



# TEXAS LEGISLATIVE STUDY GROUP

*An Official Caucus of the Texas House of Representatives*

## STEERING COMMITTEE

Chair, Rep. Garnet Coleman  
 Co-Vice Chair, Rep. Yvonne Davis  
 Co-Vice Chair, Senator Jose Rodriguez  
 Co-Vice Chair, Rep. Ana Hernandez  
 Treasurer, Rep. Armando Walle  
 Secretary, Rep. Victoria Neave  
 General Counsel, Rep. Lina Ortega  
 Freshman Rep., Rep. Vikki Goodwin

Rep. Diego Bernal  
 Rep. Abel Herrero  
 Rep. Mando Martinez  
 Rep. Eddie Rodriguez  
 Rep. Toni Rose  
 Sen. Jose Menendez  
 Rep. Harold Dutton  
 Rep. Chris Turner  
 Rep. Rafael Anchia  
 Rep. Jessica Farrar

Rep. Mary Gonzalez  
 Rep. Gina Hinojosa  
 Rep. Rhetta Bowers  
 Rep. John Turner  
 Rep. Ina Minjarez  
 Rep. Sergio Munoz  
 Rep. Carl Sherman  
 Rep. Alex Dominguez  
 Rep. Nicole Collier  
 Rep. Julie Johnson

## Representative

## Desk:

### LSG Floor Report For POSTPONED BUSINESS Calendar – Wednesday, May 15, 2019

<p><b>SB 20</b>          By:          Huffman            Alvarado            Bettencourt            Campbell            Flores            Nelson            Paxton            Perry</p> <p><b>Sponsor:</b>          Thompson,          Senfronia            Krause            Collier            White            Davis,          Yvonne</p>	<p>Relating to the prevention of, prosecution of, penalties for, and other consequences of prostitution, trafficking of persons, and related criminal offenses and to orders of nondisclosure for persons who committed certain of those offenses; regulating occupations to prevent and respond to those criminal offenses, including requiring a student occupational permit for those purposes; authorizing fees; increasing criminal penalties; creating criminal offenses.</p>	<p>Criminal Jurisprudence</p> <p>Vote:  <input checked="" type="radio"/> 9 Ayes  <input type="radio"/> 0 Nays  <input type="radio"/> 0 PNV  <input type="radio"/> 0 Absent</p>	<p>SB 20 is based on the Texas Human Trafficking Prevention Task Force’s legislative recommendations to improve Texas’ response to human trafficking. All provisions are supported by the membership of the Task Force, which includes 59 state agencies, law enforcement entities, district attorney’s offices, victim-serving organizations, and regional human trafficking coalitions.</p> <p>The 14 recommendations that are addressed through SB 20’s provisions are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Expand Texas Department of Licensing and Regulation’s (TDLR) authority to conduct more comprehensive background checks under the Massage Therapy program, such as including fingerprint background checks for both new applicants and existing massage therapists, massage instructors, massage schools, and massage establishment owners.</li> <li>2. Require posting of human trafficking awareness signs in licensed massage establishments and schools as an effort to bring more awareness to the issue along with resources.</li> <li>3. Require additional reporting by massage therapy schools to identify fraudulent schools and students through measures such as issuing student permits, standardizing school reporting of hours, and determining examination eligibility, which are all current practices for Barbering and Cosmetology programs.</li> <li>4. Remove the five-year “sit-out” period for massage therapy licensees which will then allow TDLR to provide for reasonable analysis of a licensee’s criminal history before making a determination on the license.</li> <li>5. Provide TDLR with authority to act more effectively in instances of sexual violations by massage therapy licensees.</li> <li>6. Provide enforcement provisions in the massage therapy statute similar to other TDLR programs.</li> <li>7. Provide Rape Shield Law protections for human trafficking and child sexual abuse victims.</li> <li>8. Include adult sex trafficking and adult sex crimes in the list of offenses where evidence of uncharged crimes is allowable for the purpose of showing the relationship between the defendant and the victim or the state of mind of the defendant or the victim.</li> <li>9. Provide prosecutorial tools to pursue state charges against online traffickers of websites similar to Backpage, similar to federal provisions from the Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act (FOSTA) and Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act (SESTA).</li> <li>10. Include continuous human trafficking as a stackable offense.</li> <li>11. Make the definition of “coercion” found under the current Penal Code chapter related to trafficking of persons applicable to adult and child labor trafficking.</li> <li>12. Create a new process to protect commercial lessees from operating in the vicinity of human trafficking. This provision will allow for legitimates businesses to void their leases if their lessor also leases to an illicit massage business within the same mall, strip mall, shopping center, or office building.</li> <li>13. Enhance the nondisclosure process under the Department of Public Safety chapter of the Government Code</li> </ol>	<p><b>Favorable</b>          Evaluated by:          Merci Mohagheghi          (713) 382-7007          Merci@TexasLSG.org</p>
--	---	--	---	--

OK for Distribution  Rep. Garnet Coleman

for victims of human trafficking. This provision will allow for human trafficking victims to request nondisclosure of their criminal history record information on the grounds that their offense was solely as a victim of trafficking.

14. Amend prostitution and related statutes to provide increased penalties for buyers and mandatory community supervision for sellers as an effort to decrease demand and to direct individuals at high risk of human trafficking to services.

## LSG Floor Report For MAJOR STATE Calendar – Wednesday, May 15, 2019

<p><b>SB 698</b> By: Birdwell</p> <p><b>Sponsor:</b> Lozano   Blanco</p>	<p>Relating to the expedited processing of certain applications for permits under the Texas Clean Air Act.</p>	<p>Environmental Regulation</p> <p>Vote: 8 Ayes 0 Nays 0 PNV 1 Absent</p>	<p>Shortening the wait time for air permit applications from the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) is high priority. TCEQ is limited to a certain amount of people they can hire, and this makes it difficult to expedite the air permit process.</p> <p>SB 698 provides for the use of full-time equivalent TCEQ employees to assist in the expediting air permit applications filed under the Texas Clean Air Act. Currently, TCEQ can add a surcharge for expedited permits to cover the expenses including overtime, contract labor, and other costs—SB 698 adds costs of full-time equivalent commission employees to help the expediting process to that list of compensated items. This gives TCEQ more flexibility in getting permits processed at a reasonable rate.</p>	<p><b>Favorable</b> Evaluated by: Sophia Creede (832) 865-4774 Sophia@TexasLSG.org</p>
--	--	---	--	--

