

From: [REDACTED]
To: [CityClerk](#)
Subject: Comments on City Maps
Date: Friday, November 10, 2023 8:04:48 AM



As a resident of Palm Desert, I'm writing to express my support for the Redistricting Map 103b as submitted by Gregg Akkerman. I believe the boundaries therein to be understandable and to retain the most neighborhood identity. It's my understanding that it is in population compliance per the demographer.

Thanks
-Mark Freeman

From: [REDACTED]
To: [CityClerk](#)
Subject: Comments on city redistricting maps
Date: Friday, November 10, 2023 12:43:51 PM



To Anthony Mejia:

Please note for the record that I am in support of Map 102b/103b for the following reasons:

1. The boundaries are the most logical and easy to identify while other map proposals are more confusing. Non-contiguous neighborhoods don't make sense for a voting district. My neighborhood on Hovley Lane west is wholly contained in proposed District 3.
2. Longstanding traditions for neighborhood identity are respected
3. As I understand them, all compliance requirements with regards to population and contiguousness are met

Doug Brown

[REDACTED]

Pal, Desert CA 92260

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [CityClerk](#)
Subject: Comment on city maps
Date: Thursday, November 9, 2023 10:35:15 PM

I support map 102b/103b submitted by G. Akkerman.

Kelly Ellis

From: [REDACTED]
To: [CouncilMeeting Comments](#)
Subject: Nov. 16 meeting re: 5 District Maps
Date: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 12:52:46 PM

Dear Sir/Madam:

I am a resident of Palm Desert and write to encourage the Council to vote for the “Ackerman” map which leaves the Northern District intact. I believe doing so fulfills the intention of re-drawing the maps in the first place as it ensures that each district is represented by an individual who actually resides in that district. Consequently, the very real needs and concerns of each individual district can be more readily identified and addressed.

I appreciate your kind consideration.

Very truly yours,
Linda DeMetrick

From: Stephen Nelson [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, November 13, 2023 9:24 PM
To: CityClerk <CityClerk@palmdesert.gov>
Subject: Opposition to Maps 105/109
Importance: High

Mr. Mejia-

Please file my comment as opposition to Maps 105/109 for the public record.

The purpose of this exercise is to provide the residents of Palm Desert with local representation within the cities jurisdiction and to ensure the local government complies with State of CA laws, specifically the Voting Rights Act.

Every resident of Palm Desert loves the city we call home despite our position on the topic of local jurisdiction and/or districts within the City of Palm Desert. My personal view of establishing districts within Palm Desert will only further enhance and increase the overall effectiveness of future councils. By having a councilperson who resides in the district it will provide a unique perspective on the needs of those citizens in that area in order to prioritize the needs of those citizens.

For the reasons mentioned above I am voicing my steadfast opposition to the following maps:

Map 105, while the demographer mentions, "Maps 105/109 achieve a greater balance in dividing "future population" growth in North Palm Desert."

- Future population growth. One cannot determine the percentage of growth that will actually occur in the north over the next 5 to 7 years. Just because there are planned and/or approved projects those projects could take several years on average to complete. Once completed they have to be leased and/or purchased before we get to the point of counting new residents for the purposes of drawing district lines. My own community and surrounding parcel was started in 2016/17 timeframe and to date there are still 7 parcels yet to be purchased and/or developed as originally planned for future development. Nobody has a crystal ball to accurately predict future growth therefore we should base our district boundaries and decision on actual residents data available today. What happens if a developer pulls out of a project for whatever reason like the Monterey Ridge on Dick Kelly Blvd which still stands incomplete today. Domani is another example of a planned community which was projected to be complete years ago and was left unfinished for some time until Lennar finished it recently, and could negatively affect drawing a district on proposed/future growth. The demographers language says, you "may consider" it doesn't say "you must". This decision should be left to a future council when and if the time comes to bifurcate the northern district.
- One of the western borders (Gerald Ford and Rembrandt Parkway) goes through a singular community (i.e. The Gallery). The western half of the gallery will be in 1 district while the eastern half of the gallery will be in another and what I consider to be in conflict of CA point 2....Minimizing division of neighborhood and communities of interest) and possibly another prohibited criteria.

