City feasible without rushing like the previous City Council did.

Julie Sisk was called to speak but did not respond.

Vicki Tsui provided background on herself; noted that considering other factors such as traffic lights was critical to the conversation; discussed the debate over values, statistics, and anecdotal evidence; the power of the City Council to protect residents; the importance of thinking about the future; she pointed out that no one was taking choice away from people; and she asked the City Council to support Option 1.

Karim Sahli asked the City Council to vote for Option 1; discussed people who did not want to lose a few minutes vs. others did not want to lose their lives; businesses that want to protect their bottom lines vs. others who don't want to pay hospital bills; opposition by Hackman's paid group vs. support from local and regional organizations and leaders; climate change deniers vs. the scientific community; drivers who want to be stuck vs. those who want to move freely in and out of the City; those who want the status quo vs. those who want to act against the climate crisis; he asserted that they would win whether it was now or in two years; and he asked the City Council to vote to support Option 1.

Alex Lazar reported volunteering regularly for the Bike Co-op; discussed the beloved bike lane on Venice Boulevard; thriving businesses along the bike lane; data indicating improvements to business in the Downtown corridor even before the bike lane has

been connected to the network of transit options; the need for a strong transit network to reduce traffic; induced demand; he indicated that he was tired of restaurants blaming bike lanes for their troubles; and he asked the City Council to choose Option 1 and provide the strong network the City deserves.

Jonathan Eby provided background on himself; spoke in support of Option 1; discussed the feeling of increased safety with the protected bike lanes; and he hoped that the City Council would support good infrastructure for bikes and buses.

Nathan Fan asserted that MOVE Culver City created a vibrant livable area and was a benefit to everyone; discussed public space; the only non-park area in the City that has people there for the sake of being there; humanization; cars as the number one killer of children in Los Angeles; peace of mind provided by the project; he wanted to see the project expanded to arterial streets; and he asked that the City Council support Option 1.

Michael Monagan with one minute ceded by Kenji Haroutunian, noted that according to the survey he should be against MOVE Culver City, but instead he loves it; he indicated that his wife did not feel comfortable sharing lanes with the buses; he discussed benefits to riding his bike; large employers and people moving into the area; the need to provide alternatives; he expressed support for Option 1; and he hoped the City would lead the way to a better future.

Brendon Chung was called to speak but did not respond.

Tracy Egbas was called to speak but did not respond.

Marie Aizac was called to speak but did not respond.

Adam Mekrut was called to speak but did not respond.

Ian Wasserman discussed Culver City as a haven in car-centric, monotonous Los Angeles; the sustainable, walkable Downtown area; he noted that he still mostly drives, but chooses to live Downtown because of existing infrastructure; he noted that cars are not the future; discussed the appeal of Disneyland and cities in Europe; idealized, walkable cities; encouraged people to look at the data that indicates a minimal change in vehicle travel time with faster buses, increased public ridership, and more pedestrians which translates to more people bringing in business along the corridor; he reported giving business to Lundeen's because he walked by and saw the storefront;

perception; the reputation of the City; he pointed out that many people were watching to see what Culver City is doing about sustainability; expressed concern with moving backwards; and he asked that the City Council adopt Option 1 to keep the project permanent and expand it further.

Andrew Shults was called to speak but did not respond.

Brandon Gordon addressed his comments to Jesse Nuñez and Darrel Menthe who represent dozens of businesses along the corridor who they claim are losing business; discussed vocal opposition to the project; lack of evidence provided; anecdotes; he noted that cars did not spend money, people did; and he felt that money should be invested into people, not vehicles.

Annette Tossounian was called to speak but did not respond.

Marie Leyva was called to speak but did not respond.

Kyle Johnson stood with the 32 organizations urging the City Council to adopt Option 1 to make MOVE Culver City permanent and expand the project across the City without adding car lanes; discussed walking and his use of buses, cars, and bikes; and he cited reasons for wanting MOVE Culver City as a car owner.

Steve Siegel was called to speak but did not respond.

Samuel Schmidt noted many reasons cited why MOVE Culver City is a great idea; questioned how many other times the City Council had heard from children about a topic they were passionate about; noted that the project made children safer and got them outside; stated that MOVE Culver City was an opportunity to prioritize people over cars; he discussed economic incentives; arguments against the project; and he asked that the City Council choose Option 1 to allow the project to flourish and be the example that Los Angeles needs.

Jeffrey McIlvain discussed the impact of a car on a child and his experience being hit at the age of 14, noting that expanding MOVE Culver City was the future and would save lives.

