



Co-Vice Chair, Rep. Yvonne Davis

Co-Vice Chair, Senator Jose Rodriguez

Co-Vice Chair, Rep. Rene Oliveira

Representative

Desk

LSG Floor Report For Postponed Business- Thursday, April 20, 2017

Bill	Caption	Committee	Analysis & Evaluation	Recommendation
HB 2335 By: Miller	Relating to requiring evidence-based trauma training for certain attorneys, court-appointed volunteer advocates, child-care workers, and child protective services employees.	Human Services	<p>This bill would require that certain attorneys, child advocates, child care facilities workers, and CPS case workers be required to receive evidenced-based trauma training. In recent years, behavioral health professions have become increasingly aware of the effects of trauma on the development of children. 100% of children who have entered into CPS or foster care have experienced multiple traumas, including being taken away from their families and communities. If left untreated trauma can have long term effects on a child’s behavior and relationships. Evidence based trauma trainings can help a person involved with a child’s case understand their behavioral actions and world view. Children who have experienced intense trauma often have difficulty in expressing and understanding their emotions. Some internalize stress while others express it outwardly with anger, anxiety and the like. This can lead to multiple relocations as some foster parents and CASA volunteers may think of this as acting out, rather than understanding that their ability to regulate their needs have been diminished by the effects of trauma.</p> <p>Currently, DFPS does require that CPS workers take a 2-hour online training course in Trauma Informed Care (TIC), this is also offered to foster parents, therapists and shelter staff. This bill would make those who work with the children required to undergo a more extensive evidence-base trauma training. Requirement would be expanded from just caseworkers, to attorney ad litem and child care workers. The bill lays out the stipulations for which the trauma training is to uphold. It also ensures that it must provide practical application when working with the children. As the legislature makes strides in redesigning the foster care system it is critical to try and understand the children who are in this environment. Expanding the requirements for trauma training is an important step in the healing process for children and helping them to achieve permanency.</p> <p>While Trust-Based Relational Intervention (TBRI) is a copyrighted therapeutic framework, it is not issued exclusively by a single company. Rather, training must be conducted by an individual who is certified to ensure both quality and limit those who may assert they are trained in TBRI when they are actually not.</p>	<p>Favorable Evaluated by: Kylie McNaught 210-382-4295 Kylie@Texaslsg.org</p>

<p>HB 1351 By: Wray</p>	<p>Relating to the prohibition of local motor fuel taxes on compressed natural gas and liquefied natural gas.</p>	<p>Ways & Means</p>	<p>HB 1351 adds compressed natural gas (CNG) and liquefied natural gas (LNG) to the definition of motor fuels protected from additional sale, use, or distribution taxes imposed by a political subdivision.</p> <p>Current tax law protects gasoline, diesel fuel, and liquefied gas from additional excise or occupational taxes imposed by local municipalities. CNG and LNG were included in the definition of liquefied gas prior to legislation enacted in 2013, which created a new method of tax collection and dealer license requirements that effectively removed both CNG and LNGs from the definition of liquefied gas. HB 1351 would close a loophole that allows local entities to impose their own motor fuel taxes on CNG and LNG fuels, and would extend equal protections to all types of motor fuels.</p> <p>Currently, CNG and LNG is taxed at a \$0.15 per gallon and applies to the use of liquefied gas for powering motor vehicles on state highways. After deductions are made from diesel and liquefied gas taxes for the purposes of refunds and administrative costs, 1/4 of these taxes are deposited to the Available School Fund and the remaining 3/4 are deposited to the State Highway Fund. As more people move to our state and drive on Texas highways, the gradual increase of the motor fuel tax revenue directly translates to the State fuel tax deposits to the State Highway Fund (SHF). However, with the simultaneous highway construction costs rising, the State's purchasing power for road construction projects is reduced. While trucks carrying natural gases tend to weigh roughly 2,000 lbs. more than trucks carrying other types of fuel and 38% of major Texas roads in fair or poor condition, adequate funding for Texas roads is necessary to preserve state infrastructure and competitive commerce.</p>	<p>Favorable Evaluated by: Katherine Kirages 210-382-4295 Katherine@Texaslsg.org</p>
<p>HB 152 By: Dutton</p>	<p>Relating to the restoration of certain rights to a criminal defendant.</p>	<p>Criminal Jurisprudence</p>	<p>HB 152 allows defendants to apply for restoration of any civil rights forfeited as a result of conviction for any offense under Texas state law, following sentence completion. This bill further increases the waiting period for defendants convicted under the laws of another country to file an application for restoration of civil rights from two years to three or more years after the date of conviction. This bill has no fiscal note and an effective date of September 1, 2017.</p> <p>HB 152 would positively impact low-risk defendants wishing to apply for a full restoration of any civil rights forfeited resulting from their conviction. While the right to vote is restored automatically upon a defendant's completion of their sentence, other civil rights are restored through a pardon or gubernatorial restoration of rights, but only for federal and foreign first offenders. Of the 93 clemency cases considered in FY 2016, only one case was considered for the restoration of civil rights in which clemency was recommended by the Board of Pardons and Parole.</p>	<p>Favorable Evaluated by: Katherine Kirages 210-382-4295 Katherine@Texaslsg.org</p>

