

# Council District Boundary Review Meeting Packet April 5, 2022

To advance to the background material for each item in the agenda, click on the item title in the agenda or click on Bookmarks in the tool bar on the left side of your screen.



**AGENDA**  
**CITY OF RICHARDSON – COUNCIL DISTRICT BOUNDARY COMMISSION**  
**TUESDAY, APRIL 5, 2022, AT 6:15 P.M.**  
**CIVIC CENTER – COUNCIL CHAMBERS**  
**411 W. ARAPAHO ROAD**

---

The Council District Boundary Commission Meeting will be held in the City Council Chambers.

---

**REGULAR BUSINESS MEETING: 6:15 P.M. – CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

**MINUTES**

1. **Approval of minutes of the regular business meeting of March 22, 2022.**

**ADJOURN**

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE ABOVE AGENDA WAS POSTED ON THE BULLETIN BOARD AT CITY HALL ON OR BEFORE 5:30 P.M., FRIDAY, APRIL 1, 2022.

\_\_\_\_\_  
KEITH KRUM, SENIOR PLANNER

ACCOMMODATION REQUESTS FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES SHOULD BE MADE AT LEAST 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE MEETING BY CONTACTING LINDSAY TURMAN, ADA COORDINATOR, VIA PHONE AT 972 744-0908, VIA EMAIL AT ADACoordinator@COR.GOV, OR BY APPOINTMENT AT 411 W. ARAPAHO ROAD, RICHARDSON, TEXAS 75080.

PURSUANT TO SECTION 30.06 PENAL CODE (TRESPASS BY HOLDER WITH A CONCEALED HANDGUN), A PERSON LICENSED UNDER SUBCHAPTER H, CHAPTER 411, GOVERNMENT CODE (HANDGUN LICENSING LAW), MAY NOT ENTER THIS PROPERTY WITH A CONCEALED HANDGUN.

PURSUANT TO SECTION 30.07 PENAL CODE (TRESPASS BY HOLDER WITH AN OPENLY CARRIED HANDGUN), A PERSON LICENSED UNDER SUBCHAPTER H, CHAPTER 411, GOVERNMENT CODE (HANDGUN LICENSING LAW), MAY NOT ENTER THIS PROPERTY WITH A HANDGUN THAT IS CARRIED OPENLY.

# Agenda Item 1

Approval of the Minutes of the March 22, 2022  
Council District Boundary Commission Meeting

**CITY OF RICHARDSON  
COUNCIL DISTRICT BOUNDARY COMMISSION MINUTES – MARCH 22, 2022**

The Richardson Council District Boundary Commission met on March 22, 2022, at 7:00 p.m. in the City Council Chambers, 411 W. Arapaho Road, Richardson, Texas.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Bryan Marsh, Chairman  
Stephen Springs, Vice Chairman  
Joe Costantino, Commissioner  
Nate Roberts, Commissioner  
Sibyl LaCour, Commissioner  
Gwen Walraven, Commissioner  
Michael Keller, Commissioner  
Gary Beach, Commissioner

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Kenneth Southard, Commissioner

**CITY STAFF PRESENT:** Sam Chavez, Interim Director – Development Services  
Chris Shacklett, Interim Asst. Director – Planning  
Keith Krum, Senior Planner – Long Range Planning  
Connie Ellwood, Executive Secretary

**WORK SESSION**

The Council District Boundary Commission met with staff in the City Council Chambers on Tuesday, March 22 for a work session.

1. Approval of the minutes of the work session meeting of February 22, 2022.

**Motion:** Commissioner Costantino moved to approve the minutes as presented; seconded by Commissioner Roberts. Motion passed 8-0.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

2. Consider and act on recommendations to the City Council for adjustments to the City Council District boundaries in compliance with the requirements of Section 4.03 of the City of Richardson City Charter. *Staff: Keith Krum.*

Mr. Keith Krum began his presentation by reviewing the boundary requirements along with the historical information concerning the council district boundaries.

Article 4 of the City Charter required the election of six City Council members and the mayor.

