



Chair, Rep. Garnet Coleman  
 Co-Vice Chair, Rep. Yvonne Davis  
 Co-Vice Chair, Sen. Jose Rodriguez  
 Co-Vice Chair, Rep. Rene Oliveira  
 Treasurer, Rep. Armando Walle  
 Secretary, Rep. Gina Hinojosa  
 Legal Counsel, Rep. Rep. Ana Hernandez  
 Freshman Rep., Rep. Evelina Ortega

Steering Committee:  
 Rep. Diego Bernal  
 Rep. Abel Herrero  
 Rep. Armando Martinez  
 Rep. Toni Rose  
 Rep. Eddie Rodriguez  
 Rep. Helen Giddings  
 Rep. Rafael Anchia  
 Rep. Chris Turner  
 Sen. Sylvia Garcia  
 Sen. Jose Menendez

Representative «Name»

Desk «Address»

| <b>Part 1</b>  |   |               |  |   | <b>LSG Floor Report For Postponed Business- Thursday, May 11, 2017</b> |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|---------------|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| <b>HB 849</b><br>By: Murr  | Relating to notice to certain lienholders of cancellation of certain personal automobile insurance coverages.           | Insurance     | This bill requires that automobile insurance providers send notice to the lienholder on the vehicle if they cancel the policy. These notifications are already considered best practice among insurance companies, but the absence of this requirement in statute can cause financial complications for other parties. The motivation for this bill involves a car salesman who sold a vehicle to an individual who totalled the vehicle after their policy was cancelled without notice, leaving him responsible for the outstanding balance on the loan. HB 849 is a straightforward adjustment to the Insurance Code that requires communication that should, and generally already does, happen within the industry.   | <b>Favorable</b><br>Evaluated by:<br>Elizabeth Hann<br>210-382-4295<br><a href="mailto:Elizabeth@Texaslsg.org">Elizabeth@Texaslsg.org</a> |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>HB 2780</b><br>By: Paddie/<br>Darby/<br>Ashby/<br>Geren/<br>Phelan et al. | Relating to the purchase of iron and steel products made in the United States for certain governmental entity projects. | State Affairs | In recent years, many iron and steel manufacturing facilities in Texas have been forced to close due to foreign countries that violate trade laws and subsidize their iron and steel products to sell at rates significantly lower than the US market value. Over 1.5 million tons of foreign steel were imported and sold in Texas last year at below market rates; with foreign products available at such low prices, it is almost impossible for US iron and steel manufacturers to compete. This has not only negatively impacted the Texas economy, but has created significant job loss within the manufacturing industry.<br><br>CSHB 2780 would require state contracts for remodeling, constructing, or altering any buildings or infrastructure to include in the documents provided to contract bidders a provision that any iron or steel product used in the project must be produced in the United States. The bill outlines exemptions for certain projects where the entity determines that use of US iron and steel products will increase the total cost of the project by more than 20%, there is inadequate availability of these products, or complying with this law does not serve the public interest. These type of domestic preference laws are widely utilized on major projects, such as the federal aid highway program, to promote domestic purchasing. This "buy America" bill ensures that Texas is investing its money in products that promote both economic prosperity and job growth for the US and Texas. Additionally, it will put many iron and steelworkers who have been laid off back to work, which can restore devastating effects on families and communities. | <b>Favorable</b><br>Evaluated by:<br>Tyler Anderson<br>210-382-4295<br><a href="mailto:Tyler@Texaslsg.org">Tyler@Texaslsg.org</a>         |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |   |                       |  |  |
|--|---|-----------------------|--|--|
| <p><b>HB 6</b><br/>By: Frank / Raymond / Klick / Dale / et al.</p> | <p>Relating to the administration of services provided by the Department of Family and Protective Services, including foster care, child protective services, and prevention and early intervention services.</p> | <p>Human Services</p> | <p>HB 6 aims to take on the difficult task of redesigning foster care in Texas, by creating a community-based foster care program, through which a single source continuum contractor (SSCC) can contract with the Department of Family and Protective Services (DFPS) to provide child placement and case management. On Thursday December 17, 2015, United States District Judge Janis Jack of Corpus Christi ruled that Texas’ foster care system was violating the constitutional rights of children. She sighted years of neglect and inappropriate placements that left children to have multiple placements. In some Texas counties, the average number of placements can be up to 15 per child. At any time, there are roughly 30,000 children in conservatorship care in Texas. These children are trapped in a broken system that can lead to further abuse and neglect they may have already been subjected to. The issue of foster care is a decades long problem, past attempts have been made to overhaul the system but to no avail. What remains is a shortage of foster care capacity, leaving foster parents overwhelmed with little support due to continuously high turnover rates of CPS case workers. HB 6 is the legislatures newest attempt to mend the wounds of Texas foster care.</p> <p><b>Community-Based Foster Care</b><br/>The bill seeks to redesign foster care requiring DFPS to contract with community-based, nonprofits, including faith based organizations, to provide child placement and case management services. The nonprofits work through the SSCC to meet the goals and requirements laid out by the bill. The bill requires that an organization place children in the least-restrictive environment with an emphasis on a family home environment if possible, being kinship or foster care. The ultimate goal would remain family reunification whenever possible for the child.</p> <p>Different from other proposals of foster care redesign, HB 6 privatizes case management by taking this service from DFPS and placing them into nonprofits contracting with the SSCC. The bill lays out the duties that would be required of the case workers under the SSCC. Little department oversight would be required of DFPS. However, before a catchment area can implemented, case management services within DFPS must conduct a readiness review of an SSCC. Qualifications of an SSCC are laid out in the bill and they would be required to hold a license from the DFPS. The bill also offers a contingency plan for the termination of contracts.</p> <p><b>Program Expansion</b><br/>HB 6 provides a roll out plan for both community based foster care and transfer of case management services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The bill give a deadline of December 21, 2019 for DFPS to identify no more than eight catchment areas they find will best implement community-based foster care.</li> <li>• Provisions of expanding case management services will be slower, allowing DFPS to identify only two catchment areas to initially transfer services too.</li> <li>• Case management may not be transferred to an SSCC until foster care services are successfully transferred.</li> <li>• Annually DFPS shall report to the legislature the readiness of remaining catchment areas</li> <li>• Based on availability of funds and readiness of remaining catchment areas DFPS would create a timeline for the continued roll out of services.</li> </ul> <p><b>Oversight</b><br/>A community engagement group will be implemented in each catchment area by utilizing community stakeholders. The group will be responsible for reporting feedback of the program implementation to DFPS. They will also be responsible for helping an SSCC to facilitate the use of local prevention and early intervention resources as well as other community resources.</p> <p>The Child Protective Services Legislative Oversight Committee would be comprised of members of both legislative chambers and members of the public appointed by the governor. The duties of the committee are outlined in the bill and rely mostly on the facilitation of transferring services and the reorganization of DFPS administrative structure.</p> <p><b>Medical and Mental Health Screenings</b></p> | <p><b>Favorable w/ Concerns</b><br/>Evaluated by: Kylie McNaught<br/>210-382-4295<br/><a href="mailto:Kylie@Texaslsg.org">Kylie@Texaslsg.org</a></p> |
|--|---|-----------------------|--|--|



The bill provides new provisions for medical and mental health screenings. Currently DFPS policies for medical and mental health screenings of a child that has been taken into conservatorship is within 30 days. This requires that screenings be conducted within three days for urban and suburban communities and five days for rural communities. It would also be required that any movement of placement of a child who is enrolled in the STAR Health Program notify the Managed Care Organization (MCO) within 24 hours.

**Foster Capacity Needs Plan**

One of the major issues facing children in the child welfare system is the limited number of foster parents. The causes of this include both the overwhelming nature of taking in a child with little support from the department and the financial burden it can put upon a family. HB 6 would require DFPS to provide monetary assistance for day care to foster parents who work full or part-time. This will help to incentivize more foster care parents to take on this important responsibility and assist those who have already done so. DFPS would also be required to develop a plan to mitigate the foster care capacity crisis. This would be done in collaboration with advocacy groups, faith-based entities and nonprofits through the collection of data on the need and availability per region. It requires both short-term and long-term goals.

**Concerns**

- This bill transfers for the first time, case management away from the state with minimal government oversight. Some agencies who take on this great responsibility lack the decades of experience with foster children and case management that many DFPS workers have.
- While a pilot program for placement has already been implemented in the Ft. Worth area and has shown success, rural areas may not have the same resources.
- Privatization of foster care has been attempted in three states, and has been found to be no more successful than the current system Texas has now.
- Initial roll out for the program expansion is only a maximum two years and reconsidered annually thereafter, such a monumental project should be allowed more time to be thoughtfully implementing.
- While the bill does not expressly state provisions for it, many have concerns that faith-based organizations may be at liberty institute discriminatory practices. The bill does not expressly protect children who may be denied services if they are LGBTQI+ or protect same-sex couples seeking to adopt. Some are concerned that religious entities may deny abortion access to teens in the system who have been sexually assaulted or are victims of sex-trafficking. Though protections for these seem implied, there are many loopholes in state and federal law that allow faith-based organizations to hold discriminatory practices.
- The bill does not address high turnover rates of case workers, nor does it address the limited amount of available services and resources to the children.

Currently, 30% of children who remain in foster care more than two-years lower their likelihood of permanency. The goal of CPS is family reunification yet when this does not work the child is placed in Permanent Managing Conservatorship (PMC), or foster care, at this point children are essentially the ward of the state. Adoption in Texas remains a long, tedious and expensive process. Leaving many children to be bounced from home to home. HB 6 is certainly a step in the right direction. Prioritizing the need for a child to remain within their community and thus disrupt normalcy as little as possible will help many children cope with the trauma of entering conservatorship. There is no doubt that the system as is in dire straits, as children continue to run away, sleep in caseworker offices or worse. Regardless of this, there should be thoughtful consideration in the capacity private entities have to carry out a such a huge project, especially as it affects the lives of our most vulnerable citizens.



|  |   |                                |  |  |
|--|---|--------------------------------|--|--|
| <p><b>HB 786</b><br/>By: VanDeaver</p> | <p>Relating to the prohibition of certain employment discrimination regarding an employee who is a volunteer emergency responder.</p> | <p>Business &amp; Industry</p> | <p>Prohibits an employer from terminating or suspending the employment of, or in any other manner discriminating against, an employee who is a volunteer emergency responder when they are late or absent in responding to an emergency. HB 786 also provides entitlements for these employees if an employer violates this mandate. Many small cities and rural communities rely on volunteer firefighters and other emergency responders to respond to fires and other emergencies. They are sometimes the only trained resource for these communities, and they save taxpayers incredible amounts of money. These volunteer firefighters must be protected from punishment for missing work when responding to emergencies. This is a public safety concern.</p> <p>The only concern in this bill is that an employer may reduce the wages otherwise owed to the employee for any period that the employee took off responding to an emergency, except as authorized by a collective bargaining agreement. A volunteer emergency responder should not be penalized in their wages otherwise owed when called on to respond to an emergency.</p> | <p><b>Favorable with Concerns</b><br/>Evaluated by:<br/>Serena Ahmed<br/>210-382-4295<br/><a href="mailto:Serena@Texaslsg.org">Serena@Texaslsg.org</a></p> |
|--|---|--------------------------------|--|--|

**LSG Floor Report For Constitutional Amendments Calendar- Thursday, May 11, 2017**

|   |   |                         |   |  |
|---|---|-------------------------|---|--|
| <p><b>HJR 67</b><br/>By: Bohac / Shine / Frullo</p> | <p>Proposing a constitutional amendment authorizing the legislature to provide for an exemption from ad valorem taxation of all or part of the market value of the residence homestead of a Purple Heart recipient or the surviving spouse of a Purple Heart recipient.</p> | <p>Ways &amp; Means</p> | <p>This resolution relates to an ad valorem property tax exemption for Purple Heart recipients and their surviving spouses. The state can recognize the valor in service of the United States demonstrated by recipients of the award by offering them the same tax relief that is offered to 100% disabled veterans. Because so many of the award are granted posthumously, it is important to extend the benefits to the service member's surviving spouse to honor their loss.</p> | <p><b>Favorable</b><br/>Evaluated by:<br/>Joel Kissell<br/>210-382-4295<br/><a href="mailto:Joel@Texaslsg.org">Joel@Texaslsg.org</a></p> |
|---|---|-------------------------|---|--|



|  |  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| <p><b>HJR 10</b><br/>By: Smithee</p>   | <p>Proposing a constitutional amendment changing the eligibility requirements for certain judicial offices.</p>                      | <p>Judiciary &amp; Civil Jurisprudence</p> | <p>HJR 10 proposes a constitutional amendment to change the eligibility requirements for Supreme Court Justices, a judge of the court of criminal appeals, a Justice of court of appeals, and district judges. Per the bill, requirements outlining valid licensure, length of time practicing law, and additional qualification requirements per the Legislature’s discretion clarify and strengthen the Texas judicial system.</p>   | <p><b>Favorable</b><br/>Evaluated by:<br/>Katherine Kirages<br/>210-382-4295<br/><a href="mailto:Katherine@Texaslsg.org">Katherine@Texaslsg.org</a></p> |
| <p><b>LSG Floor Report For General State Calendar- Thursday, May 11, 2017</b></p>      |  |  |  |   |
| <p><b>HB 3083</b><br/>By: Price/<br/>Coleman/<br/>Darby</p>                            | <p>Relating to repayment of certain mental health professional education loans.</p>  | <p>Public Health</p>                       | <p>HB 3083 amends the Education Code by adding Licensed Chemical Dependency Counselors (LCDC) to the list of professionals that may be awarded repayment assistance grants under the Loan Repayment Program for Mental Health Professionals. Texas is experiencing a severe shortage of mental health professionals. By adding the additional group Texas is encouraging the improvement of designated health professionals. HB 3083 clarifies the limitations for the amount of assistance a student may receive from the state, and removed the two-year service requirement. Per the bill, a LCDC may receive \$10,000 in assistance from the state if that individuals have received an associates degree. The bill requires the Higher Education Coordinating Board to apply for federal matching funds to ensure that money is being fully utilized, by annually seeking the maximum amount of funds.</p>  | <p><b>Favorable</b><br/>Evaluated by:<br/>Fabeain Barkwell<br/>210-382-4295<br/><a href="mailto:Fabeain@Texaslsg.org">Fabeain@Texaslsg.org</a></p>      |
| <p><b>HB 3735</b><br/>By: Frank</p>  | <p>Relating to an application for a new or amended water right submitted to the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality.</p>       | <p>Natural Resources</p>                   | <p>HB 3735 modifies the Water Code for new or amended water rights and updates language within the chapter. The bill limits the scope the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) can consider when granting or amending a water permit to what under its purview through jurisdiction. Amending language in the bill also changes language so that a permit is now <i>not inconsistent</i> with the state water plan instead of consistent. The state water plan is what Texas uses as a road map for regional and statewide needs and recommendations. Allowing leeway to deviate from the measures put forth through the state water plan could weaken the foundation of the process.</p>  | <p><b>Will of the House</b><br/>Evaluated by:<br/>Erin Eriksen<br/>210-382-4295<br/><a href="mailto:Erin@Texaslsg.org">Erin@Texaslsg.org</a></p>        |
| <p><b>HB 2962</b><br/>By:<br/>Capriglione<br/>/Sheffield<br/>/Springer<br/>/et al.</p> | <p>Relating to reporting requirements by certain health care facilities for abortion complications; authorizing a civil penalty.</p> | <p>State Affairs</p>                       | <p>CSHB 2962 adds to the complicated and restrictive web of administrative abortion restrictions already in place at the state and federal level. It requires hospitals, abortion clinics, and freestanding emergency care facilities to submit a quarterly report to DSHS outlining each abortion complication diagnosed or treated at the facility, despite the fact that clinics are already reporting this information. DSHS will develop a form for reporting these abortion complications to be published on their website. The bill mandates that this report will not include any identifying information about a patient or physician. Information contained in the report will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The name and type of facility submitting the report</li> <li>• The date and type of the abortion that caused the complication</li> <li>• The gestational age of the fetus when the abortion was performed</li> <li>• The date the complication was diagnosed or treated</li> <li>• A description of the complication</li> <li>• The number of previous live births of a patient</li> <li>• The number of previous induced abortions of the patient</li> </ul> <p>The reports made under this subchapter are confidential and not subject to open records requests. The bill describes certain situations under which the information may be released, including for statistical purposes with patient consent or to appropriate state licensing boards for the purpose of enforcing licensure laws. Additionally, DSHS will develop and publish an annual report that aggregates each abortion complication reported within the previous calendar year. CSHB 2962 imposes a civil penalty of \$500 for each</p> | <p><b>Unfavorable</b><br/>Evaluated by:<br/>Tyler Anderson<br/>210-382-4295<br/><a href="mailto:Tyler@Texaslsg.org">Tyler@Texaslsg.org</a></p>          |



