

**Steering Committee:**  
Gary VanDeaver, Chairman  
Alma Allen, Vice Chairman

Angie Chen Button  
Liz Campos

Mary González  
Donna Howard

Ann Johnson  
Ken King  
Oscar Longoria

J. M. Lozano  
Toni Rose

John Smithee  
David Spiller

---

# HOUSE RESEARCH ORGANIZATION

---

## daily floor report

---

Sunday, May 11, 2025  
89th Legislature, Number 62  
Part Two

One bill is on the Major State Calendar and 93 bills are on the General State Calendar for Sunday, May 11, 2025, for second reading consideration. The House stands adjourned until 10 a.m. on Monday, May 12.

The list of bills included in Part One of the *Daily Floor Report* appears on the following page.

HRO bill analyses from previous daily House calendars and the supplemental House calendar can also be found on the Dynamic Floor Report: <https://hro-dfr.house.texas.gov/floor-reports>



Gary VanDeaver  
Chairman  
89(R) - 62

# HOUSE RESEARCH ORGANIZATION

## Daily Floor Report

Sunday, May 11, 2025

89th Legislature, Number 62

### Part 2

HB 3986 by Muñoz	Designating the Corporal Speedy Espericueta Memorial Highway	90
HB 4045 by C. Bell	Amending point allocation for low income housing tax credit applications	91
HB 4144 by Turner	Expanding benefit eligibility for retired firefighters and peace officers	93
HB 3911 by Darby	Authorizing certain contracts for plugging or replugging inactive wells	95
HB 3976 by Button	Requiring the waiving of renewal fees for certain professional licenses	98
HB 4473 by Canales	Requiring TxDOT to conduct a study of certain county road systems	100
HB 3425 by Capriglione	Prohibiting the disclosure of certain personal data in electronic messages	102
HB 3641 by C. Bell	Authorizing counties to regulate noise levels in certain residential areas	104
HB 3642 by Hefner	Designating memorial highways and bridges	105
HB 3475 by V. Perez	Authorizing the establishment of a public law school in El Paso County	107
HB 3509 by Anchía	Revising requirements for tourism public improvement districts	109
HB 3424 by Capriglione	Amending property tax procedures for heavy equipment dealers	111
HB 3383 by Canales	Authorizing certain local government contracting for water research	113
HB 4744 by Geren	Requiring market value appraisals in periodic reappraisal plans	114
HB 4531 by Bhojani	Providing for judicial review of a fraudulent conveyance of real property	115
HB 4539 by Johnson	Authorizing ophthalmologists to dispense certain dangerous drugs	118
HB 3159 by Darby	Creating a severance tax exemption for certain restimulation well products	120
HB 5228 by Ward Johnson	Requiring certain reporting policies, creating a study on traffic stop data	124
HB 5370 by Cortez	Amending interlocal contract requirements in certain municipalities	126
HB 4359 by Capriglione	Requiring the Sunset Advisory Commission to review school districts	127
HB 4398 by Garcia Hernandez	Requiring expedited permitting for affordable housing in certain cities	129
HB 4443 by Bhojani	Establishing a careers in energy-efficient technologies pilot program	130
HB 4466 by Hickland	Requiring the issuance of certain birth records without a fee	132
HB 3861 by Canales	Authorizing driver training course dismissals under certain circumstances	133
HB 3849 by Canales	Adding certain projects to the unified transportation program	135
HB 4240 by Vasut	Providing a tax exemption for charities supporting certain medical care	137
HB 4706 by Paul	Extending pedestrian laws to certain sidewalk users	138
HB 4685 by Leach	Amending fire safety inspection standards at public and private schools	140
HB 5354 by Leach	Requiring prosecutors to report information on caseloads and personnel	142
HB 5141 by Howard	Leasing certain state property to Travis County	144
HB 5686 by Metcalf	Creating the Montgomery County Management District No. 3	147
HB 3629 by Noble	Prohibiting registered sex offenders from serving as school board trustees	154

- SUBJECT:** Designating the Corporal Speedy Espericueta Memorial Highway
- COMMITTEE:** Transportation — committee substitute recommended
- VOTE:** 12 ayes — Craddick, M. Perez, Canales, Curry, Gámez, Harris Davila, Hefner, LaHood, Little, E. Morales, Patterson, Paul
- 0 nays
- 1 absent — C. Morales
- WITNESSES:** For — (*Registered, but did not testify:* Jennifer Szimanski, Combined Law Enforcement Associations of Texas (CLEAT); Ray Hunt, Houston Police Officers’ Union; John Wilkerson, Texas Municipal Police Association (TMPA); Steven Deline)
- Against — None
- BACKGROUND:** Some have suggested that a portion of U.S. Highway 83 should be renamed in honor of Corporal Jose Luis “Speedy” Espericueta Jr., who served with the Mission Police Department for 13 years before he was killed in the line of duty.
- DIGEST:** CSHB 3986 would designate a portion of U.S. Highway 83 in the municipal limits of Mission as the Corporal Speedy Espericueta Memorial Highway. This designation would be in addition to any other designation.
- Subject to provisions in the Transportation Code requiring a grant or donation of funds to cover the cost of the marker, the bill would require the Texas Department of Transportation to design and construct markers to indicate the designation with any other appropriate information and to erect a marker at each end of the highway and the appropriate intermediate sites along the highway.
- The bill would take effect September 1, 2025.

- SUBJECT:** Amending point allocation for low income housing tax credit applications
- COMMITTEE:** Intergovernmental Affairs — favorable, without amendment
- VOTE:** 9 ayes — C. Bell, Zwiener, Cortez, Garcia Hernandez, Leo Wilson, Luther, Rosenthal, Spiller, Tepper
- 1 nay — Lowe
- 1 absent — Cole
- WITNESSES:** For — Roger Arriaga, Texas Affiliation of Affordable Housing Providers (TAAHP); Erin Hahn, Texas Housers (*Registered, but did not testify*: Zach Faddis, AURA ATX; T. J. Patterson, City of Fort Worth; Jeff Miller, Disability Rights Texas; Amy Parham, Habitat for Humanity Texas; Todd Kercheval, Rural Rental Housing Association of Texas, Texas Association of Local Housing Finance Agencies (TALHFA); Felicity Maxwell, Texans For Housing; Stephanie Matthews, Texans for Reasonable Solutions; Emily Abeln, Leticia Van de Putte, Texas Affiliation of Affordable Housing Providers (TAAHP); Jenn Saenz, Texas Apartment Association; Frances Blake, Texas Association of Builders; Kristin Smith, The Fort Cavazos Community Habitat for Humanity; Greg Anderson; Alice Woods)
- Against — None
- BACKGROUND:** Government Code sec. 2306.6710 requires the Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs (TDHCA) to score and rank an application for a low income housing tax credit that satisfies threshold criteria according to certain prioritized criteria. This criteria includes, under subsection (b)(1)(B), quantifiable community participation with respect to development evaluated on the basis of a resolution concerning the development by an applicable local government authority and, under subsection (b)(1)(J), the level of community support for the application evaluated on the basis of a written statement from the state representative of the district containing the proposed development. Subsection (g) establishes that if no written statement from a state representative is

received for an application, TDHCA must use the maximum number of points that could have been awarded under subsection (b)(1)(J) to increase the maximum number of points that may be awarded under subsection (b)(1)(B).

Concerns have been raised that, due to the highly competitive nature of scoring applications for low income housing tax credits, a neutral statement from a state representative could disadvantage an application versus an application for which no statement was received.

DIGEST: HB 4045 would amend Government Code sec. 2306.6710(g) to require TDHCA to increase of maximum points under subsection (b)(1)(B) when a written statement from a state representative did not express support for or against the application as well as when no statement was received.

The bill would take effect September 1, 2025.

- SUBJECT:** Expanding benefit eligibility for retired firefighters and peace officers
- COMMITTEE:** Trade, Workforce & Economic Development — committee substitute recommended
- VOTE:** 9 ayes — Button, Talarico, K. Bell, Bhojani, Harris Davila, Lujan, Luther, Meza, Richardson
- 0 nays
- 2 absent — Longoria, Ordaz
- WITNESSES:** For — Joe Markham, Texas State Association of Fire Fighters (*Registered, but did not testify*: Jennifer Szimanski, Combined Law Enforcement Associations of Texas (CLEAT); James Parnell, Dallas Police Association; James Kershaw, Harris County Deputies' Organization FOP #39; Ray Hunt, Houston Police Officers' Union; Aidan Alvarado and Alberto Chapa, Laredo Firefighters Association; Brian Hawthorne, Sheriffs' Association of Texas; John Wilkerson, Texas Municipal Police Association)
- Against — (*Registered, but did not testify*: Nadia Islam, City of San Antonio)
- BACKGROUND:** Concerns have been raised that, despite firefighters having a higher predisposition to develop cancer, many retired firefighters who develop cancer after leaving service are not entitled to benefits and compensation comparable to current firefighters who develop cancer.
- DIGEST:** CSHB 4144 would require a governmental entity to provide to a firefighter or peace officer who retired from the entity a critical-illness supplemental income benefit or comparable health benefit plan coverage under the bill if the firefighter or peace officer was diagnosed with one of the following diseases or illnesses by the third anniversary of their retirement:
- certain cancers;

- non-Hodgkin's lymphoma;
- multiple myeloma;
- malignant melanoma;
- renal cell carcinoma;
- acute myocardial infarction; or
- stroke.

CSHB 4144 would establish the value of the supplemental income benefit as the lesser of the firefighter or peace officer's final yearly salary or a set amount of \$100,000. The bill would authorize a governmental entity to provide such a benefit in a lump sum payment or equal payments over three consecutive months.

By September 1st of each year ending in a five, the commissioner of workers' compensation would be required by rule to adjust the prescribed set amount, initially set at \$100,000, by an amount equal to the percentage increase, if any, in the Consumer Price Index for the preceding 10 years.

