

Comments on Draft June 21, 2012 Charter Update Minutes

from: Jim Mosher (jimmosher@yahoo.com), 2210 Private Road, Newport Beach 92660 (949-548-6229)

The following are suggested corrections to the Draft Minutes of the Newport Beach Charter Update Committee's June 21, 2012 meeting as presented in "Attachment A" in the agenda packet distributed on June 25 for consideration at the June 28, 2012 meeting.

- Page 1 includes an extensive discussion of an approval of minutes without identifying what minutes are being discussed on approved.
 - Suggested change: **IV. APPROVAL OF JUNE 14, 2012 MINUTES**
- On page 3:
 - In the second paragraph from the end, it is unclear from the minutes if the City Manager was purportedly reporting the comparative "total" compensation paid directly to the Council members, the direct compensation plus the cost of benefits paid by the cities, or some other figure, and also if the higher compensation paid to Mayors is part of the averages. If this was clear at the meeting, it should be clear in the minutes, particularly since the figure quoted for Newport Beach Council Members is difficult to reconcile any number reported to the public in any recent budget.
 - In the final paragraph, "**PERS**" is more commonly referred to as "**CalPERS**" in City documents.
- On page 4,:
 - at the end of the fourth paragraph:

*"recommended that the Council not **received receive** any retirement benefits"*
 - in the following sentence:
 - My recollection is that Finance Director McCraner said that **offering** PERS (or PARS) benefits was required by law, so staff could not "opt out" of **offering** benefits, but individual Council members were **not required** to accept them. That is quite different from the statement in the minutes which suggests the IRS requires Council members to participate in a PERS.
 - As on page 3, **PERS** might be **CalPERS**

- On page 5:
 - In the second multi-line paragraph:

“He noted that he has spoken to Elizabeth ~~Starr~~ Stahr”
 - In the first line of the third paragraph from the end, “*would affect the **changes** of the Charter being amended*” is probably supposed to be “*chances*.”
 - In the second paragraph from the end, the draft minutes suggest I recommended changing Master Plan to General Plan. I did not recommend that, and was in fact shocked that the change was made without any further discussion and without a request for investigation by the Planning Division:

Suggested change: “*Jim Mosher **suggested ~~changing Master Plan to General Plan, and not change changing subsection c in~~ Section 707(c) and questioned if the reference to Master Plan in Section 707(a) might be to what is now called a General Plan,***”

- On page 6:
 - In the third line, “*other **departments head***” is probably meant to read “*other **department’s head***” or “*other department **heads***.”
 - Both motions refer to changing “Sections” when in it appears a single “Section” is being voted upon; and the Section being voted on in the second motion was most likely 709 rather than the 708 indicated.
 - Suggested changes:

*“... approve the recommended change to **Sections Section 707, ...”***

*“... approve the recommended change to **Sections ~~708~~ Section 709, ...”***