

AGENDA ITEM 37

Discuss and take any appropriate action on redistricting.

Sydney Falk with Bickerstaff, Heath & Smiley discussed the various proposed redistricting plans and answered questions.

Ronald Swain, a resident of The Ridge neighborhood, inquired about minority representation in the proposed plans.

Moved: **Commissioner Heiligenstein**

Seconded: **Judge Doerfler**

Motion: To present the JD4 and MH3 redistricting plans for consideration at the public hearing scheduled for July 31, 2001.

Vote: **5 – 0**

< Attachment >

Bickerstaff, Heath, Smiley, Pollan, Kever & McDaniel, L.L.P.

1700 Frost Bank Plaza

816 Congress Avenue

Austin, Texas 78701-2443

(512)472-8021

Fax (512)320-5638

www.bickerstaff.com

July 17, 2001

The Honorable John C. Doerfler
County Judge
710 Main Street
Georgetown, TX 78626

The Honorable Mike Heiligenstein
Commissioner, Precinct 1
400 West Main, #218
Georgetown, TX 78664

The Honorable David Hays
Commissioner, Precinct 3
3161 SE Inner Loop, Suite C
Georgetown, TX 78626

The Honorable Greg Boatright
Commissioner, Precinct 2
350 Discovery Blvd., Suite 201
Cedar Park, TX 78613

The Honorable Frankie Limmer
Commissioner, Precinct 4
412 Vance
Taylor, TX 78574

Re: Report on Plans JD4 and DH2

Dear Judge and Commissioners:

We have reviewed redistricting plans Plan JD4 and Plan DH2. An analysis of how each plan addresses the redistricting criteria adopted by the Commissioners Court follows.

Plans JD4 and DH2 were constructed by the County GIS department and provided to us for review. In each proposed plan, Commissioner Precincts 2 and 4 are left unchanged, because both those precincts were close enough to the ideal precinct population size as to not require adjustment to achieve the population balance required by the one person-one vote requirement of the U.S. Constitution.

Current Commissioner Precinct 1 is under-populated by 14.85% compared to the ideal precinct size, while current Precinct 3 is over-populated by 11.95%. The two plans

represent alternative approaches to bringing these two adjacent precincts into the required population balance.

In Plan JD4, existing Precinct 1's western boundary is expanded westward into the southern peninsula of current Precinct 3, adding two whole VTDs with substantial population to proposed Precinct 1, while the northern peninsula area of current Precinct 1 that includes part of Georgetown and the area south of Georgetown (south to Old Settler's Road) – all east of Interstate Highway 35 – is transferred from current Precinct 1 to proposed Precinct 3. The resulting configurations of the proposed precincts are more compact than the current configurations.

In Plan DH2, the northern peninsula of current Precinct 1 is retained in proposed Precinct 1, and the additional population needed by Precinct 1 is added by simply transferring one of the VTDs in the southern peninsula of current Precinct 3 to the western part of proposed Precinct 1, together with a part of the second VTD in that peninsular area of current Precinct 3. This plan thus makes less substantial changes to the current configurations of these commissioner precincts, but retains their relatively less compact current configurations.

Both plans appear to satisfy applicable legal requirements as well as the redistricting criteria adopted by the Court.

Criterion 1: Where possible, easily identifiable geographic boundaries should be followed.

It is easier for citizens to determine the Commissioner precinct where they live if the precinct boundaries follow a major street or natural boundary like a river. All commissioner precincts in Plans JD4 and DH2 follow geographic boundaries, except (a) when the outer boundaries of the County do not follow streets, rivers or other geographic sites; or (b) where the Commissioner precinct line does not follow the boundaries of a voter tabulation district ("VTD"); or (c) where a VTD line has been split, usually to honor city limit lines.

Criterion 2: Communities of interest should be maintained in a single precinct, where possible, and attempts should be made to avoid splitting neighborhoods.

To the extent practicable, where communities of interest were identified to us, Plans JD4 and DH2 have avoided splitting them. Plan JD4 keeps the City of Georgetown intact (all in proposed Commissioner Precinct 3), while Plan DH2 retains the existing assignment of Georgetown partly in Precinct 1 and partly in Precinct 3.

