

Comments from Jim Mosher
Received 12/02/2025, 1:42 PM

**City Boards, Commissions, and Committees Feedback
As of November 21, 2025**

Table 2, City Arts Commission Feedback – Historical Resources Element

Element	Goal/Section	Comment(s)	Staff Response(s)/Recommendation
Historical Resources	HR-1: Recognize and protect historically significant landmarks, sites, and structures	Revise Policy HR-1.4 with the following addition: “Encourage the preservation of structures listed in the National Register of Historic Places, and/or the list of California Historical Landmarks, and/or the Newport Beach Register of Historical Property. Provide reasonable incentives, such as waivers of application fees, permit fees, and/or any liens placed by the City for properties listed in the National Register of Historic Places, State Register, or the Newport Beach Register of Historical Property in exchange for preservation easements, designation applications, and other related preservation incentives. <u>Partner with and reasonably support non-profit, private and community organizations in applying for public and private grants that would preserve and maintain historical resources throughout the city.</u> ” (Imp. 8.2, 29.2)	Incorporate suggested edit.
Historical Resources	HR-2: Well-documented and protected archaeological and paleontological resources	N/A	N/A
Historical Resources	HR-3: Celebrate, preserve, and protect local history	N/A	N/A
Historical Resources	HR-4: Enshrine local history through education	Make the following revision to Policy HR-4.3: “Encourage collaboration with local preservation organizations, like the Newport Beach Historical Society, to research, conduct outreach, and develop programs and activities to encourage and support historic preservation and cultural <u>historical</u> tourism. (Imp. 14.16)”	1/A
Historical Resources	HR-5: Celebrate tribal cultural resources	N/A	N/A
Historical Resources	Within the “Overview.”	Add a sentence about tourism.	Incorporate suggested insert. Tie it to “historical tourism.”



Summary of Comments on 25-1565 - Attachment 2b - City Boards, Commissions, and Committees Input

Special Joint Meeting of GPUSC and GPAC - December 3, 2025
Item No. Vb - Additional Materials Received

Handwritten Page: 47



Number: 1

Author: R700

Subject: Comment on Text

Date: 12/01/2025 5:07:10 PM

Is staff suggesting rejecting this proposed revision?

If so, why?

City Boards, Commissions, and Committees Feedback
As of November 21, 2025

Table 3, Harbor Commission, PB&R Commission, and WQ/CT Committee Feedback – Harbor, Bay, and Beaches Element			
Element	Goal	Comment(s)	Staff Response(s)/Recommendation
Harbor, Bay, and Beaches	HBB-2: Minimized risk of displacement by coastal hazards	Harbor – HBB-2.1. The bullets need more clarity on what the intent is. Also, the list seems limited.	Intent is to comply with SB 272. Original policy read “HBB-2.1: Adopt a Sea-Level Rise Plan consistent with SB 272 (2023) and update the Local Coastal Program, including the Land Use Plan and Implementation Plan, as necessary (IMP 5.1) (Policy S-1.1).” Unsure of the history as to why it was revised. Recommend reverting to the original draft language.
Harbor, Bay, and Beaches	HBB-3: A harbor, bay, and beaches that attract tourism and maintain the character of coastal neighborhoods	Harbor – HBB-3.1. It is unclear how more waterfront could be created. What does the word “reasonable” mean here?	The policy relates to public spaces and beaches along the waterfront, not more waterfront. Could instead say “preservation of public spaces and beaches along the waterfront.” Reasonable is an intentional term that is meant to be subjective. The General Plan does not establish these spaces, but gives support for decisions that would provide more public spaces and beaches along the waterfront.
Harbor, Bay, and Beaches	HBB-4: Sufficient coastal infrastructure that protects coastal-dependent and public recreational uses and view corridors while matching the character of the surrounding development and protecting coastal and visual resources	Harbor – HBB-4. Clarify what are believed to be the current “view corridors”.	1 ew corridors are shown in NR. Can add map cross reference – “As further described in the Natural Resources and shown in Figure NR-4”



Number: 1

Author: R700


Subject: Comment on Text

Date: 12/01/2025 5:14:05 PM

View corridors and view points likely need updating. As I recall, there are none in Newport Coast.

