

## Item 25



# Travis County Commissioners Court Agenda Request

**Meeting Date:** Tuesday, July 30, 2013  
**Prepared By/Phone Number:** Deece Eckstein, 854-9754  
**Elected/Appointed Official/Dept. Head:** Deece Eckstein, 854-9754  
**Commissioners Court Sponsor:** Judge Biscoe

### **AGENDA LANGUAGE:**

CONSIDER AND TAKE APPROPRIATE ACTION ON LEGISLATIVE MATTERS, INCLUDING:

- A. OVERVIEW AND IMPACT OF TRAVIS COUNTY-RELATED LEGISLATION DURING THE REGULAR SESSION;
- B. UPDATE ON LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES DURING THE SECOND CALLED SESSION; AND
- C. ADDITIONS TO THE PRIORITIES, POLICY POSITIONS AND THE POSITIONS ON OTHER PROPOSALS SECTIONS OF THE TRAVIS COUNTY LEGISLATIVE AGENDA.

### **SUMMARY AND IGR COORDINATOR RECOMMENDATION:**

#### **BACKGROUND:**

- 1) Today is the last day of the Second Called Session.

#### **ISSUES AND OPPORTUNITIES:**

IGR has prepared a report on key legislative issues impacting Travis County which is attached. We will summarize and touch upon highlights in a presentation to the court.

Additionally, IGR will update the court on the status of transportation related items during the second called session.

**FISCAL IMPACT AND SOURCE OF FUNDING:** Not applicable.

**REQUIRED AUTHORIZATIONS:** None.

**NAMES, PHONE NUMBERS AND EMAIL ADDRESSES OF PERSONS WHO MIGHT BE AFFECTED BY OR BE INVOLVED WITH THIS REQUEST:**

Tanya Acevedo, Interim Chief Information Officer  
Travis County Information Technology Services  
Phone: 854-8685  
Email: [Tanya.Acevedo@co.travis.tx.us](mailto:Tanya.Acevedo@co.travis.tx.us)

Daniel Bradford, Assistant County Attorney  
County Attorney's Office  
Phone: 854-3718  
Email: [Daniel.Bradford@co.travis.tx.us](mailto:Daniel.Bradford@co.travis.tx.us)

Leslie Browder, County Executive  
Planning and Budget Office  
Phone: 854-8679  
Email: [Leslie.Browder@co.travis.tx.us](mailto:Leslie.Browder@co.travis.tx.us)

David Escamilla  
County Attorney  
Phone: 854-9415  
Email: [David.Escamilla@co.travis.tx.us](mailto:David.Escamilla@co.travis.tx.us)

Sherri Fleming, County Executive  
Health and Human Services/Veterans Services  
Phone: 854-4101  
Email: [Sherri.Fleming@co.travis.tx.us](mailto:Sherri.Fleming@co.travis.tx.us)

Cyd Grimes  
Purchasing Agent  
Phone: 854-9700  
Email: [Cyd.Grimes@co.travis.tx.us](mailto:Cyd.Grimes@co.travis.tx.us)

John Hille, Transactions Division Director  
County Attorney's Office

Phone: 854-9642  
Email: [John.Hille@co.travis.tx.us](mailto:John.Hille@co.travis.tx.us)

Danny Hobby, County Executive  
Emergency Services  
Phone: 854-4416  
Email: [Danny.Hobby@co.travis.tx.us](mailto:Danny.Hobby@co.travis.tx.us)

Roger Jefferies, County Executive  
Justice and Public Safety  
Phone: 854-4415  
Email: [Roger.Jefferies@co.travis.tx.us](mailto:Roger.Jefferies@co.travis.tx.us)

Gregg Knaupe  
Travis County Legislative Consultant  
Phone: 499-8826  
Email: [Gregg@KnaupeGR.com](mailto:Gregg@KnaupeGR.com)

Steven Manilla, County Executive  
Transportation and Natural Resources  
Phone: 854-9429  
Email: [Steven.Manilla@co.travis.tx.us](mailto:Steven.Manilla@co.travis.tx.us)

Nicki Riley  
Travis County Auditor  
Phone: 854-3227  
Email: [Nicki.Riley@co.travis.tx.us](mailto:Nicki.Riley@co.travis.tx.us)

Jessica Rio, Budget Director  
Planning and Budget Office  
Phone: 854-4455  
Email: [Jessica.Rio@co.travis.tx.us](mailto:Jessica.Rio@co.travis.tx.us)

Aerin-Renee Toussaint, Budget Analyst II  
Planning and Budget Office  
Phone: 854-1160  
Email: [Aerin.Toussaint@co.travis.tx.us](mailto:Aerin.Toussaint@co.travis.tx.us)

**TRAVIS COUNTY COMMISSIONERS COURT**  
**STATUS REPORT ON LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES**  
**As of July 30, 2013**

1. Oppose legislation or budget decisions that would create unfunded mandates or divert county revenues – IGR weighed in on several bills that would create unfunded mandates. Only one bill was filed to directly prohibit unfunded mandates, Rep. Garnet Coleman’s [HJR 96](#), but that bill was never heard in committee.
2. Oppose efforts to lower the current appraisal caps and revenue caps – twelve bills were filed. Only four of them – two revenue caps bills ([SB 102](#) by Patrick and [SB 144](#) by Williams) and two appraisal cap bills ([HJR 84](#) and [HB 1338](#) by Bell) got a hearing, and all were left pending.
3. Support funding for necessary benefits and services for Travis County residents – [SB 1](#), the 2014-2015 budget, restored some of the funding cuts from the previous session, and even made improvements in mental health services and other critical areas.
4. Support improved mental health continuity of care in the criminal justice system – some of the additional funding for mental health services will find its way, via local mental health authorities, into county jails, probation programs and re-entry services.
5. Support local control over billboards – One bill, [HB 675](#) was filed, but did not receive a hearing.
6. Support legislation to enhance county authority to manage growth – in spite of the efforts of several legislators, bills to enhance local subdivision regulation, e.g., [HB 761](#), died. On the other hand, so did several bills calculated to reduce county land use authority, e.g., [HB 3088](#). Although several bills were filed to further restrict local government use of eminent domain (e.g., [HB 476](#), [SB 96](#), and [SB 180](#)), none of them received a hearing.
7. Support increases to transportation funding – the new budget reduces the diversions from Fund 6, but that reflects the availability of money more than a legislative commitment to eliminate diversions. Only one of the bills that would statutorily restrict Fund 6 diversions, [HB 479](#),

received a hearing, and was left pending. Two bills to enhance transportation funding by increasing the vehicle registration fee, [HB 3664](#) and [HB 3666](#), got out of committee but failed to pass the House.

8. Support legislation to effectively plan and manage groundwater and surface water as a single resource – Texas law continues to treat groundwater and surface water as completely different resources. The Legislature made no progress on this front during the session.
9. Support legislation to update references to “tape” recordings of public meetings and conform them to modern technology – our bill, [SB 471](#) by Ellis, has been **signed by the Governor**.
10. Support legislation to allow political subdivisions to conform their deferred compensation plans to recent changes in federal law -- We worked with Harris County on a bill, [SB 366](#) by Taylor, which has been **signed by the Governor**.
11. Support legislation to clarify the geographic extent of ad valorem tax liens on business personal property – our bill, [SB 1606](#) by Zaffirini, has been **vetoed by the Governor**.
12. Support legislation to create two new criminal courts – [HB 3153](#) by Lewis, the omnibus courts creation bill, includes both the district and county court, effective September 1, 2015, and has been **signed by the Governor**.
13. Support legislation to allow Travis County to impose a filing fee of up to \$15 for all civil cases, with proceeds dedicated to helping pay for the construction, renovation, or improvement of the facilities that house the Travis County civil courts – our bill, [SB 1891](#) by Watson, has been **signed by the Governor**.
14. Support legislation to give the Travis County Sheriff permissive authority to enforce certain federal laws and regulations regarding commercial motor vehicles – Our bill, [HB 2304](#) by Rodriguez, has been **signed by the Governor**.
15. Support redistricting legislation that meets the threefold criteria set by the Legislature – this issue is still in progress during the special session.

**State Budget Projected Impacts on Travis County (FY 14)**

DEPARTMENT/ Program Title	Funding State Agency	State Funded FTE	Estimated Change from FY 13	Estimated FY 14 Funding	Revenue Received (FY 13)
<b>GENERAL ADMINISTRATION</b>					
Mixed Beverage Tax Reimbursements	Comptroller	0.0	\$861,131	\$7,111,037	\$6,249,906
<b>Total General Administration</b>		<b>0.0</b>	<b>\$861,131</b>	<b>\$7,111,037</b>	<b>\$6,249,906</b>
<b>COUNTY ATTORNEY</b>					
Prosecutor Longevity Pay	Comptroller, Judiciary Division	0.0	\$0	\$133,420	\$133,420
<b>Total County Attorney</b>		<b>0.0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$133,420</b>	<b>\$133,420</b>
<b>CIVIL COURTS</b>					
Family Drug Court Program	Office of the Governor Criminal Justice Division	1.0	\$0	\$137,388	\$137,388
<b>Total Civil Courts</b>		<b>1.0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$137,388</b>	<b>\$137,388</b>
<b>CRIMINAL COURTS</b>					
Indigent Defense Formula grant	Texas Task Force on Indigent Defense	0.0	\$0	\$430,945	\$430,945
Indigent Defense Systems Evaluation Project	Office of the Governor Criminal Justice Division	1.0	\$0	\$230,318	\$230,318
Veterans Court Program	Office of the Governor Criminal Justice Division	2.0	\$0	\$206,003	\$206,003
<b>Total Criminal Courts</b>		<b>3.0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$867,266</b>	<b>\$867,266</b>
<b>CSCD</b>					
Diversion Programs (Includes SMART and TAIP)	Texas Department of Criminal Justice	110.0	\$270,304	\$6,902,170	\$6,631,866
Texas Department of Criminal Justice-CJAD/Basic Supervision	Texas Department of Criminal Justice	31.0	(\$169,817)	\$2,476,230	\$2,646,047
DED Salaries			\$0	\$682,460	\$682,460
Community Corrections Programs	Texas Department of Criminal Justice	31.0	\$249,310	\$1,498,810	\$1,249,500
DWI Drug Court Grant	Office of the Governor, Criminal Justice Division	4.0	\$0	\$234,391	\$234,391
<b>Total CSCD</b>		<b>176.0</b>	<b>\$349,797</b>	<b>\$11,794,061</b>	<b>\$11,444,264</b>
<b>PRETRIAL SERVICES</b>					
Drug Diversion Court	Office of the Governor, Criminal Justice Division	1.0	\$0	\$188,422	\$188,422
<b>Total Pretrial Services</b>		<b>1.0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$188,422</b>	<b>\$188,422</b>
<b>DISTRICT CLERK</b>					
Juror Pay Reimbursement	Comptroller, Judiciary Division	0.0	\$0	\$283,578	\$283,578

DEPARTMENT/ Program Title	Funding State Agency	State Funded FTE	Estimated Change from FY 13	Estimated FY 14 Funding	Revenue Received (FY 13)
<b>Total District Clerk</b>		<b>0.0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$283,578</b>	<b>\$283,578</b>
<b>DISTRICT ATTORNEY</b>					
Prosecutor Longevity Pay	Comptroller, Judiciary Division	0.0	\$0	\$195,599	\$195,599
State Legislative Direct Appropriation Public Integrity Unit	State Legislature	34.5	(\$3,812,356)	\$0	\$3,812,356
<b>Total District Attorney</b>		<b>34.5</b>	<b>(\$3,812,356)</b>	<b>\$195,599</b>	<b>\$4,007,955</b>
<b>HHS</b>					
Contract services for Deaf	Department of Assistive and Rehabilitative Services		\$3,850	\$58,850	\$55,000
<b>Total HHS</b>		<b>0.0</b>	<b>\$3,850</b>	<b>\$58,850</b>	<b>\$55,000</b>
<b>JUVENILE PROBATION</b>					
Texas Juvenile Justice Department Agreements	Texas Juvenile Justice Department	362.0	(\$250,000)	\$5,996,122	\$6,246,122
<b>Total Juvenile Probation</b>		<b>362.0</b>	<b>(\$250,000)</b>	<b>\$6,121,021</b>	<b>\$6,371,021</b>
<b>SHERIFF</b>					
Victim Services Grant	Office of Attorney General	1.0	\$1,675	\$54,371	\$52,696
LEOSE Training Funding	Office of the Comptroller	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Automobile Theft Prevention Authority/ Sheriff's Combined Auto Theft Task Force	Texas Automobile Theft Prevention Authority	4.0	\$0	\$302,624	\$302,624
<b>Total Sheriff</b>		<b>5.0</b>	<b>\$1,675</b>	<b>\$356,995</b>	<b>\$355,320</b>
<b>EMS</b>					
Medicaid; Medical Transportation	Texas Health and Human Services Commission	0.0	\$264,135	\$1,165,384	\$901,249
CAPCOG 911 Services	Commission on State Emergency Communications through CAPCOG	0.0	(\$984,944)	\$0	\$984,944
<b>Total EMS</b>		<b>0.0</b>	<b>(\$720,809)</b>	<b>\$1,165,384</b>	<b>\$1,886,193</b>
<b>TNR</b>					
State disbursement to counties from gasoline tax & excess weight fee	Comptroller	0.0	\$0	\$126,000	\$126,000
Low Income Vehicle Repair Assistance, Retrofit, and Accelerated Vehicle Replacement Program (LIRAP)	Texas Commission on Environmental Quality	0.0	\$1,013,417	\$1,178,155	\$164,738
<b>Total TNR</b>		<b>0.0</b>	<b>\$1,013,417</b>	<b>\$1,304,155</b>	<b>\$290,738</b>
<b>TAX</b>					
Voter Registration Fund	TX Secretary of State	0.0	\$101,435	\$237,000	\$135,565
<b>Total Tax</b>		<b>0.0</b>	<b>\$101,435</b>	<b>\$237,000</b>	<b>\$135,565</b>
<b>Subtotal (Public Integrity Unit removed)</b>		<b>548.00</b>	<b>\$1,360,496</b>	<b>\$29,954,176</b>	<b>\$28,593,680</b>

<b>DEPARTMENT/ Program Title</b>	<b>Funding State Agency</b>	<b>State Funded FTE</b>	<b>Estimated Change from FY 13</b>	<b>Estimated FY 14 Funding</b>	<b>Revenue Received (FY 13)</b>
<b>COUNTY GRAND TOTAL</b>		<b>582.50</b>	<b>(\$2,451,860)</b>	<b>\$29,954,176</b>	<b>\$32,406,036</b>

The numbers above represent PBO and departmental estimates for descriptive purposes only. The Auditor's Office is the official Travis County revenue estimator, and that department's Third Revenue Estimate provided the basis for projected numbers where applicable.



