



# Legislative Study Group

## Texas House of Representatives

Chair Rep. Garnet Coleman    Vice Chair Rep. Lon Burnam    Vice Chair Rep. Donna Howard  
Treasurer Rep. Elliott Naishtat    Secretary Rep. Rafael Anchia    Legal Counsel Rep. Ana Hernandez Luna

Members,

Below is the LSG Analysis on HB 600, the SBOE redistricting bill. The LSG is unfavorable on HB 600. A copy of the analysis should be on Members' desks. Due to the charts and maps in the report, images may not display properly in your e-mail. If you have trouble viewing, [you can download a PDF copy of the report](#).

In addition, we inadvertently left off our analysis for HB 1050 in the floor report this morning. We are will of the House on HB 1050. You can find the full analysis for HB 1050 below.

### [Download the Floor Report for Thursday, April 14 here](#)

LSG Floor Report for Major State Calendar, April 14, 2011

**Bill and Amendment Analysis for Committee Substitute for House Bill 600**

**Author: Rep. Burt Solomons    Committee: Redistricting**

**Recommendation: Unfavorable**

C.S.H.B. 600 Evaluated By: Joe Madden

[Joe@TexasLSG.org](mailto:Joe@TexasLSG.org); 512-827-8756

## CSHB 600: SBOE Redistricting Map

### Introduction

The Legislature in Texas is tasked with redrawing and reapportioning four types of districts: Texas Congressional seats, the State House, the Senate, and the State Board of Education (SBOE). CSHB 600 by Chairman Solomons is the redistricting bill for the SBOE.

The SBOE is comprised of 15 members elected from single member districts across the state. Calculating the 2010 Census figures shows that the ideal SBOE district should contain 1,676,371 individuals. Court decisions have allowed deviation from the ideal number in the amount of +/- 5 percent.

### **CSHB 600 Minority Opportunity Districts**

District	%A	%B	%H	%BH	%O
<b>1 Garza Total:</b>	20.2	2.8	76.1	78.3	1.5
<b>R VAP:</b>	23.6	2.6	72.6	74.8	1.6
<b>Previous #s Total:</b>	19.3	2.9	76.9	79.2	1.5

The SBOE adopts policies and sets standards for educational programs for all Texas public schools. This includes designating and mandating curriculum standards and determining passing scores for state-mandated standardized testing. The SBOE also has an important fiduciary responsibility: managing the investment of the Permanent School Fund.

Over the last ten years, the Texas population has grown by 20.6 percent. The boom in population in Texas was mostly due to the increase in minority populations. Over 50 percent of Texas public school students are Latino, and another 14 percent are African American, but currently, only three districts - or 20 percent - can be considered Hispanic opportunity districts. Given the vast diversity of the state and the responsibilities of the SBOE, it is important to ensure that all Texans are able to receive proper representation on the board.

**The Legislature should be taking steps to draw districts that reflect the changing face of Texas instead of redrawing districts in an attempt to maintain the status quo. Because CSHB 600 fails to recognize and protect the enormous growth of minorities over the last ten years, the LSG rates the legislation as unfavorable. There are three proposed amendments that will increase minority representation in Texas on the SBOE - the LSG rates all three of the amendments as favorable.**

Population of Texas

Representation of SBOE Under CSHB 600

[\(Maps can be viewed on the PDF copy of the report, which you can access by clicking here\).](#)

CSHB 600

HB 600 continues the status quo of the current SBOE map. By further ensuring that communities of interest are splintered, the collective voice and representation of these communities remains diluted.

The public policy decisions of the SBOE over the last half decade have demonstrated how far the SBOE is from mainstream Texans.

The lack of representation does not extend simply to communities of color; it's evident across the state in communities of interest. Both the current SBOE map and CSHB 600 split Travis County, diluting the voting strength of a long standing progressive community.