|   |  |                                 |  |   |
|---|--|---------------------------------|--|---|
|   |  |                                 | <p>instance where a facility violates these reporting requirements. A facility's third consecutive violation of this section constitutes cause for the suspension or revocation of its operational license or permit.</p> <p>While this bill primarily seeks to obtain abortion complication data, it will almost certainly have negative unintended consequences. Women who already feel stigmatized for accessing a safe, legal medical procedure may be less likely to present with what they perceive to be a complication for fear that their information may be included in this type of report. Especially for smaller clinics, it could be possible to deduce that a woman accessed an abortion there based on date, location, and other identifying factors; this is concerning, as it could violate patients' confidentiality and privacy. Additionally, the information contained in these reports would be duplicative, as DSHS already requires abortion complication reporting with its "Abortion Complications Report" form (widely available on the DSHS website). Implementing an additional reporting form with requirements and timelines that are contradictory to the existing form will put a significant burden on abortion clinics, who are likely to find themselves in violation of this law resulting in costly fines or license revocation.</p> <p>Statistics show that just 1.4% of abortions performed result in a complication (with less than 0.2% of these being severe complications); this illustrates that abortion is one of the most statistically safe medical procedures that Texas access each year. If reporting requirements are being implemented to pursue public health benefit, this should be done across the board on procedures that are statistically more dangerous, such as appendectomies and wisdom tooth extractions. CSHB 2962 is a thinly veiled attempt to shame women for attempting to access reproductive healthcare and will likely overregulate many clinics providing abortions into non-compliance, resulting in decreased access for Texas women.</p> |   |
| <b>HB 3021</b><br>By: Phelan                      | Relating to indemnification and duties of engineers and architects under certain governmental contracts. | Judiciary & Civil Jurisprudence | HB 3021 mandates that the same indemnification, duty to defend and standard of care provisions that are currently applicable to local government entities now applicable to state agencies as well. This bill simply expands HB 2049 that was passed by the 2015 Texas Legislature. State agencies have begun to insert the same uninsurable duty to defend clauses and uninsurable standard of care clauses that HB 2049 corrected. Thus, HB 3021 expands these requirements from only local government entities to state agencies as well. This makes sure that every party to a construction contract is accountable for negligence.  | <b>Favorable</b><br>Evaluated by:<br>Serena Ahmed<br>210-382-4295<br><a href="mailto:Serena@Texaslsg.org">Serena@Texaslsg.org</a> |
| <b>HB 3015</b><br>By: King,<br>Tracy O.<br>/Raney | Relating to vacation leave time accounts for firefighter employee organizations.                         | Urban Affairs                   | CSHB 3015 requires a municipality to create a vacation leave time account for firefighters. Many firefighters each year have unused vacation time that is ultimately paid out to them. This would allow firefighters who are members of a union to donate accumulated vacation time to the employee organization's vacation leave time account. Use of the donated time would only be available to firefighters who are members of the organization. Any vacation time used must be approved by the fire chief and submit in writing to the municipality. Often things come up where a fellow fighter may need to exceed their paid leave so as not to miss out on important family events, or may simply may need an extra day for self-care. This will allow those who do not utilize all of their vacation time to donate the time to a fellow firefighter so as to give them leave time without losing pay.  | <b>Favorable</b><br>Evaluated by:<br>Kylie McNaught<br>210-382-4295<br><a href="mailto:Kylie@Texaslsg.org">Kylie@Texaslsg.org</a> |
| <b>HB 2757</b><br>By: Turner                      | Relating to the donation of sick leave by state employees.   | State Affairs                   | Currently, state employees can donate their accrued sick leave to another employee within the same agency that has exhausted all of their allotted sick leave via an agency sick leave pool. The law is ambiguous regarding the intended use of donated sick leave, however, which possibly subjects recipients of donated sick leave to federal income taxation. CSHB 2757 clarifies this ambiguity by specifying that individuals are eligible to receive donated sick leave only if they have exhausted all of their sick leave due to experiencing a medical emergency or are caring for a family member experiencing a medical emergency. Under this section, employees requesting donated sick leave must provide their employer with a written statement from a licensed physician documenting the medical emergency. The specifications made under this bill ensure that donated sick leave is being used for its  | <b>Favorable</b><br>Evaluated by:<br>Tyler Anderson<br>210-382-4295<br><a href="mailto:Tyler@Texaslsg.org">Tyler@Texaslsg.org</a> |



|   |   |                                  |   |   |
|---|---|----------------------------------|---|---|
|   |   |                                  | intended purpose and that recipients of donated sick leave aren't subject to additional federal income taxation, protecting employees and the state.  |   |
| <b>HB 3771</b><br>By: Cook/<br>Morrison,<br>Geanie<br>W./et al. | Relating to the definition of abortion.   | State Affairs                    | <p>CSHB 3771 updates the statutory definition of abortion to include the act of prescribing a drug, medicine, or instrument with the means to terminate a clinically diagnosable pregnancy, including the elimination of one or more fetuses in a multifetal pregnancy. An act is not considered an abortion if it is intended to save the life of a fetus, remove a dead fetus whose death was caused by spontaneous abortion, or to remove an ectopic pregnancy.</p> <p>There are a number of concerns associated with this new definition. Firstly, the definition no longer explicitly excludes contraceptives or birth control devices; this could lead to decreased access to these vital reproductive prescriptions, especially if specific pharmacies decide they no longer need to fill/provide these prescriptions. It is also scientifically inaccurate to include contraceptives in this definition, as they prevent an egg from becoming fertilized, therefore there is no embryo present. Additionally, the inclusion of selective reduction, which is used for IVF patients who have multiple viable embryo implantations, is problematic and potentially dangerous. It is common for multiple embryos (as many as 8-10) to implant during IVF; carrying this many babies to term is extremely dangerous for the woman and she should not be stigmatized or shamed for electing to increase her/her unborn children's safety by undergoing a selective reduction. While it is appropriate for the new definition to exempt ectopic pregnancy, it does not address the host of various medical situations in which a physician may recommend a patient terminate their pregnancy as the safest course of action.</p> <p>This new definition is dangerously broad and opens the door for physicians and related medical professionals to decide to no longer provide vital reproductive healthcare services, such as the prescribing of birth control. Additionally, it serves to further stigmatize abortion through its use of scientifically inaccurate information and inflammatory language. The statutory definition of abortion should be scientifically accurate and non-stigmatizing, as abortion is a safe and legal medical procedure that women have a right to access with privacy and dignity.</p> | <b>Unfavorable</b><br>Evaluated by:<br>Tyler Anderson<br>210-382-4295<br><a href="mailto:Tyler@Texaslsg.org">Tyler@Texaslsg.org</a>       |
| <b>HB 2542</b><br>By:<br>Anderson,<br>Rodney                    | Relating to notice to certain insurers by the Texas Department of Insurance regarding supervision or conservatorship of certain insurance agents. | Insurance                        | This bill amends the Insurance Code to mandate the commissioner of insurance to provide written notice of the order of suspicion or in conservatorship to each insurer who holds an appointment with that agent. This statute applies to agents licensed under both Title 11 (Title Insurance) and Title 13 (Regulation of Professionals). HB 2542 seeks to provide transparency to insurers working with agents that have been issued a notice of suspicion or conservatorship in order to make knowledgeable the risk of working with such an agent.  | <b>Favorable</b><br>Evaluated by:<br>Elizabeth Hann<br>210-382-4295<br><a href="mailto:Elizabeth@Texaslsg.org">Elizabeth@Texaslsg.org</a> |
| <b>HB 2703</b><br>By: Munoz,<br>Jr.                             | Relating to a temporary order appointing a receiver in a suit for dissolution of a marriage.  | Juvenile Justice & Family Issues | HB 2703 amends the Family Code to require the court, while a suit for the dissolution of a marriage is pending, to issue written findings of fact and conclusions of law in support of the receiver's appointment. If the court dispenses with the issuance of a bond between spouses, the bill requires the court to include an explanation of the reasons the court dispensed with the issuance of a bond. The intent of this bill is to create transparency and clarify the reasoning and conclusions that the respective judge used to appoint a receiver in a divorce case.  | <b>Favorable</b><br>Evaluated by:<br>Arielle Day<br>210-382-4295<br><a href="mailto:Arielle@Texaslsg.org">Arielle@Texaslsg.org</a>        |



|  |   |  |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| <p><b>HB 3391</b><br/>By: Geren</p>          | <p>Relating to the creation of a specialty court for certain public safety employees who commit a criminal offense; imposing fees for participation and testing, counseling, and treatment.</p> | <p>Judiciary &amp; Civil Jurisprudence</p> | <p>HB 3391 adds Chapter 129 under Government Code for purposes of creating a public safety employees treatment court program. A public safety employee is defined by this bill as a peace officer, firefighter, detention officer, county jailer or emergency medical services employee of this state. HB 3391 authorizes the commissioner’s court of a county to establish a public safety employees treatment court program for persons arrested for or charged with any misdemeanor or felony offense. A current or former public safety employee who is a defendant for a criminal offense is eligible to participate in this program, if: 1) the attorney representing the state consents to the defendant’s participation, and 2) the defendant suffered from a brain injury, mental illness, or mental disorder, including PTSD, that occurred during or resulted from their duties as a public safety employee, which consequently affected their criminal conduct at issue. <b>Or</b>, the defendant is eligible when, based on the circumstances of the defendant’s conduct, personal and social background, and criminal history, is likely to achieve the objective of ensuring public safety through rehabilitation by way of this program.</p> <p>HB 3391 offers an alternative for public safety employees that are defendants for a misdemeanor or felony offense outside of the criminal justice system. Such pretrial diversion programs exist for other populations, such as the veteran treatment court program established by the Texas Legislature in 2009. The promotion of rehabilitative systems as opposed to punitive measures by way of the criminal justice system is a crucial progressive step to be strived for all persons. Adding another treatment court program aids toward this effort.</p>   | <p><b>Favorable</b><br/>Evaluated by:<br/>Serena Ahmed<br/>210-382-4295<br/><a href="mailto:Serena@Texaslsg.org">Serena@Texaslsg.org</a></p>     |
| <p><b>HB 3422</b><br/>By:<br/>Laubenberg</p> | <p>Relating to participation by the State of Texas in the interstate voter registration crosscheck program.</p>   | <p>Elections</p>                           | <p>HB 3422 amends the Election code to allow the Secretary of State to release a voter's birth date and last four digits of their social security number to the Interstate Voter Registration Program. While ensuring that voter rolls are clean this system created by the Kansas’ Secretary of State has shown to release inaccurate data back to the states in the program. Allowing for this type of information to be sent out of state violates a voter's right for privacy. States like Oregon have dropped out of the program due to the wrongful information. Voting rights advocates assert that the Election Registration Information Center (ERIC) has a more reliable crosscheck process and is overseen by the states enrolled. Unfortunately, the Kansas program and free and the ERIC system would cost the state money.</p>   | <p><b>Unfavorable</b><br/>Evaluated by:<br/>Erin Eriksen<br/>210-382-4295<br/><a href="mailto:Erin@Texaslsg.org">Erin@Texaslsg.org</a></p>       |
| <p><b>HB 3991</b><br/>By: Larson</p>         | <p>Relating to appropriations of water for use in aquifer storage and recovery projects.</p>  | <p>Natural Resources</p>                   | <p>HB 3991 amends the Water Code allowing for water rights or amending water rights to utilize Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR). ASRs are ways to store water in an underground reservoir and then when it needed it can be recovered. Currently applications for a water right can be amended to add ASR projects. If the application for water right or amending a water right is for the Rio Grande River basin then TCEQ will consider any international water treaties and if the it would violate a treaty or court decision the right will not be granted. The bill also lays out the ability to increase the amount of water to be diverted into a ASR allocating the increase due to what water would have evaporated. Notice and hearing requirements would not be mandatory if the water right did not increase in the amount of water that may be diverted or rate of diversion or change the point of diversion. The TCEQ must make special considerations when awarding a water right that protects existing water right and also comply with environmental flow standards laid out in statute. The commission can adopt rules to expedite water right permits for ASR projects.</p> <p>ASR projects are utilized in several states for the purposes of storing water and in a way that is more environmentally friendly and conserves more water. However, it is essential that environmental flows during times of excess aren't overly diverted. Allowing for some capture is extremely beneficial but not to the extent of the environment. Advocates for the environment argue that the current environmental flow standards laid out by TCEQ do not meet the reality of what should remain now. Texas does need to plan for its next drought but not at the expense of the environment or water rights that are not being utilized for projects that are not ASRs.</p> | <p><b>Will of the House</b><br/>Evaluated by:<br/>Erin Eriksen<br/>210-382-4295<br/><a href="mailto:Erin@Texaslsg.org">Erin@Texaslsg.org</a></p> |





