

THESE MINUTES ARE NOT OFFICIAL UNTIL APPROVED BY THE  
CITY OF CULVER CITY FINANCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
CITY OF CULVER CITY  
FINANCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
CULVER CITY, CALIFORNIA

April 9, 2025  
7:00 p.m.

**CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL**

Member Griffing called the regular meeting of the City of Culver City Finance Advisory Committee to order at 7:05 p.m. in the Dan Patacchia Room at City Hall.

**Members Present:** ANDREW LACHMAN, Chair\*  
LEIGH AUSTIN, Member  
ANISSA DI VINCENTE, Member  
JOHNNIE GRIFFING, Member  
KEVIN LACHOFF, Member  
SANTHA RAJIV, Member  
VIKRAM THAKUR, Member

\*Chair Lachman arrived at 7:22 p.m.

**Absent :** MARC BAUER, Vice Chair  
KEITH JONES, Member

**Staff Present:** Lisa Soghor, Chief Financial Officer  
Ted Stevens, Director of Parks, Recreation and  
Community Services  
Elizabeth Shavelson, Assistant Chief Financial Officer  
Adam Ferguson, Senior Management Analyst  
James Lambert, Associate Analyst

**o0o**

**Pledge of Allegiance**

Member Griffing led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**o0o**

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

Member Griffing invited public comment.

The following member of the public addressed the Committee:

Thompson Lengerke discussed funding Jubilo Village and Project Homekey; accommodations for physical and cognitive abilities affecting many homeless individuals; the 50% of homeless people that are employed; discrimination; tax incentives for local businesses; eliminating discrimination against people with disabilities; helping people transition out of homelessness; and the importance of affordable housing.

o0o

## **Receipt and Filing of Correspondence**

James Lambert, Associate Analyst, indicated that no correspondence had been received.

o0o

## **Consent Calendar Items**

Item C-1

## **Approval of the Minutes for the Finance Advisory Committee Meeting of February 12, 2025**

MOVED BY MEMBER THAKUR AND SECONDED BY MEMBER AUSTIN THAT THE FINANCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE APPROVE THE MINUTES FOR THE FINANCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING OF FEBRUARY 12, 2025.

THE MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: AUSTIN, DI VINCENTE, GRIFFING, LACHOFF, RAJIV, THAKUR  
NOES: NONE  
ABSENT: BAUER, JONES, LACHMAN

o0o

## **Order of the Agenda**

No changes were made.

o0o

## Action Items

### Item A-1

#### **Receive a Presentation on Parks, Recreation & Community Services Charges and Fees and Provide Feedback**

Adam Ferguson, Senior Management Analyst, provided a presentation on proposed changes to Parks, Recreation, and Community Services (PRCS) fees and background on why the discussion is happening; discussed PRCS costs that are subsidized by General Fund revenue as is traditional for most municipalities; the amount of subsidy for PRCS; common language; direct vs. indirect costs; City Council-approved line budgets; strategy; understanding costs; connection to work plans; cost recovery vs. subsidies; essential vs. discretionary services; community need; the common good; accessibility; accessible services; constraints to accessibility; determining where to direct subsidies; community impact; strategies used by the City of Napa; priorities; the previous cost recovery; overall department goals; financial sustainability; tax use/revenue enhancement philosophy; Parks and Recreation services; the proposed switch from service areas to service categories; contract classes; identification of recovery goals and who benefits; elimination of arbitrary goal setting; equity-based decision-making; common good services; filling the gap of what is not being provided by the private sector; individualized services; and potential categories.

Chair Lachman joined the meeting.

Discussion ensued between staff and Committee Members regarding determination of categories; program offerings as compared to other cities; clarification regarding classification of items in different categories; heavily subsidized youth sports; renegotiating the MOU (Memorandum of Understanding) for non-profit youth sports; beginner activities; geographic boundaries required for participation; and outside contractors who conduct classes.

Adam Ferguson, Senior Management Analyst, discussed service category ranking from common good/open access to individualized/private use; understanding cost of services; cost per participant; attributing indirect costs; staffing allocation methodology; facilities cost; application to PRCS programs; non-resident rates; providing discounts for residents; changes to pricing; the square footage analysis; field rentals; providing consistency; field designation; and current rates.

