

Anthony Mejia

From: Anthony Mejia
Sent: Monday, December 18, 2023 1:00 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: 109 District Map Public Comment

Ms. Wood:

Thank you for your email. It will be provided to the City Council and retained for the official record.

Additionally, if you click this link, you will find an interactive mapping tool in which you can zoom in and out of the district boundaries similar to Google Maps.

<https://ndcresearch.maps.arcgis.com/apps/View/index.html?appid=ffed291898ea45dd87ed07b70fd18704>

And finally, I want to mention that the City Council did not consider any adjustments to the District 1 boundaries because those boundaries were established under the existing settlement agreement. Any changes to District 1 would require the approval from the plaintiffs and court.

-----Original Message-----

From: TERRY WOOD <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, December 18, 2023 2:06 AM
To: CouncilMeeting Comments <CouncilMeetingComments@palmdesert.gov>
Subject: 109 District Map Public Comment

December 18, 2023

Dear Council Members and Mayor of Palm Desert,

I am commenting on the renumbered 109 Map that you presented online at your December 14th, 2023 council meeting. Do you have a more detailed map of boundary streets because it is very vague towards Fred Warning area boundaries. I only see a few major streets on the entire map. Also, why not give Election area 1 the area west of Cook Street before Fred Warning and (by high school) South of Fred Warning to Deep Canyon. If I am reading the map correctly, it just seems little out of place with these added areas. I know you are trying to get the population numbers as close as possible to balance all the new districts. District 4 boundaries seem to zig zag from the Cook Street at that very end.

The voters in this newly proposed area 4 might question this if this little part added at the end includes the residences of current Councilman Trubee and/or Nestande in it.

Lastly, I did send in a comment by email to council a few months ago requesting that Zone 4 be able to vote in 2024 election for I believe that this zone has not been represented by a resident in the area of Hovely and Cook to Washington Street in city council ever if I am correct in the last 20 plus years.

Terry Wood
Palm Desert

January 10, 2024

Re: Redistricting and comments opposed to approval of Map 109

Madame Mayor and City Council,

I attended the City Council meeting on December 14, 2023, to voice my opposition to Map 109 and for the Council to reconsider including a revised version of Map 102 (referred to Map 102C) for approval. Despite numerous substantive comments provided by me and other residents that will be impacted the most from redistricting, I am very disappointed that the Council decided to exclude consideration of Map 102C. After the public comment period ended and the Council provided feedback on the public's comments, I believe the Council was not willing to be objective and consider the desire of residents in the northern sphere for Map 102C to be considered.

I also wanted to convey that I felt that most of Council's comments in opposition to considering an additional map were directed at me and others that challenged the City's decision to proceed with only one map. I was merely voicing my request for Council to reconsider Map 102C and request that the Council follow its own stated objective to consider 2-3 maps instead of just one. No resident should be made to feel uncomfortable when voicing an opinion that may be different than that of the Council's.

One of the primary reasons I am disappointed by the Council's action was to ignore substantive comments from northern sphere residents and other supporters of Map 102C when the vast majority of verbal and written public support of Map 109 was not supported with reasons to justify why Map 109 would be a better map except that it would make it more fair to all City residents. I strongly disagree with this premise since most supporters of Map 102C residents most likely do not live in the northern sphere and therefore will not be impacted by the boundaries proposed on Map 102C.

As for more specific comments that were made, I have the following observations and takeaways. Councilwoman Kelly called considering residents whose children go to the same school district as a Community of Interest to be as a "red herring." I researched various websites for how the State and other Cities define a Community of Interest and of the information I reviewed, school districts were consistently noted as one of the top Communities of Interest. Interestingly, a flood control drainage system that was referred to by Councilwoman Kelly was not mentioned as a Community of Interest in any information I researched. In my opinion it is a "red herring" is to refer to a drainage conveyance as a Community of Interest.

Another significant takeaway for me was Councilman Trubee's comment that he did not have a clear understanding of the school district boundaries and that children north of Frank Sinatra go to Palm Springs Unified schools. To me this is another example of a fundamental disconnect between the City and residents in the northern sphere. It is inappropriate to draw council district boundaries that bifurcate school districts as is done on Map 109 but the Council appears determined to not consider this as reality and to recognize school districts as a true Community of Interest.

Another red herring is to assume by approving Map 109, northern sphere residents may benefit by possibly being represented by two councilmembers. Since Map 109 splits up a true northern sphere district and District 5 includes land southward to just north of Hwy. 111, it is highly speculative and most

likely not to occur. If a councilmember does not live in the northern sphere, it would be difficult for that person to have first-hand knowledge of unique challenges we face in the northern sphere.

In closing, my observation is that the City was not transparent during the redistricting process and that by not considering the numerous substantive comments provided by northern sphere residents and others, the redistricting process did not appear to be objective and that the City's request to have public input was disingenuous. If the process had been objective, Council would have at least reconsidered Map 102C especially once it was confirmed by the demographer that it would be a viable map that meets the criteria consistent with regulatory requirements.

As a northern sphere resident, I do not support Map 109 for reasons that have been iterated and I respectfully ask that you keep the northern sphere intact and you reconsider your decision to exclude Map 102 C from consideration.

Sincerely,

Michael J Stafford

[REDACTED]

Palm Desert, CA 92211

[REDACTED]