## LSG Floor Report For GENERAL STATE Calendar – Wednesday, May 15, 2019

<p><b>SB 790</b> By: Buckingham</p> <p><b>Sponsor:</b> Morrison</p>	<p>Relating to certain audit and reporting requirements of regional planning commissions.</p>	<p>County Affairs</p> <p>Vote: 9 Ayes 0 Nays 0 PNV 0 Absent</p>	<p>SB 790 seeks to streamline annual reporting to the comptroller by amending the Local Government Code.</p> <p>SB 790 eliminates current language under the law by requiring entities reporting to a regional planning commission to send a duplicates of annual audit reports.</p>	<p><b>Favorable</b> Evaluated by: Brandi Granderson (202) 808-6140 Brandi.Granderson_HC@house.texas.gov</p>
<p><b>SB 2137</b> By: Hinojosa</p> <p><b>Sponsor:</b> Canales</p>	<p>Relating to the use of municipal hotel occupancy tax revenue by certain municipalities.</p>	<p>Ways &amp; Means</p> <p>Vote: 9 Ayes 0 Nays 0 PNV 2 Absent</p>	<p>SB 2137 authorizes a municipality (bracketed for the City of Edinberg) to use hotel occupancy tax revenue to invest in infrastructure related to certain sporting-related fields or facilities. These projects must meet specific criteria including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Located within 2,500 feet of a municipally owned field or facility and be directly related to use,</li> <li>• Located on municipally owned property and,</li> <li>• Used in the prior year and more than ten times for district, state, regional, or national sports tournaments, games, or events.</li> </ul> <p>SB 2137 further caps the amount a municipality could spend on a project to ten years times the estimated amount of property tax revenue attributed to the project.</p>	<p><b>Favorable</b> Evaluated by: Eliot Davis (713) 855-3285 Eli@TexasLSG.org</p>
<p><b>SB 668</b> By: Hughes</p> <p><b>Sponsor:</b> VanDeaver</p>	<p>Relating to data collection, reporting, and notice requirements for certain educational entities.</p>	<p>Public Education</p> <p>Vote: 13 Ayes 0 Nays 0 PNV 0 Absent</p>	<p>In the summer of 2018, a work group was created titled the K-12 Improvement, Innovation, and Mandate Relief Work Group. This work group was designed to represent teachers, school administrators, and policy organizations, and address unnecessary mandates and focus on improving polices for student outcomes. This workgroup outlined several recommendations that requires enactment from the Texas Legislature.</p> <p>SB 668 would enact the following recommendations, as identified by the work group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SB 668 requires the TEA commissioner to allow a charter holder for an open-enrollment charter school to provide a written notice of establishment for their charter up to 18 months before the charter school is</li> </ul>	<p><b>Favorable</b> Evaluated by: Marissa Gorena (956) 867-7232 Marissa@TexasLSG.org</p>

OK for Distribution –  Rep. Daniel Coleman

			<p>established and includes notice to the superintendent of a nearby school district where the charter school is likely to draw students from.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SB 668 establishes a uniform definition for “homeless children and youth” within the Education Code and throughout education statuses.</li> <li>• SB 668 improves the data collection for beginning teacher retainment by replacing the collection source from the Teacher Retirement System (TRS) to Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) to allow for a more efficient means of data collection.</li> <li>• SB 668 repeals the Best Practices Clearinghouse as it has had inconsistent funding, as recommended by a prior sunset report that TEA found to be in agreeance with.</li> <li>• SB 668 repeals the June 1st deadline for making requests for instructional materials to allow ISDs and charter schools flexibility for their needs throughout the school year.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>SB 1784</b> By: Zaffirini  <b>Sponsor:</b> Leach</p>	<p>Relating to the deduction from applied income of compensation paid to guardians of certain Medicaid recipients.</p>	<p>Judiciary &amp; Civil Jurisprudence</p> <p>Vote: 7 Ayes 0 Nays 0 PNV 2 Absent</p>	<p>Under current law, the guardian of Medicaid recipients can receive up to \$175 per person per month for their services provided to the person they are assisting. However, the cost for providing these services has increased since the amount was codified and the number of nonprofits that provide these guardians and services has decreased significantly.</p> <p>SB 1784 amends the Estates code by increasing the amount refundable to a guardian from \$175 to \$250 per month. SB 1784 allows for recipients of medical assistance who have applied income to order costs to be deducted as a personal needs allowance when computing the person’s applied income. This allows for the increase of guardianship cases throughout the state and allows for guardians to be reimbursed appropriately.</p>	<p><b>Favorable</b> Evaluated by: Santiago Cirnigliaro (713) 435-9049 Santiago@TexasLSG.org</p>
<p><b>SB 827</b> By: Huffman  <b>Sponsor:</b> Smithee</p>	<p>Relating to the transfer of civil cases by the judicial panel on multidistrict litigation.</p>	<p>Judiciary &amp; Civil Jurisprudence</p> <p>Vote: 5 Ayes 3 Nays 0 PNV 1 Absent</p>	<p>The Office of the Attorney General (OAG) is responsible for protecting the public from deceptive trade practices by private companies. The Attorney General has the authority to pursue injunctions to stop a company’s actions in a timely manner and consequently prevent harm. Currently, a multi- district litigation (MDL) panel is looking to transfer the OAG’s suit into other plaintiff’s cases that are seeking monetary relief. This causes the state to be tied down in litigation that does not involve the state and prevents for the timely ruling of the injunction.</p> <p>SB 827 prohibits the transfer of these cases by a judicial panel into other litigation unless they are specifically authorized under the Business &amp; Commerce code and if the suit is relating to consumer relief. Under SB 827, the Supreme Court of Texas cannot amend the bill or rules regarding these provisions. SB 827 allows for injunction reliefs to be resolved in a timely manner and allows for companies to stop their predatory actions. There are concerns that this bill will unnecessarily increase the Attorney General’s power beyond what is necessary. In addition, MDLs already promote efficiency in mass cases; SB 827 would hurt the consumers and only benefits pharmaceutical companies. SB 827 would restrict MDL’s and this is sometimes the only way individuals are able to afford to file suits</p>	<p><b>Will of the House</b> Evaluated by: Santiago Cirnigliaro (713) 435-9049 Santiago@TexasLSG.org</p>
<p><b>SB 1494</b> By: Paxton  <b>Sponsor:</b> Wu   Miller   Klick   Hinojosa   Rose</p>	<p>Relating to the confidentiality of personal information of certain employees and contractors of the Department of Family and Protective Services.</p>	<p>Human Services</p> <p>Vote: 7 Ayes 0 Nays 0 PNV 2 Absent</p>	<p>Currently, information regarding peace officers, corrections officers, judges, etc. is confidential and not available to the public. Their home address, phone number, social security number, emergency contact information, and whether they have family members are inaccessible to the general public. SB 1494 adds the following individuals to this exemption:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current and former Child Protective Services caseworkers, Adult Protective Services caseworkers, and investigative caseworkers through Department of Family and Services (DFPS)</li> <li>• Current and former contracted employees providing caseworker services or investigative services for DFPS</li> </ul> <p>Caseworkers are on the frontlines of potentially dangerous situations and need protection to ensure their information is kept private from individuals seeking retaliation for case-related situations. For example, caseworkers often use their own personal vehicles when working in the field. SB 1494 would prevent an individual from looking up the caseworker’s home address or phone number through a public records license plate search.</p>	<p><b>Favorable</b> Evaluated by: Ali Schoon 515-313-3712 Ali@TexasLSG.org</p>