Clemens Pilgram provided background on himself; indicated that he was currently recovering from being doored on his bicycle; he strongly urged the City Council to keep and expand the MOVE Culver City project to make the City safe; he observed that his neighborhood was quieter during rush hour; indicated driving before and after project implementation noting that traffic was

not any better before; stated that MOVE Culver City made the City more pleasant to live in and served as a model for other cities; he acknowledged that the project was not perfect, but asked that the City not roll it back; and he asked that the City vote for Option 1.

Kieran Holzhauser provided background on herself; discussed bike commuting to incorporate physical activity into every day life; noted that she did not usually recommend bike commuting to her patients due to safety concerns; acknowledged the respite provided with the opening of MOVE Culver City which has made the area more pleasant to visit and patronize; discussed cycling and public transit as affordable and ecofriendly transportation options; climate change; inflation; she felt that voting to make options less appealing, less efficient, and less safe was unacceptable; expressed concern with backtracking on improvements made to the City; and she expressed support for maintaining and expanding the project through Option 1.

Tyler Koke asked that the City Council vote to expand MOVE Culver City which has made Downtown one of his favorite areas in Los Angeles; indicated not being included in the survey because he lives in Palms; reported that before the project, he did not visit Downtown very often; acknowledged other people's experiences; and he did not see how businesses were hurt more than they were helped.

Scott Kecken was called to speak but did not respond.

Marc Vukceovich was called to speak but did not respond.

Thomas Soestini provided background on himself; reported difficulty getting friends and family to come to the City before the implementation of MOVE Culver City; discussed those who do not want traffic coming through their neighborhood; adding lanes as adding traffic; growth of the Downtown area as a destination; and he proposed providing other options for people to get in and out of Downtown that are more effective than adding another lane of traffic.

Cary Anderson provided background on himself; discussed his experience in the City; adding more lanes to get cars through faster; completely ignoring neighborhoods, the DBA, and loading zones; deletion of a social media post on the 19<sup>th</sup> about a crash between a bus and an SUV; and the creation of the Downtown Plaza in the 90s.

Ken Mand highlighted parts of the staff presentation including the fact that cut-through traffic is down, eastbound travel times are the same, and westbound travel times are better in the morning but increased by two minutes in the evening; he questioned whether the two minute slowdown was more important than the safety of children; expressed concern that if the lanes in Culver City are opened up, cars from the lane closure on Venice would all come through Culver City; discussed campaign season in November; and he asked that Council Members be smart and intentional in their decisions.

Daniel Lee was called to speak but did not respond.

Andrew Leist thanked the City Council for listening to everyone; provided background on himself; indicated being a big fan of the MOVE Culver City project; discussed the successful pilot program; asked the City Council to listen to businesses and the community by supporting and expanding the project while removing flaws; and he expressed support for Option 1.

Jennifer Caspar, Village Well Books and Coffee, provided background on herself and her business; expressed support for Option 1; noted that Downtown was the right place for her business because of the desire of community members for a safe, pleasant place to spend time enjoying scenery, public art, and public spaces; and she reported increased sales since the implementation of MOVE Culver City.

Eli Lipmen was called to speak but did not respond.

Andrew Malingowski expressed support for Option 1 as someone who lives in the Arts District and mostly drives his car; he felt that data should be heeded and that experts were better City planners than those who are not experts; he reported anecdotally that Downtown was nicer and he was spending more time there without even noticing it since MOVE Culver City had been implemented; and he felt he could ignore a two minute increase.

Denise Neal provided background on herself; acknowledged valid arguments being made; discussed issues to be resolved with buses; the importance of taking care of bus drivers; lack of a study on the Circulator; collaboration with Los Angeles; the FIFA World Cup and the Olympics; and she expressed support for Option 1 while addressing internal issues and thinking regionally.

Steve Siegel was called to speak but did not respond.

Marc Vukceovich was called to speak but did not respond.

Discussion ensued between staff and Council Members regarding appreciation for the public feedback; concern with a "winner take all" attitude; the importance of finding common ground; pre-implementation conditions; observations of bus lane usage; benefits to having a shared bus/bike lane; overwhelming feedback in favor of Option 1; validity of the survey; concern with disenfranchisement by ignoring the survey; existing as a one-car family; support for expanding MOVE Culver City; heeding voter feedback; the need to make riding the bus not take longer than driving; support for making public transportation more robust; support for on-call micro-transit; baseline figures; the need for more data; implementing a test phase; real-world experiences; the expansion of peak congestion time; Town Plaza as a well-used pedestrian place that was not in place before the pandemic; travel time for emergency vehicles; additional employees coming in for Amazon and Apple; impacts of traffic from the bike lane on Venice; finding a compromise to appease those who want an added car lane and those who want a bus/bike lane; extending the bus/bike lane to connect to the Los Angeles network on Adams; restricting right on red turns in Downtown; gridlock; impeding bus/bike flow; returning the right turn lane from Washington eastbound onto Culver westbound; enhanced and clear signage; parking and drop zones for deliveries and rideshare services; the drop zone carveout by Jameson's near the bike racks; adding frequency in bus stops; raised crosswalks; adding bike racks; and support for Option 3 with studies to gain data and lock in the best scenario.