Additionally, the bill would not apply to a governmental entity that provided to a firefighter or peace officer who retired from the entity a health benefit plan that was comparable in coverage and cost to the retiree as the health benefit plan the entity provided to the retiree on the day before the retiree retired.

The bill would take effect September 1, 2025, and would apply only to a firefighter or peace officer who retired on or after January 1, 2026.

NOTES:

According to the Legislative Budget Board, the fiscal implications of the bill cannot be determined because the number of qualifying retired peace officers and firefighters is unknown.

- SUBJECT:** Authorizing certain contracts for plugging or replugging inactive wells
- COMMITTEE:** Energy Resources — committee substitute recommended
- VOTE:** 10 ayes — Darby, E. Morales, Craddick, Dyson, J. Garcia, Gates, Gerdes, Guerra, Reynolds, Rosenthal
- 0 nays
- 1 absent — Dean
- WITNESSES:** For — Todd Staples, Texas Oil and Gas Association; Schuyler Wight (*Registered, but did not testify*: Julie Range, Commission Shift Action; Kari Gibson, ConocoPhillips; Teddy Carter, Devon Energy; Colin Leyden, Environmental Defense Fund; Jimmy Carlile, Fasken Oil and Ranch; Cyrus Reed, Lone Star Chapter Sierra Club; Jay Allison, Milestone Environmental Services; Ben Sebree, National Association of Royalty Owners - Texas; Julie Moore, Oxy; Travis McCormick, Panhandle Producers & Royalty Owners Association; Ben Shepperd, Permian Basin Petroleum Association; Gabriela Perdichizzi, Texas Association of Business; Blake Roach, Texas Farm Bureau; Rebecca Edwards, Texas Impact; Ryan Paylor, Texas Independent Producers & Royalty Owners Association (TIPRO); Jason Modglin, Western Midstream)
- Against — None
- On — (*Registered, but did not testify*: Keith May, Railroad Commission of Texas)
- BACKGROUND:** Some have suggested that allowing operators to contract for the plugging of orphaned wells located on active leases could reduce environmental hazards, improve public safety, and lighten financial and logistical burdens on the state by accelerating the removal of orphaned wells from state responsibility without penalizing operators for stepping in.

DIGEST:

CSHB 3911 would authorize an operator in good standing with the Railroad Commission of Texas (RRC), who owned an interest in a current oil and gas lease or the mineral or surface estate of a tract with an orphaned well, to contract with an RRC approved well plugger to plug or replug the well. A well plugger who entered into such a contract would be required to:

- mail notice of the well plugger's intent to plug or replug the well to the operator of the well or the surface owner at the operator's or surface owner's address at least 30 days before the well was to be plugged or replugged; and
- plug or replug the well in accordance with RRC rules.

Operators or surface owners entering into such contracts would not assume responsibility for the physical operation and control of the orphaned well and would not be liable for any plugging or replugging responsibility or damages resulting from acts done or omitted to be done relating to plugging or replugging the well.

Paying money to or contracting with a well plugger under the bill would not be an admission that the person paying the money or contracting with the well plugger was obligated to plug or replug the well. Evidence that a person had paid money to or contracted with a well plugger would not be admissible against the person in a suit in which the person's obligation to plug or replug the well was an issue, and introducing such evidence would be a compulsory ground for mistrial.

The RRC could require a plugging or replugging operation conducted under the bill to be supervised by an RRC employee. A plugging or replugging operation conducted under the bill would not be considered complete until approved by the RRC.

The bill would not apply to surface owners on which an orphaned well was located if the surface owner was the operator who abandoned the well.

The bill would amend the Natural Resources Code to include any private person who had paid RRC to plug or replug abandoned wells among the

entities exempt from liability for any damages that could occur as a result of acts done or omitted to be done by them in a good-faith effort to carry out provisions relating to abandoned wells.

The bill would take effect September 1, 2025.

SUBJECT: Requiring the waiving of renewal fees for certain professional licenses

COMMITTEE: Higher Education — committee substitute recommended

VOTE: 10 ayes — Wilson, Howard, A. Davis, Lambert, V. Perez, Shaheen,  
Shofner, Tinderholt, VanDeaver, Ward Johnson

0 nays

1 absent — Lalani

WITNESSES: For — Sandra Ramirez, San Jacinto College; Laura Kincheloe, Texas Nurses Association (*Registered, but did not testify*: Joanna Warren, Educate Texas; Glen Austin, Greater Houston Partnership; Matt Creel, Stacy Schmitt, Opportunity Austin; Ray Martinez, Texas Association of Community Colleges; Kelle Kieschnick, Texas Business Leadership Council)

Against — None

On — Steve Bruno, TDLR

BACKGROUND: Some have suggested that waiving the renewal fees for certain high-demand professional licenses could help attract and retain high-quality instructors.

DIGEST: CSHB 3976 would require a state agency that issued certain licenses by rule to waive the license renewal fee for a faculty member or adjunct professor at a higher education institution who provided instruction in the field for which the license was required. The bill would apply only to a license to practice as:

- a registered nurse or vocational nurse;
- a state-licensed pharmacist;
- a medical radiologic technologist;
- a respiratory care practitioner;
- an engineer;

- a journeyman or master plumber;
- an air conditioning and refrigeration contractor;
- a journeyman or master electrician;
- a public school educator; or
- a bilingual education or special language program teacher.

The bill would take effect September 1, 2025.

NOTES:

According to the Legislative Budget Board, the bill would have a negative impact of about \$2.2 million to general revenue related funds through the biennium.

SUBJECT: Requiring TxDOT to conduct a study of certain county road systems

COMMITTEE: Transportation — favorable, without amendment

VOTE: 10 ayes — Craddick, M. Perez, Curry, Gámez, Harris Davila, Hefner, LaHood, E. Morales, Patterson, Paul

1 nay — Little

2 absent — Canales, C. Morales

WITNESSES: For — (*Registered, but did not testify*: Adam Haynes, Conference of Urban Counties; Jay Crossley, Farm & City; Santiago Franco, Harris County Commissioners Court; Larry Woolley, Johnson County and County Judges & Commissioners Association of Texas; Steven Deline)

Against — None

On — (*Registered, but did not testify*: Brianne Glover, Texas A&M Transportation Institute)

BACKGROUND: Concerns have been raised that the construction and maintenance of county roads are governed by disparate administrative systems that differ in approaches and efficiencies.

DIGEST: HB 4473 would require the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT), in consultation with the Texas A&M Transportation Institute, to conduct a study of the construction and maintenance of county roads and bridges under the five systems of county road administration, including:

- the road supervisor system under statutory provisions regarding general county authority relating to roads and bridges;
- the ex officio road commissioner system;
- the road commissioner system;
- the road superintendent system; and
- the county road department system.

The bill would require the study to:

- provide an inventory of the system of county road administration adopted by each county in Texas and the date on which it was adopted;
- provide, for the 20 most populous counties in each of the five systems and after adjusting for inflation, the average and median cost of construction and maintenance of county roads and an average per-mile cost comparison of completed road projects among the five systems during the most recent 25-year period or the period since adoption of the county's current system.
- rank, from most to least economical for taxpayers, the systems of county road administration for the construction and maintenance of county roads, and describe the reasoning behind each rank placement.

HB 4473 would require TxDOT, by December 1, 2026, to submit a written report to the governor, the lieutenant governor, the speaker of the House, and each legislative committee with jurisdiction over transportation issues, which would include the study results and any recommendations.

The bill would expire January 1, 2027.

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, 2025.

SUBJECT: Prohibiting the disclosure of certain personal data in electronic messages

COMMITTEE: Criminal Jurisprudence — favorable, without amendment

VOTE: 11 ayes — Smithee, Wu, Bowers, Cook, J. Jones, Little, Louderback,  
Money, Moody, Rodríguez Ramos, Virdell

0 nays

WITNESSES: For — (*Registered, but did not testify*: Jennifer Tharp, Comal County Criminal District Attorney; Chris Jones, Combined Law Enforcement Associations of Texas; Ray Hunt, Houston Police Officers' Union; Brian Hawthorne, Sheriffs' Association of Texas; John Wilkerson, Texas Municipal Police Association (TMPA); Scott Rubin, Texas Police Chiefs Association)

Against — None

On — (*Registered, but did not testify*: Thomas Parkinson)

BACKGROUND: Penal Code 36.06 (a-1) provides that a person commits an offense if the person posts on a publicly accessible website the residence address or telephone number of an individual the actor knows is a public servant or a member of a public servant's family or household with the intent to cause harm or a threat of harm to the individual or a member of the individual's family or household in retaliation for or on account of the service or status of the individual as a public servant.

Penal Code 36.06 (d) provides that it is prima facie evidence of the intent to cause harm or a threat of harm to an individual the person knows is a public servant or a member of a public servant's family or household if the actor:

- receives a written demand from the individual to not disclose the address or telephone number for reasons of safety; and
- either fails to remove the address or telephone number from the publicly accessible website within a period of 48 hours after receiving the demand or reposts the address or telephone number

on the same or a different publicly accessible website, or makes the information publicly available through another medium, within a period of four years after receiving the demand, regardless of whether the individual is no longer a public servant.

Concerns have been raised that existing statutory bans on “doxing”—the public disclosure of an individual's personal information without consent—may not cover electronic messaging. Some have proposed expanding these laws to explicitly include such forms of communication.

DIGEST:

HB 3425 would make conforming changes throughout Penal Code 36.06 (a-1) and (d) to establish that a person who disclosed through an electronic communication the residence address or telephone number of an individual with the intent to cause harm or a threat of harm to the individual or a member of the individual’s family or household committed an offense and the posting of such information on a publicly accessible website as prima facie evidence.

The bill would take effect September 1, 2025, and would apply only to an offense committed on or after the bill’s effective date.

