

**Steering Committee:**

Alma Allen, Chairman  
Gary VanDeaver, Vice Chairman

Dustin Burrows  
Angie Chen Button  
Joe Deshotel

John Frullo  
Mary González  
Donna Howard

Ken King

J. M. Lozano  
Eddie Lucio III  
Ina Minjarez

Jim Murphy  
Andrew Murr  
Toni Rose

---

# HOUSE RESEARCH ORGANIZATION

---

## daily floor report

---

Monday, May 10, 2021  
87th Legislature, Number 53  
The House convenes at 1 p.m.  
Part Three

One bill is on the Major State Calendar, one joint resolution is on the Constitutional Amendments Calendar, and 67 bills are on the General State Calendar for second reading consideration today. The bills and joint resolutions analyzed or digested in Part Three of today's *Daily Floor Report* are listed on the following page.

Analyses of postponed bills and all bills on second reading can be found online at TLIS and at <https://hro.house.texas.gov/BillAnalysis.aspx>.



Alma Allen  
Chairman  
87(R) - 53

## HOUSE RESEARCH ORGANIZATION

Daily Floor Report

Monday, May 10, 2021

87th Legislature, Number 53

Part 3

HB 3286 by Schofield	Posting signs restricting parking certain vehicles by apartment overnight	140
HB 3294 by Bell	Redirecting Texas Emissions Reduction Plan funds	142
HB 3162 by Martinez	Exempting certain design-builders from certificate of merit requirements	144
HB 782 by Swanson	Modifying requirements for ballot propositions and petitions	146
HB 3298 by Allison	Establishing a computer science strategic advisory committee	150
HB 3959 by Buckley	Establishing the Texas youth livestock show grant program and fund	152
HB 1156 by Thierry	Creating a criminal offense for financial abuse of elderly individuals	154
HB 2558 by Capriglione	Prohibiting contracting with entity discriminating against firearm industry	157
HB 3673 by Johnson	Requiring DSHS to establish and maintain a sickle cell disease registry	159
HB 3546 by Cortez	City authority to add to certain public improvement districts	161
HB 100 by Gervin-Hawkins	Allowing animal control authorities to manage aggressive dogs in ETJs	163
HB 2095 by Wilson	Requiring the UT Bureau of Economic Geology to conduct water research	165
HB 156 by Ortega	Allowing El Paso County to impose additional vehicle registration fee	167
HB 3598 by Leach	Requiring minimum prison term for intoxication manslaughter	169
HB 1884 by Dominguez	Facilitating veteran, active duty apprenticeship training program grants	171
HB 1781 by Krause	Permitting the propagation of breeder deer by cloning	173
HB 4293 by Hinojosa	Creating a court reminder program for criminal defendants	174
HB 1568 by Middleton	Modifying requirements for the school district property value study	177

- SUBJECT:** Posting signs restricting parking certain vehicles by apartment overnight
- COMMITTEE:** Transportation — committee substitute recommended
- VOTE:** 11 ayes — Canales, E. Thompson, Ashby, Bucy, Davis, Lozano, Martinez, Ortega, Perez, Rogers, Smithee
- 0 nays
- 2 absent — Harris, Landgraf
- WITNESSES:** For — Paul Hawkins, Harris County Pct 3; (*Registered, but did not testify:* Jamaal Smith, City of Houston, Office of the Mayor Sylvester Turner)
- Against — None
- BACKGROUND:** Some have noted that while current law allows a county to restrict parking commercial vehicles overnight in a residential subdivision, the same protection is not provided for apartment complexes.
- DIGEST:** CSHB 3286 would allow the owner or manager of an apartment complex to make a request to the county or municipality for the posting of official signs prohibiting the parking of a commercial motor vehicle in a public right-of-way adjacent to the complex after 10 p.m. and before 6 a.m.
- The bill would apply only to a county or municipality with a population of more than 220,000.
- The county or municipality could post one or more signs as requested or as it determined necessary. A sign would have to be posted in the public right-of-way no more than 10 feet from the property line of the complex and facing the roadway. A sign also would have to include arrows clearly indicating the area subject to the parking restriction.
- The bill would not apply to a vehicle owned by a commercial establishment that was parked in the public right-of-way adjacent to the property where the establishment was located.

The bill would take effect September 1, 2021.

- SUBJECT:** Redirecting Texas Emissions Reduction Plan funds
- COMMITTEE:** Appropriations — favorable, without amendment
- VOTE:** 23 ayes — Bonnen, M. González, Ashby, C. Bell, Capriglione, Dean, Dominguez, Gates, Holland, Howard, A. Johnson, Jarvis Johnson, Morrison, Raney, Rose, Schaefer, Stucky, E. Thompson, Toth, VanDeaver, Walle, Wilson, Wu
- 0 nays
- 4 absent — Julie Johnson, Minjarez, Sherman, Zwiener
- WITNESSES:** For — Cyrus Reed, Lone Star Chapter, Sierra Club; (*Registered, but did not testify*: Courtney Perry; TJ Patterson, City of Fort Worth; and nine individuals)
- Against — None
- On — Steven Albright, Associated General Contractors of Texas Highway Heavy Utility and Industrial Branch; Sam Gammage, Texas Chemical Council; (*Registered, but did not testify*: Mike Wilson, Texas Commission on Environmental Quality)
- BACKGROUND:** Under Transportation Code sec. 501.138, \$20 of each motor vehicle title fee is distributed to the comptroller if the title applicant's residence is a county located in a nonattainment area according to certain federal air quality standards. Those funds are deposited to the credit of the Texas Mobility Fund. The Texas Department of Transportation then must remit an equal amount of funds from the State Highway Fund to the Texas Emissions Reduction Plan (TERP) fund.
- Some have suggested redirecting title fees from the Texas Mobility Fund to the TERP fund to simplify the appropriation mechanism and ensure that the fund could be properly sustained.

**DIGEST:** HB 3294 would redirect collected motor vehicle title fees to the Texas Emissions Reduction Plan (TERP) fund.

The Texas Department of Transportation would remit an equal amount of funds from the State Highway Fund to the Texas Mobility Fund instead of the TERP fund.

The comptroller would have to deposit the fees to the Texas Mobility Fund instead if the fees were collected on or after the last day of the biennium during which the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality published the national ambient air quality standards for ozone in the Texas Register.

The bill would take effect September 1, 2021, and would apply only to a fee collected on or after that date.

