

**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
COMPILATION OF PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Submitted to the Committee on Land & Resource Management
For HB 2494

Compiled on: Thursday, April 3, 2025 2:33 PM

Note: Comments received by the committee reflect only the view of the individual(s) submitting the comment, who retain sole responsibility for the content of the comment. Neither the committee nor the Texas House of Representatives takes a position on the views expressed in any comment. The committee compiles the comments received for informational purposes only and does not exercise any editorial control over comments.

Hearing Date: April 3, 2025 8:00 AM

Teri Bates
Self
Corsicana, TX
Yes to HB 2494.

Katrina Aulson
Self
Waxahachie, TX
Support

John Jenkins
Self
Ovilla, TX
I support this bill.

Sylvia Coulson
self- Dietitian
Waxahachie, TX
I support this bill.

Josh Schroeder, Mayor
City of Georgetown
Georgetown, TX

The City of Georgetown opposes HB 2494. Allowing residents to disannex from the city due to the “failure to provide services” piece fundamentally misinterprets the purpose of Municipal Service Agreements (MSAs) and the complexities of city service provision. This bill introduces significant fiscal and operational concerns that would have a detrimental impact on Georgetown residents.

As one of the many Texas cities experiencing rapid population growth, Georgetown has strategically annexed areas in partnership with developers and homebuilders within our ETJ to ensure that essential services—such as police, fire, water, and transportation infrastructure—are provided while maintaining a high standard of service for our residents. However, HB 2494 would penalize cities like Georgetown by allowing disannexation of areas that have not yet received full services, even though we are actively working to provide them. For instance, a resident could choose to disannex simply because they are on septic and now want city wastewater, or because a new fire station, which is necessary but not yet warranted by population, will be built in two years. Should one homeowner be permitted to disannex because their fire response time is a few minutes slower than a neighbor who lives closer to the station?

The City of Georgetown is already facing challenges due to the negative effects of SB 2038 (88R), and HB 2494 would exacerbate these issues for our residents. This bill presents serious financial risks and threatens the provision of critical services that directly affect public safety and quality of life. Additionally, disannexation could undermine Georgetown's ability to manage land-use planning effectively. Without municipal oversight, areas that were previously subject to city zoning and development regulations could become vulnerable to unregulated land uses. This could lead to the development of projects like onsite wastewater treatment plants, which would lower surrounding property values, create environmental hazards, and lead to conflicts between incompatible land uses. Georgetown has worked diligently to ensure responsible and sustainable growth, but this bill would further strip the tools needed to manage that growth effectively.

Further disannexation would also deprive Georgetown of essential tax revenue needed to fund ongoing infrastructure and public services, including emergency services outlined in the Municipal Service Agreements. This loss of revenue would likely force an increase in taxes for existing residents, which is both unfair and inequitable. If the Legislature aims to address affordable housing, creating a fragmented patchwork of developments will only make everything more expensive for all, without achieving the intended goals. HB 2494 would destabilize Georgetown’s ability to provide essential services, lengthen emergency response times, and disrupt long-term land-use planning.

Sharon Tryon
Self
Waxahachie, TX
I support this bill

Vickie Dillow
Self
Waxahachie, TX

Support. Thankful we are beginning to monitor and legislate these municipalities and require them to uphold their responsibilities to the people.

Daniel Southerland
Self. Business Owner.
Red Oak, TX
I support this bill!

Linda Ricks
Self
Midlothian, TX

Dear Members,
I support this bill.
Thank you,
Linda Ricks

Melody Allen
Self - Logistics Manager
Waxahachie, TX

I support this bill.

Bettie Gray
Self
Waxahachie, TX

I support HB 2494

Kathy Ponce
Self
Maypearl, TX

I support this bill 100%. People who were forcefully annexed need protections in place

Roger Queen
Self
Waxahachie, TX

I support SB2494.