SUBJECT: Authorizing counties to regulate noise levels in certain residential areas

COMMITTEE: Intergovernmental Affairs — committee substitute recommended

VOTE: 11 ayes — C. Bell, Zwiener, Cole, Cortez, Garcia Hernandez, Leo Wilson, Lowe, Luther, Rosenthal, Spiller, Tepper

0 nays

WITNESSES: For — (*Registered, but did not testify*: Melissa Shannon, Bexar County Commissioners Court; Joshua Sanders, City of Houston; Adam Haynes, Conference of Urban Counties; Josie Castro Garcia, Dallas County; Elisa M. Tamayo, El Paso County; Santiago Franco, Harris County Commissioners Court; James Kershaw, Harris County Deputies' Organization FOP #39; Ray Hunt, Houston Police Officers' Union; John Wilkerson, Texas Municipal Police Association (TMPA); Julie Wheeler, Travis County Commissioners Court)

Against — None

BACKGROUND: Concerns have been raised that counties are unable to regulate noise violations in residential areas located in unincorporated areas outside of municipal enforcement.

DIGEST: CSHB 3641 would authorize a commissioners court of a county to regulate the level of noise emanating from a residence or a tract of land located in a residential area in the unincorporated area of the county. A commissioners court would not be authorized to regulate the use of fireworks.

A person would commit an offense if the person on two or more occasions violated an order adopted under the bill. An offense under the bill would be a class C misdemeanor (maximum fine of \$500).

The bill would take effect September 1, 2025.

- SUBJECT:** Designating memorial highways and bridges
- COMMITTEE:** Transportation — committee substitute recommended
- VOTE:** 12 ayes — Craddick, M. Perez, Curry, Gámez, Harris Davila, Hefner, LaHood, Little, C. Morales, E. Morales, Patterson, Paul
- 0 nays
- 1 absent — Canales
- WITNESSES:** For — (*Registered, but did not testify:* Ray Hunt, Houston Police Officers’ Union; Clay Taylor, Texas DPS Officers Association; John Wilkerson, Texas Municipal Police Association (TMPA); Steven Deline)
- Against — None
- BACKGROUND:** Some have suggested designating portions of the state highway system as memorial highways and bridges to honor the lives of Petty Officer Billy Wayne Machen, Molly Mullens, and Highway Patrol Trooper Kevin Alexis Ramirez Vasquez.
- DIGEST:** CSHB 3642 would designate certain portions of the state highway system as the following memorial highways and bridges:
- the Farm-to-Market Road 852 bridge crossing Lake Gilmer in Upshur County, as the Petty Officer Billy Machen Memorial Bridge, in addition to any other designation;
  - the portion of U.S. Highway 287 in Wilbarger County between its intersection with County Road 111 and County Road 132 East as the Molly Mullens Mile, in addition to any other designation; and
  - the portion of State Highway 302 in Ector County between its intersection with Farm-to-Market Road 2019 and the Ector-Winkler County line as the Trooper Kevin Ramirez Vasquez Memorial Highway.

Subject to a grant or donation of funds, the bill would require the Texas Department of Transportation to:

- design and construct markers indicating the designations as the Petty Officer Billy Machen Memorial Bridge, the Molly Mullens Mile, and the Trooper Kevin Ramirez Vasquez Memorial Highway, as applicable, and any other appropriate information;
- erect a marker at each end of the Petty Officer Billy Machen Memorial Bridge; and
- erect a marker at each end of the Molly Mullens Mile and the Trooper Kevin Ramirez Vasquez Memorial Highway, and at appropriate intermediate sites along each highway.

The bill would take effect September 1, 2025.

- SUBJECT:** Authorizing the establishment of a public law school in El Paso County
- COMMITTEE:** Higher Education — favorable, without amendment
- VOTE:** 10 ayes — Wilson, Howard, A. Davis, Lalani, Lambert, V. Perez, Shaheen, Shofner, VanDeaver, Ward Johnson
- 1 nay — Tinderholt
- WITNESSES:** For — (*Registered, but did not testify:* Tracy Johnson, DFER TX; Elisa M. Tamayo, El Paso County; Amanda Garcia, Texas AFT-AAUP; and 6 individuals)
- Against — None
- On — Heather Wilson, The University of Texas at El Paso
- BACKGROUND:** Some have suggested that the establishment of a public law school in El Paso would provide increased access to legal education, help address local legal needs, and contribute to the region’s economic growth.
- DIGEST:** HB 3475 would authorize a university system’s governing board to establish and operate, as a professional school of the system, a school of law in El Paso County as the governing board considered appropriate. In administering the law school, the governing board could prescribe courses leading to customary degrees offered at other leading American schools of law and could award those degrees. The governing board could assign responsibility for the management of the law school to a general academic teaching institution in the university system. The governing board could accept and administer gifts and grants from any public or private person or entity for the use and benefit of the law school.
- The bill would require a governing board that intended to establish a law school in El Paso County to notify the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB), which in turn would have to provide a statement regarding that intention on its website and provide the other governing boards with a reasonable opportunity to notify THECB of an

intent to establish such a law school. If THECB received more than one notice, it would have to determine which governing board could establish the law school.

Before a governing board established such a law school, the board would have to request THECB to prepare a feasibility study to determine the actions the university system would have to take to obtain accreditation of the law school. THECB would have to deliver a copy of the study to the governing board and the chair of each relevant standing committee.

The university system governing board that established an El Paso law school could acquire, construct, improve, renovate, enlarge, or equip property, buildings, structures, or other facilities for the law school to be financed by the issuance of bonds. Such bonds could not amount to more than \$40 million in an aggregate principal amount.

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, 2025.

NOTES: The Legislative Budget Board estimates that there would be costs related to the establishment of the law school beginning in fiscal year 2028.

SUBJECT: Revising requirements for tourism public improvement districts

COMMITTEE: Intergovernmental Affairs — committee substitute recommended

VOTE: 10 ayes — C. Bell, Zwiener, Cole, Cortez, Garcia Hernandez, Leo Wilson, Luther, Rosenthal, Spiller, Tepper

1 nay — Lowe

WITNESSES: For — Justin Bragiel, Texas Hotel & Lodging Association (*Registered, but did not testify*); Jake Anderson, City of Dallas; T. J. Patterson, City of Fort Worth)

Against — None

BACKGROUND: Local Government Code sec. 372.0035 authorizes certain municipalities to undertake a project that confers a special benefit on areas that share a common characteristic or use. Such a project can only be undertaken under the section for the purpose of special supplemental services for improving and promoting a public improvement district solely composed of territory in which the only businesses are hotels. Such a district created after September 1, 2019, may undertake a project under the section only for advertising, promotion, or recruitment directly related to hotels. The section also limits its applicability to certain districts based on a varying minimum number of rooms used for sleeping in the district's hotels, depending on the population and, if applicable, the location of the establishing municipality.

Local Government Code sec. 372.005 establishes that a petition to establish a public improvement district described by sec. 373.0035 is sufficient only if signed by the record owners of taxable real property liable for assessment under the proposal who constitute:

- more than 60 percent of the appraised value of taxable real property liable for assessment under the proposal; and

- more than 60 percent of all record owners of taxable real property, or more than 60 percent of the area of all taxable real property that is liable for assessment under the proposal.

Some have suggested that current statute regulating tourism public improvement districts composed of hotels should be clarified in certain areas.

DIGEST:

HB 3509 would revise Local Government Code sec. 372.005 to require that the petition be signed by qualified petitioners who represented:

- more than 60 percent of the appraised value of hotel property liable for assessment under the proposal; and
- more than 60 percent of hotels or more than 60 percent of the area of real property that would be liable for assessment under the proposal.

The bill would define a qualified petitioner as a person employed in a management position responsible for hotel operations who provided a written statement that the person was authorized to enter into a binding agreement concerning hotel operations on behalf of the owner. The written statement would have to be included in a petition to create a district under the bill.

HB 3509 would repeal provisions limiting project authorization under Local Government Code sec. 372.0035 to certain municipalities based on population and location, as well as certain public improvement districts based on the number of hotel sleeping rooms. The bill also would repeal the provision restricting the purposes for which a municipality could undertake a project under that section.

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, 2025.

- SUBJECT:** Amending property tax procedures for heavy equipment dealers
- COMMITTEE:** Ways & Means — committee substitute recommended
- VOTE:** 13 ayes — Meyer, Martinez Fischer, Bernal, Button, Capriglione, Gervin-Hawkins, Hickland, Muñoz, Noble, V. Perez, Troxclair, Turner, Vasut  
0 nays
- WITNESSES:** For — Ed Noonan, United Rentals (*Registered, but did not testify*: Mark Vane, HB Strategies)  
Against — (*Registered, but did not testify*: Steven Deline)
- BACKGROUND:** Tax Code sec. 23.1242 requires heavy equipment owners to assign a unit property tax to each item of heavy equipment sold, leased, or rented from a dealer’s inventory. The unit property tax of each item is equal to the sales price or the monthly rental or lease payment of the item multiplied by the unit property tax factor. On or before the 20th day of each month, the owner of the equipment is required to deposit the total amount of unit property tax assigned to all items of heavy equipment sold, leased, or rented from the dealer’s inventory in the preceding month with the county tax assessor-collector. The collector is required to deposit the money to the credit of the owner’s escrow account for the prepayment of property taxes.  
  
Some have suggested that property tax compliance procedures for heavy equipment dealers should be modernized and streamlined.
- DIGEST:** CSHB 3424 would require a heavy equipment owner’s unit property tax payments under Tax Code sec. 23.1242 to be paid quarterly, rather than monthly. Not later than December 15th of each year, the county tax assessor-collector would have to provide written notice to each owner for whom the collector maintained an escrow account for of the factor used to calculate the unit property tax for the following tax year for each location in which the owner’s heavy equipment inventory was located.

CSHB 3424 would require a dealer to complete a heavy equipment inventory tax form each quarter, rather than each month. The bill would require the dealer to include the aggregate amount received for sold, leased, or rented heavy equipment on the form, rather than reporting the amount for each item. The dealer also could aggregate the amount of unit property tax assigned to items of heavy equipment. The bill would remove the requirement for the dealer to include the reason no unit property tax was assigned if applicable.

