

THESE MINUTES ARE NOT OFFICIAL  
UNTIL APPROVED BY THE  
CULVER CITY  
STANDING GOVERNANCE SUBCOMMITTEE  
OF THE CITY COUNCIL

REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
CULVER CITY STANDING GOVERNANCE  
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE CITY COUNCIL  
CULVER CITY, CALIFORNIA

December 3, 2025  
3:00 p.m.

**Call to Order & Roll Call**

Council Member Fish called the regular meeting of the Standing Governance Subcommittee of the City Council to order at 3:00 p.m. at City Hall.

Present: Bubba Fish, Council Member  
Yasmine-Imani McMorrin, Council Member

Staff Present: Shelly Wolfberg, Assistant to the City Manager  
Christina Burrows, Deputy City Attorney  
Jeremy Bocchino, City Clerk  
T'Ana Allen, Deputy City Clerk

o0o

**Pledge of Allegiance**

Council Member Fish led the Pledge of Allegiance.

o0o

**Public Comment – Items NOT On The Agenda**

Council Member Fish invited public comment.

Shelly Wolfberg, Assistant to the City Manager, reported that no requests to speak had been received.

o0o

**Receipt of Correspondence**

Shelly Wolfberg, Assistant to the City Manager, indicated that no correspondence had been received.

o0o

**Consent Calendar Items**

Item C-1

**Approval of Minutes of the Standing Governance Subcommittee Meeting Held on October 8, 2025**

MOVED BY COUNCIL MEMBER MCMORRIN, SECONDED BY COUNCIL MEMBER FISH AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED, THAT THE STANDING GOVERNANCE SUBCOMMITTEE APPROVE MINUTES OF THE STANDING GOVERNANCE SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON OCTOBER 8, 2025.

o0o

**Order of the Agenda**

No changes were made.

o0o

**Action Items**

Item A-1

**Reconsideration of a Recommendation to City Council to Consolidate Public Comment at City Council Meetings**

Jeremy Bocchino, City Clerk, noted that the Subcommittee had sent the item to the City Council and the City Council remanded it back to the Subcommittee; discussed the task to consolidate public comment at City Council meetings; feedback received that was not positive; feedback requesting the ability to provide public comment after the presentation and Council discussion; educating the public on why public

comment exists; public feedback on ways to make the meetings more efficient including setting reasonable time expectations for Council Member remarks; elimination of repetitive questions; consolidation of proclamations and recognitions into a single monthly presentation or short summary section; encouragement for staff and Council Members to come prepared; and other suggestions.

Discussion ensued between staff and Subcommittee Members regarding community feedback that caused the item to be remanded back to the Subcommittee; good suggestions made; concerns about lack of context; ensuring consistency with keeping people engaged; practices employed by the Santa Monica City Council; the intent of proposed changes to expand access rather than limit it; concern that considering items late at night limits access; common sense reforms around Council Member comments; providing a balanced proposal; and working together to improve efficiency.

Council Member Fish invited public comment.

The following member of the public addressed the Subcommittee:

Jeannine Wisnosky discussed traditionally engaged members of the public coming to City Council meetings; concern with the idea of limiting public comment creating a cycle of mistrust; her analysis indicating the Subcommittee Members spent the most time speaking at City Council meetings; she proposed starting the meeting on time at 7:00 p.m. with commendations moved to another day each month; expressed support for limiting comment time and the number of times a Council Member can return for additional comments; support for allowing the public to hear the presentation and remarks from Council Members before they make their comments; and benefits of helpful public comment to Council Members.

Additional discussion ensued between staff and Subcommittee Members regarding appreciation for staff efforts; resistance to change; practices of the School Board; concern with loss of commenters as the meeting goes later and later; support for being able to hear comments from the public at the start of the meeting; the Mayor's prerogative; community member analysis; monitoring how much time is spent on comments by Council Members and the public; online commenting; and a suggestion to implement a pilot program to receive public

comment at the start of the meeting and allow the public to submit questions for Council Member review after the public has heard the staff report.

Further discussion ensued between staff and Subcommittee Members regarding the current need to cut off receipt of public comment after the meeting has started; an observation that if public comment is received the next day, it would be too late to impact the decision made at the previous evening; the practice in Menifee county that allows for real time submissions and response; practices used by Supervisor Mitchell in participatory budgeting for unincorporated areas; ensuring people feel like they have the opportunity to respond in the moment; the new system; the ability for Council Members to request to speak rather than to be asked to speak; use of a timer for Council Member comments; the educational component; the ability to speak one on one with Council Members; and providing opportunity to share opinions at Council meetings which could shape the resulting vote.

