



Legislative Study Group (LSG) Floor Report – Calendar for Sunday, May 25, 2025

This report only includes bills on 2nd reading that were set for the Daily House Calendar for May 25.

General State Calendar (continued)

<p>SB 1964</p> <p>Sponsor: Capriglione</p> <p>By: Parker</p>	<p>Relating to the regulation and use of artificial intelligence systems and the management of data by governmental entities.</p>	<p>Delivery of Government Efficiency</p> <p>11 Ayes 0 Nays 0 PNV 2 Absent</p>	<p>To address the growing usage of artificial intelligence (AI) systems in workplaces, SB 1964 creates a proactive regulatory framework in the public sector to protect the civil rights of Texas constituents.</p> <p>SB 1964 requires the Department of Information Resources (DIR), through rulemaking, to create an AI system Code of Ethics that every state agency and local government must follow. The Code of Ethics must be consistent with the heightened scrutiny of artificial intelligence systems' best practices recognized globally — such as the Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework published by the National Institute of Standards and Technology. Additionally, DIR is required to publish training materials and host forums to educate government officials and the public on the usage of AI.</p> <p>To streamline the implementation, SB 1964 would establish a Public Sector AI advisory board made up of six state agency representatives and two technical experts. The advisory board would assist state agencies in the development, deployment, and use of artificial intelligence systems.</p> <p>As the use of AI in the public-sector increases, there is a growing need for guardrails to protect Texans. SB 1964 creates minimum disclosures, enforcement levers, a regulatory sandbox for testing, and a complaint webpage to promote public accountability in the use of emerging technology.</p> <p>With the goal of maintaining transparency and public safety, SB 1964 establishes clear standards for the public sector usage of AI systems that make decisions affecting individuals' legal rights of access to governmental services. Proper oversight of the public-sector usage of AI systems is crucial for ensuring an accountable and transparent government.</p>	<p><u>Favorable</u></p>
<p>SB 1300</p> <p>Sponsor: Cook Smithee </p>	<p>Relating to the prosecution and punishment of the criminal offense of organized retail</p>	<p>Criminal Jurisprudence</p> <p>8 Ayes 3 Nays</p>	<p>SB 1300 broadens the definition of organized retail theft and increases penalties in a way that risks punishing low-level, survival-driven theft as organized crime, raising serious concerns about fairness, proportionality, and the misuse of unreliable data.</p>	<p><u>Will of the House</u></p>

A.C. Waller

OK for Distribution

<p>Louderback Tepper Curry</p> <p>By: Flores</p>	<p>theft; increasing criminal penalties.</p>	<p>o PNV o Absent</p>	<p>The Texas Organized Retail Theft Task Force (TORTTF) estimates that organized retail theft (ORT) cost Texas \$442 million in 2022, resulting in over \$21 million of lost state tax revenue and 4,700 Texas jobs. The bill author states that enhanced penalties are needed to deter this crime.</p> <p>SB 1300 adds new conduct that constitutes an ORT offense, including unlawfully appropriating merchandise from a merchant either in concert with others or on two or more occasions within 180 days, regardless of whether the individual acted alone. It also includes receiving benefits from others who committed such offenses or intentionally overwhelming store security. The bill expands the definition of “retail merchandise” to include gift cards and sets presumptions for intent based on packaging manipulation. It increases criminal penalties by one degree across the board and raises the maximum punishment for the most serious offense to a felony of the first degree, punishable by 15 to 99 years in prison and a \$250,000 fine. The bill removes current enhancements for use of alarms or managing others in a theft ring but makes deferred adjudication count as a conviction for future enhancements. It also allows prior theft evidence to be used at trial and permits aggregated property value to be used without listing individual items in the indictment.</p> <p>While SB 1300 aims to reduce financial losses caused by organized theft, its broad framework could still be used to prosecute individuals who are not part of criminal networks. The lack of a clear distinction between large-scale operations and acts of economic desperation raises the risk of excessive punishment for taking essential goods like food or baby supplies.</p> <p>If an individual steals two times within six months, regardless of the amount or whether they acted in concert, they can be charged with ORT. The 2024 TORTTF report distinguishes shoplifting as involving a lone actor stealing items for personal use, compared to organized retail theft, which involves a network of people taking large quantities of merchandise. By covering simple shoplifting as conduct that can be charged as ORT, this bill could disproportionately affect low-income individuals without effectively deterring professional theft rings. Additionally, research from the Department of Justice has shown that enhanced penalties have little to no effect on crime deterrence and may increase recidivism.</p> <p>While SB 1300 aims to deter organized retail theft and hold offenders accountable, it does not clearly differentiate between coordinated criminal activity and acts of necessity, raising concerns about proportionality within the criminal justice system.</p>	
<p>SB 1644</p> <p>Sponsor:</p>	<p>Relating to the use of a consumer's credit score in the</p>	<p>Insurance</p> <p>8 Ayes</p>	<p>SB 1644 fosters fair insurance pricing in Texas by setting clear update requirements and allowing policyholders to request re-evaluations.</p>	<p><u>Favorable</u></p>