City Boards, Commissions, and Committees Feedback
As of November 21, 2025




Table 3, Harbor Commission, PB&R Commission, and WQ/CT Committee Feedback – Harbor, Bay, and Beaches Element			
Element	Goal	Comment(s)	Staff Response(s)/Recommendation
Harbor, Bay, and Beaches	HBB-8: Well-managed and economically productive harbor, bay, and beaches	<p>Harbor – HBB-8.1. explain how expansion of existing marinas might be possible.</p> <p>HBB-8.2. Explain what is meant by “lower-cost” recreational boating.</p> <p>HBB-8.3. Consider changing the word “provide” to “maintain” as there likely isn’t space for additional anchorages in federal areas.</p> <p>HBB-8.5. Who would the temporary use be provided by?</p> <p>HBB-8.7.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explain what the term “reasonable” means. How are the renewable annual permits in compliance with State Lands Commission? This is on “Live Aboard permits”, shouldn’t we change “Reasonable maximum number” for a live-aboard permit and tie it to a specific percentage of moorings as it is today? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 8.1 suggested edit “Protect and, where feasible through the use of new designs and technology, enhance marinas and expand dry boat storage facilities.” 12 Suggest removal of “lower-cost” 8.3 Accept suggested edit 8.5 Will require coordination with Harbor Department on revisions 8.7 Should remain vague for flexibility for future for GP purposes. No change recommended.

 Number: 1 Author: R700 Subject: Comment on Text Date: 12/01/2025 7:12:05 PM
The lower-income mooring holders will likely not be thrilled by this revision, which seems to further exclude them.

The language may have come from the LCP, specifically CLUP Policy 3.3.2-3. "Continue to provide shore moorings and offshore moorings as an important source of low-cost public access to the water and harbor," which may have been influenced by Coastal Act Section 30213. "Lower cost visitor and recreational facilities shall be protected, encouraged, and, where feasible, provided."




City Boards, Commissions, and Committees Feedback
As of November 21, 2025

Table 3, Harbor Commission, PB&R Commission, and WQ/CT Committee Feedback – Harbor, Bay, and Beaches Element			
Element	Goal	Comment(s)	Staff Response(s)/Recommendation
Harbor, Bay, and Beaches	HBB-9: Cost-efficient servicing and managing of Newport Harbor	<p>Harbor – HBB-9. Consider adding language about adopting technology for harbor management (smart buoys, online mooring rentals, vessel tracking) to improve efficiency and user experience. This is in process today.</p> <p>HBB-9.1. Explain what the term “reasonable” means.</p> <p>HBB-9.3. “reasonable value for the lease rates” should be “fair market value per State Lands Commission”. Are the “waterfront developments” public, private or either? Under “Public Access to Coastal Resources”, the term “worst case” is stated in reference to sea level rise. There have been numerous sea level studies that have a wide range in theories about the total rise over time. As such, worst case should be better defined. Which study should be cited?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggested policy: “Support efficient harbor management through the use of emerging technologies such as smart buoys, online mooring rentals, vessel tracking, and other technologies, to the extent feasible.” 9.1 ¹ould say “market” rate of return instead. 9.3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ²se suggested edit All development public and private In terms of worst case, this is informed by our existing conditions analysis. This could change with further analysis conducted for the SLR plan or the best available data at a point in time.
Harbor, Bay, and Beaches	HBB-10: Safe and accessible beach and harbor access points	<p>Harbor – HBB-10.5. Expand on this to commit to funding and include the Harbor Department and on the water fire suppression.</p> <p>PB&R – We believe the safety of people on foot versus motorized and other non-foot traffic should be a balancing factor in the Preamble to HBB-10 and where otherwise applicable. Especially in consideration of prioritizing safe access to parks, beaches, & other recreation facilities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggested edit: “Provide for marine safety, such as lifeguards, harbor patrol, on the water fire suppression, police, and traffic and parking enforcement through dedicated funds for the Harbor Department and other applicable departments.” Suggested edit - ³ee comment

	Number: 1	Author: R700	Subject: Comment on Text	Date: 12/02/2025 9:40:18 AM
Again, I don't think such a revision will be universally acclaimed. "Market rate" is not always a well-defined concept, such as for residential piers, where there is no market. There may also be circumstances in which charging something less than fair market value can be found consistent with the purposes of the public trust. "Reasonable" sounds the better word to me.				
	Number: 2	Author: R700	Subject: Comment on Text	Date: 12/01/2025 7:22:39 PM
Same comment as for HBB-9.1 revision, above.				
	Number: 3	Author: R700	Subject: Comment on Text	Date: 12/01/2025 7:27:45 PM
What comment is this referring to?				

