



LEAGUE OF
WOMEN VOTERS®

2019 Coppel

VOTERS GUIDE

NON PARTISAN

EARLY VOTING • OCTOBER 21, 2019 – NOVEMBER 1, 2019 ELECTION DAY • NOVEMBER 5, 2019 • POLLS OPEN 7 AM TO 7 PM

BE A TEXAS VOTER

About This Voters Guide

This printed *Voters Guide* lists items that will be on the ballot for the November 5, 2019 Texas constitutional amendments and city of Coppel sales tax referendum. This *Voters Guide* is funded and published by the League of Women Voters of Dallas which does not support or oppose any political party or candidate. Call 214-688-4125 or lwvdallas@sbcglobal.net for questions.

Vote411.org

You may also see all items on your ballot on-line at Vote411.org.

Photo ID Requirement

People voting in person must present a form of photo ID or alternative approved by the state or else may only vote provisionally. For more information and exceptions see DallasCountyVotes.org or call 214.819.6300.

Eligibility for Voting

You must be a citizen of the United State, registered to vote in the county of your residence 30 days prior to election day, and must be at least 18 years old on election day. You cannot vote if you have been declared by a court exercising probate jurisdiction to be totally mentally incapacitated or partially mentally incapacitated without the right to vote or are a convicted felon who has not completed your sentence, probation and/or parole.

Early Voting Times & Locations

Monday Oct 21 – Saturday Oct 26	8AM to 5PM
Sunday Oct 27	1PM to 6PM
Monday Oct 28 – Wednesday Oct 30	8AM to 5PM
Thursday Oct 31 – Friday Nov 1	7AM to 7PM

Dallas County residents may vote at any of these locations:

Addison Fire Station #1	4798 Airport Pkwy	Addison
Balch Springs Civic Center	12400 Elam Road	Balch Springs
Bear Creek Community Church	2700 Finley Road	Irviing
Bethany Luth Ch (Nelson Hall)	10101 Walnut Hill Lane	Dallas
Brookhaven Col-W Bldg Rm 105	3939 Valey View Ln	Farmer Brnch
Cedar Hill Gov Cntf Main Lobby	285 Uptown Blvd	Cedar Hill
Cedar Valley Col "M" Bldg	3030 North Dallas Ave	Lancaster
Coppel Town Cntr Main Lobby	255 E Parkway Blvd	Coppel

Crosswinds High Sch Rm 104	1100 N Carrier Pkwy	Grand Prairie
Disciple Central Com Ch Rm 104	901 N Polk St	DeSoto
Duncanville Library Rms 1,2,3	201 James Collins	Duncanville
Eastfield Col-Main Cmp "C" Bldg	3737 Motley Dr	Mesquite
Eastfield Col-Pleasant Grv Cmp	802 S Buckner	Dallas
El Centro Col-Main Cmp Lobby	801 Main Street	Dallas
El Centro Col-West Cmp Com Rm	3330 N Hampton Road	Dallas
Florence Recreation Center	2501 Whitson Way	Mesquite
Fretz Park Library	6990 Belt Line Road	Dallas
Friendship West Baptist Church	2020 Wheatland Road	Dallas
George Allen Courts Building	600 Commerce St	Dallas
Glenn Heights City Hall	1938 S Hampton Rd	Glenn Heights
Grauwylar Park Rec Center	7780 Harry Hines Blvd	Dallas
Highland Hills Library	6200 Bonnie View Road	Dallas
Irving Arts Center	3333 N Macarthur Blvd	Irving
Irving City Hall Main Lobby	825 W Irving Blvd	Irving
Josey Ranch Library	1700 Keller Springs Rd	Carrollton
Lakeside Activity Center	101 Holley Park Drive	Mesquite
Lancaster Vet Memorial Lib	1600 Vet Memorial Pkwy	Lancaster
Lochwood Library	11221 Lochwood Blvd	Dallas
Marsh Lane Baptist Church	10716 Marsh Lane	Dallas
Martin Luther King Core Bldg	2922 Martin Luther King Blvd	Dallas
Martin Weiss Rec Center	1111 Martindell Avenue	Dallas
Mountain Creek Library	6102 Mountain Creek Pkwy	Dallas
Mountain View Col "E" Bldg	4949 W Illinois Ave	Dallas
North Lake Col "L" Bldg	5001 N MacArthur Blvd	Irving
Oak Cliff Sub-Courthouse	410 S Beckley	Dallas
Our Redeemer Luth Ch-Dallas	7611 Park Lane	Dallas
Our Redeemer Luth Ch-G Prairie	4729 S Carrier Pkwy	Grand Prairie
Paul L Dunbar Lan-Kiest Lib	2008 East Kiest Blvd	Dallas
Richardson Civic Center	411 W Arapaho Road	Richardson
Richland College-Garland Camp	675 W Walnut St	Garland
Richland Col-Main Cmp"G" Bldg	12800 Abrams Rd	Dallas
Rowlett City Hall Annex	4004 Main St	Rowlett
Sachse City Hall	3815 Sachse Road	Sachse
Samuell Grand Rec Center	6200 East Grand Ave	Dallas
Skyline Branch Library	6006 Everglade Road	Dallas
South Garland Library	4845 Broadway Blvd	Garland
Southern Meth U-Hughes-Trig	3140 Dyer St	Dallas
Sunnyvale Town Hall	127 North Collins Road	Sunnyvale
University of Dallas-5B Hall	2925 Gorman Dr	Dallas
University Park UMC-Caldwell	4024 Caruth Blvd	Dallas
Valley Ranch Library	401 Cimarron Trail	Irving