Criterion 3: To the extent possible, Commissioner precincts should be composed of whole voting precincts. Where this is not possible or practicable, Commissioner precincts should be drawn in a way that permits the creation of practical voting

precincts and that ensures that adequate facilities for polling places exist in each precinct.

It is not yet determined to what extent the County will have to make changes in the current configuration of its voting precincts as a result of state redistricting line changes or to satisfy state law requirements regarding numbers of registered voters, but using the current voting precincts (VTDs) as the basic building units in a redistricting plan ensures to the degree possible that there are adequate polling places and provides administration efficiency. To the extent possible, the commissioner precincts in Plans JD4 and DH2 are composed almost entirely of whole voter tabulation districts. Plan JD4 splits six VTDs and Plan DH2 splits eleven VTDs.

Criterion 4: Although it is recognized that existing commissioner precincts will have to be altered to reflect new population distribution, any districting plan should be based on existing precincts to the extent possible.

Although it is always possible to construct plans that differ considerably from the current districting plan, such changes tend to cause voter confusion and interfere with constituent-incumbent relations. Both plans JD4 and DH2 are based on the current commissioner precincts, which remain in relatively the same geographic relationship to each other. Because of the disparities in population distribution over the decade, some precinct lines had to be moved to balance population. As noted above, it was not necessary to adjust the boundaries of current Precincts 2 and 4.

Criterion 5: Precincts must be configured so that they are relatively equal in total population according to the 2000 federal census. In no event should the total deviation between the largest and the smallest commissioner precinct exceed ten percent.

The precincts in both plans JD4 and DH2 are relatively equal in total population according to the 2000 federal census, with a maximum total population deviation in Plan JD4 of 8.77%, and Plan DH2 of 7.39%, as compared with the maximum total deviation of 26.80% for the current precincts.

Precinct 2 currently has a total population of 65,237, which is 4.39% above the ideal size. Precinct 4 currently has a total population of 61,560, which is 1.49% below the ideal size. This is well within the permissible 10% total maximum deviation. As no population adjustment was necessary, they remain unchanged.

Plan JD4

Precinct 1 currently has a total population of 53,211, which is 14.85% under the ideal size. Plan JD4's Precinct 1 has a total population of 63,413, which brings it to 1.47% above the ideal size.

Precinct 3 currently has a total population of 69,959, which is 11.95% above the ideal size. Plan JD4's Precinct 3 has a total population of 59,757, which makes it 4.38% below the ideal size.

Plan DH2

Precinct 1 currently has a total population of 53,211, which is 14.85% under the ideal size. Plan DH2's Precinct 1 has a total population of 62,555, which brings it to 0.10% above the ideal size.

Precinct 3 currently has a total population of 69,959, which is 11.95% above the ideal size. Plan DH2's Precinct 3 has a total population of 60,615, which makes it 3.00% below the ideal size.

Criterion 6: The precincts should be compact and composed of contiguous territory. Compactness may contain a functional, as well as a geographical dimension.

The precincts in both plans JD4 and DH2 are contiguous and relatively compact. Compactness can include functional considerations such as (a) the availability of transportation and communication, (b) the existence of common social and economic interests, (c) the ability of precincts to related to each other and (d) the existence of shared interests.

Plan JD4 results in precincts that are somewhat more compact than the precincts in Plan DH2 or the current configuration. Both plans satisfy this criterion.

Criterion 7: Consideration may be given to the preservation of incumbent-constituency relations by recognition of the residence of incumbents and their history in representing certain areas.

All incumbents have been retained in their current precincts in both plans, maintaining precinct cores and protecting incumbents from contests with each other.

Criteria 8 and 9: The plan should be narrowly tailored to avoid retrogression in the position of racial minorities as defined in the Voting Rights Act with respect to their effective exercise of the electoral franchise. The plan should not fragment a geographically compact minority community or pack minority voters in the presence of polarized voting so as to create liability under section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, 42 U.S.C. § 1973c.