City Boards, Commissions, and Committees Feedback
As of November 21, 2025

Table 3, Harbor Commission, PB&R Commission, and WQ/CT Committee Feedback – Harbor, Bay, and Beaches Element			
Element	Goal	Comment(s)	Staff Response(s)/Recommendation
Harbor, Bay, and Beaches	HBB-11: Multifaceted and integrated coastal access	<p>Harbor – HBB-11. Expand wayfinding beyond signage to include digital tools (apps, QR codes, real-time maps) for visitor navigation which is in effect today.</p> <p>HBB-11.1. suggest changing the word “encourage” to “maintain”.</p> <p>HBB-11.3. It is not clear where a marine terminal could be located in Newport Harbor. Does this HBB apply?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggested edit 11.5: “Improve accessibility to coastal areas and represent neighborhood character through the use of navigation tools such as wayfinding signage, real-time maps, QR codes, and other applicable methods.” 11.1 incorporate suggested edit 11.3 Not applicable to GP
Harbor, Bay, and Beaches	HBB-12: Protection of the visual and ecological resources of Upper Newport Bay	<p>Harbor – HBB – 12.1. Maintain public use in Upper Newport Bay Nature Preserve and Ecological Reserve to the extent that such use is consistent with the preservation of sensitive resources including monitoring and maintenance of Newport Bay Trash Interceptor.</p> <p>PB&R – Who exactly is the Newport Bay Watershed Executive Committee? Also, should the Newport Bay Conservancy be referenced as a coordinating entity in HBB-12.2, as the Upper Newport Bay is their area of specialty and there is longstanding coordination with the City?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New policy suggestion: HBB 12.8: Minimize pollution in the Upper Newport Bay through support of actions and infrastructure that reduce trash such as the Newport Bay Trash Interceptor. 12.2 suggested edit: “Continue interagency coordination with relevant entities involved in the protection and preservation of Upper Newport Bay.” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Also in policy 11.1 NR and should be carried over.
Harbor, Bay, and Beaches	Not Specified	<p>Harbor – There should be something in this document to maintain the relationship with the County for the launch ramp facility as there are no other launch ramps in the harbor., Could consider identifying a new launch ramp location owned by the City. If the County were to end the lease arrangement, how would vessel launching be possible?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggested policy: “HBB-4.5: Support the continued use of the launch ramp facility through coordination with the County of Orange; and consider opportunities for the siting and development of a new launch ramp facility owned by the City.”


-
-  Number: 1 Author: R700 Subject: Comment on Text Date: 12/01/2025 7:31:03 PM
The revision seems to have erased the original intent to improve conventional signage. Shouldn't that be retained?
-
-  Number: 2 Author: R700 Subject: Comment on Text Date: 12/01/2025 7:36:48 PM
What does this response mean? This policy is apparently in the Circulation Element, as well. Is staff suggesting the policies be deleted?
-
-  Number: 3 Author: R700 Subject: Comment on Text Date: 12/01/2025 7:44:50 PM
I believe the Trash Interceptor was promoted as a temporary stop-gap measure with an expected life of about 10 years. So some vision for what might succeed it may be needed.

