Sunset Commission Review of State Agencies				
HB 3302 By: Gonzales, Larry	Relating to the sunset review process and certain governmental entities subject to that process	State Affairs	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: • Grouping sunset reviews for river authorities geographically to minimize travel and lodging costs • Moves back sunset dates for the Teacher Retirement System, Texas Facilities Commission, Office of State and Federal Regulations, and the Texas Real Estate Commission • 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 • Revises the definition of "state agency" for the purposes of the Texas Sunset Act • 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 • 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 Essentially, this bill makes statutory changes that will improve the functionality and efficiency of the Texas Sunset Commission. **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.** State agency employees do 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.	**Favorable w/ Concerns**
Abortion Complication Reporting				
HB 2962 By:	Relating to reporting requirements by certain	State Affairs	CSHB 2962 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. DSHS will develop a form for reporting these abortion	**Unfavorable**

PO Box 12943, Capitol Station, Austin, TX 78711-2943 Phone 210.382.4295 Info@TexasLSG.org www.TexasLSG.org

OK for Distribution – Rep Garnet Coleman

Capriglione /Sheffield /Springer /et al.	health care facilities for abortion complications; authorizing a civil penalty.		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: • The name and type of facility submitting the report • The date and type of the abortion that caused the complication • The gestational age of the fetus when the abortion was performed • The date the complication was diagnosed or treated • A description of the complication • The number of previous live births of a patient • The number of previous induced abortions of the patient 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 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. 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. DSHS 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. CSHB 2962 seeks to address a non-issue and will likely overregulate many clinics providing abortions into non-compliance, resulting in decreased access for Texas women.	
Maternal Mortality				

OK for Distribution – Rep Garnet Coleman

HB 2035 - By: Walle/Minjarez/Thierry/Davis, Sarah/Howard	Relating to the continuation of the Maternal Mortality and Morbidity Task Force	Public Health	Texas' maternal mortality rate is alarmingly high; a 2016 study in *The Journal Of Obstetrics and Gynecology* revealed that it is not only higher than the national average, but is the highest in the developed world. Maternal deaths can be caused by cardiac events, drug overdose, mental illness (specifically postpartum depression), and other health issues. It is important to note that maternal mortality disproportionately impacts Black women; while Black women account for just 11% of total births in Texas, they constitute 30% of all maternal deaths. The DSHS Maternal Mortality and Morbidity Task Force was formed in 2013 to study the causes of maternal mortality and morbidity and to make recommendations for ways to reduce incidence of pregnancy related deaths among Texas women. HB 2035 extends the abolishment date of the task force from 2019 to 2023 to ensure that they have ample time to fully investigate the causes of maternal mortality in Texas. The task force has already successfully reviewed over 40 maternal death cases since its inception, and has been able to identify risk factors associated with maternal death as well as make recommendations to the legislature on how to begin to tackle the issue. Extending the task force is critical to ensure that Texas women have the healthiest pregnancy outcomes possible.	**Favorable**
SB 1929 By: Kolkhorst, et al. (Sp: Burkett, Walle)	Relating to maternal mortality and morbidity and pregnancy-related deaths, including postpartum depression	Public Health	Texas' maternal mortality rate is alarmingly high; a 2016 study in The Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology revealed that it is not only higher than the national average, but is the highest in the developed world. The DSHS Maternal Mortality and Morbidity Task Force was established by the Legislature in 2013 to study the causes of maternal mortality and morbidity and to make recommendations for ways to reduce the incidence of pregnancy related deaths among Texas women. To date, the task force has published two reports detailing its findings on the causes of maternal mortality in Texas. While the picture is still incomplete, the findings have begun to unearth the root causes of maternal mortality among women in Texas. The top causes of maternal mortality that have been identified by the task force include cardiac incidents (20.6%), drug overdose (11.6%), hemorrhage (9%), homicide (9%), and suicide (5%). In addition to primary causes, the task force also identified racial and geographic disparities in incidence of maternal mortality; for example, while Black women account for just 11% of total births in Texas, they constitute 30% of all maternal deaths. SB 1929 seeks to address the causes of maternal mortality identified by the task force by instructing DSHS to evaluate and compile a list of methods for reducing maternal mortality that focus on the most prevalent causes identified by the task force. Additionally, the department should compile a list of methods for treating postpartum depression in economically disadvantaged women. DSHS will be required to submit a biennial written report summarizing these efforts to the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Speaker of the House, Legislative Budget Board, and appropriate standing committees of the Legislature. Finally, the bill requires DSHS to apply for federal grant funds available for the screening and treatment of postpartum depression under the 21st Century Cures Act of the US Congress, passed in 2015. These provisions will all work concurrently to put the recommendations of the task force into action, and will begin the critical work of addressing maternal mortality in Texas. In addition to the aforementioned provisions, SB 1929 extends the abolishment date of the DSHS Maternal Mortality and Morbidity Task Force to 2023 and authorizes the task force to select all cases of maternal mortality for review (currently, they are only authorized to randomly select cases). The bill also expands the scope of the task force to include the study and review of rates and disparities in pregnancy related deaths as opposed to just looking for trends. These changes ensure that the task force has ample time, a large sample of cases to investigate, and the statutory authority to investigate disparities, all of which will result in more accurate, usable recommendations.	**Favorable**