|  |  |   |  |   |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| <p><b>HB 2755</b><br/>By: Turner</p>                                     | <p>Relating to the punishment for the offense of tampering with a governmental record; increasing a criminal penalty.</p>  | <p>General Investigating &amp; Ethics</p> | <p>Currently, tampering with a government record is a class A misdemeanor (Penal Code, sec. 37.10). In order to protect sensitive payroll information and taxpayer dollars. HB 2755 seeks to increase the penalty regarding tampering with government payroll documents. In some instances, there has been discrepancies with payroll within certain state agencies. This bill would make the penalty for tampering with a government record containing requests for compensation to a state officer or employee a state jail felony.</p>  | <p><b>Favorable</b><br/>Evaluated by:<br/>Ana Ramon<br/>210-382-4295<br/><a href="mailto:Ana@Texaslsg.org">Ana@Texaslsg.org</a></p>                     |
| <p><b>HB 1886</b><br/>By: Miller/<br/>Bonnen,<br/>Dennis/<br/>Zerwas</p> | <p>Relating to dyslexia screening and testing, the employment of dyslexia specialists by regional education service centers, and the development by the Texas Education Agency of a list of training opportunities for educators regarding dyslexia.</p> | <p>Public Education</p>                   | <p>HB 1886 requires each regional education service center to employ a licensed dyslexia therapist to serve as the dyslexia specialist for the school districts the center serves. The dyslexia specialist would provide school districts with the support and resources that are necessary to assist students with dyslexia and the families of students with dyslexia. The bill also requires that the dyslexia screening program approved by the State Board of Education include screening at the end of each school year for kindergarteners and first graders. HB 1886 also requires the Texas Education Agency to develop training opportunities regarding dyslexia that enables educators to implement instruction that is systemic, explicit, and evidence-based to meet the educational needs of students with dyslexia. This bill seeks to improve the academic success of students with dyslexia by providing for the early identification of and intervention for a child with dyslexia.</p>  | <p><b>Favorable</b><br/>Evaluated by:<br/>Arielle Day<br/>210-382-4295<br/><a href="mailto:Arielle@Texaslsg.org">Arielle@Texaslsg.org</a></p>           |
| <p><b>HB 1616</b><br/>By:<br/>Thompson,<br/>Senfronia</p>                | <p>Relating to an exemption from civil liability for certain professionals for the disclosure of certain mental health information.</p>  | <p>Public Health</p>                      | <p>HB 1616 exempts professionals authorized to practice medicine, evaluate, and treat mental disorders from civil liability for disclosing certain mental health information. The obligation of a professional to maintain a patient’s right to privacy, despite the compulsion to provide warning of imminent and severe danger that patient may pose, is an ethical dilemma that has existed for some time. Texas statute holds that the professional is obligated to the patient only, and has no duty to warn unless providing information to a governmental agency, or medical and law enforcement personnel. With the numerous occurrences of school shootings, church shootings, and more recently college campus stabbings, a professional who is aware of potential danger their patient could inflict, could possibly save the lives of many by revealing this information. It can be challenging for mental health providers to protect the future behaviors of their patients. HB 1616 could make a critical difference by allowing providers to take quick action by disclosing and reporting information to protect the community and the patient. HB 1616 includes mental health personnel to the list of agencies confidential information may be disclosed, and exempts professionals from civil liability if in good faith, they determine the probability of imminent physical injury by the patient to the patient, or others.</p> | <p><b>Favorable</b><br/>Evaluated by:<br/>Tyler Anderson<br/>210-382-4295<br/><a href="mailto:Tyler@Texaslsg.org">Tyler@Texaslsg.org</a></p>            |
| <p><b>HB 1223</b><br/>By: Murr/<br/>Israel</p>                           | <p>Relating to the operation and movement of authorized emergency vehicles.</p>  | <p>Transportation</p>                     | <p>This bill allows operators of emergency vehicles to have more flexibility when operating a lawful ambulance or police vehicle (or any other authorized emergency vehicle) by using an audible or visual signal, instead of being required to use an audible signal. Additionally, regular everyday driver conductors will still have to give the same respect whether the operator of the emergency vehicle is using audible or visual signals.</p>   | <p><b>Favorable</b><br/>Evaluated by:<br/>Andrea Elizondo<br/>210-382-4295<br/><a href="mailto:Andrea@Texaslsg.org">Andrea@Texaslsg.org</a></p>         |
| <p><b>HB 1632</b><br/>By: Bonnen,<br/>Greg</p>                           | <p>Relating to deferred payment of ad valorem taxes for certain persons serving in the United States armed forces.</p>   | <p>Ways &amp; Means</p>                   | <p>This bill removes references to “war or national emergency” as a qualifier for receiving an exemption from penalties associated with delinquent property tax payments. Under current statute, members of the armed forces have sixty days following the first of four events happening:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Their discharge from their branch of service,</li> <li>• Their return to Texas for more than 10 days,</li> <li>• Their transition from an active duty component to reserve component of the armed forces, or</li> </ul>  | <p><b>Favorable</b><br/>Evaluated by:<br/>Katherine Kirages<br/>210-382-4295<br/><a href="mailto:Katherine@Texaslsg.org">Katherine@Texaslsg.org</a></p> |



|   |   |                                 |  |  |
|---|---|---------------------------------|--|--|
|   |   |                                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The war or national emergency they serve during ends.</li> </ul> <p>HB 1632 also amends the Tax Code so that members who fail to make payments on delinquent property taxes owe interest on their back taxes but do not face an additional penalty.</p> <p>After more than a decade, the conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan have officially ended and the exemption is no longer required. Removing the exemption from statute also prevents situations where a member of the armed forces is stationed elsewhere in the world and finds themselves having to sort out property taxes for real property they are unable to utilize during their service.</p>   |  |
| <b>HB 1300</b><br>By: Springer                  | Relating to the collection and use of municipal hotel occupancy taxes.  | Ways & Means                    | This bill amends the revenue cap that a municipality may use for the administration of an electronic tax administration system at the lesser of one percent or \$75,000 per year. These electronic systems are utilized to collect the hotel occupancy tax, and revenue from the tax is intended for the promotion of tourism and the hotel and conference industry within a municipality. The bill also clarifies that administration does not include audits of the electronic systems. HB 1300 ensures that tax revenue is spent in alignment with its purpose and encourages efficiency within its collection.   | <b>Will of the House</b><br>Evaluated by:<br>Katherine Kirages<br>210-382-4295<br><a href="mailto:Katherine@Texaslsg.org">Katherine@Texaslsg.org</a> |
| <b>HB 2552</b><br>By:<br>Thompson,<br>Senfronia | Relating to prostitution and trafficking of persons and to certain criminal and civil consequences of that conduct. | Judiciary & Civil Jurisprudence | <p>HB 2552 is an omnibus bill that strengthens Texas’s response to illegal massage establishments (IMEs) in five vital ways. <b>One</b>, this bill adds to the list of false, misleading or deceptive acts or practices under the Deceptive Trade Practices Act: the operation of an unlicensed massage establishment, one or that does not comply with licensing requirements. This creates a civil liability for these businesses. <b>Two</b>, this legislation allows proof of arrest or law enforcement testimony for prostitution-related activity, or evidence of a previous suit against the landowner of such common nuisance activity at their property, to serve as prima facie evidence that the defendant knowingly tolerated the activity and did not make a reasonable attempt to abate the activity. <b>Three</b>, requires the Bureau of Identification and Records to collect and analyze data on all prostitution arrests and outcomes. Texas does not systematically collect data on trafficking-related crimes across Texas. This information is vital for guiding strategy aimed at reducing the demand for illegal commercial sex and trafficking, and for protecting minors and adults from violence and exploitation from buyers and traffickers. <b>Four</b>, expands the definition of “promotion of prostitution” in the Penal Code to include how it is illegal to provide a person or premises for the purposes of prostitution, closing a loophole in this statute. <b>Five</b>, amends the Property Code so that commercial property owners can evict businesses from their property if they reasonably believe that the business is involved in prostitution or human trafficking. This will permit property owners acting in good faith to evict tenants engaged in these activities faster and with fewer costs, while making bad faith property owners more susceptible to actions brought against them by local governments, as they will have no excuse for permitting the tenancy to continue.</p> <p>Thousands of businesses across Texas that claim to offer massage services are actually fronts for human trafficking and compelling prostitution. IME owners exploit the women trapped there and force them to have sex with multiple men per day. In Harris County, these IMEs outnumber Starbucks, and in other cities such as Dallas and San Antonio the number is not far behind. Local law enforcement agencies are forced to spend a disproportionate amount of time patrolling these establishments, and the surrounding communities suffer a decrease in the overall quality of life including heightened risks of violent crime. Additionally, in cities such as Houston without zoning, these establishments may be in closer proximity to homes and other neighborhood entities, thus making them even more of a serious problem for Texas families. HB 2552 is a crucial bill to addressing this problem and making real progress against this exploitative activity.</p> | <b>Favorable</b><br>Evaluated by:<br>Serena Ahmed<br>210-382-4295<br><a href="mailto:Serena@Texaslsg.org">Serena@Texaslsg.org</a>                    |



|   |   |                         |  |   |
|---|---|-------------------------|--|---|
| <p><b>HB 1151</b><br/>By: Schofield</p>   | <p>Relating to the deadline for returning a ballot voted by mail.</p>   | <p>Elections</p>        | <p>HB 1151 amends the Elections code to allow a ballot by mail to be counted up until 5pm on the day after the election if the envelope was postmarked to by 7pm on Election Day. If a ballot by mail is still being processed these votes can get missed and would not be counted. This extension provides a much-needed opportunity to enchanted voter enfranchisement.</p>  | <p><b>Favorable</b><br/>Evaluated by:<br/>Erin Eriksen<br/>210-382-4295<br/><a href="mailto:Erin@Texaslsg.org">Erin@Texaslsg.org</a></p>      |
| <p><b>HB 3871</b><br/>By: Thierry</p>   | <p>Relating to substandard residential building fines issued by certain municipalities.</p>                     | <p>Urban Affairs</p>    | <p>HB 3871 allows a municipality to impose a substandard residential building fine on the owner of a residential building deemed a nuisance. A substandard residential building, also known as a nuisance residential building, is categorized as dilapidated, uninhabitable, and a health or safety hazard. If the fine is not paid this bill allows the municipality to file a lien on the property. After the lien is file, it is extinguishable if payment is received. This will help residential communities to maintain integrity while helping to keep their residents safe.</p>   | <p><b>Favorable</b><br/>Evaluated by:<br/>Kylie McNaught<br/>210-382-4295<br/><a href="mailto:Kylie@Texaslsg.org">Kylie@Texaslsg.org</a></p>  |
| <p><b>HB 2782</b><br/>By: Wilson</p>  | <p>Relating to the method used in rating public school districts and campuses for accountability purposes.</p>  | <p>Public Education</p> | <p>The scoring method for determining a school’s A-F accountability rating should guarantee that every school could potentially achieve the top score should they perform at the required level. HB 2782 essentially codifies this as the intent of the legislature and reassures school districts that the legislature does not intend for a forced curve system to determine a school’s rating.</p>  | <p><b>Favorable</b><br/>Evaluated by:<br/>Arielle Day<br/>210-382-4295<br/><a href="mailto:Arielle@Texaslsg.org">Arielle@Texaslsg.org</a></p> |
| <p><b>HB 3152</b><br/>By: Thompson, Senfronia/ Howard/ Collier/ Walle/ Herrero/et al.</p> | <p>Relating to the care and transportation provided to a sexual assault survivor by a health care facility.</p> | <p>Public Health</p>    | <p>Sexual assault forensic examiners are medical professionals, often nurses, who are highly trained in specific techniques related to performing a sexual assault forensic examination (rape kit). These professionals are best equipped to handle the sensitive, often emotional process of walking a sexual assault survivor through their forensic exam. There are currently about 80 SAFE-ready medical facilities in Texas, predominantly located in urban areas. CSHB 3152 seeks to increase awareness of and access to SAFE nurses by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requiring DSHS to designate health care facilities that employ or contract with a sexual assault forensic examiner as SAFE-ready facilities</li> <li>• Requiring non-SAFE-ready facilities to inform sexual assault survivors that they do not employ a SAFE nurse, but that the survivor has the right to be safely transferred to the closest SAFE-ready facility</li> <li>• Requiring staff of the non-SAFE-ready facility to contact the SAFE-ready facility to ensure there will be a SAFE nurse present and ready to perform the forensic exam when the survivor arrives</li> <li>• Requiring non-SAFE-ready facilities to develop a plan to train personnel on sexual assault forensic evidence collection, resulting in an increased number of SAFE trained nurses</li> <li>• Requiring DSHS to publish to their website an annually updated list of SAFE-ready facilities in Texas</li> </ul> <p>The bill also requires DSHS to develop an information form to be provided to sexual assault providers who present at non-SAFE-ready facilities seeking a forensic exam. This form is to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information on the benefits of receiving a forensic exam performed by a SAFE nurse</li> <li>• A link to the DSHS website that lists all SAFE-ready facilities</li> </ul> | <p><b>Favorable</b><br/>Evaluated by:<br/>Tyler Anderson<br/>210-382-4295<br/><a href="mailto:Tyler@Texaslsg.org">Tyler@Texaslsg.org</a></p>  |