OK for Distribution

<p>Smithee By: Schwertner</p>	<p>underwriting or rating of certain personal lines property and casualty insurance policies.</p>	<p>0 Nays 0 PNV 1 Absent</p>	<p>Currently, Texas insurers must disclose how often they update policyholders’ credit scores for underwriting and rating, but there are no clear rules governing these practices. The Office of Public Insurance Counsel (OPIC) recommends requiring insurers to update credit scores at least every three years to align with national standards. This recommendation is based on the understanding that credit scores typically improve over time, and relying on outdated scores may unfairly penalize consumers and misrepresent their actual risk.</p> <p>SB 1644 mandates that insurers using credit scoring for personal insurance policies use credit reports no older than 90 days when making decisions that negatively affect the insured. Additionally, insurers must review and update credit reports at least every three years and adjust policy ratings and premiums accordingly. Insurers are required to re-underwrite and re-rate a policy using a current credit report upon the request of the insured or their agent, but no more than once every 12 months. Additionally, insurers must notify insureds within 30 days when an adverse action is taken based on credit information, informing them of their right to request re-underwriting and re-rating.</p> <p>SB 1644 improves the accuracy of insurance pricing in Texas by updating credit score-related mandates.</p>	
<p>SB 2217 Sponsor: Shaheen By: Hughes</p>	<p>Relating to certain election practices and procedures.</p>	<p>Elections 8 Ayes 0 Nays 0 PNV 1 Absent</p>	<p>SB 2217 standardizes key practices in election reporting, reconciliation, and voting system functionality to improve transparency and consistency across Texas jurisdictions.</p> <p>Currently, counties vary in how they report election data, reconcile voter check-ins with ballot counts, and use electronic systems to track and process votes. These inconsistencies can complicate public understanding of election results.</p> <p>SB 2217 aims to create consistent election administration standards across counties by requiring that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Electronic voting systems be able to produce a list of all voters accepted to vote; • Provisional ballots be included with the results for the period they were cast; • The general custodian of election records prepares a reconciliation report comparing ballots cast to voters checked in and a report of all voters accepted to vote; • The presiding judge conducts daily vote-voter reconciliations and prepares a report of the number of ballots scanned by optical scanners at early voting sites; and • An election system that uses a central accumulator — defined as a voting system that tracks vote totals for multiple precincts — can produce detailed vote totals. 	<p><u>Favorable</u></p>



			By strengthening the technical and procedural foundation of election administration, SB 2217 promotes clarity, uniformity, and a more transparent voting experience for both officials and the public.	
<p>SB 2373</p> <p>Sponsor: Capriglione</p> <p>By: Johnson</p>	<p>Relating to financial exploitation or financial abuse using artificially generated media or phishing communications; providing a civil penalty; creating a criminal offense.</p>	<p>Delivery of Government Efficiency</p> <p>11 Ayes 0 Nays 0 PNV 2 Absent</p>	<p>SB 2373 creates protections for Texans when Artificial Intelligence (AI) is used for scams or other phishing schemes intended to exploit individuals.</p> <p>With the emergence of AI, reports of scams have rapidly increased. These scams can be very convincing, using deep-fake voices and other phishing methods to trick victims into transferring money out of their bank account or even providing the criminals with private information. SB 2373 defines relevant terms that Texas code currently does not address, such as Artificial Intelligence and artificially generated media.</p> <p>The bill creates a civil cause of action and imposes criminal penalties based on the damages incurred when media is disseminated with the intention of financial exploitation. The civil cause of action will allow for victims to recover actual damages and court costs, with an additional civil penalty of up to \$1,000 a day for each day the deceptive media is disseminated. Regarding criminal penalties, SB 2373 provides a sliding scale of charges based on the amount of financial loss for the victim beginning at a Class C Misdemeanor for an amount less than \$100 and escalating to a First Degree Felony for \$300,000 or more. For clarity, the bill also creates exceptions for certain entities, such as radio stations, that transmit AI-generated material to another person without malicious intent.</p> <p>By establishing both civil and criminal penalties, SB 2373 creates recourse for victims and aims to deter bad actors, addressing the potential dangers of emerging technology pose to consumers.</p>	<p><u>Favorable</u></p>
<p>SB 2431</p> <p>Sponsor: Howard</p> <p>By: Campbell</p>	<p>Relating to requiring foreign language credit opportunities for students enrolled in study abroad components or programs offered by certain institutions of higher education in this state.</p>	<p>Higher Education</p> <p>10 Ayes 1 Nays 0 PNV 0 Absent</p>	<p>SB 2431 aims to address the decline in foreign language proficiency among college students by encouraging greater access and incentives to pursue language learning.</p> <p>According to a report by the Modern Language Association, enrollment in foreign language courses at U.S. colleges has declined by about 29% since 2009. The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages revealed that, within a five-year outlook, 64% of employers in the healthcare and social assistance sectors and 59% in the trade sector anticipated increased demand for employees with foreign language skills.</p> <p>SB 2431 requires public institutions of higher education to offer students the option to earn foreign language credit through study abroad programs. Specifically, if a baccalaureate degree program includes a study abroad component in a</p>	<p><u>Favorable</u></p>