- SUBJECT:** Exempting certain design-builders from certificate of merit requirements
- COMMITTEE:** Judiciary and Civil Jurisprudence — committee substitute recommended
- VOTE:** 8 ayes — Leach, Davis, Julie Johnson, Krause, Middleton, Moody, Schofield, Smith
- 0 nays
- 1 absent — Dutton
- WITNESSES:** For — Corbin Van Arsdale, AGC-Texas Building Branch; (*Registered, but did not testify*: Jennifer Fagan, Texas Construction Association; Jack Baxley, TEXO The Construction Association)
- Against — (*Registered, but did not testify*: Peyton McKnight, American Council of Engineering Companies of Texas)
- BACKGROUND:** Civil Practice and Remedies Code sec. 150.002(a) requires that in any action or arbitration proceeding for damages arising out of the provision of professional services by a licensed or registered professional, a claimant must file with the complaint an affidavit, called a certificate of merit, from a third-party licensed architect, licensed professional engineer, registered landscape architect, or registered professional land surveyor who:
- is competent to testify;
  - holds the same professional license or registration as the defendant; and
  - practices in the area of practice of the defendant and offers testimony based on the person's knowledge, skill, experience, education, training, and practice.
- The 86th Legislature in 2019 enacted SB 1928 by Fallon, which extended the certificate of merit requirement for plaintiffs who file suit against certain licensed or registered professionals to include all claimants who file such suits.

DIGEST: CSHB 3162 would exempt certain third-party plaintiffs that were design-builders or design-build firms from the requirements to file a third-party affidavit under Civil Practice and Remedies Code sec. 150.002(a) in connection with filing a third-party claim or cross-claim against a licensed or registered professional.

The exemption would apply if the action or arbitration proceeding arose out of a design-build project in which a governmental entity contracted with a single entity to provide both design and construction services for the construction, expansion, extension, rehabilitation, alteration, or repair of a facility, a building or associated structure, a civil works project, or a highway project.

The bill would take effect September 1, 2021, and would apply only to an action commenced on or after that date.

- SUBJECT:** Modifying requirements for ballot propositions and petitions
- COMMITTEE:** Elections — favorable, without amendment
- VOTE:** 7 ayes — Cain, Beckley, Clardy, Fierro, Jetton, Schofield, Swanson  
2 nays — J. González, Bucy
- WITNESSES:** For — Alan Vera, Harris County Republican Party Ballot Security Committee; Shelby Sterling, Texas Public Policy Foundation; Faith Bussey; Tom Glass; (*Registered, but did not testify*: Molly White, Conservative Republicans of Texas; Gerald Welty, Convention of States; Chad Ennis, Texas Public Policy Foundation; Robert L. Green, Travis County Republican Party Election Integrity Committee; Marcia Strickler, Wilco We Thee People; and 17 individuals)
- Against — (*Registered, but did not testify*: Heather Hurlbert, City of Corpus Christi; Guadalupe Cuellar, City of El Paso; Sally Bakko, City of Galveston; Jon Weist, City of Irving; Christine Wright, City of San Antonio; Stephanie Gomez, Common Cause Texas; Joanne Richards, Common Ground for Texans; Susan Schultz, League of Women Voters of Texas; Leonard Aguilar, Texas AFL-CIO; Glen Maxey and Jen Ramos, Texas Democratic Party; Carisa Lopez, Texas Freedom Network; Monty Wynn, Texas Municipal League; Stephanie Gharakhanian, Workers Defense Action Fund; and 30 individuals)
- On — (*Registered, but did not testify*: Scott O’Grady, Texans for Election Integrity; Beth Biesel, Texas Eagle Forum; Keith Ingram, Texas Secretary of State)
- BACKGROUND:** Concerns have been raised about the lack of uniformity in the process for home-rule municipalities to place initiatives before voters. Some have called for the Legislature to standardize the requirements for certain petitions in order to avoid the costly resubmission of a referendum to voters in multiple elections.

**DIGEST:** HB 782 would create certain requirements for the wording of ballot propositions, exempt religious organizations from the prohibition on circulating or submitting a recall election petition, specify procedures for review of ballot proposition language by the secretary of state, modify requirements for petitions, and specify requirements for mandamus actions, among other provisions.

**Proposition wording.** A ballot proposition prescribed by an authority ordering an election would have to substantially submit the question with such definiteness and certainty that the voters would not be misled.

If a court ordered a new election due to a contested election being declared void, a person could seek from the court a writ of mandamus to compel the governing body of a city to comply with the requirement that a ballot proposition must substantially submit the question with such definiteness and certainty that the voters are not misled.

**Religious organizations.** The bill would specify that the statute prohibiting a corporation or labor organization making a political contribution in connection with a recall election would not prohibit a religious organization from circulating or submitting a petition in connection with a recall election.

**Proposition review.** By the seventh day after the date on which a home-rule city published in the election order or by other means ballot proposition language proposing an amendment to the city charter or a voter-initiated initiative or referendum as requested by petition, a registered voter eligible to vote in the election could submit the proposition for review by the secretary of state.

The secretary of state would have to review the proposition by the seventh day after the date the secretary received the submission to determine whether the proposition was misleading or inaccurate. If the secretary of state determined that the proposition was misleading or inaccurate, the city would have to draft a proposition to cure the defects and give notice of the new proposition using the method of giving notice prescribed for notice of an election.

A proposition drafted by a city to cure the defects could be submitted to the secretary of state. If the secretary determined that the city had on its third attempt drafted a misleading or inaccurate proposition, the secretary would draft the ballot proposition.

**Mandamus.** In an action in a court of competent jurisdiction seeking a writ of mandamus to compel a city's governing body to comply with the definiteness and certainty requirement for ballot propositions, the court would have to make its determination without delay and could order the city to use ballot proposition language drafted by the court.

The court could award a plaintiff or relator who substantially prevailed in a mandamus action the party's reasonable attorney's fees, expenses, and court costs. Governmental immunity to suit would be waived and abolished only to the extent of the liability created by this provision.

Following a nonappealable judgment containing a finding by a court that a ballot proposition drafted by a city did not meet the definiteness and certainty requirements, the city would have to submit to the secretary of state for approval any proposition to be voted on at an election held by the city before the fourth anniversary of the court's finding. A city could not accept legal services relating to a proceeding without paying fair market value for those services.