|   |  |                                 |  |   |
|---|--|---------------------------------|--|---|
|   |  |                                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A statement informing the survivor of their right to receive a forensic exam at the medical facility of their choice within 96 hours after their assault</li> <li>• A statement informing the survivor that a statement to law enforcement is not required, but if they wish to inform law enforcement then they must obtain authorization from law enforcement to receive the SAFE exam (this is pre-existing law)</li> <li>• The phone contact 1-800-656-HOPE, which will provide the survivor with free and confidential assistance</li> <li>• Information on the process by which the survivor can file a complaint against the healthcare facility</li> </ul> <p>About ⅔ of assault survivors choose not to present at a medical facility for an examination at all; the process is lengthy, invasive, and can be re-traumatizing if the professional performing the exam isn't properly trained. This bill ensures that survivors of sexual assault will be provided with consistent, accurate information regarding their rights to SAFE nurses so they can make fully informed decisions regarding their medical care. Not only will this improve the quality of care, but it will provide autonomy and control to an individual who has just experienced a horrific crime, bringing necessary justice and compassion to sexual assault survivors in Texas.</p>   |   |
| <b>HB 3343</b><br>By: Paul                            | Relating to the suspension and reactivation of the operation of the Texas Health Reinsurance System.           | Insurance                       | <p>HB 3343 amends the Insurance Code as it relates to the suspension and reactivation of the operation of the Texas Health Reinsurance System (THRS). This bill mandates the commissioner of insurance to hold a hearing for the purpose of suspending or reactivating the THRS, if he/she is under the impression that small employer health benefit plans are threatened with the inability to secure reinsurance. It prohibits the system from operating after an order of suspension of the system's operation, until a subsequent order authorizing the operation of the system goes into effect.</p> <p>The bill also necessitates the established THRS board of directors to submit a suspension plan for the operation of THRS to the commissioner within the stipulated timeline. It mandates that necessary transactions needed to suspend the system are subject to a state audit. The bill requires the State Auditor's Office to report the cost of the audit to the state comptroller and stipulates that the THRS board remit the amount to the comptroller to go to the General Revenue Fund.</p> <p>This bill seeks to address the concern that the Texas Health Reinsurance System (THRS) does not function as initially intended. THRS is a nonprofit which delivers reinsurance to insurers of small employer health benefit plans. Many feel the program's administrative expenses and resources are too costly and not being used efficiently.</p> | <b>Favorable</b><br>Evaluated by:<br>Elizabeth Hann<br>210-382-4295<br><a href="mailto:Elizabeth@Texaslsg.org">Elizabeth@Texaslsg.org</a> |
| <b>HB 3702</b><br>By: Davis, Yvonne                   | Relating to the notice of rights provided to an injured employee under the Texas workers' compensation system. | Business & Industry             | <p>Requires a notice that must already be adopted and distributed to include information related to an injured employee's right to choose a treating doctor. There are concerns that injured employees are not aware of their right to choose a treating doctor in a case involving workers' compensation. In the general powers and duties of the Office of Injured Employee Counsel, mandated by Chapter 404 under Labor Code, the Public Counsel must adopt a notice of injured employees' rights and responsibilities to be distributed by the division. HB 3702 simply requires this notice to an inform of the employee's right to choose a treating doctor, including a doctor of medicine, osteopathic medicine, optometry, dentistry, podiatry or chiropractic, who is licensed and authorized to practice. The Public Counsel shall adopt this notice not later than December 1, 2017.</p>   | <b>Favorable</b><br>Evaluated by:<br>Serena Ahmed<br>210-382-4295<br><a href="mailto:Serena@Texaslsg.org">Serena@Texaslsg.org</a>         |
| <b>HB 2121</b><br>By: Cyrier/ Anderson, Charles "Doc" | Relating to damages in certain contract claims against the state.  | Judiciary & Civil Jurisprudence | <p>Provides that an award of damages may include attorney's fees when the claim for breach of contract is for engineering, architectural, or construction services, or related materials, and the amount of actual damages in controversy is less than \$250,000. Such contracts refer to written contracts between a unit of a state government and a contractor for building constructions projects, or non-TxDOT construction services under Chapter 2260, Government Code. Currently, an award of damages for a breach of contract claim may not include attorney's fees for the prevailing party.</p>   | <b>Favorable</b><br>Evaluated by:<br>Serena Ahmed<br>210-382-4295<br><a href="mailto:Serena@Texaslsg.org">Serena@Texaslsg.org</a>         |



|   |  |                  |  |   |
|---|--|------------------|--|---|
|   |  |                  | For some parties, it is not worth pursuing a claim of breach in these contracts against the state for damages under \$250,000 without the potential for recovering attorney’s fees. For instance, if the damages are \$100,000, it is not in the party’s best interest to sue when their attorney’s fees are expected to be between \$100,000 to \$200,000. HB 2121 simply aligns this provision of breach of contract against the state with that of local government entities, allowing the courts to award attorney’s fees to the prevailing party  |   |
| <b>HB 2691</b><br>By: Bonnen,<br>Greg   | Relating to certain election practices and procedures.   | Elections        | HB 2691 amends the Election Code in order to create a process for filling vacancies of Election and alternate judges for countywide polling places. A list of names will be submitted by the county chair for judges of the party with the highest number of votes in direct proportion to the percentage of precincts in each county. A judge is not required to serve in the same precinct that they reside and can serve at any countywide polling location. It would align the rules used for non-countywide locations so that the processes are similar. The use of countywide polling places is also extended to run off and May elections to avoid voter confusion. This bill will help streamline the process of overseeing countywide polling locations which are utilized in large counties and are increasingly popular among voters. It would also widen the pool with whom the commissioner’s court picks to be judges will help to enhance the overall voting process.   | <b>Favorable</b><br>Evaluated by:<br>Erin Eriksen<br>210-382-4295<br><a href="mailto:Erin@Texaslsg.org">Erin@Texaslsg.org</a>                           |
| <b>HB 1372</b><br>By: Koop/<br>Oliverson/<br>Martinez,<br>“Mando”/<br>Burkett               | Relating to information included in the curriculum of each driver education course and driving safety course.  | Transportation   | This bill requires that information about law enforcement procedures for traffic stops be included in the curriculum for driver education and driving safety courses. The curriculum must include a demonstration of the proper actions to be taken during a traffic stop and information on proper interactions with law enforcement. DPS will consult with the Texas Commission of Licensing and Regulation to appoint regional leaders in driver education industry and in law enforcement to assist in the development of the driver education and driving safety course requirements. Although there is no adequate statewide curriculum about law enforcement procedures for driver education and driver safety courses, prospective peace officers should also be trained on proper traffic stop procedures and knowing how to deescalate high tense situations.  | <b>Will of the House w/Concerns</b><br>Evaluated by:<br>Andrea Elizondo<br>210-382-4295<br><a href="mailto:Andrea@Texaslsg.org">Andrea@Texaslsg.org</a> |
| <b>HB 306</b><br>By:<br>Minjarez/<br>Faircloth/<br>Moody/<br>Larson/<br>King Ken/<br>et al. | Relating to harassment, bullying, and cyberbullying of a public school student or minor and certain mental health programs for public school students. | Public Education | HB 306 amends several sections of statute to address the epidemic of cyberbullying in Texas schools. The bill includes preventative measures as well as punitive measures to create a deterrent for the cyberbullying of minors and to empower students, parents, and educators with the tools necessary to combat cyberbullying. The provisions intended to increase the awareness and responsiveness to cyberbullying in schools include, but are not limited to: requires school districts to adopt cyberbullying policies, requires teachers and principals to fulfill continuing education requirements that include instruction on how grief and trauma affect student learning and behavior, and requires the Texas Education Agency to establish and maintain an Internet website that provides districts with resources regarding grief-informed and trauma-informed practices. A school district’s cyberbullying policy would include a procedure for students to anonymously report an incident of bullying.<br><br>HB 306 also provides injunctive relief for minors who are victimized by cyberbullying. A court may issue a temporary restraining order or permanent injunction to prevent further cyberbullying, including an order or injunction to compel a defendant who is the parent of a minor engaging in cyberbullying to take reasonable actions to stop their child from continuing to cyberbully. The bill also amends the Penal Code to include bullying as an act that constitutes the Class B misdemeanor offense of harassment. If the person engaging in bullying has previously violated a temporary restraining order or their conduct results in serious bodily injury or death, the offense is a Class A misdemeanor. | <b>Favorable</b><br>Evaluated by:<br>Ana Ramon<br>210-382-4295<br><a href="mailto:Ana@Texaslsg.org">Ana@Texaslsg.org</a>                                |
| <b>HB 3576</b><br>By: Guerra/<br>Longoria/  | Relating to the investigation of, and release of information concerning,   | Public Health    | Proper monitoring and documentation of emerging high consequence communicable diseases, like Zika virus, is critical to ensure that local and state authorities can effectively plan and support clinical interventions. Certain geographic regions, such as the Rio Grande Valley, are disproportionately vulnerable to Zika; it is critical that the state work effectively with federal agencies such as the CDC to implement important public health protocols.  | <b>Favorable</b><br>Evaluated by:<br>Tyler Anderson   |



|   |  |                               |   |  |
|---|--|-------------------------------|---|--|
| <p>Zerwas/<br/>Loano/<br/>Sheffield/et<br/>al.</p>    | <p>communicable disease, including the Zika virus and other high consequence communicable diseases.</p>  |                               | <p>CSHB 3576 ensures that Texas can assist in proper surveillance by providing for the release of certain information pertaining to individuals who contract communicable diseases such as Zika. Information related to a person suspected of having a health condition resulting from exposure to a high consequence communicable disease that can be released to appropriate federal agencies includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Name, address, sex, race, occupation</li> <li>• Date of the onset of the health condition</li> <li>• Probable source of infection or exposure</li> <li>• Other requested information relating to the infection</li> </ul> <p>The bill also requires DSHS to investigate the effects of communicable diseases such as Zika, including detrimental public health effects, and expands the purposes for which DSHS may investigate communicable disease.</p>  | <p>210-382-4295<br/><a href="mailto:Tyler@Texaslsg.org">Tyler@Texaslsg.org</a></p>   |
| <p><b>HB 661</b><br/>By: Parker/<br/>et al.</p>       | <p>Relating to access to certain investigational drugs, biological products, and devices that are in clinical trials by patients with severe chronic diseases.</p> | <p>Public Health</p>          | <p>“The Right to Try Act”, passed during the 84th Legislative Session, allowed for patients with terminal illnesses to access certain investigatory drugs and treatments that are still undergoing clinical trial and are not yet FDA approved. HB 661 amends the Health and Safety Code to expand access to investigational drugs to patients living with severe chronic illness, defined within the bill as an illness requiring medical attention for longer than one year and that entail significant functional impairment or severe pain that limits the patient’s daily life. Patients with chronic illnesses are authorized to access investigational drugs under this bill if they have considered all other FDA approved treatment options and have determined with their doctor that those treatments are unavailable or unlikely to provide significant relief. Patients must give their informed consent before accessing any investigational drugs under this bill. The bill offers liability protections to pharmaceutical manufacturers against any harm done to the patient as a result of using the drug. Additionally, it states that the Texas Medical Board may not revoke a physician’s license based solely on the physician’s recommendations to a patient regarding accessing an investigational drug.</p> <p>There are a number of concerns with expanding access to investigational drugs for non-terminal patients with chronic illness. These concerns include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The bill does not clearly define clinical trial, leaving patients open to increased risks if they are not accessing the drugs through a scientific controlled clinical trial conducted through a national authorizing entity such as the IRB</li> <li>• Drugs administered under this subsection only have to have completed Phase I of a clinical trial. Phase I primarily relates to determining dosage and does not allow for full investigation into the efficacy or safety concerns associated with the drug. Drugs administered under this subchapter would pose less risk to patients if they were at least Phase II</li> <li>• Patients cannot truly offer informed consent if they are unaware of the full scope of side-effects and risks associated with an investigational drug or treatment</li> <li>• Expanding the Medical Freedom Act beyond those with terminal illness dangerously expands the number of individuals who can access investigational drugs, potentially leading to a significant number of individuals experiencing negative side effects</li> <li>• These investigational drugs could exacerbate the severity of an individual’s chronic illness that could have otherwise been managed with safe, FDA approved treatments</li> <li>• The bill offers legal protections and remedies for all parties involved except the patient</li> </ul> | <p><b>Unfavorable</b><br/>Evaluated by:<br/>Tyler Anderson<br/>210-382-4295<br/><a href="mailto:Tyler@Texaslsg.org">Tyler@Texaslsg.org</a></p> |
| <p><b>HB 2908</b><br/>By: Hunter/<br/>King, Phil/</p> | <p>Relating to the punishment for a criminal offense committed against a person</p>  | <p>Criminal Jurisprudence</p> | <p>HB 2908 enhances criminal penalties to the next higher punishable offense for certain offenses committed against a peace officer due to bias or prejudice. Under the bill, increased punishment extends to crimes classified as offenses against the person, arson, criminal mischief, graffiti, unlawful restraint, terroristic threat, and intoxicated assault. Through provisions in Texas statute, punishment for assault extends to both a peace officer or their spouse if a person causes bodily injury. While peace officers certainly face heightened</p>   | <p><b>Will of the House</b><br/>Evaluated by:<br/>Katherine Kirages</p>  |



|  |   |                                |   |   |
|--|---|--------------------------------|---|---|
| Villalba/<br>Herrero/et<br>al.                       | because of bias or prejudice on the basis of status as a peace officer; increasing a criminal penalty.  |                                | risks in the line of duty, this increase in risk is a direct result of a volatile social and political climate. Furthermore, there are already provisions outlining heightened punishment for offenses against public servants, and this adds a specific occupation to groups of persons protected from bias or prejudice based on certain identifiers that they have little to no choice in being or exhibiting.   | 210-382-4295<br><a href="mailto:Katherine@Texaslsg.org">Katherine@Texaslsg.org</a>  |
| <b>HB 2557</b><br>By: Miller/<br>Zerwas/<br>Reynolds | Relating to the development of certain local government transportation infrastructure projects; authorizing the issuance of bonds.  | Transportation                 | A intelligent transportation system is an innovative or intelligent technological transportation systems, infrastructure, or facilities, including elevated freight transportation facilities; are in proximity to, or within, an existing right-of-way on the state highway system, or connects land ports of entry to the state highway system. This bill allows certain counties to adopt an order, from the commissioners court or a local government corporation, that authorizes the county and a navigation district located wholly or partly in the county to develop rail facilities. Certain counties include: a county that is adjacent to a county with a population of 4 million or more, a county that has a population of 300,000 or more, and a county that has created a rural transportation district with an adjacent county pursuant to statutory provisions relating to the creation of the rural transportation district by more than one county. The bill also allows a rural rail transportation district to exercise those powers if each county that created the district adopts an order. This legislation would also allow counties to issue bonds for rail facilities secured by a pledge of the revenues of the facilities. Revenues include: contract revenue, grant revenue, or other revenue collected in connection with the facilities. Improvements are needed for Texas ports and related transportation infrastructure projects to accommodate increased trade that makes the state's economy thrive. | <b>Favorable</b><br>Evaluated by:<br>Andrea Elizondo<br>210-382-4295<br><a href="mailto:Andrea@Texaslsg.org">Andrea@Texaslsg.org</a>    |
| <b>HB 2473</b><br>By: Davis,<br>Sarah                | Relating to the disclosure of gifts by vendors to certain local government officers and of certain relationships with local government officers; creating a criminal offense. | General Investigating & Ethics | Requires a vendor to submit a completed disclosure form created by the Texas Ethics Commission to a local governmental entity. If a vendor has or is seeking to enter into a contract with a local governmental entity, and the vendor has given one or more gifts during the preceding calendar quarter with an aggregate value of more than \$100 to a local government officer or family member of that local government officer, then they must submit a disclosure statement. This statement must not be submitted later than the 15th day of the first month of each calendar quarter. Currently, vendors are already required to file a conflicts disclosure statement. HB 2473 clarifies the procedures for submitting this disclosure. If a vendor is required to submit the statement and knowingly fails to submit the disclosure, the violation is a class C misdemeanor offense.   | <b>Favorable</b><br>Evaluated by:<br>Serena Ahmed<br>210-382-4295<br><a href="mailto:Serena@Texaslsg.org">Serena@Texaslsg.org</a>       |
| <b>HB 2988</b><br>By: Frullo                         | Relating to authorization for the conveyance of certain real property from Texas Tech University to Texas Tech University Health Sciences Center.                             | Higher Education               | HB 2988 allows the coordinating board to transport property that is a part of the original main campus of Texas Tech University in Lubbock to Texas Tech University Health Sciences Center. The board must make this transfer while considering the best interest of both institutions. The bill states that the transaction must be in the form of an agreement with appropriate documents between the two institutions  | <b>Favorable</b><br>Evaluated by:<br>Fabeain Barkwell<br>210-382-4295<br><a href="mailto:Fabeain@Texaslsg.org">Fabeain@Texaslsg.org</a> |
| <b>HB 3349</b><br>By: Gervin-<br>Hawkins             | Relating to creating an abbreviated certification program and probationary and standard certificates for trade and industrial workforce training.                             | Public Education               | HB 3349 creates an accelerated teacher certification program for trade and industry workforce professionals so they can become certified to train others. Admission eligibility requirements include, but are not limited to, a high school diploma or postsecondary credential, 7 years of full-time experience within the preceding 10 years in an approved occupation in which instruction is offered, and current licensure in an approved occupation for which instruction is offered. The bill also requires participants to undergo 80 hours of specific training regarding classroom management, relevant federal and state education laws, creating lesson plans, and creating student assessment instruments. The intent of HB 3349 is to provide a way for individuals with several years of experience and subject knowledge to become technical skills educators without having to obtain a four-year degree.  | <b>Favorable</b><br>Evaluated by:<br>Arielle Day<br>210-382-4295<br><a href="mailto:Arielle@Texaslsg.org">Arielle@Texaslsg.org</a>      |



