

May 8, 2014, City Arts Commission Agenda Item Comments

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

Item IV: Approval of Minutes – April 17, 2014

Changes to the draft minute passages shown in *italics* are suggested in **strikeout underline** format.

Page 1, Item 4, paragraph 1: “~~Vice Chair Greer asked that corrections be made to reflect that the fourth and last installation will be installed this week, as stated under the Fine Arts Ad Hoc report. Have been selected not pending review. Line 7, referencing the event begins at 1:00pm and not 10:00am.~~” [The portion suggested for deletion appears to be someone’s rough notes inadvertently left in as the draft was completed. The identical content is repeated with greater precision in the lines that follow.]

Page 1, near end: “Motion made by Commissioner Smith and seconded by Chair Goldberg and carried (5-2) to approve the minutes of March 13, 2014 **minutes** as amended and noted.” [note: The reporting here, and in subsequent items, of a “5-2” vote would normally be taken to mean 2 opposed, but in this case it means 2 absent. To correlate with “ayes-noes-abstentions-absences” format in which the names are listed, it might better be reported as “5-0-0-2.”]

Page 2, sentence before last Motion: “Tim ~~Heatherton~~ **Hetheron**, Library Services Director, was available to provide clarification to the articles, as needed.”

Page 3, paragraph 2: “Richard Stein, Arts Orange County (OC) Executive Director, provided a ~~Power Point~~ **PowerPoint** presentation ...”

Page 3, paragraph 3 from end: “Richard Stein noted that Arts OC was not asked to ~~photo-shop~~ **the photoshop** each piece into this presentation ...”

Page 3, paragraph 2 from end: “Chair Goldberg opened ~~for~~ public ~~comments~~ **comment**.”

Page 4, paragraph 4, sentence 3: “He also noted that one of the selections ~~appear~~ **appears** to be currently installed elsewhere.”

Page 4, paragraph 6: “Board of Library Trustee ~~Robyn Grant~~ and former City Arts Commissioner **Robyn Grant** complimented the Commission ...”

Page 4, motion: “Motion made by Commissioner Smith and seconded by Commissioner Magrutsche and carried (5-2) to ratify the work of the committee as presented showing each of the sculptures ~~photo-shopped~~ **photoshopped** to scale in their proposed locations, for presentation to City Council.”

Page 5, Item C.6, sentences 3 and 5: “He noted the ~~suitability~~ art placement **suitability** requirements, ... He noted the plans ~~in~~ **of** having interns help with this project.”

Page 6, Item 6: “Chair Goldberg discussed upcoming concerts and events, with the first being the ~~Hutchinson Concert~~ **Hutchins Consort** on Sunday, June 22 ...”

Item V.A.2. Financial Report

1. With less than three months left in the fiscal year, and only two events (June 14 Art Exhibition and June 22 concert) planned during that time, it is unclear how the \$11,000 of programming surplus shown on page 1 will be spent. If not spent, will the balance revert to the City's General Fund?
2. It is likewise unclear what the plan is for spending the large remaining balance in the Civic Center Sculpture account (page 3).
3. A minor point, but on page 2, line 3 from end: why are "*Museum Tour Refunds to customers*" debited against the Arts Commission account if revenues from ticket sales are not credited to it? Or are the revenues credited, if so where?

Item V.A.3. Cultural Arts Activities

Regarding the recipients of Cultural Arts Grants (The Baroque Music Festival and 15th Annual Newport Beach Film Festival), I assume the reports eventually submitted to the Arts Commission by the organizations will detail exactly what the grants were spent on and the degree of public participation in the supported activities.

Item V.B.1. Recap of the April 28, 2014 Boards, Commissions and Committees Training

I would like to again emphasize that although the Commission could adopt such a rule in its By-laws, there is nothing in the Brown Act that *limits* public comment to a single 3-minute statement on each agenda item.

Indeed, I suspect increased interaction with the audience would lead to livelier, better-attended and ultimately more productive meetings.

To the best of my knowledge, the Commission is, for example, free to respond to and re-open public comment on agenda items at any time additional input from the public might add to its discussion. The only restriction I am aware of is that each time public comment is opened, each member of the public must be given an equal opportunity to speak to and interact with the Commission.

I would also like to emphasize that the numerous "Monthly Reports" on City Arts Commission agendas should not be used as platforms for discussion or decision unless the public has been explicitly alerted on the agenda to the exact topic that needs to be discussed or decided. Since that is rarely, if ever, the case, the person giving a report that includes a matter that needs discussion or decision should ask for the matter to be clearly noticed to the public on the *next* agenda (or at a special meeting), and hold the discussion then.