LSG Floor Report For General Calendar- Thursday, April 20, 2017

Bill	Caption	Committee	Analysis & Evaluation	Recommendation
------	---------	-----------	-----------------------	----------------



<p>HB 1014 By: Alonzo</p>	<p>Relating to the composition of the board of trustees of the Employees Retirement System of Texas</p>	<p>Pensions</p>	<p>This bill would amend the Government Code to include a retiree as a member of the board of trustees for the Employees Retirement System. Currently, a retiree is not eligible to serve as an elected member of the board. Under this bill, only one retiree may serve on the board.</p> <p>There have been concerns that retirees are not afforded a voice to serve on the board of trustees and should be eligible for election. As retirees constitute a direct representation of the members, it is only logical that a retiree be elected to the ERS board of trustees. It is important that there is adequate representation on the board as there is a need to have a voice for retirees as well as the active members.</p>	<p>Favorable Evaluated By: Elizabeth Hann 210-382-4295 Elizabeth@Texaslsg.org</p>
<p>HB 518 By: Darby / Parker / Thompson, Senfronia / Murphy / Oliverson / et al.</p>	<p>Relating to the retention and use of sales tax revenue collected by certain retailers to provide job training and placement services to certain persons.</p>	<p>Ways & Means</p>	<p>This bill authorizes certain non-profit organizations to retain some of the sales tax they collect to fund job training programs for individuals with disabilities and other employment challenges. After certification with the Comptroller’s office, qualifying nonprofits are able to keep 30% of the sales tax from the sale of donated goods during the first year, and 50% for subsequent years. These funds can only be used for the maintenance of job training, placement, and retention activities, and certification can be withdrawn if performance metrics are not met and the organization would be required to pay back a portion of the tax savings based on how many clients do not secure a job.</p> <p>The bill is clearly targeted to support organizations within the Goodwill system, who provide valuable support to their communities and individuals in need. The system’s organizational structure is tied to its network of resale shops, the source of the sales tax under consideration. The fiscal note attached to HB 518 indicates that this tax break would lead to a loss of sales tax revenue totaling \$24.2 million in the FY 20-21 biennium, as that is when qualifying organizations would be eligible for certification. Although this funding would be specific to a limited number of organizations, the money would go towards building a strong foundation for the future of the Texas workforce as a direct result of Goodwill services.</p>	<p>Favorable Evaluated by: Katherine Kirages 210-382-4295 Katherine@Texaslsg.org</p>
<p>HB 728 By: Guerra / Cook / Bohac / Parker / Howard / et al.</p>	<p>Relating to the establishment by the commissioner of education of an advanced computer science program for high school students.</p>	<p>Public Education</p>	<p>This bill requires the commissioner of education to develop and implement an advanced computer science program for high school students. Students who successfully complete the advanced computer science course may earn an advanced mathematics credit or an advanced science credit. The Bureau of Labor Statistics projects 37.5 percent growth from 2012 to 2022 in the “computer systems design and related services” industry. The intent of this bill is to ensure that students are being equipped with the skills necessary to fulfill the hiring needs of businesses interested in moving to Texas. As technology continues to evolve, it becomes increasingly imperative that Texas offers students the ability to graduate high school with this important skill set.</p>	<p>Favorable Evaluated by: Arielle Day 225-588-1221 Arielle@Texaslsg.org</p>
<p>HB 776 By: Ashby</p>	<p>Relating to the removal of home addresses from personal financial statements filed by certain persons.</p>	<p>General Investigating & Ethics</p>	<p>HB 776 amends the Government Code to remove personal information from personal financial statements filed with the Texas Ethics Commission. Currently statute only protects the home addresses of judges or justices, this would change that to all individuals who submit personal financial statements. Any previous statements, current statements or future statements would redact all home addresses from any member of the public viewing the information, sharing the</p>	<p>Favorable Evaluated by: Kylie McNaught 210-382-4295 Kylie@Texaslsg.org</p>