The bill would require the dealer to file the inventory statement with the collector each quarter, rather than each month.

The bill would remove the requirement for a dealer to file a copy of the statement with the chief appraiser. Instead, the dealer would be required to retain complete and accurate records documenting the disposition of each item of heavy equipment sold, leased, or rented for at least four years from the date of the item's disposition, which the chief appraiser or collector could examine.

CSHB 3424 would specify that the person who acquired the business or assets of an owner could use the same unit property tax factor that the owner who owed the current year tax would use when paying the current year tax.

The bill would take effect January 1, 2026.

- SUBJECT:** Authorizing certain local government contracting for water research
- COMMITTEE:** Intergovernmental Affairs — favorable, without amendment
- VOTE:** 11 ayes — C. Bell, Zwiener, Cole, Cortez, Garcia Hernandez, Leo Wilson, Lowe, Luther, Rosenthal, Spiller, Tepper
- 0 nays
- WITNESSES:** For — (*Registered, but did not testify:* Louie Sanchez, City of Denton; Ariel Traub, City of Garland, Texas; Joshua Sanders, City of Houston; Nadia Islam, City of San Antonio; Rick Thompson, County Judges and Commissioners Association of Texas; Byron Ryder, Leon County Judge and President of County Judges and Commissioners Association of Texas; Reggie Loeffler, Mason; Christine Yanas, Methodist Healthcare Ministries; Kirk Frye, Parmer County; Sydney Murphy, Polk County; Cade Tredway, Texas Rural Water Association; Cicely Kay, Travis County Commissioners Court)
- Against — None
- BACKGROUND:** Concerns have been raised that some local governments are uncertain about whether they have the clear legal authority to enter into interlocal agreements for joint research and planning activities related to water resources.
- DIGEST:** HB 3383 would authorize a local government to contract with another local government, the state, or the federal government to jointly participate in research or planning activities related to water resources.
- 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, 2025.

- SUBJECT:** Requiring market value appraisals in periodic reappraisal plans
- COMMITTEE:** Ways & Means — favorable, without amendment
- VOTE:** 11 ayes — Meyer, Martinez Fischer, Bernal, Button, Capriglione, Gervin-Hawkins, Hickland, Muñoz, Noble, V. Perez, Turner
- 1 nay — Vasut
- 1 absent — Troxclair
- WITNESSES:** For — (*Registered, but did not testify:* Brent South, Texas Association of Appraisal Districts; Ryan Chismark, Texas Association of Property Tax Professionals)
- Against — Paul Johnson (*Registered, but did not testify:* Russell Hayter)
- On — (*Registered, but did not testify:* Allison Mansfield, Comptroller of Public Accounts)
- BACKGROUND:** Concerns have been raised that some appraisal district boards of directors have elected to adopt reappraisal plans that direct the chief appraiser to appraise property at a standard other than market value.
- DIGEST:** HB 4744 would require the biennial plan for the periodic reappraisal of all properties in an appraisal district to be developed according to the requirement that all taxable property be appraised at its market value as determined by the application of generally accepted appraisal methods and techniques.
- The bill would take effect September 1, 2025.

- SUBJECT:** Providing for judicial review of a fraudulent conveyance of real property
- COMMITTEE:** Trade, Workforce & Economic Development — favorable, without amendment
- VOTE:** 9 ayes — Button, Talarico, K. Bell, Bhojani, Harris Davila, Lujan, Luther, Meza, Richardson
- 0 nays
- 2 absent — Longoria, Ordaz
- WITNESSES:** For — Kathy Green, AARP Texas; John Warren, County and District Clerks Association; Aaron Day, Texas Land Title Association  
(*Registered, but did not testify:* Joshua Sanders, City of Houston; Aaron Taliaferro, Tarrant County Administrator's Office; Frances Blake, Texas Association of Builders; Jim Grace, The National Rental Home Council; Steven Deline)
- Against — None
- BACKGROUND:** Concerns have been raised regarding a process in Texas for property owners to challenge fraudulent and forged documents used to wrongfully claim title to property. Some have suggested creating a process to reduce confusion about the rightful ownership of the property.
- DIGEST:** HB 4531 would authorize an owner of real property who had reason to believe that a document or instrument in the real property records purporting to convey title to or an interest in the real property was fraudulent to file a motion with the applicable district clerk to which the movant had attached a copy of the document or instrument and:
- documentary evidence of a person's conviction of an offense under certain titles of the Penal Code with respect to the document or instrument; or
  - the filing and recording of an uncontroverted owner's affidavit and certificate of mailing.

HB 4531 would authorize an owner of real property to file an affidavit and certificate of mailing that substantially complied with forms provided by the bill in the real property records of the county in which a document or instrument purporting to convey title to or an interest in the real property was recorded. A property owner who filed such an affidavit would be required to notify the grantor and grantee of the purported conveyance. If the grantor or grantee did not, within 120 days of the affidavit being filed, file a controverting affidavit, the property owner could bring a motion for a district court ruling as provided by the bill.

A district judge with jurisdiction over real property matters in the county where the applicable document or instrument was recorded would have jurisdiction over a motion under the bill. The district court could rule on the motion based solely on a review of the attached document or instrument, the attached documentary evidence, and any relevant public records without hearing any testimonial evidence. The court's review could be made ex parte without delay or notice of any kind. An appellate court would be required to expedite review of the district court's finding.

A document or instrument that purported to convey title to or an interest in real property would be presumed fraudulent if a person had been convicted of an offense under titles of the Penal Code governing offenses against property and public administration for conduct with respect to the document or instrument, or if the document or instrument was the subject of an owner's affidavit an certificate of mailing was filed and recorded and a controverting affidavit was not timely filed under HB 4531.

HB 4531 would establish that a bona fide purchaser or a mortgagee for value, or a purchaser's successor or assign, could rely conclusively on a determination in a district court's finding of fact and conclusion of law recorded under the bill that a document or instrument did not convey title to or an interest in the real property described in the document or instrument.

HB 4531 would provide model forms for a motion, affidavit, district court finding, and certificate of mailing under the bill.

The bill would take effect September 1, 2025.

NOTES: According to the Legislative Budget Board, the fiscal implications of the bill cannot be determined due to a lack of case-level data.

- SUBJECT:** Authorizing ophthalmologists to dispense certain dangerous drugs
- COMMITTEE:** Public Health — committee substitute recommended
- VOTE:** 12 ayes — VanDeaver, Campos, Collier, Cunningham, Frank, Johnson, J. Jones, Olcott, Pierson, Schofield, Shofner, Simmons
- 0 nays
- 1 absent — Bucy
- WITNESSES:** For — Sanjiv Kumar, Texas Society of Eye Physicians and Surgeons (*Registered, but did not testify*: Daniel Gonzalez, Texas Academy of Family Physicians; Michelle Romero, Clayton Stewart, Texas Medical Association; Bobby Hillert, Texas Orthopaedic Association; Clayton Travis, Texas Pediatric Society; Rachael Reed, Texas Society of Eye Physicians and Surgeons; Steven Deline)
- Against — None
- On — (*Registered, but did not testify*: Stephen Carlton, Texas Medical Board)
- BACKGROUND:** Occupations Code sec. 413.001 defines a "dangerous drug" as a device or a drug that is unsafe for self-medication and that is not included in Schedules I through V or Penalty Groups 1 through 4 of the Texas Controlled Substances Act. This provision also defines "dispense" to mean to prepare, package, compound, or label a dangerous drug in the course of professional practice for delivery under the lawful order of a practitioner to an ultimate user or the user's agent.
- Concerns have been raised that ophthalmologists may face challenges securing timely access to certain low-volume medications for patients following treatment, due to limited pharmacy stock and delivery delays.
- DIGEST:** CSHB 4539 would authorize a physician specializing in ophthalmology to dispense to the physician's patients commercially sealed and packaged

nonsystemic dangerous drugs in drop or ointment form for initial, post-examination, post-procedural, or emergent ophthalmic treatment. The bill would authorize a physician to charge and receive reimbursement for stocking, storing, and labeling a nonsystemic dangerous drug dispensed without obtaining a license to practice pharmacy. A physician who dispensed nonsystemic dangerous drugs would be required to:

- comply with each labeling provision under statutory provisions relating to pharmacy and pharmacists applicable to that class of drugs; and
- ensure compliance with packaging and recordkeeping provisions applicable to that class of drugs.

For the purposes of the bill, “dangerous drug” and “dispense” would have the meanings assigned by Occupations Code sec. 413.001.

CSHB 4539 would specify that the Texas Pharmacy Act would not prevent a practitioner from dispensing dangerous drugs to a patient as provided by the bill.

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, 2025.

SUBJECT: Creating a severance tax exemption for certain restimulation well products

COMMITTEE: Ways & Means — committee substitute recommended

VOTE: 11 ayes — Meyer, Martinez Fischer, Bernal, Button, Capriglione,  
Hickland, Muñoz, Noble, V. Perez, Troxclair, Vasut

1 nay — Turner

1 absent — Gervin-Hawkins

WITNESSES: For — Travis McCormick, Panhandle Producers and Royalty Owners Association; Dean Foreman, Texas Oil and Gas Association; Tricia Davis, Texas Royalty Council; Ed Longanecker, TIPRO (*Registered, but did not testify*: Amy Maxwell Biard, Aethon Energy; Gil Bujano, Bpx energy; Julie Williams, Chevron; Mark Vane, Civitas Resources; Kari Gibson, ConocoPhillips; Royce Poinsett, Coterra; Teddy Carter, Devon Energy; Jim Cohn, EP Energy E&P Company, LLC, Protégé Energy III LLC, Verdun Oil EF II LLC, Verdun Oil EF III LLC, Verdun Oil & Gas LLC; Samantha Omev, ExxonMobil; Chris Hosek, Halliburton; Greg Macksood, Hilcorp Energy; Jay Allison, Milestone Environmental Services; Craig Chick, Murphy Oil Corporation; Julie Moore, Oxy; Michael D. Lozano, Permian Basin Petroleum Association; Trace Finley, Port of Corpus Christi Authority; Jay Brown, Repsol; Karr Ingham, Texas Alliance of Energy Producers; Robert Wood, Texas Association of Manufacturers; Barry Smitherman, Texas Geothermal Energy Alliance; Trace Finley, Texas Independent Produced Water Association)

Against — (*Registered, but did not testify*: Steven Deline; Amy Frazier)

On — (*Registered, but did not testify*: Shannon Brandt and Lynn Pham, Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts)

BACKGROUND: Some have suggested that creating a strategic incentive framework for oil and gas operators to restimulate previously tapped wells could help extend the productive life of existing infrastructure and improve production from declining shale wells.