## County Clerk Fees

Records archive fee	HB 1513	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Records archive fee set by Commissioners Court; can increase current \$5 fee up to \$10</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Effective September 1, 2013</li></ul>
Records management and preservation fee		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Records management fee set by County Clerk; can increase current \$5 fee up to \$10</li></ul>	

## Courts - Civil Filing Fee Increases

Civil filing fee for courthouse improvements assessed on cases filed in district, probate, and county courts in Travis County	SB 1891	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Fee determined by Commissioners Court</li><li>Fee can be set up to \$15</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Fees deposited into a special account in the county treasury dedicated to the construction, renovation, or improvement of the facilities that house the courts collecting the fee</li><li>For every dollar spent, county will match one dollar</li><li>Effective January 1, 2014</li></ul>
Electronic filing fee on certain court costs and cases filed in a supreme, appeals, district, county, statutory county, or statutory probate court	HB 2302	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Statutory fees set at \$20/\$10/\$5 on certain cases</li><li>An additional \$2 fee can be set by Commissioners Court</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>\$20/\$10/\$5 fees are remitted to the Comptroller</li><li>\$2 fee may be used by a local government to recover the actual electronic filing system operating costs incurred</li><li>Effective January 1, 2014</li></ul>
District courts records management and preservation fee	HB 1513	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Fee is set by Commissioners Court up to \$10; current fee is \$5</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Fee must be set and itemized in the county's budget as part of the budget preparation process and be approved in a public meeting</li><li>Effective January 1, 2014</li></ul>

## Courts - Other Fees

Collection fee on outstanding amounts owed to the county relating to a civil case, including unpaid fines, fees, or court costs	HB 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Fee determined by Commissioners Court</li><li>Fee can be set up to 30% of referred amount</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The collection fee may be used to compensate the attorney or vendor who collects the debt</li><li>Effective immediately</li></ul>
Fee for alternative dispute resolution centers and criminal dispute resolution services	SB 1237	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Fee set by Commissioners Court up to \$350 for criminal dispute resolution services</li><li>No limit set for alternative dispute resolution centers</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Fees cannot be collected from alleged victims of crimes</li><li>Fees must be based on defendant's ability to pay</li><li>Effective January 1, 2014</li></ul>
Truancy prevention	SB 1419	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Fee is set by Commissioners Court up to \$10</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The fee is charged upon conviction and is sent to the comptroller; a local government may then request funds for providing truancy prevention and intervention services</li><li>Effective January 1, 2014</li></ul>

## Justice and Public Safety Fees

A prostitution prevention program participation fee	SB 484	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>A statutory fee of \$1,000 is set once the Commissioners Court establish a prostitution prevention program</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Counseling and services fee to cover costs of the counseling and services provided</li><li>Victim services fee to be deposited in the general revenue fund for appropriation to the PPP grant program</li><li>Law enforcement training fee - 5% of total fee paid</li><li>Effective September 1, 2013</li></ul>
---	--------	--	---

## Justice of the Peace Fees

Occupational driver's license	HB 438	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>\$30.00±</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Bill expands license issuance to Justices of the Peace; currently only issuers are county and district court clerks</li><li>Effective September 1, 2013</li></ul>
-------------------------------	--------	--	---

## Probate Fees

Supplemental Public Probate Administrator Fee	HB 1755	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>A statutory supplemental fee of \$10 is set if the Commissioners Court decides to appoint a public probate administrator</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>For the support of the office of public probate administrator; fees collected shall be deposited into the county treasury to fund the expenses of the public probate administrator's office</li><li>Effective January 1, 2014</li></ul>
---	---------	--	---

## Other Fees

Fee for protest hearings held following the rejection of an alcoholic beverage license	SB 1035	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>A statutory fee of \$25</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Increase from current fee of \$5</li><li>Effective September 1, 2013</li></ul>
--	---------	---	--

## Transportation & Natural Resources Fees

A fee on subdivision plat revision requests	SB 552	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Fee is set by Commissioners Court</li><li>Based on cost of processing application and inclusion of publication of notice costs</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Fee is to offset the cost of publishing notices and mailing costs of notifying property owners</li><li>Effective immediately</li></ul>
---	--------	--	--

**Conference Committee Report on SB 1 (2014-15 Biennium)\***

(Introduced version of the House/Senate General Appropriations Act, Including Committee Substitutes for SB 1 and House Committee Substitute for SB 1)  
 Programs Affecting Counties  
 Texas Association of Counties, County Information Program (CIP)

**Article I – General Government**

Comptroller of Public Accounts:

Programs	Description						
Fiscal Research and Studies	Eliminating the agency’s public outreach, publications and local government assistance programs. It provides seminars and workshops to local government officials on financial matters. Funding not restored in the proposed budgets for 2014-15.						
	House	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
		\$7,388,356	\$7,381,609	\$113,624	\$113,195	\$0	\$0
Lateral Road Funds Districts: Distributions to Counties for Road Repair and Maintenance – Strategy: A.1.5(CPA, Fiscal Programs)	Funds distributed to counties for road expenses, including construction and maintenance. HB 1/SB 1 proposed budget amounts are approximately \$14.8 million, which is \$229,000 <b>more</b> than the current budget. Committee Substitute - SB 1/HCSSB 1: Probably a technical adjustment adds \$119.00 in fiscal year 2014. <b>CCR adopted the same figures.</b>						
	House	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
		\$7,300,000	\$7,300,000	\$7,300,000	\$7,300,000	<b>\$7,529,119</b> <del>\$7,529,000</del>	\$7,300,000
	Senate	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
		\$7,300,000	\$7,300,000	\$7,300,000	\$7,300,000	<b>\$7,529,119</b> <del>\$7,529,000</del>	\$7,300,000

Texas Association of Counties, Legislative/County Information Program, prepared by Paul Emerson, TAC State Financial Analyst, [Paule@county.org](mailto:Paule@county.org)

\*Highlighted in **red** are the changes that occurred during the Conference Committee.

Sources:

- Conference Committee Report on SB 1 (CCR), May 26, 2013
- CSSB 1, March 13, 2013
- HB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013
- SB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013
- 82<sup>nd</sup> General Appropriations Act - 2012-13 (Fiscal Size-up, September 12, 2011)
- Notes – from LBB, Summary of Legislative Budget Estimates House/Senate (2014-15 Biennium)

**Article I – General Government**

Comptroller of Public Accounts:

Programs	Description														
Gross Weight/Axle Fee: Distributions to Counties per Transportation Code section 621.353 - Strategy: A.1.10 (CPA, Fiscal Programs)	Funding is the same as the current budget. <b>Note:</b> Funding reflects a method-of-finance swap from State Highway Fund 6 to General Revenue Funds for distributions to counties of a portion of amounts collected from gross weight and axle weight permit fees to align with the Texas Transportation Code, Section 621.353. Committee Substitute SB 1/HCSSB 1: Stayed the same. <b>CCR adopted the same figures.</b>														
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 15%;">House</td> <td style="width: 10%;">2010</td> <td style="width: 10%;">2011</td> <td style="width: 10%;">2012</td> <td style="width: 10%;">2013</td> <td style="width: 10%;">2014</td> <td style="width: 10%;">2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$7,500,000</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$7,500,000</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$7,500,000</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$7,500,000</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$7,500,000</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$7,500,000</td> </tr> </table>	House	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015		\$7,500,000	\$7,500,000	\$7,500,000	\$7,500,000	\$7,500,000	\$7,500,000
	House	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015								
	\$7,500,000	\$7,500,000	\$7,500,000	\$7,500,000	\$7,500,000	\$7,500,000									
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 15%;">Senate</td> <td style="width: 10%;">2010</td> <td style="width: 10%;">2011</td> <td style="width: 10%;">2012</td> <td style="width: 10%;">2013</td> <td style="width: 10%;">2014</td> <td style="width: 10%;">2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$7,500,000</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$7,500,000</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$7,500,000</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$7,500,000</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$7,500,000</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$7,500,000</td> </tr> </table>	Senate	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015		\$7,500,000	\$7,500,000	\$7,500,000	\$7,500,000	\$7,500,000	\$7,500,000	
Senate	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015									
	\$7,500,000	\$7,500,000	\$7,500,000	\$7,500,000	\$7,500,000	\$7,500,000									
Mixed Beverage Tax Reimbursements – Strategy: A.1.2 (CPA, Fiscal Programs)	Reimbursements to counties and incorporated municipalities from mixed beverage tax collections. HB 1/SB 1 will add \$61.3 million <b>more</b> than the current budget. <b>Note:</b> As a result of an increase in the rate of reimbursement from 8.3065 percent to the new statutory minimum rate of reimbursement of 10.7143 percent, effective September 1, 2013. Committee Substitute - SB 1/HCSSB 1: Stayed the same. <b>CCR adopted the same figures.</b>														
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 15%;">House</td> <td style="width: 10%;">2010</td> <td style="width: 10%;">2011</td> <td style="width: 10%;">2012</td> <td style="width: 10%;">2013</td> <td style="width: 10%;">2014</td> <td style="width: 10%;">2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$128,318,000</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$132,937,000</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$119,714,964</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$126,305,843</td> <td style="text-align: right;">149,456,000</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$157,840,000</td> </tr> </table>	House	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015		\$128,318,000	\$132,937,000	\$119,714,964	\$126,305,843	149,456,000	\$157,840,000
	House	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015								
	\$128,318,000	\$132,937,000	\$119,714,964	\$126,305,843	149,456,000	\$157,840,000									
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 15%;">Senate</td> <td style="width: 10%;">2010</td> <td style="width: 10%;">2011</td> <td style="width: 10%;">2012</td> <td style="width: 10%;">2013</td> <td style="width: 10%;">2014</td> <td style="width: 10%;">2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$128,318,000</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$132,937,000</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$119,714,964</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$126,305,843</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$149,456,000</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$157,840,000</td> </tr> </table>	Senate	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015		\$128,318,000	\$132,937,000	\$119,714,964	\$126,305,843	\$149,456,000	\$157,840,000	
Senate	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015									
	\$128,318,000	\$132,937,000	\$119,714,964	\$126,305,843	\$149,456,000	\$157,840,000									

Sources:

Conference Committee Report on SB 1 (CCR), May 26, 2013

CSSB 1, March 13, 2013

HB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013

SB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013

82<sup>nd</sup> General Appropriations Act - 2012-13 (Fiscal Size-up, September 12, 2011)

Notes – from LBB, Summary of Legislative Budget Estimates House/Senate (2014-15 Biennium)

Article I – General Government

Comptroller of Public Accounts

Programs	Description						
Grants Programs – Strategy: Underage Tobacco Program	Eliminating underage tobacco enforcement grants (\$4 million). This strategy is <b>no longer</b> in HB 1/SB 1.						
	House	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
		\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Grants Programs Local Continuing Education Grants A.1.7 (CPA, Fiscal Programs)	Local continuing education grants for law enforcement officers –known as the LEOSE program. SB 1proposed \$12 million <b>more</b> than HB 1. Committee Substitute SB 1 stayed the same. HCSSB 1 adds \$3 million per year and \$6 million to Article XI (wish list). <b>CCR adopted the Senate’s version.</b>						
	House	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
		\$6,000,000	\$6,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000
State Energy Conservation Office – Goal B: Energy Office	Providing revolving loans to state agencies and local governments – including school districts – to retrofit buildings with new technology and equipment to reduce energy and water consumption. Both bills proposed \$58.7 million. Committee Substitute SB 1: Stayed the same. <b>CCR adopted the same figures.</b>						
	Senate	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
		\$6,000,000	\$6,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$6,000,000	\$6,000,000