Both plans avoid retrogression and do not fragment a geographically compact minority community or pack minority voters. Currently, there are three majority Anglo precincts and one plurality precinct. Both plans leave Precincts 2 and 4 as they are

currently configured. Neither plan retrogresses since the plurality precinct, Precinct 2, remains unchanged.

Precinct 2 is currently a majority Anglo precinct. Its current total population is made up of 13.31% Hispanics, 79.57% Anglos, and 2.95% African-Americans, with respective voting age populations of 11.76%, 81.47% and 2.79%.

Precinct 4 is currently a majority Anglo precinct. Its current total population is made up of 23.41% Hispanics, 64.04% Anglos and 9.17% African-Americans, with respective voting age populations of 20.80%, 67.28% and 8.89%.

Plan JD4

Precinct 1 is currently a majority Anglo precinct. Its current total population is made up of 21.09% Hispanics, 67.48% Anglos and 5.41% African-Americans with respective voting age populations of 19.17%, 70.10% and 5.01%. Plan JD4's Precinct 1 is composed of 16.72% Hispanics, 70.66% Anglos and 5.17% African-Americans. The voting age population in Plan JD4 is 15.44% Hispanic, 72.65% Anglo and 4.84% African-American. JD Plan 4's Precinct 1 is a majority Anglo precinct.

Precinct 3 is currently a majority Anglo precinct. Its current total population is made up of 12.40% Hispanics, 80.92% Anglos and 2.85% African-Americans, with respective voting age populations of 10.57%, 83.28% and 2.70%. Plan JD4's Precinct 3 is composed of 15.55% Hispanics, 79.84% Anglos and 2.67% African-Americans. The voting age population in Plan JD4 is 13.13% Hispanic, 82.57% Anglo and 2.54% African-American. Plan JD4's Precinct 3 is a majority Anglo precinct.

Plan DH2

Precinct 1 is currently a majority Anglo precinct. Its current total population is made up of 21.09% Hispanics, 67.48% Anglos and 5.41% African-Americans with respective voting age populations of 19.17%, 70.10% and 5.01%. Plan DH2's Precinct 1 is composed of 19.42% Hispanics, 68.50% Anglos and 5.34% African-Americans. The voting age population in Plan DH2 is 17.77% Hispanic, 70.88% Anglo and 4.97% African-American. DH2's Precinct 1 is a majority Anglo precinct.

Precinct 3 is currently a majority Anglo precinct. Its current total population is made up of 12.40% Hispanics, 80.92% Anglos and 2.85% African-Americans, with respective voting age populations of 10.57%, 83.28% and 2.70%. Plan DH2's Precinct 3 is composed of 12.78% Hispanics, 81.94% Anglos and 2.53% African-Americans. The voting age population in Plan DH2 is 10.79% Hispanic, 84.32% Anglo and 2.42% African-American. Plan DH2's Precinct 3 is a majority Anglo precinct.

07/17/2001

Page 303

Letter to the Commissioners' Court

July 17, 2001

Page 6

We hope this analysis has been helpful. We look forward to working with you as you refine this plan and consider other plans. Please do not hesitate to call us if you have questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Penny Redington", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Penny Redington
Sydney W. Falk, Jr.

PR/SWF/cmh
Attachment

Williamson County Commissioner Precincts

-Plan JD 4 -

2000 Census Total and Voting Age Population

District	Persons	Deviation	Hispanic % of Total Population	Non-Hispanic Anglo % of Total Population	Non-Hispanic Black % of Total Population	Non-Hispanic Asian % of Total Population	Non-Hispanic Other % of Total Population
1	63,413	1.47%	16.72%	70.66%	5.17%	5.56%	1.89%
2	65,237	4.39%	13.31%	79.57%	2.95%	2.25%	1.92%
3	59,757	-4.38%	15.55%	79.84%	2.67%	0.76%	1.18%
4	61,560	-1.49%	23.41%	64.04%	9.17%	1.68%	1.70%
Totals	249,967		17.20%	73.55%	4.98%	2.59%	1.68%

Ideal Size = $249,967/4 = 62,492$ per district.

