



CITY OF PALM DESERT
CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE
INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

Date: May 9, 2024
To: Honorable Mayor and Councilmembers
From: Anthony J. Mejia, City Clerk
Subject: City Council Meeting of May 9, 2024

Below you will find questions received from the Mayor or Councilmembers and answers provided by City staff regarding tonight's City Council meeting:

ITEM 09k: RESOLUTION FOR THE NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION'S MAYORS' MONARCH PLEDGE TO RENEW THE CITY'S EFFORTS TO PROTECT AND ENHANCE THE POLLINATOR POPULATION

Q1: Did any of the entries of the student art contest include pollinators? If so, can this count as part of the community project? What is the expected participation from the Living Desert in the project? (Pg. 112)

A1: While some of the student art contest entries did include pollinators, these were not incorporated into the Mayors' Monarch Pledge community projects this year. However, staff will endeavor to incorporate student art in future community projects related to this program.

The Living Desert contributes to this program by continuing to maintain and operate its native planting website, which is linked on the QR codes at the pollinator garden and within Civic Center Park (www.livingdesert.org/conservation/take-action/native-planting).

ITEM 9n: APPROVE THE START OF PROCEEDINGS TO LEVY AND COLLECT ANNUAL ASSESSMENTS AND GRANT PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF THE 2024-25 ENGINEER'S REPORT FOR CONSOLIDATED PALM DESERT LANDSCAPING AND LIGHTING MAINTENANCE DISTRICT NO.1

Q1: Why is 83% of the \$157,878 being allocated to the Canyon Cove District? How was the 83% calculated, as 83% of the \$157,000 is roughly \$131,000, and the report from Willdan shows \$129,000 is coming out of the General Fund? (Pg. 161 & 198)

A1: The city's general benefit contributions are a percentage of the Total Operating Costs of the Zone in question. For Canyon Cove (Zone 2), the Total Operating Costs were \$155,584.10; 83% of which is calculated to be the \$129,134.80.

ITEM 10a: INTRODUCTION OF AN ORDINANCE ADDING SECTION 2.38.070 TO THE PALM DESERT MUNICIPAL CODE TO ALLOW FOR THE ELECTRONIC OR PAPER FILING OF CAMPAIGN FINANCE DISCLOSURE STATEMENTS

Q1: How will the system allow for signature by both candidate and treasurer?

A1: The electronic filing system allows either the treasurer or candidate to file using an individual ID and pin. Alternatively, the system can be set to require both the treasurer and candidate to review prepared documents and sign with individual IDs and pins. However, only 3 out of 200 agencies using an electronic filing system require this double verification process.

Several years ago, the Ventura County Counsel found the double verification unnecessary and created an undue burden on filers. They pioneered allowing the treasurer to file on behalf of the candidate and committee. They reasoned that the public portal allows the candidate to immediately review and file amendments, and the Form 410 obligates both parties to all filings. Riverside County has adopted the single verification process, and these filings are accepted by the Secretary of State and Fair Political Practices Commission.

ITEM 10b: REQUEST FOR DIRECTION REGARDING LUPINE PLAZA PROJECT CST00015

Q1: If the slurry is delayed as discussed with dining decks, would this work be concurrent, or would it result in additional construction with negative impact to merchants and shoppers? (Pg. 290)

A1: The construction of the improvements at Lupine Plaza is scheduled to occur in the summer of 2025. The El Paseo Street Rehabilitation Project may be broken into two phases with the first phase, ADA curb ramps, driveways, sidewalk, and curb and gutter improvements being constructed in the summer of 2024. This work will have less impact on the businesses than the rehabilitation of the asphalt concrete paving. The second phase, the pavement rehabilitation, may be deferred one or two years based upon issues related to the dining deck program. If the street rehabilitation project is constructed in the summer of 2025, it will be concurrent with the Lupine Plaza improvements, and the most disruptive items of work will be conducted simultaneously.

Q2: How many letters/emails have we received regarding Lupine Plaza in the past? If possible, please estimate how many favored or opposed the project?

A2: Staff identified 24 comments through Engage Palm Desert, 9 support, and 15 opposed. In reviewing previous City Council meeting records pertaining to Lupine Plaza, staff identified a total of four emails in support, 21 opposed, and two petitions containing 37 and 70 signatures in opposition. The letters/petitions of opposition were primarily related to the permanent closure of Lupine Lane.

ITEM 11a: APPEAL OF THE DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIRECTOR DETERMINATION THAT A LIVING ROOM CANNOT BE COUNTED AS A BEDROOM FOR PURPOSES OF A SHORT-TERM RENTAL

Q1: Is it correct that the ONLY issue before City Council will be the 2nd issue raised by the property owner, namely, the definition of "bedroom," since the other two issues are not topics of appeal to the City Council at this time?

A1: Correct, the only issue before the City Council is the appeal of the director's determination that a living room cannot be counted as a bedroom.

The appeal of the Building Official's determination that a den cannot be counted as a bedroom will be considered by the Building Board of Appeals. The Board's decision is subject to appeal to the City Council and therefore the specifics of that decision should not be discussed at this appeal hearing.