OK for Distribution –  Rep. Daniel Coleman

<p><b>SB 1707</b> By: Lucio</p> <p><b>Sponsor:</b> Allen</p>	<p>Relating to the duties of school district peace officers, school resource officers, and security personnel.</p>	<p>Public Education</p> <p>Vote: 13 Ayes 0 Nays 0 PNV 0 Absent</p>	<p>School districts are authorized to develop school safety policy which often includes providing security personnel in different ways. These school security personnel can include schools commissioning their own peace officers, entering an agreement with local law enforcement to provide resource officers, and hiring non-commissioned security personnel. Currently there is no definition for non-emergency duties for these school security personnel and this can lead to dangerous situations where they intervene with student code of conduct violations and not just when the law is broken. These interactions tend to escalate unnecessarily, and students of color and students with special needs are most likely to be affected.</p> <p>SB 1707 will require a district that commissions peace officers, uses resource officers, or hires other security personnel to adopt a policy that outlines the duties of these positions. Their duties will include protecting the safety and welfare of students, employees, and school property, and will not include routine student discipline or other student contact unrelated to their law enforcement duties.</p>	<p><b>Favorable</b> Evaluated by: Marissa Gorena (956) 867-7232 Marissa@TexasLSG.org</p>
<p><b>SB 1189</b> By: Buckingham   Creighton   Fallon   Lucio</p> <p><b>Sponsor:</b> Capriglione</p>	<p>Relating to certain deceptive advertising of legal services.</p>	<p>Judiciary &amp; Civil Jurisprudence</p> <p>Vote: 5 Ayes 3 Nays 0 PNV 1 Absent</p>	<p>There has been a significant increase of commercial advertisement from attorneys that focus on medical services, prescription drugs, and other health-related issues. These commercials inform the viewers that they may be entitled to different types of compensations if they file a claim with that attorney. There are concerns that these individuals call the number on the screen of the commercial, provide them with their personal information, but they are not in fact speaking with an attorney and instead with a representative from the company that is paying for the ad. This company then, in turn, “sells” the clients that called to a presumed attorney.</p> <p>SB 1189 amends the government code in order to protect consumers. SB 1189 prohibits a television ad that promotes legal services from including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presenting the advertisement as a medical alert, health alert, consumer alert, drug alert, public service announcement, or any similar phrase</li> <li>• Displaying the logo of a state or federal agency that suggests the advertisement comes from a state or federal agency</li> <li>• Using the term “recall” to refer to a product that has not been recalled by a state or federal agency</li> </ul> <p>SB 1189 however does require that an advertisement for legal services to verbally and visually:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State this is a paid advertisement for legal services</li> <li>• Identify the sponsor of the advertisement</li> <li>• Identify the law firm that will provide the legal services if someone chooses to engage the commercial</li> </ul> <p>If the commercial is for a drug that has been approved by the Food and Drug Administration, the commercial shall display language that indicates people should not stop taking the medication before consulting with their doctor.</p> <p>If a company violates the provisions set out by SB 1189, the office of the attorney general may enforce the business and commerce code, but a private cause of action cannot be created.</p> <p>There are concerns that the language of this bill will harm patient safety. The public has a right to be informed of any health risks that they could be facing for the medication they are taking, and they should have the right to make a decision if they would like to pursue legal actions against the company.</p>	<p><b>Unfavorable</b> Evaluated by: Santiago Cirnigliaro (713) 435-9049 Santiago@TexasLSG.org</p>

<p><b>SB 357</b> By: Nichols  <b>Sponsor:</b> Canales</p>	<p>Relating to outdoor advertising signs regulated by the Texas Department of Transportation.</p>	<p>Transportation  Vote: 10 Ayes 2 Nays 0 PNV 1 Absent</p>	<p>TxDOT is asking for explicit legislation regarding billboard height compliance, to clarify and align with the legislative intent regarding height restrictions from last session's sunset legislation.</p> <p>SB 357 would establish height regulation for commercial billboards statewide at 60 feet (currently interpreted and generally enforced height is 42.5 feet), with a provision to grandfather in those signs 85 feet or shorter and built prior to March 2017.</p>	<p><b>Favorable</b> Evaluated by: Sophia Creede (832) 865-4774 Sophia@TexasLSG.org</p>
<p><b>SB 1257</b> By: Huffman  <b>Sponsor:</b> Leach   Bonnen, Greg</p>	<p>Relating to the investigation and prosecution of criminal offenses involving the trafficking of persons.</p>	<p>Criminal Jurisprudence  Vote: 6 Ayes 3 Nays 0 PNV 1 Absent</p>	<p>SB 1257 will authorize the attorney general full concurrent jurisdiction in certain multi-jurisdictional cases and concurrent jurisdiction following the county or district attorney's first right of refusal in single jurisdictions. As most know, human trafficking is a prevalent problem in Texas, an issue that affects more than 300,000 people in our state. However, the language of SB 1257 makes the false narrative that local District Attorney's (DA) and their offices are having a problem prosecuting cases related to human trafficking and the solution to that is to grant the attorney general the ability to step-in without going through the local prosecutor. Texas prosecutors, with more than 5,000 staff members statewide, are successfully convicting human traffickers and securing long sentences. The attorney general has only four lawyers dedicated to human trafficking, and SB 1257 does not increase that number. In addition, DAs are currently allowed to request the help of the Office of the Attorney General (OAG) if additional resources are needed.</p> <p>If the OAG is interested in helping prosecute more cases under the offense of human trafficking they would do better in assisting law enforcement officers obtaining the additional resources that they need for investigations in order to help the prosecutors convict people under such an offense. Currently, prosecutors cannot prosecute human trafficking cases unless law enforcement agencies first make arrests for those crimes, which is why it is so typical that prosecutors will instead go after a charge of aggravated assault, for example, as that would be easier to prove and still puts the offender behind bars.</p>	<p><b>Unfavorable</b> Evaluated by: Merci Mohagheghi (713) 382-7007 Merci@TexasLSG.org</p>
<p><b>SB 1312</b> By: Lucio  <b>Sponsor:</b> Guerra</p>	<p>Relating to certain programs to prevent vector-borne and zoonotic diseases in border counties; requiring an occupational license; authorizing a fee.</p>	<p>Agriculture &amp; Livestock  Vote: 8 Ayes 0 Nays 0 PNV 1 Absent</p>	<p>Vector-borne diseases are often transmitted among their human, animal, or plant hosts by insects that are the transmitters of disease-causing organisms by carrying pathogens from one host to another. Vectors of human disease are typically species of mosquitoes and ticks that can transmit viruses, bacteria, or parasites to humans and other warm-blooded hosts.</p> <p>In 2018, the Texas Department of State Health Services (TDSHS) determined that border counties need assistance with emerging public health threats, especially threats that involve the ability to undertake vector control. Border counties are at a high risk of being in contact with vector-borne diseases such as the Zika Virus, which is a virus that is transmitted by a mosquito and has been known to cause microcephaly, or the congenital condition associated with incomplete brain development in babies, for mothers infected with a mosquito carrying Zika.</p> <p>SB 1312 directs the Texas Department of Agriculture (TDA) to develop a noncommercial applicator license for mosquito control on border counties. SB 1312 will allow the license to be a restricted based license and only to be used for state-limited-use-pesticides for mosquito control in border counties. Additionally, SB 1312 directs the TDSHS to work with TDA to conduct a study on potential needs from border counties relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• vector-borne and zoonotic diseases</li> <li>• capacity for vector mitigation and control</li> <li>• strategies to improve or develop continuing education on disease prevention</li> <li>• public outreach initiatives for vector-borne and zoonotic disease prevention</li> </ul>	<p><b>Favorable</b> Evaluated by: Marissa Gorena (956) 867-7232 Marissa@TexasLSG.org</p>

