

February 2, 2016, PB&R Consent Calendar Comments

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

Item IV.A. Minutes of the November 3, 2015 PB&R Commission

The following corrections are suggested:

Page 2, after paragraph E: “~~Chair Howald opened the public comments; seeing none, the public comments were closed.~~” [?: page 1 indicates public requests to pull items from the Consent Calendar were invited before the Commissioners announced items they wanted pulled. It’s possible the invitation for public comment was repeated at this point, but it seems unlikely since the minutes indicate additional public comment was invited separately on each item pulled]

Page 2, paragraph 4 from end, last sentence: “*The original trees on Poppy Avenue have been removed and **addressed** the next steps were addressed.”*

Page 3, paragraph 1: “*Jim Mosher commented on the donor’s request to plant two specific species of trees. He reported that the Commission is being asked to approve a different species **then is approved for that street** and questioned the rationale.*” [The item in question had to do with a *park* tree donation, and the comment was that staff’s recommendation differed from the donor’s request. I cannot recall how “*approved for that street*” could relate to a park. But if it did, “then” should be “than.”]

Page 3, Item A: “*Recommendation: Consider staff’s recommendation to deny request of Dan & Katherine **Heinfield Heinfield** to remove one City Eucalyptus tree at 901 Chestnut Place.*”

Page 3, last paragraph: “*Dan **Heinfield Heinfield**, applicant, provided a brief PowerPoint presentation ...*”

Page 4, paragraph 5: “*Mr. **Heinfield Heinfield** stated that in 2011, other trees in the area were trimmed but the subject tree was not.*”

Page 4, Item B, Recommendation (and **page 5**, motion): “*Consider staff’s recommendation to remove one Special City Eucalyptus - Neighborhood tree **from Joseph Smith** at 431 Santa Ana Avenue; ...*” [This is indeed how the recommendation was noticed on the agenda and it may be how the motion was made, but the expression “*from Joseph Smith*” seems strange. In the November 3rd staff report, the recommendation was actually the more typical “*consider the removal of one Special City Tree - Neighborhood Tree **located** at 431 Santa Ana Avenue, **Front 1.***”]

Page 5, motion at top of page: see previous comment

Page 5, Item D, Recommendation (and **page 7**, motion): “*request of Paul McDonough to relocate an existing bench **from the corner of Lindo Avenue at West Edgewater Blvd. to the end of Buena Vista Blvd at West Edgewater Avenue***” [Again, this is what the November 3rd agenda said, but it is backwards. As the body of the November 3rd staff report explains, the request, and I assume the motion on page 7, regarded relocating an existing bench **from** the end of Buena Vista Blvd at West Edgewater Avenue **to** the corner of Lindo Avenue at West Edgewater Blvd.]

Page 6, paragraph 1 under Public Comments: “Lisa **Scorsell Scorziell** referenced a handout that she submitted for distribution ...”

Page 6, paragraph 3 from end: “Carolyn Stockton, property owner at **360 350 Buena Vista**, reported that when she moved in that there was no bench at that location.” [To the best of my knowledge is there is no “360 Buena Vista.” The last lot on the City maps is “350.”]

Page 7, line 1: “Tom **Caprian Kupfrian** stated that his wife's family donated the bench, ...” [The suggested spelling is from the November 3rd staff report. A person of this name lives in Anaheim.]

Page 7, paragraph 2: “In response to Chair Howald's inquiry, Mrs. **Caprian Kupfrian** reported that the bench was donated in 2002 ...”

Page 7, motion: see comment regarding Recommendation for Item D on page 5, above.

Page 7, paragraph 2 from end: “Chair Howald commented on the Coral tree at Ensign **View Park** and Director Pisani reported that a replacement tree was planted yesterday ...”

Page 7, last paragraph: “Discussion ensued regarding the City not meeting its water conservation goals and **the Commission** asked about the grass in front of City Hall and parks.”

Item IV.F. Bench Donation - Mariners Park

There is either some confusion about this item (possibly related to regular agenda Item V.C?), or it has been improperly agendized.

The staff report implies PB&R is simply being asked to accept a standard bench donation with a plaque “*In Memory of Zach Cornwell*.”

However, Attachment C to the staff report indicates that in return for the bench donation, this is a request to name the entire baseball facility “*CORNWELL FIELD at MARINERS PARK*” at a March 5, 2016, ceremony, apparently including installation or unveiling of the plaque (of unspecified dimensions) shown in Attachment B.

Touching as it may seem, approval of such a proposal appears to be contrary to both Council [Policy B-17](#) (“*Parks, Facilities and Recreation Program Donations*”) and [Policy B-9](#) (“*Naming of City Parks & Facilities*”).

First, under Policy B-17, to qualify for something more than the standard 2x6 inch “*In Memory of...*” plaque, the value of the donation would have to exceed \$4,000, which is not indicated in the staff report. Even if it exceeded that value (for example, including the bullpen proposed in Item V.C), Policy B-17 does not contemplate that donating one thing gives the donor the right to name or dedicate something else.

Second, under Policy B-9, a proposal to name a park amenity, such as a playing field, requires Council approval based on a recommendation from PB&R. The donor appears to be under the misimpression that PB&R can grant such wishes by itself.