OK for Distribution – Rep Garnet Coleman

SB 1599 - By: Miles, et al. (Sp: Walle)	Relating to maternal mortality reporting and investigation information	Public Health	Texas' maternal mortality rate is alarmingly high; a 2016 study in The Journal Of Obstetrics and Gynecology revealed that it is not only higher than the national average, but is the highest in the developed world. Maternal deaths can be caused by cardiac events, drug overdose, mental illness (specifically postpartum depression), and other health issues. The DSHS Maternal Mortality and Morbidity Task Force was formed in 2013 to study the causes of maternal mortality and morbidity and to make recommendations for ways to reduce incidence of pregnancy related deaths among Texas women. The task force's first report submitted to the Texas Legislature noted a number of significant problems with reporting, investigation, and data collection related to maternal deaths in Texas. Specifically, they cited notable variation in how maternal death cases were being investigated and significant issues with cases being misrouted or not reported to the correct investigative entity, such as the medical examiner or justice of the peace. Additionally, the task force found a lack of standardization in lab testing administered during investigations of maternal deaths, such as the timing and quality of toxicology testing performed. These inconsistencies result in data that is uninterpretable or invalid, which makes it difficult for the task force to truly unearth the underlying causes of maternal mortality in Texas. SB 1599 attempts to address these reporting and investigative issues in a number of ways. It instructs DSHS to establish a systematic protocol for pregnancy related death investigations and best practices for reporting pregnancy related deaths to the medical examiner or justice of the peace, when applicable. The bill outlines specific information to be contained in these protocols and best practices, including: guidelines for determining when comprehensive toxicology screening should be performed, determining when a death should be reported or investigated by a medical examiner or justice of the peace, and how to correctly complete the death certificate of a person who died from pregnancy related causes. This information is to be posted to DSHS website to allow physicians and other appropriate professionals to easily reference it, increasing the chances for standardization and compliance. Increasing standardization and use of best practices in reporting and investigations will improve maternal mortality data, allowing the task force to more accurately determine the causes of maternal mortality. This will allow the task force to make impactful recommendations aimed at addressing this critical issue, which will help ensure safe, healthy pregnancies for Texas women.	**Favorable**
Municipal Annexation				
SB 715 By: Campbell, Sponsor: Huberty	Relating to municipal annexation.	Land and Resource Management	SB 715 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. SB 715 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. 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. A municipality with a population of at least 500,000 may annex an area if:	**Unfavorable**

OK for Distribution – Rep Garnet Coleman

			• each land owner in the area requests the annexation; • the municipality and the land owners enter into a written agreement stipulating the services to be provided by the municipality; • the municipality holds at least two public hearings no less than ten days apart; and • the municipality provides adequate notice of the hearings 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: • a consent petition is signed by more than 50% of the registered voters of the area; the municipality adopts a formal resolution to annex the area; • the municipality mails a notice of the proposed annexation; and • the municipality holds at least one public hearing 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. If the targeted annexation area has a population of 200 or more, then the municipality may annex the area if: • the municipality holds an election and the majority of voters approve the annexation; • 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 • the municipality adopts a formal resolution to annex the area • the municipality provides notice to each property owner in the area • the municipality holds at least two hearings 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. 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: • an industrial district • land subject to a strategic partnership agreement between the municipality and a water conservation and reclamation district 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. 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	