			<p>location where a language other than English is primarily spoken, the institution must provide an opportunity, under rules established by the bill, for students to receive foreign language credit as part of that experience.</p> <p>Lastly, SB 2431 requires the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) to adopt rules necessary to implement this requirement. These rules must define what qualifies as a study abroad component or program and establish the procedures by which a student may earn foreign language credit through participation in such a program.</p> <p>SB 2431 seeks to reverse declining trends in language learning by allowing students to earn foreign language credit through study abroad programs.</p>	
<p>SB 1758 Sponsor: Landgraf By: Birdwell</p>	<p>Relating to the operation of a cement kiln and the production of aggregates near a semiconductor wafer manufacturing facility.</p>	<p>Environmental Regulation</p> <p>8 Ayes 0 Nays 0 PNV 1 Absent</p>	<p>SB 1758 creates a pilot program and requires a study on the impacts of cement kilns and aggregate production on semiconductor wafer manufacturing. This study could protect an important technological industry while allowing the state to learn more about the potential harms of cement and aggregate production on other industries.</p> <p>As of 2016, the most recent available data, there are 11 cement kilns in Texas. The cement kiln industry converts limestone and other minerals to cement by applying heat, and the process creates significant air quality concerns for the local environment. Recently, a kiln was proposed in Grayson County, which was met with significant public outcry due to both public health concerns and the potential impact on the local production of semiconductor wafers. Semiconductor wafers are used in many important technologies, are extremely sensitive to any amount of debris in the air or vibrations of the earth, and their production is highly important to job creation and financial success in Grayson County. The bill author contends that further study is needed on the impacts of cement kilns on semiconductor wafer manufacturing.</p> <p>SB 1758 establishes the Cement or Aggregate Production and Semiconductor Wafer Manufacturing Facility Pilot Program in Grayson County. The bill’s provisions are set to expire September 1, 2031, and only apply to semiconductor wafer facilities beginning operations in 2025 and cement or aggregate facilities operating under a new source review permit. This limits the bill specifically to the proposed cement kiln and semiconductor wafer facility in Grayson County. During this period, SB 1758 prohibits the construction or operation of cement and aggregate-associated facilities within 10 miles of the applicable semiconductor wafer manufacturing facility in Grayson County.</p> <p>SB 1758 directs the Bureau of Economic Geology at UT Austin to study how aggregate production affects seismic activity and its impact on nearby semiconductor wafer manufacturing in Grayson County. The Bureau must report findings and recommendations by August 1, 2026.</p>	<p><u>Favorable</u></p>



			<p>SB 1758 exempts cement kilns and aggregate production facilities from liability for damage to semiconductor wafer facilities caused by vibrations or seismic activity, only if the cement kiln or aggregate facility was operating before the semiconductor facility began operations. This limitation of liability applies only to a cause of action that happens after the bill goes into effect.</p> <p>We already know the detrimental health effects associated with air pollution as a result of cement kilns. SB 1758 would focus on its effects on S semiconductor wafers, which are used in anything from computer microprocessors to solar panels to military equipment. As this new technology continues to blossom in Texas, it is important to evaluate the impacts of potentially incompatible industries, and it's possible that the study could also lead to positive outcomes for the study of industry harms on human health as well.</p>	
<p>SB 2480 Sponsor: Oliverson By: Campbell</p>	<p>Relating to the Texas Physician Health Program and the regulation of certain occupations by the Texas Medical Board; expanding the applicability of surcharges.</p>	<p>Public Health 9 Ayes 0 Nays 1 PNV 3 Absent</p>	<p>SB 2480 addresses funding gaps and expands access to the Texas Physician Health Program (TXPHP) by requiring all Texas Medical Board (TMB) licensees to pay a surcharge and participate in monitoring, ensuring broader support and oversight for impaired health professionals.</p> <p>The TXPHP offers confidential support services, including early intervention, assessment, treatment referral, and monitoring, to health professionals who may be impaired and unable to practice safely. The 88th Legislature enacted a statute intended to fund the TXPHP through a license renewal surcharge for all TMB licensees; however, due to limited statutory language, the surcharge can currently only be collected from physicians and physician assistants.</p> <p>SB 2480 establishes that the TXPHP is a confidential, non-disciplinary program available to all individuals licensed or authorized by the TMB, and it requires the program to accept self-referrals. It also allows the TMB or relevant advisory bodies to refer individuals to the program and mandate participation as a condition for obtaining or maintaining licensure. The definition of a program participant is broadened to include any individual receiving services, not just physicians and physician assistants. The surcharge structure is updated by applying the fee to all types of initial and renewal authorizations, not just registration permits. Additionally, the TMB must conduct a continuous query on the National Practitioner Data Bank, which tracks disciplinary actions and malpractice claims against providers for all individuals licensed or authorized by the TMB. It also updates the surcharge requirement to cover the costs of these queries by expanding it to all license types and clarifying that it applies to both initial issuance and renewals.</p> <p>SB 2480 ensures the long-term viability of the TXPHP and strengthens the State's ability to protect patients while supporting the well-being of all licensed health professionals.</p>	<p><u>Favorable</u></p>