|  |  |                      |   |  |
|--|--|----------------------|---|--|
| <p><b>HB 810</b><br/>By: Parker/<br/>Springer/<br/>Paul/<br/>Anderson,<br/>Charles<br/>"Doc"/<br/>Burkett/et<br/>al.</p> | <p>Relating to the provision of certain investigational stem cell treatments to patients with certain severe chronic diseases or terminal illnesses and regulating the possession, use, and transfer of adult stem cells; creating a criminal offense.</p> | <p>Public Health</p> | <p>CSHB 810 authorizes patients with terminal illnesses or severe chronic diseases (as defined by the bill) to access investigational stem cell treatments that are currently undergoing clinical trial but have not yet been approved by the FDA. Patients with terminal or chronic illnesses are authorized to access investigational drugs under this bill if they have considered all other FDA approved treatment options and have determined with their doctor that those treatments are unavailable or unlikely to provide significant relief. Patients must give their informed consent before accessing any investigational stem cell treatments under this bill. The bill offers liability protections to pharmaceutical manufacturers against any harm done to the patient as a result of using the drug. Additionally, it states that the Texas Medical Board may not revoke a physician's license based solely on the physician's recommendations to a patient regarding accessing an investigational stem cell treatment.</p> <p>There are a number of concerns with expanding access to investigational stem cell treatments for patients with terminal and chronic illness. These concerns include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The bill does not clearly define clinical trial, leaving patients open to increased risks if they are not accessing the treatment through a scientific controlled clinical trial conducted through a national authorizing entity such as the IRB</li> <li>• Patients cannot truly offer informed consent if they are unaware of the full scope of side-effects and risks associated with an investigational stem cell treatment</li> <li>• These investigational treatments could exacerbate the severity of an individual's terminal or chronic illness that could have otherwise been managed with safe, FDA approved treatments</li> <li>• Offering widespread access to investigative stem cell treatments without proper oversight could jeopardize the future of regenerative medical research</li> <li>• Many stem cell clinics are unregulated and do not monitor outcomes beyond anecdotal measures, such as how the patient feels or how they perceive their recovery to be going. These non-scientific non-measurable outcomes do not contribute to the body of evidence on stem cells and are not significant enough to prove the treatments are efficacious.</li> <li>• The bill offers legal protections and remedies for all parties involved except the patient</li> </ul> <p>Regenerative medicine and stem cell treatment is a promising, rapidly progressing area of medical research that should be sufficiently funded and supported. Prematurely allowing a large subset of people to access investigational stem cell treatment, however, could compromise future access for the general population should these patients widely experience adverse side effects due to participating in investigative stem cell treatments that were not properly prescribed or monitored.</p> | <p><b>Unfavorable</b><br/>Evaluated by:<br/>Tyler Anderson<br/>210-382-4295<br/><a href="mailto:Tyler@Texaslsg.org">Tyler@Texaslsg.org</a></p> |
| <p><b>HB 3236</b><br/>By: Kacal</p>  | <p>Relating to the costs associated with the provision of certain investigational drugs, biological products, and devices that are in clinical trials.</p>   | <p>Public Health</p> | <p>HB 3236 amends the Health and Safety Code to allow pharmaceutical manufacturers to accept payments for investigational drugs or devices. Currently, pharmaceutical companies are not authorized to accept payments from patients who can access investigational drugs (those who are terminally ill). Passage of this bill would establish a profit-based incentive for pharmaceutical companies to more widely distribute investigational drugs that have not proved to be efficacious and may have negative side effects. Drugs provided under this bill are only required to have completed phase I of clinical trial: this means the drugs have not been proven to be safe, much less effective. The bill offers no legal recourse for a patient whose condition is made significantly worse due to using an investigational drug obtained under this subchapter. Additionally, authorizing fees would increase access only for those with financial means, further exacerbating socioeconomic disparity within our healthcare system. While some patients stand to benefit from this bill, it is not in the best public health interest of all Texans for investigational drugs to be provided at a cost; the primary entities who benefit from this bill are drug manufacturers, who stand to gain a significant amount of capital by accepting payments for investigational drugs.</p>  | <p><b>Unfavorable</b><br/>Evaluated by:<br/>Tyler Anderson<br/>210-382-4295<br/><a href="mailto:Tyler@Texaslsg.org">Tyler@Texaslsg.org</a></p> |





|   |  |                         |   |  |
|---|--|-------------------------|---|--|
| <p><b>HB 3179</b><br/>By: Lozano</p>                  | <p>Relating to the Texas college work-study program and to establishing a program for the off-campus employment of certain students at public or private institutions of higher education.</p> | <p>Higher Education</p> | <p>HB 3179 helps alleviate the financial burden for students in higher education by establishing work-study, and internship opportunities to eligible students who express financial need. HB 3179 requires the Higher Education Coordinating Board to collaborate with eligible institutions and employers to administer the Texas Works Internship Program. The purposes of this program are to help students attend school by providing them with part-time employment funded in part by the state. A student is considered eligible for this program only if they are a Texas resident, are enrolled full time in an undergraduate program, establishes financial need, and meets eligibility criteria established by the coordinating board. HB 3179 states that the coordinating board must develop and adopt the necessary rules for the program’s implementation, compliance with nondiscriminatory practices, and to disburse each eligible institution with copies of these rules. The bill prohibits state support for the Texas WORKS internship program from exceeding the amount specified by appropriation HB 3179 states that if funding for the Texas WORKS internship program is insufficient to cover the cost of all eligible students, priority for funding is based on the order of application. HB 3179 removes the authority of an eligible institution of higher education to enter agreements with employers participating in the Texas college work-study program. These institutions now will be authorized to employ eligible students in the work-study program. Funds received by eligible students are not considered as financial aid for the academic year in which they were earned.</p>   | <p><b>Favorable</b><br/>Evaluated by:<br/>Fabeain Barkwell<br/><a href="mailto:Fabeain@Texaslsg.org">Fabeain@Texaslsg.org</a></p>                            |
| <p><b>HB 3292</b><br/>By: Klick</p>                   | <p>Relating to the continuation and reinstatement of medical assistance for certain individuals.</p>   | <p>Human Services</p>   | <p>CSHB 3292 seeks to address the issue of persons receiving medical assistance becoming ineligible due to a temporary increase of income or paperwork issues. Currently an individual who receives Supplemental Security Income (SSI) or other benefits and is eligible for medical assistance may temporarily lose the medical assistance if they have even a one month increased income, for example a tax refund. Similarly, medical assistance can be temporarily lost if there is an error in the paperwork. This allows the Health and Human Services Commission (HHSC) to recertify the individual within 90 days of becoming ineligible. This will rectify issues with gaps in coverage, assuring individuals remain receiving the services they need.</p>   | <p><b>Favorable</b><br/>Evaluated by:<br/>Kylie McNaught<br/>210-382-4295<br/><a href="mailto:Kylie@Texaslsg.org">Kylie@Texaslsg.org</a></p>                 |
| <p><b>HB 3302</b><br/>By:<br/>Gonzales,<br/>Larry</p> | <p>Relating to the sunset review process and certain governmental entities subject to that process.</p>  | <p>State Affairs</p>    | <p>CSHB 3302 serves as a vehicle to make necessary adjustments that will better align and group state agencies subject to sunset review during the upcoming biennium. The bill makes numerous adjustments to the sunset review schedule to better group entities that are set for sunset review during the upcoming biennium. The bill also makes statutory changes to the Texas Sunset Act. Major provisions of CSHB 3302 include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grouping sunset reviews for river authorities geographically to minimize travel and lodging costs</li> <li>• Moves back sunset dates for the Teacher Retirement System, Texas Facilities Commission, Office of State and Federal Regulations, and the Texas Real Estate Commission</li> <li>• Removes regional education service centers, the Maternal Mortality and Morbidity Task Force, the Palliative Care Interdisciplinary Advisory Council, and the Perinatal Advisory Council from their provisions related to the Sunset Act</li> <li>• Revises the definition of “state agency” for the purposes of the Texas Sunset Act</li> <li>• Makes clarifications related to the duties of the Sunset Commission including expressly defining it as a legislative agency and clarifying confidentiality requirements related to certain communications and reports made by the Sunset Commission</li> <li>• Repeals a provision that requires state agencies and the Texas Workforce Commission (TWC) to make a reasonable effort to relocate an employee who is displaced because the state agency or its advisory committee is abolished or reorganized under the Texas Sunset Act</li> </ul> <p>Essentially, this bill makes statutory changes that will improve the functionality and efficiency of the Texas Sunset Commission. <b>One provision that is concerning, however, is repealing the requirement for TWC to make a reasonable effort to relocate employees displaced as a result of The Sunset Act; this will be economically detrimental to working Texas families.</b> State agency employees do</p> | <p><b>Favorable w/<br/>Concerns</b><br/>Evaluated by:<br/>Tyler Anderson<br/>210-382-4295<br/><a href="mailto:Tyler@Texaslsg.org">Tyler@Texaslsg.org</a></p> |



|                              |   |                         |  |   |
|------------------------------|---|-------------------------|--|---|
|                              |   |                         | not have control over sunset provisions; it is reasonable and fair to require TWC to attempt to relocate the employee, as they have not committed any adverse action to result in their unemployment. Additionally, assisting these employees in obtaining a new job will reduce the number of families forced to live off of unemployment insurance, which is often insufficient to provide for basic needs.  |   |
| <b>HB 3565</b><br>By: Klick  | Relating to the distribution of benefits under the supplemental nutrition assistance program.   | Human Services          | This bill requires that the Health and Human Services Commission (HHSC) establish a 28 day even distribution schedule for Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) benefits. Currently all snap benefits are awarded on within the first 15 days of the month. During this time grocers face having to increase employees on the floor as well as attempt to keep up the produce. This will allow grocery stores to maintain the quality of food while not having to overwork employees within the first 15 days of the month while ensuring quality satisfaction for the customer. Evenly distributing benefits throughout the month will help to ensure quality produce for those receiving SNAP as well as help stores create a stable and consistent work environment.   | <b>Favorable</b><br>Evaluated by:<br>Kylie McNaught<br>210-382-4295<br><a href="mailto:Kylie@Texaslsg.org">Kylie@Texaslsg.org</a>                 |
| <b>HB 3663</b><br>By: Burns  | Relating to marketing contracts and agricultural liens.   | Agriculture & Livestock | Provides an exemption to a contract purchaser who purchases an agricultural crop from an agricultural producer pursuant to certain marketing contracts. Under certain marketing contracts, there has been an increase in financing costs for such contract purchasers. HB 3663 seeks to exempt such contract purchasers as it relates to prioritizing agricultural liens under Property Code, Chapter 70, over conflicting security interests or liens.  | <b>Favorable</b><br>Evaluated by:<br>Serena Ahmed<br>210-382-4295<br><a href="mailto:Serena@Texaslsg.org">Serena@Texaslsg.org</a>                 |
| <b>HB 3721</b><br>By: Parker | Relating to access to and participation in cancer clinical trials.                              | Public Health           | CSHB 3721, entitled the "Improving Patient Access to Cancer Clinical Trials Act", seeks to improve cancer patients' access to controlled clinical trials by offering assistance to patients who are experiencing financial barriers that limit their ability to access these treatments. The bill does this by authorizing the Cancer Prevention and Research Institute of Texas (CPRIT) to make grants to higher education institutions and advanced medical research facilities to be used for the purpose of increasing access to and participation in their cancer clinical trials. Grant funds can be utilized for community outreach and ancillary costs for patients such as lodging and travel expenses. Additionally, the bill requires CPRIT to establish an ad hoc committee to address access to and participation in cancer clinical trials.<br><br>Cancer clinical trials are registered with the IRB and are conducted under full panel of researchers and physicians. While they are not without risk, they are more regulated and carry less potential harm than some other types of investigational drugs and treatments. The financial assistance offered in this bill will help address socioeconomic disparities that impact healthcare access. 595,600 cancer related deaths occurred in Texas in 2016; increasing patients' access to clinical trials by offering financial assistance will increase access to treatment for individuals who would not otherwise have been able to obtain it, resulting in improved health outcomes for marginalized populations. This bill ensures that the benefits of health research are made available equitably among the state's vulnerable populations. Additionally, it will ensure that clinical trials are being conducted on diverse patient populations, adding to the robustness of available medical research. | <b>Favorable w/<br/>Concerns</b><br>Evaluated by:<br>Tyler Anderson<br>210-382-4295<br><a href="mailto:Tyler@Texaslsg.org">Tyler@Texaslsg.org</a> |
| <b>HB 3768</b><br>By: Howard | Relating to the establishment of the Texas Guided Pathways program to facilitate the completion | Higher Education        | HB 3768 establishes The Texas Guided Pathways program to authorize each institution of higher education to develop recommended course sequences that ensure efficient pathways to completion for undergraduate certificate and degree programs. HB 3768 seeks to provide students with a transparent understanding of what courses would transfer through each institution, and enables students to compare recommended course sequences. By June 1st of each year, an institution must submit to the coordinating board each  | <b>Favorable</b><br>Evaluated by:<br>Fabeain Barkwell<br>210-382-4295   |