**Petitions.** The illegibility of a signature on a petition submitted to a home-rule city would not be a valid basis for invalidating the signature if the required information provided with the signature legibly provided enough information to demonstrate that the signer was eligible to have signed the petition and signed the petition on or after the 180th day before the date the petition was filed.

The secretary of state would have to prescribe a form, content, and procedure for a petition. The secretary of state would have to adopt the required petition form by January 1, 2022.

A home-rule city that used a form different from the official form could not invalidate a petition because it did not contain information that the petition form failed to provide for or to require to be provided.

A person who circulated or submitted a petition would not have to use a form prescribed by the secretary of state or a home-rule city. A petition that did not use an officially prescribed form would have to contain the substantial elements required to be provided on the official form.

The bill would repeal the statute specifying that any requirements for the validity or verification of petition signatures prescribed by a home-rule city charter provision or a city ordinance would be effective only if the charter provision or ordinance was in effect September 1, 1985.

**Submission of certain petitions.** Home-rule cities with procedures requiring the governing body of the city to hold an election on receipt of a petition requesting the election that complied with the applicable requirements would have to determine the validity of a submitted petition, including by verifying the petition signatures, by the 30th day after the city received the petition. A city could not restrict who could collect petition signatures. These provisions would apply notwithstanding any city charter provision or other law.

The bill would specify that for a proposed charter amendment to be put to voters at an election, the number of registered voters of the municipality that would have to support the petition must be equal to at least 5 percent of the number of registered voters of the municipality on the date of the most recent election held throughout the municipality or 20,000, whichever number was the smaller.

The notice of the election for a proposed charter amendment in a newspaper of general circulation in the municipality would have to include a substantial copy of the proposed amendment in which language sought to be deleted by the amendment was bracketed and stricken through and language sought to be added by the amendment was underlined.

The bill would take effect September 1, 2021, and would apply only to a petition submitted on or after January 1, 2022.

- SUBJECT:** Establishing a computer science strategic advisory committee
- COMMITTEE:** Public Education — committee substitute recommended
- VOTE:** 12 ayes — Dutton, Allen, Allison, K. Bell, Bernal, Buckley, M. González, Huberty, K. King, Meza, Talarico, VanDeaver
- 0 nays
- 1 absent — Lozano
- WITNESSES:** For — Jennifer Bergland, Texas Computer Education Association; (*Registered, but did not testify:* Ray Sullivan, Amazon; Andrea Chevalier, Association of Texas Professional Educators; Daniel Womack, Dow, Inc.; Sebastien Laroche, Methodist Healthcare Ministries of South Texas, Inc.; Thomas Ratliff, Microsoft; Tracy Young, NAF; Naomi Miller, Northside ISD; Taylor Sims, Project Lead the Way; Hillary Lilly, San Antonio ISD; Grover Campbell, TASB; Servando Esparza, TechNet; Dena Donaldson, Texas AFT; Barry Haenisch, Texas Association of Community Schools; Mike Meroney, Texas Association of Manufacturers; Casey McCreary, Texas Association of School Administrators; Mark Terry, Texas Elementary Principals and Supervisors Association; Laura Atlas Kravitz, Texas State Teachers Association; Jarod Love, The College Board; Gilbert Zavala, The Greater Austin Chamber of Commerce; Thomas Parkinson)
- Against — None
- On — Carol Fletcher, The University of Texas and Texas Advanced Computing Center; (*Registered, but did not testify:* Eric Marin, Monica Martinez, and Tim Regal, Texas Education Agency)
- BACKGROUND:** Interested observers note that insufficient numbers of public school students are taking computer science courses to meet demand in the Texas job market for workers skilled in computer science and coding.

**DIGEST:** CSHB 3298 would require the Texas Education Agency to establish the computer science strategic advisory committee to develop and provide recommendations for increasing computer science instruction and participation in public schools.

The advisory committee would be composed of at least 11 members as specified in the bill. In appointing members, the governor, lieutenant governor, and House speaker would have to coordinate appointments to ensure that the six individuals they collectively appointed included:

- three public school educators certified in computer science;
- one parent or person standing in parental relation to a public school student;
- one person employed in the technology industry; and
- one faculty member of an institution of higher education.

The governor would appoint the presiding officer and the committee could hold public meetings.

By January 1 of each odd-numbered year, the advisory committee would have to submit to the governor and Legislature a report that included recommended changes to state law, including funding proposals and timelines for the implementation of the recommended changes. The report would have to include recommendations as specified in the bill to increase enrollment in high school computer science courses.

By December 31, 2022, the State Board of Education would have to review and revise, as needed, the essential knowledge and skills of the technology applications curriculum.

The bill would take immediate effect if finally passed by a two-thirds record vote of the membership of each house. Otherwise, it would take effect September 1, 2021.

**NOTES:** According to the Legislative Budget Board, the bill would have an estimated negative impact of about \$227,000 to general revenue through fiscal 2023.

- SUBJECT:** Establishing the Texas youth livestock show grant program and fund
- COMMITTEE:** Agriculture and Livestock — committee substitute recommended
- VOTE:** 7 ayes — Burns, Anderson, Bailes, Cole, Cyrier, Herrero, Rosenthal
- 0 nays
- 2 absent — Guillen, Toth
- WITNESSES:** For — Tommy Neal, Texas Youth Now; Caden Carver; Briana Hicks; Shane Meier; Jonathan Olivarez; Savay Sexton; (*Registered, but did not testify*: David Sinclair, Game Warden Peace Officers Association; John Kroll, State Fair of Texas; Elizabeth Choate, Texas Veterinary Medical Association; and seven others)
- Against — None
- On — (*Registered, but did not testify*: Billy Zanolini, Texas A&M Agrilife; Dan Hunter, Texas Department of Agriculture)
- BACKGROUND:** Concerns have been raised about the negative effect the COVID-19 pandemic has had on the youth livestock show industry in Texas, resulting in the cancellation of youth livestock shows and loss of money and scholarships for youth from the sale and showing of their animals. Some have called for the creation of a Texas youth livestock show grant program to ensure that meaningful opportunities for Texas youth involved in the raising and showing of livestock continue during and after the recovery from the pandemic.
- DIGEST:** CSHB 3959 would require the Texas Department of Agriculture (TDA) to establish and administer the Texas youth livestock show grant program. TDA would have to establish grant eligibility requirements, a grant application process, and encourage participation from livestock shows of varying sizes, types of entries, and needs.