OK for Distribution

<p>SB 3039 Sponsor: Davis, Aicha By: West</p>	<p>Relating to the transfer of students in public higher education.</p>	<p>Higher Education 10 Ayes 1 Nays 0 PNV 0 Absent</p>	<p>SB 3039 aims to improve the transfer process for students moving between junior colleges and universities by increasing transparency around credit transferability, enhancing institutional accountability, and providing direct support to transfer students through designated liaison officers.</p> <p>Many students transferring from junior colleges to universities encounter challenges obtaining necessary information, discovering too late that certain academic credits are nontransferable, and facing a lack of support during the transition. Students often only become aware of these barriers when they are already in the process of transferring, leading to delays, added costs, or disruptions in their academic progress. To address these issues, SB 3039 introduces several key reforms.</p> <p>Transfer Credit Transparency Institutions of higher education must post on their admissions webpage the five degree or certificate programs with the most denied transfer credits and the five most commonly denied courses for each. THECB will provide an annual list of these courses and may adopt rules for implementation.</p> <p>Transfer Liaison SB 3039 requires each higher education institution to designate a transfer liaison to coordinate with other institutions, the THECB, and support transfer students. The liaison must provide students with core and field of study curricula, accepted and denied credits, and dispute procedures. Upon admission, they must assist transfer students with a degree audit. THECB will establish rules for implementation.</p> <p>Updated Reporting Requirements SB 3039 renames the “Report of Nontransferable Credit” to “Transfer Report and expands the report by requiring general academic teaching institutions to include details of the institution’s goals for improving outcomes for public junior college transfer students, evaluate transfer pathways, identify barriers, and describe actions such as faculty collaboration, advising financial aid, and degree alignment. The report must be provided to THECB and the legislature by May 1st. The THECB rule may require additional information.</p> <p>By September 1 of each even-numbered year, THECB must submit a report to state leaders evaluating efforts to support transfer students. It must include comparative data on admissions, financial aid, graduation, time-to-degree, a study of transfer practices, and legislative recommendations aligned with the state’s higher education master plan.</p>	<p><u>Favorable</u></p>
---	---	--	---	--------------------------------



OK for Distribution

			<p>Each public junior college must submit an annual report by May 1 detailing courses taken by students who transferred to a general academic institution, earned an associate degree, or completed a field of study. The report must include any additional information required by THECB.</p> <p>SB 3039 seeks to reduce academic disruption, lower costs, and improve degree completion rates for Texas transfer students by streamlining the transfer process, ensuring students receive timely, and accurate information.</p>	
<p>SB 3047</p> <p>Sponsor: Cole</p> <p>By: Zaffirini</p>	<p>Relating to the creation of the Pura Vida Municipal Management District No. 1; providing authority to issue bonds; providing authority to impose assessments, fees, and taxes; granting a limited power of eminent domain.</p>	<p>Intergovernmental Affairs</p> <p>9 Ayes 1 Nays 1 PNV 0 Absent</p>	<p>SB 3047 creates the Pura Vida Municipal Management District No. 1 to help support local development through infrastructure improvements and public services.</p> <p>Municipal management districts are special districts that provide improvements and services to generate economic development in certain areas of municipalities. SB 3047 establishes the Pura Vida Municipal Management District No. 1 and grants it powers commonly held by similar districts, including the authority to collect funds by issuing obligations and imposing assessments or taxes, with voter approval.</p>	<p><u>Favorable</u></p>
<p>SB 3073</p> <p>Sponsor: Smithee</p> <p>By: Huffman</p>	<p>Relating to the duty of a magistrate to make written findings in certain criminal proceedings.</p>	<p>Criminal Jurisprudence</p> <p>7 Ayes 1 Nays 0 PNV 3 Absent</p>	<p>SB 3073 requires magistrates to enter written findings within 24 hours when they determine there is no probable cause to justify an arrest, adding new procedural obligations in pretrial proceedings.</p> <p>After the 2021 passage of the Damon Allen Act, which reformed pretrial release policies for violent and repeat offenders, concerns emerged that some defendants were being released without sufficient documentation of the reasons. In response, stakeholders began calling for clearer requirements on how magistrates record their bail decisions. SB 3073 aims to increase transparency in pretrial proceedings by requiring magistrates to document, in writing, the bases for any finding that probable cause does not exist within 24 hours of the determination.</p> <p>While SB 3073 seeks to improve accountability in pretrial release decisions, it burdens magistrates with additional paperwork only when they decline to find probable cause, creating an imbalance that may incentivize continued detention. Judges have expressed concern that this will effectively make them auditors of prosecutors and law enforcement—reviewing and diagnosing deficiencies in affidavits after they have already been reviewed by a district attorney. Magistrates emphasize their role is not to proofread filings or coach law enforcement on how to support a charge but to determine innocence or guilt. Additionally, this places further strain on already overwhelmed dockets,</p>	<p><u>Unfavorable</u></p>