|  |   |                                     |  |   |
|--|---|-------------------------------------|--|---|
|  | by students of undergraduate certificate and degree programs.   |                                     | <p>recommended course sequence, post each course sequence on the institution’s internet website in an accessible location, and incorporate how to use those course sequences in student advising.</p> <p>HB 3768 authorizes the commissioner of the Higher Education Coordinating Board to work with the Texas OnCourse Initiative at UT Austin, to develop a statewide web-based platform, where students can compare course sequences to determine which classes align with their degree plan, determine what courses would transfer to another institution, and what credits would apply toward their degree. The bill requires all institutions to participate in the development of regional transfer compacts to ensure guaranteed transfer into that institution. Because research institutions serve state-wide populations. No later than November 1st of each even-numbered year, the board shall submit a report to the of transfer compacts between institutions of higher education, and an analysis of the impact of those compacts on students’ efficient progress toward completion of an undergraduate certificate or degree program</p>  | <a href="mailto:Fabeain@Texaslsg.org">Fabeain@Texaslsg.org</a>  |
| <b>HB 1082</b><br>By: Nevarez  | Relating to the applicability to certain draft grant applications of the exception from disclosure under the public information law for agency memoranda. | Government Transparency & Operation | The Department of State Health Services had an opportunity to apply for a grant that would have helped with funds regarding overdose prevention education and better access to opioid fighting drugs. However, the grant was never submitted and there is currently no mechanism to provide the unfinished grant documents to the public. These documents would help provide interested parties insight as to why an agency didn’t apply for the grant. HB 1082 seeks to make unfinished grant documents available to the public since currently those documents are not subject to Sec. 552.021. AVAILABILITY OF PUBLIC INFORMATION. This bill would help increase transparency to the public and help ensure that the state learns from past unfinished grants.  | <b>Favorable</b><br>Evaluated by:<br>Ana Ramon<br>210-382-4295<br><a href="mailto:Ana@Texaslsg.org">Ana@Texaslsg.org</a>                        |
| <b>HB 2720</b><br>By: Shine/et al.                                     | Relating to the location of a polling place.  | Elections                           | HB 2720 amends the Election Code to prohibit the use of a facility as a polling if the candidate or family either owns the building or has a business within the building. By a third degree of consanguinity or second degree by affinity would exclude these locations in counties with over a 3.3 million population. The bill would strengthen the integrity of elections by removing this type of familial conflict of interest.  | <b>Favorable</b><br>Evaluated by:<br>Erin Eriksen<br>210-382-4295<br><a href="mailto:Erin@Texaslsg.org">Erin@Texaslsg.org</a>                   |
| <b>HB 2855</b><br>By: Paddie/<br>Herrero/<br>Larson/<br>Kuempel/et al. | Relating to the identification of breeder deer by use of microchip implants.  | Culture, Recreation & Tourism       | <p>HB 2855 provides deer breeders the opportunity to identify breeder deer by implanting a microchip, recognized by the United States Department of Agriculture. HB 2855 states that a deer breeder who is using a microchip must provide a microchip reader for inspections by the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department, and the Texas Animal Health Commission. The bill authorizes Parks and Wildlife Commission to regulate the use of microchip implants for identifying breeder deer. Microchip implants have proven to be long lasting, easier to implement, quicker, and have a zero to none failure rate. HB 2855 gives deer breeders the option to recognize deer, in addition to tagging and tattooing as other methods of identification. Though the language in the bill is permissive, and does not mandate that deer breeders utilize microchips, concerns remain. Current statute calls for ear tags while the animals are in pens, and an alpha-numeric ear tattoo when released, at a minimum. Microchips may already be used as supplemental identification. Additionally, the lack of visible identification is a concern that could lead to issues with disease management, as captive deer breeders can transport and release these animals to be co-mingled with pasture-born deer all over the state, and certain deer are used for venison. While there is still the option to tattoo, stakeholders believe that there is a need for better visibility of identification markers.</p> <p>TPWD believes that changes to breeder deer identification are necessary at some point, however there are several other changes that are necessary when this transition of improving deer identification takes place. When these changes are made, they should all be accomplished at once. To introduce a partial change that will be effective for two years, followed by a more comprehensive change will create confusion on the part of deer breeders, thus creating compliance issues.</p> | <b>Will of the House</b><br>Evaluated by:<br>Fabeain Barkwell<br>210-382-4295<br><a href="mailto:Fabeain@Texaslsg.org">Fabeain@Texaslsg.org</a> |



|   |  |                                |   |   |
|---|--|--------------------------------|---|---|
| <p><b>HB 1540</b><br/>By: Rodriguez, Justin</p> | <p>Relating to counseling regarding postsecondary education for public high school students.</p>   | <p>Public Education</p>        | <p>Current statute requires school counselors to provide high school students and their parents information regarding postsecondary education such as financial aid eligibility and the importance of postsecondary education. HB 1540 requires school counselors to also provide information regarding the importance of selecting a major before enrollment, or as soon as possible after enrollment. The information must include the potential consequences of delaying that decision, particularly if the student intends to transfer between postsecondary educational institutions. The intent of this bill is to help students achieve their postsecondary goals by properly planning and preventing the accumulation of excess credits.</p>  | <p><b>Favorable</b><br/>Evaluated by:<br/>Arielle Day<br/>210-382-4295<br/><a href="mailto:Arielle@Texaslsg.org">Arielle@Texaslsg.org</a></p>           |
| <p><b>HB 2389</b><br/>By: Burkett</p>           | <p>Relating to the supervision of pharmacist-interns, pharmacy technicians, and pharmacy technician trainees by a pharmacist and the adoption of rules by the Texas State Board of Pharmacy.</p> | <p>Public Health</p>           | <p>HB 2389 prohibits the Texas State Board of Pharmacy from adopting rules that would prohibit a pharmacist, pharmacist-intern, or pharmacy technician employed by a pharmacy from accessing the pharmacy’s database from a remote location via a secure and private connection for the purpose of performing certain prescription processing functions. Allowing these licensed professionals to perform certain tasks such as data entry or patient follow-up from home opens up employment opportunities to non-traditional workers such as stay-at-home moms or homebound individuals with disabilities. Additionally, it will decrease the administrative burden placed upon pharmacists who are often sidetracked by clerical work being performed in the pharmacy. Many states, such as Arizona and New Mexico, allow licensed pharmacists and related professionals to perform certain</p> <p>The bill also amends the Occupations Code to clearly define “direct supervision” as it relates to the Texas Pharmacy Act. This new definition offers clarity and uniformity as it relates to supervision and training for pharmacy technicians and pharmacy interns.</p>  | <p><b>Favorable</b><br/>Evaluated by:<br/>Tyler Anderson<br/>210-382-4295<br/><a href="mailto:Tyler@Texaslsg.org">Tyler@Texaslsg.org</a></p>            |
| <p><b>HB 722</b><br/>By: Longoria</p>           | <p>Relating to certain procedures for defendants who successfully complete a period of state jail felony community supervision.</p>  | <p>Criminal Jurisprudence</p>  | <p>HB 722 authorizes a judge who places an individual on community supervision for a state jail felony to amend the record of conviction for that person to instead reflect a Class A misdemeanor, with written consent of the prosecuting attorney prior to sentencing. After completion of two-thirds of the original community supervision period for a state jail felony, the individual can submit a written motion for the judge to review the person’s record and determine whether amending the record of conviction is in the best interest of justice, with the exception of the following state jail felonies: burglary, burglary of vehicles, improper sexual contact or intercourse with a person in custody, driving while intoxicated with a child passenger, offenses against the person, failure to comply with the sex offender registration program, of offenses involving family violence. The bill further outlines the requirements and procedure regarding an amendment to an individual’s conviction record, which applies only to an individual placed on community supervision for a state jail felony committed on or after September 1, 2017. HB 722 seeks to provide low-level offenders who have proven their dedication to making a positive change in their lives and behaviors an opportunity to access treatment and pursue future opportunities for success in education and employment, as well as saving taxpayer dollars.</p> | <p><b>Favorable</b><br/>Evaluated by:<br/>Katherine Kirages<br/>210-382-4295<br/><a href="mailto:Katherine@Texaslsg.org">Katherine@Texaslsg.org</a></p> |
| <p><b>HB 2483</b><br/>By: Parker</p>            | <p>Relating to the capture, use, or recording of certain items for commercial purposes, including the prosecution of criminal offenses regarding unauthorized recordings.</p>                    | <p>Business &amp; Industry</p> | <p>Clarifies that manufacturing and sales of hard-drives, flash drives, memory cards, and other digital storage devices filled with unauthorized sound recordings may not avoid criminal prosecution under state law. Musical piracy is harmful to the business of music retailers, artists, songwriters, record labels and other associated parties. It is also harmful to Texas families as there are no local, state or federal taxes collected on the sale on these unauthorized recordings. Thus, on the one hand, HB 2483 is beneficial in that it simply updates the code to include these new digital trends in the manufacture and sales of fraudulent music products, so that they are not exempt from criminal prosecution.</p> <p>On the other hand, HB 2483 also mandates that the court shall order a person convicted with an offense of music piracy to pay restitution to the owner or lawful producer of a master recording. This is on top of imprisonment sentences up to five years, fines not exceeding \$250,000, or both. Requiring the court to order restitution payments to a person convicted with music piracy along with very high imprisonment sentences and fines may be hurting more than helping working families in Texas.</p>   | <p><b>Will of the House</b><br/>Evaluated by:<br/>Serena Ahmed<br/>210-382-4295<br/><a href="mailto:Serena@Texaslsg.org">Serena@Texaslsg.org</a></p>    |



|   |   |                               |   |  |
|---|---|-------------------------------|---|--|
| <p><b>HB 2996</b><br/>By: Ashby / Shine</p> | <p>Relating to the establishment of a rural resident physician grant program.</p>   | <p>Higher Education</p>       | <p>HB 2996 authorizes the Higher Education Coordinating Board to establish the Rural Resident Physician Grant to encourage new graduate medical education positions that improve and preserve access to care in rural nonmetropolitan areas. The bill requires the coordinating board to award grants to new or expanded physician residency programs at teaching hospitals, and consult with physicians, teaching hospitals, medical schools, and independent residency programs to establish criteria for the grant program. Grant funds may only be provided to a physical residency program that provides care in rural or nonmetropolitan areas, or until the program becomes eligible for grant funding. HB 2996 states that the coordinating board must monitor physician residency programs to ensure compliance with grant funds. Per the bill, any unused grant funds must be returned, and money regained shall be disbursed to award grants to other eligible candidates.</p>   | <p><b>Favorable</b><br/>Evaluated by:<br/>Fabeain Barkwell<br/>210-382-4295<br/><a href="mailto:Fabeain@Texaslsg.org">Fabeain@Texaslsg.org</a></p>       |
| <p><b>HB 3819</b><br/>By: Howard</p>        | <p>Relating to the prosecution of the offense of improper contact with a victim and to providing certain rights to a victim of a criminal offense and the victim's family regarding contact by an inmate or an inmate's representative.</p> | <p>Criminal Jurisprudence</p> | <p>HB 3819 allows crime victims and their guardians or the relatives of a deceased victim to consent to contact or request no contact from either the defendant who committed an offense against the victim or the defendant's representatives. The bill defines a defendant's representatives as family members, friends, attorneys, and third parties working on behalf of the defendant. Within the bill, the Texas Department of Criminal Justice (TDCJ) must create and adopt policies prohibiting an individual imprisoned in a facility operated by or under contract with TDCJ from contacting victims of the offense for which the person is currently serving a sentence. These policies must cover prohibited contact with a victim by any means, directly or indirectly, in the following circumstances:<br/>The victim was 17 years of age or older at the time the offense was committed,<br/>The individual was confined after committing a 3g (offense against the person) crime, reportable conviction or adjudication, or an offense relating to a judgment containing affirmative finding of use of a deadly weapon or firearm, and<br/>TDCJ has not, before the inmate makes contact, received the victim's written and dated consent to contact and provided the defendant with a copy of the consent.</p> <p>Should a defendant violate these policies, the individual forfeits all or any portion of good conduct time accrued. Similarly, if TDCJ is notified of a defendant/representative's violation of a no-contact request, TDCJ must document the violation in the defendant's file and forward the documentation to the appropriate parole panel, for use when a defendant's release on parole or to mandatory supervision is being considered. HB 3819 will protect victims of crime from unwanted contact with the individuals who have caused them pain and suffering, and seeks to restore power in deciding whether they want contact with the individual or not.</p> | <p><b>Favorable</b><br/>Evaluated by:<br/>Katherine Kirages<br/>210-382-4295<br/><a href="mailto:Katherine@Texaslsg.org">Katherine@Texaslsg.org</a></p>  |
| <p><b>HB 3476</b><br/>By: Huberty</p>       | <p>Relating to cardiac assessments of high school participants in extracurricular athletic activities sponsored or sanctioned by the University Interscholastic League.</p>   | <p>Public Education</p>       | <p>HB 3476 requires high school student athletes, as a part of their required physical examination, to undergo an electrocardiogram or echocardiogram one time before the student's first year of participation and another time before the student's eleventh grade year of participation. The intent of the bill is to enhance the health and safety of student athletes by providing for the early identification of students at risk of cardiac arrest. However, scientific medical organizations contend that ECG screenings often give false results and should not be mandated.</p> <p>The bill requires the University Interscholastic League to adopt rules which allow school districts that demonstrate a hardship to delay administering the required electrocardiograms or echocardiograms and to adopt rules that allow a student to receive a waiver if their parent or guardian request it.</p>   | <p><b>Favorable w/Concerns</b><br/>Evaluated by:<br/>Arielle Day<br/>210-382-4295<br/><a href="mailto:Arielle@Texaslsg.org">Arielle@Texaslsg.org</a></p> |