**DIGEST:** CSHB 3159 would exempt hydrocarbons produced from a restimulation well that was certified by the Railroad Commission of Texas (RRC) from oil and gas production taxes until the earlier of:

- the last day of the 36th consecutive month following the month in which the well first produced hydrocarbons after a restimulation treatment was completed; or
- the date on which the cumulative amount of taxes exempted and any amount credited back under the bill equaled the lesser of the restimulation costs or \$750,000.

**Application for certification.** The bill would authorize the operator of a restimulation well to apply to RRC for certification that the well was a qualifying well. The application could be made at any time after the first day the well produced hydrocarbons following the date a restimulation treatment was completed. RRC could require an applicant to provide any relevant information required to administer the bill. If RRC approved an application, RRC would be required to issue a certificate designating the well as a qualifying well.

RRC could revoke a certificate if it determined that a well that was certified as a qualifying well was not a restimulation well or the operator was claiming or had claimed an exemption under the bill for hydrocarbons produced from a well that was not a qualifying well. RRC would be required to notify an operator that a certificate was revoked. An exemption provided by the bill would be automatically revoked on the date RRC revoked a certificate, unless it issued a new certificate for the well.

**Qualifying for exemption.** To qualify for the exemption provided by the bill, the person responsible for paying the tax would have to apply to the comptroller. The comptroller would be required to determine the form and content of the application, which would have to include RRC-issued certificate designating a well as a qualifying well and a report of the restimulation costs incurred to perform the restimulation treatment on the qualifying well. Restimulation costs would include only the current and contemporaneous restimulation costs associated with performing the restimulation treatment.

The comptroller would have to approve an application for an exemption provided by the bill if the application met the requirements of the bill. The comptroller could require the person applying for the exemption to provide any relevant information necessary to administer the bill. The comptroller could establish procedures to comply with the bill.

The bill would not apply to an oil or gas well that:

- had less than 60 months of production reported to RRC before the date a restimulation treatment was performed;
- was part of an enhanced oil recovery project, as defined by state law;
- was drilled but not completed and did not have a record of hydrocarbon production reported to RRC; or
- was not an inactive well, as defined by state law, immediately before the restimulation treatment was performed.

Gas produced from a qualifying well that was previously certified by RRC as a well that produced or would produce high-cost gas would not be eligible for the tax reductions for certain high-cost gas during the period the gas was exempt from tax under the bill.

**Credits.** The bill would establish that, if the oil and gas production tax, as applicable, was paid at the applicable rate on hydrocarbons produced from a qualifying well on or after the date RRC issued a certificate for the well but before the date the comptroller approved an application for an exemption, the person responsible for paying the tax would be entitled to a credit against the oil or gas production taxes in an amount equal to the amount of tax paid during that period.

To receive the credit, the person responsible for paying the tax would have to apply to the comptroller before the expiration of the applicable period for filing a tax refund claim under certain Tax Code provisions.

**Penalties.** A person who made or submitted an application, report, or other document or item of information to RRC or the comptroller under

the bill that the person knew was false or untrue in a material fact would be subject to the penalties imposed under the Natural Resources Code.

A person who applied or attempted to apply for an exemption under the bill for hydrocarbons produced from a well that the person knew was not a qualifying well would be liable to the state for a civil penalty. The amount of the penalty could not exceed the sum of \$10,000 and the difference between the amount of taxes paid or attempted to be paid and the amount of taxes due. The attorney general could recover such a penalty in a suit brought on behalf of the state in Travis County.

RRC would be authorized to adopt the rules necessary to administer the bill.

The bill would take effect September 1, 2025, not affect tax liability accruing before that effective date, and apply only to hydrocarbons produced on or after January 1, 2026.

**SUBJECT:** Requiring certain reporting policies, creating a study on traffic stop data

**COMMITTEE:** Homeland Security, Public Safety & Veterans' Affairs — favorable, without amendment

**VOTE:** 9 ayes — Hefner, R. Lopez, Cortez, Dorazio, Hickland, Isaac, Louderback, McLaughlin, Pierson

0 nays

2 absent — Canales, Holt

**WITNESSES:** For — Luis Soberon, Texas 2036 (*Registered, but did not testify*: BJ Wagner, Coruth Police Institute at the Meadow Mental Health Policy Institute; Kathy Mitchell, Equity Action; Alycia Castillo, Texas Civil Rights Project; Steven Deline)

Against — None

On — (*Registered, but did not testify*: Greg Stevens, Texas Commission on Law Enforcement)

**BACKGROUND:** Some have suggested standardizing reporting policies and conducting a study on traffic stop data collected by the Texas Commission on Law Enforcement could help ensure that traffic stop data reported by law enforcement agencies is consistent and accurate.

**DIGEST:** HB 5228 would amend certain policies and establish a study related to traffic stop data collection.

**Policies.** HB 5228 would require the Texas Commission on Law Enforcement (TCOLE), in consultation with the Department of Public Safety and certain law enforcement institutions, to develop policies to ensure the quality and accuracy of incident-based traffic stop data reported by law enforcement agencies.

Not later than January 1 of every odd-numbered year, TCOLE would be required to review, and revise as necessary, the guidelines and policies related to reporting of incident-based traffic stop data to ensure that the data was of the quality necessary to enable academic research and reporting based on the data.

The bill would require TCOLE to make the incident-based data, other than information not subject to disclosure under the Texas Public Information Act, available on its publicly accessible website in a format that enabled the public to obtain an electronic copy and readily access the information. TCOLE also would have to publish on its website a glossary of terms relating to the incident-based data that assisted the public in understanding the data.

**Study.** HB 5228 would require TCOLE to conduct a study on the incident-based traffic stop data and, based on the findings of that study, make recommendations regarding:

- improving the quality of the data collected;
- reducing any redundant reporting or regulatory requirements;
- the feasibility of collecting and reporting certain data regarding encounters between peace officers and members of the public, including each detention by a peace officer of a pedestrian; and
- the feasibility of collecting sufficient data to support a multivariate analysis.

By January 1, 2027, TCOLE would have to report the study's findings and recommendations to the governor, the lieutenant governor, the speaker of the House, and each member of the Legislature. Provisions regarding the study would expire September 1, 2027.

The bill would take effect September 1, 2025.

**NOTES:**

According to the Legislative Budget Board, the bill would have a negative impact of \$200,000 to general revenue related funds through the biennium.

**SUBJECT:** Amending interlocal contract requirements in certain municipalities

**COMMITTEE:** Intergovernmental Affairs — favorable, without amendment

**VOTE:** 10 ayes — C. Bell, Zwiener, Cortez, Garcia Hernandez, Leo Wilson, Lowe, Luther, Rosenthal, Spiller, Tepper

0 nays

1 absent — Cole

**WITNESSES:** For — Hope Wells, San Antonio Water System (*Registered, but did not testify*: Steven Deline)

Against — None

**BACKGROUND:** Some have suggested that the San Antonio Water System should be able to use a streamlined process for entering into certain interlocal contracts.

**DIGEST:** HB 5370 would amend interlocal contract requirements to exclude a water utility owned by a municipality containing more than 75 percent of the population of a county with a population of two million or more from the requirement that a contract be authorized by the governing body of each party to the contract.

The bill would take effect September 1, 2025.

- SUBJECT:** Requiring the Sunset Advisory Commission to review school districts
- COMMITTEE:** Delivery of Government Efficiency — committee substitute recommended
- VOTE:** 11 ayes — Capriglione, Bhojani, Alders, Bowers, Campos, Cook, Curry, L. Garcia, Olcott, Tinderholt, Troxclair
- 0 nays
- 2 absent — Cain, Rodríguez Ramos
- WITNESSES:** For — None
- Against — None
- On — (*Registered, but did not testify:* Eric Beverly, Sunset Advisory Commission; Christopher Lucas, Texas Education Agency)
- BACKGROUND:** Concerns have been raised that administrative overhead and other inefficiencies in school district spending may consume funds that could otherwise enhance classroom instruction. Some have suggested that requiring the Sunset Advisory Commission to review certain school districts could help to identify problematic practices and highlight models of efficiency.
- DIGEST:** CSHB 4359 would require the Sunset Advisory Commission (Sunset) to review the operations and conduct a forensic audit of certain independent or consolidated school districts. Sunset would be required to review two school districts each review cycle. A school district identified for review would be subject to the requirements of the Texas Sunset Act as if it was a state agency but could not be abolished.
- The bill would require Sunset, by no later than October 31 of each odd-numbered year, to select an education service center region from which the school districts to be reviewed would be selected. Sunset would have to review the school districts within the selected region that had the lowest

and highest instructional spending per student, respectively, according to the most recent information reported to the Texas Education Agency.

Sunset would be required to prepare a report identifying areas of each district's operations that did not effectively or efficiently use district funds and that detracted from instructional spending, and make recommendations to address its findings. The review also could include recommendations related to the district's governance, management, operating structure, and compliance with legislative requirements.

The bill would take effect September 1, 2025.

NOTES:

According to the Legislative Budget Board, the bill would have a negative impact of \$1,217,080 to general revenue related funds through the biennium.