<p><b>SB 1370</b> By: Nichols <b>Sponsor:</b> Ashby</p>	<p>Relating to invoices and payments under certain state contracts for outside legal services.</p>	<p>Judiciary &amp; Civil Jurisprudence  Vote: 9 Ayes 0 Nays 0 PNV 0 Absent</p>	<p>Currently, when a state agency hires an outside attorney for counsel, they must pay that attorney's fees for goods and services 30 days after the invoice is received or after the goods and services have been provided. However, some state agencies have to get approval from the Office of the Attorney General (OAG) before they can issue a payment for that invoice. This creates an issue since some invoices can be 100 pages long and it may take both state agencies over 30 days to approve the invoice.</p> <p>SB 1370 amends the government code to extend this deadline from 30 days to 45. Under this new deadline, the state agency has 25 days to submit the invoice to the OAG and the OAG has 20 days to approve or reject the invoice as well as make the payment to the third-party counsel. By extending the deadline, both state agencies have more time to evaluate the contracts and make timely payments.</p>	<p><b>Favorable</b> Evaluated by: Santiago Cirnigliaro (713) 435-9049 Santiago@TexasLSG.org</p>
<p><b>SB 557</b> By: Kolkhorst <b>Sponsor:</b> Moody</p>	<p>Relating to use of the electronic funds transfer system operated by the comptroller.</p>	<p>State Affairs  Vote: 9 Ayes 2 Nays 0 PNV 2 Absent</p>	<p>SB 557 is a clean-up from the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts with three main changes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. adds the Texas Emergency Services Retirement System to current code to be able to receive electronic fund transfers, as they are currently excluded;</li> <li>2. there is conforming language to make sure that anything that would not be in sync with the new language is stricken throughout the bill; and</li> <li>3. it updates the text to allow the comptroller to also use the system to deposit the amount of an employee's payroll deduction as required.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Favorable</b> Evaluated by: Merci Mohagheghi (713) 382-7007 Merci@TexasLSG.org</p>
<p><b>SB 1852</b> By: Paxton <b>Sponsor:</b> Smithee</p>	<p>Relating to disclosures required in connection with the issuance of certain health benefit plans.</p>	<p>Insurance  Vote: 7 Ayes 0 Nays 0 PNV 2 Absent</p>	<p>SB 1852 removes the requirement that a signature is needed for the written disclosure statement upon the renewal of a Consumer Choice Health Plan. A consumer choice health plan is s health plan with more limited benefits to keep costs low for the consumer or small employer.</p> <p>It has become difficult obtaining these signatures from consumers, resulting in an administrative burden for the healthcare provider and consumers alike. In striking this language, SB 1852 would allow for more flexibility for renewal as well as lessen administrative burden. Disclosures about coverage versus non-coverage will still be provided in written format to the consumer and no provisions are made to these disclosure agreements.</p>	<p><b>Favorable</b> Evaluated by: Elizabeth Churaman (281)-686-4544 Elizabeth@texaslsg.org</p>
<p><b>SB 1497</b> By: Zaffirini <b>Sponsor:</b> Parker</p>	<p>Relating to the registration and regulation of brokers by the Public Utility Commission of Texas.</p>	<p>State Affairs  Vote: 11 Ayes 0 Nays 0 PNV 2 Absent</p>	<p>SB 1497 will help ensure that electric retail customers are protected while bringing greater accountability by applying the same registration and customer protection requirements that are applied to aggregators to brokerage services.</p> <p>Currently, the Public Utility Commission (PUC) has little recourse to follow-up with any complaints a customer may have filed against a broker who may have provided poor or misleading services such. SB 1497 will require that any person who provides a brokerage service (meaning providing advice or procurement to, or acting on behalf of, a retail electric customer regarding the selection of a retail electric provider, or a product or service offered by a retail electric provider) unless they are registered with the PUC. By registering, brokers will then be required to comply with customer protection provisions, disclosure requirements, and marketing guidelines establish by the commission and by any rules that the PUC adopts in order to implement the provisions of SB 1497. The PUC will be required to process a person's application no later than the 60th day after the date that the person files.</p>	<p><b>Favorable</b> Evaluated by: Merci Mohagheghi (713) 382-7007 Merci@TexasLSG.org</p>
<p><b>SB 1511</b> By: Nichols   Bettencourt   Birdwell   Kolkhorst <b>Sponsor:</b></p>	<p>Relating to the operation of the Battleship "Texas."</p>	<p>Culture, Recreation &amp; Tourism  Vote: 9 Ayes 0 Nays 0 PNV</p>	<p>The Battleship Texas is a unique and historic landmark with the distinction of being the last battleship to have participated in both World Wars. The ship is currently docked in the Houston Ship Channel under the responsibility of the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD); however, the TPWD is increasingly challenged to preserve, maintain and operate the site given the deterioration of the ship and water inundation.</p> <p>It has been determined by various stakeholders that the best course of action is to transfer the responsibility of the Battleship to a qualified nonprofit with a memorandum of understanding (MOU). SB 1511 would establish provisions of the MOU with a 99-year term, which must be consistent with the Standards for Historic Vessel Preservation</p>	<p><b>Favorable</b> Evaluated by: Eliot Davis (713) 855-3285 Eli@TexasLSG.org</p>

OK for Distribution -  Rep. Daniel Coleman

<p>Cyrier   Toth   Martinez   Holland   Bucy</p>		<p>0 Absent</p>	<p>Projects with Guidelines for Applying the Standards published by the Secretary of the Department of the Interior, as well as ensure the public's interest and public access to the site. The bill also requires that the nonprofit consult with the state historic preservation office on repair or preservation matters.</p> <p>The Battleship currently costs TWPD \$1,693,541 annually. The funds from that GR-Dedicated account would go to support the MOU and successful preservation within current TPWD appropriations.</p>	
<p><b>SB 781</b> By: Kolkhorst</p> <p><b>Sponsor:</b> Leman</p>	<p>Relating to the regulation of child-care facilities.</p>	<p>Human Services</p> <p>Vote: 7 Ayes 0 Nays 0 PNV 2 Absent</p>	<p>A general residential operation (GRO) is a child-care facility which offers 24/7 care for more than 7 children or young adults which may include treatment services. Residential treatment centers (RTCs) are a specific type of GRO which provides treatment services for children or young adults with emotional disorders. SB 821 changes various code which deals with the licensing, regulation, and requirements for GROs and by extension RTCs.</p> <p>SB 781 requires HHSC to develop strategies to reduce the number of runaway incidents of a child in DFPS conservatorship from an RTC. In addition, HHSC must ensure these strategies align with requirements regarding normalcy and prudent parenting standards within current state and federal statute. DFPS will coordinate with General Residential Operations (GROs) to improve quality of care for individuals in care in residential care settings.</p> <p>SB 781 requires DFPS to develop a strategic plan to implement requirements for residential treatment centers to receive federal funds through the Family First Prevention Services Act (FFPSA). With limited guidance federally, it is crucial that Texas review its programs/services and prepare for implementation in a short period of time. Requiring a review of placements which will be eligible for FFPSA funds will also be crucial as Texas continues to roll-out Community-Based Care throughout the state. SB 781 requires the strategic plan to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess the impact of accreditation on quality of care</li> <li>• Assess ways to incentivize providers to get accredited</li> <li>• Study outcomes in qualified residential treatment programs (QRTPs)</li> <li>• Assess cost feasibility to the state to provide QRTPs which meet FFPSA requirements</li> <li>• Recommendations to implement the requirements of QRTPs in Texas</li> </ul> <p>Texas does not currently have any facilities which meet QRTP standards for a higher quality of care and QRTPs are another avenue to draw down FFPSA federal funds. There are concerns that Texas should not be studying the impact of accreditation but rather should be studying how to get more facilities to meet QRTP standards in Texas. Texas kids who have such high needs deserve a higher standard of care. There are concerns that if barriers are not overcome to transition all RTCs to a higher standard of care as a QRTP, there will be a two-tiered system of care between some QRTPs and RTCs when the children served within those facilities have similar level of needs. In addition, there are concerns about lack of input from stakeholders as SB 781 does not require DFPS to develop this strategic plan with any input from external experts or stakeholders. This strategic plan will be submitted to the legislature by September 1, 2020.</p> <p>SB 781 waives hearing requirements for new or expanded GROs, cottage homes, etc. if they are providing services to children or young adults who are victims of human trafficking.</p> <p>SB 781 adds into code that DFPS may not issue a license to a facility whose application was denied or who closed their facility to avoid disciplinary action prior to the 5th anniversary of their closure.</p> <p>When contracting or renewing contracts with potential providers, DFPS shall consider their past compliance with requirements and their operational plan. SB 781 adds language into code which requires HHSC, when engaging in</p>	<p><b>Favorable, with Concerns</b></p> <p>Evaluated by: Ali Schoon 515-313-3712 Ali@TexasLSG.org</p>

