

# Irving Muslims PAC

---

## District 3 Questionnaire

*May 2026 General Election*

*Responses are listed in ballot order per race*

## Standing Against Anti-Muslim Hate

*Irving has a documented history of anti-Muslim public demonstrations and political rhetoric, including statements made by public officials in civic settings.*

*If you witnessed or became aware of anti-Muslim rhetoric from a fellow elected official, a candidate, or a public figure in Irving, what would you do, concretely? Would you say so publicly, and if so, how?*

### Tammam Alwan

---

This isn't a theoretical question for Irving. We've had elected officials in our city use anti-Muslim rhetoric in public settings, and that recent history is real. Irving's 75038 ZIP code, part of which is in District 3, is the most diverse in the country, and that's one reason our city is so unique. The 14th Amendment guarantees equal protection to every resident, and rhetoric that degrades any community undermines the trust our city runs on. I speak out when anyone is targeted because of their faith or background, whether at a family gathering or a community meeting, and that's what I'd do as a council member. I'd say so publicly, clearly, and on the record, in the same room.

### Abdul Khabeer

---

*No response received*

### Kejal Patel

---

*No response received*

## Equal Treatment for Muslim Institutions

*Irving's mosques, Islamic schools, Muslim community organizations, and Muslim businesses are subject to the same zoning, permitting, and administrative processes as all other institutions.*

*If a Muslim organization reported to you that their permitting process had been delayed, denied, or handled inconsistently compared to similar requests from other religious institutions, what steps would you take?*

---

### Tammam Alwan

Every institution in Irving, regardless of faith or background, deserves consistent treatment under the same zoning, permitting, and administrative processes. That's what the 14th Amendment requires. If a Muslim organization brought me a documented pattern of delay or denial, my first step would be to pull the record and compare it to similar applications. I wouldn't assume bad faith without evidence, but I wouldn't look away from it either. I've watched how quickly "we're reviewing it" becomes a permanent holding pattern, and I wouldn't let that stand. If the data showed inconsistency, I'd name it, including publicly during council commentary when the item comes before us. Fair process isn't negotiable, and I'd hold that standard for every institution, every time.

---

### Abdul Khabeer

*No response received*

---

### Kejal Patel

*No response received*

## Protecting Families and Children

*Irving's public libraries and schools serve children across a wide range of ages.*

*What do you personally think about the availability of materials dealing with sexuality and gender in city-funded spaces for young children?*

---

### **Tammam Alwan**

This became far more divisive in Irving than the issue warranted. National culture war politics landed in a local library conversation, and the cost was real, in trust, in relationships, and in the time and energy our city spent on a fight that a quieter, more professional process could have avoided. Librarians are professionals who take their work seriously, and the people on both sides of this debate are neighbors who care about this community. Everyone deserved a calmer, more deliberate process than they experienced. As a former educator who's thought carefully about child development, my view is that children's books should reflect the full diversity of our community, including families that look different from one another. That's not the issue. Materials that deal explicitly with sexuality or gender, whether heterosexual or homosexual, aren't developmentally appropriate for young children in city-funded spaces. Moving them to a more appropriate section was a reasonable, proportionate solution. That's where this should have landed from the start, and I'm glad it did.

---

### **Abdul Khabeer**

*No response received*

---

### **Kejal Patel**

*No response received*

## Opposing Harmful Industries

*The Irving City Council has zoning authority over the location and concentration of alcohol outlets, vape and smoke shops, THC dispensaries, gambling establishments, and sexually oriented businesses.*

*1. When a proposed zoning change raises public safety or community character concerns, what criteria guide your decision?*

*On March 20, 2025, the council voted 6 to 3 to approve Ordinances 2025-47-UDC and 2025-48-ZC (Agenda Items 45 and 46), a rezoning proposal brought by Las Vegas Sands Corporation for 1,001 acres including the former Texas Stadium site. The proposal originally included casino gaming as a permitted use. Sands withdrew that component hours before the vote but stated publicly that without gaming the project makes no financial sense, and they continue to lobby for gaming legalization in Austin.*

*2a. How would you have voted, and do you believe the council adequately weighed the long-term implications of approving zoning that leaves the door open for a casino if Texas law changes?*

*2b. Would you support an ordinance explicitly prohibiting casino gaming as a permitted use within Irving's zoning code?*

### Tammam Alwan

1. When a zoning change raises public safety or community character concerns, I ask the same questions I apply to every proposal: Does this improve daily life for residents? Who benefits, and who actually pays? What's the full cost, including long-term? And how will we know if it worked? In practice that means looking at whether a use will increase calls for police or fire, strain local resources, contribute to addiction, affect kids in nearby schools or parks, impact nearby houses of worship, or change a neighborhood in ways residents haven't had a real chance to weigh in on. Concentration matters, too. A single establishment raises different questions than a corridor of them near a school or residential neighborhood, and I evaluate each application in that full context.