OK for Distribution – Rep Garnet Coleman

			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. 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. SB 715 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. A concerning unintended consequence of SB 715 is its effect on undocumented immigrant communities and property owners who are not registered voters. There are many property owners who are eligible to vote and are not registered. By requiring only registered voters to participate in annexation related elections and petitions, undocumented property owners and non-registered voters with property are left out of the decision-making process and without a say in what happens to their land.	
Relating to Do-Not Resuscitate Orders				
HB 2063 By: Bonnen, Greg et al.	Relating to general procedures and requirements for do-not-resuscitate orders	State Affairs	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: • Is issued in compliance with the written directions of a competent patient • 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 • Is issued in compliance with the directions of the patient's advance directive • Is issued in compliance with the directions of the patient's legal guardian or medical power of attorney • 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 **one** person that can include the patient's spouse, adult child, parent, or nearest living relative. • 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 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.	**Unfavorable**

OK for Distribution – Rep Garnet Coleman

			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: • The bill may limit settings in which a DNR can be considered valid, which could violate the patient's wishes • 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 • 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 • 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 • 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 • The bill should explicitly ensure that the patient's best care is a top priority - sometimes this means withdrawing life sustaining treatment	
Texting while Driving				
HB 62 By: Craddick	Relating to the use of a wireless communications device while operating a motor vehicle; creating a criminal offense; modifying existing criminal penalties.	Transportation	In 2015, the Texas Department of Transportation reported on the dangers of distracted driving in Texas. Overall, they estimated that distracted driving caused 470 fatalities and over 18,000 injuries on our state's roads. This is a dangerous trend that needs to be addressed and help stop preventable fatalities. HB 62 bans texting while driving a moving vehicle. Texting includes: using a cell phone to read, write, or send an electronic message. It does exempt in the cases of emergencies, reporting illegal activity, using a hands-free device, relaying information to a dispatcher or utilizing a device associated with the driver's job in the vehicle. The bill includes a misdemeanor offense punishable by a fine ranging from $25 to $99. For repeat offenders, there could be penalties up to $200. This bill also states that a peace officer may not take possession of the phone or otherwise inspect a portable wireless communication device in the possession of the operator unless authorized by the Code of Criminal Procedure, the Penal Code, or other law.	**Favorable**
Restrictions on Bathroom Use				
SB 6 **By:** **Kolkhorst/** **et al.**	Relating to regulations and policies for entering or using a bathroom or changing facility; authorizing a civil penalty.	Senate State Affairs	SB 6 discriminates against transgender Texans and families. It requires school districts, open-enrollment charter schools, political subdivisions (meaning government entities of a state including counties and municipalities), and state agencies to adopt a policy that restricts the use of each multiple occupancy bathroom or changing facility located on the entity's grounds to a person's "biological sex", rather than a person's actual gender identity. SB 6 also prohibits political subdivisions from adopting or enforcing orders, ordinances, or other measures that relates to a private entity's policy regarding the designation or use of a bathroom or changing facility on their premises, or that requires or prohibits the private entity to adopt such a policy. This nullifies the local ordinances in five Texas cities, with populations over 100,000, that offer some protections for lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender communities in relation to the use of bathrooms in public places. This bill further restricts a political subdivision's ability to ensure the dignity and worth of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender Texans are protected by prohibiting political subdivisions from considering a private entity's policies regarding bathroom use when the two entities are engaged in creating a contract. School districts, open-enrollment charter schools, political subdivisions, and state agencies who violate this proposed requirement are liable to civil penalties described as follows:	**Unfavorable**