Additional discussion ensued between staff and Committee Members regarding looking at what other cities are charging, which was the previous fee-setting practice; resident vs. non-resident fees; implementing gradual increases rather than increasing fees all at once; approval of direct costs; staff fees; peripheral costs; maintenance and overhead included in base costs; drop-in activities; on-site

staff; usage of the Teen Center; a request for a Committee tour of PRCS programming and facilities; the Parks Tour for the PRCS Commission; making exceptions for those who cannot pay; providing scholarships; the Teen Center as serving an afterschool population; the ability to adjust the amount of subsidy; rearranging categories; level of mandated staffing; out of school staffing; concern with decreased attendance if costs are increased too much; beginner activities; the last review of fees in 2014; plans for annual review of fees; adding other beginner activities; increasing flexibility and the ability to update items with annual review; clarification that the analysis is not based on participation; specialized activities; the expanded definition of residents; policy decisions to include students whether they are residents or not; consistency with the actions of other cities; non-resident use of day camps; the demand for CCARP (Culver City Afterschool Recreation Program); summer and seasonal camps; restructuring costs so everyone can go on field trips; grant funded programs; potential grants that could lower costs; and having a clear idea of costs to outreach to non-profits for grants.

Adam Ferguson, Senior Management Analyst, discussed the PRCS work plans; analyzing rental opportunities to maximize use of space; contract classes; examining participation; market value and competition; identification of gaps in programming; staff review of proposals submitted; the 70/30 revenue split; contract term; vacancies; lost revenue; ensuring that partnerships have reciprocal benefit; guarding against being a granting organization; ensuring classes align with purposes and are financially viable; market and resources; whether alternative coverage is available; service analysis; and next steps.

Additional discussion ensued between staff and Committee Members regarding outreach; feedback from the community; and concerns with large price increases for the Teen Center.

Chair Lachman apologized for being late to join the meeting and invited public comment.

James Lambert, Associate Analyst, indicated that no public comment had been received.

Further discussion ensued between staff and Committee Members regarding current participants who have scholarships from a non-profit; lack of an internal scholarship policy; potential corporate business sponsors; the request for feedback and recommendations from the FAC; consensus recommendations; ensuring that the system is working vs. gaining more revenue; and applying the model to the previous year to gain baseline data.

The following member of the public addressed the Committee:

Marci Baun asserted that if prices were increased, the way the pool is run would have to be changed; she discussed staffing; length of sessions; shutting down the

pool after 1:00 p.m.; seniors and others who depend on the pool to stay healthy; people with limited income; residents and others who no longer swim at The Plunge because of the 55 minute limit; competition with El Segundo, Hawthorne, and Santa Monica where their drop-in lanes allow people to swim for as long as they want; and she noted that Culver City needed to consider and work through the issues or participation would continue to decline.

Discussion ensued between staff and Committee Members regarding determining whether the endeavor is worthwhile; lack of a methodology in the way fees have been set in the past; being cost-competitive; potential loss of participation; support for a gradual phase in of increased fees; community feedback in how taxpayer dollars are spent; feedback on whether to increase afterschool fees or subsidize them 100%; analysis as part of the User Fee Study; the overall 30% cost recovery rate that is in line with PRCS departments throughout California; PRCS as a department as where tax dollars typically go; facilities rental fees; appreciation for the work of staff to gather the data; categorization; a suggestion to look at data mid-year for potential adjustments; comparisons with past trends; and addressing those who may not be able to continue utilizing services.

Chair Lachman indicated that the time for providing public comment on the item had passed, but another opportunity for public comment would occur at the end of the meeting.

Further discussion ensued between staff and Committee Members regarding Health and Human Services categories; City Council strategic goals; providing better socio-economic equity through programming; benefits that could accommodate requests; providing proof of being in a threshold that could be subsidized; outreach through the Culver City website to encourage companies to make an investment in the community; grants; resources required to obtain and address grants; staff workload; establishing a baseline to measure changes; annual review in order to help the community and financial goals; consideration of an annual Consumer Price Index (CPI) adjustment; aligning adjustments with the budget; the excellent start to the process; preparation for low-income housing being added to Culver City; flexibility to change fees as the budget changes with an annual process; providing improvement to services with increased costs; examination of the market and what is being offered; difficulty in making comparisons to other cities; the new approach to looking at things with recategorization of services; City Council discretion; policy decisions; making the amount of subsidy clear; level of discount provided to residents; moving the Teen Center to the Health and Human Services section; offsetting increases with an income sensitive scale; the Cultural Affairs Foundation; and concern with people who cannot afford to go to the Teen Center as ending up hanging around in the park.

Additional discussion ensued between staff and Committee Members regarding support for moving the Teen Center to Health and Human Services; looking at

what percentage of the population that uses The Plunge are seniors and potentially moving senior use of the pool to Health and Human Services; request for revenue projections based on last year's participation; supply and demand; support for increasing the price for pottery classes; exploration of outside funding; development of a program to address the low socio-economic population; examination of the top revenue producers; volume; efficiency; support for being public policy driven; building a framework around what is important to Culver City; vested interests; extending the invitation to the FAC next time a Parks Tour is given; and agreement to open up public comment again.