Additional discussion ensued between staff and Council Members regarding appreciation to staff and the public for their efforts and input; impact of the project in the City and in the region as evidenced by the amount of public comment; making decisions that are best for the City and the region based upon the goals outcomes listed in the project description; providing wholistic transportation options for pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit riders; providing multiple options for people to move through the space; aspirations; encouraging residents to replace one car trip with a sustainable mode since the project started; envisioning a reimagining of the streets and public spaces; prioritizing moving people over cars in the design of the street; increasing safety and addressing the climate crisis; preparation for future growth in the City; electric cars as helping with the climate but not traffic; collaboration with

regional partners; Council Members, Assembly Members, and Supervisors in support of the project; the upcoming Olympics; the increased number of buses; the need for a sophisticated network to move people; prioritizing efficient, safe, and sustainable methods of travel while minimizing the impacts of vehicular traffic; increased bus ridership on the corridor; increased usage in all categories; safety; decreased injuries and accidents; firefighters use of mobility lanes to avoid traffic during peak hours; families feeling safer; people who have moved to the City because of projects like this; the medical doctor who discussed health impacts; minimizing impacts of vehicular traffic; offering equitable, convenient, sustainable mobility options; costs to own a car; improving public transit systems; becoming more of a destination than a cut-through City; decreasing cut-through trips; opposition in the survey; the clear majority wanting the project to continue with alterations; whether surveys are the best way to make policy decisions; lack of a survey for the anti-camping ordinance; consistency; the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC); the need for cities to do more to decrease emissions and VMT; greenhouse gas emissions; NRDC estimates on impacts of adding a lane of traffic; the future; choosing to move forward holistically, or watering the project down and kicking the can down the road; political courage; meeting sustainability and equity goals; increasing safety; mitigating traffic; lack of other plans to accomplish goals; clarification that MOVE Culver City is one of the first Complete Streets in the region; including all users in the design process; providing a dedicated bike lane; not centering cars; Option 3 as taking away choices; concerns for families using bus/bike lanes; slowing down the bus system; decreased efficiency; causing frustration for people who are already frustrated; the need for a CEQA analysis; disproportionate impacts on protected populations covered by the Title 6 of the Civil Rights Act; federal funding for transit; support for Option 1 as the most appropriate option based on the data; taking the opportunity to lead; fixing the timing of lights; drop off zones; updating or removing bike lights; adding a scrambler; and support for extending the project from La Cienega to Adams.

Further discussion ensued between staff and Council Members regarding adjustments made to the project; future steps; support for the pilot project; support for well-run, frequent, fast, clean, and on-time public transportation to make a difference in car volume; implementation of the free K-12 bus passes and improvements to signage; advocacy for public transportation as the only way out of traffic congestion; context for the report;

the difficulty of drawing conclusions from the data; new businesses in the City; attributing traffic to the end of the pandemic, but attributing increases to pedestrian, bus, and bike activity to MOVE Culver City; variables that cannot be controlled; different surveys conducted; demographics; public transportation cited as key to those who support the project; those who oppose the project due to traffic congestion and gridlock; lack of detailed data regarding traffic incursion into the neighborhoods; the goal of the project to change user behavior; messing up people's lives by making changes before alternatives are available; families expressing opposition to the MOVE Culver City Project; the need to improve headways and reliability with public transportation; current level of on-time performance for buses; support for Option 3 with reevaluation after two years and examination of alternatives at that time; people who do not like the plastic dividers; other cities that rely on paint; calculations on environmental impacts and greenhouse gases and the number of additional cars in the City if the traffic lane is opened up; pollution generated by idling cars vs. driving cars; concern with taking children biking along the corridor due to fine particulate matter; support for opening more connections to Ballona Creek where the air is cleaner; threats and insults to Council Members; finding a middle ground; the 40% of residents who wanted to reverse everything and go back to the way it was before the project; and the feeling that Option 3 is a compromise.

