



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:

Amendment Floor Report for SB 604 – Friday, May 17, 2019

Author: Buckingham | Birdwell Sponsor: Paddie
 (Texas Department of Motor Vehicles Sunset Bill)

<p>Canales 861648</p>	<p>This amendment is similar to HB 2834 which did not make it out of calendars. Information confidentiality is important during investigations and joint investigations. TxDMV gets complaints about dealerships they license or credential as household goods movers, for example. When the complaint is sufficient, TxDMV will open an investigation to look into what is going on. TxDMV would like to protect individuals who complain as well as entities they license. One example would look like: someone purchased a used car from a dealership and was unhappy with how they were treated on the premises. The dealership could become defensive and want to know who complained but releasing that information could hinder an investigation more than help it. TxDMV doesn't currently have the authority to withhold the information even though it can be in the best interest of the parties submitting or receiving the complaint. Amendment 648 simply allows information related to ongoing investigations to be kept confidential until the investigation is dismissed or finally resolved.</p>	<p><u>Favorable</u></p>
<p>Fierro 861669</p>	<p>SB 604 requires county assessor-collectors to provide an electronic system for motor vehicle dealers to submit title and registration applications online in the name of the purchaser but some of the bigger counties in Texas use private offices to contract this work out so implementing this legislation would leave Texans unemployed and counties left with the bill to implement this process. Impacted counties already comply with specific contracts that require state/county funds accountability, security of state/county assets, quality of work performance, and employee training to prevent and lessen any fraud, waste, or abuse. This is a standard practice in counties with private contracted offices such as El Paso and Bexar Counties. So, re-bidding of existing contracts is un-warranted since Counties already comply with current Local Government Code and require County Commissioner's Court approval.</p> <p>Amendment 699 amends the Sunset Bill for the Texas Department of Motor Vehicles (TxDMV), SB 604, to exempt Hidalgo and El Paso Counties from the new requirements for county assessor-collectors to design an electronic system for motor vehicle dealers to submit title and registration applications online in the name of the motor vehicle purchaser and the requirement for county assessor collectors to comply with state contracting standards and re-bid existing county contracts.</p>	<p><u>Favorable</u></p>
<p>Minjarez 861650</p>	<p>This amendment allows certain counties to administer an additional \$10 vehicle registration fee if approved by the voters with the goal to incorporate all stand-alone legislation filed this session regarding optional vehicle registration fees (Optional VRFs). Bexar, Cameron, El Paso, Hidalgo, and Webb counties have had authority to impose Optional VRFs since 2007. This means that certain counties can add an additional \$10 vehicle registration fee that will go to regional mobility authorities to fund long-term transportation projects.</p> <p>Amendment 650 allows Brazos County (HB 642 by Representative Raney which was passed out of the house on May 2nd, 2019), Williamson County (HB 3353 by Representative Bucy), and Dimmit, Frio, Kinney, Maverick, Uvalde, Val Verde, and Zavala Counties (HB 333 by Chair Nevarez, passed out of the house on April 23rd, 2019) to impose Optional VRFs not to exceed \$10 through an order adopted by the county commissioners court.</p>	<p><u>Favorable</u></p>