- Four (4) elected to “places” that correspond to geographic districts (Council Places 1 through 4)
- Two elected at-large
- Mayor elected at-large

- Registered voters vote on all positions in each election

The Charter also required the City Council to appoint a Commission every ten (10) years to review Council District boundaries to ensure population equality between the districts. The City Council must revise/realign the boundaries, if necessary, by ordinance within six (6) months of the Commission's appointment. The Commission was appointed at the end of January. The deadline for a adoption of the revised boundaries is July 24, 2022.

Prior to 1989, Council District boundaries in Richardson were Central Expressway and Belt Line Road/Main Street. In 1989, a charter election took place adding the requirement to review the boundaries after a census along with approving new district boundaries. In 1992, the first year that the requirement took place, the Council District boundaries were reviewed, but no changes were necessary. In 2002 and 2012, the boundaries were revised. Mr. Krum noted that when he calculated the deviation in the boundaries prior to 1989, the result was 111%.

Mr. Krum then reviewed the boundary criteria for consideration:

- Substantial equality of population among districts, which is traditionally held as a maximum deviation of no more than 10%
- Identifiable boundaries, such as highways, streets or creeks
- Districts that are compact and contiguous
- Avoid splitting neighborhood between districts
- Avoid dual member districts where current district members are placed in the same district or moving a Council Member out of a district and into another.

Mr. Krum provided data related to current boundaries:

- The 2010 Population/Deviation when the Boundary Commission and Council completed this exercise in 2012 was 4.5%, and the population at that time was just under 100,000 with the ideal district population at approximately 25,000 residents.
- The 2020 population over the last ten (10) years added an additional 20,000 residents to the city, making the total population 119,469. The ideal population for each district would be just under 30,000 residents. The current total deviation for Richardson's current City Council districts is 41.7%, well above the goal deviation of 10%. Additionally, Districts 1, 2 and 3 were below the ideal district population, with District 4 being the only district above the ideal population. The current boundaries did not split any neighborhoods or homeowners' associations.

Mr. Krum continued by presenting the two (2) options for consideration.

### **Option A**

- Option A had a total deviation of 6.0%
- The changes being made between current boundaries and Option A included:
  - Lennox area residential moves from District 3 to District 4 (moved 719 residents to District 4)

- Northrich neighborhood moves from District 4 to District 3 (moved 5,077 residents to District 3)
- The Richardson IQ (including the Eastside and GreenVue developments) moves from District 4 to District 2 (moved 1,657 residents to District 2)
- Mark Twain neighborhood moves from District 4 to District 1 (moved 2,654 residents to District 1)

Option A met all criteria, with District 2 being less compact than the other districts.

### **Option B**

- Option B had a total deviation of 4.5%
- The changes being made between current boundaries and Option B included:
  - Lennox area residential moves from District 3 to District 4 (moved 719 residents to District 4)
  - Northrich neighborhood moves from District 4 to District 3 (moved 5,077 residents to District 3)
  - The portion of the CityLine development between Plano Road and the DART Rail moves from District 4 to District 2 (moved 2,366 residents to District 2)
  - Mark Twain neighborhood moves from District 4 to District 1 (moved 2,654 residents to District 1)

Option B met all criteria, except that CityLine was split between District 2 and District 4.

Mr. Krum concluded his presentation and made himself available for questions.

Chairman Marsh asked about the criteria for neighborhood splitting and communities of interest and what was meant by communities of interest.

Mr. Krum responded that CityLine would be considered a community of interest even though there was not a formal neighborhood association. There was a proximity to the residential buildings where residents have common areas that allow for interaction with one another. They were somewhat different than traditional garden style apartments, where a gated complex would limit interaction with neighboring communities.

Chairman Marsh commented there was no scorecard as to which of the stated criteria carried more weight, rather the criteria were merely items to be considered with the population deviation percentage being the most important.

Mr. Krum concurred.

Commissioner Springs asked about the splitting of CityLine and how large a difference it would be to split. He also asked what the total number of residents would be for the IQ.

Mr. Krum stated he had data supporting the inquiry, however it was not available at the present time.

Mr. Shacklett stated on the west side of the DART Rail there were approximately 705 apartment units and a development with fifty-eight (58) townhomes currently under construction.

Mr. Krum responded that the 705 apartment units were not in the portion that was being considered for shifting from District 4 to District 2.

Chairman Marsh responded that the Eastside and GreenVue area (within the Richardson IQ) was approximately 1,650 residents versus 2,366 within CityLine.