			<p>information with the public and adds in the removal of private information that may be posted on the commission’s website.</p> <p>At this point, individuals who are not judges or justices, home addresses are open to public, redacting personal home addresses would serve to protect individuals’ private information.</p>	
<p>HB 89 By: King, Phil / Goldman / Alvarado / Davis, Sarah / Cook / et al.</p>	<p>Relating to state contracts with and investments in companies that boycott Israel.</p>	<p>State Affairs</p>	<p>Texas has a long standing, mutually beneficial relationship with Israel; Israel is Texas’ 4th largest trade partner and Texas has invested in business and economic development activities in Israel. CSHB 89 is an attempt to support Israel by prohibiting State investment in and contracts with companies who participate in the Boycott, Divest, Sanction Israel (BDS) movement. BDS’ goal is to pressure Israel to end its occupation of Palestine, recognize the fundamental human rights of Palestinian people, and allow Palestinian refugees to return to their homes within Israeli occupied territory.</p> <p>CSHB 89 enacts multiple provisions related to state contracts with and investments in companies that engage in BDS. These provisions include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prohibiting state agencies or political subdivisions from entering into a contract for goods or services with any company unless the contract contains written verification that the company does not boycott Israel and will not boycott Israel for the duration of the contract. • Requiring the comptroller to establish and maintain a registry of all companies that boycott Israel to be provided to the state’s four retirement systems as well as the permanent school fund and publicly display the list. • Requiring the comptroller to submit the registry to the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Speaker of the House, and Attorney General. The registry should be updated at least one a year. • Requiring that state agencies notify the comptroller if the agency owns direct or indirect holdings in a company from the list. • Requiring the state agency to notify the companies that are in violation warning them that they are at risk of divestment by state governmental entities if they are unable to clarify or rectify their Israel-related activities. • Requiring state agencies to sell, redeem, divest, or withdraw all publicly traded interests in the company should the company fail to cease participation in BDS. • Requiring that a company be removed from the comptroller’s registry once they have ceased all activities related to boycotting Israel. • Requiring each state agency applicable under this subchapter to submit an annual report to the attorney general and the presiding officer of each house of the legislature that identifies all the agency’s investments sold, redeemed, divested, withdrawn, or prohibited under this chapter. <p>The bill offers an avenue for the state agency to cease divesting from a registered company if clear and convincing evidence shows that the agency has suffered or will suffer a loss in their hypothetical assets as a result of having to divest. This provision is limited and only applies to ensure the agency does not suffer a loss or deviate from its benchmark. To</p>	<p>Will of the House Evaluated by: Tyler Anderson 210-382-4295 Tyler@Texaslsg.org</p>



			utilize this exemption, the agency must provide a written report to the presiding officer of each house of the legislature and the attorney general providing justification for deciding to cease divestment. Finally, the bill authorizes the attorney general to bring any action necessary to enforce the prohibition against investing in companies that boycott Israel. (Note: it is not the LSG’s intention to take a side or preference on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict)	
HB 367 By: Bernal / VanDeaver / Price / Thompson, Senfronia / Minjarez / et al.	Relating to the authority of a school district to donate food to a nonprofit organization to be served to students of the district.	Public Education	<p>Texas ranks second nationally in food insecurity. A national study on hunger conducted by the nation’s largest domestic hunger-relief organization, Feeding America, revealed that more than 4.65 million Texans, including nearly 1.9 million children, have limited or uncertain access to enough food for a healthy lifestyle. Although many schools have been innovative in finding ways to address the needs of their hungry students, the overlapping of local, state and federal laws creates confusion regarding if and when a school may give leftover food to hungry students. As a result, many schools throw away untouched and unopened food that could be given to the hungry students on their campus. HB 367 creates a procedure that allows schools to distribute food they would normally throw away to the food-insecure students at the school.</p> <p>The bill allows a district employee or parent of a student enrolled at the school to be a designee of a third-party nonprofit organization. The designee becomes an agent of the nonprofit in that they are permitted to collect the surplus food that the school wishes to donate. The donated food may be received, stored and distributed on the campus. This is a permissive bill that does not mandate participation or override any health or safety codes. This bill has no fiscal note. HB 367 creates clear statewide guidelines for a voluntary campus food donation program that will help feed hungry children and reduce food waste.</p>	Favorable Evaluated by: Arielle Day 225-588-1221 Arielle@Texaslsg.org
HB 1083 By: Perez / Guillen	Relating to authorizing a regulatory authority to establish reduced water utility rates funded by donations for the benefit of elderly customers.	Natural Resources	<p>HB 1083 would amend the Water Code to codify the allowance for private Investor-Owned Utilities (IOUs) to offer discounted water rates to elderly residents. The regulatory authority must allow the IOU the ability to receive donations for providing discounted rate service; however, the recovery of costs may not come through a rate increase for other customers.</p> <p>The reduced rate created through the passage of this bill does not:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Make or grant unreasonable preference for a corporation or persons. 2. Subject a corporation or persons to unreasonable prejudice or disadvantage. 3. Constitute an unreasonable difference as to rates of service between classes of service. <p>Discounted rates for utilities currently exist from public utility entities for Senior Citizens and HB 1083 seeks to create a template for private companies to offer similar programs. Texas has the third largest elderly population in the U.S., with a 10% poverty rate. For seniors living on a fixed income the opportunity for IOUs to offer discounted rates could bring financial relief.</p>	Favorable Evaluated by: Erin Eriksen 210-382-4295 Erin@Texaslsg.org