OK for Distribution –  Rep. Daniel Coleman

			<p>disciplinary measures for a licensed entity, to consider previous repeated violations and the nature of specific violations including if those violations involved the abuse, neglect, or death of a child.</p> <p>SB 781 adds into code regulations specifically for GROs which have more than 7 children in their facility and provide treatment services for children with emotional disorders. As part of these GROs licensing requirements, they must submit a “proposed operation plan” to HHSC. SB 781 states that the operational plan must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a community engagement piece to improve relations between GROs and the community where it is located</li> <li>• an educational plan to provide appropriate educational services for the needs of the children in care (in coordination with the Texas Education Agency)             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ an impact statement from the school district as to the impact the facility may have on their school district</li> </ul> </li> <li>• trauma-informed plan to address runaway situations</li> <li>• the qualifications, background, and compliance history of each individual involved in management</li> </ul> <p>SB 781 states that in the facility’s licensure application, the applicant must state if they plan to provide services to child victims of human trafficking but don’t need to include that information in their operational plan. SB 821 specifies that any information relating to services for human trafficking victims is confidential and may not be released. HHSC must approve this plan before moving forward with a public hearing or granting licensure for operation. These additional requirements allow for increased community input, and while important, could be a factor in the denial of a license to a GRO and lessen placements for children with high needs within their community.</p> <p>When considering applications to operate a GRO, HHSC may consider any information gained throughout the application review process, the proposed operational plan, community support or opposition for the facility, the impact statement from the school district, etc. SB 781 clarifies that HHSC may deny an application if the community doesn’t have resources to support the children in care, if the school district would be significantly impacted, and if licensing the facility will have significant adverse impact on the community; limiting community engagement for children in care.</p> <p>In addition, SB 781 requires a public hearing to be held at the request of the county where a GRO is located to consider public comments prior to the renewal of that GROs license. This allows for considerably more input about the renewal of a license for a facility and could significantly impact the licensure process; potentially limiting the availability of GROs to serve children in care with high needs. General residential operations are already subject to public input when they are newly entering an area and SB 781 would require them to go through the public hearing process at a renewal. While it is important for the community to be involved and support GROs in their area, oftentimes that is not the case and facilities could potentially close with extra requirements.</p>	
<p><b>SB 1468</b> By: Campbell  <b>Sponsor:</b> Goodwin</p>	<p>Relating to annexation by certain municipalities of a special district under a strategic partnership agreement.</p>	<p>Land &amp; Resource Management</p> <p>Vote: 6 Ayes 0 Nays 0 PNV 3 Absent</p>	<p>At the conclusion of a Strategic Partnership Agreement (SPA) between a municipality and Municipal Utility District (MUD), the municipality fully annexes the MUD. However, in some cases, services provided by municipalities through the SPA impacts areas outside of the MUD and annexation would manipulate logical boundaries of these areas. SB 1468 requires municipalities annexing 400 or more water or wastewater connections that are located outside the MUD to also be annexed under these specific conditions. Prior to annexation, these areas outside of the MUD would have the ability to participate in annexation approval elections, petitions, and written agreements, as applicable. SB 1468 provides an exemption for counties with a population of more than 1.7 million. SB 1468 provides residents that depend on the district’s utility services to exercise their right to vote during the annexation process since they will be directly impacted by this process.</p>	<p><b>Favorable</b> Evaluated by: Donisha Cotlone (832) 496-4424 Donisha@TexasLSG.org</p>

OK for Distribution –  Rep. Daniel Coleman



<p><b>SB 1531</b> By: Hancock</p> <p><b>Sponsor:</b> White</p>	<p>Relating to the eligibility for certain occupational licenses and the use of a person's criminal history as grounds for certain actions related to the license.</p>	<p>Corrections</p> <p>Vote: 8 Ayes 0 Nays 0 PNV 1 Absent</p>	<p>Individuals with felony convictions are restricted when it comes to working in licensed occupations. SB 1531 prohibits the Texas Commission of Licensing and Regulation (TCLR) or the Texas Department of Licensing and Regulation (TDLR) from denying licensing for podiatry or not admitting a person to an examination solely based on a person's conviction of a felony/crime involving moral turpitude. SB 1531 also prohibits TCLR or TDLR from disciplining a licensed midwife, refusing to renew the license of a midwife, or refusing to issue a midwife license to an applicant based on conviction of a misdemeanor involving moral turpitude or a felony.</p> <p>SB 1531 allows revocation of a license belonging to a licensed breeder if, after the license is issued, the licensed breeder or a controlling person of the licensed breeder pleads guilty or nolo contendere to, is convicted of, or receives deferred adjudication for animal cruelty or neglect in Texas or any other jurisdiction. TDLR must issue a notice of the revocation so that the individual has an opportunity to prove within 20 days that this did not happen. SB 1531 specifies that a plea of nolo contendere is sufficient for TDLR to deny/refuse/renew an animal breeder license.</p> <p>Finally, SB 1531 removes current requirement for applicants of electrician licenses to demonstrate their honesty, trustworthiness, and integrity. SB 1531 also removes the requirement that applicants for auctioneer's license must have not been convicted of a felony in the five years preceding the date of the application. This is beneficial to everyone involved because it provides opportunity for previously incarcerated individuals to join the workforce.</p>	<p><b>Favorable</b> Evaluated by: Sophia Creede (832) 865-4774 Sophia@TexasLSG.org</p>
<p><b>SB 2200</b> By: Kolkhorst</p> <p><b>Sponsor:</b> Turner, John   Davis, Sarah   Sheffield   Cortez</p>	<p>Relating to the authority of the Health and Human Services Commission to obtain criminal history record information.</p>	<p>Public Health</p> <p>Vote: 10 Ayes 0 Nays 0 PNV 1 Absent</p>	<p>The Health and Human Services Commission (HHSC) uses background checks or criminal history record information (CHRIs) using an individual's fingerprints to inform hiring, licensing, contracting, and volunteer recruiting decisions, among others. Recent federal policy requires that any state agency who wishes to access CHRIs must have statutory authority to do so. Currently, HHSC is not explicitly given such authority in Texas statute and has been working with DPS to access this information. Because a 2015 legislative action through SB 200 created HHSC through the consolidation of health agencies that did have authorized access to CHRIs, it was assumed that the same authority would be passed on to HHSC, as well. However, this was not the case.</p> <p>SB 2200 addresses this issue by explicitly naming HHSC in the statutes that permit certain state agencies to access CHRIs. This clarifies state law and complies with federal regulations and policy.</p>	<p><b>Favorable</b> Evaluated by: Sharon Jacob 920-675-9865 Sharon@TexasLSG.org</p>
<p><b>SB 1700</b> By: Whitmire</p> <p><b>Sponsor:</b> Miller</p>	<p>Relating to the discharge of a prisoner from a county jail.</p>	<p>County Affairs</p> <p>Vote: 8 Ayes 0 Nays 0 PNV 1 Absent</p>	<p>SB 1700 seeks to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure by shortening the discharge timespan of someone convicted of a misdemeanor. The defendant's discharging time would change from 6 a.m. to 7 p.m. to 6am to 7pm. The discharging time is applied to any defendant despite their confinement period.</p> <p>SB 1700 allows the sheriff or any jail administrator to release a defendant any time during forgoing the discharge day. SB 1700 also allows a defendant to receive credit for 18 hours or less of served time.</p> <p>However, if there is a release after the proposed timespan, SB 1700 requires a defendant to agree/request a release after 5 p.m. and before 6 a.m.; or be subject to a warrant issued by another county; be in custody under a custody of governmental boy; and/or mental health facility patient</p> <p>SB 1700 will address safety and heightening criminal monitoring during inmate releases.</p>	<p><b>Favorable</b> Evaluated by: Brandi Granderson (202) 808-6140 Brandi.Granderson_HC @house.texas.gov</p>