City Boards, Commissions, and Committees Feedback
As of November 21, 2025


Table 3, Harbor Commission, PB&R Commission, and WQ/CT Committee Feedback – Harbor, Bay, and Beaches Element			
Element	Goal	Comment(s)	Staff Response(s)/Recommendation
		acknowledge the Department's importance in daily operations and long-term harbor sustainability.	
Harbor, Bay, and Beaches	Not Specified	Harbor – The Orange County Sheriff's Harbor Patrol role is mentioned only indirectly through safety policies. Consider adding a specific policy on collaboration between the City and the Sheriff's Department to ensure consistent, effective, and well-coordinated law enforcement on the water.	Suggested policy 5.4: "Coordinate with the Orange County Sheriff's Department ¹ Harbor Patrol to provide consistent, effective, and well-coordinated law enforcement on the water."
Harbor, Bay, and Beaches	Within the "Economic Value of the Harbor" Section	Harbor – The data is from 2018. Should we obtain later data and add a note that this data will be updated every X years to maintain relevance?	² an use language provided combined with the language from the background report: <p>"The City manages an interconnected 47.7-mile shoreline system composed of bay and ocean beaches, vital dunes, as well as the navigational waters of Newport Harbor and the tidal wetlands of Upper Newport Bay. Newport Harbor is the largest recreational boat harbor on the West Coast, with more than 9,000 recreational boats. The beaches serve an estimated ³million visitors, swimmers and surfers per year. Beach and boating users are vital to the local economy.</p> <p>As further detailed in the Harbor and Bay Element Existing Conditions and Background Report, Newport Harbor provides significant economic benefits to both the City and the greater county. Based on visitor spending patterns, Newport Harbor is estimated to account for slightly over 30 percent of all direct tourism related spending</p>

Prepared by Ben Zdeba, Planning Manager
for GPAC Review

 Number: 1 Author: R700 Subject: Comment on Text Date: 12/01/2025 8:03:36 PM
? why "on" ?

 Number: 2 Author: R700 Subject: Comment on Text Date: 12/01/2025 8:20:07 PM
Is repeating such lengthy detail, when it already exists in the Background Report, consistent with objective of a "streamlined" General Plan? And as alluded to in the comment, doesn't this year the numbers refer to need to be mentioned.

As to the request to update this "every X years," will that require a General Plan Amendment each time the numbers are revised"

 Number: 3 Author: R700 Subject: Comment on Text Date: 12/01/2025 8:27:18 PM
The number "10 million visitors a year" has long been quoted. Is 8 million supposed to be the part of those that just the beaches? How many others are attracted by harbor amenities? What is the basis for any of these numbers?

City Boards, Commissions, and Committees Feedback
As of November 21, 2025

Table 3, Harbor Commission, PB&R Commission, and WQ/CT Committee Feedback – Harbor, Bay, and Beaches Element			
Element	Goal	Comment(s)	Staff Response(s)/Recommendation
			<p>(nearly 1,400 million) in the City of Newport Beach. This includes spending on accommodations, entertainment, restaurants, retail, etc. during their stay within Newport Harbor, which for day-trip visitors is estimated to average slightly under four hours.</p> <p>Further, based on an analysis of maritime and visitor serving industries that are located in Newport Beach due to the presence of the harbor, it is estimated that Newport Harbor creates \$547.4 million in direct economic output. This level of economic activity supports approximately 4,440 direct jobs with earnings of \$195.8 million. In total, Newport Harbor is estimated to support approximately 5,900 indirect jobs or 1,500 additional indirect jobs in Orange County. In total it is estimated Newport Harbor creates \$787 million in total economic output to the county's economy.</p>
Harbor, Bay, and Beaches	Within the "Introduction" Section	<p>WQ/CT –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommends replacing the Purpose paragraph with emphasis on economic impact. Potential draft (ILLUSTRATIVE FOR FLOW AND EMPHASIS, CONSULTANT SHOULD REVIEW FOR ACCURACY OF NUMBERS AND CONTEXT) 	<p>Suggested language provided above. Doesn't make sense as purpose statement. Need to consider online format.</p> <p>Suggested new policy: "8.9: At least every five years, conduct regular assessments of the economic viability of the harbor to track potential changes.</p>

Prepared by Ben Zdeba, Planning Manager
for GPAC Review



Number: 1

Author: R700

Subject: Comment on Text

Date: 12/01/2025 8:14:28 PM

Is \$400 million "all" or "30% of all"? And is 30% harbor visitor spending alone, not counting beach visitors?