Sources:

- Conference Committee Report on SB 1 (CCR), May 26, 2013
- CSSB 1, March 13, 2013
- HB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013
- SB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013
- 82<sup>nd</sup> General Appropriations Act - 2012-13 (Fiscal Size-up, September 12, 2011)
- Notes – from LBB, Summary of Legislative Budget Estimates House/Senate (2014-15 Biennium)

**Article I – General Government**

Commission on State Emergency Communications:

Programs	Description																				
9-1-1 Services –Goal A	Providing grants and assistance to local governments through Regional Planning Commissions as they develop and implementing regional plans and maintenance for 9-1-1 services. HB 1 proposed \$102 million. SB 1 proposed \$89.1 million. The difference between HB 1 and SB 1 is \$12.9 million. HB 1 is \$2 million <b>more</b> than the current budget. SB 1 is \$10.9 million <b>less</b> than the current budget. Committee Substitute SB 1 adds \$40.6 million to its baseline budget. HCSSB 1 stayed the same. Additional funds in Article XI (wish list) in both bills. <b>CCR adopted the Senate’s version</b>																				
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>House</th> <th>2010</th> <th>2011</th> <th>2012</th> <th>2013</th> <th>2014</th> <th>2015</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td>\$65,418,771</td> <td>\$59,034,001</td> <td>\$49,658,985</td> <td>\$50,395,129</td> <td>\$47,233,097</td> <td>\$54,795,374</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	House	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015		\$65,418,771	\$59,034,001	\$49,658,985	\$50,395,129	\$47,233,097	\$54,795,374						
	House	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015														
	\$65,418,771	\$59,034,001	\$49,658,985	\$50,395,129	\$47,233,097	\$54,795,374															
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Senate</th> <th>2010</th> <th>2011</th> <th>2012</th> <th>2013</th> <th>2014</th> <th>2015</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td>\$65,418,771</td> <td>\$59,034,001</td> <td>\$49,658,985</td> <td>\$50,395,129</td> <td><b>\$69,523,363</b></td> <td><b>\$60,227,686</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td><del>\$44,582,002</del></td> <td><del>\$44,583,001</del></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Senate	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015		\$65,418,771	\$59,034,001	\$49,658,985	\$50,395,129	<b>\$69,523,363</b>	<b>\$60,227,686</b>						<del>\$44,582,002</del>	<del>\$44,583,001</del>
Senate	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015															
	\$65,418,771	\$59,034,001	\$49,658,985	\$50,395,129	<b>\$69,523,363</b>	<b>\$60,227,686</b>															
					<del>\$44,582,002</del>	<del>\$44,583,001</del>															

Sources:

Conference Committee Report on SB 1 (CCR), May 26, 2013

CSSB 1, March 13, 2013

HB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013

SB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013

82<sup>nd</sup> General Appropriations Act - 2012-13 (Fiscal Size-up, September 12, 2011)

Notes – from LBB, Summary of Legislative Budget Estimates House/Senate (2014-15 Biennium)

**Article I – General Government**

Office of the Governor (Trusteed Programs):

Programs	Description							
Disaster Funds – <i>Strategy A.1.2</i>	Providing grants for disaster funding to state and local agencies. HB 1/SB 1 proposed budget amounts are the same, \$59.2 million, which is \$20.2 million <b>more</b> than the current budget. Committee Substitute SB 1: adds \$4.1 million to its baseline budget in fiscal year 2014. HCSSB 1 adds \$5 million to its baseline amount. <b>CCR adopted the Senate’s version.</b>							
	House	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	
		\$11,224,889	UB	\$39,000,000	\$0	<del>\$29,623,134</del>	<b>\$34,623,134</b>	\$29,623,134
Criminal Justice – <i>Strategy A.1.3</i>	Senate	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	
		\$11,224,889	UB	\$39,000,000	\$0	<del>\$29,623,134</del>	<b>\$33,710,514</b>	<b>\$29,623,134</b>
	Providing criminal justice grants to state and local entities, non-profit organizations and independent school districts for a variety of criminal justice related projects. HB 1/SB 1 proposed budget amounts are the same, \$189.2 million, which is \$47.4 million <b>more</b> than the current budget. Committee Substitute SB 1: adds \$1.6 million to its baseline budget. HCSSB 1 stayed the same. <b>CCR adopted the Senate’s version.</b>							
	House	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	
		\$88,679,912	\$87,126,995	\$71,426,890	\$70,426,889	\$96,853,289	\$92,360,714	
	Senate	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	
	\$88,679,912	\$87,126,995	\$71,426,890	\$70,426,889	<del>\$96,853,289</del>	<b>\$97,653,289</b>	<b>\$93,160,714</b>	

Sources:

- Conference Committee Report on SB 1 (CCR), May 26, 2013
- CSSB 1, March 13, 2013
- HB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013
- SB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013
- 82<sup>nd</sup> General Appropriations Act - 2012-13 (Fiscal Size-up, September 12, 2011)
- Notes – from LBB, Summary of Legislative Budget Estimates House/Senate (2014-15 Biennium)

**Article I – General Government**

Office of the Governor (Trusteed Programs):

Programs	Description														
County Essential Services Grants – Strategy A.1.7	Providing grants that fund local governments with unanticipated and extraordinary criminal justice related expenditures. HB 1/SB 1 restored funding of \$2.3 million. Committee Substitute SB 1/HCSSB 1: Stayed the same. <b>CCR adopted the same figures.</b>														
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>House</th> <th>2010</th> <th>2011</th> <th>2012</th> <th>2013</th> <th>2014</th> <th>2015</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td>\$780,190</td> <td>\$780,190</td> <td>\$0</td> <td>\$0</td> <td>\$1,170,333</td> <td>\$1,170,333</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	House	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015		\$780,190	\$780,190	\$0	\$0	\$1,170,333	\$1,170,333
	House	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015								
	\$780,190	\$780,190	\$0	\$0	\$1,170,333	\$1,170,333									
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Senate</th> <th>2010</th> <th>2011</th> <th>2012</th> <th>2013</th> <th>2014</th> <th>2015</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td>\$780,190</td> <td>\$780,190</td> <td>\$0</td> <td>\$0</td> <td>\$1,170,333</td> <td>\$1,170,333</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Senate	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015		\$780,190	\$780,190	\$0	\$0	\$1,170,333	\$1,170,333	
Senate	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015									
	\$780,190	\$780,190	\$0	\$0	\$1,170,333	\$1,170,333									

Sources:

Conference Committee Report on SB 1 (CCR), May 26, 2013

CSSB 1, March 13, 2013

HB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013

SB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013

82<sup>nd</sup> General Appropriations Act - 2012-13 (Fiscal Size-up, September 12, 2011)

Notes – from LBB, Summary of Legislative Budget Estimates House/Senate (2014-15 Biennium)



**Article I – General Government**

Office of the Governor (Trusteed Programs):

Programs	Description						
Economic Development and Tourism – Strategy A.1.9	Providing loans to local economic development corporations that assist local regions and communities with economic growth and development through job creation and capital investment. HB 1/SB 1 each proposed \$107.8 million, which is \$40.8 million <b>more</b> than the current budget. Committee Substitute SB 1: adds \$5.9 million to its baseline budget. \$386,668 is reduced from HCSSB 1. <b>CCR adopted the Senate’s version.</b>						
	House	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
		\$41,422,107	\$44,757,106	\$43,646,016	\$23,340,541	\$53,711,128	\$53,709,822
						\$53,904,462	\$53,903,156
Drug Courts Grants – (Rider 12)	Senate	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
		\$41,422,107	\$44,757,106	\$43,646,016	\$23,340,541	\$57,876,128	\$55,792,322
						\$53,904,462	\$53,903,156
Drug Courts Grants – (Rider 12)	Funding for counties to develop and maintain a drug court. HB 1/SB 1 each proposed \$1.5 million, the same as the current budget. Committee Substitute SB 1/HCSSB 1: Stayed the same. <b>CCR adopted the same figures.</b>						
	House	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
		\$1,593,500	\$1,593,500	\$750,000	\$750,000	\$750,000	\$750,000
Drug Courts Grants – (Rider 12)	Senate	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
		\$1,593,500	\$1,593,500	\$750,000	\$750,000	\$750,000	\$750,000

Sources:

Conference Committee Report on SB 1 (CCR), May 26, 2013

CSSB 1, March 13, 2013

HB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013

SB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013

82<sup>nd</sup> General Appropriations Act - 2012-13 (Fiscal Size-up, September 12, 2011)

Notes – from LBB, Summary of Legislative Budget Estimates House/Senate (2014-15 Biennium)

**Article I – General Government**

Historical Commission:

Programs	Description							
Courthouse – <i>Strategy A.1.3</i>	Providing grants to counties for the renovation and rehabilitation of historic courthouses. <b>Note:</b> Funding reflects a decrease of \$22.3 million in GO bond proceeds. HB 1/SB 1 proposed budget amounts are the same \$836,302 – used only for staff to administer the Courthouse Preservation program. Committee Substitute SB 1: adds \$20 million in Article IX (Contingent Provisions), while HCSSB 1 adds \$10 million to the agency bill pattern. HCSSB 1 also includes \$29.1 million in Article XI (wish list). Both proposed budgets use general revenue funds. <b>CCR adopted the Senate’s version - only operational funds to administer the program.</b>							
	House	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	
		\$23,163,276	\$463,276	\$20,463,276	\$463,276	\$418,151	\$418,151	\$10,461,151 \$461,151
Senate	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015		
		\$23,163,276	\$463,276	\$20,463,276	\$463,276	\$418,151	\$418,151	\$461,151 \$461,151
Development Assistance Programs – <i>Strategy A.2.1</i>	Providing grants to cities and counties that promote economic development through historic preservation. HB 1/SB 1 proposed budget amounts are the same, \$5.7 million, which is \$784,170 <b>less</b> than the current budget. Committee Substitute SB 1/HCSSB 1: adds \$786,000 to each baseline amount. <b>CCR adopted \$3,495,578 per year.</b>							
	House	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	
		\$4,047,577	\$4,047,577	\$3,314,248	\$3,175,077	2,852,578	2,852,577	\$3,245,578 \$3,245,577
Senate	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015		
		\$4,047,577	\$4,047,577	\$3,314,248	\$3,175,077	\$2,852,578	\$2,852,577	\$3,245,578 \$3,245,577

Sources:

Conference Committee Report on SB 1 (CCR), May 26, 2013

CSSB 1, March 13, 2013

HB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013

SB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013

82<sup>nd</sup> General Appropriations Act - 2012-13 (Fiscal Size-up, September 12, 2011)

Notes – from LBB, Summary of Legislative Budget Estimates House/Senate (2014-15 Biennium)

**Article I – General Government**

Library and Archives Commission:

Programs	Description						
Aid to Local Libraries – Strategy A.1.2	Provide funding for Loan Star Libraries grants for public library service enhancements, including the Texas Reads grants for literacy programs and Library System Negotiated Grants for regional library system initiatives. <b>Note:</b> Funding reflects a decrease of \$12.5 million in Federal Funds, including \$6.4 million from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) for completion of the Broadband Technology Opportunities Program (BTOP) to expand computing capabilities at local libraries. HB 1/SB 1 proposed budget amounts are the same, \$4.1 million, which is \$5.6 million <b>less</b> than the current budget. Committee Substitute SB 1: adds \$23,000 to its baseline budget. HCSSB 1 – Stayed the same. <b>CCR adopted the Senate’s version.</b>						
	House	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
		\$14,830,763	\$14,853,500	\$7,937,497	\$1,782,600	\$3,792,081	\$299,611
	Senate	2010	2011	2012	2013	2012	2013
		\$14,830,763	\$14,853,500	\$7,937,497	\$1,782,600	<b>\$3,815,081</b>	<b>\$299,611</b>

**Article I – General Government**

Secretary of State:

Programs	Description						
Election/Voter Registration Section – Strategy B.1.5	The Election/Voter Registration section manages funds for the primary election financing program and reimburses counties for postage for voter registration application. HB 1/SB 1 proposed budget amounts are the same, \$6 million. Note: HB 1/SB 1 appropriates \$4.4 million to Help America Vote Act (HAVA). Committee Substitute SB 1/HCSSB 1: Stayed the same. <b>CCR adopted the same figures.</b>						
	House	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
		\$15,480,319	\$675,929	\$5,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$1,000,000
	Senate	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
	\$15,480,319	\$675,929	\$5,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$1,000,000	

**Article II – Health & Human Services**

Department of Family and Protective Services:

Programs	Description						
Child Abuse and Neglect Prevention Programs - Goal C	Restored CPS funding. HB 1/SB 1 proposed budget amounts are the same, \$64.1 million. This amount is \$2.1 million <b>more</b> than the current budget. Committee Substitute SB 1: adds \$10.0 million to its baseline budget. HCSSB 1 adds \$41.2 million. <b>CCR adopted \$44,042,522 in FY2014 and \$44,822,364 in FY2015.</b>						
	House	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
		\$45,883,571	\$45,883,571		\$30,997,701	<del>\$51,197,735</del> \$32,306,917	<del>\$54,110,721</del> \$31,788,568
	Senate	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
	\$45,883,571	\$45,883,571	\$30,997,700	\$30,997,701	<del>\$37,305,170</del> \$32,306,917	<del>\$36,763,704</del> \$31,788,568	