<p><b>SB 2119</b> By: Alvarado</p> <p><b>Sponsor:</b> Goldman</p>	<p>Relating to the transfer of the regulation of motor fuel metering and motor fuel quality from the Department of Agriculture to the Texas Department of Licensing and Regulation; providing civil and administrative penalties; creating criminal offenses; requiring occupational licenses; authorizing fees.</p>	<p>International Relations &amp; Economic Development</p> <p>Vote: 8 Ayes 1 Nays 0 PNV 0 Absent</p>	<p>SB 2119 transfers oversight and regulation of the Liquid Weights and Measures Program and the Motor Fuel Quality Program from the Texas Department of Agriculture (TDA) to the Texas Department of Licensing and Regulation (TDLR). SB 2119 specifically states that TDLR shall be the department which administers and regulates all motor fuel metering devices sold in Texas. The authority to inspect and register motor fuel metering devices lies with TDLR. All aspects of these programs dealing with standards for measuring liquid motor fuel, testing of motor fuel, stop-sale order, penalties, etc. are transferred exactly from the Agriculture Code to the Occupations Code to be under the authority of TDLR. SB 2119 gives TDLR the authority to, by rule, establish fees in amounts which are reasonable yet necessary to cover costs of the department for running the program. In addition, TDLR is given authority to license and oversee third party service coordinators to conduct inspections and testing of motor fuel metering devices. The Texas Commission of Licensing and Regulation (TCLR) will adopt rules to determine fees for testing, inspection, and other services and may only use the funds from these fees to be used to administer/implement the program. SB 2119 clarifies that the state metrology laboratory used for quality metrics will remain with the TDA. TDLR will use the laboratory to test/inspect the equipment and standards used by the third party licensed service inspectors to ensure compliance. SB 2119 states that TDLR and the laboratory will enter into a memorandum of understanding to continue these services equal to what was being provided to TDA.</p> <p>The following are added provisions into SB 2119:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expands violations dealing with refusing to allow the test of a motor fuel metering device to include if the person obstructs the way of the inspector to perform their duties or if they obliterate the tag required by TDLR to be placed on the device             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Class C misdemeanor</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Requires TDLR to conduct a criminal background check on each individual who applies to be a licensed service technician or their controlling entity</li> <li>• Allows the licensure of a licensed service company to be valid for one or two years as established by the TCLR through commission rule</li> <li>• Allows TCLR to also establish by rule the requirements for renewing the license of a service company and the payment of renewal fees</li> <li>• Grants TCLR the authority to adopt rules pertaining minimum standards for motor fuel quality which must comply with nationally recognized minimum standards</li> <li>• Limits the civil penalty for violation of the sale of motor fuel to be no more than \$2,500 (previously \$10,000).</li> <li>• Allows registration of fuel metering devices to be valid for one or 2 years as established by commission rule.</li> </ul> <p>SB 2119 cleans up code to reflect the transfer of the Liquid Weights and Measures Program and Motor Fuel Quality Program to TDLR.</p> <p>As all motor fuel testing and pump maintenance is done by a third party licensed service company already, the Motor Fuel Quality program and Liquid Weights and Measures program better match with TDLR's other programs. SB 2119 transfers these programs to TDLR allowing for an effective licensure process, appropriate regulation, and oversight to these programs.</p>	<p><b>Favorable</b> Evaluated by: Ali Schoon 515-313-3712 Ali@TexasLSG.org</p>
<p><b>SB 1801</b> By: Huffman</p> <p><b>Sponsor:</b> Hunter</p>	<p>Relating to orders of nondisclosure for certain victims of trafficking of persons or compelling prostitution.</p>	<p>Criminal Jurisprudence</p> <p>Vote: 8 Ayes 0 Nays</p>	<p>SB 1801 will allow for those who have been victims of an offense of trafficking of person, continuous trafficking of persons, or compelling prostitution to become eligible to file a petition for orders of nondisclosure of criminal history record information. Many of these victims are often coerced or tricked into staying in the business in a variety of roles, and SB 1801 recognizes that by widening the applicability for those eligible to file a petition for orders of nondisclosure.</p>	<p><b>Favorable</b> Evaluated by: Merci Mohagheghi (713) 382-7007 Merci@TexasLSG.org</p>