Election Day Times & Locations

Dallas Co residents may vote at any polling location on Election Day.

Polls open 7 AM to 7 PM on Nov 5, election day. For election day locations see DallasCountyVotes.org or call 214.819.630

TEXAS CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT ELECTION

All potential amendments that appear on your ballot must originate in the legislature. The Texas Constitution cannot be amended by citizen-led ballot initiatives, referendums or petitions, as in some other states. The ten amendments voters will consider in this election were approved by the state legislature earlier this year. Explanations and reasons to vote for and against these propositions were developed by the League of Women Voters of Texas.

STATE OF TEXAS PROPOSITION 1 *(Municipal Judges)*

BALLOT LANGUAGE: “The constitutional amendment permitting a person to hold more than one office as a municipal judge at the same time.”

EXPLANATION: The Texas Constitution (Article 16, Section 40) prohibits a person from holding more than one public office at the same time but has many exceptions, including county commissioner, justice of the peace, notary public, postmaster, etc. The proposed constitutional amendment would add elected municipal judge to this list of exceptions. A municipal judge oversees pre-trial hearings, small claims proceedings, and misdemeanor cases in a city or town. Proposition 1 would allow municipal judges to hold more than one paid public office at the same time, meaning they could simultaneously preside over multiple municipalities, regardless of whether they were appointed or elected.

Watch a short video on Prop. 1: <https://youtu.be/zGFBdY2bGt8>

For more information: House Research Organization HJR 72: <https://hro.house.texas.gov/pdf/ba86R/HJR0072.PDF>

ARGUMENTS:

For

- A municipal judge oversees essential local proceedings, such as pretrial hearings, small claims proceedings, and misdemeanor cases. Often smaller municipalities do not have municipal judges or attorneys qualified to serve as judges. Prop 1 would make it easier for smaller municipalities to fill empty judgeships with qualified individuals.
- The proposition could benefit public safety by making it easier to obtain search warrants and streamlining other proceedings, such as ordinance violations, misdemeanor offenses and other types of cases.

Against

- This proposition is unnecessary as Texas law already permits a person to be appointed as a municipal judge in more than one municipality at the same time. This law would only allow a person to be elected in more than one municipality.
- If the municipal judge were elected to a community where he or she was not a resident, he or she may not have an understanding or interest in that community.

STATE OF TEXAS PROPOSITION 2 *(Water Projects in Distressed)*

BALLOT LANGUAGE: The constitutional amendment providing for the issuance of additional general obligation bonds by the Texas Water Development Board in an amount not to exceed \$200 million to provide financial assistance for the development of certain projects in economically distressed areas.”