Grants under the program could be used only to provide financial assistance to youth livestock shows in the state. To be eligible for a grant, a youth livestock show would have to be part of the youth livestock validation program and have been in existence for less than 10 years or be a regional youth livestock show.

**Show fund.** The bill would create the Texas youth livestock show fund as an account in the general revenue fund administered by TDA. Money in the account could be used only by the department to provide grants under the program and to promote and encourage donations to the fund. The fund would consist of:

- gifts, grants, including federal grants, and other donations received for the fund;
- interest earned on the investment of money in the fund; and
- any money appropriated to the fund by the legislature.

TDA could accept grants, gifts, or donations from any source that were made for the purposes of the grant program. Money from gifts, grants, or donations would have to be deposited in the Texas youth livestock show fund.

The bill would take effect September 1, 2021.

**NOTES:**

According to the Legislative Budget Board, the bill would have an estimated negative impact of about \$5.2 million to general revenue through fiscal 2023.

SUBJECT: Creating a criminal offense for financial abuse of elderly individuals

COMMITTEE: Criminal Jurisprudence — committee substitute recommended

VOTE: 9 ayes — Collier, K. Bell, Cason, Cook, Crockett, Hinojosa, A. Johnson,  
Murr, Vasut

0 nays

WITNESSES: For — Tim Morstad, AARP; Sherry Hubbard, TX Silver-Haired  
Legislature; (*Registered, but did not testify*: Frederick Frazier, Dallas  
Police Association/FOP716 State FOP Director; James Parnell, Dallas  
Police Association; David Sinclair, Game Warden Peace Officers  
Association; Ray Hunt, HPOU; Meredyth Fowler, Independent Bankers  
Association of Texas; Kaden Norton, LeadingAge Texas; Robert Howden,  
Texas Credit Union Association; Dallas Reed, Texas Municipal Police  
Association; John Chancellor, Texas Police Chiefs Association; Ramon  
Garza, This Is Texas Freedom Force; Julie Campbell; Vanessa  
MacDougal; Thomas Parkinson)

Against — None

On — (*Registered, but did not testify*: Kevin Fretwell and Kyle Swihart,  
Office of the Attorney General)

BACKGROUND: Concerns have been raised that elderly individuals are vulnerable to  
financial abuse and exploitation, and it has been proposed that a criminal  
offense for such actions would help protect them from being victims of  
these crimes.

DIGEST: CSHB 1156 would make it a criminal offense to knowingly engage in the  
financial abuse of an elderly individual, which would be someone 65  
years old or older.

**Financial abuse, exploitation.** Financial abuse would be defined as the  
wrongful taking, appropriation, obtaining, retention, or use of, or assisting  
in the wrongful taking, appropriation, obtaining, retention, or use of,

money or other property of another by any means, including by exerting undue influence. The term would include financial exploitation.

Financial exploitation would be defined as the wrongful taking, appropriation, obtaining, retention, or use of money or other property of another person by a person who had a relationship of confidence or trust with the other person. Financial exploitation could involve coercion, manipulation, threats, intimidation, misrepresentation, or the exerting of undue influence. The term would include:

- the breach of a fiduciary relationship, including the misuse of a durable power of attorney or the abuse of guardianship powers, that resulted in the unauthorized appropriation, sale, or transfer of another person's property;
- the unauthorized taking of personal assets;
- the misappropriation, misuse, or unauthorized transfer of another person's money from a personal or a joint account; and
- the knowing or intentional failure to effectively use another person's income and assets for the necessities required for the person's support and maintenance.

Persons would be considered to have a relationship of confidence or trust with another person if the person:

- was a parent, spouse, adult child, or other relative by blood or marriage;
- was a joint tenant or tenant in common with the other person;
- had a legal or fiduciary relationship with the other person;
- was a financial planner or investment professional who provided services to the other person; or
- was a paid or unpaid caregiver of the other person.

**Penalties.** Punishments for the offense would be based on the value of the property taken, appropriated, obtained, retained, or used. The offense would be a:

- class B misdemeanor (up to 180 days in jail and/or a maximum fine of \$2,000) if the value was less than \$100;
- class A misdemeanor (up to one year in jail and/or a maximum fine of \$4,000) if the value was \$100 or more, but less than \$750;
- state-jail felony (180 days to two years in a state jail and an optional fine of up to \$10,000) if the value was \$750 or more but less than \$2,500;
- third-degree felony (two to 10 years in prison and an optional fine of up to \$10,000) if the value was \$2,500 or more but less than \$30,000;
- second-degree felony (two to 20 years in prison and an optional fine of up to \$10,000) if the value was \$30,000 or more but less than \$150,000; and
- first-degree felony (life in prison or a sentence of five to 99 years and an optional fine of up to \$10,000) if the value was \$150,000 or more.

Individuals subject to prosecution under both this section and another section of the Penal Code could be prosecuted under either section or both sections.

The bill would take effect September 1, 2021.

- SUBJECT:** Prohibiting contracting with entity discriminating against firearm industry
- COMMITTEE:** State Affairs — committee substitute recommended
- VOTE:** 8 ayes — Paddie, Harless, P. King, Metcalf, Raymond, Shaheen, Slawson, Smithee
- 3 nays — Hernandez, Deshotel, Howard
- 2 absent — Hunter, Lucio
- WITNESSES:** For — Felisha Bull, Gun Owners of America; Tara Mica, National Rifle Association; Darren Lasorte, National Shooting Sports Foundation; Rick Briscoe, Open Carry Texas; Darryl Valdes, Texas State Rifle Association; and six individuals; (*Registered, but did not testify:* Angela Smith, Fredericksburg Tea Party; Andi Turner, Texas State Rifle Association; and 28 individuals)
- Against — (*Registered, but did not testify:* Matt Simpson, ACLU of Texas; Will Temple, Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association; Gyl Switzer, Texas Gun Sense; Joshua Houston, Texas Impact; and 11 individuals)
- On — Whitney Blanton, Texas Treasury and Safekeeping Trust Company
- BACKGROUND:** Operation Choke Point was a program operated by the U.S. Department of Justice and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation between 2013 and 2017, under which unofficial directives were issued to banks to restrict access to essential banking services for merchants in certain industries, including members of the firearms and ammunition industries. Concerns have been raised that although the program ended in 2017, leaders of banks and financial institutions have continued this discriminatory banking practice.
- DIGEST:** CSHB 2558 would prohibit a governmental entity from entering into a contract with a company for the purchase of goods or services unless the contract contained a written verification from the company that it:

- did not have a written or unwritten internal practice, policy, guidance, or directive that discriminated against a firearm entity or firearm trade association based solely on its status as a firearm entity or trade association; and
- would not discriminate during the term of the contract against a firearm entity or trade association based solely on its status.