Additional discussion ensued between staff and Council Members regarding public engagement; success of the project in meeting goals; incentivizing alternative forms of transit; traffic that existed before the project; wide support of the project by local, county, and statewide organizations; the IPCC Report demanding that local governments reduce emissions and concern that adding a car lane will do the opposite; safety concerns; the fact that MOVE Culver City itself is a compromise; infrastructure that centers cars; considering who is centered, who is impacted, and who has the power; excluding the most vulnerable in the community; political will; the continued fight no matter the outcome; voting to protect and expand MOVE Culver City; voting for the future; people who want to move across the community safely; support for Option 1 including the pedestrian scramble, replacing the paint, revising the timing of the lights, signage, bike lights, the extension to Adams, and improving transit; the ability to increase investment during the budget process; clarification that there is no need to wait; working together to create a better world; and facts and data that support Option 1.



Further discussion ensued between staff and Council Members regarding the duty to listen to businesses, organizations, and residents; balancing everything to create a compromise; expanding the process; education; creating buy-in to use public transportation; support for Option 3 as a compromise; community and expert buy-in; building a robust, connected system; regional connectivity; promoting usability; different approaches to similar goals; the duty to those who spoke; survey data; bike racks; drop off and pick up; scramble intersections; micro-transit; support for connecting to the Adams Boulevard bike lane; and changing behaviors.

Discussion ensued between staff and Council Members regarding changing Option 3 to indicate up to two years; disappointment in the current consultants; allowing other consultants the opportunity to work on the project; additional time necessary if a new consultant is retained; and sending a message that the report is flawed.

MOVED BY COUNCIL MEMBER ERIKSSON AND SECONDED BY COUNCIL MEMBER O'BRIEN THAT THE CITY COUNCIL: CONTINUE WITH THE PILOT PROJECT FOR UP TO TWO YEARS, MODIFYING THE CORRIDOR DESIGN TO ADD VEHICLE CAPACITY WHERE IT IS NEEDED AND PRESERVE A PROTECTED SHARED BUS/BIKE LANE THROUGHOUT.

THE MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: ERIKSSON, O'BRIEN, VERA  
NOES: MCMORRIN, PUZA

Additional discussion ensued between staff and Council Members regarding extension of the bus/bike lane; prioritizing extending the shared bus/bike lane from Washington and La Cienega Avenue east to Adams Boulevard; and the transit center at Washington and Fairfax.

MOVED BY COUNCIL MEMBER O'BRIEN AND SECONDED BY MAYOR VERA THAT THE CITY COUNCIL: DIRECT THAT THE SHARED BUS/BIKE LANE BE EXTENDED FROM WASHINGTON AND LA CIENEGA TO WASHINGTON AND FAIRFAX.

THE MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: ERIKSSON, O'BRIEN, VERA  
NOES: MCMORRIN, PUZA

Heather Baker, City Attorney, clarified that now that the City Council had given direction regarding proposed modifications, staff would study and evaluate under CEQA before anything commences, with the item returning to the City Council.

MOVED BY MAYOR VERA AND SECONDED BY COUNCIL MEMBER O'BRIEN THAT THE CITY COUNCIL:

1. AUTHORIZE STAFF TO PROCEED WITH THE DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NEXT PHASE OF THE DOWNTOWN CORRIDOR; AND,

2. APPROVE THE UPDATE TO THE DESIGN GUIDELINES, AS APPROPRIATE; AND,

3. AUTHORIZE THE CITY MANAGER TO NEGOTIATE AND APPROVE AMENDMENT(S) TO THE PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT WITH SAM SCHWARTZ ENGINEERING FOR THE MOVE CULVER CITY PROJECT IN AN AMOUNT NOT-TO-EXCEED \$275,000 FOR THE ADDITIONAL SCOPE OF SERVICE; AND,

4. AUTHORIZE THE CHIEF TRANSPORTATION OFFICER TO APPROVE AMENDMENT(S) TO THE PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT IN AN AMOUNT NOT-TO-EXCEED \$125,000 TO COVER CONTINGENCY COSTS; AND,

5. AUTHORIZE THE CITY ATTORNEY TO REVIEW/PREPARE THE NECESSARY DOCUMENTS; AND,

6. AUTHORIZE THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE SUCH DOCUMENTS ON BEHALF OF THE CITY.

THE MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: ERIKSSON, O'BRIEN, VERA

NOES: MCMORRIN

ABSTAIN: PUZA

Further discussion ensued between staff and Council Members regarding the intersection of Washington and Culver; City Council consensus from Council Members Eriksson and O'Brien as well as Mayor Vera to direct staff to explore making Washington Boulevard from Culver Boulevard one way going westbound to Overland to enable a two-way bike track, dedicated bus lane, and potential greenbelt; existing plans; clarification that the proposed change would not impact the next phase of the project on Sepulveda and Jefferson; running a computer simulation; staff time; and clarification that Public Works would lead the study.

o0o

**Public Comment - Items Not on the Agenda (Continued)**

Mayor Vera invited public comment.