			<p>particularly in high-volume jurisdictions processing hundreds or even thousands of arrests daily. Lastly, there are concerns that the added procedural requirements for securing a release may, in effect, lead to increased pretrial detention.</p> <p>While SB 3073 is intended to foster greater transparency in pretrial proceedings, its specific focus on documenting the absence of probable cause risks creating practical challenges and potential imbalances within the judicial system.</p>	
<p>SB 2920</p> <p>Sponsor: Slawson</p> <p>By: Campbell</p>	<p>Relating to the regulation of steroid use by students participating in athletic competitions sponsored or sanctioned by the University Interscholastic League.</p>	<p>Public Education</p> <p>9 Ayes 3 Nays 0 PNV 3 Absent</p>	<p>SB 2920 prohibits student athletes from invoking a medical exemption to UIL’s steroid ban if the prescribed steroid is used as part of gender-transition treatment, effectively targeting transgender youth and overriding physician judgment.</p> <p>Students participating in University Interscholastic League (UIL) athletics are banned from using steroids, with an exemption for those receiving them under a physician’s care for a valid medical purpose. This allows students undergoing medically necessary treatments to remain eligible for competition, provided they comply with random steroid testing protocols. Current law does not explicitly define or exclude treatments related to gender transition from this exemption.</p> <p>SB 2920 would prevent treatment involving steroids for the purpose of transitioning a minor student’s biological sex from constituting a “valid medical purpose.” As a result, students prescribed such treatment — regardless of medical oversight — would lose their exemption under UIL policy and become ineligible to participate in athletics if they test positive for steroids or refuse testing.</p> <p>By singling out gender-transition care, SB 2920 discriminates against a small, vulnerable group of students, excludes them from school athletics, and may deter families from pursuing medically endorsed care. The bill undermines existing UIL safeguards that already allow for legitimate medical oversight while maintaining competitive fairness.</p>	<p><u>Unfavorable</u></p>
<p>SB 2781</p> <p>Sponsor: Shaheen</p> <p>By: Birdwell</p>	<p>Relating to the imposition of civil penalties for certain violations with respect to political contributions and expenditures made by certain persons who engage in</p>	<p>State Affairs</p> <p>12 Ayes 2 Nays 0 PNV 1 Absent</p>	<p>SB 2781 establishes a cap on the civil penalty a former member of the Legislature can receive for inappropriately using campaign funds while acting as a lobbyist in the 2-year moratorium after they are no longer a member. While this could prevent exorbitant fines, it could also limit the Texas Ethics Commission’s ability to enforce the law.</p> <p>HB 2677 (86R) restricts former members of the Legislature from engaging in activities that require them to register as lobbyists if they have made a political contribution using campaign funds in the past two years. The bill sponsor states that in 2023, the Texas Ethics Commission (TEC) issued an opinion that a violator of this law could face fines of \$5,000</p>	<p><u>Will of the House</u></p>



	lobbying activities.		<p>or triple "the amount at issue," and that the TEC left "the amount at issue" undefined. The bill sponsor is concerned that this lack of definition could result in exorbitant fines.</p> <p>Under SB 2781, if a former member acts as a lobbyist and then uses their campaign account for donations or contributions within the two-year moratorium, they are subject to a civil penalty that cannot exceed twice the amount of the violating contribution or expenditure. Also under SB 2781, if a former member has used their campaign funds to contribute to another candidate and then lobbies within 2 years, they are subject to a civil penalty in an amount not to exceed twice the amount of all contributions or expenditures made in the two years preceding their lobbying.</p> <p>Unethical conduct by a former member should be treated as a serious offense, and the TEC should not be limited in their ability to enforce laws against this unethical behavior. However, it is extremely common for penalties to be capped in statute to prevent unregulated fining by agencies, and SB 2781 could bring these penalties in line with this precedent.</p>	
<p>SB 826</p> <p>Sponsor: Parker</p> <p>By: Little</p>	<p>Relating to the operation of a motor vehicle in a school crossing zone while intoxicated; increasing a criminal penalty.</p>	<p>Criminal Jurisprudence, S/C on New Offenses and Changed Penalties</p> <p>9 Ayes 0 Nays 0 PNV 2 Absent</p>	<p>SB 826 increases the penalty for driving while intoxicated in a school zone to a state jail felony, reinforcing the seriousness of endangering children.</p> <p>Driving while intoxicated is dangerous in any context, but the risk is especially acute in school zones, where children, parents, and school staff are concentrated during key hours of the day. These areas are designated to ensure safer walking, biking, and vehicle drop-offs, and impaired driving threatens that intended safety. The bill sponsor states that while existing laws carry penalties, they do not currently reflect the heightened risk posed by such conduct in school zones.</p> <p>SB 826 aims to protect students and school communities by enhancing the penalty for driving while intoxicated in a school zone from a Class B misdemeanor with a minimum 72-hour jail term to a state jail felony, carrying a penalty of 180 days to two years. The enhanced penalty applies when the offense occurs in a designated school crossing zone during the time a reduced speed limit is in effect.</p> <p>By increasing the consequences for DWI offenses in school zones, SB 826 elevates the legal response to this high-risk behavior and aligns the law with the goal of keeping children safe.</p>	<p><u>Favorable</u></p>
<p>SB 766</p> <p>Sponsor:</p>	<p>Relating to the correction of references to the</p>	<p>Judiciary & Civil Jurisprudence</p>	<p>SB 766 updates multiple statutory codes to replace references to the Texas Natural Resource Conservation Commission with references to the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ).</p>	<p><u>Favorable</u></p>



