CITY OF RICHARDSON
COUNCIL DISTRICT BOUNDARY COMMISSION
MINUTES – APRIL 3, 2012

The Council District Boundary Commission met April 3, 2012 at 5:30 p.m. at City Hall in the East Conference Room on the first floor, 411 W. Arapaho Road, Richardson, Texas.

MEMBERS PRESENT:
David Gantt, Chairman
Gerald Bright, Commission Member
Janet DePuy, Commission Member
Marilyn Frederick, Commission Member
Barry Hand, Commission Member
Thomas Maxwell, Commission Member

MEMBERS ABSENT:
Bill Hammond, Vice Chair
Don Bouvier, Commission Member
Eron Linn, Commission Member

CITY STAFF PRESENT:
Michael Spicer, Director of Development Services
Susan Smith, Asst. Dir. of Dev. Svcs – Dev. & Engr.
Israel Roberts, Development Review Manager
Keith Krum, Sr. Planner
Chris Shacklett, Planner
Kevin Laughlin, City Attorney
Kathy Welp, Executive Secretary

1. **Meeting convened at 5:37 p.m.**

2. **Minutes of March 20, 2012 meeting.**

   Motion: Mr. Bright made a motion to approve the minutes as presented; second by Mr. Hand. Motion passed 6-0.

3. **Review and discuss demographic data, physical characteristics, and criteria associated with Options A through D and new Options G and H.**

   Mr. Krum reported that the suggestion from the Members to use the alleys as boundaries prompted staff to re-examine all the options. Staff found that in Option C, the area adjacent to Richland Park, some census blocks had been split by district boundaries, but the populations had not been properly allocated. Therefore, he went through the exercise of distributing the population more accurately, which resulted in a population increase of 300 moving from District 1 to District 3. He also pointed out the differences between Options G and H and noted that Option H rated the best in terms of compactness.

   Chairman Gantt stated the options that do not split the districts using the census blocks made more sense to him.

Mr. Krum replied that current boundaries follow the alley by Richland Park so it was not unprecedented to have an alley as a boundary that split census blocks.

Mr. Hand said he did not have a problem with using the alleys as boundaries, but Chairman Gantt thought there was the possibility of public scrutiny if the census blocks were split.

Mr. Laughlin replied he did not think that would be the case because census blocks are an administrative tool for the Census Bureau to use for statistical purposes, but the criteria of the Voting Rights Act (i.e., neighborhoods, natural boundaries, etc.), would be more important.

Chairman Gantt said he thought the next step was to reduce the number of options to a more manageable number and present those options at the public hearing.

Mr. Hand suggested moving forward with Options C, G, and H. Mr. Krum pointed out that Options C and H were very similar.

Chairman Gantt asked why Mr. Hand preferred those options and Mr. Hand replied that Options C and G were very different and, to use the staff's improvements, H should be included.

Ms. DePuy reminded the Members that a suggestion had been made in a previous meeting to present two totally different options at the public hearing.

Chairman Gantt noted there were presently six options and requested feedback from the Members as to which ones should be kept and which ones eliminated.

Mr. Hand suggested eliminating Option C and there was no opposition from the Members so C was eliminated.

Chairman Gantt noted that the major difference between Options A and B was the deviation, and Mr. Krum pointed out that difference came from where the Eastside development was located.

Mr. Bright, Mr. Hand, and Ms. Frederick stated they preferred Option A over Option B and the remaining Members concurred and eliminated Option B.

Mr. Krum asked for decision on Option D.

Ms. DePuy and Mr. Hand said the option seemed to be too fractured, and Mr. Bright thought of the four remaining options, D was the least desirable.

Chairman Gantt stated that Options D and G were similar, and it was preferable to have three options, but he liked G better than H. He added that G provided an alternative north/south configuration that allowed City Council representatives to cover the most area.

Mr. Hand thought Option H had the most potential for growth, and Options A, G, and H had a nice range of options. He also wanted to know if Option G could be strengthened by having District 1 cross Highway 75.

Chairman Gantt pointed out that the Bush/75 development would be on both sides of Highway 75, but Mr. Hand thought the Palisades area might be added to District 1 instead.

Mr. Krum pointed out that the Palisades did not contain any existing population so the total deviation would not be affected.

Chairman Gantt suggested moving a block of apartments at Alma and Highway 75 into District 1 to achieve the same purpose, but Mr. Krum replied that would lower the deviation and put all of the Bush/75 development in District 1.

Mr. Hand stated he thought District 1 might be okay as presented but needed room for growth, and Chairman Gantt noted that there was open land on the south side of Renner Road that is zoned for multi-family, in addition to land in District 2 along the turnpike.

Chairman Gantt asked if all the members were in agreement that Options A, G, and H should move forward to the public hearing.

Motion: Mr. Bright moved to present Options A, G, and H at the public hearing; second by Ms. Frederick. Motion passed 6-0.

4. **Determine which options to present at public hearing.**

   The Members directed staff to present Options A, G and H at the public hearing.

5. **Set next meeting and/or public hearing date(s).**

   The public hearing date is tentatively set for Tuesday, April 24, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

6. **Adjourn**

   The meeting was adjourned at 6:18 p.m.

Bill Hammond

FOR David Gantt, Chairman
Council District Boundary Commission