OK for Distribution -  Rep. Daniel Coleman

<p>Thompson, Senfronia</p>		<p>0 PNV 1 Absent</p>	<p>SB 1801 will remove the requirements that in order for a person to petition that they not have been convicted of or placed on deferred adjudication community supervision for any offense other than a fine-only offense during the period after the court pronounced the sentenced or placed the person on community supervision. SB 1801 will require that the petition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• be made in writing;</li> <li>• allege specific facts that, if proved, would establish that the petitioner committed the offense solely as a victim of said offenses;</li> <li>• if the person has previously submitted a petition on the same grounds and that the person has not committed the offense on or after the date on which the person first filed a petition.</li> </ul> <p>SB 1801 will revise the time frame in which a person may file a petition from what is currently only after the person's conviction is set aside to only on or after the first anniversary of the date the person either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• completed the sentence, including any term of confinement imposed and payment of all fines, costs and restitution imposed; or</li> <li>• received a dismissal and discharge, if the person was placed on deferred adjudication community supervision.</li> </ul> <p>SB 1801 will allow for a person who was convicted or placed on deferred community supervision for more than one applicable offense solely as a victim of the offense of trafficking of persons, continuous trafficking of person, or compelling prostitution to file a petition for an order of nondisclosure to request consolidation of the person's petitions where the person was most recently convicted or placed on deferred adjudication.</p> <p>To ensure that these provisions are made known, SB 1801 will require commercially sexually exploited persons court program to provide each program participant with information related to the right to petition for an order of nondisclosure of criminal history record information applicable to the offenses laid out.</p>	
<p><b>SB 536</b> By: Zaffirini <b>Sponsor:</b> Murr</p>	<p>Relating to associate judges for guardianship proceedings and protective services proceedings in certain courts.</p>	<p>Judiciary &amp; Civil Jurisprudence  Vote: 6 Ayes 0 Nays 0 PNV 3 Absent</p>	<p>Statutory probate courts specialize in adjudicating the estates code. Additionally, the court has assigned court investigators and court visitors. These courts oversee guardianship cases in 10 of the state's biggest counties. In the other 244 counties, guardianship cases are heard by probate courts or county courts. These courts are also responsible for other criminal cases and the judges may not be experts in the estates code. There are concerns that the smaller counties in the state should have specialty courts such as statutory probate courts to handle the guardianship cases.</p> <p>SB 536 establishes regional specialized guardianship courts that have assigned associate judges and court staff. This assists smaller counties in providing assistance with guardianship cases with staff that have knowledge of these cases. SB 536 allows for the presiding judges in these counties to assess whether the county would benefit from having these specialty courts and assess whether funds are available to cover the costs of these courts. Under SB 536, the Office of Court Administration can contract with available county, state, and federal agencies to gather the necessary funds for these courts to be established.</p>	<p><b>Favorable</b> Evaluated by: Santiago Cirnigliaro (713) 435-9049 Santiago@TexasLSG.org</p>
<p><b>SB 1823</b> By: Campbell <b>Sponsor:</b> Murphy</p>	<p>Relating to the regulation of state banks, state trust companies, and third-party service providers of state banks and state trust companies.</p>	<p>Pensions, Investments &amp; Financial Services  Vote: 11 Ayes 0 Nays</p>	<p>SB 1823 adds provisions defining a "third-party service provider" as a person who engages in assembling or evaluation of a consumer's credit, and would strike language regarding the minimum administrative fine on entities in violation of current laws. Additional language would apply as the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If legal action is being taken against a third-party servicer, a person whom a subpoena is no directed to is prohibited from warning or notifying the person whom the subpoena is directed to.</li> <li>• Disclosing records requested by the subpoena</li> <li>• Discussing whether the records requested have been furnished to the investigating body.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Favorable</b> Evaluated by: Elizabeth Churaman (281)-686-4544 Elizabeth@texaslsg.org</p>

OK for Distribution -  Rep. Daniel Coleman

		<p>0 PNV 0 Absent</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Describing any examination of the person or body under investigation including testimony or transcripts of the examination.</li> </ul> <p>SB 1832 adds provisions into code in order to maintain integrity during investigations of third-party financial servicing bodies. The prohibition of subpoena disclosure would allow investigations to be more effective by not having the body under investigation retroactively tampering with data or evidence of wrongdoing.</p>	
<p><b>SB 821</b> By: Nelson</p> <p><b>Sponsor:</b> Price</p>	<p>Relating to children's advocacy centers.</p>	<p>Human Services</p> <p>Vote: 7 Ayes 0 Nays 0 PNV 2 Absent</p>	<p>Children Advocacy Centers (CACs) are local centers that collaborate with many entities involved in a child abuse case, so that information is shared, and the child and family's unique needs are met. CACs help coordinate child protective services caseworkers, medical professionals, advocates, law enforcement, etc. through a multidisciplinary team to determine what the child needs throughout the progression of the case. This allows the child and their family to receive services through one coordinating entity which reduces the likelihood of re-victimization. These local centers provide child-friendly locations for interviews which consider the child's trauma history. These centers get involved with child abuse cases (mostly child sexual abuse cases) for which they get a referral from either the Department of Family and Protective Services (DFPS) or local law enforcement. CACs were codified during the 74th legislative session when there were only 13 local centers. Currently, there are 71 local centers throughout Texas and code needs to be updated to reflect best practices which CACs are already practicing.</p> <p>SB 821 adds language throughout code which states that CACs may also be involved in child neglect cases. Currently, these centers are already providing services for some child neglect cases when there are criminal charges against an individual who is not the caregiver and the caregiver is engaged in neglectful supervision of the child. While child neglect cases are a small percentage of their services, SB 821 codifies clarifications that they may also handle these cases. SB 821 does not expand the scope of practice for CACs; a referral from DFPS or law enforcement is still required in order to participate in cases.</p> <p>Currently, CACs enter into an "interagency memorandum of understanding" which defines which agencies participate in the multidisciplinary team and provides guidelines for the team to follow in response to any cases brought to the center. SB 821 amends language which adds that each entity (law enforcement, CAC staff, DFPS staff, etc.) must strive to minimize the revictimization of the child victim and their non-offending family members through the process and work as a team toward positive outcomes. SB 821 also clearly places into statute that the interagency memorandum of understanding must be redone every 3 years and with any significant change to the participating entities. These memorandums of understanding are what dictates locally which cases CACs are responsible for engaging in.</p> <p>SB 821 places into statute protocol for local centers to follow when building multidisciplinary teams. It clarifies that each individual CAC must create a multidisciplinary team working protocol which includes the CACs mission statement, the role of each participating agency in the team, and criteria for referrals of cases which warrant a team response. In addition, the protocol must include procedures for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The intake process</li> <li>Accessing after-hour services</li> <li>Information sharing of important information within the team</li> <li>Conducting forensic interviews, medical evaluations, mental health evaluations, etc.</li> <li>Advocating for victims and their families</li> <li>Facilitate case tracking and review</li> <li>Ways to address conflicts within the team</li> </ul>	<p><b>Favorable</b> Evaluated by: Ali Schoon 515-313-3712 Ali@TexasLSG.org</p>

OK for Distribution -  Rep. Daniel Coleman

SB 821 updates language in code regarding the duties of CACs to reflect their current practices when coordinating and providing services to child abuse or neglect victims. These sections were previously in the contracting portion of code. In addition, SB 821 places into statute that a center must:

- Review DFPS reports relating to the abuse and neglect of a child to ensure comprehensive services through the multidisciplinary team
- Assess and provide needed services for children and their families
- Comply with standards set forth by the statewide Child Advocacy Centers of Texas Inc.
- Have a process which requires the multidisciplinary team to regularly share information on the investigations and services needed
- Have a system to track the progress and outcome of cases
- Provide culturally competent services
- Provide a child-focused setting for services which is safe and comfortable
- Provide victim support and advocacy for children and their families
- Provide access to medical and mental health evaluations and services which are evidence-based and trauma-focused for children and their families

In addition, SB 821 does the following:

- Adds that DFPS must have a member (executive officer or employee with proper authority to make decisions) on the CACs governing board
- Clarifies that a multidisciplinary team may include certain agencies which participate in child abuse or neglect investigations and/or provides services for child abuse or neglect victims and agree to enter into a memorandum of understanding
- Adds language regarding continued CAC review of DFPS Statewide Intake Reports of abuse and neglect

SB 821 adds language allowing CACs to be involved in providing services to persons with a disability who have experienced abuse or neglect. Local CACs have been partnering with Adult Protective Services and have determined that it is more appropriate for an adult with a disability and cognitive functioning equivalent to that of a child be interviewed and receive services through a CAC. SB 821 also clarifies in statute that although CACs are coordinating services with law enforcement and DFPS for cases, those entities are not relieved of their duties and are still responsible for the investigation of abuse and neglect.

Given the highly sensitive nature of information shared through CACs, SB 821 clarifies that any confidential information shared with the CAC remains the property of the agency providing that information and that any request for confidential information must be made to that agency and not the CAC. Throughout code, rather than using language which says “video”, SB 821 clarifies that it is an electronic recording.