- SUBJECT:** Requiring expedited permitting for affordable housing in certain cities
- COMMITTEE:** Land & Resource Management — favorable, without amendment
- VOTE:** 5 ayes — Gates, Lalani, Hinojosa, Hunter, Morgan
- 2 nays — Alders, Virdell
- 2 absent — Y. Davis, R . Lopez
- WITNESSES:** For — Nathan Kelley, TAAHP; Felicity Maxwell, Texans for Housing (*Registered, but did not testify*: Zach Faddis, AURA ATX; Ashley Brundage, Dallas Area Habitat for Humanity; Bryan Tony, Dallas Housing Coalition; Tanya Lavelle, Disability Rights Texas; Kyle Jackson, Texas Apartment Association; J.D. Hale, Texas Association of Builders; Kenneth Flippin, Texas Chapter US Green Building Council; Nate Walker, Texas Housers; Foundation Communities; Blanca Laborde, The Real Estate Council; Steven Deline; Susan Stewart)
- Against — (*Registered, but did not testify*: Ariel Traub, City of Garland)
- BACKGROUND:** Concerns have been raised that there is a severe shortage of available housing units that are affordable for very low-income households.
- DIGEST:** HB 4398 would require that an application for a building permit for a housing development project that had received a low income housing tax credit be granted or denied by a municipality in no more than half the time allotted by the municipality to grant or deny any residential building permit application. If the municipality had adopted an accelerated residential building permit review process, and applicant for a building permit for such a project would have to be allowed to submit the application under that process.
- The bill would apply only to a municipality with a population of more than 100,000.
- HB 4398 would take effect September 1, 2025.

**SUBJECT:** Establishing a careers in energy-efficient technologies pilot program

**COMMITTEE:** Trade, Workforce & Economic Development — committee substitute recommended

**VOTE:** 7 ayes — Button, Talarico, K. Bell, Bhojani, Harris Davila, Lujan, Meza  
2 nays — Luther, Richardson  
2 absent — Longoria, Ordaz

**WITNESSES:** For — None  
Against — None  
On — (*Registered, but did not testify*: Mary York, The Texas Workforce Commission)

**BACKGROUND:** Some have suggested that creating a pilot program for state agencies to collaborate in providing specialized skills training to participants could help to address workforce shortages in energy-efficient technologies.

**DIGEST:** CSHB 4443 would require the Texas Workforce Commission (TWC), in consultation with the Texas Education Agency (TEA) and the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB), to establish and administer a pilot program in the Dallas-Fort Worth metropolitan area under which TWC partners with public junior colleges, public technical institutes, and energy-efficient technology employers to provide necessary education and training to students for entry into jobs in industries using energy-efficient technologies.

Subject to approval by THECB, a public junior college or technical institute would be authorized to offer dual credit courses to high school students or college-level courses to high school graduates participating in the pilot program. The bill also would require TWC, in consultation with TEA and the THECB, to establish:

- curriculum requirements for courses and training offered under the pilot program;
- eligibility criteria for a student or an employer to participate; and
- a certificate of completion that TWC could award to a participant for successfully completing a course of study and training.

CSHB 4443 would require TWC, under the pilot program, to ensure that the local workforce development board serving the workforce development area in which the pilot program was administered maintained placement rates, wages paid, and other information for each pilot program participant following program completion, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, sex, income, and location.

The bill would authorize TWC, TEA, and THECB to adopt rules as necessary for the administration of the pilot program.

Additionally, the bill would require TWC, by December 1, 2030, to evaluate the pilot program's effectiveness and report the evaluation results to the Legislature. The report would have to include TWC's recommendation on whether the pilot program should be implemented statewide. The bill would expire September 1, 2031.

The bill would take effect September 1, 2025.

- SUBJECT:** Requiring the issuance of certain birth records without a fee
- COMMITTEE:** Public Health — committee substitute recommended
- VOTE:** 13 ayes — VanDeaver, Campos, Bucy, Collier, Cunningham, Frank, Johnson, J. Jones, Olcott, Pierson, Schofield, Shofner, Simmons
- 0 nays
- WITNESSES:** For - Veronica Molina, Kim Wilkes, Bell County Child Welfare Board (*Registered, but did not testify*: Adam Haynes, Conference of Urban Counties; Josie Castro Garcia, Dallas County; Elisa M. Tamayo, El Paso County; Katelyn Caldwell, Harris County Commissioners Court; Stephanie Battaglia, Texas CASA; Julie Wheeler, Travis County Commissioners Court; Steven Deline)
- Against - None
- On - (*Registered, but did not testify*: Tara Das, Department of State Health Services)
- BACKGROUND:** Some have suggested eliminating fees for certified copies of birth certificates requested by counties or child welfare boards would support caseworkers who work with the Department of Family and Protective Services (DFPS) to obtain documentation for children under DFPS conservatorship and in child protection suits.
- DIGEST:** CSHB 4466 would require the state registrar, a local registrar, or a county clerk, on request of a county or a child welfare board appointed by the county commissioners court, to issue without a fee a certified copy of a birth record to the county or board if the request was related to a child protection suit filed by a governmental entity.
- The bill would take effect September 1, 2025.

- SUBJECT:** Authorizing driver training course dismissals under certain circumstances
- COMMITTEE:** Transportation — favorable, without amendment
- VOTE:** 11 ayes — Craddick, M. Perez, Curry, Gámez, Harris Davila, Hefner, LaHood, Little, E. Morales, Patterson, Paul
- 0 nays
- 2 absent — Canales, C. Morales
- WITNESSES:** For — (*Registered, but did not testify:* Nadia Islam, City of San Antonio)
- Against — None
- BACKGROUND:** Concerns have been raised that traffic offenders may have certain violations dismissed once they complete a state-approved driving safety course or motorcycle operator training course, but that a dismissal only applies to one traffic offense, meaning that if an individual was charged with multiple offenses in the same incident, only one of those offenses could be dismissed on completion of the applicable course.
- DIGEST:** HB 3861 would replace the authorization for a justice or municipal court only to dismiss one eligible charge for each completion of a driving safety or motorcycle operator training course with provisions establishing that if a defendant who satisfied all other requirements to have a charge dismissed by the completion of such a course was charged with more than one offense arising out of the same criminal transaction, each charge would be eligible for dismissal following the successful completion of one course for all of the charges, provided that each charge on its own would be eligible for dismissal and the defendant otherwise satisfied all applicable requirements.
- If a defendant requested a driving safety course or motorcycle operator training course for more than one offense arising out of the same criminal transaction, a court would be authorized to require the defendant to pay a

separate reimbursement fee for each offense committed by the defendant eligible for dismissal.

Additionally, HB 3861 would revise the requirement for a defendant who elected driving safety course or motorcycle operator training course dismissal to send to a court by certified mail a written request to take a course by including as an alternative method for sending such a request to send the written request instead, if authorized by the court, through a court-designated email address or online portal, on or before the answer date on the notice to appear.

The bill would take effect September 1, 2025, and would only apply to a defendant requesting a driving safety course or motorcycle operator training course on or after the effective date.

- SUBJECT:** Adding certain projects to the unified transportation program
- COMMITTEE:** Transportation — favorable, without amendment
- VOTE:** 11 ayes — Craddick, M. Perez, Curry, Gámez, Harris Davila, Hefner, LaHood, Little, E. Morales, Patterson, Paul
- 0 nays
- 2 absent — Canales, C. Morales
- WITNESSES:** For — (*Registered, but did not testify*: Olivia Piercy, City of Eagle Pass, City of Pharr; Adam Benefield, Councilmen Place 2; Jeff Emerick, Texas Association of Business; Steven Deline)
- Against — None
- On — (*Registered, but did not testify*: Humbert “Tito” Gonzalez, Texas Department of Transportation)
- BACKGROUND:** Some have suggested that the Texas Transportation Commission should focus certain funding on border security infrastructure and creating stronger international trade routes.
- DIGEST:** HB 3849 would require the Texas Transportation Commission, by rule, to include a category for projects related to improving border security and establishing international trade corridors in the project categories under the unified transportation program. The bill would require the projects assigned to this category to:
- provide greater security in the movement of goods or enhance the flow of goods from an international border crossing onto the state highway system; or
  - mitigate congestion affecting airports, railroad crossings, or other transportation infrastructure within 60 miles of an international border crossing.

A category required under the bill could only be initially implemented if the Legislature made a specific appropriation for that purpose.

The bill would take effect September 1, 2025.

- SUBJECT:** Providing a tax exemption for charities supporting certain medical care
- COMMITTEE:** Ways & Means — favorable, without amendment
- VOTE:** 12 ayes — Meyer, Martinez Fischer, Bernal, Button, Capriglione, Gervin-Hawkins, Hickland, Muñoz, Noble, V. Perez, Turner, Vasut
- 0 nays
- 1 absent — Troxclair
- WITNESSES:** For — Bill Sealy, Sealy & Smith Foundation
- Against — (*Registered, but did not testify*): Steven Deline)
- BACKGROUND:** Tax Code sec. 11.18(a)(3) provides a property tax exemption for the real property owned by a charitable organization that consists of an interest in a mineral in place, including a royalty interest, provided that the interest was donated to a charitable organization by the previous owner of the interest and was not severed from the surface estate.
- Some have suggested providing a property tax exemption for charitable organizations that financially support medical care at certain higher education institutions.
- DIGEST:** HB 4240 would include charitable organizations that provided financial support for medical care at certain institutions of higher education specified by the bill among those eligible for certain tax exemptions, including the exemption established under Tax Code sec 11.18(a)(3).
- The bill would take effect January 1, 2026.
- NOTES:** According to the Legislative Budget Board, the expansion of the list of charitable organizations that qualify for a property tax exemption under the bill could reduce taxable property values, and the related costs to the Foundation School Fund could be increased through the operation of the school finance formulas.