OK for Distribution – Rep Garnet Coleman

			1) First violation = not less than $1,000 and not more than $1,500 2) Second and subsequent violations = not less than $10,000 and not more than $10,500 **Note: Each day a violation is continued constitutes a separate violation.** Violations are determined on the basis of complaints filed by citizens with the Attorney General. Complaints may only be filed if the citizen first provides the school district, open-enrollment charter school, political subdivision or state agency with a written notice detailing the violation in relation to bathroom use. After the third business day of receiving the written notice, if the school or political subdivision does not cure the violation, then the citizen may file the complaint with the Attorney General's office. If the Attorney General determines there is legal action to pursue against the accused school district or political subdivision in regard to bathroom policies of SB 6, then the Attorney General shall provide the appropriate officer of the accused entity with a written notice detailing the violation including location of the bathroom or changing facility, the proposed penalty amount, and a 15-day time frame after receiving the notice to cure the violation in order to avoid the penalty. However, if the entity has been found previously liable by a court for violating SB 6, then this time frame is not offered to avoid the civil penalties. SB 6 also increases criminal penalties for crimes committed in a bathroom or changing facility by one degree. Furthermore, if the crime is a first-degree felony, then the minimum sentencing is increased to fifteen years. The list of which criminal violations this applies to is as follows: murder, manslaughter, criminally negligent homicide, unlawful restraint, kidnapping, aggravated kidnapping, public lewdness, indecent exposure, indecency with a child, improper relationship between educator and student, invasive visual recording, voyeurism, assault, sexual assault, aggravated assault, aggravated sexual assault, injury to child, elderly or disabled individuals, abandoning or endangering a child, deadly conduct, terroristic threat, criminal trespass, harassment, prostitution, promotion of prostitution, aggravated promotion of prostitution, compelling prostitution, obscenity, sale, distribution or display of harmful material to a minor, sexual performance by a child, possession or promotion of child pornography, or electronic transmission of certain visual material depicting minor. Exceptions for these requirements apply to persons and purposes as follows: custodial purposes, for maintenance or inspection purposes, providing medical or emergency assistance, or to accompany persons or to require other persons for assistance. In the case of school districts and open-enrollment charter schools, only employees, authorized volunteers, parents, guardians, conservators or authorized caregivers may accompany a student in need of assistance. In the case of political subdivisions and state agencies, SB 6 requirements for multiple occupancy bathrooms and changing facilities do not apply to children who are younger than eight years of age *and* accompanying the person caring for them. SB 6 does not prohibit these entities from providing accommodations, upon request, for a person to use single-occupancy bathrooms or changing facilities, or a faculty bathroom or changing facility, other than their biological sex, but no accommodations are allowed for multiple-use bathrooms or changing facilities. This bill does not prohibit these accommodations only under special circumstances. SB 6 is discriminatory against the LGBTQ community. Banning trans women from using the same bathroom as cis women in the intention of women's protection and privacy is of sickening similarity to the era of segregated bathrooms by race under the guise of safety. This bill harbors dangerous animosity towards working Texas individuals and families permeating everyday life beyond bathroom usage. If passed, we are encouraging a culture of violence against Texans whose identities simply do not coincide with what is written on their birth certificate. The average life expectancy for transgender Americans is 35 years of age, which rivals the lowest	