<p>Landgraf By: Zaffirini</p>	<p>Texas Natural Resource Conservation Commission.</p>	<p>11 Ayes 0 Nays 0 PNV 0 Absent</p>	<p>The Texas Natural Resource Conservation Commission was renamed to the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality in 2004. However, many references to the previous name remain in statute. SB 766 replaces these references to reflect the updated name.</p>	
<p>SB 2460 Sponsor: Plesa By: Creighton</p>	<p>Relating to rapid DNA analysis performed by certain law enforcement agencies and the content of certain DNA databases.</p>	<p>Homeland Security, Public Safety & Veterans' Affairs 10 Ayes 0 Nays 0 PNV 1 Absent</p>	<p>SB 2460 authorizes law enforcement agencies to perform rapid DNA analysis for inclusion in the State's DNA database, modernizing forensic processes to improve investigative efficiency and reduce lab backlogs.</p> <p>Currently, only accredited laboratories may conduct DNA analysis for inclusion in the Department of Public Safety's (DPS) DNA database. This restriction predates advances in rapid DNA technology, which can now produce valid DNA profiles in under two hours outside of traditional lab settings. The bill sponsor has indicated that authorizing rapid DNA analysis would help modernize the state system and improve efficiency.</p> <p>SB 2460 aims to integrate rapid DNA analysis into the State's forensic infrastructure by authorizing law enforcement agencies to conduct such analyses with DPS approval. The bill permits agencies to request authorization from the public safety director to use a rapid DNA analysis system, requires the director to establish FBI-aligned standards for their use, and updates existing laws and procedures to include rapid DNA analysis and authorized law enforcement agencies. It authorizes the submission of rapid DNA results for certain arrestees and registrants instead of traditional lab analysis and revises rules governing database access, sample handling, oversight, and inter-agency evidence sharing. The bill also adds definitions for "authorized law enforcement agency" and "rapid DNA analysis" and amends the definition of "DNA record" to include rapid results.</p> <p>By updating the law to allow rapid DNA testing under regulatory safeguards, SB 2460 ensures that Texas can lawfully apply new forensic tools while maintaining consistency with FBI standards and existing procedures.</p>	<p><u>Favorable</u></p>
<p>SB 527 Sponsor: Oliverson By: Schwertner</p>	<p>Relating to health benefit coverage for general anesthesia in connection with certain pediatric dental services.</p>	<p>Insurance 7 Ayes 0 Nays 0 PNV 2 Absent</p>	<p>SB 527 requires health plans to cover general anesthesia for dental procedures in children under 13 when it is medically necessary, ensuring timely care.</p> <p>Currently, pediatric patients often experience delays in dental care because many medical insurance plans do not cover general anesthesia for dental procedures unless the child is acutely ill or has severe facial swelling due to infection. This restrictive coverage requirement frequently forces children to wait until their condition worsens before anesthesia is approved, delaying necessary treatment. The American Academy of Pediatric Dentistry reports that more than 30 states</p>	<p><u>Favorable</u></p>



