

The Question Before McKinney

The motion before the city is simple: that the citizens of McKinney, not City Hall, should have the final say – and that four offices should be placed before the voters to decide.

Let us be clear at the outset about what is not being argued. We do not argue that these officials are criminals. We do not argue that any law was broken. We do not ask anyone to be removed by petition. A recall removes no one; it returns a decision to the people to whom it belongs. What follows is not a verdict. It is a request for one – from the only body entitled to render it, the voters of McKinney.

We rest the case on six grounds.

First, that a vote is meant to mean something. Twice, in 2015 and again in 2023, the residents of McKinney went to the ballot box and declined to fund a commercial airport with their bonds – the second time by nearly fifty-nine percent. One may believe the airport is a fine idea and still hold that a ballot result is a decision, not an opening bid. The recall does not relitigate the airport. It asks the same ballot box that spoke twice to speak once more – this time on the officials, not the project.

Second, that the city should be measured against its own standard. We need not invent a rule to hold anyone to. The city's own Council-approved goals commit it, in writing, to public meetings and to "full transparency." Yet a multi-year contract with a commercial airline was signed with no public meeting, no agenda item, and no disclosure – kept from residents until the Attorney General of Texas ordered it released. When a government's conduct and its own written standard diverge this plainly, the question of which to believe is one voters are entitled to answer themselves.

Third, that this is a pattern, and not a single night. The opposition would prefer that this be about one meeting, one project, one grievance – because a single item is easy to dismiss. But the record is broader than any one decision, and it was assembled by many residents, in many neighborhoods, over more than a decade: elections treated as advisory, public input treated as a formality, public records treated as secrets. No single item is the grounds for recall. The grounds for recall are the pattern they form.

Fourth, that the decision belongs to neighbors, not to us. This petition removes no official from office. Its only power is to schedule an election – after which every registered voter in McKinney, not a committee and not a court, makes the call. Those who sign are not rendering judgment. They are asking that judgment be rendered by the whole city, at the polls, in the open.

Fifth, that we are using the city's own instrument. Recall is not an act of disruption imported from outside. It is written into the McKinney charter as a right reserved to residents, for precisely this circumstance. To use it is not to break the process. It is to run the process as designed – the same process the city used in 2020, lawfully and to completion.

Sixth, and finally, that McKinney is stronger for having asked. Whatever the voters decide, the outcome is the same in one respect: a city government that has answered to its residents directly, on the record, at the ballot box. That is not a loss for McKinney. It is how a healthy city corrects course – unemotionally, lawfully, and in public.

The standard we ask you to apply is not whether any rule was broken. It is a simpler question: who is this city designed to answer to? We hold that the answer is its residents – and we ask only that they be permitted to say so, in a vote.