SB 821 places into statute best practices for Children Advocacy Centers throughout Texas to ensure that children are receiving comprehensive and collaborative services which fit the needs of the child and take into account their trauma history.

<p><b>SB 1746</b> By: Miles</p> <p><b>Sponsor:</b> White   Reynolds   Rose</p>	<p>Relating to the inclusion of certain students as students at risk of dropping out of school.</p>	<p>Public Education</p> <p>Vote: 11 Ayes 0 Nays 0 PNV 2 Absent</p>	<p>According to a research study conducted by the University of Texas at San Antonio (UTSA), 1 out of 28 children has a parent who is currently in prison. Currently, there is no section that outlines students that have been incarcerated or has a parent or guardian who has been incarcerated within the lifetime of the student as an at-risk student. Students who have parents who have been incarcerated or are in the prison system are at a high risk of having academic difficulties and they are at risk of dropping out of school.</p> <p>SB 1746 adds students that have been incarcerated, or have a parent or guardian who has been incarcerated, to the list of students that are at risk of dropping out of school. This is a benefit for students who qualify under this at risk category to receive certain services like supportive guidance through programs such as Communities in Schools.</p>	<p><b>Favorable</b> Evaluated by: Marissa Gorena (956) 867-7232 Marissa@TexasLSG.org</p>
<p><b>SB 2223</b> By: Creighton</p> <p><b>Sponsor:</b> Canales   Cain</p>	<p>Relating to the efficient provision of pilot services by the board of pilot commissioners for Harris County ports.</p>	<p>Transportation</p> <p>Vote: 12 Ayes 0 Nays 0 PNV 1 Absent</p>	<p>The Houston Ship Channel accommodates two-way vessel traffic within Galveston Bay without significant interruption (when the weather is moderate). Increasingly, larger vessels seek access to these ports. For many years the Houston Pilots have made traffic decisions which limit ship traffic in order to safely accommodate bigger ships. Most recently, a Pilot measure put in place last fall requires one-way traffic for a new generation of vessels that call the Port Authority's public container terminals. The Board of Pilot Commissioners for Harris County Ports oversees licensing and regulation for vessels, pilots, and pilot services for Harris County Ports. To secure efficient pilot services for these ports, the board's duties include adoption of rules and issuance of orders to pilots and vessels.</p> <p>Starting in 2021, SB 2223 limits the size of vessels that can operate within the jurisdiction of the Board of Pilot Commissioners for Harris County Ports to 1,100 feet until the board determines, after the recommendation of 80% of the Pilots, that it is safe for larger vessels to operate under two-way traffic conditions. From 2019 until 2021, SB 2223 limits the number of large ships going to the public terminals in the port to one per week, which is about 52 ships of 9000 ships that transit through yearly, and does not allow passage to vessels that cannot turn around within the applicable turning basin. Starting in 2021, if the board receives a recommendation that these large vessels may be operated in a safe and efficient manner while maintaining two-way traffic from at least 80% of the pilots operating under its jurisdiction, SB 2223 authorizes the Board of Pilot Commissioners for Harris County Ports to adopt rules authorizing larger vessels. The Board can only do this after holding at least two public hearings.</p> <p>The industry is already at work to fix this. The Port Authority works collaboratively with stakeholders to address coordination of vessels and maximize two-way traffic on the Houston Ship Channel. It has been working with the Army Corps of Engineers for almost ten years on future improvements to the waterway, because the ultimate solution to these issues is expediting and funding the federal improvement project—dredging the channels to make them deeper and wider for the larger vessels. The Port Authority and the Pilot Board have a proven 96-year collaborative history to accommodate ship traffic and vessel size growth with respect to all Houston Ship Channel interests. The legislative proposals regarding two-way traffic could harm the collaboration and stifle future growth.</p>	<p><b>Favorable, with Amendments</b> Evaluated by: Sophia Creede (832) 865-4774 Sophia@TexasLSG.org</p>
<p><b>SB 1915</b> By: Alvarado</p> <p><b>Sponsor:</b> Canales   Cain</p>	<p>Relating to the board of pilot commissioners for Harris County ports.</p>	<p>Transportation</p> <p>Vote: 12 Ayes 0 Nays 0 PNV 1 Absent</p>	<p>The Port of Houston is responsible for many jobs, revenue, and economic impact throughout the state of Texas. At the Houston Ship Channel, the state certified pilots have been the final arbiter for ship channel decision-making involving safety and traffic. The Port of Houston Authority's public terminals, along with private terminals, are market participants with financial interests in the traffic decisions the Pilots make daily. For many years the Houston Pilots have made traffic decisions which limit ship traffic in order to safely accommodate bigger ships. Most recently, a Pilot measure that was put in place last fall requires one-way traffic for a new generation of vessels that can transit the enlarged Panama Canal, and that call the Port Authority's public container terminals. Oil and gas companies don't want these bigger ships because they could slow down the flow of traffic. This will hurt the future of commerce going through the port because it will end in bigger ships and the business they bring being turned away. Currently, the Board of Pilot Commissioners for the Ports of Harris County composed of the Port Commissioners of the Port of</p>	<p><b>Favorable, with Amendments</b> Evaluated by: Sophia Creede (832) 865-4774 Sophia@TexasLSG.org</p>

OK for Distribution -  Rep. Daniel Coleman

Houston Authority, i.e. commissioners that serve on the Port Commission authority also serve on the Pilot Board. SB 1915 replaces members of the port commission on the Harris County Board of Pilot Commissioners with separately-appointed pilot commissioners. Pilots set rules regarding safety because they are professional mariners and their priority is keeping everyone safe while the Board of Pilot Commissioners for Harris County Ports has focused on investigations of accidents, licensing of Pilots, and setting rates; they have not guided the Pilots safety decisions.

SB 1915 separates the Board of Pilot Commissioners for Harris County Ports from the Port Commissioners of Houston Port Authority of Harris County as an effort to mitigate recent issues regarding the controversial one-way traffic policy (the bigger vessels can only fit if two-way traffic pauses so certain large vessels in effect occupy both lanes). The Pilot Board will mimic the Port Authority’s manner of selecting a board: two members chosen by majority of Houston’s Mayor and City Council, two chosen by majority of Harris County Commissioner's Court, one member chosen by Pasadena’s Mayor and City Council, and one member chosen by majority of the Harris County Mayors' and Councils' Association, and the chair will be chosen by a joint committee of the City of Houston Mayor and City Council and Harris County Commissioners' Court. The bill also permits the governor to appoint two members.

SB 1915 also sets qualifications for board members and addresses how to handle vacancies in the board. Individuals are not eligible to serve on the board if they have previously served at least twelve years on the board or if they are currently serving or have ever served as port commissioners for the Port of Houston Authority of Harris County Texas. SB 1915 requires the appointing entity to appoint a new pilot commissioner within 45 days following an expired term or vacancy in the board. The chair of the board must be appointed every January of odd-numbered years and their term expires February of each odd year. If appointing entities don’t appoint in time, the appointing is left to the governor. Pilot commissioners serve staggered two-year terms that expire as of February 1st. SB 1915 clarifies that the board has exclusive jurisdiction over the regulation of pilots who provide pilot services in Harris County ports.

The language of SB 1915 could allow a group of Pilots to block the regulatory action by the Pilot Board, as well—this is problematic because Pilots are left without any regulatory agency (the federal government does not oversee pilots acting under their state licenses). SB 1915 ignores the administrative and investigative support structures the Pilot Board uses to license and review incidents.