

**LEGISLATIVE BUDGET BOARD**  
**Austin, Texas**

**FISCAL NOTE, 83RD LEGISLATIVE REGULAR SESSION**

**March 22, 2013**

**TO:** Honorable Gary Elkins, Chair, House Committee on Technology

**FROM:** Ursula Parks, Director, Legislative Budget Board

**IN RE: HB889** by Fallon (Relating to the requirement that certain governmental bodies broadcast meetings on the Internet.), **As Introduced**

<p><b>No fiscal implication to the State is anticipated.</b></p>
--

The bill would amend the Government Code to require the governing body of a county, public school district, or home-rule municipality with a population of 50,000 or more to broadcast regularly scheduled open meetings over the Internet and make archived video and audio available. The governmental body would not be required to establish a separate Internet site.

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) indicated the bill would have no direct fiscal implications for the Foundation School Program or the operations of the TEA.

**Local Government Impact**

TEA interpreted the bill's provisions to apply to a school district that had a population of 50,000 or more within its geographic boundaries. Based on 2010 U.S. Census data, there are over 100 school districts that would be affected. Applicable school districts would be required to broadcast open meetings of the board of trustees and provide archived broadcasts using an Internet website. The TEA indicated there would be administrative costs to school districts that would have to either purchase equipment or pay for services to broadcast video and audio of open meetings which could be broadcast over an Internet site such as YouTube. The location of the open meeting would also require a live Internet high speed connection, a video camera, and a computer with video and audio cards. There would be costs for a person to operate a video camera which could range from a few hundred dollars to \$100,000 or more depending on the number of meetings, the amount and quality of equipment to broadcast the meetings; and whether the equipment was purchased, leased, or part of a services contract that covered the cost of labor to provide video and audio broadcasts over the Internet.

There could be a fiscal impact to applicable cities and counties that would vary depending on current processes in a locality.

The City of Austin reported that no significant fiscal impact is anticipated as the city currently airs public meetings live via video, and archives meetings online. The city also noted that a few advisory boards and commissions currently only post audio recordings; and that holding meetings in a public venue would not likely result in a savings.

The City of Conroe reported there would be costs for new equipment totaling an estimated \$4,000 in fiscal year (FY) 2014; and upgraded equipment costs of \$10,000 in FY 2017. The city's affected department's current fiscal year budget is \$100,000.

The City of Baytown reported there would be costs totaling an estimated \$46,147 including costs for mobile recording equipment (\$23,147); staff overtime (\$8,000); and meeting archival costs (\$15,000). The city's affected department's current fiscal year budget is \$201,428.

Dallas County reported there would be costs totaling an estimated \$339,625 including costs for one new employee (\$114,625); computer equipment (\$225,000) in FY 2014; and costs ranging from \$119,210 in FY 2015 to \$134,095 in FY 2018. Dallas County's affected department's current fiscal year budget is \$16.9 million. The county also noted that the county currently does not have the necessary equipment or staff to broadcast their public meetings on the county's website.

**Source Agencies:** 701 Central Education Agency

**LBB Staff:** UP, RB, TP, JBi