CITY OF RICHARDSON
COUNCIL DISTRICT BOUNDARY COMMISSION
MINUTES – APRIL 24, 2012

The Council District Boundary Commission met April 24, 2012 at 7:00 p.m. at City Hall in the Council Chambers on the first floor, 411 W. Arapaho Road, Richardson, Texas.

MEMBERS PRESENT:
Bill Hammond, Vice Chair
Gerald Bright, Commission Member
Janet DePuy, Commission Member
Marilyn Frederick, Commission Member
Barry Hand, Commission Member
Thomas Maxwell, Commission Member
Don Bouvier, Commission Member
Eron Linn, Commission Member

MEMBERS ABSENT:
David Gantt, Chairman

CITY STAFF PRESENT:
Michael Spicer, Director of Development Services
Keith Krum, Sr. Planner
Kevin Laughlin, City Attorney
Kathy Welp, Executive Secretary

1. **Meeting convened at 7:02 p.m.**

2. **Minutes of April 3, 2012 meeting.**

   Motion: Mr. Bright made a motion to approve the minutes as presented; second by Mr. Hand. Motion passed 7-0.

3. **Staff presentation of district boundary criteria and three district boundary options under consideration.**

   Mr. Krum opened the presentation by noting that reconfiguration of Council district boundaries was covered under the Voting Rights Act and reviewed criteria the Commission had considered when making their decision, as follows:

Federal (required)	Local (discretionary)
Population deviation between most populous and least populous should not exceed 10%.	Boundaries should keep incumbents in their respective districts.
Boundaries should be compact and contiguous.	Boundaries should respect existing HOA boundaries.
Boundaries should follow roadways or other easily identifiable physical features.	Boundaries should not be precluded from crossing Central Expressway.
Boundaries should not dilute minority voting strength.	Boundaries should account for future growth where possible.

Mr. Krum presented the Commission's three selected options, highlighting the percent of population deviation, impact on Homeowners Associations (HOA) boundaries, racial and ethnic population percentages, proposed district compactness and contiguity, and the physical boundaries of each option.

No action was taken.

4. **Public Hearing to receive comments related to the three district boundary options under consideration.**

Mr. Joseph Elliott, President of Cottonwood Creek Civic Association (CCCA), 12 Vicksburg Lane, Richardson, Texas, read a statement from the Association's Board of Directors stating that Option 2 posed a severe disruption to their neighborhood integrity and would impair the strong bond between their civic association and the Canyon Creek Homeowners Association (CCHOA). He asked that Option 2 not be adopted and indicated that Option 1 was the best for the City.

Mr. Hand asked Mr. Elliott to explain his opposition to Option 2 and his statement that it would severely break down collaboration between the CCCA and the Canyon Creek Homeowners Association.

Mr. Elliott replied that the two neighborhoods are inter-mingled through a variety of activities and programs and that establishing an artificial boundary could sever the close ties between the two areas that have existed for some time.

Mr. Chip Pratt, 2700 W. Prairie Creek, Richardson, Texas, representing Canyon Creek Homeowners Association, stated he had received feedback from 8 of 10 board members and all were in support of Option 1. He concurred with Mr. Elliott's assessment that the two neighborhoods have shared community interests and it would not be in the best interest of either group for Option 2 to be approved.

Ms. Cathe Schmitt, 510 Canyon Creek Drive, Richardson, Texas, stated she was in favor of Option 1.

Mr. Jeremy Thomason, 3301 Canyon Creek Drive, Richardson, Texas, Board Member of Canyon Creek Homeowners Association, asked that the record reflect that the CCHOA was in support of the continuity between the two groups expressed by the Mr. Elliott and supported Option 1.

Mr. Andrew Laska, 502 Hyde Park, Richardson, Texas, President of the Richardson Heights Neighborhood Association (RHNA), stated his association adamantly opposed Option 1, favored Option 2, and accepted Option 3. He added that Option 1 created a segregated district in the City in terms of income, housing types, house values, future development, and traditional representation.