*(Travis County Districts 5 & 10)*

	VAP:	22.5	2.7	73.6	75.9	1.6
<b>2 Berlanga</b>	Total:	22.8	3.0	73.2	75.7	1.6
	D VAP:	27.0	2.9	68.8	71.3	1.7
<b>Previous #s</b>	Total:	22.3	2.8	73.6	76.0	1.7
	VAP:	26.3	2.7	69.4	71.8	1.9
<b>3 Soto</b>	Total:	19.7	7.3	71.9	78.4	2.0
	D VAP:	23.0	7.2	68.2	74.9	2.2
<b>Previous #s</b>	Total:	20.5	6.4	72.2	77.7	1.8
	VAP:	24.0	6.3	68.2	74.0	2.0
<b>4 Allen</b>	Total:	13.2	29.7	53.7	82.4	4.4
	D VAP:	16.2	30.4	49.1	78.9	5.0
<b>Previous #s</b>	Total:	10.8	32.9	53.1	85.1	4.1
	VAP:	13.5	33.9	48.7	81.9	4.7
<b>13 Knight</b>	Total:	21.2	30.1	46.0	75.3	3.4
	D VAP:	25.8	30.2	40.8	70.5	3.7
<b>Previous #s</b>	Total:	18.1	31.8	48.0	79.1	2.8
	VAP:	22.7	32.1	42.6	74.2	3.1

<b>CSHB 600 Non-Minority Opportunity Districts</b>						
<b>5 Mercer</b>	Total:	55.4	5.9	35.0	40.3	4.3
	R VAP:	59.5	5.5	31.2	36.3	4.2
<b>Previous #s</b>	Total:	54.0	9.1	33.2	41.4	4.6
	VAP:	58.2	8.1	29.6	37.2	4.6
<b>6 Leo</b>	Total:	44.3	12.6	33.1	45.0	10.8
	R VAP:	48.0	11.8	29.8	41.0	11.1
<b>Previous #s</b>	Total:	43.5	12.9	33.8	45.9	10.5
	VAP:	47.3	12.0	30.4	41.9	10.8
<b>7 Bradley</b>	Total:	50.8	19.0	21.4	39.9	9.3
	R VAP:	54.1	18.2	18.9	36.8	9.1

In addition to continuing previous dilutions of communities, CSHB 600 also ignores the demographic realities of the state.

Since 89% of the population growth in Texas over the last ten years was from non-Anglos, it would stand to reason that their growth would be reflected in a new redistricting map for the State Board of Education. However, CSHB 600 does not add a single additional minority opportunity district, and instead reduces by 3.2 percent the African American population in District 4 in the Houston area, represented by an African American member of the SBOE.

The Hispanic population in Texas grew at a rate of 41.8 percent while the African American population grew at a rate of 22.1 percent. The Anglo population, however, grew at 4.2 percent, lower than the national growth rate of 9.7 percent and the lowest of all races in Texas.

The Census numbers show a clear picture of Texas that does not match the current dynamics on the SBOE. Both ethnic and language minorities and various communities of interest across the state do not have the representation they deserve on the SBOE.

Because CSHB 600 fails to repair earlier dilutions in certain communities, and because it fails to recognize and protect the enormous growth of minorities over the last ten years, the LSG rates the bill as unfavorable.

**Rep. Alonzo Floor Substitute #1**

Representative Alonzo's first amendment to CSHB 600 is a statewide substitute that creates an additional majority Hispanic majority district (District 6) in Harris County. Under his plan, District 6 in Harris County is 57 percent Hispanic with an Hispanic voting age population of 52.3 percent. It also further enhances the overall effectiveness of the three existing Hispanic opportunity districts by maintaining the effectiveness of District 1 and increasing the Hispanic population to 72.7 percent of the Voting Age population. In District 2, this amendment increases the Hispanic Voting Age population by 1.6 percent to 70.4 percent, making it a more effective district.

CSHB 600 reduces the African American population in District 4 by over 3.2 percent to 29.7 percent by removing African American communities in northeast Ft. Bend County. Representative Alonzo's amendment restores and enhances the African American population in the district. This is particularly important since that area of Ft. Bend County has experienced African American population growth.

[\(A copy of the maps can be viewed on the PDF copy of the report, which you can access by clicking here\).](#)

Under the current SBOE map and under CSHB 600, Travis County and the surrounding Central Texas community of interest is split. Representative Alonzo's amendment would make the community whole again and restore its