Discussion ensued between staff and Subcommittee Members regarding the overall understanding of what public comment is meant to be; successful implementation at the School District; making goals clear; providing an educational piece similar to the statement on hate speech; email received during the meeting that does not go into the formal record; appreciation for the new system; time taken up by Council Member comments; the intent to provide more access and improve efficiency; the backlog of items ready to be heard; items that take priority; space as a factor of what can be considered; support for exploring time limits for Council Member comments; time taken when the City Council is trying to figure things out; providing a timer visible to Council Members; letting the public know that Council Members would also be limited; rearranging public comment so that there is one comment period for each category; helpfulness of the presentations in understanding the issues; a suggestion to make presentations available with the staff reports; the current deadline to provide presentations; last minute changes; policy of the Metro Board; time saved with making consolidated public comment for the Consent Calendar; basic meeting length; efforts to address the issue; and gaging progress during a six month pilot program.

Additional discussion ensued between staff and Subcommittee Members regarding agreement to provide options for City

Council consideration for a six month pilot program including limiting time provided for Council Member comment; the intent to increase access; Council Members who pull Consent Calendar items to highlight them; questions that have been answered prior to the meeting; etiquette; the short length of time to digest correspondence received; setting an earlier drop dead date for agendas to allow more time for review by the City Council and the public; people who request to speak 5 minutes before the meeting; City Council access to e-comments as they are received; accessibility; providing the ability to call, write, or send an email; educating the public; ensuring that public comment is copied to Council Members; providing multiple avenues for people to submit; coordination of all methods of providing comment; allowing time to ensure things are done correctly; items that get pushed off with a strict deadline; the 72-hour requirement of the Brown Act; the review process for staff reports; encouraging the public to use e-comments; identification of how many comments are coming in each format; comments coming in through the City Clerk; concerns related to dropping an agenda with "coming soon" items; and making revisions to agendas.

Further discussion ensued between staff and Subcommittee Members regarding agreement to provide the City Council options for consideration of a six month pilot program including limiting time provided for Council Member comment to ten minutes per item, frontloading comments for Action Items similar to what is currently being done for Consent Calendar Items, explaining that the intent is that as many comments as possible are able to be heard and the meeting is not too long, examination of how presentations for City Council consideration can be made available to the public earlier, providing information for the new ability of Council Members to have access to e-comments as they come in, educating the public to encourage utilization of e-comments if that is an accessible option, removal of the ability to cede time, shortening recognitions, and not allowing public comment at the end of the meeting; allowing access to presentations in advance if comment is going to be limited; providing a recommendation on how to get an agenda out to the public earlier; posting copies of recognitions online; the total time limit to make public comment that is rarely enforced; messaging and education around e-comments and the purpose of public comments; letting people know that if they miss the deadline to submit public comment they can submit directly to the City Council; and verification of the City

Council email address.

oOo

Item A-2

**Discussion of Potential Culver City Campaign Finance Reforms**

T'Ana Allen, Deputy City Clerk, provided a summary of the material of record; discussed the Culver City Campaign Ordinance; the ability to make things more strict than what is required by the FPPC (Fair Political Practices Committee); sections that cover limitations on contributions; disclosure of top donors; practices of other cities; mass mailings; the potential campaign and contributions dashboard; difficulty finding the portal; implementation of a new webpage for things related to the FPPC; Form 700; and benefits of having a dashboard.

Discussion ensued between staff and Subcommittee Members regarding mass mailings; the Vote 16 petition; the FPPC webpage as being helpful to candidates and to the public; the next election; timing with making changes; introducing a component to request candidate information to be helpful for the public; and beginning the process to make changes that would be implemented after the November election.

Council Member Fish invited public comment.

The following members of the public addressed the Subcommittee:

Jeannine Wisnosky expressed support for transparency in government; discussed issues to be taken seriously if the measures are going to function as intended; her advocacy for a lobby registry for the last five years; concern with ensuring that any reforms adopted are grounded in workable reality; the need for verifiable facts, transparency and accurate numbers to ensure public trust in information from the dais; differing claims about community member spending; those who did not disclose donors or provide information on who was behind their messaging; numbers that shift from meeting to meeting; criticism of those who are transparent; undermining trust; suspicion cast on individuals who have done nothing legally wrong; Council Members who did not disclose support received from outside groups and Culver City

organizations; the need to address real sources of influence; administrative resources required for the proposals; enforcement; staff workload to create an index of campaign ads; the need to create a dashboard that includes outside expenditures to provide the full story; and the role of digital and social media advertising.

Phil Lelyveld referenced Item A-1; questioned why he could only see his e-comment when he makes submissions; noted that if he could see comments from others that he agreed with he could provide a thumbs up which could save time; and he felt that public participation in comments could be increased by allowing everyone to see what everyone else is saying.