Sources:

Conference Committee Report on SB 1 (CCR), May 26, 2013

CSSB 1, March 13, 2013

HB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013

SB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013

82<sup>nd</sup> General Appropriations Act - 2012-13 (Fiscal Size-up, September 12, 2011)

Notes – from LBB, Summary of Legislative Budget Estimates House/Senate (2014-15 Biennium)

Article II – Health & Human Services

Department of State Health Services:

Programs	Description						
Mental Health SVCS	HB 1/SB 1 proposed budget amounts are the same, \$551.3 million. This amount is \$1.8 million <b>less</b> than the current budget. Committee Substitute SB 1: adds \$106 million to its baseline budget. HCSSB 1 adds \$108.5 million. <b>CCR adopted \$331,040,750 in FY2014 and \$333,958,331 in FY2015.</b>						
Adults – Strategy B.2.1	House	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
		\$279,201,869	\$285,668,473	\$270,615,444	\$282,513,627	\$327,823,897	\$332,045,366
						\$276,479,775	\$274,874,548
	Senate	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
	\$279,201,869	\$285,668,473	\$270,615,444	\$282,513,627	\$326,606,827	\$330,828,296	
					\$276,479,775	\$274,874,548	
Mental Health SVCS	HB 1/SB 1 proposed budget amounts are the same, \$125.5 million. This amount is \$28 million <b>less</b> than the current budget. Committee Substitute, SB 1: adds \$86 million to its baseline budget. HCSSB 1 adds \$83.5 million. <b>CCR adopted \$90,787,682 in FY2014 and \$110,189,122 in FY2015.</b>						
Children-Strategy B.2.2	House	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
		\$66,307,943	\$66,238,093	\$75,537,904	\$77,928,014	\$97,270,972	\$111,758,977
						\$62,911,006	\$62,584,548
	Senate	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
	\$66,307,943	\$66,238,093	\$75,537,904	\$77,928,014	\$98,546,522	\$113,034,527	
					\$62,911,006	\$62,584,548	

Sources:

Conference Committee Report on SB 1 (CCR), May 26, 2013

CSSB 1, March 13, 2013

HB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013

SB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013

82<sup>nd</sup> General Appropriations Act - 2012-13 (Fiscal Size-up, September 12, 2011)

Notes – from LBB, Summary of Legislative Budget Estimates House/Senate (2014-15 Biennium)

Conference Committee Report on SB 1 (2014-15 Biennium)\*

**Article II – Health & Human Services**

Department of State Health Services:

Programs	Description
Mental Health Crisis SVCS – Strategy B.2.3	HB 1/SB 1 proposed budget amounts are the same, \$168.1 million. This amount is \$3.1 million <b>more</b> than the current budget. Committee Substitute SB 1: adds \$40 million to its baseline budget. HCSSB 1 adds \$50 million. <b>CCR adopted \$106,249,880 in FY2014 and \$114,932,744 in FY2015.</b>
	House
	2010
	2011
2012	
2013	
2014	
2015	
Senate	
2010	
2011	
2012	
2013	
2014	
2015	
North-Star Behavioral Health - Strategy B.2.4	HB 1/SB 1 proposed budget amounts are the same, \$210.1 million. This amount is \$15.1 million <b>less</b> than the current budget. Committee Substitute SB 1: adds \$16.5 million to its baseline budget. HCSSB 1 adds \$18.4 million. <b>CCR adopted \$113,398,422 in FY2014 and \$113,194,896 in FY2015.</b>
	House
	2010
	2011
2012	
2013	
2014	
2015	
Senate	
2010	
2011	
2012	
2013	
2014	
2015	
Indigent Health Care (UTMB) Health - Strategy B.3.2	HB 1/SB 1 proposed budget amounts are the same, \$9.8 million. This amount is \$1.7 million <b>less</b> than the current budget. Committee Substitute SB 1/HCSSB 1: Stayed the same. <b>CCR adopted the same figures.</b>
	House
	2010
	2011
2012	
2013	
2014	
2015	
Senate	
2010	
2011	
2012	
2013	
2014	
2015	

Rev. Date: 06/24/2013, Monday

Sources:

Conference Committee Report on SB 1 (CCR), May 26, 2013

CSSB 1, March 13, 2013

HB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013

SB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013

82<sup>nd</sup> General Appropriations Act - 2012-13 (Fiscal Size-up, September 12, 2011)

Notes – from LBB, Summary of Legislative Budget Estimates House/Senate (2014-15 Biennium)

**Article II – Health & Human Services**

Department of State Health Services:

Programs	Description						
County Indigent Health Care - Strategy B.3.3	HB 1/SB 1 proposed budget amounts are the same, \$4.4 million. This amount is \$51,294 <u>less</u> than the current budget. Committee Substitute SB 1/HCSSB 1: Stayed the same. <b>CCR adopted the same figures.</b>						
	House	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
		\$7,198,442	\$7,198,537	\$2,201,880	\$2,201,879	\$2,176,232	\$2,176,233
	Senate	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
		\$7,198,442	\$7,198,537	\$2,201,880	\$2,201,879	\$2,176,232	\$2,176,233

Sources:

Conference Committee Report on SB 1 (CCR), May 26, 2013

CSSB 1, March 13, 2013

HB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013

SB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013

82<sup>nd</sup> General Appropriations Act - 2012-13 (Fiscal Size-up, September 12, 2011)

Notes – from LBB, Summary of Legislative Budget Estimates House/Senate (2014-15 Biennium)

Conference Committee Report on SB 1 (2014-15 Biennium)\*

**Article II – Health & Human Services**

Department of State Health Services:

Programs	Description						
EMS and Trauma Care System - Strategy B.3.1	HB 1/SB 1 proposed budget amounts are the same, \$137.8 million. Committee Substitute SB 1/HCSSB 1: adds \$3.6 million to both baseline amounts. <b>CCR adopted the same figures.</b>						
	House	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
		\$86,647,702	\$86,647,901	\$68,903,513	\$68,903,514	\$70,649,265	\$70,770,264
						\$68,903,514	\$68,903,513
Senate	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	
					\$70,649,265	\$70,770,264	
					\$68,903,514	\$68,903,513	
Mental Health State Hospitals - Strategy C.1.3	HB 1/SB 1 proposed budget amounts are the same, \$809.5 million. This is \$26.1 million <b>more</b> than the current budget. Committee Substitute SB 1: adds \$18.3 million to its baseline budget. HCSSB 1 adds \$11 million. <b>CCR adopted \$420,896,736 in FY2014 and \$414,899,705 in FY2015.</b>						
	House	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
		\$381,931,305,	\$385,841,872	\$394,061,469	\$389,339,514	\$411,068,699	\$409,501,104
						\$405,428,324	\$404,113,989
Senate	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	
					\$411,776,752	\$413,109,157	
					\$405,428,324	\$404,113,989	
Mental Health Community Hospitals - Strategy C.2.1	HB 1/SB 1 proposed budget amounts are the same, \$150.7 million. This is \$43.3 million <b>more</b> than the current budget. Committee Substitute SB 1: Stayed the same. HCSSB 1 adds \$2.4 million. <b>CCR adopted the House's version.</b>						
	House	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
		\$30,118,077,	\$30,118,077	\$53,703,096	\$53,703,096	\$76,890,052	\$76,250,921
						\$75,690,052	\$75,050,921
Senate	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	

Rev. Date: 06/24/2013, Monday

Sources:

Conference Committee Report on SB 1 (CCR), May 26, 2013

CSSB 1, March 13, 2013

HB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013

SB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013

82<sup>nd</sup> General Appropriations Act - 2012-13 (Fiscal Size-up, September 12, 2011)

Notes – from LBB, Summary of Legislative Budget Estimates House/Senate (2014-15 Biennium)



**Article III – Higher Education**

Texas A&M Forest Service:

Programs	Description																					
Volunteer Fire Department Assistance Program - VFDAP (Wildfire and Emergency Program) – Strategy A.1.1	<p>HB 1 proposed budget amount is \$50.3 million. This is \$122.3 million <b>less</b> than the current budget. SB 1 proposed budget is \$77.5 million, which is \$95.1 million <b>less</b> than the current budget. Committee Substitute SB 1: adds \$10.1 million to the baseline budget, additional \$23.5 million in Article XI (wish list). HCSSB 1 adds \$20 million, additional \$33 million in Article XI (wish list). <b>CCR adopted \$45,005,351 in FY2014 and \$45,038,351 in FY2015.</b></p>																					
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>House</th> <th>2010</th> <th>2011</th> <th>2012</th> <th>2013</th> <th>2014</th> <th>2015</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td><del>\$35,155,351</del></td> <td><del>\$35,188,351</del></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>\$42,918,910</td> <td>\$42,918,910</td> <td>\$146,798,063</td> <td>\$25,798,063</td> <td><del>\$25,125,351</del></td> <td><del>\$25,125,351</del></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	House	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015						<del>\$35,155,351</del>	<del>\$35,188,351</del>		\$42,918,910	\$42,918,910	\$146,798,063	\$25,798,063	<del>\$25,125,351</del>	<del>\$25,125,351</del>
	House	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015															
						<del>\$35,155,351</del>	<del>\$35,188,351</del>															
	\$42,918,910	\$42,918,910	\$146,798,063	\$25,798,063	<del>\$25,125,351</del>	<del>\$25,125,351</del>																
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Senate</th> <th>2010</th> <th>2011</th> <th>2012</th> <th>2013</th> <th>2014</th> <th>2015</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td><del>\$43,755,351</del></td> <td><del>\$43,788,351</del></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>\$42,918,910</td> <td>\$42,918,910</td> <td>\$146,798,063</td> <td>\$25,798,063</td> <td><del>\$38,725,351</del></td> <td><del>\$38,725,351</del></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Senate	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015						<del>\$43,755,351</del>	<del>\$43,788,351</del>		\$42,918,910	\$42,918,910	\$146,798,063	\$25,798,063	<del>\$38,725,351</del>	<del>\$38,725,351</del>	
Senate	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015																
					<del>\$43,755,351</del>	<del>\$43,788,351</del>																
	\$42,918,910	\$42,918,910	\$146,798,063	\$25,798,063	<del>\$38,725,351</del>	<del>\$38,725,351</del>																

Sources:

Conference Committee Report on SB 1 (CCR), May 26, 2013

CSSB 1, March 13, 2013

HB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013

SB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013

82<sup>nd</sup> General Appropriations Act - 2012-13 (Fiscal Size-up, September 12, 2011)

Notes – from LBB, Summary of Legislative Budget Estimates House/Senate (2014-15 Biennium)

**Article IV Judiciary**

Office of Court Administration, Texas Judicial Council:

Programs	Description						
Indigent Defense Commission <i>Strategy D.1.1</i>	HB 1/SB 1 proposed budget amounts are the same, \$62.2 million, which is the same as the current budget. Committee Substitute SB 1/HCSSB 1: adds \$16.7 million to both baseline amounts. Full funding of \$135.5 million in Article XI (wish list) in both bills. <b>CCR adopted the same figures.</b>						
	House	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
		\$29,614,045	\$29,065,130	\$29,774,951	\$32,512,893	<b>\$48,449,904</b>	<b>\$30,546,228</b>
						<del>\$31,143,922</del>	<del>\$31,143,922</del>
	Senate	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
		\$29,614,045	\$29,065,130	\$29,774,951	\$32,512,893	<b>\$48,449,904</b>	<b>\$30,546,228</b>
						<del>\$31,143,922</del>	<del>\$31,143,922</del>

Sources:

Conference Committee Report on SB 1 (CCR), May 26, 2013

CSSB 1, March 13, 2013

HB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013

SB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013

82<sup>nd</sup> General Appropriations Act - 2012-13 (Fiscal Size-up, September 12, 2011)

Notes – from LBB, Summary of Legislative Budget Estimates House/Senate (2014-15 Biennium)

**Article IV Judiciary**

Judiciary Section, Comptroller's Department:

Programs	Description
Assistant Prosecutor Longevity Reimbursement to Counties <i>(Gov. Code 41.255(d) Strategy D.1.1)</i>	These funds are used to supplement the pay of assistant district attorneys that have at least four years of lifetime services credit as an assistant prosecutor. HB 1/SB 1 proposed budget amounts are the same, \$8.1 million, which is \$570,000 <b>more</b> than the current budget. <b>CCR adopted the same figures.</b>  <b>Note: Felony prosecutors</b> – payments shall not exceed \$11,083 per year in single-county districts with populations over 50,000; or \$22,500 per year in districts with populations over 50,000; or \$27,500 per year in districts with populations under 50,000 for those district attorneys, criminal district attorneys and county attorneys.