OK for Distribution – Rep Garnet Coleman

			life expectancy of a third world country. What bills like SB 6 do is perpetuate a lack of empathy and understanding, which can lead to deadly consequences. Seven trans women have been murdered in 2017; in 2016 there were 27. The transgender community is an extremely vulnerable population and we need to help protect and lift them up instead of passing legislation to further restrict their access to bathrooms and, therefore, living a life in public. • 61% of transgender Texans avoid using the bathroom in public places. • 34% go so far to as regulate what they eat and drink so as to limit the frequency of needing to use a bathroom. • 54% had health problems due to lack of access to restrooms. • 77% of transgendered people do not have any form of ID that matches their gender identity Hostile limitations such as SB 6 force the transgender community out of the public sphere for fear of their safety. Undoubtedly, transgender youth in Texas will be the most affected by this legislation. SB 6 would regulate public schools and open-enrollment charter schools and will not allow for a Superintendent to enforce policy that is in violation of this bill. For cities, states, and schools that do not bar transgender people access to the bathroom of their gender identity there has never been an incident. In fact, the people who are the most vulnerable in the spaces subject to policing in this bill is the transgender community. When 70% of the trans community reports mistreatment in a public bathroom and there has never been a single incident of mistreatment for cisgender women, it seems obvious who actually needs the state's protection. **Negative effects on Texas economy** Notwithstanding the controversy over the amount, the reality is that similar bills such as in North Carolina have caused substantial economic loss, and Texas would be no exception. After North Carolina passed HB 2 in 2016, the NBA pulled out their scheduled 2017 All-Star game in Charlotte, which cost the city $100 million in profits. Various entertainers canceled their scheduled performances, and businesses halted expansions in the state, including PayPal which cancelled a 400-job expansion. The NCAA relocated seven championship games to outside of the state. There is an exemption that applies to private entities that lease or contract to use a building owned or leased by this state or political subdivision. This implies that sports teams or businesses who lease or contract government buildings such as stadiums or convention centers would not have to adopt the SB 6 policy on prohibiting individuals from using the restroom that coincides with their gender identity. However, this will not be enough to keep business and sports teams from cancelling their events in Texas. The reason businesses, sports events, performers, and organizations cancel their scheduled conventions are because they are against discriminatory policies. Eliminating the policy having to apply to their event does not eliminate their opposition to the policy in the rest of the state. An overview of companies, conventions, associations and sports events opposed to SB 6 and scheduled to host high-profile events in Texas are as follows. The Texas Association of Business is fervently opposed to the legislation, as is Texas Competes, a coalition of over one 1,000 companies united in interests for a Texas that promotes social equality *and* a competitive economy. CEO's from differing industries and associations have expressed opposition to SB 6 as it is discriminatory, expresses Texas as an unwelcoming state and how it is widely understood that discrimination is simply bad for business. A coalition of Texas Conventions and Visitors Bureaus joined together to form "Texas Welcomes All" in opposition to discriminatory legislation such as SB 6. The NCAA has eight events	

OK for Distribution – Rep Garnet Coleman

			scheduled in Texas through 2019, including the 2018 men's final four event scheduled in San Antonio for 2018 that would cost the state $135 million in lost profits to the state if they cancelled the event. These lost profits are even expected to amount to much more when accounting for domino effects on business investments in equipment, etc. Last year, the NCAA's board of governors created standards requiring host cities to "demonstrate how they will provide an environment that is safe, healthy and free of discrimination." The NAACP withdrew its high-profile convention scheduled in Charlotte, North Carolina because the state passed their anti-transgender bill, and rescheduled their annual convention for 2018 in San Antonio, but if SB 6 were to pass and the NAACP withdrew its scheduled convention in San Antonio, there would be an estimated loss of around $10 million dollars. Clearly, this legislation would have disastrous effects for the Texas economy, ranging from loss in jobs to hotel stays to consumer expenditures at businesses, and this would range from hundreds of millions in losses to the state to multi-billions.	
Rollback Tax Elections				
SB 2 By: Bettencout SP: Bonnen, Dennis	Relating to the administration of the ad valorem tax system.	Ways & Means	SB 2, or the Property Tax Payer Empowerment Act of 2017, makes several reforms to the Texas ad valorem tax system administration. **One of the most negatively impactful provisions left out of the House version of the bill is the required 5% rollback tax rate. It is imperative to the wellbeing of counties and cities to maintain the current process for taxpayers to petition for a rollback election; any amendments or changes to the bill affect this provision would render the LGS rating <u>unfavorable.</u>** While the bill will not affect tax rates, taxable property values, collection rates, or other variables that could affect local or state taxing unit revenues, SB 2 seeks to provide transparency and accessibility to taxpayers through substantive changes to the process and methods by which information is made available to the public, as well as statutory changes relating to local property tax appraisal and review. Notable provisions within the bill include: • Requiring the Comptroller to prescribe tax rate calculation forms for designated officers or employees to use in submitting tax rates, both in taxing units other than school districts and school districts, and the requirements relating to the electronic fillable forms, • Requiring the Comptroller to include school district tax rates in the taxing unit's imposed rates, as reported by each appraisal district, including submission guidelines and deadlines, • Establishing special appraisal review board panels for properties appraised at $50 million or more in specified property categories, in counties with a population of 1 million or more, including size, eligibility requirements, and other affairs relating to the aforementioned panels, • Regarding a Notice of Appraised Value, requiring chief appraisers within an appraisal district to inform property owners of their right to protest to be heard by a special panel of the appraisal review board, as well as repealing the requirement to include the estimated amount of tax that would be imposed on the property through the previous year's tax rate, if the appraised value is greater than that of the preceding tax year, • Regarding property taxation and assessment: Renaming the effective tax rate as the "no-new-revenue tax rate", and the effective maintenance and operation (M&O) tax rate to the "no-new-revenue M&O tax rate", • Prohibiting a taxing unit's designated officers or employees (with the exception of school districts) to submit the no-new-revenue tax rate and rollback tax rate to the unit's governing body without first using the tax calculation forms prescribed by the Comptroller. Similarly, the taxing unit can not adopt the rates until the designated officer/employee certifies accuracy on the forms and the values match the unit's certified appraisal roll values, • Requiring taxing units to provide taxpayers with notices containing specified tax bill information, as well as requirements for public tax rate hearings and related notices,	**Favorable w/Concerns**