Mr. Krum confirmed the Richardson IQ was approximately 1,650 residents.

With no further questions of staff, Chairman Marsh opened the public hearing and asked if there was anyone that wanted to speak in favor or opposition of the request.

Chairman Marsh stated there was only one response received in favor of Option A and in opposition of Option B.

With no further comments in favor or in opposition of the request, Chairman Marsh asked the Commission to decide on continuing the public hearing, which would allow the community to provide input on the options presented or allow the Commission to consider an additional option. He also asked if an additional option was presented, would it be as part of a new public hearing or could it be considered under the current public hearing.

Mr. Chavez responded that the public hearing could be continued to consider another option or receive additional information from staff. It was staff's preference the public hearing be left open should that be the direction of the Commission in order to avoid readvertising and pushing the date for a hearing out by fifteen (15) days.

He continued by stating that the public had sufficient time to voice their opinion through the on-line comment cards, articles in the newspaper, and articles in Community Impact, as well as attendance at this evening's public hearing. He recommended that prior to making a motion, if the motion was to forward a recommendation or recommendations to the Council, that the motion would include to recommend approval of a certain option or options and to close the public hearing with the motion as opposed to the way the City Plan Commission issues the closure prior to the motion.

Chairman Marsh asked the Commission if they were comfortable with the two (2) options that had been presented and if they were ready to move forward with selecting one (1) option to recommend to Council or to recommend both option.

Commissioner Walraven was inclined not to split CityLine (Option B) and go with Option A.

Commissioner LaCour stated she was at first inclined to go with Option B due to the fact it had a lower percentage deviation; however, after reviewing the comment provided in opposition, she agreed and would be supporting Option A.

Vice Chairman Springs observed the IQ historically had been in the current zone over the last twenty (20) years. He stated that that after further review, he was inclined to go with Option A.

Commissioner Beach stated that he preferred Option B, even with the one (1) comment received in opposition and felt it was not statistically significant. He continued by stating that every resident in the City had one (1) vote for every Council Member regardless of district or at-large. He was still inclined to support Option B due to the fact it fit the parameter of the lowest deviation and felt there would be more growth where that deviation would expand over time.

Commissioner Costantino stated he was in favor of Option A.

Commissioner Roberts stated he was in favor of Option A. He did not feel that another option needed to be brought forward.

Commissioner Keller stated he concurred that another option was not necessary and was satisfied to move forward with the options presented. He disagreed with Commissioner Beach's observation about splitting the CityLine area. He stated while it was true that every resident could vote for each person that would be running for individual districts, there was something to be said regarding the individuals running for said district and how they would represent the neighborhood, which tied into the idea of not splitting neighborhoods. He felt the individual representing a district would look out for the best interest of the residents in their district, which to him made sense to keep communities of interest together. He was not totally supportive of having the IQ as shown in Option A, but he felt that Option A was the better option so that CityLine would not be split, keeping the unity within the community of interest.

Chairman Marsh stated he liked both options, originally leaning more towards Option A but moving towards Option B due to the lowest deviation and the compactness of the districts. The public comment did sway his opinion of the importance of keeping the unity within the community of interest for CityLine, even though it was not recognized as a neighborhood association. If CityLine was split between districts, there was potential to have two (2) Council Members residing within CityLine (one on the west side of the DART Rail and one on the east side of the DART Rail). He did not feel that made sense. In Option A, District 2 would have the smallest population and the most room to grow. With the DART Arapaho Station and the mixed-use zoning put in place, he felt over the next ten (10) years, there should be more growth within that area. He was leaning towards Option A.

Mr. Chavez stated what was unique in the on-line response card was the description of CityLine as a community. The original vision for CityLine was to create a community, and the comments from a resident indicated that the vision had come to fruition.



With no further comments in favor or opposition, Chairman Marsh closed the public hearing and asked for a motion.

**Motion:** Commissioner Walraven made a motion to close the public hearing and to recommend approval of Option A: Seconded by Vice Chairman Springs. Motion passed 7-1. Commissioner Beach in opposition.

**ADJOURN**

With no further business before the Commission, Chairman Marsh adjourned the regular business meeting at 7:37 p.m.

---

Bryan Marsh, Chairman

DRAFT