			<p>have enacted laws requiring medical insurance to cover general anesthesia for dental treatment of young and special needs patients, recognizing the importance of timely and safe care. Without such coverage, children endure prolonged pain, untreated dental issues, and higher risks of complications. Expanding anesthesia coverage is, therefore, critical to ensuring timely, effective, and safe dental care for pediatric patients.</p> <p>SB 527 mandates that health benefit plans covering general anesthesia also provide it when medically necessary for dental procedures in children under 13. Coverage applies when the child cannot safely undergo the procedure without anesthesia due to a documented physical, mental, or medical condition, and a qualified provider administers it.</p> <p>SB 527 mandates anesthesia coverage, preventing treatment delays and protecting children from pain and complications.</p>	
<p>SB 1946 Sponsor: Manuel Garcia, Linda By: Zaffirini</p>	<p>Relating to the creation of a family violence criminal homicide prevention task force.</p>	<p>Homeland Security, Public Safety & Veterans' Affairs 6 Ayes 4 Nays 0 PNV 1 Absent</p>	<p>SB 1946 creates a statewide task force led by the Governor's office and the Texas Council on Family Violence to study and recommend ways to prevent family violence homicides, aiming to address a persistent and deadly public safety crisis.</p> <p>From 2021 to 2023, more than 600 Texans – primarily women – were killed in acts of family violence. Despite past legislative efforts, rates of intimate partner homicide remain high and pose ongoing danger to everyone involved. Data from TCFV shows that, in 2023 alone, 16 additional non-partner victims were also killed. The bill sponsor states that a coordinated statewide approach is necessary to identify risk factors and develop effective policy responses.</p> <p>SB 1946 requires the Governor to establish the Family Violence Criminal Homicide Prevention Task Force within the Criminal Justice Division. The task force steering committee must include the Governor and the head of statewide family violence advocacy group. It will comprise of representatives from family violence centers, survivor advocacy organizations, law enforcement, legal aid providers, public health agencies, academia, prosecutors, survivors of abuse, and other relevant stakeholders. The task force must analyze risk factors, advise on training for frontline professionals, collect and publish data on family violence homicide response and survivor services, and produce policy recommendations to reduce such violence. The group will use federal and state funding and may establish working groups on specific topics. Members may receive per diem and travel reimbursements. The task force will report findings by December 1, 2026 and be abolished on January 1, 2028.</p> <p>By convening a broad coalition of experts and stakeholders to identify solutions and recommend legislative action, SB 1946 helps Texas address a deadly and persistent threat to public safety and family stability.</p>	<p><u>Favorable</u></p>



<p>SB 2885 Sponsor: Buckley By: Flores</p>	<p>Relating to the use of reclaimed water that has been treated to meet certain standards as part of an aquifer storage and recovery project.</p>	<p>Natural Resources 9 Ayes 0 Nays 0 PNV 4 Absent</p>	<p>SB 2885 aims to authorize and regulate the use of reclaimed water in aquifer storage and recovery (ASR) projects by establishing clear standards and permitting pathways.</p> <p>Texas is experiencing increasing strain on local water supplies due to rapid population growth. Many local political subdivisions are exploring strategies like aquifer storage and recovery (ASR) using treated effluent wastewater. However, the state's existing regulatory framework does not explicitly allow reclaimed water to be used for ASR projects and has caused significant obstacles.</p> <p>SB 2885 authorizes the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ), by rule or permit, to allow the injection of reclaimed water into Class V wells for use in ASR projects, provided the water is treated in accordance with standards adopted by the TCEQ for that purpose. This authorization applies notwithstanding existing requirements for TCEQ to consider compliance with the federal Safe Drinking Water Act when adopting rules or issuing permits for ASR injection wells.</p> <p>SB 2885 seeks to eliminate regulatory uncertainty by establishing clear provisions for using treated reclaimed water in ASR projects.</p>	<p><u>Favorable</u></p>
<p>SB 1243 Sponsor: Slawson By: Birdwell</p>	<p>Relating to the dissolution of a public utility agency</p>	<p>Natural Resources 9 Ayes 0 Nays 0 PNV 4 Absent</p>	<p>SB 1243 aims to improve governmental efficiency and reduce administrative expenses by authorizing the dissolution of a public utility agency when it is no longer necessary.</p> <p>The BRPUA was created to facilitate joint ownership and operation of a water treatment plant by the Acton Municipal Utility District (AMUD) and the Johnson County Special Utility District (JCSUD). However, AMUD has since acquired JCSUD's interest and is now the sole owner of the plant. As a result, the BRPUA no longer serves its intended purpose and now represents an unnecessary and duplicative layer of government. This redundancy leads to inefficiencies and increased administrative costs.</p> <p>SB 1243 allows participating public entities in a public utility agency to dissolve the agency through concurrent ordinances. All agency obligations, assets, permits, and licenses may be transferred to the remaining public entities upon dissolution. The bill also authorizes a single remaining public entity to unilaterally dissolve the agency by ordinance if it is the sole participant.</p> <p>SB 1243 seeks to streamline local government operations by authorizing the dissolution of a public utility agency through local decision-making.</p>	<p><u>Favorable</u></p>