OK for Distribution – Rep Garnet Coleman

			• Authorizing taxable property owners to file injunctions to restrain tax collection by their corresponding taxing unit within 15 days after adopting a tax rate, if the aforementioned unit or chief appraiser has not complied with the computation, publication, posting, or other related requirements. In this instance, the property owner is entitled to a refund of taxes paid, attorney's fees, and related court costs, • Requiring each taxing unit to establish and maintain a public database containing property values, property taxes, tax rates, hearing dates, and other related information, as well as a website containing related information and audit information as prescribed by the Comptroller, • Regarding local review, repealing the provision that permits taxing units to challenge the level of appraisals of any category of property in the district or in territory within the district before the appraisal review board. Instead, the bill requires a notice of protest for property owners requesting to be heard by a special panel if the property is in a provided category. SB 2 further makes conforming repeals and changes to keep continuity between the proposed changed within related statutes. The Legislative Budget Board estimates a negative impact to General Revenue Related Funds in the amount of $624,000 through the 2018-19 fiscal biennium. Currently, local governments have the choice to increase property-tax revenue by up to 8% per year, excluding taxes from new construction projects. Should local governments propose increased property taxes over the 8% cap, taxpayers can petition for a special "rollback" election to determine whether to reduce the tax rate to the previous 8% ceiling. Major provisions within the Senate version of the bill included requiring a special "rollback" election if local property taxes increased by more than 5% by local governing units. Consequently, this decreased cap placed harmful restrictions on local cities and counties' abilities to fund and provide public services, such as public safety, education, and health care, through a regressive system and decreased source of revenue. By removing restrictive requirements in the House version of SB 2, local governments are able to provide taxpayers with local control regarding property taxes, as well as providing taxpayers with necessary information regarding their tax bills. Ensuring clear and accessible information on property taxes and property owners' rights bolsters relations between state and local governments, as well as providing accountability to taxpayers by providing a uniform and certified calculation process. However, any changes relating to limiting local governments' ability to provide and fund services should be avoided, as instituting a smaller cap for property-tax revenue will do little to reduce the burden on homeowners. School districts receive more than half of local property taxes, which would remain unchanged by smaller property tax ceilings; instead, this would restrict cities and counties from being able to raise revenue for local services rather than reduce school property taxes. With an emphasis on local and state transparency provisions, the House version of SB 2 stands to make helpful improvements to the ad valorem tax system administration.	
Union Dues Check-Off				
SB 13 **By: Huffman**	Relating to payroll deductions for state and local government employee organizations.	State Affairs	SB 13 would prohibit non-emergency public employees from authorizing voluntary paycheck deductions for membership fees to labor organizations. However, there is a carve out protection for certain municipal public safety workers in law enforcement, fire departments, and emergency medical services (EMS). Further protections extend to: • Any public employee's ability to elect to deduct or withhold a monetary amount from salaries for donations to charitable organizations,	**Unfavorable**