The following members of the public addressed the City Council:

Till Stegers was called to speak but did not respond.

Robert Boerner was called to speak but did not respond.

Philip Lelyveld thanked Mayor Vera and the City Council for making the MOVE Culver City discussion the main topic of the meeting rather than putting it at the end of a meeting.

Jim Shanman was called to speak but did not respond.

Lorri Horn was called to speak but did not respond.

Julie Sisk was called to speak but did not respond.

Charlie Sisk was called to speak but did not respond.

Steve Seigel was called to speak but did not respond.

Andrew Malingowski reported that signage prohibiting adult soccer in Syd Kronenthal Park was largely ignored; noted racist connotations related to the ban; he asked that the City look at the rule and determine whether it is still necessary and make it ok for adults to play without any interference; and he reported an altercation where CCPD was called when there was a disagreement over field use.

Discussion ensued between staff and Council Members regarding clarification that the rule is for all parks to prevent turf from being damaged; previous consideration of the topic by the Parks, Recreation and Community Services Commission; and staff agreement to provide an update at a future meeting.

Denise Neal questioned whether community participatory meetings would be allowed for the process; discussed creation of a regional plan; working with the county and surrounding cities; public input and participation to make things strategically better; disappointment in the outcome of MOVE Culver City; addressing what people need; and improvement of the overall regional plan with upcoming public events.

Mayor Vera indicated that neighbors would be included in a deeper conversation moving forward.

o0o

**Items from Council Members**

None.

o0o

**Council Member Requests to Agendize Future Items**

Council Member Eriksson referenced a request made earlier in the meeting for clarification on the EHRAC statement regarding antisemitism and received consensus to bring the item back from Mayor Vera and Council Member O'Brien.


o0o


April 24, 2023

**Adjournment**

There being no further business, at 2:12 a.m., Tuesday, April 25, 2023, the City Council, Culver City Housing Authority Board, Culver City Parking Authority Board, Redevelopment Financing Authority, and Successor Agency to the Culver City Redevelopment Agency Board adjourned to a meeting to be held on May 8, 2023.

oOo

 for \_\_\_\_\_  
Jeremy Bocchino  
CITY CLERK of Culver City, California  
EX-OFFICIO CLERK of the City Council and SECRETARY of the  
Successor Agency to the Culver City Redevelopment Agency  
Board, Redevelopment Financing Authority, and Culver City  
Housing Authority Board, Culver City, California

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
ALBERT VERA  
MAYOR of Culver City, California and CHAIR of the Successor  
Agency to the Culver City Redevelopment Agency Board,  
Redevelopment Financing Authority, and Culver City Housing  
Authority Board.

Date: May 8, 2023



# Measure M Metro Active Transport, Transit, and First/Last Mile (MAT) Program Update




## Staff Recommendation

CONSIDER DEOBLIGATING \$434,969.47 of previously approved MAT funding and returning those funds to the MAT Program.




# Project Background



**MOVE Culver City Impacted Project Area**

- MAT Project Elements:**
- Class IV separated bikeway
  - Bus only lanes
  - Establishment of bus boarding islands
  - Pedestrian improvements



- OPTION 3
- LONP, SOW, LOI IV Bikeway
- MOVE CULVER IV Bikeway

- Modified Project Elements**
- Combined bus and bike lane
  - Removal bus boarding islands
  - Adding vehicle capacity





# Discussion

- > MAT funds were used in the installation of the Class IV bikeway, bus-only lanes, and bus boarding islands.
- > The executed Funding Agreement between Metro and the City of Culver City contains a provision which states that facilities that cease to be used for the original purpose in the Scope of Work, must be returned to Metro.
- > Metro staff recommends to deobligate \$434,969.47 in MAT funds. The remainder of the total MAT funds for this project will remain intact.

# Equity

- > MAT Cycle 1 projects were evaluated using a screening and ranking process based on indexes of socio-economic and environmental disadvantage, including equity, safety, and connectivity/mobility indicators.
- > Projects within Equity Focus Communities (EFCs) were assigned additional points as part of the evaluation process.
- > The removal of project elements impacts the safety of vulnerable road users and affects the ranking that was used in project evaluations.



# Next Steps

> Upon Board approval, the City of Culver City will be formally notified of the action. Staff will revise the existing Funding Agreement with an amendment to indicate the revised funding amount.