<b>Previous #s</b>	Total:	51.0	16.4	27.7	43.6	5.4
	VAP:	55.3	15.5	24.2	39.4	5.3
<b>8 Cargill</b>	Total:	60.6	11.8	23.8	35.0	4.4
<b>R</b>	VAP:	64.6	10.9	20.4	31.0	4.4
<b>Previous #s</b>	Total:	69.4	13.6	14.9	28.2	2.4
	VAP:	72.7	13.0	12.2	25.0	2.3
<b>9 Ratliff</b>	Total:	69.2	15.3	13.7	28.7	2.1
<b>R</b>	VAP:	72.7	14.5	11.0	25.4	2.0
<b>Previous #s</b>	Total:	67.3	11.3	15.7	26.7	6.0
	VAP:	70.6	10.8	13.2	23.8	5.7
<b>10 Farney</b>	Total:	56.8	13.0	24.8	37.0	6.2
<b>R</b>	VAP:	61.1	11.7	21.4	32.7	6.3
<b>Previous #s</b>	Total:	51.7	12.8	26.2	38.4	9.9
	VAP:	55.7	11.9	23.0	34.5	9.8
<b>11 Hardy</b>	Total:	63.4	10.3	20.2	30.0	6.5
<b>R</b>	VAP:	67.4	9.3	17.3	26.2	6.4
<b>Previous #s</b>	Total:	63.7	10.9	20.1	30.5	5.8
	VAP:	67.9	9.7	17.0	26.5	5.7
<b>12 Clayton</b>	Total:	53.4	13.0	25.1	37.7	8.9
<b>R</b>	VAP:	58.1	11.9	21.4	33.0	8.8
<b>Previous #s</b>	Total:	49.9	13.5	27.4	40.5	9.6
	VAP:	54.7	12.5	23.5	35.6	9.7
<b>14 Lowe</b>	Total:	67.9	8.3	16.7	24.6	7.5
<b>R</b>	VAP:	71.3	7.6	14.1	21.5	7.1
<b>Previous #s</b>	Total:	69.2	8.7	17.6	25.9	4.9
	VAP:	72.8	7.9	14.8	22.5	4.8
<b>15 Craig</b>	Total:	60.6	6.5	30.8	36.7	2.6
<b>R</b>	VAP:	65.2	5.9	26.5	32.2	2.7
<b>Previous #s</b>	Total:	57.3	6.0	34.7	40.2	2.5
	VAP:	62.1	5.5	30.1	35.4	2.5

voice. The proposed District 10 in this amendment creates a compact district made up of four whole counties: Travis, Williamson, Hays and Bastrop.

### **Representative Alonzo Floor Substitute #2 and Representative Martinez Fischer Floor Substitute**

Representative Alonzo's second floor substitute amendment and Representative Martinez Fischer's floor substitute amendment would also create a new Hispanic opportunity District 6.

The new, Hispanic majority district would be wholly contained within Harris county. Currently, District 6 has a voting age Hispanic population of 29.8 percent, and a black + Hispanic voting age population of 41 percent. The new district would have a voting age Hispanic population of 52.1 percent, and a black + Hispanic voting age population of 70.7 percent.

The amendments would also slightly increase the Hispanic population numbers in District 1, which stretches from El Paso down to Starr County.

[\(A copy of the maps can be viewed on the PDF copy of the report, which you can access by clicking here\).](#)

-----  
**HB 1050 by Rep. Woolley -- Will of the House**

*Relating to initial claims under the unemployment compensation system.*

*Small Business and Economic Development*

*Analysis by David Kanewske, [david@texaslsg.org](mailto:david@texaslsg.org)*

Currently, when an employee is fired "for cause" from an employer that paid into unemployment insurance, they cannot claim unemployment insurance unless they file an appeal within 14 days of their termination. However, if the employee finds other employment and obtains a paycheck within those 14 days, and then is fired from that 2<sup>nd</sup> employer, the employee can get unemployment insurance. Often an employee can have a friend or relative "hire" them on for a very short period of time, issue them a paycheck, and then fire them so the employee can receive unemployment insurance. If an employee is fired "for cause," the employer does not have to give further reasons for why the employee was let go.

HB 1050 seeks to close this loophole by having an employee be required to work at least 30 hours with this second employer before they can qualify for unemployment insurance. This 30 hours is equivalent to one full time work week. The change is done by changing the definition of "person for whom the claimant last worked" in statute. If the second employer pays into unemployment insurance, then the employee would not need to work 30 hours with the second employer before being fired to receive unemployment insurance.

An employee could legitimately gain a second employment within the two week window and then be fired for reasons beyond their control before they have worked 30 hours. This employee would not be able to appeal their original firing, and would not be able to gain unemployment insurance. This bill would affect people attempting to bend the rules of the system, but would also harm some people who are caught in unfavorable circumstances.