To discriminate against a firearm entity or trade association would mean, with respect to the entity or trade association:

- refusing to engage in the trade of any goods or services;
- refraining from continuing an existing business relationship;
- terminating an existing business relationship; or
- otherwise expressing a prejudice against the entity or association.

The bill would apply only to a contract to be paid partly or wholly from public funds between a governmental entity and a company with at least 10 full-time employees that had a value of at least \$100,000. The bill would not apply to a governmental entity that determined the requirement was inconsistent with its constitutional or statutory duties related to the issuance of debt obligations or the deposit or investment of funds.

The bill would take effect September 1, 2021, and would apply only to a contract entered into on or after that date.

- SUBJECT:** Requiring DSHS to establish and maintain a sickle cell disease registry
- COMMITTEE:** Public Health — favorable, without amendment
- VOTE:** 10 ayes — Klick, Guerra, Allison, Coleman, Collier, Jetton, Oliverson, Price, Smith, Zwiener
- 0 nays
- 1 absent — Campos
- WITNESSES:** For — Heather Avant, Carol's Promise; Tonya Prince, Sickle Cell Association of Houston, Inc.; Titilope Fasipe, Texas Children's Hospital; (*Registered, but did not testify*: Tim Schauer, Community Health Choice; Eric Woomer, Global Blood Therapeutics; Bill Kelly, Mayor's Office, City of Houston; André Harris, Sickle Cell Association of Houston; David Reynolds, Texas Chapter of the American College of Physicians; Dan Finch, Texas Medical Association; Clayton Travis, Texas Pediatric Society)
- Against — None
- On — (*Registered, but did not testify*: Manda Hall, Department of State Health Services)
- BACKGROUND:** Some have suggested the need to establish a sickle cell disease registry to aid in the cure and treatment of sickle cell disease in the state.
- DIGEST:** HB 3673 would require the Department of State Health Services (DSHS) to establish and maintain a sickle cell disease registry including a record of individuals in the state who have been diagnosed with sickle cell disease and any other information deemed necessary by the executive commissioner of the Health and Human Services Commission (HHSC).
- Data.** The bill would require a health care facility to provide to DSHS data regarding individuals who have been diagnosed with sickle cell disease.

"Health care facility" would mean a licensed hospital or any other facility that provided diagnostic or treatment services to patients with sickle cell disease.

**Rules.** As soon as practicable after the bill's effective date, the executive commissioner of HHSC by rule would have to develop guidelines to:

- obtain information regarding individuals diagnosed with sickle cell disease from health care facilities;
- protect the confidentiality of the individuals under Occupations Code sec. 159.002, regarding the confidential communication in the physician-patient relationship; and
- ensure that the registry was developed in a manner consistent with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA).

**Reports.** The bill would require DSHS to publish an annual report to the Legislature containing information obtained from health care facilities.

DSHS, in cooperation with other sickle cell disease reporting organizations and research institutions, could publish reports the department determined were necessary to create and maintain the sickle cell disease registry.

The bill would take effect September 1, 2021.

**NOTES:**

According to the Legislative Budget Board, the bill would have a negative impact of about \$2 million to general revenue through fiscal 2022-23.

- SUBJECT:** City authority to add to certain public improvement districts
- COMMITTEE:** Urban Affairs — favorable, without amendment
- VOTE:** 7 ayes — Cortez, Holland, Bernal, Campos, Jarvis Johnson, Minjarez, Slaton
- 1 nay — Gates
- 1 absent — Morales Shaw
- WITNESSES:** For — Scott Joslove, Texas Hotel Association; (*Registered, but did not testify*: Allison Greer Francis, CHCS; Guadalupe Cuellar, City of El Paso; Jeff Coyle, City of San Antonio)
- Against — None
- BACKGROUND:** Local Government Code sec. 372.0035 allows certain municipalities to undertake projects that confer a special benefit on areas that share a common characteristic or use in public improvement districts composed only of hotels.
- It has been suggested that clarification is needed regarding municipal authority to add new hotels to an existing common characteristic public improvement district.
- DIGEST:** HB 3546 would allow the governing body of a municipality to add hotel property to an existing common characteristic public improvement district if a sufficient number of the record owners of the real property had consented to be included by signing the original petition to establish the district or by signing a petition or written consent to include the property in the district.
- The number of consenting owners would be considered sufficient if the record owners owned more than 60 percent of the appraised value of taxable real property liable for assessment in the district and:

- constituted more than 60 percent of all record owners of such property; or
- owned, in aggregate, more than 60 percent of the area of such property.

These requirements would replace the requirement that the property could have been included in the district without violating the requirements of the original petition to create the district regardless of whether the record owners of the property signed the original petition.

The bill would take immediate effect if finally passed by a two-thirds record vote of the membership of each house. Otherwise, it would take effect September 1, 2021.

- SUBJECT:** Allowing animal control authorities to manage aggressive dogs in ETJs
- COMMITTEE:** Urban Affairs — committee substitute recommended
- VOTE:** 9 ayes — Cortez, Holland, Bernal, Campos, Gates, Jarvis Johnson, Minjarez, Morales Shaw, Slaton
- 0 nays
- WITNESSES:** For — Frank Archuleta (*Registered, but did not testify*: Tammy Embrey, City of Corpus Christi; Daniel Collins, County of El Paso)
- Against — None
- BACKGROUND:** Concerns have been raised about the number of attacks on domestic animals and livestock by dangerous and aggressive dogs in the extraterritorial jurisdictions of cities, where animal control authorities often do not operate.
- DIGEST:** CSHB 100 would allow a municipal animal control authority to impound and manage dangerous and aggressive dogs in the municipality's extraterritorial jurisdiction (ETJ) if the authority received a notarized affidavit signed by at least two residents from different households in the ETJ requesting assistance from the authority and alleging that:
- dangerous or aggressive dogs have repeatedly attacked humans, domestic animals, or livestock within the ETJ; and
  - due to the presence of these dogs, the ETJ is an unsafe environment for humans, domestic animals, or livestock.
- For the purposes of the bill's provisions, an "aggressive dog" would mean a dog that made an unprovoked attack that caused bodily injury to a domestic animal or livestock and occurred in a place other than an enclosure reasonably secured to prevent the dog from leaving.
- CSHB 100 would apply only in an ETJ in which no animal control authority was authorized to operate or the operating animal control

authority did not provide for the impoundment or management of dangerous or aggressive dogs.