- SUBJECT:** Extending pedestrian laws to certain sidewalk users
- COMMITTEE:** Transportation — favorable, without amendment
- VOTE:** 11 ayes — Craddick, M. Perez, Curry, Gámez, Harris Davila, Hefner, LaHood, Little, E. Morales, Patterson, Paul
- 0 nays
- 2 absent — Canales, C. Morales
- WITNESSES:** For — (*Registered, but did not testify:* Stephanie Mace, AARP Texas; Katrina Miller, Farm&City; Kenneth Flippin, Texas Chapter of US Green Building Council)
- Against — (*Registered, but did not testify:* Steven Deline)
- BACKGROUND:** Some have suggested that creating a framework for non-pedestrian sidewalk users to operate in pedestrian areas lawfully could improve safety for all sidewalk traffic and increase clarity for law enforcement investigating crashes.
- DIGEST:** HB 4706 would require vehicle operators to stop and yield the right-of-way to a sidewalk user crossing a roadway in a crosswalk if no traffic control signal was in place or operation and the sidewalk user was on the half of the roadway in which the vehicle was traveling or approaching so closely from the opposite half of the roadway as to be in danger.
- A “sidewalk user” would include an individual lawfully operating on a sidewalk a bicycle, a motor-assisted scooter, an electric personal assistive mobility device, a skateboard, roller skates, or a similar device.
- A sidewalk user would be prohibited from suddenly leaving a curb or other place of safety and proceeding into a crosswalk in the path of a vehicle so close that it would be impossible for the vehicle operator to stop and yield. A sidewalk user also could not approach or enter a crosswalk at a speed greater than was reasonable and prudent under the

existing conditions and having regard for actual and potential existing hazards. For these purposes, a speed greater than eight miles per hour would be prima facie evidence that the speed was not reasonable and prudent.

Additionally, HB 4706 would prohibit the operator of a vehicle approaching from the rear of a vehicle stopped at a crosswalk to permit a sidewalk user to cross a roadway from passing the stopped vehicle. The bill also would require a sidewalk user approaching an intersection with a stop sign to stop before entering the crosswalk and after stopping, yield the right-of-way to a vehicle that had entered the intersection or that was approaching the intersection so closely as to be an immediate hazard to the sidewalk user entering or moving across the crosswalk.

The bill would make conforming changes to certain Transportation Code provisions applicable to pedestrians related to traffic and pedestrian control signals.

The bill would take effect September 1, 2025.

- SUBJECT:** Amending fire safety inspection standards at public and private schools
- COMMITTEE:** Intergovernmental Affairs — committee substitute recommended
- VOTE:** 11 ayes — C. Bell, Zwiener, Cole, Cortez, Garcia Hernandez, Leo Wilson, Lowe, Luther, Rosenthal, Spiller, Tepper
- 0 nays
- WITNESSES:** For — (*Registered, but did not testify:* Jennifer Szimanski, Combined Law Enforcement Associations of Texas (CLEAT); Katelyn Caldwell, Harris County Commissioners Court; Ray Hunt, Houston Police Officers’ Union; Osman Moradel, Texas AFT; Matt Dowling, Texas Medical Association; Jennifer Easley, Texas PTA; Jennifer Allmon, The Texas Catholic Conference of Bishops)
- Against — None
- BACKGROUND:** Government Code sec. 419.029 states that the Texas Commission on Fire Protection may establish minimum curriculum requirements for preparatory, in-service, and advanced courses and programs for a school operated by or for the state or a local government specifically for training fire protection personnel or recruits.
- Concerns have been raised that school fire safety inspections are typically limited to fire hazards, which may put less emphasis on other safety measures that could be vital in an emergency situation, such as automated external defibrillators.
- DIGEST:** CSHB 4685 would amend Government Code sec. 419.029 to require that the minimum curriculum requirements for training for fire protection personnel or recruits would be required to include training on conducting a fire safety inspection at a public or private school as prescribed by the bill.
- The bill would require that a fire safety inspection of a public or private school required by law include an examination of each automated external

defibrillator on the school campus to determine whether the defibrillator was fully functional, which would have to include verifying that the defibrillator's pads and battery had not expired and that the defibrillator's status indicator light indicated that the device was ready for use. A representative of the school campus would be required to present each automated external defibrillator for inspection.

A person who conducted a fire safety inspection under the bill would be required to:

- provide a written report of the inspection and any relevant paperwork pertaining to the findings of the inspection to, if the inspection was of a public school, the principal of the school and the superintendent of the applicable school district, or if the inspection was of a private school, the director of the school; and
- at the time the person provided the report, indicate on the report the method by which, and the time and date on which, the person provided the report to the appropriate person.

The bill would require the report to be filed at the school campus to which the report related and according to the year in which the inspection occurred.

The bill would take effect September 1, 2025.

- SUBJECT:** Requiring prosecutors to report information on caseloads and personnel
- COMMITTEE:** Judiciary & Civil Jurisprudence — favorable, without amendment
- VOTE:** 11 ayes — Leach, Johnson, Dutton, Dyson, Flores, J. González, Hayes, LaHood, Landgraf, Moody, Schofield
- 0 nays
- WITNESSES:** For — Luis Soberon, Texas 2036 (*Registered, but did not testify*: Nick Hudson, American Civil Liberties Union of Texas; Michael Bullock, Austin Police Association; Derek Cohen, Right on Crime)
- Against — (*Registered, but did not testify*: Philip Mack Furlow, 106th Judicial District Attorney; Steven Deline)
- On — Shannon Edmonds, Texas District and County Attorneys Association (TDCAA)
- BACKGROUND:** Some have suggested that obtaining data on caseloads and staffing of prosecutors would help to address issues that have led to prosecutor vacancies across the state.
- DIGEST:** HB 5354 would require each prosecuting attorney to report in the form and manner prescribed by the Texas Judicial Council information on:
- the categories of criminal offenses prosecuted by the prosecuting attorney and the number of criminal cases in each category;
  - the number of personnel employed by the prosecuting attorney and whether that number was sufficient to support the prosecutor’s caseload;
  - the number of times a defendant was released on bond or by reducing bail due to a delay of a trial or criminal action; and
  - the number of electronic notices submitted by the prosecuting attorney to a court as required when a defendant is charged with a felony in a different county while released on bail.

In prescribing the information to be submitted, the Texas Judicial Council would be required to consult with the Texas District and County Attorneys Association and other interested persons.

Not later than September 1, 2026, the Texas Judicial Council would be required to prescribe the information, and form and manner of submission, that a prosecuting attorney was required to report.

The bill would take effect September 1, 2025.

SUBJECT: Leasing certain state property to Travis County

COMMITTEE: Public Health — committee substitute recommended

VOTE: 12 ayes — VanDeaver, Campos, Bucy, Cunningham, Frank, Johnson, J. Jones, Olcott, Pierson, Schofield, Shofner, Simmons

0 nays

1 absent — Collier

WITNESSES: For — Michael Bullock, Austin Police Association; Adam Haynes, Conference of Urban Counties; Andy Brown, Travis County Government-Travis County Judge; Sally Hernandez, Travis County Sheriff's Office (*Registered, but did not testify*: Terra Tucker, Alliance for Safety and Justice; Travis Krogman, Austin Chamber of Commerce; Houston Tower, Austin EMS Association; Joshua Houston, Caritas of Austin; Rob Borja, Central Health, CommUnityCare; Pam Madere, Central Texas Public Safety Commission; Carrie Rogers, City of Austin; Jennifer Szimanski, Combined Law Enforcement Associations of Texas; Rick Thompson, County Judges and Commissioners Association of Texas; Matthew Geske, Downtown Austin Alliance; Elisa M. Tamayo, El Paso County; Katelyn Caldwell, Harris County Commissioners Court; Carlos Lopez, Justices of the Peace and Constables Association of Texas; Elizabeth Montgomery, Samsung Austin Semiconductor, LLC.; Brian Hawthorne, Sheriffs' Association of Texas; Guy Herman, Statutory Probate Judges of Texas; Jose Melendez, Texas Public Policy Foundation; Julie Wheeler, Travis County Commissioners Court; Ann Howard, Travis County Precinct 3; Patricia Aronin; Steven Deline; Mindy Ellmer; Pilar Sanchez; Jacquie Van Wormer)

Against — None

On — Sonja Burns (*Registered, but did not testify*: Andrew Powers, Health and Human Services Commission)

**BACKGROUND:** Concerns have been raised that Travis County lacks sufficient locations for law enforcement and first responders to take individuals experiencing a behavioral health crisis, limiting emergency department capacity and patient access to care. Some have suggested leasing certain state property to Travis County to establish a jail diversion center.

**DIGEST:** CSHB 5141 would direct the Health and Human Services Commission (HHSC) to lease to Travis County the real property described by the bill as soon as practicable after the bill's effective date. The bill would specify the metes and bounds of that property, restrict the county's use of the property to use in a manner that primarily promoted a public purpose of the state, and provide for the lease's termination and the property's ownership to revert back to HHSC automatically if the county failed to use the property in such a manner for more than 180 continuous days.

The bill would require HHSC to lease the property by an appropriate instrument of transfer, which would have to provide for the aforementioned restriction and:

- provide that the lease would be for a term of 99 years;
- provide that Travis County could operate and maintain public amenities with the property and construct and demolish improvements, utilities, infrastructure, and amenities on the property; and
- describe the leased property by metes and bounds.

The bill would require HHSC to retain custody of the instrument of transfer after it was filed in the county's real property records.

The bill would exempt the lease of real property from Health and Safety Code provisions governing management of surplus real property and the lease of real property related to the provision of mental health and intellectual disability services and from Natural Resources Code provisions governing real estate transactions authorized by the Legislature.

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, 2025.