|   |  |                         |  |  |
|---|--|-------------------------|--|--|
| <p><b>HB 2063</b><br/>By: Bonnen, Greg / et al.</p> | <p>Relating to general procedures and requirements for do-not-resuscitate orders.</p>    | <p>State Affairs</p>    | <p>Do not resuscitate orders (DNRs) instruct health care professionals not to attempt life-sustaining treatment, such as CPR or cardioversion, on a patient whose circulatory or respiratory function has ceased, rendering them dead. Current law pertaining to the provision of DNRs lacks clarity and is largely left up to interpretation by individual health care facilities and physicians. CSHB 2063 seeks to address these ambiguities by stipulating that a DNR is only valid if the order:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is issued in compliance with the written directions of a competent patient</li> <li>• Is issued in compliance with the oral directions of a competent patient delivered to or observed by two adult witnesses, at least one of whom is not a health care professional</li> <li>• Is issued in compliance with the directions of the patient’s advance directive</li> <li>• Is issued in compliance with the directions of the patient’s legal guardian or medical power of attorney</li> <li>• Is issued in compliance with a treatment decision made in accordance with Health and Safety Code Section 166.039, which outlines the procedure for when a patient has not completed a written or oral DNR and is now incapable of communication. If a patient presents who falls under this section, the facility is responsible for notifying <b>one</b> person that can include the patient’s spouse, adult child, parent, or nearest living relative.</li> <li>• Is not contrary to the directions of a patient who was competent at the time that they conveyed the directions, even if it is a physician’s opinion that the patient’s death is imminent regardless of the provision of life-sustaining treatment or that a DNR is the medically appropriate course of action</li> </ul> <p>Additionally, the bill requires health care facilities to provide patients with notice of the facility’s policies regarding the rights of the patient in relation to his/her DNR. Healthcare facilities subject to the requirements of this bill include hospitals, assisted living facilities, and hospice settings. The bill attempts to take necessary steps to ensure DNRs are being issued in a consistent, medically ethical way. It does, however, present many concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The bill may limit settings in which a DNR can be considered valid, which could violate the patient’s wishes</li> <li>• The bill violates patient-doctor confidentiality by requiring two witnesses for a verbal DNR to be valid. Many people would likely prefer to make this decision privately in consultation with their doctor</li> <li>• The requirement of a second witness that is non-hospital staff may be difficult for patients who do not have family or friends in the hospital with them. This may require involvement of a complete stranger in a private medical decision for the purpose of ensuring that the DNR is valid</li> <li>• The bill places an administrative burden on physicians and healthcare facilities, especially in the case of an indigent patient who may not have family members the hospital can contact</li> <li>• It is not feasible in every situation for the physician to prepare and obtain required documents, acceptable witnesses, etc. - in these cases, physicians may be forced to perform a full-code on patients who have clearly expressed that this is against their wishes</li> <li>• The bill should explicitly ensure that the patient’s best care is a top priority - sometimes this means withdrawing life sustaining treatment.</li> </ul> | <p><b>Unfavorable</b><br/>Evaluated by:<br/>Tyler Anderson<br/>210-382-4295<br/><a href="mailto:Tyler@Texaslsg.org">Tyler@Texaslsg.org</a></p> |
| <p><b>HB 3439</b><br/>By: Koop / Meyer /</p>        | <p>Relating to a school district contract to partner with an open-enrollment charter</p> | <p>Public Education</p> | <p>HB 3439 encourages partnerships between public school districts and open enrollment charter schools by creating financial and accountability incentives. Under this bill students attending the district charter partnership campuses are considered district students for enrollment purposes. This means the public school would receive facilities funding it otherwise would have lost if the students had</p>  | <p><b>Favorable w/concerns</b><br/>Evaluated by:</p>   |



|   |  |                                       |   |  |
|---|--|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| <p>Deshotel / Bohac / Longoria / et al.</p>                               | <p>school to operate a district campus.</p>  |                                       | <p>left. The bill also includes a provision which allows a school that partners with an open enrollment charter specifically to improve their D or F rating to receive a two-year pause in the accountability system, during which the commissioner could not impose a sanction or take action against the campus. Interested parties contend that ISD school employees do not have adequate protection under this bill. There are also concerns regarding the practicality of creating an incentive for this one, specific avenue for collaboration that has not been proven to be more effective than other avenues.</p>  | <p>Arielle Day<br/>210-382-4295<br/><a href="mailto:Arielle@Texaslsg.org">Arielle@Texaslsg.org</a></p>   |
| <p><b>HB 3851</b><br/>By: Howard / Cortez / Flynn / Sheffield / Klick</p> | <p>Relating to policies and training regarding the use of epinephrine auto-injectors by public institutions of higher education; providing immunity.</p> | <p>Higher Education</p>               | <p>HB 3851 allows institutions of higher education the ability to adopt policies that pertain to epinephrine auto-injectors. Anaphylaxis is a severe allergic reaction typically to food and other types of allergens. In 2015, the 84th legislature passed policy that authorized school districts, and certain charter schools to implement policies to treat individuals suffering from anaphylaxis. HB 3851 extends this same chance to institutions of higher education. Epinephrine is the only medication that can reverse the reaction from anaphylaxis. In addition, studies show that teens and young adults are the highest risk age group for food induce fatalities. Should an institution choose to adopt a policy for epinephrine auto-injectors HB 3851 will give them the guidelines to do so. The provisions described in HB 3851 could potentially save numerous lives. In situations of anaphylactic shock every second counts, and emergency medical services may not always arrive in time to help.</p>   | <p><b>Favorable</b><br/>Evaluated by:<br/>Fabeain Barkwell<br/>210-382-4295<br/><a href="mailto:Arielle@Texaslsg.org">Arielle@Texaslsg.org</a></p>     |
| <p><b>HB 1462</b><br/>By: Bonnen, Greg / Laubenberg / Fallon</p>          | <p>Relating to temporary branch polling place hours of operation.</p>  | <p>Elections</p>                      | <p>HB 1462 amends the election code to affix a temporary branch polling place during the early voting period to one location. The polling location must be open for 8 hours each day or 3 hours if the city or county clerk for that territory holding the election and there are less than 1,000 registered voters. What this bill does is get rid of what’s known as “rolling polling” where polling machines travel to different locations during the early voting period. This is utilized in mainly rural counties although community college campuses and senior living facilities use this program as well. There is concern that rolling polling is used to specifically harvest certain voters for certain elections; however, then the issue should be regulating those elections and not removing a program that helps Texans to vote closer to where they live.</p>   | <p><b>Unfavorable</b><br/>Evaluated by:<br/>Erin Eriksen<br/>210-382-4295<br/><a href="mailto:Arielle@Texaslsg.org">Arielle@Texaslsg.org</a></p>       |
| <p><b>HB 424</b><br/>By: Huberty / Larson / Workman / Bailes / et al.</p> | <p>Relating to municipal annexation.</p>   | <p>Land &amp; Resource Management</p> | <p>HB 424 seeks to amend the Local Government Code to insert subchapters regulating the annexation authority and procedures of municipalities wholly located in one or more counties each with a population of over 500,000 or a municipality wholly located in a county with a population of 500,000 or less which proposes to annex an area in a county with a population of 500,000 or more. The bill generally maintains the current statutory framework of rules governing annexation for municipalities in counties with less than 500,000 people.</p> <p>HB 424 strikes from the previously stipulated rules the ability for a person residing or owning land in an annexed area within a municipality, with a population of 1.6 million or more, to enforce a service plan by use of a petition for change in policies and procedures, of which without compliance the person maintains the right to arbitrate.</p> <p>It gives the municipality, with a population of at least 500,000, the authority to annex non-contiguous areas that are within the municipality’s extra-territorial jurisdiction. The bill also maintains that if the municipality agrees to provide solid waste collection services to the annexed area and the annexed resident continues to use a private service provider, then the municipality is not required to provide the solid waste collection services and they cannot charge the resident for the municipality waste services for a period of two years.</p> <p>A municipality with a population of at least 500,000 may annex an area if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• each land owner in the area requests the annexation;</li> </ul> | <p><b>Unfavorable</b><br/>Evaluated by:<br/>Elizabeth Hann<br/>210-382-4295<br/><a href="mailto:Elizabeth@Texaslsg.org">Elizabeth@Texaslsg.org</a></p> |



|  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
|  |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the municipality and the land owners enter into a written agreement stipulating the services to be provided by the municipality;</li> <li>the municipality holds at least two public hearings no less than ten days apart; and</li> <li>the municipality provides adequate notice of the hearings</li> </ul> <p>The bill provides an alternate set of rules in statute to address the annexation, by municipalities in counties with 500,000 or more people, of areas with populations of less than 200 or 200 or more. If the targeted annexation area has a population of less than 200, then the municipality may annex the area if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a consent petition is signed by more than 50% of the registered voters of the area;</li> <li>the municipality adopts a formal resolution to annex the area;</li> <li>the municipality mails a notice of the proposed annexation; and</li> <li>the municipality holds at least one public hearing</li> </ul> <p>If the petition fails, the municipality must wait at least one year to restart the proposed annexation process. Also, if a petition protesting the annexation is signed by at least 50% of the number of voters who voted in the most recent municipal election, then the municipality must hold an election to vote on the annexation.</p> <p>If the targeted annexation area has a population of 200 or more, then the municipality may annex the area if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the municipality holds an election and the majority of voters approve the annexation;</li> <li>the municipality gets a petition signed by more than 50% of the land owners in the area if the registered voters of the area do not own more than 50% of the land</li> <li>the municipality adopts a formal resolution to annex the area</li> <li>the municipality provides notice to each property owner in the area</li> <li>the municipality holds at least two hearings</li> </ul> <p>If the election fails, the municipality must wait at least one year to restart the proposed annexation process. Also, if a petition protesting the annexation is signed by at least 50% of the number of voters who voted in the most recent municipal election, then the municipality must hold a separate election to vote on the annexation.</p> <p>The bill stipulates that municipalities in counties with populations of 500,000 or more may follow the general rules for municipalities with less than 500,000 people for the annexation of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>an industrial district</li> <li>land subject to a strategic partnership agreement between the municipality and a water conservation and reclamation district</li> </ul> <p>The bill also stipulates that areas with reservoirs or airports may be annexed without consent of any owners or residents of the area if the annexing municipality is in a county with less than 500,000 people or if the annexing municipality is in a county with more than 500,000 people and there are no owners of the land other than the municipality and residents of the area.</p> |  |
|--|--|---|--|





|   |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|
|   |  |  | <p>The bill maintains current statute in regard to the annexation of roads, highways, private ways, and other ways without consent of any person with respect to municipalities in counties with populations of less than 500,000. The bill provides a municipality in a county with a population of 500,000 or more may annex a road or other right-of-way on request of the owner or the governing body of the road by using the procedures for annexing an area by a municipality in a county with less than 500,000 people.</p> <p>The bill stipulates that municipalities in counties with populations of 500,000 or more (or municipalities aiming to annex an area located in a county with a population of 500,000 or more) may not annex an area, other than certain special districts, for the limited purposes of applying their planning, zoning, health, and safety ordinances.</p> <p>HB 424 would also repeal certain provisions related to annexation of certain specified areas. It repeals provisions authorizing certain annexations of non-contiguous or narrowly connected areas and the requirement for municipalities to seek federal clearance prior to annexation. The bill also repeals a provision of the Water Code concerning the collection of regulatory assessments from retail customers, which is addressed within the context of the bill.</p> <p>One concerning unintended consequence of HB 424 is its effect on undocumented immigrant communities. By requiring only registered voters to participate in annexation related elections and petitions, undocumented property owners are left without a say in what happens to their land. One concerning unintended consequence of HB 424 is its effect on undocumented immigrant communities. By requiring only registered voters to participate in annexation related elections and petitions, undocumented property owners are left without a say in what happens to their land.</p> |  |
| <p><b>HB 3772</b><br/>By: Button / Parker / Capriglione / Springer / Martinez, "Mando" / et al.</p> | <p>Relating to operation of the Texas leverage fund program administered by the Texas Economic Development Bank.</p>           | <p>Economic &amp; Small Business Development</p> | <p>CSHB 3772 extends the expiration of the Texas Leverage Fund (TLF) past the September 1, 2022 end date. The TLF was established in 1992 to allow local Economic Development Corporations (EDCs) to leverage economic sales and usage taxes for local economic development projects. Through the years, the TLF has been moved between departments, in 2003 it was moved into the Office of the Governor. Movements were made with no underlying changes in statute, leaving some statute to be shut off while assuming each office would operate under the master resolution.</p> <p>While no loans have been provided since Governor Abbott office, there were loans that were provided in FY 2013-14 allowing for about 17 out of 22 of the active loans to have a maturity date past the 2022 dates. This bill allows the TLF to extend past its original expiration date while clarifying operational language. CSHB 3772 codifies statute that was previously streamline out of the program guidelines through the departments moves. While the bill has been given a negative fiscal note of over \$4 million dollars, this reflects the one-time movement of the fund outside of the treasury in order to correlate with the legislation. Beyond this one-time movement, the program is self-sustaining.</p> <p>This bill is a means of protecting a loan program which serves mostly small towns and rural communities averaging at 5000-6000 in population. It assists these towns with necessary projects that would take decades to fund from accumulating sales tax. Some projects covered include main street rehabilitations to improve business development, sewer projects and land development projects.</p>  | <p><b>Favorable</b><br/>Evaluated by:<br/>Tyler Anderson<br/>210-382-4295<br/><a href="mailto:Tyler@Texaslsg.org">Tyler@Texaslsg.org</a></p> |
| <p><b>HB 2777</b><br/>By: Phelan</p>  | <p>Relating to an application for the amendment of a certificate of public convenience and necessity in an area within the</p> | <p>Natural Resources</p>                         | <p>HB 2777 would allow a Class A utility the ability to receive a certificate of convenience and necessity by the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality which will afford the utility the same rights and powers as the district. Class A utilities are ones that provide water or wastewater service through 10,000 or more taps or connections. This would not apply to a MUD located, either partially or wholly, within a corporated area or an extraterritorial jurisdiction of a municipality. The bill also lays out the stipulations needed for an</p>   | <p><b>Favorable</b><br/>Evaluated by:<br/>Erin Eriksen<br/>210-382-4295<br/><a href="mailto:Erin@Texaslsg.org">Erin@Texaslsg.org</a></p>     |