Steve Mayer
Self
Georgetown, TX

By allowing an area disannexation from a City because they believe they're not receiving "full city services" is a subjective interpretation. It does not allow for weather related events which are not within the control of a city. If an area is allowed to disannex it will lead to increased costs for the city and its residents. There are issues of right of way which would impact those in surrounding neighborhoods and possibly for the city as a whole. I am not in favor of this bill in it's current form
"

Laura Klein Plunkett
Self-Retired
Georgetown, TX

I am opposed to HB2494. This bill allows areas to petition for disannexation from a municipality if “full city services” are not provided. The bill, however, does not define what “full city services” are. That’s a problem.

The negative impacts of this bill include potential revenue loss from disannexed areas, increased legal and administrative burdens from expedited court cases (with attorney’s fees awarded to petitioners if successful), and reduced flexibility in managing resource allocation, especially for cities struggling with budget constraints or infrastructure challenges. This could also discourage future annexations due to the risk of reversal.

For residents in annexed areas, the bill empowers them to seek disannexation if services are inadequate. TBut what defines “inadequate”? Under this bill, someone could disannex from any part of the city if they believe their emergency response time is too long, or they think the service they receive are somehow inequitable. This would result in increased costs for everyone. And what about the land-use concerns for surrounding neighbors due to the uncertainty and disruption of shifting jurisdictional boundaries? This could negatively impact property taxes, increase pressure on city resources if disannexations reduce the tax base, and indirectly impact service quality citywide.

Anne Griffin
Self
Red Oak, TX

I support the passage of HB 2494.

MARCUS HENRY
self
WAXAHACHIE, TX
Vote YES

Beverly Gatlin
Self
Italy, TX
I support this Bill.

Michele Wallace, Mrs.
Self
Waxahachie, TX
I am for this bill.

Lorne Liechty
Self County Commissioner
Heath, TX

I am opposed to this bill as currently written.

Tammy Baker
Self
Corsicana, TX

I am writing to provide my support for HB2494. I request a Yes Vote for this Bill.

Lisa Healy
Self
Midlothian, TX

I support this bill. Please vote it out of committee. Thank you for your consideration.

Samantha Buford
Self
Palmer, TX

I support this Bill.

Benjamin Hartman
Self, Engineer and Planner
Mansfield, TX

Deny or Significantly change. Cities may not be able to provide water and sewer due to CCN boundary issues. IF a second component of the bill would allow cities to annex land and annex the CCN this could make more sense. However there is still a practicality component for things like gravity sewer. Some areas simply can't gravity sewer to a treatment facility.

Aaron James
Self/ mason
Wht Settlemt, TX

I support HB 2494.

Caryn Moore, Mrs
Self
Waxahachie, TX

I support this bill.

Robert Ryan
Self, Agent
Rockwall, TX

Public Comment Opposing HB 2494

Dear Chair Gates, Vice Chair Lalani, and Committee Members,

I am writing to express my opposition to House Bill 2494, which seeks to amend the Local Government Code to facilitate the disannexation of certain areas from municipalities due to alleged failures in service provision.

While municipal accountability is crucial, this bill presents several concerns:

Ambiguity in Service Obligations: The bill does not clearly define what constitutes a failure or refusal to provide services, potentially leading to subjective interpretations and disputes that could burden municipal resources and the judicial system.

Financial Implications: Disannexation can disrupt municipal budgets and planning, especially if significant investments have been made in infrastructure or services for the area in question. This could lead to financial instability and affect services for remaining residents.

Precedent for Fragmentation: Facilitating disannexation based on service disputes may set a precedent that encourages fragmentation, undermining the cohesive development and governance of urban areas.

Alternative Remedies Exist: Existing mechanisms allow residents to address service grievances through municipal channels or elections. This bill may bypass these processes, leading to hasty decisions without thorough deliberation.

In conclusion, while ensuring municipalities fulfill their service commitments is essential, HB 2494's approach may lead to unintended consequences that outweigh its benefits. I respectfully urge the committee to oppose this bill and consider alternative measures to enhance municipal accountability without resorting to disannexation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Robert Ryan

John Cowan
Self
Rockwall, TX

I strongly oppose HB 2494. This bill in its current form will result in undue infrastructure expenses in County government and may give some cities an incentive to abandon maintaining aging or failing infrastructure so that the county can assume the burden and expense of such services.