

## August 4, 2015, PB&R Agenda Comments

Comments on Newport Beach Parks, Beaches and Recreation Commission agenda submitted by:  
Jim Mosher ( [jimmosher@yahoo.com](mailto:jimmosher@yahoo.com) ), 2210 Private Road, Newport Beach 92660 (949-548-6229)

### ***Item (5)A. Minutes of June 2, 2015 Meeting***

The following very minor correction is suggested:

**Page 1**, Item 3, paragraph 2: the **semicolon** at the end of next to last line looks like it was intended to be a **comma**.

### ***Item (5)B. Parks & Operations Division Activity Report***

Regarding the “*Brown is the new Green*” campaign for the City medians, the hope that dye applied to the brown grass will last until the rain returns begs the question of whether the expectation is that rain alone will be sufficient to make the grass recover? If not, what is the plan to restore the medians? And how much will it cost?

### ***Item (5) D, E, F & G. Picnic Table Donation – Cliff Drive Park***

There seems to be a minor mix-up in these three items to replace existing park benches with concrete.

In contrast to Items D and F, which are shown, respectively, going on the large concrete pad with connecting path and on the small pad farthest from that, **Items E and G share the same “Attachment B” map and photos** indicating the donated bench would go at the same location, namely the small pad closest to the large one.

It would seem important to resolve this so the plaques for Items E and G are installed at the expected locations.

One also assumes none of the benches being replaced in these items, or in Item H at Irvine Terrace Park, bear previous dedications. If they do, that would complicate the issue.

### ***Item (6)A. Request for Temporary Lights at Bonita Canyon Sports Park (BCSP) Field #5 by Newport-Mesa Soccer Club (NMSC)***

The staff report does not make clear if the City has a clear policy on deployment of user-provided equipment at City parks, including use and storage of lights, and what criteria the Commission should use in evaluating the request. [City Council Policy B-15](#) provides some guidance on the kinds of Commission decisions that require special notice, but does not appear to define the criteria to be used in making the decisions.

Related to that, the staff report includes an Attachment D implying neighboring residents were notified of the present hearing (as required by Policy B-15) by postcard, but the “Noticing” paragraph preceding that makes no mention of the postcards having been sent.

### ***Item (6)B. Modifications to the Youth Sports Commission (YSC) Member Requirements & Field Allocation & Use Policy***

I am personally not clear on what the Youth Sports Commission is, who created it and what relation it has to the City government.

From what little I know about it, the “**YSC Policy Background**” provided in the staff report is misleading. The “*Youth Sports Commission Member Requirements and Field Allocation & Use Policy*” (the “**Policy**”) document being presented for revision was *not* created in 2003. It was in fact presented to PB&R for the first time at its meeting last [August \(Item 7b\)](#), and was said to be an extensively revised and updated compilation of three existing documents.

It was unclear to me at that time, and remains unclear, whether adoption of the “Policy” required City Council ratification.

That said, it would have been helpful to provide a link to where a copy of the currently-adopted Policy can be found (I was unable to find it on the City website, including its [Adult and Youth Sports](#) web pages). This is especially important because the redlined version provided with the staff report does not always make it clear what existing parts are being changed. For example, on page 4 (“Definitions”) there is a table indicating in red that for Grass Fields the proposed Fall In-Season Closing Date is “*Second Friday in December.*” Without consulting the current “Policy” (which I can find only in the [staff report](#) from August 5, 2014) one would not know that it currently reads “*December 15.*”

Regarding the change from 1 to 5 year contracts (page 6 of the redlined version), I would guess the language needs to be cleaned up. Not only is it completely unclear to me what the substance of the contract is intended to be, but it would appear the proposed language makes a 5 year contract term *mandatory*. Was that the intention, or is any term between 1 and 5 years acceptable? Also, who is authorized to grant the contract at the City end? Are the contracts for all the member organizations supposed to be synchronized to the same five year end date? And if they are no longer annual, what is the significance of the existing “*due by the Fall allocation meeting in June*” language? Which June is being referred to?

In the new “*SYNTHETIC TURF RULES AND REGULATIONS*” on page 14, the reference to “**Field 1**” in part D is unclear. I assume this has something to do with the new synthetic turf at Bonita Creek Park, but are these rules intended to apply only to that park and not to other synthetic turf the City might add elsewhere? Likewise, are these rules and regulations intended to apply *only* to youth sports?

In part K.1 of those new regulations, the expectation that users will “*leave the field cleaner than you found it*” seems unrealistic and unenforceable. Shouldn’t it be “**at least as clean as**”? There are a number of other minor grammatical errors that could be corrected.

***Item (6)C. Bench Donation – Ruby Avenue / North Bay Front***

Since this item uses essentially the same boilerplate format as Items D through H on the Consent Calendar, the staff report fails to make clear what differentiates this request from those.

Is there already a bench at this location? Does it have a dedication? Why is it being replaced? Is the new style different from the old?

***Item (6)D. Ad Hoc Committee / Liaison Appointment***

It is good to see a list of committees active during the preceding year, but it would seem to me that the purpose of the ad hoc advisory committees should be clear enough, when they are formed, that they would automatically or self-sunset when they declare they have presented their final report to the full Commission. It is difficult to see why any additional year-end action by the Commission is needed to end them.

This would apply, for example, to the **West Newport Community Center** committee, which should have a clearly defined, completable work product and ideally a definite due date for its report.

It would also apply to the **Community Service Award** committee. If it was appointed for a limited time to return with a specific limited recommendation, that should be clearly stated. Otherwise, if as the staff report implies it simply continues to exist indefinitely, it has become a standing committee of the Commission and its meetings should be open and publicly noticed.

Finally, I am uncomfortable with the “liaison” appointments to committees created by others. If the appointees serve as more than mere observers, and if the full Commission will later be serving in a review capacity with regard to proposals from these groups, then there can be an ethical problem with the Commission reviewing work that its members have participated in formulating. It is important to realize that if the Commission had created these committees and their membership included persons not on the Commission, then the Brown Act would require the committees’ meetings to be open and noticed just like those of the Commission itself.