The bill would take immediate effect if finally passed by a two-thirds record vote of the membership of each house. Otherwise, it would take effect September 1, 2021.

SUBJECT: Requiring the UT Bureau of Economic Geology to conduct water research

COMMITTEE: Natural Resources — committee substitute recommended

VOTE: 9 ayes — T. King, Harris, Kacal, Larson, Paul, Price, Ramos, Walle,  
Wilson

0 nays

2 absent — Bowers, Lucio

WITNESSES: For — (*Registered, but did not testify*: Dana Harris, Austin Chamber of  
Commerce; Judith McGeary, Farm and Ranch Freedom Alliance; Frank  
Reilly, Texas Water Future Corporation; Julie Wheeler, Travis County  
Commissioners Court)

Against — (*Registered, but did not testify*: Mike Hodges, Texas Press  
Association)

On — Leah Martinsson, Texas Alliance of Groundwater Districts;  
Michael Young, UT Austin; (*Registered, but did not testify*: Kimberly  
Nygren, Texas Commission on Environmental Quality; John Dupnik,  
Texas Water Development Board)

BACKGROUND: Some have noted that water data collected by agencies and universities  
has not been coordinated or disseminated well, leading to missed  
opportunities to benefit from an aggregate analysis of the data.  
Suggestions have been made to require a single entity to coordinate and  
disseminate the data to address this issue.

DIGEST: CSHB 2095 would require the University of Texas Bureau of Economic  
Geology, in coordination with the Texas Water Development Board  
(TWDB), to make studies of water, including surface water, groundwater,  
soil moisture, and atmospheric moisture, to improve on data gaps and on  
the processing, analysis, modeling, and integration of water-related data.

The bureau would have to work to enhance, advance, or integrate models characterizing the water resources of the state, including:

- improving the techniques for multiscale modeling;
- expanding the use of artificial intelligence and machine learning;
- integrating multiscale modeling and machine learning;
- creating interoperable, modular, or coupled modeling strategies;
- improving access to and methods for achieving high-performance computing; and
- improving access to open-source, community-supported modeling.

In fulfilling these duties, the bureau would have to cooperate with TWDB and several state agencies, river authorities, water districts, and universities as listed in the bill. Such entities would have to provide data to the bureau on request and to the extent available. The bureau also could coordinate with federal agencies or private entities.

The bureau and TWDB would have to enter into a memorandum of understanding to define their powers, duties, and functions related to the provisions of this bill. Data and information compiled would be made available in accordance with other studies, investigations, and surveys under current law.

To the extent of any conflict or inconsistency, current laws describing the powers, duties, and functions of TWDB would prevail.

The bill would take effect September 1, 2021.

**NOTES:**

According to the fiscal note, the bill would cost about \$5.7 million in general revenue related funds in fiscal 2022-23 for the salaries and benefits of additional FTEs that would be needed by the University of Texas Bureau of Economic Geology, as well as equipment and other materials.

- SUBJECT:** Allowing El Paso County to impose additional vehicle registration fee
- COMMITTEE:** Transportation — favorable, without amendment
- VOTE:** 13 ayes — Canales, E. Thompson, Ashby, Bucy, Davis, Harris, Landgraf, Lozano, Martinez, Ortega, Perez, Rogers, Smithee
- 0 nays
- WITNESSES:** For — Sal Alonzo, El Paso County; Eduardo Calvo, El Paso Metropolitan Planning Organization; (*Registered, but did not testify:* Guadalupe Cuellar, City of El Paso; Adam Haynes, Conference of Urban Counties; Daniel Collins, County of El Paso; Thamara Narvaez, Harris County Commissioners Court; Ray Sullivan, HNTB; Tracey Borders, The Associated General Contractors of Texas Highway, Heavy, Utilities and Industrial Branch)
- Against — Terri Hall, Texas TURF, Texans for Toll-free Highways; Don Dixon; (*Registered, but did not testify:* Matt Long, Fredericksburg Tea Party of Texas)
- On — (*Registered, but did not testify:* Roland Luna and Clint Thompson, Texas Department of Motor Vehicles)
- BACKGROUND:** Transportation Code sec. 502.402 allows certain counties that border Mexico and have a population over 250,000 to impose an additional vehicle registration fee of up to \$10, the revenues of which are sent to the regional mobility authority located in the county.
- Some have called for allowing El Paso County to impose an additional vehicle registration fee, after receiving voter approval, to fund long-term priority transportation projects in the region.
- DIGEST:** HB 156 would allow certain counties to impose an additional vehicle registration fee of up to \$10 if approved by a majority of the qualified voters of the county at an election. The fee would be in addition to a fee imposed under Transportation Code sec. 502.402.

The bill would apply to certain counties that bordered Mexico and contained a municipality that unilaterally created a regional mobility authority (El Paso County).

Revenue from the fee would have to be sent to the regional mobility authority to fund long-term transportation projects that were consistent with purposes specified in the Texas Constitution and included in a plan approved by the metropolitan planning organization that served the county.

The fee could take effect and be removed in accordance with current law authorizing optional county registration fees. The fee would be collected for a vehicle when other fees were collected. A vehicle exempt from vehicle registration fees also could be registered without payment of the additional fee.

The Texas Department of Motor Vehicles would have to adopt rules to administer the additional registration fee.

The bill would take immediate effect if finally passed by a two-thirds record vote of the membership of each house. Otherwise, it would take effect September 1, 2021.