Total Maximum Deviation = $[4.39\% - (-4.38\%)] = 8.77\%$

District	Total VAP*		Hispanic % of Total VAP	Non-Hispanic Anglo % of Total VAP	Non-Hispanic Black % of Total VAP	Non-Hispanic Asian % of Total VAP	Non-Hispanic Other % of Total VAP
1	44,182		15.44%	72.65%	4.84%	5.59%	1.48%
2	44,506		11.76%	81.47%	2.79%	2.43%	1.56%
3	43,734		13.13%	82.57%	2.54%	0.78%	0.99%
4	42,643		20.80%	67.28%	8.89%	1.70%	1.33%
Totals	175,065		15.23%	76.06%	4.73%	2.63%	1.34%

*Voting Age Population

7/16/01

Williamson County Commissioner Precincts
- Plan JD4 -

2000 Census Total and Voting Age Population

District	Persons	Ideal Size	Deviation	Hispanic	% of Total Hispanic Population	Anglo	% of Total Anglo Population	Black	% of Total Black Population	American Indian	% of Total American Indian Population	Asian	% of Total Asian Population	Hawaiian-Pacific Islander	% of Total Hawaiian-Pacific Islander Population	Other	% of Total Other Population	Two or More	% of Total Two or More Population
1	63,413	62,492	1.47%	10,605	16.72%	44,808	70.96%	3,277	5.17%	189	0.30%	3,527	5.56%	40	0.06%	56	0.09%	909	1.43%
2	65,237	62,492	4.39%	8,684	13.31%	51,906	79.57%	1,925	2.95%	224	0.34%	1,469	2.25%	53	0.08%	91	0.14%	885	1.36%
3	59,757	62,492	-4.38%	9,291	15.55%	47,712	79.04%	1,596	2.67%	152	0.25%	453	0.76%	20	0.03%	33	0.06%	500	0.84%
4	61,560	62,492	-1.49%	14,410	23.41%	39,421	64.04%	5,646	9.17%	194	0.32%	1,034	1.68%	48	0.08%	48	0.08%	759	1.23%
Totals	249,967			42,990	17.20%	183,847	73.55%	12,444	4.98%	759	0.30%	6,483	2.59%	161	0.06%	230	0.09%	3,053	1.22%

Ideal Size = 249,967/4 = 62,492 per district.



District	Total VAP	Hispanic VAP	% of Total Hispanic VAP	Anglo VAP	% of Total Anglo VAP	Black VAP	% of Total Black VAP	American Indian VAP	% of Total American Indian VAP	Asian VAP	% of Total Asian VAP	Hawaiian-Pacific Islander VAP	% of Total Hawaiian-Pacific Islander VAP	Other VAP	% of Total Other VAP	Two or More VAP	% of Total Two or More VAP
1	44,182	6,822	15.44%	32,087	72.65%	2,140	4.84%	134	0.30%	2,469	5.59%	26	0.06%	27	0.06%	467	1.06%
2	44,506	5,232	11.76%	36,259	81.47%	1,241	2.79%	164	0.37%	1,080	2.43%	35	0.08%	42	0.09%	453	1.02%
3	43,734	5,743	13.13%	36,109	82.57%	1,111	2.54%	120	0.27%	340	0.78%	17	0.04%	13	0.03%	281	0.64%
4	42,643	8,899	20.89%	28,692	67.28%	3,792	8.89%	143	0.34%	723	1.70%	35	0.08%	24	0.06%	366	0.86%
Totals	175,065	26,665	15.23%	133,157	76.06%	8,284	4.73%	561	0.32%	4,612	2.63%	113	0.06%	106	0.06%	1,567	0.90%

Voting Age Population

RECORDERS MEMORANDUM

All or parts of the text on this page was not
clearly legible for satisfactory reproduction.

Williamson County Commissioner Court Precincts Plan JD4



- Precinct 1
- Precinct 2
- Precinct 3
- Precinct 4
- Voting District
- Stream
- Road
- Water
- Existing Precinct
- Boundary

RECORDERS MEMORANDUM
All or parts of the text on this page was not
clearly legible for satisfactory reproduction.

