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| **BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE** Interested parties note that current law making the county judge, if present, the presiding officer of the county commissioners court is problematic for certain meetings held via videoconference call. H.B. 536 seeks to address this issue by providing for a certain exemption from that law. |
| **CRIMINAL JUSTICE IMPACT**It is the committee's opinion that this bill does not expressly create a criminal offense, increase the punishment for an existing criminal offense or category of offenses, or change the eligibility of a person for community supervision, parole, or mandatory supervision. |
| **RULEMAKING AUTHORITY** It is the committee's opinion that this bill does not expressly grant any additional rulemaking authority to a state officer, department, agency, or institution. |
| **ANALYSIS** H.B. 536 amends the Local Government Code to make the statutory provision establishing the county judge, if present, as the presiding officer of the county commissioners court inapplicable to a meeting held by videoconference call if the county judge is not located at the physical space made available to the public for the meeting.  |
| **EFFECTIVE DATE** On passage, or, if the bill does not receive the necessary vote, September 1, 2017. |