OK for Distribution – Rep Garnet Coleman

			• Covered public safety workers' state employee labor organizations and similar entities with a membership of at least 2,000 active or retired workers who hold/have held certification from the Texas Commission on Law Enforcement, • Municipalities with a population of more than 10,000 that receive revenue from the state and allows deductions for purposes other than charity, health insurance, taxes, or any other purposes, applicable only to firefighters and EMS personnel • Police departments in municipalities that are not covered by a collective bargaining agreement or meet and confer agreement As of 2016, Texas had the second-highest number of employed workers in the nation with more than 10 million employees, yet had the lowest union membership rate on record since 1989. Based on current data from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, a mere 4.5% of all Texas employees are union members. Although Texas is a right to work state labor association membership is entirely voluntary; similarly, payroll deduction is voluntary and reduces the risk of identity theft and credit card fraud because employees make the decision to automatically send dues directly to their unions. The repeal of voluntary payroll deduction in this bill explicitly targets the freedom of association and financial planning of non-emergency public workers at a disproportionate rate than employees covered under this statute. Public employees should equally have the right to spend their paycheck as they see fit, regardless of occupation or membership of a particular professional organization. SB 13 seeks to indirectly weaken the role of certain labor organizations and workers' abilities to organize and voice concerns to their local government by blocking an avenue of economic freedom through a state mandate: The American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) lost nearly 70% of their membership after passage of a similar law in Wisconsin. Arguments that local governments collect union membership dues at the taxpayers' expense are unsubstantiated, as Texas Education Code clearly mandates labor organizations are responsible to cover any administrative costs incurred from implementing payroll deduction.	
Public School Finance Reform				
HB 21 **By: Huberty, Zerwas, Turner, Ken King, Dutton, et al.**	Relating to the funding of primary and secondary education.	Public Education	HB 21 is a promising first step towards improving a school finance system that is notorious for its complex nature and convoluted funding mechanisms. The system has been heavily criticized for having outdated funding elements, and it has been accused of not funding education equitably. This is due in part to the fact that Texas funds public schools by using a property tax system that creates an unfair dynamic in which the poorest school districts tax at a higher rate than the state's wealthiest school districts but receive less from the state in per pupil funding. Although this bill does not make the substantial changes to the school finance system that are necessary for decreasing disparity, it makes meaningful improvements. Contingent on the passage of HB 21, the House budget contains an increase of approximately $1.5 billion in state aid to districts, which increases per pupil funding for 95% of districts, 98% of all students in the state. School districts are funded through three main sources: local school district property taxes, state funds, and federal funds. A school district's property tax rate is made up of a Maintenance and Operation (M&O) tax and an Interest in Sinking (I&S) tax. The M&O tax	**Favorable w/Concerns**

OK for Distribution – Rep Garnet Coleman

			pays for the day-to-day operations of the district, and the I&S tax pays the money due on bonds issued by the district to construct facilities. The state provides several revenue streams including: the Foundation School Program (FSP), Facilities Funding, and Grants. The main source of state dollars for school districts come from the FSP. These dollars are from general revenue, the Available School Fund (ASF), state lottery dedicated revenue, etc. The FSP is the primary means of distributing state aid to Texas schools. This program funds the schools finance formulas to pay for day-to-day operations. The distribution of these dollars along with some local dollars can be found in Chapter 41 and 42 of the education code. They are divided into two tiers of formulas. Tier 1 consists of the Basic Allotment (BA) and is currently set in statute at $4,765 per student or a higher amount through the appropriation process. Tier I is supposed to provide districts with adequate funding necessary to deliver a basic education program, but most districts find that they cannot provide an adequate level of education with their Tier I funding. Tier II is intended to supplement Tier I funding; it pays for enrichment (i.e. education activities and programs chosen by the school district to customize its education experience. Once the basic allotment is set, there are adjustments made to it in order to determine the level of funding each school district needs. The adjustments are based on district and student characteristics (i.e. district size, teacher salary in neighboring districts, special education students, gifted and talented). Adjustments and weights drive additional funding to districts in an attempt to help cover costs arising from district and student characteristics. **HB 21 eliminates:** • The High School allotment • The Transportation allotment • A 1993 Hold Harmless Provision • Additional State Aid for Staff Salary Increases **HB 21 provides:** • Hardship Grant • New Weight for Dyslexia Students • Increase to the Bilingual Allotment Weight • Expands the Career and Technology Allotment Weight **Basic Allotment** If HB 21 passes, the budget increases the basic allotment, which is the base level of funding all districts start with, from $5,140 to $5,350 per student in each year of the biennium. A portion of this funding increase comes from the elimination of funding elements that are considered outdated and inefficient. The bill also creates, increases, and expands funding elements that benefit all school districts. **Eliminates the High School and Transportation Allotment** By eliminating the high school and transportation allotments and essentially folding them into the basic allotment, per pupil funding across the state would increase by about $210. An increase in the state's share of funding to public schools by this amount lowers the burden of recapture, the state's mechanism for collecting money from "property-rich" districts and redistributing it to "property-poor" districts, by approximately $173 million in 2018 and $205 million in 2019.	