<p>HB 1140 By: Anderson, Charles "Doc" / Guillen / Raney / Cospers / Israel / et al.</p>	<p>Relating to the allocation categories for state funding of public transportation.</p>	<p>Transportation</p>	<p>This bill adds new definitions to the Transportation Code to set a distinction in between suburban and urban. It will help with setting proper allocation funds for public transportation projects from the Department of Transportation (TxDOT).</p> <p><u>New definitions:</u> Large urbanized area - means an urbanized area with a population of 200,000 or more. Small urbanized area - means an urbanized area with a population of less than 200,000.</p> <p>Additionally, the Texas Transportation <i>Commission shall</i> allocate to large urbanized, small urbanized area, and nonurbanized areas under the formula program. The formula includes: transportation provider's performance, the number of its riders, the need of residents in its service area for public transportation, population, population density, land area, and other factors established by the Texas Transportation Commission. The amount appropriated from all sources to the commission each state fiscal biennium for public transportation, other than money from the U.S. and amounts specifically appropriated for coordination, technical support, or other administrative costs.</p> <p>According to TxDOT, it is assumed any costs or duties associated with implementing the provisions of the bill could be absorbed within existing resources. There is no anticipation of significant fiscal impacts of state and local government.</p>	<p>Favorable Evaluated by: Andrea Elizondo 210-382-4295 Andrea@Texaslsg.org</p>
<p>HB 1761 By: Smithee</p>	<p>Relating to jurisdiction of the Texas Supreme Court</p>	<p>Judiciary & Civil Jurisprudence</p>	<p>Allows the Texas Supreme Court discretionary jurisdiction to review any interlocutory appeal that is of important jurisprudence to the state. Interlocutory appeals or orders are signed by trial judges after a case is filed and before a case is called for trial. HB 1761 cleans up language in the Government Code. The specific cases listed of when the Texas Supreme Court has appellate jurisdiction are struck, leaving it to the supreme court to determine whether the appeal presents a question of important jurisprudence to the state. Currently, attorneys use this statute more so than any of the cases struck by this bill to petition for review of an appeal by the supreme court. It will also reduce costs to litigants in the form of attorney's fees for interlocutory appeals as they would not have to perform additional work to identify and describe the jurisdictional conflict for every single interlocutory appeal.</p>	<p>Favorable Evaluated by: Serena Ahmed 210-382-4295 Serena@Texaslsg.org</p>
<p>HB 3107 By: Ashby</p>	<p>Relating to the production of public information under the public information law.</p>	<p>Government Transparency & Operation</p>	<p>This bill amends the Government Code to allow counties to set limits on the requests for public records. In some cases, it has been found that individuals abuse the system for requesting public records. This can become a burdensome task for county offices and subsequently clog the system. Likewise, exorbitant requests that go unpaid can cost the county hundreds of thousands of dollars. Currently there are no limitations in statute for the number of requests that can be made to a governmental office. Similarly, despite the laws surrounding costs accrued and reported to the requestor for repayment, there is no time limit for which the requestor must pay the fees.</p> <p>HB 3107 sets stipulations for counties to create yearly or monthly, hourly time limits for which one can work to fulfill public records request for a single case. The bill sets a minimum standard for the hourly time limits so that a request limits cannot be less than 36 hours per year or 15 hours in a one month period.</p>	<p>Favorable Evaluated by: Kylie McNaught 210-382-4295 Kylie@Texaslsg.org</p>



