

Chris Freeland

From: Dana Reed
Sent: Thursday, October 5, 2023 5:23 PM
To: Donna Griffith; Chris Freeland
Cc: Todd Leishman (BBK Law)
Subject: Council Member Peabody Memo

Mayor Griffith & Chris:

Earlier today we received a copy of a memo from Council Member Peabody addressed to City Manager Chris Freeland lamenting an alleged “...lack of urgency to complete specific projects.”

I am troubled by Council Member Peabody’s habit of involving himself in administrative decisions properly made by our City Manager and his staff.

For example, he expresses displeasure that no “legal letter” has been sent to SitelogicIQ for its failure to install specialized solar equipment which city staff has determined is simply not available to anyone at this time. Absent a Council policy determination, the decision to send or not send a letter, and when to do so, is clearly an administrative decision to be made by the City Manager after consulting the City Attorney. If Council Member Peabody wants a letter sent, he should place the matter on a Council agenda where we can decide.

Council Member Peabody then complains that the construction area adjacent to Celebrity One has not yet been returned to its original condition. Again, when and how to handle this situation is clearly an administrative decision, not the purview of a single Council Member.

Next, he is flummoxed because the signage on IW Lane has not been completed. He implies that best practices concerning the awarding of public contracts give way to his decades of installing signs for the private sector. Again, unless the City Council wishes to intervene, this is not a policy decision, it is a combination of administrative action and state law.

He claims it is “inexcusable” that his favorite project, a pathway on Fairway Drive, has not been completed to his liking. Again, absent a Council vote to the contrary, the timeline for completing projects is an administrative decision. The mere fact that Council Member Peabody is personally enamored with this project is not sufficient to cause it to leapfrog over other worthwhile projects in the city.

He continues to demand financial information, in excruciating detail, about sales at The Vue. The fact that he has a familial interest in a competing restaurant makes this demand for detail even more troubling.

Section 2.03.060 of the city’s Policy Manual states as follows:

To uphold the integrity of the Council-Manager form of government and to provide proper checks and balances, Members of the Council shall refrain from becoming directly involved in the administrative affairs of the City, which includes the Indian Wells Golf Resort, unless directed by a majority of the Council to participate in a specific policy or project.

I acknowledge, pursuant to the policy section cited above, Council Member Peabody’s actions are proper, if he is directed to do so by a majority of the Council.

Accordingly, please consider this email the required 14 day notice requesting that this matter be placed on the agenda at the October 19, 2023 meeting of the City Council where we can discuss this issue and vote whether or not to authorize Council Member Peabody to continue to be directly involved in these administrative matters.

Sincerely,

Dana Reed

bcc: City Council



Dana W. Reed
Councilmember

44-950 Eldorado Drive
Indian Wells, California 92210-7497
www.IndianWells.com
dreed@IndianWells.com
V (760) 346-2489 C (213) 880-9350

The views expressed in this email are those of the sender alone, acting and communicating individually.
They do not necessarily represent the official views of the City of Indian Wells.