- SUBJECT:** Creating the Montgomery County Management District No. 3
- COMMITTEE:** Intergovernmental Affairs — favorable, without amendment
- VOTE:** 10 ayes — C. Bell, Zwiener, Cole, Cortez, C. Garcia Hernandez, Leo Wilson, Luther, Rosenthal, Spiller, Tepper
- 1 nay — Lowe
- WITNESSES:** For — (*Registered, but did not testify*: Chuck Mains and Robert Tautenhahn, 7 Coves Dev LTD)
- Against — None
- BACKGROUND:** Some have suggested that an area located within Montgomery County would benefit from the creation of a management district.
- DIGEST:** **Purpose.** HB 5686 would create the Montgomery County Management District No. 3. The stated purpose of the district would be to serve a public use and benefit, including by:
- promoting the health, safety, welfare, and enjoyment of residents, employers, employees, potential employees, visitors, consumers, and the public;
  - providing needed funding to preserve, maintain, and enhance the economic health and vitality of the district;
  - supporting employment, commerce, housing, transportation, tourism, recreation, the arts, and entertainment within the district;
  - providing for the restoration, preservation, and enhancement of scenic beauty through pedestrian ways, landscaping, and development; and
  - providing water, wastewater, drainage, road, and recreational facilities in the district.

The district would be created to supplement, not supplant, county or municipal services currently provided by Montgomery County, the City of Conroe, or the City of Willis. The district would not act as the agent or

instrumentality of any private interest, though many private interests could benefit. All or any part of the district would be eligible to be included in a tax increment reinvestment zone or a tax abatement reinvestment zone.

**Board of directors.** The district would be governed by a board of five directors who would serve staggered four-year terms, with either two or three directors' terms expiring on June 1 of each odd-numbered year. Directors would be required to be appointed by the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) from a list of individuals recommended by the board.

The initial board of directors would be composed of five named individuals: Michele Burke, Andrew Williams, Benjamin Mellado, Mehmet Okumus, and Joey Sergio Soto. The terms of the first three directors would expire June 1, 2027, and the terms of the remaining two would expire June 1, 2029.

**Powers and duties.** The district would have the powers and duties necessary to accomplish the purposes for which it was created. It could provide, design, construct, acquire, improve, relocate, operate, maintain, or finance an authorized improvement project or service. The district could contract with a governmental or private entity to carry out these activities, which would be considered a governmental function under provisions relating to interlocal cooperation contracts.

The board could authorize the creation of a nonprofit corporation to assist in carrying out district projects or services. The nonprofit would be considered a local government corporation, and the district's board would appoint its directors.

To protect the public interest, the district could contract with a qualified party to provide law enforcement services for a fee. Additionally, the district could join and pay dues to charitable or nonprofit organizations whose services align with the district's purposes.

The bill would allow the district to establish economic development programs to promote state or local economic development and stimulate business and commercial activity. These programs could include loans,

grants, and the provision of district services or personnel. The district would be authorized to exercise the economic development powers granted to municipalities under relevant provisions.

The district could acquire, lease, construct, develop, own, operate, and maintain parking facilities. Such facilities would serve a public purpose and be considered components of a street or road improvement, even if privately operated. Development and operation of the parking system could also be considered an economic development program.

The board would be required to adopt a resolution setting procedures and the number of directors' signatures necessary for authorizing disbursements or transfers of district funds. The district could add or exclude land as provided by relevant provisions in the Water Code. The district would not be permitted to exercise the power of eminent domain.

**Assessments.** The board could not finance a service or improvement project with assessments unless a written petition requesting that service or improvement had been filed with the board, signed by the owners of a majority of the assessed value of real property in the district, based on the most recent certified tax appraisal roll for the county.

The board, by resolution, could impose and collect an assessment for any authorized purpose in all or any part of the district. An assessment, a reassessment, or an assessment resulting from an addition to or correction of the assessment roll by the district, penalties and interest on an assessment or reassessment, an expense of collection, and reasonable attorney's fees incurred by the district would be:

- a first and prior lien against the property assessed;
- superior to any other lien or claim other than a lien or claim for county, school district, or municipal ad valorem taxes; and
- the personal liability of and a charge against the owners of the property, even if the owners were not named in the assessment proceedings.

The lien would be effective from the date of the resolution imposing the assessment until the date the assessment was paid. The board could

enforce the lien in the same manner as it could enforce an ad valorem tax lien against real property. The board could make a correction to or deletion from the assessment roll that did not increase the amount of assessment of any parcel of land without providing notice and holding a hearing in the manner required for additional assessments.

**Taxes and bonds.** The district would be required to hold an election to obtain voter approval before imposing an ad valorem property tax. If authorized by voters, the district could impose an operation and maintenance tax on taxable property in the district for any district purpose, including maintaining and operating the district, constructing or acquiring improvements, or providing a service. The board would be required to determine the operation and maintenance tax rate, which could not exceed the rate approved at the election.

The district could borrow money on terms determined by the board and issue bonds, notes, or other obligations to pay for any authorized district purpose. The district could issue bonds payable from a variety of revenue sources, including ad valorem taxes, assessments, impact fees, contract payments, grants, or other district funds, or any combination thereof. The cap on bond principal amounts under certain provisions relating to bonds for recreational facilities would not apply to the district.

The district could issue bonds secured by revenue other than ad valorem taxes or by contract payments, without an election, provided that the applicable requirements in the Water Code were met. If authorized at an election, the district could issue bonds payable from property taxes. At the time the district issued such bonds, the board would be required to impose a continuing direct annual property tax without limit as to rate or amount for as long as the bonds remained outstanding. Bond propositions could be presented to voters as a single proposition or split into multiple propositions. The board could not issue bonds until each municipality in the district had consented to the creation of the district and the inclusion of land in the district.

**Sales and use tax.** The district could impose a sales and use tax. The bill would establish that the provisions of the Municipal Sales and Use Tax

Act applied to the district, unless a provision was inconsistent with the bill.

A sales and use tax would require approval by a majority of voters. The bill would specify election dates and procedures as well as provide for ballot language. Following voter approval, the board would have to set the initial tax rate in increments of one-eighth of 1 percent. The board could later increase or decrease the rate by the same increment unless doing so would impair repayment of outstanding debt.

When determining the maximum combined rate, the board would be required to consider the tax rates of all overlapping political subdivisions and any other tax changes approved in elections held on the same date. Rates could not exceed the lesser of the maximum amount authorized by the election or the maximum combined.

Sales and use tax revenue would be available for any district purpose and could be pledged, alone or with other revenue, to secure bonds or other obligations. The board could abolish the sales and use tax without holding an election unless the tax had been used to secure outstanding debt.

If a district later added territory, it would extend the tax to the new area without holding an additional election. If a territory were removed, the tax would no longer apply to that area but would remain in effect in the rest of the district.

If the tax were abolished or the rate were reduced to zero, a new election would be required before the tax could be reimposed. Any rate change or tax abolishment would have to be reported to the comptroller.

**Division of the district.** The district could be divided into two or more new districts if the district created by the bill had never issued bonds or was imposing ad valorem taxes. The bill would set forth the procedures, including a required confirmation election, for dividing the district.

Districts created by the division could have all the powers and duties of the original district and be subject to all the same provisions. This would

include the requirement that an election be held before the new district could impose a tax or issue bonds payable with property taxes.

The new district could not include any land outside the area for the original district described by the bill.

**Defined areas.** The district would be authorized, subject to procedures and limitations set forth in the bill, to define areas or designate certain property of the district to pay for improvements, facilities, or services that primarily benefit that area or property instead of the district as a whole.

The district could not impose a property tax on the defined area without an election held in accordance with the bill.

**Dissolution.** The board would be required to dissolve the district on written petition filed with the board by the owners of:

- at least two-thirds of the assessed value of the property subject to assessment by the district based on the most recent certified county property tax rolls; or
- at least two-thirds of the surface area of the district, excluding roads, streets, highways, utility rights-of-way, other public areas, and other property exempt from assessment by the district according to the most recent certified county property tax rolls.

The board could dissolve the district by majority vote at any time. The district could not be dissolved by its board if the district:

- had any outstanding bonded indebtedness until that bonded indebtedness had been repaid or defeased in accordance with the order or resolution authorizing the issuance of the bonds;
- had a contractual obligation to pay money until that obligation had been fully paid in accordance with the contract; or
- owned, operated, or maintained public works, facilities, or improvements unless the district contracted with another person for the ownership, operation, or maintenance of the public works, facilities, or improvements.

**Implementation.** The bill would specify the territory included in the district.

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, 2025.

- SUBJECT:** Prohibiting registered sex offenders from serving as school board trustees
- COMMITTEE:** Public Education — favorable, without amendment
- VOTE:** 15 ayes — Buckley, Bernal, Allen, Ashby, Bryant, Cunningham, Dutton, Frank, Hinojosa, Hunter, Kerwin, Leach, Leo Wilson, Schoolcraft, Talarico
- 0 nays
- WITNESSES:** For — (*Registered, but did not testify*: Tricia Cave, Association of Texas Professional Educators (ATPE); Mandi Kimball, Children at Risk; Jennifer Szimanski, Combined Law Enforcement Associations of Texas (CLEAT); M Paige Williams, Criminal District Attorney John Creuzot; James Parnell, Dallas Police Association; James Kershaw, Harris County Deputies' Organization FOP #39; Ray Hunt, Houston Police Officers' Union; Andrea Sparks, Not On Our Watch; Sheri Blankenship, Texas Association Community Schools; Kristen Lenau, Texas Association Against Sexual Assault; Amy Beneski, Texas Association of School Administrators; Paige Williams, Texas Classroom Teachers Association; John Wilkerson, Texas Municipal Police Association (TMPA); Jennifer Easley, Texas PTA; Jennifer Allmon, The Texas Catholic Conference of Bishops; Shelia Franklin, Charlene Reagan, Fran Rhodes, True Texas Project; Patty Quinzi, TX AFT; Steven Deline; Michelle Evans; Brita Treat; Mark Treat)
- Against — None
- On — (*Registered, but did not testify*: Christopher Lucas and David Rodriguez, Texas Education Agency)
- BACKGROUND:** Concerns have been raised that currently, there are no specific restrictions preventing registered sex offenders from running for or serving on a school district board of trustees.

DIGEST:

HB 3629 would prohibit a person who was required to register as a sex offender from being eligible to serve as a trustee of an independent school district.

The bill would apply only to the eligibility of a person to serve on a board of trustees for a term that began on or after the bill's effective date or to fill a vacancy that occurred on or after the effective date.

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, 2025.