			This also incorporates a time limit for a requestor to repay the county for the time and supplies utilized to fulfill their request to 60-days. Unwillingness to pay would result in the withdrawal of the request. The bill outlines those who are exempt from these time limitations, including press.	
HB 2126 By: Button	Relating to the franchise tax rate applicable to certain taxable entities that sell telephone prepaid calling cards.	Ways & Means	<p>This bill adds language to Sec. 171.002 of the Tax Code to clarify that prepaid calling cards are not considered telecommunications (telecom) services for franchise tax calculations. Any retailer or wholesaler who provides utility services, including telecom, is automatically disqualified from receiving the discounted franchise tax rate under the current law. The Comptroller’s office has historically not treated calling cards as telecom, although a recent administrative law ruling concurring with the Federal Communications Commission says that they are classified as telecom because they have no intrinsic value beyond providing telecom access.</p> <p>While there is no fiscal impact on the state because of how the Comptroller’s office currently handles calling cards, the state would receive additional revenue from the franchise tax if cards are treated as telecom products moving forward and the retailers and wholesalers started paying the full rate. Businesses may stop selling calling cards to maintain the discounted rate, reducing their availability to Texans who rely on them to make international calls to developing countries.</p>	Favorable Evaluated by: Katherine Kirages 210-382-4295 Katherine@Texaslsg.org
HB 2437 By: Phillips	Relating to confidentiality of reports and related information for a solvency examination of an insurance carrier.	Insurance	<p>This bill amends the Insurance Code to increase privacy and confidentiality for the insurance industry. It adds language that prohibits a consumer bringing a civil action against an insurance company from being able to obtain any preliminary or final examinations reports conducted by the insurance agency.</p> <p>These examinations are to be considered privileged for all purposes and would NOT be subject to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disclosure under Chapter 552 of the Government Code (which stipulates rules on the transparency of government and public information) • A subpoena, except for a grand jury subpoena • Discovery or admissibility in evidence in a civil action <p>The commissioner may use his/her authority to use these conducted examinations or reports in the furtherance of any legal or regulatory action that, according to the commissioner, is appropriate.</p> <p>This is a pro-industry, anti-consumer bill which seeks to block information and allow the insurance industry to operate in secrecy. It would make it more difficult for a lawyer to gather reports or examinations in a case brought against an insurance company and ultimately provides legal protections for insurance companies. This bill would allow the insurance industry to operate behind closed doors in the name of “privacy”. It would make it more difficult for consumers to hold insurance companies accountable.</p>	Unfavorable Evaluated by: Elizabeth Hann 210-382-4295 Elizabeth@Texaslsg.org
HB 122 By: Dutton / Rose / Johnson,	Relating to the age of criminal responsibility and to certain substantive and procedural matters related to that age.	Juvenile Justice & Family Issues	Texas is one of only seven states that automatically sends all arrested 17-year-olds through the adult criminal justice system, regardless of the nature of the offense or the teenager’s personal experiences. In 2015, over 22,000 17-year-olds were arrested and subjected to Texas’ adult criminal justice system. The overwhelming majority of those arrests were for nonviolent offenses. Research shows that teenagers involved in the criminal justice system are more likely to move past	Favorable Evaluated by: Arielle Day 225-588-1221 Arielle@Texaslsg.org