Prepared By: Bickerstaff, Heath, Smiley, Pollan, Kever & McDaniel, L.L.P.
Data Sources: County Commissioner lines obtained from the Texas Legislative Council and projected into decimal degrees format.
Roads, water and other features obtained from the 2000 Tiger/line files, U.S. Census Bureau.

Williamson County

- Plan MH3 -

2000 Census Total and Voting Age Population

District	Persons	Deviation	Hispanic % of Total Population	Non-Hispanic Anglo % of Total Population	Non-Hispanic Black % of Total Population	Non-Hispanic Asian % of Total Population	Non-Hispanic Other % of Total Population
1	63,400	1.45%	19.31%	68.58%	5.35%	4.91%	1.85%
2	65,235	4.39%	13.31%	79.56%	2.95%	2.25%	1.92%
3	59,772	-4.35%	12.81%	82.05%	2.48%	1.45%	1.22%
4	61,560	-1.49%	23.41%	64.04%	9.17%	1.68%	1.70%
Totals	249,967		17.20%	73.55%	4.98%	2.59%	1.68%

Ideal Size = $249,967/4 = 62,492$ per district.

Total Maximum Deviation = $[4.39\% - (-4.35\%)] = 8.74\%$

District	Total VAP*		Hispanic % of Total VAP	Non-Hispanic Anglo % of Total VAP	Non-Hispanic Black % of Total VAP	Non-Hispanic Asian % of Total VAP	Non-Hispanic Other % of Total VAP
1	44,771		17.66%	70.97%	4.98%	4.93%	1.46%
2	44,504		11.76%	81.47%	2.79%	2.43%	1.56%
3	43,147		10.80%	84.44%	2.37%	1.40%	1.00%
4	42,643		20.80%	67.28%	8.89%	1.70%	1.33%
Totals	175,065		15.23%	76.06%	4.73%	2.63%	1.34%

*Voting Age Population

7/16/01

Williamson County
-Plan MH3-

2000 Census Total and Voting Age Population

District	Persons	Ideal Size	Deviation	Hispanic	% of Total Hispanic Population	Anglo	% of Total Anglo Population	Black	% of Total Black Population	American Indian	% of Total American Indian Population	Asian	% of Total Asian Population	Hawaiian- Pacific Islander	% of Total Hawaiian- Pacific Islander Population	Other	% of Total Other Population	Two or More	% of Total Two or More Population
1	63,400	62,492	1,45%	12,241	19.31%	43,482	68.59%	3,392	5.35%	195	0.31%	3,114	4.81%	33	0.05%	83	0.10%	880	1.39%
2	65,235	62,492	4.39%	8,684	13.31%	51,904	78.56%	1,925	2.95%	224	0.34%	1,469	2.25%	53	0.08%	91	0.14%	885	1.36%
3	59,772	62,492	-4.35%	7,655	12.61%	49,040	82.05%	1,481	2.48%	146	0.24%	866	1.45%	27	0.05%	28	0.05%	529	0.89%
4	61,560	62,492	-1.49%	14,410	23.41%	39,421	64.04%	5,946	9.17%	194	0.32%	1,004	1.68%	48	0.08%	46	0.08%	759	1.23%
Totals	249,967			42,990	17.20%	183,847	73.55%	12,444	4.98%	759	0.30%	6,483	2.59%	161	0.06%	230	0.09%	3,053	1.22%

Ideal Size = 249,967/4 = 62,492 per district.