<p>SB 2610 Sponsor: Capriglione By: Blanco</p>	<p>Relating to a limitation on civil liability of business entities in connection with a breach of system security.</p>	<p>Delivery of Government Efficiency 9 Ayes 2 Nays 0 PNV 2 Absent</p>	<p>SB 2610 codifies the best practices for certain small businesses to follow when storing an individual's personal identifying information by creating a safe harbor provision that protects them against liability if a person is harmed.</p> <p>Currently, Texas lacks clear and consistent standards for how small businesses should create, implement, and maintain cybersecurity policies and procedures when storing an individual's personal identifying information as defined in the Business and Commerce Code. This information could be an individual's social security number, date of birth, or other information that identifies an individual.</p> <p>SB 2610 takes a measured approach by bracketing sizes of business entities ranging from businesses with 20 employees or fewer to businesses with at least 100 employees but fewer than 250 employees. This aims to prevent placing too high a burden on small businesses, yet encourages businesses to take steps to protect individuals' most precious data. SB 2610 outlines specific standards for cybersecurity that are recognized globally, such as the Framework for Improving Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity published by the National Institute of Standards and Technology. SB 2610 does not stop class action law going forward, cannot be used for a claim prior to the effective date, and does not create a new private cause of action.</p> <p>SB 2610 seeks to encourage businesses to proactively protect individuals' private information by establishing clear data security standards tailored to the size of the business.</p>	<p><u>Favorable</u></p>
<p>SB 2595 Sponsor: Oliverson By: Middleton</p>	<p>Relating to the creation of the criminal offense of harassing, intimidating, or threatening another person while concealing identity with a mask or other headgear.</p>	<p>Criminal Jurisprudence 6 Ayes 4 Nays 0 PNV 1 Absent</p>	<p>SB 2595 creates a new criminal offense for wearing a mask or headgear while harassing, intimidating, or threatening others in public, but its vague definitions, broad language, and overlap with existing statutes raise serious concerns about its impact on free expression and the potential for discriminatory enforcement.</p> <p>The bill sponsor has expressed concern about individuals using masks to conceal their identities while engaging in threatening conduct in public spaces, stating that this behavior presents a risk to public safety.</p> <p>SB 2595 establishes a Class B misdemeanor offense for anyone who, while wearing a mask or headgear that conceals their identity or makes them harder to identify, intentionally harasses, intimidates, or threatens another person in a public space. The bill defines "harass" as conduct meant to cause fear or emotional distress and "intimidate" as conduct intended to cause someone to act or not act out of fear for their safety — both of which hinge on subjective interpretation. It includes affirmative defenses for wearing masks or headgear related to holidays, occupational safety, weather protection, theatrical use, emergencies, illness prevention, and religious observance. However, these defenses are only available during prosecution, meaning individuals may still be detained and charged even if their mask or headgear falls</p>	<p><u>Unfavorable</u></p>



			<p>squarely within those exceptions. The bill also allows prosecution under both this offense and any overlapping Penal Code violations, increasing the risk of multiple convictions for a single act.</p> <p>Although framed as a public safety measure, SB 2595 lacks clear enforcement standards. The subjective nature of its definitions, combined with an ambiguous description of what qualifies as identity-concealing headgear, could easily lead to arbitrary or biased enforcement. Everyday items like scarves, face masks, hoodies, or religious coverings could fall under its scope, placing particular burdens on immunocompromised individuals and people who wear head coverings for cultural or religious reasons. Even if a person successfully establishes a defense to prosecution and is ultimately not convicted, they could still face arrest, court proceedings, legal representation fees, and the consequences of having an arrest on their record.</p> <p>Moreover, SB 2595 directly threatens constitutional rights. Texas law, including the riot statute, already allows for the prosecution of threatening or disorderly behavior, making this new offense redundant. Instead, the bill imposes an additional layer of criminal liability that risks suppressing First Amendment-protected activities such as protest. The U.S. Supreme Court has repeatedly upheld the right to anonymous political expression as a safeguard against retaliation, most notably in <i>McIntyre v. Ohio Elections Commission</i>. In <i>Aryan v. Mackey</i>, a Texas district court recognized mask-wearing during protests as symbolic speech protected by the First Amendment. SB 2595 undermines these precedents by criminalizing protected expression and discouraging peaceful, lawful assembly.</p> <p>Rather than enhancing public safety, SB 2595 endangers fundamental rights, creates unnecessary legal exposure for innocent individuals, and threatens to suppress free expression across Texas.</p>	
<p>SB 857 Sponsor: Louderback By: Schwertner</p>	<p>Relating to the authorized removal of certain motor vehicles.</p>	<p>Homeland Security, Public Safety & Veterans' Affairs</p> <p>9 Ayes 3 Nays 0 PNV 0 Absent</p>	<p>SB 857 allows law enforcement to tow vehicles if a driver is unlicensed, has an invalid license, or lacks insurance, imposing a harsh financial penalty that disproportionately harms low-income Texans.</p> <p>Texas roads are increasingly congested, and the bill's sponsor states that unlicensed and uninsured drivers pose a safety and accountability risk. Currently, officers may issue citations in these cases but lack the statutory authority to tow the vehicle solely for these violations.</p> <p>SB 857 authorizes peace officers and DPS license and weight inspectors to tow or require the movement of a vehicle from a highway if the driver does not hold a valid license, is driving with an invalid license, is operating without insurance, or is a minor driving without a license.</p>	<p><u>Unfavorable</u></p>



OK for Distribution

			<p>While intended to promote road safety and legal compliance, SB 857 would disproportionately impact lower-income Texans. Many Texas drivers are unlicensed or uninsured because they cannot afford to do so, and towing their vehicle would result in additional fees that could jeopardize their ability to work or transport children to school. Instead of encouraging compliance, this bill risks deepening financial instability for low-income families.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--



OK for Distribution