2a. I would have voted no. Las Vegas Sands stated publicly that the project makes no financial sense without gaming then pulled gaming as a permitted use hours before the vote. That sequence alone should have given every council member pause. Basic studies on traffic, public safety, and residential impact hadn't been completed when the item was before the planning and zoning commission in March, and those questions were still open when it reached the council. Residents showed up and spoke out, and when that many people take time to come to a meeting, the least a council member can do is slow down and listen. I wouldn't have voted to approve such a large project without those answers.

2b. On an ordinance explicitly prohibiting casino gaming: yes, I'd support one. The research is clear that casino development is associated with increases in gambling addiction and crime, and that the social costs often offset the new tax revenue. Since Sands has said publicly that gaming is the point, the honest move is to say so clearly in the zoning code now, before the infrastructure is in place and a future variance becomes the easier path. I'd want Irving to make that call deliberately, with full public debate, and not by default.

### Abdul Khabeer

*No response received*

### Kejal Patel

*No response received*

## First Amendment Rights

*Texas state law currently restricts cities from contracting with companies that boycott Israel, including through BDS-aligned purchasing decisions.*

*Do you believe this law reflects sound public policy?*

---

### Tammam Alwan

No, I don't think this state law reflects sound public policy. Boycott is a protected form of expression with a long history in American civic life, from the Boston Tea Party to the Montgomery Bus Boycott. A law that singles out one foreign country for special protection, while leaving cities free to contract with companies that boycott neighboring states, isn't consistent with First Amendment principles. That said, as a council member I'd be bound by Texas law, and the city doesn't have the option to disregard it. My disagreement belongs with the state legislature.

---

### Abdul Khabeer

*No response received*

---

### Kejal Patel

*No response received*

## Moral Courage in Public Life

For the May 29, 2025 regular council meeting, three addendum items were submitted, including Resolution RES-2025-166, expressing support for the President's efforts to achieve a permanent ceasefire in Gaza and the release of all hostages. The addendum was certified and posted by the City Secretary on Monday, May 26, 2025 by 5:30 p.m., more than 72 hours before the meeting. Before any discussion or vote could take place, all three items were struck from the agenda after points of order were sustained by the presiding officer. Irving Muslims PAC has submitted written inquiries to the City Attorney's Office regarding the legal basis for that removal under Section 5.1(B) of the Council Rules of Procedure, which states that a properly submitted agenda item may only be removed by the member who requested it. As of the date of this questionnaire, no response has been received.

1. How would you have voted on Resolution RES-2025-166, and why?
2. What would you do to ensure that Irving residents and elected council members can bring good-faith items before the council without having them removed on procedural grounds before any discussion takes place?

### Tammam Alwan

1. I would have voted yes. City government is the level closest to residents, and when hundreds of Irving residents sign petitions, send emails to local elected officials, show up repeatedly to city hall for public comments over a span of two years, and ask their council to put something on the record, the job of an elected representative is to hear them. A resolution expressing support for a ceasefire and the release of hostages isn't a foreign policy mandate. It's a statement about the sanctity of human life, including family lost by our own city's residents. More than 100 American cities passed similar resolutions, and that's a legitimate use of the resolution process. My focus as a council member stays on roads, safety, parks, and housing, but residents who took the time to show up and speak deserved a vote, and I'd have given them one.

2. What you've described is a process problem, regardless of the subject matter. If Section 5.1(B) of the Council Rules says a properly submitted item may only be removed by the member who requested it, that rule needs to be followed. Removing an item that was certified and posted on time before any discussion or vote, without a written legal explanation, undermines the basic trust that residents and council members need to have in the process. I'd push for a written response from the City Attorney's Office, and if that response doesn't hold up under the plain language of the rules, I'd bring the item back. Public comments were recently moved to the end of meetings. Items are being struck before discussion. Residents who show up deserve to be heard, not managed. That's what paying attention actually looks like, and I'd hold that standard every time.

### Abdul Khabeer

*No response received*

### Kejal Patel

*No response received*