- SUBJECT:** Requiring minimum prison term for intoxication manslaughter
- COMMITTEE:** Corrections — favorable, without amendment
- VOTE:** 7 ayes — Murr, Allen, Burrows, Rodriguez, Sherman, Slaton, White
- 0 nays
- 2 absent — Bailes, Martinez Fischer
- WITNESSES:** For — Troy Benthall; Tammy Benthall; Susan Davis; (*Registered, but did not testify*: M. Paige Williams, for Dallas County Criminal District Attorney John Creuzot; James Parnell, Dallas Police Association; Jason Vaughn, Texas Young Republicans; John Wilkerson, Texas Municipal Police Association; Michael Farrington)
- Against — (*Registered, but did not testify*: Shea Place, Texas Criminal Defense Lawyers Association)
- On — Jorge Renaud, Latino Justice
- BACKGROUND:** Penal Code sec. 49.08 makes intoxication manslaughter a criminal offense. It is an offense to operate a motor vehicle in a public place, operate an aircraft, watercraft, or amusement ride, or to assemble a mobile amusement ride and be intoxicated and by reason of that intoxication cause the death of another by accident or mistake. Offenses are second-degree felonies (two to 20 years in prison and an optional fine of up to \$10,000).
- Code of Criminal Procedure art. 42A.401 establishes minimum terms of confinement when a judge grants community supervision to individuals convicted of offenses under Penal Code ch. 49. Under art. 42A.401(a)(5), for convictions of intoxication manslaughter, judges must require a term of confinement of not less than 120 days.
- Under Government Code sec. 508.145, in general, individuals are eligible for release on parole when their actual calendar time served plus good

conduct time equals one-fourth of their sentence imposed or 15 years, whichever is less.

Government Code sec. 508.147 requires parole panels to release an individual serving a prison term to a program called mandatory supervision if the individual has not been released on parole to when the actual calendar time the individual has served plus any accrued good conduct time equals the sentence. An individual released on mandatory supervision is considered to be released on parole. Under Government Code sec. 508.149(b) individuals may not be released to mandatory supervision if a parole panel determines that the inmate's accrued good conduct time is not an accurate reflection of the inmate's potential for rehabilitation, and the inmate's release would endanger the public.

Concerns have been raised that terms of confinement in some intoxication manslaughter cases have not been long enough to reflect the seriousness of this crime.

**DIGEST:**

HB 3598 would require a minimum term of five years in prison for intoxication manslaughter. If a judge granted an individual community supervision for intoxication manslaughter, the judge would have to impose a sentence of at least five years in prison. Judges granting community supervision would be authorized to reduce the five-year term to a minimum term of at least two years if the judge made a finding that the best interest of the community would be served and the public would not be harmed by the reduction. The finding would have to be entered in the record.

An individual serving a sentence in prison for intoxication manslaughter would not be eligible for release on parole or mandatory supervision until the actual calendar time served, without consideration of good conduct time, equaled five years.

The bill would take effect September 1, 2021, and would apply to offenses committed on or after that date.

- SUBJECT:** Facilitating veteran, active duty apprenticeship training program grants
- COMMITTEE:** Defense and Veterans' Affairs — favorable, without amendment
- VOTE:** 6 ayes — Raymond, Buckley, Cyrier, Lambert, Lopez, E. Morales
- 2 nays — Biedermann, Tinderholt
- 1 absent — Gervin-Hawkins
- WITNESSES:** For — David Lopez, IUEC Local 21; Ronnie Smitherman, Texas Building and Construction Trades Council; (*Registered, but did not testify:* Steven Albright, Associated General Contractors of Texas Highway Heavy Utility and Industrial Branch; Dana Harris, Austin Chamber of Commerce; Mitch Fuller, Texas VFW; Daniel Womack, Dow Inc.; Daniel Collins, El Paso County; Traci Berry, Goodwill Central Texas; John McCord, NFIB; Rene Lara, Texas AFL-CIO; J.D. Hale, Texas Association of Builders; Lori Henning, Texas Association of Goodwills; Mike Meroney, Texas Association of Manufacturers; Juan Ayala, Texas Mayors of Military Communities; Julie Wheeler, Travis County Commissioners Court; Molly Weiner, United Ways of Texas)
- Against — None
- BACKGROUND:** Education Code sec. 133.001(1) defines an “apprenticeship training program” as a training program that provides on-the-job training, preparatory instruction, supplementary instruction, or related instruction in a trade that has been certified as an apprenticable occupation by the Bureau of Apprenticeship Training of the U.S. Department of Labor.
- Interested parties have noted that the Texas Workforce Commission has had success through collaborations with community and technical colleges in providing occupational training to veterans, and the state should provide more incentives for nonprofit organizations to facilitate veteran and active duty military participation in apprenticeship training programs.

**DIGEST:** HB 1884 would require the Texas Workforce Commission (TWC) to develop and administer a program under which the commission could award grants to one or more nonprofit organizations that facilitated the participation in apprenticeship training programs of veterans and active duty military service members who were transitioning into civilian employment. The bill would assign “apprenticeship training program” the definition specified in Education Code sec. 133.001(1).

A grant under the program could be used only to recruit or assist veterans or active duty military service members transitioning into civilian employment to participate in an apprenticeship training program in Texas.

As soon as practicable after the bill’s effective date, TWC would have to adopt rules for the administration of the bill’s provisions, including rules for verifying that state funds awarded to a nonprofit organization were being used appropriately.

The bill would take effect September 1, 2021.

**NOTES:** According to the Legislative Budget Board, the bill would have an estimated negative impact of \$600,000 to general revenue through fiscal 2023.

- SUBJECT:** Permitting the propagation of breeder deer by cloning
- COMMITTEE:** Culture, Recreation and Tourism — favorable, without amendment
- VOTE:** 6 ayes — K. King, Burns, Clardy, Frullo, Krause, Martinez
- 2 nays — Israel, C. Morales
- 1 present not voting — Gervin-Hawkins
- WITNESSES:** For — Jason Abraham, Wildlife Reflections; Blake Russell; (*Registered, but did not testify*: Elise Richardson, Texas Deer Association)
- Against — Brian Treadwell; (*Registered, but did not testify*: Carrie Simmons, Texas Chapter of the Wildlife Society; John Shepperd, Texas Foundation for Conservation; David Yeates, Texas Wildlife Association; Susana Carranza; Idona Griffith; Suzanne Mitchell)
- On — John Silovsky, Texas Parks and Wildlife
- BACKGROUND:** Parks and Wildlife Code sec. 43.357 permits the Texas Parks and Wildlife Commission to regulate deer breeding.
- DIGEST:** HB 1781 would require the Texas Parks and Wildlife Commission (TPWC) to allow the holder of a valid deer breeder’s permit to engage in the business of breeding breeder deer, including the propagation of breeder deer by cloning. TPWC would be able to make regulations governing the propagation of breeder deer by cloning.
- The bill would take immediate effect if finally passed by a two-thirds record vote of the membership of each house. Otherwise, it would take effect September 1, 2021.