- The district also creates a massive geographic area that goes from our northern most areas to our CA-111 which is defeats the purpose of districting for a specific area.
- It could create a scenario where both proposed districts could be represented by people who do not live in the northern sphere, therefore leaving it represented by someone who doesn't live in the northern sphere.
- All homes from Frank Sinatra north are part of Palm Springs Unified School District and should be represented by an individual person to work with that school district as it doesn't effect any other jurisdiction other than the north. The proposed map would bifurcate the school district line and place the responsibility on two councilpersons in lieu of one.

Map 109, again the demographer made the same comments about this map.

- I would like to echo the same comments above about factoring "future growth" in this map to draw district lines.
- The proposed map creates districts, specifically, district 4 that spans from the western edge of the city to its eastern border.
- Its crosses defined school district lines
- It dilutes the northern sphere of its identification and normal boundaries combining it with other distinct parts of the city.
- District 3, is weirdly shaped district and doesn't achieve communities of interests in my opinion.
- District 5, again is including areas that dilute the northern sphere. It could potentially favor a person who does not live in the area.
- It also crosses over school district lines (PSUSD vs DSUSD), less so than Map 105 but enough to be a problem for a district boundary. Commonality is key within a district.

Regards,
SN

Stephen Nelson (He/Him)



From: [REDACTED]
To: [CouncilMeeting Comments](#)
Subject: 5 District Map
Date: Friday, November 10, 2023 11:36:19 AM



Please support the Akerman map & leave the north in tact - no mega districts in the city!

From: [REDACTED]
To: [CouncilMeeting Comments](#)
Subject: 5 Districts map
Date: Friday, November 10, 2023 4:05:36 PM



I support the 5 Districts map submitted by Gregg Akkerman. This map makes the most sense and is the best way to fairly represent all the people of Palm Desert.

Mary J Morris

Resident of Palm Desert

From: [REDACTED]
To: [CouncilMeeting Comments](#)
Subject: Fwd: District Maps
Date: Saturday, November 11, 2023 11:57:17 AM



Dear City Councilmembers,

I would like to give my support for the maps labeled 102B and 103B as they appear to be the same map prepared by Gregg Akkerman. These maps reflect, I believe the intent of districting as it sets the parameters clearly in the northern part of the city, which have unique issues in common.

Thank you in advance for considering my input.

Dennis Steele
Palm Desert resident

From: [REDACTED]
To: [CouncilMeeting Comments](#)
Subject: Public Comment for Agenda Item 12a Redistricting Maps
Date: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 1:54:43 PM



I am asking the Palm Desert City Council not to support maps 105 or 109 because they fail to achieve the required criteria.

These maps take a drastically different approach to redistricting by creating “tall” districts in the north part of the city based on future population growth, but this creates inherent problems.

Firstly, according to the staff report, the city may consider “Future Population Growth” ONLY if all Federal and State criteria have been met, but the districts drawn in maps 105 and 109 do not satisfy this threshold.

Specifically, the criteria from the California Voting Rights Act states that new districts must “minimize the division of neighborhoods and ‘communities of interest,’” and maps 105 and 109 fall short of this requirement.

For example, residents of north Palm Desert often cite living conditions considerably different than the rest of the city due to wind and sand, binding them together as a community of interest. And yet, these maps propose districts that run from the northern reaches of the city all the way to the south as far as Fred Waring Drive and even Highway 111. Those district boundaries would obliterate Country Club Drive as the traditional demarcation of north and south portions of the city, thus diluting the collective voice of northern residents and destroying longstanding communities of interest--**making the adoption of such a map non-compliant with the California Voting Rights Act and exposing the city to litigation.**

Secondly, the Palm Springs Unified School District includes all of Palm Desert north of Frank Sinatra Drive. However, maps 105 and 109 would split this area, dividing yet another longstanding community of interest.

Lastly, an expectation of redistricting is to provide each district a designated council member who would share the daily life experiences of his/her constituents. However, maps 105 and 109 would create the potential for a council member who supposedly represents the mindset of the north but might actually live well south of Country Club Drive.

To conclude, the districts as drawn on maps 105 and 109 are inherently non-compliant with the California Voting Rights Act, divide multiple communities of interest, dilute the collective voice of voters in north Palm Desert, and reduce the quality of representation by future council members.

Therefore, I urge the council to remove maps 105 and 109 from consideration and instead focus on the remaining submissions that respect communities of interest and Palm Desert tradition.

Thank you,
Gregg Akkerman
Palm Desert Resident, Chair of Parks and Recreation Committee