City Boards, Commissions, and Committees Feedback
As of November 21, 2025

Table 3, Harbor Commission, PB&R Commission, and WQ/CT Committee Feedback – Harbor, Bay, and Beaches Element			
Element	Goal	Comment(s)	Staff Response(s)/Recommendation
		<p>and vital dunes to the navigational waters of Newport Harbor and the tidal wetlands of Upper Newport Bay. Our region-serving beach and water recreation facilitates vital visitor-serving businesses and protects backshore communities, neighborhoods and infrastructure.</p> <p>Activity and access. Newport Harbor is the largest recreational boat harbor on the West Coast, with more than 9,000 recreational boats. Navigation, harbor water quality, and marina policies must complement beach access and safety. Our beaches serve an estimated 8 million visitors, swimmers and surfers a year. Beach and boating users are the backbone of Newport's hospitality economy.</p>	
Harbor, Bay, and Beaches	Not Specified	<p>WQ/CT – Discovery and Potential Creation of a City Committee Emphasizing City Beaches.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Issue: The Beaches are a vital part of our community. Yet there is no clear oversight into Beach management, economic programs tied to beaches, and issues tied to Coastal Resilience. This void in management needs to be addressed, and may be best resolved by the creation of a new City committee focused on the topic. Or clarification on where this lives. Beaches & Coastal Resilience Committee. Establish a standing Beaches & Coastal Resilience Committee to advise the City Council on ocean-beach management, sand budgeting and replenishment, 	<p>Suggested policy 5.4: ¹Establish a committee to advise the City Council on decisions related to beaches and coastal resilience. The formation of such a committee should consider the recommendations provided by the Water Quality and Coastal Tidelands Committee as further detailed in the Outreach Summary for the General Plan Update process.</p>

Prepared by Ben Zdeba, Planning Manager
for GPAC Review

 Number: 1 Author: R700 Subject: Comment on Text Date: 12/01/2025 8:33:07 PM

As to advising regarding beaches, this proposed policy seems to conflict with City Charter Subsection 709(a), which tasks the Parks, Beaches and Recreation Commission with advising the Council on "all matters pertaining to ... beaches."

City Boards, Commissions, and Committees Feedback
As of November 21, 2025

Table 4, Parks, Beaches & Recreation Commission Feedback – Recreation Element

Element	Goal	Comment(s)	Staff Response(s)/Recommendation
Recreation	R-1: A community with high-quality recreation programs	N/A	N/A
Recreation	R-2: Programs for older adults that benefit and are used by residents	N/A	N/A
Recreation	R-3: New parks and connections that increase resident access to recreation, parks, and open space opportunities	Would it be relevant to include something about assessing the use of parks and how under-utilized areas might be repurposed for public use? (i.e. the back corner of Sunset Ridge Park behind the playground)	I think this would best align with goal 4. Suggested policy 4.8 “Evaluate park and recreational facility usage and needs to identify needed enhancements.”
Recreation	R-4: Parks and recreation facilities that are preserved, upgraded, and well-maintained	We like the idea of promoting more dog parks. We believe this should have its own bullet point as opposed to being a part of Policy R-4.2. The bullet point prioritizing new dog parks might mention the frequency of infractions related to dogs off leash, dogs in protected areas, etc., and that additional dog parks would not only provide dogs a safe place to recreate, but reduce the dangers to people of dogs off leash and to wildlife and more of dogs in protected open spaces.	Suggested policy 3.10 “Encourage the incorporation of dog parks to provide opportunities for residents to let their dogs off leash in protected areas, while reducing off-leash occurrences in areas where it is discouraged.”
Recreation	R-5: Parks and recreational facilities that are adapted to meet a variety of needs for existing and future residents	Policy R-5.8: Use reasonable efforts to evaluate tree canopy cover in parks and the public right-of-way, considering shade and priority active transportation corridors. (Policy S-7.1.5) What is meant by this highlighted portion?	Suggested edit: Evaluate the availability of shade in parks and the public right-of-way to identify areas that could be enhanced with more shade to improve the user experience on hot days. Public parks and active-transportation corridors should be prioritized for any identified enhancements. To the extent reasonable, evaluation could occur through the development of a Parks Master Plan or similar citywide effort or through a site-specific project such as a capital improvement project.

Prepared by Ben Zdeba, Planning Manager
for GPAC Review

 Number: 1	Author: R700	Subject: Comment on Text	Date: 12/01/2025 9:05:47 PM
through			