Mr. Charlie Newton, 2106 Goldenrod Drive, Richardson, Texas, concurred with Mr. Laska's comments and recommended that property values for each option should also be considered. He stated that Option 2 was the most balanced, and Options 1 and 3 were too similar to the current boundaries.

Mr. Pratt returned to state that it was his opinion citizens from the middle and upper income homes tend to be more involved with the City, and there was a distinct possibility that if Option 2 were approved, all elected officials could feasibly come from areas north of Belt Line Road, whereas in Options 1 and 3 that possibility was less likely.

Ms. Kathy Dreyer, 2 Lundy's Lane, Richardson, Texas, agreed with earlier statements that CCCA and CCHOA were very much like one association and she did not want them separated. Ms. Dreyer added that while her first vote was for Option 1, Option 3 would be more acceptable than Option 2.

Mr. Laska returned to say that he would prefer to have a district boundary going through his neighborhood because that would mean two council representatives would be covering the one neighborhood. He added that those who opposed Option 2 may not have considered the advantages of having two elected officials representing their areas; however, he stated that Option 3 would be an acceptable compromise.

There being no further comments, Vice Chair Hammond recognized Ms. Nancy Wilson, who was in the audience, and the part she played in the redistricting process for the City after the 2000 U.S. Census. The public hearing was closed.

5. **Take necessary action related to the Commission's consideration of the three district boundary options.**

Vice Chair Hammond said he appreciated those in the audience for taking the time to come out and express their opinions. He noted there were several paths the Commission could take before making a recommendation to the City Council and requested comments from the Commission.

Mr. Hand suggested that given some of the comments from the public, and questions brought up during the work session, he felt it was prudent to allow staff to gather additional information and for the Members to meet again at a later date.

Vice Chair Hammond asked if it would be possible for the staff to gather the additional information to have a meeting on May 1st or May 15th.

Mr. Krum replied that there would not be enough time to prepare the additional information the Commission was requesting by May 1. He added that another option may be to meet in between those meeting in two weeks.

Vice Chair Hammond assured the public that there would be further discussion and another meeting with the date to be determined within the first two weeks of May.

Mr. Bouvier asked for clarification concerning what would be considered at the next meeting, and whether a second public hearing was being recommended. He added that the notification for tonight's hearing had gone well beyond what was typically required for a public hearing and did not think another public hearing was necessary.

Mr. Hand responded that the Commission would review additional information identified during the Commission's briefing session for each option and district, including: rental percentage, median income, age of homes, and property values. In addition, he stated that having another public hearing might be beneficial and would demonstrate the transparency of the process before the decided upon option is submitted for final approval.

Mr. Bright said he was the one who suggested another public hearing to give citizens who could not attend tonight's meeting another opportunity to address the Commission. He acknowledged that the public hearing posting exceeded what was required.

Ms. Frederick stated that having another public hearing would be helpful only if new and relevant information were presented, as opposed to repeating the same comments from the current public hearing.

Mr. Linn reminded the Commission that the redistricting process happens once every ten years and it was their responsibility to make sure all the citizens and HOAs were given the opportunity to be heard.

Motion: Mr. Hand made a motion directing staff to gather the additional information identified and reconvene in at least one week for further deliberation to determine which option(s) would be sent to the City Council; second by Ms. Frederick.

Mr. Bright asked staff if one week to gather all the information was feasible.

Mr. Krum replied that the next City Plan Commission agenda on May 1 would be a lengthy one, including three zoning cases that required public hearings. He added that he did not think there was sufficient time to prepare the information by May 1.

Vice Chair Hammond clarified that a meeting date did not need to be decided at the moment, especially taking into consideration the concerns raised by Mr. Krum, but another meeting would be held soon, at a future date to be determined.

Motion passed 4-3 with Mr. Bouvier, Mr. Bright, and Ms. DePuy opposed.

6. Determine next meeting date, if necessary

No action taken.

7. Adjourned.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:56 p.m.

Bill Hammond, Vice Chair
Council District Boundary Commission