District	Total VAP*	Hispanic VAP	% of Total Hispanic VAP	Anglo VAP	% of Total Anglo VAP	Black VAP	% of Total Black VAP	American Indian VAP	% of Total American Indian VAP	Asian VAP	% of Total Asian VAP	Hawaiian- Pacific Islander VAP	% of Total Hawaiian- Pacific Islander VAP	Other VAP	% of Total Other VAP	Two or More VAP	% of Total Two or More VAP
1	44,771	7,908	17.66%	31,775	70.97%	2,228	4.98%	143	0.32%	2,207	4.93%	22	0.05%	27	0.06%	463	1.03%
2	44,504	5,232	11.76%	36,257	81.47%	1,241	2.79%	184	0.37%	1,080	2.43%	35	0.08%	42	0.09%	453	1.02%
3	43,147	4,659	10.80%	36,433	84.44%	1,023	2.37%	111	0.26%	802	1.40%	21	0.05%	13	0.03%	285	0.66%
4	42,643	8,868	20.80%	28,692	67.28%	3,792	8.89%	143	0.34%	723	1.70%	35	0.08%	24	0.06%	366	0.86%
Totals	175,065	26,665	15.23%	133,157	76.06%	8,284	4.73%	561	0.32%	4,612	2.63%	113	0.06%	106	0.06%	1,567	0.90%

*Voting Age Population

RECORDERS MEMORANDUM
All or parts of the text on this page was not
clearly legible for satisfactory recordation.



RECORDERS MEMORANDUM
All or parts of the text on this page was not clearly legible for satisfactory reproduction.

Williamson County Commissioner Precincts

- Plan DH2-

2000 Census Total and Voting Age Population

District	Persons	Deviation	Hispanic % of Total Population	Non-Hispanic Anglo % of Total Population	Non-Hispanic Black % of Total Population	Non-Hispanic Asian % of Total Population	Non-Hispanic Other % of Total Population
1	62,555	0.10%	19.42%	68.50%	5.34%	4.91%	1.83%
2	65,237	4.39%	13.31%	79.57%	2.95%	2.25%	1.92%
3	60,615	-3.00%	12.78%	81.94%	2.53%	1.50%	1.25%
4	61,560	-1.49%	23.41%	64.04%	9.17%	1.68%	1.70%
Totals	249,967		17.20%	73.55%	4.98%	2.59%	1.68%

Ideal Size = 249,967/4 = 62,492 per district.

Total Maximum Deviation = [4.39%- (-3.00%)] = 7.39%

District	Total VAP*		Hispanic % of Total VAP	Non-Hispanic Anglo % of Total VAP	Non-Hispanic Black % of Total VAP	Non-Hispanic Asian % of Total VAP	Non-Hispanic Other % of Total VAP
1	44,079		17.77%	70.88%	4.97%	4.94%	1.45%
2	44,506		11.76%	81.47%	2.79%	2.43%	1.56%
3	43,837		10.79%	84.32%	2.42%	1.44%	1.02%
4	42,643		20.80%	67.28%	8.89%	1.70%	1.33%
Totals	175,065		15.23%	76.06%	4.73%	2.63%	1.34%

***Voting Age Population**

Williamson County Commissioner Precincts
- Plan DH2 -

2000 Census Total and Voting Age Population






District	Persons	Ideal Size	Deviation	Hispanic VAP	% of Total Hispanic Population	Anglo VAP	% of Total Anglo Population	Black VAP	% of Total Black Population	American Indian VAP	% of Total American Indian Population	Asian VAP	% of Total Asian Population	Hawaiian-Pacific Islander VAP	% of Total Hawaiian-Pacific Islander Population	Other VAP	% of Total Other Population	Two or More VAP	% of Total Two or More Population
1	62,555	62,492	0.10%	12,151	19.42%	42,850	68.50%	3,341	5.34%	192	0.31%	3,071	4.91%	33	0.05%	63	0.10%	854	1.37%
2	65,237	62,492	4.39%	8,684	13.31%	51,906	78.57%	1,925	2.95%	224	0.34%	1,469	2.25%	53	0.08%	91	0.14%	885	1.36%
3	60,615	62,492	-3.00%	7,745	12.78%	49,670	81.94%	1,532	2.53%	149	0.25%	909	1.50%	27	0.04%	28	0.05%	555	0.92%
4	61,560	62,492	-1.49%	14,410	23.41%	39,421	64.04%	5,646	9.17%	194	0.32%	1,034	1.69%	48	0.08%	48	0.08%	759	1.23%
Totals	249,967			42,990	17.20%	183,847	73.55%	12,444	4.98%	759	0.30%	6,483	2.59%	161	0.06%	230	0.09%	3,053	1.22%

Ideal Size = 249,967/4 = 62,492 per district.