Judiciary Section, Comptroller's Department:

Programs	Description						
Juror Pay (Judiciary Section, Comptroller's Dept.) <i>Strategy D.1.8</i>	HB 1/SB 1 proposed budget amounts are the same, \$21.8 million. This amount is \$3.4 million <b>more</b> than the current budget. Committee Substitute SB 1/HCSSB 1: Stayed the same. <b>CCR adopted the same figures.</b>						
	House	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
		\$10,802,000	\$10,802,000	\$9,181,700	\$9,181,700	\$10,881,700	\$10,881,700
	Senate	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
		\$10,802,000	\$10,802,000	\$9,181,700	\$9,181,700	\$10,881,700	\$10,881,700

**Article IV Judiciary**

Special Provisions - Judiciary Section, Comptroller's Department

Programs	Description
Sec 11. Judicial Compensation	<b>CCR adopted the following provision: \$17.4 million per year to fund the judicial salary increase which includes benefits. This represents a 12% salary increase for all state judges.</b> <b>Note:</b> This particular appropriation to state judges will require counties to review compensation for all district and statutory county judges prior to September 1, 2013. For additional information click on <a href="#">attachment</a> .

**Article IV Judiciary**

Court of Criminal Appeals:

Programs	Description
Judicial Education Goal B	HB 1/SB 1 proposed budget amounts are the same, \$17.2 million, which is the same as the current budget. Funds from the GR Dedicated – Judicial & Court Personnel Training Fund No. 540 are partially allocated among the various riders below. Committee Substitute, SB 1/HCSSB 1: Added \$1.37 million to Goal B. <b>CCR adopted \$18,377,368 for the biennium.</b>
Judicial and Court Personnel Training <i>Govt. Code 74.025 (Rider 7)</i>	HB 1/SB 1 proposed budget amounts are the same, \$850,000 per year. The amount budgeted per fiscal year is designated for the Court of Criminal Appeals to contact with training entities providing for the training and continuing legal education of the clerks and other court personnel of the appellate courts, district courts, county courts at law, county courts, justice courts, and municipal courts. This is the same amount as in the current budget. <b>CCR adopted the same figures.</b>
Judicial Education <i>Rider 2 (a).</i>	HB 1/SB 1 proposed budget amounts are the same, \$807,500 per year. The amount budgeted per fiscal year is for the continuing legal education of judges of county courts performing judicial functions. Committee Substitute, SB 1/ HB 1: Stayed the same. HCSSB 1 adds \$344,000. <b>CCR adopted the same figures.</b>
Judicial Education <i>Rider 2 (b).</i>	HB 1/SB 1 proposed budget amounts are the same, \$608,722 for the 2014-15 biennium. The amount budgeted is for administrative oversight functions. Committee Substitute, SB 1: adds \$400,000 to this rider. <b>CCR adopted \$951,322 for the biennium.</b>
Technical Assistance for Prosecutors & Criminal Defense Attorneys <i>Rider 3 (a).</i>	HB 1/SB 1 proposed budget amounts are the same, \$1.9 million for the 2014-15 biennium. The amount budgeted is to contract with statewide professional associations of prosecuting attorneys to provide continuing legal education courses, programs, and technical assistance projects for prosecutors and prosecutor office personnel. Committee Substitute, SB 1/HCSSB 1: Stayed the same. <b>CCR adopted \$2,507,500 for the biennium.</b>

Sources:

Conference Committee Report on SB 1 (CCR), May 26, 2013

CSSB 1, March 13, 2013

HB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013

SB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013

82<sup>nd</sup> General Appropriations Act - 2012-13 (Fiscal Size-up, September 12, 2011)

Notes – from LBB, Summary of Legislative Budget Estimates House/Senate (2014-15 Biennium)

**Article IV Judiciary**

Court of Criminal Appeals:

Programs	Description
Prosecutors & Criminal Defense Attorneys <i>Rider 3 (b).</i>	HB 1/SB 1 proposed budget amounts are the same, \$2.2 million for the 2014-15 biennium. The amount budgeted is to contract with a statewide professional association of criminal defense attorneys and other entities that provide continuing legal education courses, programs and technical assistance projects for criminal defense attorneys who regularly represent indigent defendants in criminal matters. Committee Substitute, SB 1/HCSSB 1: Stayed the same. <b>CCR adopted \$2,210,000 for the biennium.</b>

**Article V – Public Safety & Criminal Justice**

Department of Criminal Justice:

Programs	Description						
Basic Supervision <i>Strategy A.1.1</i>	HB 1/SB 1 proposed budget amounts are the same, \$155.6 million. This amount is \$64.8 million <b>less</b> than the current budget. Committee Substitute SB 1/HCSSB 1: \$5.8 million is reduced in both baseline amounts. <b>CCR adopted \$110,159,693 in FY20114 and \$113,135,151 in FY2015.</b>						
	House	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
		\$111,443,958	\$112,680,413	\$110,355,121	\$109,969,834	<del>\$75,020,875</del> \$77,744,349	<del>\$74,796,333</del> \$77,825,614
	Senate	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
		\$111,443,958	\$112,680,413	\$110,355,121	\$109,969,834	<del>\$75,020,875</del> \$77,744,349	<del>\$74,796,333</del> \$77,825,614

Sources:

Conference Committee Report on SB 1 (CCR), May 26, 2013

CSSB 1, March 13, 2013

HB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013

SB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013

82<sup>nd</sup> General Appropriations Act - 2012-13 (Fiscal Size-up, September 12, 2011)

Notes – from LBB, Summary of Legislative Budget Estimates House/Senate (2014-15 Biennium)

**Article V – Public Safety & Criminal Justice**

Department of Criminal Justice:

Programs	Description						
Prison Diversions (Treatment Alternatives, Community Corrections) – <i>Goal A</i>	HB 1/SB 1 proposed budget amounts are the same, \$556 million. This amount is \$485,693 <b>less</b> than the current budget. Committee Substitute SB 1: adds \$24.2 million to its baseline budget. HCSSB 1 adds \$43 million. <b>CCR adopted \$297,711,932 in FY2014 and \$301,087,389 in FY2015.</b>						
	House	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
		\$280,412,879	\$286,024,332	\$277,236,527	\$279,251,242	<del>\$297,801,860</del>	<del>\$301,327,965</del>
						\$277,960,406	\$278,041,670
	Senate	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
		\$280,412,879	\$286,024,332	\$277,236,527	\$279,251,242	<del>\$290,236,932</del>	<del>\$290,012,389</del>
						\$277,960,406	\$278,041,670
Academic/ Vocational Training – <i>Strategy C.2.2</i>	HB 1/SB 1 proposed budget amounts are the same \$3.8 million. This amount is \$1.1 million <b>more</b> than the current budget. Committee Substitute SB 1/HCSSB 1: Stayed the same. <b>CCR adopted the same figures.</b>						
	House	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
		\$2,332,715	\$2,332,714	\$1,363,883	\$1,363,883	\$1,919,044	\$1,919,044
	Senate	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
		\$2,332,715	\$2,332,714	\$1,363,883	\$1,363,883	\$1,919,044	\$1,919,044

Sources:

Conference Committee Report on SB 1 (CCR), May 26, 2013

CSSB 1, March 13, 2013

HB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013

SB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013

82<sup>nd</sup> General Appropriations Act - 2012-13 (Fiscal Size-up, September 12, 2011)

Notes – from LBB, Summary of Legislative Budget Estimates House/Senate (2014-15 Biennium)

**Article V – Public Safety & Criminal Justice**

Department of Criminal Justice:

Programs	Description						
Project Reintegration of Offenders (RIO) – Strategy C.2.3	<b>Zero funding for 2014-15.</b>						
	House	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
		\$5,043,000	\$5,157,308	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
In-Prison Treatment - Strategy C.2.5	Senate	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
		\$5,043,000	\$5,157,308	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HB 1/SB 1 proposed budget amounts are the same, \$69.7 million, which is \$218,682 <b>less</b> than the current budget. Committee Substitute SB 1/HCSSB 1: Stayed the same. <b>CCR adopted the same figures.</b>						
In-Prison Treatment - Strategy C.2.5	House	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
		N/A	N/A	\$34,943,615	\$34,943,615	\$34,834,274	\$34,834,274
	Senate	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
	N/A	N/A	\$34,943,615	\$34,943,615	\$34,834,274	\$34,834,274	

Sources:

Conference Committee Report on SB 1 (CCR), May 26, 2013

CSSB 1, March 13, 2013

HB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013

SB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013

82<sup>nd</sup> General Appropriations Act - 2012-13 (Fiscal Size-up, September 12, 2011)

Notes – from LBB, Summary of Legislative Budget Estimates House/Senate (2014-15 Biennium)



**Article V – Public Safety & Criminal Justice**

Department of Criminal Justice:

Programs	Description						
Operate Parole System – Goal F	HB 1/SB 1 proposed budget amounts are the same, \$321.5 million. This amount is \$9.9 million <b>more</b> than the current budget. Committee Substitute SB 1/HCSSB 1: adds \$10.0 million to both baseline amounts. <b>CCR adopted the same figures.</b>						
	House	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
		\$149,530,590	\$159,772,426	\$155,561,513	\$156,058,081	<del>\$159,755,695</del> <b>\$165,131,533</b>	<del>\$161,790,664</del> <b>\$166,393,286</b>
	Senate	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
		\$149,530,590	\$159,772,426	\$155,561,513	\$156,058,081	<del>\$159,755,695</del> <b>\$165,131,533</b>	<del>\$161,790,664</del> <b>\$166,393,286</b>

Commission on Jail Standards:

Programs	Description
Standards – Goal A	Effective Jail Standards: HB 1/SB 1 proposed budget amounts are the same, \$1.1 million. This amount is \$55,505 <b>less</b> than the current budget. <b>CCR adopted the same figures.</b>

Sources:

Conference Committee Report on SB 1 (CCR), May 26, 2013

CSSB 1, March 13, 2013

HB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013

SB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013

82<sup>nd</sup> General Appropriations Act - 2012-13 (Fiscal Size-up, September 12, 2011)

Notes – from LBB, Summary of Legislative Budget Estimates House/Senate (2014-15 Biennium)

**Article V – Public Safety & Criminal Justice**

Juvenile Probation Commission (JPC) and Juvenile Justice Department (JJD):

Programs	Description						
Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Programs – Strategy A.1.6	Newly formed agency Texas Juvenile Justice Department (JJD) budget is combined with Juvenile Probation Commission (JPC) budget for fiscal years 2012-13. JPC received \$4.2 million for fiscal year 2012 only, while JJD was funded \$12.8 million under this same strategy. <b>Note:</b> Funding for JJD includes a reduction of \$76.1 million in All Funds (\$63.5 million in General Revenue Funds). These reductions are primarily related to declining LBB staff projected populations of juvenile offenders in state facilities. HB 1/SB 1 proposed budget amounts are the same, \$17.2 million. Committee Substitute SB 1/HCSSB 1: Stayed the same. Senate also added \$3 million for the Starr County Juvenile Justice Center and \$11.9 million for the diversion initiative program in Article XI (wish list). <b>CCR adopted the same figures.</b>						
	House	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
		\$11,476,023	\$11,534,404	\$8,570,701	\$8,614,302	\$8,614,302	\$8,614,302
	Senate	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
		\$11,476,023	\$11,534,404	\$8,570,701	\$8,614,302	\$8,614,302	\$8,614,302

Sources:

Conference Committee Report on SB 1 (CCR), May 26, 2013

CSSB 1, March 13, 2013

HB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013

SB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013

82<sup>nd</sup> General Appropriations Act - 2012-13 (Fiscal Size-up, September 12, 2011)

Notes – from LBB, Summary of Legislative Budget Estimates House/Senate (2014-15 Biennium)

**Article V – Public Safety & Criminal Justice**

Juvenile Probation Commission (JPC) and Juvenile Justice Department (JJD):

Programs	Description						
Harris County Leadership Academy (formerly known as Harris County Boot Camp) Rider 30	HB 1/SB 1 proposed budget amounts are the same, \$2 million. Committee Substitute SB 1/HCSSB 1: Stayed the same. <b>CCR adopted the same figures.</b>						
	House	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
		\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
	Senate	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
		\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000

**Article VI – Natural Resources**

Department of Agriculture:

Programs	Description						
Texas Feeding Texans (Home Delivered Meal Grant Program) – Strategy D.2.1	Funding counties’ Meal on Wheels programs and various other nonprofit organizations that provide daily meals to the elderly and disabled. <b>No significant reduction to this program, approximately \$9 million per fiscal year.</b> Committee Substitute SB 1/HCSSB 1: Stayed the same. <b>CCR adopted the same figures.</b>						

Sources:

- Conference Committee Report on SB 1 (CCR), May 26, 2013
- CSSB 1, March 13, 2013
- HB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013
- SB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013
- 82<sup>nd</sup> General Appropriations Act - 2012-13 (Fiscal Size-up, September 12, 2011)
- Notes – from LBB, Summary of Legislative Budget Estimates House/Senate (2014-15 Biennium)

**Article VI – Natural Resources**

Commission on Environmental Quality:

Programs	Description
Air Quality Assessment and Planning – <i>Rider 25 (from Strategy A.1.1)</i>	Provides funding for the Low Income Vehicle Repair, Replacement and Retrofit (LIRAP) for air quality grants to local governments - HB 1/SB 1 proposed budget amounts are the same, \$11.2 million. Also, \$1.25 million is for county to implement local initiatives projects to reduce air emissions, including but not limited to the following: the expansion of AirCheck Texas Repair and Replacement Assistance Program, TCEQ Smoking Vehicle program, and the enhancement of transportation system improvements. <b>CCR adopted \$14,079,280 to fund LIRAP for the biennium.</b>
Texas Emission Reduction Plan (TERP) Grants & Administration – <i>Rider 21</i>	Provides financial incentives to eligible individuals, businesses or local governments to reduce emissions from polluting vehicles and equipment - HB 1/SB 1 proposed budget amounts are the same, \$130.3 million. This amount is \$16 million <b>more</b> than the current budget. Additional funds in Article XI (wish list) in both bills: Senate \$88.4 million and House \$139.6 million. <b>CCR adopted \$77,596,164 for both years.</b>

Sources:

- Conference Committee Report on SB 1 (CCR), May 26, 2013
- CSSB 1, March 13, 2013
- HB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013
- SB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013
- 82<sup>nd</sup> General Appropriations Act - 2012-13 (Fiscal Size-up, September 12, 2011)
- Notes – from LBB, Summary of Legislative Budget Estimates House/Senate (2014-15 Biennium)

**Article VI – Natural Resources**

Parks and Wildlife Department:

Programs	Description						
Local Park, Boating Access and Other Grants – Strategy B.2.1	HB 1/SB 1 proposed budget amounts are the same, \$868,960, which is \$12,500 <b>less</b> than the current budget. <b>Note:</b> A decrease of \$4.4 million in Federal Funds for completed local park acquisition and development, and completed local boat ramp and recreational trail grant projects. Committee Substitute SB 1: Stayed the same. HCSSB 1 adds \$1 million. Both bills include additional funding of \$15.5 million to restore local park funding in Article XI (wish list). <b>CCR adopted \$8,184,480 per year.</b>						
	House	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
	\$20,857,570	\$15,354,860	\$434,480	\$446,980	<b>\$934,480</b>	<del>\$434,480</del>	<b>\$934,480</b>
Senate	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	
\$20,857,570	\$15,354,860	\$434,480	\$446,980	<del>\$434,480</del>	<del>\$434,480</del>	\$434,480	

Soil and Water Conservation Board:

Programs	Description						
Flood Control Dam Grant Program (Rider 8)	HB 1/SB 1 proposed budget amounts are the same, \$4 million. Committee Substitute SB 1/ HCSSB 1: Adds \$10 million to its baseline budget. <b>CCR adopted \$14.8 million.</b>						

Sources:

- Conference Committee Report on SB 1 (CCR), May 26, 2013
- CSSB 1, March 13, 2013
- HB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013
- SB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013
- 82<sup>nd</sup> General Appropriations Act - 2012-13 (Fiscal Size-up, September 12, 2011)
- Notes – from LBB, Summary of Legislative Budget Estimates House/Senate (2014-15 Biennium)

**Article VII – Business and Economic Development**

Department of Motor Vehicles:

Programs	Description						
Automobile Burglary and Theft Grants – <i>Strategy B.2.1</i>	HB 1/SB 1 proposed budget amounts are the same, \$29.8 million, which is \$15,059 <b>less</b> than the current budget. Committee Substitute SB 1: adds \$3.0 million to its baseline budget. HCSSB 1 stayed the same. <b>CCR adopted the House’s version.</b>						
	House	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
		\$15,214,355	\$0	\$14,911,870	\$14,911,870	<b>\$14,904,341</b>	<b>\$14,904,340</b>
	Senate	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
		\$15,214,355	\$0	\$14,911,870	\$14,911,870	<b>\$16,394,775</b>	<b>\$16,394,774</b>
						<del>\$14,904,341</del>	<del>\$14,904,340</del>

Sources:

Conference Committee Report on SB 1 (CCR), May 26, 2013

CSSB 1, March 13, 2013

HB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013

SB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013

82<sup>nd</sup> General Appropriations Act - 2012-13 (Fiscal Size-up, September 12, 2011)

Notes – from LBB, Summary of Legislative Budget Estimates House/Senate (2014-15 Biennium)

**Article VII – Business and Economic Development**

Workforce Commission:

Programs	Description						
Project Reintegration of Offenders (RIO) – Strategy A.1.7	Project RIO provides a link between education, training and employment for participants during incarceration and employment, training and education after release. <b>Zero funding for 2014-15.</b>						
	House	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
		\$10,761,725	\$10,764,151	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Senate	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
		\$10,761,725	\$10,764,151	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Sources:

Conference Committee Report on SB 1 (CCR), May 26, 2013

CSSB 1, March 13, 2013

HB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013

SB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013

82<sup>nd</sup> General Appropriations Act - 2012-13 (Fiscal Size-up, September 12, 2011)

Notes – from LBB, Summary of Legislative Budget Estimates House/Senate (2014-15 Biennium)

**Article VII – Business and Economic Development**

Department of Transportation:

Programs	Description						
Planning, Design, and Management - Strategy A.1.1	HB 1/SB 1 proposed budget amounts are the same, \$717.7 million, which is \$111.1 million <b>more</b> than the current budget. Committee Substitute SB 1/HCSSB 1: Stayed the same. <b>CCR adopted the same figures.</b>						
	House	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
	\$219,220,658	\$134,106,369	\$308,072,136	\$298,493,553	\$358,442,421	\$359,259,513	
Right of Way Acquisition – Strategy A.1.3	Senate	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
	\$219,220,658	\$134,106,369	\$308,072,136	\$298,493,553	\$358,442,421	\$359,259,513	
	House	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Right of Way Acquisition – Strategy A.1.3	HB 1/SB 1 proposed budget amounts are the same, \$717.5 million, which is \$291 million <b>less</b> than the current budget. Committee Substitute SB 1: Stayed the same. HCSSB 1 adds \$30 million in FY 2015. <b>CCR adopted the House’s version.</b>						
	\$344,807,796	\$196,132,979	\$589,889,339	\$418,715,132	\$512,445,837	\$235,055,686	\$205,055,686
	Senate	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
\$344,807,796	\$196,132,979	\$589,889,339	\$418,715,132	\$512,445,837	\$205,055,686		

Sources:

Conference Committee Report on SB 1 (CCR), May 26, 2013

CSSB 1, March 13, 2013

HB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013

SB 1, Introduced version, January 15, 2013

82<sup>nd</sup> General Appropriations Act - 2012-13 (Fiscal Size-up, September 12, 2011)

Notes – from LBB, Summary of Legislative Budget Estimates House/Senate (2014-15 Biennium)



## LEGISLATION OF SIGNIFICANT INTEREST FOR COUNTIES IN THE 83<sup>RD</sup> TEXAS LEGISLATURE

### *Budget*

Last session, the Legislature faced a cash crunch and made dramatic funding cuts, including to some county programs. This session, the State's cash situation was much rosier, and the [2014-2015 budget](#) restores some, but not all, of those cuts. The conference committee report includes more funding for K-12 education, reduction of diversions from Fund 6 (the major source of transportation funding), and \$5.2 billion in additional funding for health and human services.

Some county programs, and how they fare in the 2014-2015 budget:

- Lateral Road Funds – at \$14.8 million, a modest increase in funding over the next two years.
- Local Continuing Education Grants for Law Enforcement Officers – After zeroing out the line item two years ago, budget conferees restored the program's \$6 million per year.
- Disaster Funding to State and Local Agencies – Budget conferees agreed on \$33.7 million in FY 2014 and \$29.6 million in FY 2015, up from a combined \$39 million in 2012-13.
- Criminal Justice Grants to State and Local Entities – they took a \$35 million hit last biennium, but funding increased by \$13 million, to \$189.2 million, in the biennium to come.
- Drug Courts – legislative funding was cut in half in 2012-13, and left unchanged this session at \$750,000 per year.
- Courthouse Preservation Program – Budget conferees agreed on \$461,151 per year to operate the department within the Texas Historical Commission that administers the program – for salaries, etc. However, the conferees eliminated funding for the actual program.
- Mental Health Services for Children – Budget conferees agreed on \$201 million for the FY 2014-2015 biennium.
- County Indigent Health Care – The House and Senate agreed on \$2.17 million per year for the biennium.
- Indigent Defense – House and Senate both agreed on \$48.4 million in FY 2014 and \$30.5 million in FY 2015.
- Automobile Burglary and Theft Grants – Budget conferees agreed on \$14.9 million per year.

### ***Budget Diversions***

For years, the Legislature has been increasingly reliant on a combination of diversions of dedicated funds and withholding funds to certify the budget as strategies to balance the budget. This session, given the improved cash situation, there was considerable discussion of reducing the Legislature's reliance on both. The [budget](#) does reduce diversions from Fund 6, but not significantly. In the end, the Legislature voted to study the issue further in HB 7, *infra*.

[HB 7](#) – by Darby. This bill directs the Legislative Budget Board (LBB) to develop and implement a process to review the dedication, appropriation, and accumulation of general revenue-dedicated funds. The bill further directs LBB to come up with measures on how to reduce the reliance on dedicated funds over the next six years. Among other provisions, the bill expands the use of various dedicated fund accounts. *Effective 6/14/2013, except Section 19 takes effect 9/1/2015.*

### ***Property Tax Policy***

- *Property Tax Exemptions*

In recent years, the trend towards filing bills and joint resolutions to create or extend various property tax exemptions has accelerated. Such legislation is very appealing to legislators, who claim credit for helping particular populations while imposing an unfunded mandate on local governments. This session, approximately 60 such bills were filed.<sup>1</sup> Of these, two passed and will go before the voters in November:

[HJR 62](#) and [SB 163](#) – mandatory residence homestead property tax exemption for the surviving spouse of a member of the armed forces who is killed in action, so long as the spouse does not remarry.

[HJR 24](#) and [HB 97](#) – mandatory residence homestead property tax exemption for a disabled veteran or the surviving spouse of one, set at the same percentage as the level of the veteran's disability rating.

Property tax exemptions produce a reduction in total value available to be taxed. Each affected taxing entity is left with two choices:

- a) leave tax rates the same and accept a reduction in available revenues, even though exemptions almost never reduce demand for services; or,

---

<sup>1</sup> A spreadsheet listing the bills, the activity or class they are exempting, and their potential fiscal impact (as measured in preliminary analyses from the LBB) was provided to the Court in April and is available upon request.

b) adjust tax rates and shift the tax burden to other, non-exempted taxpayers.

In April, the Court added the following Policy Position to the Legislative Agenda:

Support legislation that gives counties and other local governments additional permissive authority to grant property tax exemptions.

- *Property Tax Collections*

[HB 1597](#) – by Gonzalez, Naomi. This bill allows an individual who is disabled or at least 65 years of age and qualifies for a residence homestead exemption or a disabled veteran who qualifies for an exemption to make installment payments on the ad valorem taxes imposed on the residence homestead of the individual in four equal installments without penalty or interest if:

- the first installment is paid before the delinquency date, and
- is accompanied by a notice to the taxing unit that the person will pay the remaining taxes in three equal installments; and,
- the remaining three installments are paid before, respectively, April 1, June 1, and August 1.

The bill also prohibits the penalty from accruing on the unpaid balance during the period of the agreement and provides new language that must be included in a notice of delinquency instructing the homeowner to contact their tax office regarding entering into an installment agreement. *Effective 9/1/2013.*

### *Appraisal and Revenue Caps*

As in past sessions, several bills were filed to lower or otherwise modify appraisal caps and revenue caps. *None of the bills got out of committee.*

The appraisal cap bills fell into three broad categories:

- 1) Constitutional amendment and enabling legislation to reduce the appraisal cap below the current 10%: [HJR 58](#) and [HB 428](#) (Creighton), [SJR 15](#) and [SB 154](#) (Patrick), [SJR 9](#) and [SB 95](#) (Nichols)
- 2) Constitutional amendment and enabling legislation to establish a 10% limitation on increases to the appraisal of commercial or industrial property: [SJR 14](#) and [SB 155](#) (Patrick); and,
- 3) Constitutional amendment and enabling legislation to establish a 5% limitation on increases to the appraisal of all real property: [HJR 84](#) and [HB 1338](#) (Bell)

The revenue cap bills were heard in committee and left pending: [SB 102](#) (Patrick) and [SB 144](#) (Williams).

### ***Water Infrastructure Funding***

[HB 4](#) – by Ritter. This bill serves as the enabling legislation for [SJR 1](#) and together with this proposed constitutional amendment and [HB 1025](#) will provide \$2 billion for funding the state water plan. It creates two funds in the state treasury and outside the general revenue fund, sets aside no less than 10 percent of the funds for rural political subdivisions or agricultural water conservation and no less than 20 percent for water conservation and reuse projects. It also restructures the Water Development Board from 6 part-time members to three full-time, paid members, and sets forth requirements for areas of expertise for them. *Effective 9/1/2013, with certain sections contingent upon voter approval of SJR 1.*

[SJR 1](#) – by Williams/Pitts. This proposed constitutional amendment creates a State Water Implementation Fund, subject to voter approval. Contingent on that approval, [HB 1025](#), one of two supplemental appropriations bills to address issues in the 2012-2013 biennium (the other is [HB 10](#)), transfers \$2 billion from the Rainy Day Fund into the new fund.