- SUBJECT:** Creating a court reminder program for criminal defendants
- COMMITTEE:** Judiciary and Civil Jurisprudence — favorable, without amendment
- VOTE:** 9 ayes — Leach, Davis, Dutton, Julie Johnson, Krause, Middleton, Moody, Schofield, Smith
- 0 nays
- WITNESSES:** For — Nick Hudson, American Civil Liberties Union of Texas; Koretta Brown, Texas Organizing Project; (*Registered, but did not testify:* Terra Tucker, Alliance for Safety and Justice; Traci Berry, Goodwill Central Texas; Noel Johnson, JPCA; Kathy Mitchell, Just Liberty; Nicholas Chu, Carlos Lopez, and Jama Pantel, Justices of the Peace and Constables Association of Texas; Penny Rayfield, OnShore Assembly; Joshua Massingill, Prison Fellowship Ministries; Matt Clark, Professional Bondsmen of Texas; Maggie Luna, Statewide Leadership Council; Ray Sullivan, Texas Association of Business; Lori Henning, Texas Association of Goodwills; Douglas Smith, Texas Criminal Justice Coalition; Amelia Casas, Texas Fair Defense Project; Nikki Pressley, Texas Public Policy Foundation; Julie Wheeler, Travis County Commissioners Court; and 17 individuals)
- Against — None
- BACKGROUND:** It has been suggested that court reminder programs could improve the overall efficiency of Texas courts, working as a cost-effective solution to the issues associated with a criminal defendant failing to appear at a scheduled court date.
- DIGEST:** HB 4293 would require the Office of Court Administration (OCA) to develop and make available to each county a court reminder program allowing the county to send a text message notifying criminal defendants of scheduled court appearances.
- Purposes.** The court reminder program's purposes would have to include reducing costs associated with defendants who failed to appear for a

scheduled court appearance, improving the efficiency of courts in Texas, reminding criminal defendants to appear at each scheduled court appearance, and reducing the number of criminal defendants confined in a county jail due solely to the defendant's failure to appear for a scheduled court appearance.

**Requirements.** The court reminder program would have to:

- be available to each county at no cost;
- comply with applicable state and federal laws requiring the consent of an individual before sending a reminder by text message;
- provide text message reminders for each court appearance of a defendant who had access to a device that could receive text messages and provided the court administrator with an operational phone number for the device;
- document each occurrence of a criminal defendant receiving a text message reminder;
- identify criminal defendants with scheduled court appearances who lacked access to devices that could receive text messages;
- document the number of criminal defendants who failed to appear at scheduled court appearances after being sent one or more text message reminders;
- include the technological capability, at the discretion of the local administrative judge, to provide additional information concerning scheduled court appearances, such as the location, available transportation, and procedures for defendants unable to attend an appearance;
- support partnerships with local law enforcement agencies, local governments, and local public defenders in accordance with the purposes of the program; and
- provide one or more publicly available websites through which criminal defendants could request text reminders.

**Establishment of county programs.** The judges of the county courts, statutory county courts, and district courts with jurisdiction over criminal cases in each county would be required to establish a court reminder program allowing the county to send text messages notifying criminal

defendants of scheduled court appearances. The judges could join the state program developed by OCA or could develop a county program that complied with the requirements for the state program.

**Municipal program.** OCA or the judges of the county courts, statutory county courts, and district courts with jurisdiction over criminal cases in each county could partner with municipalities and local law enforcement agencies to allow:

- individuals who received a citation and were released to receive text message reminders of scheduled court appearances; and
- criminal defendants in municipal court to receive text message reminders of scheduled court appearances.

Any municipality that entered such a partnership with OCA would be required to pay all of the costs of sending text reminders, including the costs of linking the municipal court database with that state court administrator database.

**Other provisions.** By September 1, 2022, OCA and the judges of the county courts, statutory county courts, and district courts with jurisdiction over criminal cases in each county would be required to develop and make available the court reminder program established under the bill.

The bill would take effect September 1, 2021.

**NOTES:**

According to the Legislative Budget Board, the bill would have a negative impact of about \$122,000 to general revenue through fiscal 2023.

- SUBJECT:** Modifying requirements for the school district property value study
- COMMITTEE:** Public Education — committee substitute recommended
- VOTE:** 11 ayes — Dutton, Lozano, Allison, K. Bell, Bernal, Buckley, Huberty, K. King, Meza, Talarico, VanDeaver
- 1 nay — Allen
- 1 absent — M. González
- WITNESSES:** For — Tommy Watson, Galveston Central Appraisal District; Cheryl Johnson, Galveston County Tax Office; (*Registered, but did not testify:* Elizabeth Nezda Orr, AT&T; Calvin Tillman; Al Zito)
- Against — None
- On — (*Registered, but did not testify:* Korry Castillo, Comptroller of Public Accounts; Leonardo Lopez and Eric Marin, Texas Education Agency)
- BACKGROUND:** Government Code sec. 403.302 requires the comptroller to conduct an annual study to determine the total taxable value of all property in each school district. If after conducting the study the comptroller determines that the local value for a school district is valid, the local value is presumed to represent taxable value for the district. In determining whether the local value for a district is valid, the comptroller must use a margin of error that does not exceed 5 percent, with certain exceptions.
- Under sec. 403.302(1), if after conducting the required study for a year the comptroller determines that a school district is an eligible school district, for that year and the following year the taxable value for the school district is the district's local value.
- Under sec. 403.3011(2), an "eligible school district" means a district for which the comptroller has determined the aggregate local value of all of the categories of property sampled by the comptroller is not less than 90

percent of the lower limit of the margin of error in the most recent study, among other requirements.

Some have suggested that the current margin of error in the school district property value study provides an incentive for appraisal districts to overestimate these values.

**DIGEST:** CSHB 1568 would raise the maximum margin of error for the comptroller's property value study under Government Code sec. 403.302 from 5 percent to 7.5 percent.

The bill also would amend the definition of "eligible school district" to lower the floor for aggregate local value of all the categories of property sampled by the comptroller to 85 percent, rather than 90 percent, of the lower limit of the margin of error.

The bill would apply only to the annual study conducted for a tax year beginning on or after January 1, 2022.

The bill would take immediate effect if finally passed by a two-thirds record vote of the membership of each house. Otherwise, it would take effect September 1, 2021.

**NOTES:** According to the Legislative Budget Board, the bill could result in taxable values being reduced and the related costs to the Foundation School Fund being increased through the operation of the school finance formulas.