Jarvis / Cook / Wu / et al.			<p>delinquency and successfully transition to adulthood when they go through a juvenile justice system instead of the adult system. HB 122 raises the age of criminal responsibility to 18 and extends jurisdiction of juvenile courts to 17-year-olds. This legislation is a common sense step for Texas in light of emerging research on why sending 17-year-olds through the juvenile justice system, which focuses on rehabilitation, yields better public safety outcomes.</p> <p>The main argument of those opposed to raising the age of criminal responsibility is the cost associated with absorbing 17-year-olds that are currently in the adult justice system into the juvenile justice system. Juvenile justice stakeholders in states across the nation were also concerned about the fiscal impact raising the age would have. The Justice Policy Institute, a national nonprofit organization focused on justice reform, published a report that shows how raising the age did not have the fiscal impact that many stakeholders feared. The report shows that eight states have raised the age in the last decade, including Louisiana and South Carolina in 2016, without having the anticipated effect of causing a spike in juvenile-corrections costs or overwhelming their juvenile justice system.</p> <p>Additional Reasons to Raise the Age:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The federal Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) requires correctional facilities to provide sight and sound separation between youth under 18 and adults. Raising the age helps Texas comply and avoid substantial litigation costs. • 17-year-olds can't serve in the military, serve on a jury, vote, buy cigarettes, sign a contract, get married or get tattoos without parental permission. Raising the age more accurately reflects our societal consensus for maturity. • The juvenile justice system offers age-appropriate programming, education, therapeutic interventions, and opportunities for family involvement. • Parents can participate in meetings with defense lawyers in juvenile court. Parents are not even notified when their 17-year-old is arrested under current law. • Long-term savings. Research shows that youth that enter the juvenile system are less likely to recidivate. • Most 17-year-olds are still in high school • Various studies have confirmed that adult correctional facilities are a breeding ground for violence and abuse. The adult system exposes youth to settings that pose a severe danger to their mental and physical health. 	
HB 1555 By: Kuempel	Relating to the sale of lottery tickets by certain wine and beer retailers	Licensing & Administrative Procedures	<p>HB 1555 amends the Government Code to exempt certain retailers who sell alcohol for consumption on or off the premises to be able to sell lottery tickets. This provision would allow locations whose gross sales in alcohol are 30% or less with a Chapter 25 permit; which authorizes the sale of beer and wine.</p> <p>Grocery stores are increasingly adding cafes to their locations which sell both beer and wine for consumption on the premises. Under the current statute these locations will not be permitted to also sell lottery tickets, and this bill creates within statute the ability for these locations to do so. Since the provision only includes locations that derive 30% or less of their gross revenue from alcohol, this would preclude any establishment whose primary business is the selling of alcohol.</p>	<p>Favorable Evaluated by: Erin Eriksen 210-382-4295 Erin@Texaslsg.org</p>



<p>HB 873 By: Pickett</p>	<p>Relating to prohibiting certain establishments serving the public from restricting a peace officer or special investigator from carrying a weapon on the premises.</p>	<p>Homeland Security & Public Safety</p>	<p>In this bill, an establishment serving the public may not prohibit or restrict peace officers or special investigators from carrying a weapon that they are authorized to carry on a public establishment’s premises, regardless if they are engaged in the actual discharge of the officer’s or investigator’s duties while carrying the weapon.</p> <p>Establishment serving the public means:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hotel, motel, or other places of lodging • Restaurant or other places that food is offered for sale • Retail business or other commercial establishment or an office building • Sports venue • Any other place of public accommodation, amusement, convenience, or resort <p>There are several public venues that prevent people from entering the venue with weapons, including off-duty peace officers. These type of establishment policies pose a safety risk as an off-duty peace officer may be called on to take action in self-defense or in defense of the safety and well-being of the public.</p>	<p>Favorable Evaluated by: Andrea Elizondo 210-382-4295 Andrea@Texaslsg.org</p>
<p>HB 2504 By: Hernandez/ Coleman</p>	<p>Relating to the compensation provided to the governing body of certain special districts.</p>	<p>County Affairs</p>	<p>Provides uniformity in compensation between Water District Directors and Emergency Service District (ESD) Commissioners. Water and emergency service districts are local political subdivisions that provide critical public functions. ESD’s may provide fire, rescue, EMS and other emergency services to unincorporated areas of Texas, and water districts also serve a wide variety of functions including but not limited to supplying raw and treated water supplies and flood control as just brief examples out of many.</p> <p>The needs for these functions for both districts have been increasing, and thus so has their day-to-day involvement with their respective directors and commissioners. There is a current difference between the compensation provided to Water District Directors in the Water Code and the ESD Commissioners in the Health and Safety Code. Following the increasing day-to-day need for their services, concerns have developed over the retention of emergency service personnel as their compensation is limited to \$3,000 per year, and not more than \$50 per day that the commissioner performs duties associated with their work. A board of five commissioners governs an ESD.</p> <p>In order to establish uniformity and address this serious concern on retention for their needed skilled work, HB 2504 repeals the sections in Health and Safety Code that address ESD Commissioners’ compensation, and then adds a new section that mandates the entitlement of such commissioners’ compensation to receive the same compensation of Water District Directors described in the Water Code: these amounts are not to exceed \$7,200 per year and a per diem cap of \$150, akin to the same per annual pay afforded state lawmakers.</p>	<p>Favorable Evaluated by: Serena Ahmed 210-382-4295 Serena@Texaslsg.org</p>