### ***Transportation/Mobility Funding***

TxDOT officials told lawmakers at the start of the session that the agency needed an additional \$4 billion in revenue each year *just to maintain current levels of congestion*. They also requested another \$1.6 billion to address roads [torn up by truck activity](#) in South and West Texas counties in the midst of an oil drilling boom. Budget writers ultimately found only \$850 million extra for TxDOT, with \$450 million of that dedicated to counties affected by energy development.

The \$450 million was contained in [HB 1025](#) by Rep. Jim Pitts (R-Waxahachie), which made the money contingent upon passage of legislation that included overweight truck fine increases and legislation to develop a program for disbursing grants to counties experiencing increased oil and gas activity. The overweight truck fine increases are in [HB 2741](#) by Rep. Larry Phillips (R-Sherman), which includes long overdue overweight truck fine increases, topping out at \$10,000.

The grants program for counties with increased oil and gas activity was in [SB 1747](#) by Sen. Carlos Uresti (D-San Antonio), which allows a county to designate an area affected by oil and gas exploration and production and create a county energy transportation reinvestment zone. The bill includes requirements for creating the zone and permits such zones to fund projects with tax increment financing or, alternatively, through bonds issued by a road utility district with the same boundaries as the zone.

- Enhanced Transportation Funding

Efforts to enhance transportation funding during the regular session focused on two strategies: reducing diversions from Fund 6 and increasing transportation revenues. As mentioned above, the 2014-2015 budget makes some progress on the former goal, but legislation to accomplish the latter goal failed.

[HB 3664](#) – by Darby. This bill would increase vehicle registration fees by \$30. The incremental revenue from this increase goes to the State Highway Fund, with one-third to be used for payments on voter approved transportation debt and two-thirds to be used for acquiring ROW, planning, designing, and constructing nontolled improvements to the state highway system. *Died on the House floor.*

[HB 3666](#) – by Darby. This bill allows for a \$15 public safety surcharge to be assessed and collected along with vehicle inspection fees. The revenue would be deposited into the general revenue fund for DPS, thus reducing the diversions from Fund 6. *Died in the Calendars Committee.*

- Comprehensive Development Agreements

Several years ago, as Texans grew concerned that TxDOT was moving too fast on new toll projects with private companies, the Legislature began a new tradition of passing a bill each session to authorize certain “[comprehensive development agreements](#)” to move forward. [SB 1730](#) by Nichols/Phillips includes about a dozen road projects, most around Dallas-Fort Worth and Houston that TxDOT can now develop with private entities. Toll roads or toll lanes are expected to be a feature of most of the projects. *Effective on 9/1/2013.*

- Regional Mobility Authorities

Separately, [SB 1489](#) by Watson/Phillips will make it easier for [regional mobility authorities](#) – quasi-public agencies that often spearhead toll projects – to work on such projects with cities and counties just outside their jurisdiction. *Effective on 5/18/2013.*

- Transportation Reinvestment Zones

Lawmakers also passed several new laws easing the way for communities to make better use of a financing tool called [Transportation Reinvestment Zones](#), or TRZs. When a city or county establishes an area as a TRZ, it can borrow money to fund a transportation project with plans to pay the loan back from the additional (typically, property) tax revenue the project is expected to attract. [SB 1110](#) by Nichols/Pickett removes limits on the use of sales tax revenue in TRZ financing. *Effective on 9/1/2013.*

## *Transparency*

So-called “transparency” legislation received a big [boost](#) from the Comptroller, who made it her signature issue during the session. The focus, of course, was on transparency of local governments.

[HB 14](#) / [SB 14](#) – by Pitts / Williams. This was the omnibus bill, affecting K-12 schools, cities, counties and special districts. Notwithstanding the problematic provisions that would create confusion and additional expense for counties, the CUC, TAC, and CJCAT withdrew their opposition after several clarifying amendments were added. However, neither bill passed.

Although an omnibus bill did not pass, several components of the Combs’ proposals affecting counties became law:

[SB 637](#) – by Paxton / Flynn. This bill changes the content required for a county to properly call for a debt obligation election. A county must publish an election order including, among other things:

- a) the proposition language that will appear on the ballot;
- b) the purpose for which the debt obligations are being authorized;
- c) the principal amount of debt obligations; and
- d) the taxes necessary to be raised to pay back the debt.

The election order must be posted at each polling location during an election, in three public places in the county 21 days before the election and on the county’s website 21 days before the election if the county maintains a website. *Effective 9/1/2013.*

[SB 656](#) – by Paxton / Button. This bill adds requirements to the procedures that the commissioners court must undergo in order to properly pass a budget.

- 1) Any budget must be approved by a record vote.
- 2) The adopted budget must include a cover page with a specific statement about how much revenue will be raised relative to the previous year.
- 3) The cover page must also state the debt obligations owed by the county and the property tax rates for the preceding fiscal year.
- 4) A copy of the record vote on the budget must be posted.

*Effective 9/1/2013.*

[SB 843](#) – by Paxton / Hilderbran. The bill sets up extensive internet reporting requirements for the Comptroller regarding local governments and other political subdivisions. Local governments would have to provide the information, and the

Comptroller would make it available on the website. Much information is already available, but there would be some costs to collect and provide the additional information to the Comptroller. *The bill did not pass.*

[SB 1510](#) – by Hinojosa / Hilderbran. This bill seeks to provide the public an easier method for understanding property tax rate notices for counties and municipalities. It simplifies the information that must be included in such notices and requires publication on the local government’s website as well as in a newspaper of general circulation. *Effective on 1/1/2014.*

### ***Elections***

[SB 578](#) – by Duncan / Sheffield, J.D. Under current law, counties can consolidate precincts into “voting centers” except in primary and primary runoff elections. This would allow their use in primaries and primary runoffs as well. *Effective on 9/1/2013.*

### ***Judiciary and Courts Administration***

Judicial Pay Raise – The 2014-2015 budget includes a 12% pay raise for judges, including associate judges.

[HB 3153](#) – by Lewis / West. Omnibus courts creation bill, creating five new district courts and four new county courts throughout the state, as well as some provisions affecting magistrates and juvenile board. The bill includes a district court and a county court at law, both with criminal jurisdiction, in Travis County to take effect on September 1, 2015. *Effective on various dates.*

[HB 2302](#) – by Hunter / West. The Texas Supreme Court has mandated that courts use an electronic filing system. This bill would establish a state e-filing fund, paid for as follows:

- a \$20 filing fee on civil cases in district or county courts;
- a \$10 filing fee on civil cases in justice of the peace courts; and
- a \$5 court cost assessed upon a criminal conviction.

The fees and costs would be collected and accounted for by counties. The revenue would pay for upgrades to the State’s e-filing system, and to create a grant program to allow counties to catch up on their technology.



The bill also permits a county to charge an additional \$2 filing fee, but only as necessary to offset its costs of developing and maintaining an electronic filing system. The \$2 fee is effective on January 1, 2014, and expires on September 1, 2019. *Effective on 9/1/2013.*

[SB 390](#) – by West / Lewis. This bill changes the effective dates of all new or amended court costs and fees collected by the clerk of a district, county, statutory, municipal or justice court until the next January after the law takes effect. *Effective on 6/14/2013.*

[HB 1513](#) – by Lewis / West. Relating to temporary increases in the records archive fees and the records management preservation fees charged by district and county clerks. Allows a commissioners court to increase the records archive fee from \$5 to not more than \$10. Monies from the fee must be used for the preservation and restoration of the district court records archive. The bill also allows a county clerk to increase both the records management and preservation fee and the records archive fee from \$5 to not more than \$10. *Effective Dates: On 9/1/2013, commissioners courts and county clerks are authorized to increase the above mentioned fees; on 9/1/2019, the maximum fee amounts are reverted back to the amounts set prior to 9/1/2013. The amended court costs and fees become effective 1/1/14 due to the passage of [SB 390](#) which amended Government Code, Section 51.607.*

[HB 2021](#) – by Rodriguez, E. / Hinojosa. This bill authorizes a commissioners court to contract with a private attorney or public or private vendor for the collection of an amount owed to the county relating to a civil case, including unpaid fines, fees or court costs if the amount is more than 60 days overdue. It also allows the county to authorize the addition of a collection fee of 30 percent of the amount referred to compensate the contracted collector. This does not apply to the collection of commercial bail bonds. *Effective on 6/14/2013.*

### ***Indigent Defense***

[HB 1318](#) – by Turner, Sylvester / Whitmire. As filed, this bill required a court in certain juvenile cases to appoint counsel within a reasonable time before the first detention hearing to represent the child at that hearing, unless the court finds that the appointment is not feasible due to exigent circumstances. The bill was amended to include a number of provisions relating to caseloads and reporting for attorneys representing indigent defendants:

- requires a county to prepare and provide to the Texas Indigent Defense Commission (“Commission”) information that describes for the preceding fiscal year the number of court appointments for indigent defendants made to each attorney accepting appointments in the county.



- requires a county to provide to the Commission any plans or proposals submitted to the commissioners court with respect to public defender offices and managed assigned counsel programs, certain contracts relating to a contract defender program and any revisions to plans, proposals or contracts previously submitted to the Commission.
- requires a court appointed attorney to submit information that describes the percentage of the attorney's practice time that was dedicated to court appointments for indigent defendants to the county each year on a form prescribed by the Commission.
- prohibits a public defender's office from accepting an appointment to represent an indigent defendant if the acceptance of the appointment would violate the maximum allowable caseloads established at the office and requires a court to determine whether the chief public defender has demonstrated adequate good cause for refusing the appointment.
- requires the Commission to conduct a study for the purpose of determining guidelines for establishing a maximum allowable caseload for a criminal defense attorney representing indigent defendants.

*Effective on 9/1/2013, except Sections 1 and 6 take effect 9/1/2014.*

### ***Criminal Justice***

[SB 484](#) – by Whitmire. This bill requires a commissioners court in a county with a population of more than 200,000 to establish a prostitution prevention program for defendants charged with a prostitution offense unless a municipality in the county has established such a program, subject to sufficient federal or state funding for that purpose. Counties that are mandated to establish a program must apply for federal and state funds; counties failing to establish and maintain a program as required are ineligible to receive state funds for a community supervision and corrections (i.e., adult probation) department. It authorizes certain fees that may be collected from participants in the program, sets forth certain program powers and duties, and makes the authority to establish the program permissive in counties with populations of 200,000 or less.  
*Effective on 9/1/2013.*

This bill did not pass, but would have had a significant impact on counties. [SB 262](#) – by Huffman, as originally filed, would cut off criminal justice grant funding to ALL criminal justice or law enforcement entities in a county if the county fell below 90% reporting threshold for criminal case dispositions. Although it was amended to give counties notice and opportunity to cure, its provisions were still thought very restrictive.

## *Juvenile Justice*

[SB 511](#) – This bill applies to Travis County, and creates a pilot project wherein the county’s juvenile courts may sentence juvenile felony offenders to its post-adjudication secure facility instead of to a state facility operated by the Texas Juvenile Justice Department. The change requires approval of the local Juvenile Board. The pilot ends on December 31, 2018. *Effective on June 14, 2013.*

- *Truancy Prevention and Intervention*

For two sessions now, legislators have sought to address the perceived criminalization of truancy, removing it from the schools into the criminal justice system. One goal has been to provide more services to at-risk youth prior to being charged with a truancy offense. Several bills were offered to address the problem, including [SB 1419](#). SB 1419 permits the employment and deployment of juvenile case managers to work with schools and families to address the problem *before* the truant youth and/or parents got into the system. The bill also creates a truancy prevention and diversion fund, paid for by a \$2 court cost assessed on all truancy convictions. The local jurisdiction (municipality or county) may keep half of the revenue “for the purpose of operating or establishing a juvenile case manager program, if the county or municipality has established or is attempting to establish a juvenile case manager program.” The rest is sent to the state, to be distributed by the criminal justice division of the governor's office to local governmental entities for truancy prevention and intervention services. *Effective on 9/1/2013.*

[HB 1479](#) – by Villarreal / Van de Putte – applies only to Bexar County, and requires the Bexar County Judge and the Mayor of San Antonio to create a task force to recommend a uniform truancy policy for the various affected entities in the county. *Effective on 6/14/2013.*

## *Mental Health*

The inadequacy of the State’s process for dealing with mental health issues, particularly as they affect the criminal justice system, has received a lot of attention in the last couple of sessions. Fortunately, the Legislature increased funding for state and community-based mental health programs during the last two sessions. It also made substantive changes to the State’s mental health infrastructure. [HB 3793](#), by Coleman, directs the Department of State Health Services to plan for the allocation and funding of an appropriate number of state mental hospital beds and outpatient treatment beds. It

also establishes a planning advisory committee to review the state's resources and the efficient provision of mental health services. It also contains language expanding the list of mental health disorders eligible for assessment and treatment by local mental health authorities. The expansion of treatment for disorders such as post-traumatic stress, obsessive compulsive, attention deficit, eating disorders and others will be prioritized only after the "big three" serious mental illnesses (bipolar, schizophrenia and depression) are treated and depending on availability of funds. The bill also requires local mental health authorities to include jail diversion strategies in their management plans. *Effective on various dates.*