OK for Distribution – Rep. Garnet Coleman

	<p>Amendment 650 would also allow Bexar County (HB 130 by Representative Minjarez/SB 2434 by Senator Menendez) and El Paso County (HB 2769 by Representative Ortega/SB 2184 by Senator Rodriguez) to increase their fees to a maximum of \$20 if approves by the county in an election—these counties already have the authorization to implement \$10 Optional VRFs.</p> <p>Amendment 650 allows Nueces County (SB 2273 by Senator Hinojosa and the House floor amendment to HB 333 by Chair Canales) to implement the \$10 Optional VRFs through an order adopted by the county commissioners court AND increase the amount to a maximum of \$20 with the approval of the county voters in an election.</p> <p>The portion of fee revenue from the additional vehicle registration fees will go to long-term transportation projects in the counties the fees are collected in or other counties participating in the regional mobility authority. If there is no regional mobility authority, the collected revenue goes to the county.</p>	
<p>Paddie 861652</p>	<p>This amendment is introduced in a bill, as well, HB 1711 by Representative Paddie. Amendment 852 provides the option for issuance of digital license plates. The purpose is to add functionality regarding motor vehicle license plates. Digital license plates have GPS capabilities, Radio Frequency ID technology that can link with toll booths and parking meters, automatic registration renewal, ability to purchase multiple specialty license plates (revenue stream) and ability to post public safety notices. Furthermore, digital license plates use E-ink technology which is reflective and visible during day and night. There is one vendor providing this technology.</p> <p>Law enforcement agencies rely on plate readers and their technology systems are not built for digital license plates. However, the Radio Frequency ID technology works better in some ways—officers can acquire registration and license plate information without reading the plate. This doesn't force digital license plates on Texans, it allows citizens to acquire them. They are relatively expensive due to the E-ink technology (\$400+).</p>	<p><u>Favorable</u></p>
<p>Paddie 861654</p>	<p>Currently, SB 604 requires TxDMV to establish education and training requirements for applicants to become independent motor vehicle dealers. This is important because currently there are instances where people become independent motor vehicle dealers without proper education on what they are getting into. Then, individuals attain their licenses and end up with violations. SB 604 requires applicants to complete the education and training before acquiring their first license and every two years when they renew their licenses, as well.</p> <p>Amendment 654 deletes that section and substitutes requirements for independent motor vehicle dealers to complete web-based education and training developed by TxDMV including information on laws and board rules applicable to independent motor vehicle dealers and the consequences of violating those rules. The biggest change is that Amendment 654 does not require applicants to complete additional training for subsequent renewal of the applicant's license, so they will only have to complete the education and training once.</p>	<p><u>Favorable</u></p>
<p>Amendment Floor Report for SB 18 – Friday, May 17, 2019 Author: Huffman Nelson Sponsor: Geren (Relating to the protection of expressive activities at public institutions of higher education.)</p>		
<p>Cain 861775</p>	<p>This amendments was previously filed as HB 2100 by Rep. Cain.</p> <p>This amendment prevents restrictions on speech by public colleges and universities as it is seen as a form of censorship. This amendment does not protect behavior that crosses the line into targeted harassment and threats or that creates a continued hostile environment that materially and substantially disrupts the functioning of the institution.</p>	<p><u>Unfavorable</u></p>

OK for Distribution  Rep. G. Coleman

	<p>This amendment would require that each institution of higher education adopt a policy detailing students’ and employees’ rights and responsibilities regarding expressive activities at the institution. Within this policy, it must also establish disciplinary sanctions for those who unduly interfere with such expressive activities of others on campus. A point of concern within the amendment is its requirement for an institution to maintain an official position of neutrality on “matters of public concern,” when approving an invited person to speak on campus, which is defined as matters related to health and safety; environmental, economic or community well-being; a local, state, or federal government; a public official or figure; a good or service; or a public policy or controversy. An institution of higher education should be allowed to take a stance on public policy issues, which can be on a number of topics, as a way to create an environment that fosters tolerance and safety on campus. For an institution to do so does not take away its capabilities of protecting expressive activities of their employees or students, and it should not be mandated that colleges and universities take up a neutral stance on all matters of public concern.</p> <p>If an institution of higher education violates provisions laid out in this amendment, the attorney general or the person whose expressive rights have been violated may bring an action of injunctive relief to compel the institution to comply or to recover compensatory damages, or \$1,000 (whichever is greater), as well as pay the court costs and attorney’s fees. Each day that the higher institution is to be found in violation of a rule or policy set out by this amendment’s provisions will constitute as a separate charge. As a temporary provision, prior to December 1, 2020, each institution of higher education shall prepare, post on their website, and submit to the governor and the members of the legislature a report regarding the institution’s implementation of this amendment’s requirements.</p>	
--	---	--

OK for Distribution  Rep. Garnett Coleman