Discussion ensued between staff and Subcommittee Members regarding moving forward in areas of transparency; collaboration with IT for the implementation of some of the dashboards; support for dashboards that have been implemented in other departments; streamlining processes; feasibility of making the changes; balance; concerns with misinformation; the ability to track who gave what during the campaign process; information being provided; identification of major donors; providing training videos on how to use the portals; information available on the Culver City FPPC page; ensuring that the things being done are actually being used by the public; large amounts of independent expenditures in the last election; the flood of money being poured into local elections; FPPC requirements to disclose top donors on mailers; compliance; PACs (Political Action Committees); public reporting of violations; making it clear on what one needs to do as a candidate; a suggestion to include mailer requirements on the website; connecting FPPC rules with what Culver City requires; providing information on how to report non-compliant flyers; campaign disclosure manuals; managing candidate issues; financial issues that go to the FPPC; advertising disclosure charts; the candidacy process; increased effectiveness of the FPPC; IEs (independent expenditures); and the need for due diligence by campaign managers.

Additional discussion ensued between staff and Subcommittee Members regarding enforcement; using things already in place; Culver City resources; loopholes; education; looking at having a policy similar to the Los Angeles policy that could make it clear where Culver City stands; the need for consequences for violators; having a policy that is more

strict than the \$50,000 limit; the value of making it clear which IEs are not following the rules; the requirement for Culver City to report non-compliance to the FPPC; concern that if Culver City makes a rule and does not enforce it that people will assert that Culver City is not doing its job; potential distrust if there is the perception of selective enforcement; attentiveness of the public during election season; cultural benefit to having Culver City rules even if they are harder to enforce; Culver City rules to follow the FPPC rules; the high threshold for small local elections; looking at what peer cities are doing in terms of disclosure laws; and agreement to include FPPC information about mailers on the Culver City website.

o0o

Item A-3

**(1) Discussion of a Democracy Vouchers Program and Public Matching Funds Program and, if Desired, (2) Provide Direction to Staff as Appropriate.**

Shelly Wolfberg, Assistant to the City Manager, provided a summary of the material of record.

Council Member Fish invited public comment.

The following member of the public addressed the Subcommittee:

Jeannine Wisnosky discussed concern with feasibility noting that Culver City would be the smallest city in the country with the most complex election structure and lack of infrastructure to support it if democracy vouchers are implemented; costs to administrate; programs in Seattle and Los Angeles; the statewide program in Minnesota; the need to identify a new funding source; cost per election cycle; Berkeley and Oakland; and she urged the Subcommittee to acknowledge limits of budget, staffing and infrastructure, and to focus on achievable and enforceable transparency measures.

Discussion ensued between staff and Subcommittee Members regarding the opt in rate for the voucher program; actual costs; looking at opt in rates for other cities; support for a pilot program; public education; Culver City as being on

the pioneering end of many new ideas; implementation of guardrails and limits; program deadlines; understanding the actual dollar amount; allowing access to help level the playing field, engage people, and allow for participation; additional information needed before going to the City Council; identification of funding sources; understanding actual costs; and understanding whether other programs have a finite amount of money.

Additional discussion ensued between staff and Subcommittee Members regarding appreciation to staff for their efforts; size of Culver City as a potential barrier; matching funds vs. a voucher system; staff time; the goal to support grassroots candidates; looking at the minimum version of a program that could make an impact; financial and other barriers to grassroots candidates; the difficulty of levelling the playing field; and looking at how the impact will be seen.

o0o

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

Council Member Fish invited public comment.

Shelly Wolfberg, Assistant to the City Manager, reported that no requests to speak had been received.

o0o

**Items from Members/Staff**

Discussion ensued between staff and Subcommittee Members regarding date of the next meeting; timeframe to bring back the meeting efficiency item; intent of a mass mailer index to identify where items are coming from and who the donors are; encouragement for candidates to provide examples of all of their advertisements as part of the candidacy process; understanding information to be collected; policies of the city of Berkeley; the inability to implement policy requirements for candidates before July; the ability to request information; staff agreement to further research the Berkeley program; adding the mailer requirements; and the need for the item to come back before the Subcommittee.

o0o

**Adjournment**

There being no further business, at 5:20 p.m., the Standing Governance Subcommittee of the City Council adjourned to a meeting to be held on February 4, 2026 at 3:00 p.m.

o0o

---

Shelly Wolfberg  
SECRETARY of the Culver City Standing Governance  
Subcommittee of the City Council, Culver City, California

APPROVED

---

Bubba Fish  
COUNCIL MEMBER, Standing Governance Subcommittee of the  
City Council, Culver City, California