|   |   |                         |   |   |
|---|---|-------------------------|---|---|
|   | boundaries of a political subdivision.  |                         | application and it would be prohibitive for any other information to be requested. The Public Utility Commission will review the application within 60 days of filing. Once the application is reconsidered it is final.  |   |
| <b>HB 3717</b><br>By: King,<br>Tracy O. | Relating to programs to provide incentives for conserving water in outdoor landscapes.  | Agriculture & Livestock | Requires the Texas Department of Agriculture (TDA) to establish, maintain and publish a list of publicly funded programs in Texas that encourage the replacement of a lawn with landscaping that requires less water to maintain. A governmental entity or retail public utility that operates a landscape incentive program, wholly or partly funded by public money, shall register the program with the TDA for inclusion on said list. The TDA would also be required to maintain and publish a list for each type of climate in this state related to the types of grasses and other plants that can sustain healthy growth in the particular climate with minimal irrigation. This bill also allows a landscaping incentive program to provide monetary incentives for purchasing and installing irrigation and sprinkler controllers. These types of controllers' conserve water by adjusting depending on the weather conditions, soil moisture levels, and so on.<br>Water is a finite resource that must be used efficiently in order to support the livelihoods of all Texas families and wildlife habitats. While there are local water conservation efforts across the state, including planting water conserving grass, most water utilities and other entities need to increase their conservation efforts, according to a 2016 review of more than 300 city utilities by the Texas Living Waters Project. HB 3717 addresses this serious concern. | <b>Favorable</b><br>Evaluated by:<br>Serena Ahmed<br>210-382-4295<br><a href="mailto:Serena@Texaslsg.org">Serena@Texaslsg.org</a>                       |
| <b>HB 3409</b><br>By: Lambert           | Relating to the provision of services and resources to certain individuals by a state supported living center and to the creation of a schedule of support services a state supported living center may provide and procedures for establishing applicable fees for those services. | Human Services          | CSHB 3409 requires the Health and Human Services Commission (HHSC) to establish a list of services a state supported living centers (SSLCs), as well a create a schedule of fees an SSLC may charge for services. SSLCs are campus-like residential facilities for individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities (IDD) that provide treatment and medical services including dental. Some individuals with an IDD may live in communities that have an SSLC in the area. This bill allows for the schedule of fees to use the reimbursement rate of services under Medicaid or submit written justification of the rate. The bill also allows an expansion of services for individuals in community that have a severe IDD but may not live in an SSLC. This will expand the utilization of state facilities and benefit rural areas by expanding services.  | <b>Favorable</b><br>Evaluated by:<br>Kylie McNaught<br>210-382-4295<br><a href="mailto:Kylie@Texaslsg.org">Kylie@Texaslsg.org</a>                       |
| <b>HB 3428</b><br>By: Collier           | Relating to minimum standards regarding the continuity of prescription medications for the care and treatment of county jail prisoners.   | County Affairs          | HB 3428 ensures that those who enter a county jail continue to receive their prescribed medications. According to the Texas Department of Criminal Justice, 34% of inmates have a mental illness and most have substance disorders. A large percentage of persons who enter county jails are already on medications for either or both physical ailments or mental illness. This bill requires reasonable rules to be adopted by the Texas Commission on Jail Standards to require county jails to continue to provide a prescribed medication or its generic form, to a person entering jail until a medical professional has prescribed otherwise.<br>HB 3428 amends Government code so that proper continuity of care can be given to individuals in jail to ensure their safety, and the safety of others. This bill has a compliance date of January 1, 2018 for the Texas Commission on Jail Standards to adopt reasonable rules and procedures to establish minimum standards regarding the continuity of prescription medications while incarcerated in a county jail.  | <b>Favorable</b><br>Evaluated by:<br>Tiffany Williams<br>210-382-4295<br><a href="mailto:Tiffany@Texaslsg.org">Tiffany@Texaslsg.org</a>                 |
| <b>HB 2975</b><br>By: Raney             | Relating to requiring public junior colleges to report certain financial and instructional information for certain instructional locations.   | Higher Education        | HB 2975 authorizes public junior colleges to report certain financial information for instructional locations. HB 2975 defines instructional sites as facilities located in service areas of junior college districts, outside of the main campus district, where 2,000 or more students are enrolled in an academic year. The bill states that by December 1st of each fiscal year every junior college district must submit to the Legislative Budget Board a report on the number of contact hours for the preceding year, student attainment of completion milestones as measured by formula funding, total amount of state appropriations, tax revenue, and tuition and fee revenue collected based on student enrollment at instructional sites. The report must also include the amount of tuition and fees collected from dual credit courses, money spent on the instructional sites in the preceding fiscal year, and the number of full time,  | <b>Favorable w/<br/>Concerns</b><br>Evaluated by:<br>Fabeain Barkwell<br>210-382-4295<br><a href="mailto:Fabeain@Texaslsg.org">Fabeain@Texaslsg.org</a> |



|   |  |                                  |   |  |
|---|--|----------------------------------|---|--|
|   |  |                                  | and adjunct faculty. HB 2975 seeks to provide transparency pertaining to how community colleges are using allocated funds to make informed decisions about future appropriations, however there could be challenges with obtaining this information. Community colleges don't fully fit into the definition of instructional sites as they have multiple locations with no main campus, and have multiple sites that fall into districts of 2,000 or more. Furthermore, property taxes are based district-wide and not by student enrollment. Stakeholders from community colleges believe they would have to make assumptions of allocated costs, because they do not have the date to report on the true direct costs being asked for in the bill.  |  |
| <b>HB 3088</b><br>By: Ortega / Thompson, Senfronia / Kuempel / Giddings | Relating to exemptions for certain residential property owners from the applicability of certain regulations of residential mortgage loan companies and residential mortgage loan originators. | Investments & Financial Services | HB 2975 authorizes public junior colleges to report certain financial information for instructional locations. HB 2975 defines instructional sites as facilities located in service areas of junior college districts, outside of the main campus district, where 2,000 or more students are enrolled in an academic year. The bill states that by December 1st of each fiscal year every junior college district must submit to the Legislative Budget Board a report on the number of contact hours for the preceding year, student attainment of completion milestones as measured by formula funding, total amount of state appropriations, tax revenue, and tuition and fee revenue collected based on student enrollment at instructional sites. The report must also include the amount of tuition and fees collected from dual credit courses, money spent on the instructional sites in the preceding fiscal year, and the number of full time, and adjunct faculty. HB 2975 seeks to provide transparency pertaining to how community colleges are using allocated funds to make informed decisions about future appropriations, however there could be challenges with obtaining this information. Community colleges don't fully fit into the definition of instructional sites as they have multiple locations with no main campus, and have multiple sites that fall into districts of 2,000 or more. Furthermore, property taxes are based district-wide and not by student enrollment. Stakeholders from community colleges believe they would have to make assumptions of allocated costs, because they do not have the date to report on the true direct costs being asked for in the bill. | <b>Favorable</b><br>Evaluated by:<br>Katherine Kirages<br>210-382-4295<br><a href="mailto:Katherine@Texaslsg.org">Katherine@Texaslsg.org</a> |
| <b>HB 1720</b><br>By: Phillips  | Relating to parental notice regarding an incident of lice in a public elementary school.   | Public Education                 | HB 1720 requires a school administrator or nurse of a public elementary school who becomes aware of the fact that a child has lice to notify the parent of the child with lice within forty-eight hours and to notify the parents of each child assigned to the same class as the child with lice within five days. The bill specifies that the notice to parents, other than the parent of the child with lice, may not identify the child with lice. The bill also requires the notice to include the recommendations of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for the treatment and prevention of lice. The intent of this bill is to prevent the spread and reoccurrence of lice in the classroom and to inform parents of the proper way to treat and prevent an incident of lice.  | <b>Favorable</b><br>Evaluated by:<br>Arielle Day<br>210-382-4295<br><a href="mailto:Serena@Texaslsg.org">Serena@Texaslsg.org</a>             |
| <b>HB 2653</b><br>By: Geren   | Relating to the authority of a district court to hear and determine certain ad valorem tax appeals.  | Ways & Means                     | This bill amends the Tax Code to create system for property owners to dispute findings by the Appraisal Review Board. Property owners are entitled to utilize the court system to appeal the ARB's final determination regarding a valuation, and the following steps will occur: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The case can be reprocessed by the ARB in situations where the property owner did not exhaust all administrative processes available to them;</li> <li>• The ARB shall then conduct a hearing to reevaluate the case and issue a written statement regarding the matter; and then</li> <li>• The ARB's reevaluation of the case can be appealed back to the original court at the property owner's request</li> </ul> <p>All parties are authorized to waive the process outlined above and elect to have the court make a final determination regarding the matter. HB 2653 outlines an easily-understood set of steps for property owners to follow, but the additional time and money associated with pursuing the matter in the courts may be prohibitive in some instances; language addressing this concern by making the ARB responsible for paying court costs if their initial valuation was inaccurate may be advisable.</p>   | <b>Favorable</b><br>Evaluated by:<br>Katherine Kirages<br>210-382-4295<br><a href="mailto:Katherine@Texaslsg.org">Katherine@Texaslsg.org</a> |



|  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p><b>HB 2820</b><br/>By: Pickett</p>                              | <p>Relating to establishing the Texas Peace Officers' Memorial Ceremony Committee to recognize and honor peace officers who were killed in the line of duty.</p> | <p>Homeland Security &amp; Public Safety</p> | <p>The bill establishes the Texas Peace Officers' Memorial Ceremony Committee to plan, oversee, and facilitate annual ceremonies recognizing and honoring peace officers of this state who were killed in the line of duty. The committee consists of the following members: a president, or the president's designee of any law enforcement organization, a surviving spouse of a peace officer killed in the line of duty selected by Concerns of Police Survivors of this state; and non-voting members or designees of the members. The nonvoting members or designees of the members include: governor, lieutenant governor, speaker of the house of representatives, attorney general, director of DPS, executive director of the board, and the executive director of TCOLE. The committee shall meet as necessary to plan and coordinate an annual memorial ceremony on the Capitol grounds to honor Texas peace officers who were killed in the line of duty. The bill would also authorize for the ceremonies to be funded with public or private money.</p> | <p><b>Favorable</b><br/>Evaluated by:<br/>Andrea Elizondo<br/>210-382-4295<br/><a href="mailto:Andrea@Texaslsg.org">Andrea@Texaslsg.org</a></p>    |
| <p><b>HB 2649</b><br/>By: Capriglione / Howard</p>                 | <p>Relating to certain meetings of open-enrollment charter schools.</p>  | <p>Public Education</p>                      | <p>HB 2649 amends the Education Code to require open enrollment charter schools to host their open meetings in the county in which the charter school is located, broadcast the meetings over the Internet, and archive the recordings. The intent of this bill is to ensure that the open meetings of open-enrollment charter schools are easily accessible to parents and guardians wishing to attend.</p>   | <p><b>Favorable</b><br/>Evaluated by:<br/>Arielle Day<br/>210-382-4295<br/><a href="mailto:Arielle@Texaslsg.org">Arielle@Texaslsg.org</a></p>      |
| <p><b>HB 2828</b><br/>By: Oliveira</p>                             | <p>Relating to the regulation of certain sweepstakes in this state.</p>  | <p>Business &amp; Industry</p>               | <p>HB 2828 adds an exemption to allow a sweepstakes company that operates under a Consent Judgment, is awarding a million-dollar prize or more, and is in good standing with the state of Texas, to mail these prizes to Texas residents. Currently, residents in all other 49 states are eligible to win a million or multimillion dollar sweepstake prize by mail, but Texas residents cannot. Chapter 622, Business and Commerce Code, is the law governing sweepstake businesses. Currently, this chapter conflicts with the settlement agreement that Texas and 26 other states reached with Publisher Clearing House (PCH). This conflict has resulted in Texas residents' sweepstake eligibility by mail only for cash prizes less than \$50,000. HB 2828 simply clarifies this issue, and ensures Texas consumers are eligible to receive the same million dollar prizes by mail as residents in all other 49 states.</p>  | <p><b>Favorable</b><br/>Evaluated by:<br/>Serena Ahmed<br/>210-382-4295<br/><a href="mailto:Serena@Texaslsg.org">Serena@Texaslsg.org</a></p>       |
| <p><b>HB 2482</b><br/>By: Miller / Zerwas / Reynolds</p>           | <p>Relating to the authority of certain counties to operate a roadway clearance program; creating an offense.</p>  | <p>County Affairs</p>                        | <p>As current statute stands, Fort Bend County does not have the authority to operate a roadway clearing program which would allow for timely removal of vehicles on the road that may be causing congestion due to an accident.</p> <p>H.B. 2482 amends the Occupations Code to authorize the commissioners court to enter into an inter-local agreement with such a program as Safe Clear. Participation in this program would alleviate traffic in the Fort Bend area if an accident occurred.</p> <p>In order to prevent tow trucks that are not on tow rotation list from showing up and removing vehicles from the freeway or shoulder, HB 2482 creates a misdemeanor offense for a towing company to operate against the provisions created by the Sheriff or Commissioners Court.</p>  | <p><b>Favorable</b><br/>Evaluated by:<br/>Tiffany Williams<br/>210-382-4295<br/><a href="mailto:Tiffany@Texaslsg.org">Tiffany@Texaslsg.org</a></p> |
| <p><b>HB 2249</b><br/>By: Sheffield / Zerwas / Murphy / Howard</p> | <p>Relating to requirements for and the transparency of epidemiological reports and immunization exemption information and reports.</p>                          | <p>Public Health</p>                         | <p>The number of school children with immunization exemptions has significantly increased in the past decade; families are choosing to conscientiously abstain from vaccinating their children for numerous reasons. With this increase in children who are not vaccinated comes the risk of compromised herd immunity, which can lead to outbreaks of vaccine-preventable diseases such as measles. While these outbreaks pose a risk to all Texans, they are especially dangerous for immunocompromised children, such as those who are undergoing cancer treatment.</p> <p>HB 2249 seeks to provide greater transparency regarding vaccine exemptions to better inform parents and communities of potential public health risks. It makes changes to the Health and Safety Code and the Education Code to update vaccine reporting requirements;</p>  | <p><b>Favorable</b><br/>Evaluated by:<br/>Tyler Anderson<br/>210-382-4295<br/><a href="mailto:tyler@texaslsg.org">tyler@texaslsg.org</a></p>       |



|  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  | <p>most notably, it changes vaccine exemption reporting requirements from district level to campus level, allowing for more targeted surveillance of clusters of unvaccinated students. In addition to bringing the reporting requirements down to campus level, HB 2249 requires that DSHS publish the reports on its website. This allows parents to access critical public health information about their child’s school, leading to better informed decisions and increased control over their child’s health outcomes. The bill also requires school districts, at the request of a parent or guardian, to provide a copy of the school’s immunization rate disaggregated by type of vaccine. As noted previously, this is especially critical for parents of immunocompromised children.</p> <p>These exemption reports are already completed annually by school nurses; the information contained is de-identified, therefore it does not compromise the safety or confidentiality of individual children. HB 2249 does not mandate vaccines or tighten the circumstances under which a family can obtain a conscientious exemption; it merely updates reporting requirements, allowing all families to access critical public health information about their neighborhood school population’s vaccine exemptions. Finally, the bill requires DSHS to prepare and submit a biennial report to the legislature that contains a report of outbreaks of vaccine preventable diseases and various types of de-identified exemption information. This report will allow for better monitoring and oversight of vaccine exemptions and areas that are particularly vulnerable to vaccine-preventable disease outbreaks.</p> |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|