District	Total VAP	Hispanic VAP	% of Total Hispanic VAP	Anglo VAP	% of Total Anglo VAP	Black VAP	% of Total Black VAP	American Indian VAP	% of Total American Indian VAP	Asian VAP	% of Total Asian VAP	Hawaiian-Pacific Islander VAP	% of Total Hawaiian-Pacific Islander VAP	Other VAP	% of Total Other VAP	Two or More VAP	% of Total Two or More VAP
1	44,079	7,834	17.77%	31,242	70.88%	2,189	4.97%	140	0.32%	2,177	4.94%	22	0.05%	27	0.06%	448	1.02%
2	44,506	5,232	11.76%	36,259	81.47%	1,241	2.79%	164	0.37%	1,080	2.43%	35	0.08%	42	0.09%	453	1.02%
3	43,837	4,731	10.79%	36,964	84.32%	1,062	2.42%	114	0.26%	832	1.44%	21	0.05%	13	0.03%	300	0.68%
4	42,943	8,868	20.80%	28,892	67.28%	3,792	8.89%	143	0.34%	723	1.70%	35	0.08%	24	0.06%	366	0.86%
Totals	175,065	26,665	15.23%	133,157	76.06%	8,284	4.73%	561	0.32%	4,612	2.63%	113	0.06%	106	0.06%	1,567	0.90%

Voting Age Population

RECORDERS MEMORANDUM
All or parts of the text on this page was not
clearly legible for satisfactory reproduction.

 Existing Precinct Boundary
 Precinct 1
 Precinct 2
 Precinct 3
 Precinct 4
 Voting District
 Stream
 Road
 Water

Inset 1


RECORDERS MEMORANDUM

All or parts of the text on this page was not clearly legible for satisfactory reproduction.

⁽³⁾ Prepared By: Bickelstaff, Heath, Smiley, Pollan, Kewer & McDaniel, L.L.P.
Data Sources: County Commissioner lines obtained from the Texas Legislative Council and projected into decimal degrees format.
Roads, water and other features obtained from the 2000 Tiger/line files, U.S. Census Bureau.

Inset 2

July 2001, WilliamsonCo_CC_DH2client



AGENDA ITEM 38

Discuss and take any appropriate action on transfer of civil warrant deputies and applicable assets from Sheriff's Dept to various Constables.

Precinct 3 Constable Bobby Gutierrez addressed the court and answered questions concerning the transfer of civil warrant deputies and applicable assets from Sheriff's Dept. to Constables.

Moved: **Judge Doerfler**

Seconded: **Commissioner Limmer**

Motion: To approve transfer of civil warrant deputies and applicable assets from Sheriff's Dept to various Constables.

Vote: 5 – 0

AGENDA ITEM 39

Discuss and take appropriate action on appointment of person to serve on Loop One-183 Corridor Special Committee.

Moved: **Commissioner Boatright**

Seconded: **Judge Doerfler**

Motion: To appoint Gary Coe to serve on the Loop One-183 Corridor Special Committee.

Vote: 5 – 0

AGENDA ITEM 40

Discuss and take appropriate action concerning county's position on public and/or individuals requesting name change for numbered county roads.

Moved: **Commissioner Boatright**

Seconded: **Judge Doerfler**

Motion: To adopt a position that the county does not change the names of county roads that are numbered.

Vote: 5 – 0

AGENDA ITEM 41

Discuss and take any appropriate action concerning 2002 county budget, including, but not limited to setting a public hearing date for preliminary hearing if deemed necessary.

No action was taken on this agenda item.

AGENDA ITEM 42

Discuss and take any appropriate action on road bond program.

Mike Weaver of Prime Strategies addressed the court concerning road bond issues.

AGENDA ITEM 43

Discuss and take any appropriate action on jail/courthouse annex expansion.

No action was taken on this agenda item.