A member of the public expressed support for the plan; discussed potential impacts of raising costs to lower income community members; legacy residents who depend on services; examination of prior years of participation; the long waiting list for CCARP; providing scholarships; expanding access to CCARP; and leveraging cost recoveries and subsidies to increase volume.

A member of the public expressed appreciation for the understandable presentation and suggested expanding the popular pottery program.

Discussion ensued between staff and Committee Members regarding what would be entailed with expansion of the pottery program; potential expansion of facilities with the Parks Plan; providing a Makers' Space; and the need to synthesize comments.

Lisa Soghor, Chief Financial Officer, summarized agreed upon items including: examination of select programs such as the Teen Center, Senior Center, and The Plunge to determine whether they might be better suited in the Health and Human Services category; an examination of revenue projections using last fiscal year's participation to see what the changes would have yielded; support for raising the price of pottery classes; support for the exploration of outside funding, scholarships, grants, donations, and a sliding scale based on income levels; development of a program to address lower socio-economic participants; reevaluation of resident subsidies; research into what other cities are doing in terms of a resident subsidy; evaluating the top five program revenue generators; use of data from the first year as the baseline; annual review with interim mid-year review; and adjusting for inflation annually with CPI.

MOVED BY MEMBER GRIFFING AND SECONDED BY MEMBER AUSTIN THAT THE FINANCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE PROVIDE RECOMMENDATIONS AND FEEDBACK AS DISCUSSED.

THE MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: AUSTIN, DI VINCENTE, GRIFFING, LACHMAN, LACHOFF, RAJIV, THAKUR  
NOES: NONE

ABSENT: BAUER, JONES

o0o

Item A-2

**Receive Reports for Discussion from the (1) Assets Ad Hoc Subcommittee, (2) Structural Revenue Review Ad Hoc Subcommittee, (3) Affordable Housing Ad Hoc Subcommittee, (4) 2025 Government Efficiency Ad Hoc Subcommittee; and (5) Provide Direction to Staff, if Deemed Appropriate**

Member Griffing reported that the Assets Ad Hoc Subcommittee had not met; discussed coordination with staff for a final review; work on a GIS map; and he noted that they were coming to the end of the subcommittee's work.

Chair Lachman reported that the Structural Review Ad Hoc Subcommittee had met to go over the PRCS Fee Study; noted that the Affordable Housing Ad Hoc Subcommittee had completed their tasks unless additional direction is given; and he discussed vacant commercial property.

Discussion ensued between staff and Committee Members regarding the upcoming Economic Development Subcommittee meeting; cost of converting commercial property to be residential; and zoning code amendments.

Member Di Vincente reported on the 2025 Government Efficiency Ad Hoc Subcommittee noting receipt of one submission, and the need for continued outreach.

o0o

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

Chair Lachman invited public comment.

James Lambert, Associate Analyst, indicated that no public comment had been received.

o0o

**Items from Committee Members/Staff**

Lisa Soghor, Chief Financial Officer, discussed community budget meetings; public participation; promotion on social media; the Ask Your CFO campaign to educate and solicit input; providing 30 second shorts on Instagram; and upcoming budget presentations.

Discussion ensued between staff and Committee Members regarding the feasibility study on the proposed quarter cent tax; polling indicating some support; all mail-in ballots; off-cycle elections; the survey conducted; a suggestion to have an informational or study session on how cities can support school districts and share resources; clarification that the item is not in the work plan and the City Council has not given direction for a study session; learning from what other people are doing; the need to vet the suggestion with the City Attorney; and funding possibilities for Jubilo Village.

Lisa Soghor, Chief Financial Officer, discussed agenda items for the next meeting including quarterly reports.

Additional discussion ensued between staff and Committee Members regarding looking at policies of other cities for contingency reserves for a possible recommendation to the City Council; and affirmation of Government Efficiency recommendations at the June meeting.

**o0o**



**Adjournment**

There being no further business, at 9:50 p.m., the City of Culver City Finance Advisory Committee adjourned their meeting to a regular meeting to be held on May 14, 2025.

**o0o**

---

James Lambert  
SECRETARY of the Culver City Finance Advisory Committee  
Culver City, California

APPROVED

---

Andrew Lachman  
CHAIR of the Finance Advisory Committee, Culver City, California

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that, on the date below written, these minutes were filed in the Office of the City Clerk, Culver City, California and constitute the Official Minutes of said meeting.

---

Jeremy Bocchino  
CITY CLERK

---

Date