[HB 2392](#) by Menendez / Van de Putte directs the Department of State Health Services to implement a veterans mental health program that would include jail diversion services and veteran courts. *Effective on 9/1/2013.*

[SB 1475](#) by Duncan / Zerwas authorizes the establishment of a pilot program to administer in-jail competency restoration services to inmates declared incompetent to stand trial, instead of transporting them to a state mental hospital for competency treatment. *Effective on 9/1/2013.*

[SB 1185](#) by Huffman / Thompson, S., creates a mental health jail diversion pilot program for Harris County in which the county will match funds from the state to address recidivism among those with mental illness. *Effective on 6/14/2013.*

[SB 1189](#) by Huffman / Fletcher provides law enforcement the authority and guidelines for the disposition of firearms seized when a person is taken into custody without a warrant due to mental health crisis. *Effective on 9/1/2013.*

### ***Public Information***

[SB 1297](#) – by Watson / Branch. This bill authorizes governmental bodies to use a publicly viewable electronic communications board through which board members can communicate with each other. Only board members and staff persons they delegate would be able to participate on the bulletin board. However, no official action can be taken via this method of communication. *Effective on 9/1/2013.*

[HB 2414](#) – by Button / Deuell. The bill allows a commissioners court to hold a meeting by videoconference call and authorizes a member of the court to participate in that meeting remotely if the video and audio feed meet certain criteria. During a meeting by videoconference call, the court must provide certain suitable physical space for the

public to participate in the meeting and the member presiding over the meeting must be present at that physical location. The legislation also includes key provisions from SB 1297, discussed above. *Effective on 6/14/2013.*

[SB 1368](#) – by Davis / Alvarado. This bill amends the definition of public information under the Public Information Act to include any information (1) that a governmental body spends or contributes public money for the purpose of writing, producing, collecting, assembling or maintaining or (2) that is created by an individual officer or employee of a governmental body in his or her official capacity and is related to official business, and (3) any electronic communication on any device if it is in connection with the transaction of official business. The bill also adds a definition of "official business" among other provisions. *Effective on 9/1/2013.*

[SB 471](#) – by Ellis / Harper-Brown. This bill updates the Open Meetings Act by eliminating the requirement that certain meetings be “tape” recorded. Allows option to use either analog or digital technologies to record and store meetings. *Effective on 5/18/2013.*

One bill with far-reaching and unfortunate implications for local governments was not successful. As filed, [HB 2934](#), by Hunter, would bar texting, e-mails, or other electronic communication by elected officials (not just among them) during a meeting. There are a few exceptions for communicating with family members, during an emergency, and basic administrative matters. For example: a commissioner could not text another commissioner about their lunch plans; a county judge could not ask his attorney in an e-mail about a matter on the Agenda. The bill bogged down over fierce opposition from counties and other local governments, and died in committee.

### ***Environmental Regulation***

Counties retain significant responsibility for environmental enforcement in their jurisdictions, often in partnership with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ). Representative Cindy Burkett introduced two bills that would have severely restricted county enforcement of environmental laws:

- [HB 3117](#) would allow the Attorney General to intervene in and settle an environmental enforcement action brought by a county, even against the county’s wishes.
- [HB 3119](#) would prohibit counties from using contingent fee agreements with outside counsel in environmental enforcement lawsuits.

Both bills were heard in committee, but left pending.

The Legislature, which last session cut funding for the [Texas Emissions Reduction Program](#) from \$225 million to \$114 million, raised its total biennial funding to \$155 million. TERP provides financial incentives to eligible individuals, businesses or local governments to reduce emissions from polluting vehicles and equipment, especially heavy diesel equipment.

The Legislature also reduced funding in 2011 for the [LIRAP](#) (Low Income Vehicle Repair, Retrofit, and Accelerated Vehicle Retirement Program) and LIP (Local Initiative Projects) programs, from a biennial total of \$100 million in 2010-11 to \$12.5 million in 2012-13. The 2014-15 budget leaves LIRAP funding at that level, but a rider specifies that about \$1.7 million each year must be channeled directly to Travis and Williamson counties. Also, [HB 2859](#) by Harless / Patrick adds \$2 million per year for local initiative projects. *Effective on 9/1/2013.*

### ***Pollution Control Offsets / Prop. 2***

The program for providing property tax write-offs for pollution control property – called Prop 2 because it was Proposition 2 on the state ballot on November 2, 1993 – is authorized by [§1-l of the Texas Constitution, Article VIII](#). Although counties support the original intent of the legislation, they have had to fight off attempts by industry to extend the exemption to industrial processes, facilities and end products. That battle continued this session.

[HB 1897](#) – by Eiland / Carona. The bill clarifies procedural requirements for claiming an exemption and sets up a new effective date for the exemption to begin once a permit has been issued – January 1 of the next year. This simplifies valuations of these exemptions. The bill also provides a temporary ad valorem tax exemption on property used for pollution control for certain landfill-generated gas conversion facilities capable of producing pipeline quality gas, expiring December 31, 2015. *Effective on 9/1/2013.*

[HB 2712](#) – by Perez / Taylor. This bill was designed for Harris County, and only applies to nonattainment areas near Houston. It permits local governments to exempt qualifying "energy storage systems" that are used to prevent, monitor, control or reduce air pollution from ad valorem taxation. *Effective on 1/1/2014.*

## *Land Use / Growth Management*

Texas grants its counties less land use authority than almost any state in the Union. Particularly in urbanizing counties, however, local officials seek modest authority to manage growth. This session, four different bills ([HB 761](#), [HB 1537](#), [SB 170](#), [SB 456](#)), sought to expand on the authority granted to counties in 2009 to adopt a version of the Residential Construction Code and require homebuilders to submit inspection reports. These bills put more teeth into the reporting requirement by giving a county the option to require issuance of a certificate of compliance prior to utility connections for new residential construction. This would improve builder compliance (currently, only a handful of builders submit reports). If the County opted to require the provisions of this bill, the County would have to produce a certificate of compliance within five working days of the request. In order to meet the requirement, the County may need additional FTEs. However, the legislation does not allow the County to assess a fee to recoup the cost of service. However, none of the bills passed.

[SB 194](#) – by West / Coleman. This bill applies only to a residential subdivision that is divided into 1,000 or more lots and is in the unincorporated area of the county. It directs a commissioners court to adopt infrastructure standards requiring at least two means of ingress and egress in the subdivision to provide for sufficient routes of travel for emergency vehicles and for evacuation purposes resulting from fire or other natural disasters. This does not limit the authority of a commissioners court under any other existing law, as applicable, to adopt more stringent infrastructure standards. *Effective on 9/1/2013.*

## *Eminent Domain*

Last session, one of Governor Perry's emergency items was reform of Texas's eminent domain law. In 2007, Perry had vetoed an eminent domain bill, drawing the ire of property rights and agricultural groups. In 2009, he sought to make amends by pushing another bill, which died in the "chub-a-thon" at the end of that session; hence the emergency designation in 2011. Then, [SB 18](#) clarified that eminent domain may be invoked only for public *uses*, not public *purposes*. It also modified processes and requirements governing eminent domain, and requires governmental entities to pay relocation expenses for displaced property owners and provide a relocation advisory service. This session, [SB 655](#) by Birdwell / King, P. extended the "public use" limitation on the use of eminent domain to special purpose districts and water districts.

Senate Bill 18 also created Subchapter C of [Chapter 2206](#) of the Government Code, requiring governmental entities seeking to exercise eminent domain power to file a letter with the Comptroller summarizing all the constitutional or statutory provisions they believe allow them to use that power. The letter was due on December 31, 2012. Because some governmental entities did not meet that deadline, Representative Bill Callegari filed [HB 24](#) during the Second Called Session, creating an alternative filing process for such entities. However, that bill did not receive a hearing in committee.

Previous discussions of eminent domain authority have focused on its use by public entities. However, this session a number of bills were filed to address perceived [abuses](#) of eminent domain authority by private pipeline companies. [HB 3547](#) and [SB 1625](#) sought to tighten the definition of “common carrier” and the process by which pipeline companies sought that designation from the Railroad Commission. Neither bill passed.

During the session, some stakeholders unhappy with the SB 18 compromise continued to push for more legislation. Ultimately, however, none of the bills discussed below passed.

[HB 20](#) – by Kolkhorst. This bill would entitle a person whose property was acquired through eminent domain to repurchase the property if “the initial use of the property is not the public use for which the property was acquired.” This, of course, would be problematic for entities using eminent domain, as there may be many moving parts to a particular project and not all of them will come together at the same time. The entities’ use, or non-use, of the property during that transition period thus becomes the grounds for asserting a right of repurchase.

[HB 476](#) / [SB 180](#) – by Kolkhorst / Van de Putte. These bills make multiple changes to the public notice and repurchase requirements, including the provision entitling a person whose property was acquired through eminent domain to repurchase the property if “the initial use of the property is not the public use for which the property was acquired.”

[HB 1250](#) – by Frank. Amends the Government Code to require that “private property acquired through eminent domain ... must *initially* be used for the public use for which it was acquired.”



## *Emergency Services*

[HB 712](#) – by Murphy / Patrick. Under previous law, counties with a population of 350,000 or more that furnish firefighting equipment to a municipality or volunteer fire department must keep the equipment in good working order. This bill shifts that responsibility to the volunteer fire department that accepts the fire-fighting equipment, removing the mandate off the county that donated the equipment. *Effective on 9/1/2013.*

[HB 487](#) – by Bell / Nichols. The bill authorizes a commissioners court, county judge, county fire marshal, certain volunteer fire departments or an emergency management director or coordinator designated for the county to request or accept certain care, assistance, or advice, including the loan or operation of construction or heavy equipment if needed to address a man-made or natural disaster. A person who provides such care, assistance, or advice to a county is immune from civil liability, except in a case of reckless conduct or intentional misconduct that occurs while providing voluntary assistance to a county. *Effective on 5/24/2013.*

## *Fireworks*

Legislation that would have affected the county judge's and commissioners court's authority related to the regulation of fireworks – including [HB 3236](#) by Ritter, [HB 3429](#) by Lucio III, and [HB 3557](#) by Ritter – did not pass. The current regulatory provisions in Texas Local Government Code Chapter 352 and Texas Government Code Chapter 418 remain in effect.

## *Indigent Health Care / Medicaid*

One of the major issues facing the Legislature this session was whether or how the State would expand its Medicaid program under the provisions of the Affordable Care Act. Although the Governor steadfastly opposed expansion, legislators and especially budget writers eyed the \$90 billion in federal funds that would flow into the state covetously. Ultimately, though, no consensus was reached and the issue was left unresolved – in part, at least, because of a battle between public and private hospitals over continuation of the DSH program. At least one bill and a couple budget riders were filed to resolve the dispute, none of which passed. That bill and a couple of the “Medicaid expansion bills” are summarized below.

[HB 3680](#) – by Kolkhorst. This bill would require public hospitals or hospital districts (in reality, the eight transferring districts, which includes Central Health) to use their intergovernmental transfer (IGT) dollars to fund DSH first, before anything else. This was the private hospitals' attempt to continue the DSH program, even though the 1115



Waiver provides more flexibility and a better return on investment for the transferring hospitals.

[HB 3376](#) – by Turner, S. This was one of several bills that would direct the Health and Human Services Commission to expand Medicaid coverage “to the extent funds are appropriated to the commission for that purpose.” Its companions included [SB 1232](#), [HB 3122](#), [HB 3266](#), [HB 3487](#), [HB 3700](#) and [HB 3806](#).

[HB 3791](#) – by Zerwas. Relating to a "Texas solution" to reforming and addressing issues related to the Medicaid program, including the creation of an alternative program designed to ensure health benefit plan coverage to certain low-income individuals through the private marketplace; authorizing a fee.

[SJR 61](#) / [SB 1808](#) – by Schwertner. This bill requires offsetting property tax decreases by counties and hospital districts if Medicaid eligibility is expanded in accordance with the federal Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. There were significant problems with the methodology for calculating the amount of the offset in the enabling legislation. *SJR and SB were voted favorably in Finance Committee, but did not reach the floor of the Senate.*

### ***Commissioners Court/County Administration***

[SB 265](#) – by Huffman / Thompson, S. This bill relates to the bonds required of certain county officials, and allows a commissioners court to self-insure in lieu of an otherwise required bond of office for a county officer or employee. It also establishes that a district attorney or a criminal district attorney is not required to execute the required bond of office if the commissioners court chooses to self-insure against losses that would have been covered by the bond. *Effective on 5/18/2013.*

[SB 692](#) – by Carona / Miller, D. Under current law, county judges, commissioners, and attorneys in counties over 100,000 people, as well as justices of the peace in counties over 125,000, are required to file a personal financial disclosure form. This bill permits these officers, and candidates for those offices, to file the required financial disclosure statement with the county clerk by electronic mail. *Effective on 9/1/2013.*

[HB 699](#) – by Davis, J. / Taylor. This bill allows the commissioners court of a county to designate an area other than at the county courthouse where public sales of real property may take place. The area must be a public place within a reasonable proximity of the courthouse and in a location as accessible to the public as the courthouse door.

The court is required to record that designation in the real property records of the county. The sale may not be held prior to the 90th day after the designated area is recorded. *Effective on 10/1/2013.*