OK for Distribution – Rep Garnet Coleman

			Eliminates A 1993 Hold Harmless Provision The hold harmless provision that the bill repeals was originally designed to transition districts into the recapture system. This is an outdated and inefficient funding element that currently benefits less than 40 districts. **Eliminates Additional State Aid for Staff Salary Increases** Additional State Aid for Staff Salary Increases (Sec. 42.2513) is a section of the Education Code that essentially designates funds to school districts specifically for support staff salary increases. The repeal of this section does not remove districts' requirement to increase wages for support staff; neither does it have the effect of reducing the amount districts are required to pay support staff. The aforementioned section of code is rendered unnecessary by the protection to support staff provided under Section 22.107 of the Education Code, Wage Increase for Support Staff. **Hardship Grant** The bill creates a Hardship Grant that provides assistance to districts in order to defray the financial hardship of ASATR's expiration. Nearly 160 school districts still receive money through ASATR (Additional State Aid for Tax Reduction), which is set to expire in September. The grant is set to expire in September of 2019. **New Weight for Dyslexia Students** HB 21 adds a 0.1 weight for students with dyslexia. This new funding weight provides districts with an additional 10% of funding for students with dyslexia. The bill limits eligibility for funding through this allotment to not more than 5% of a district's students in average daily attendance. **Increases Bilingual Allotment Weight** The bill increases the bilingual allotment weight from 0.1 to 0.11. This is an allotment that has not been increased since its inception in 1984. Data shows that bilingual education is a small investment with a large return for the state in the form of a well-educated workforce. **Expansion of the Career and Technology Allotment Weight** The bill also expands the current career and technology funding to include eighth grade and technology application courses. The expansion of this allotment creates greater accessibility to Career and Technology Education (CTE) programs. **Concerns that are important to highlight for HB 21:** HB 21 does not increase the basic allotment in statute; it only increases the basic allotment for the next biennium. The bill's intent is to eliminate certain allotments in order to increase the basic allotment. Increasing the basic allotment in statute is necessary to fulfill the bill's intent. Under HB 21, transportation costs shift from being a separate expense with distinct costs factors to being mixed into the basic allotment. Consequently, the bill does not provide transportation funding to districts based on need or cost. Including transportation in the basic allotment essentially means that districts and charters that provide little to no transportation service to students will receive funding for an expense they do not incur. **Comments on Disparity**	

OK for Distribution – Rep Garnet Coleman

			A school finance system that uses local property taxes to fund education is inherently inequitable. In school districts across the state, classroom sizes have been increasing past state-recommended teacher-student ratios. Disparity and inequity in this system force school districts to make sacrifices in various departments while struggling to keep up with the minimum education standards set by the state. Past funding cuts have caused districts to raise taxes or seek donations to keep extracurricular programs, extra school supplies, and other options available to students. HB 21 is a good first step, but without a statutory increase to the basic allotment and significant funding formula changes, Texas' school finance system continues to be inequitable.	

OK for Distribution – Rep Garnet Coleman