EXPLANATION: Proposition 2 would allow the Water Development Board to issue general obligation bonds for the Economically Distressed Areas Program (EDAP). The outstanding bonds could not exceed \$200 million. The bonds would be used to develop water supply and sewer projects in economically depressed areas of the state. EDAP assists water infrastructure projects when the median income of a region is less than 75% of the state’s median income. The proposed amendment would give the Water Development Board the money to finance water and wastewater infrastructure in economically distressed areas.

For more information: [House Research Organization SJR 79](#)

ARGUMENTS:

For

- All citizens deserve clean water, regardless of their income. Socioeconomic factors should not determine access to safe water. It’s a basic right.
- This program needs to be replenished so it can continue funding existing and future projects for communities that could not otherwise afford it.
- Financing with bonds will provide more reliable funding over a longer period of time. Using general revenue would strain limited resources.

Against

- The net impact to the general revenue fund will be \$3,375,000 through 2021.
- This is another constitutionally dedicated fund which the state should avoid. Infrastructure improvements should be funded using general revenue.
- This is a local issue and should not be handled by the state.

STATE OF TEXAS PROPOSITION 3 *(Tax Relief for Disaster Areas)*

BALLOT LANGUAGE: “The constitutional amendment authorizing the legislature to provide for a temporary exemption from ad valorem taxation of a portion of the appraised value of certain property damaged by a disaster.”

EXPLANATION: Proposition 3 would allow the Texas Legislature to give a temporary property tax exemption in a governor-declared disaster area. The exemption would be 15%, 30%, 60%, or 100%, depending on the amount of property damage. The local government would choose whether or not to adopt the temporary exemption and would determine how long the exemption would last.

For more information: [House Research Organization HJR 34](#)

ARGUMENTS:

For

- In the event of environmental disasters, a tax exemption would bring quicker and easier relief to those affected.
- Proposition 3 would be easier and more affordable for the local government than the current property reassessment process, which is both lengthy and expensive.

Against

- Since Proposition 3 relies on the local government to decide whether or not to adopt the tax exemption, it does not guarantee it will help as many people as intended. Any such relief should be mandatory.
- Though there would now be predetermined damage categories, the property may still have to undergo an extensive reappraisal process.

STATE OF TEXAS PROPOSITION 4 *(Personal Income Tax)*

BALLOT LANGUAGE: “The constitutional amendment prohibiting the imposition of an individual income tax, including a tax on an individual’s share of partnership and unincorporated association income.”

EXPLANATION: Proposition 4 would prohibit the Texas Legislature from establishing a personal state income tax.

For more information: [House Research Organization HJR 38](#)

ARGUMENTS:

For

- A 2019 poll by the University of Texas at Austin and the Texas Tribune found 71% of respondents oppose an individual state income tax. *
- Texas has a low-tax, pro-growth approach to economic expansion, and that is dependent on having no personal income tax. This amendment could support population growth in Texas, as families and businesses may move to Texas because there is no state income tax.
- An income tax would also increase the size of government by requiring a large bureaucracy to administer it.

Against

- This amendment is not necessary because the Texas Constitution now prohibits the Legislature from imposing an income tax without a statewide referendum (Art. 8, Sec. 24, adopted in 1993). In addition, any net revenue from that tax must be used for the support of education.
- Revenue from an income tax could reduce the tax burden on businesses, which pay a higher proportion of taxes in Texas than in other states.
- The current Legislature and today’s voters should not make taxation decisions for future Texans. The needs of Texans change over time, so future Texans should make their own choices on taxation.
- One reason Texans pay high property and sales taxes may be because Texas has no income tax. If Proposition 4 passed, these taxes would likely continue to increase, so Proposition 4 would not necessarily decrease the size of state government.

STATE OF TEXAS PROPOSITION 5 *(Sporting Goods Tax to Support State Parks)*

BALLOT LANGUAGE: “The constitutional amendment dedicating the revenue received from the existing state sales and use taxes that are imposed on sporting goods to the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department and the Texas Historical Commission to protect Texas’ natural areas, water quality, and history by acquiring, managing, and improving state and local parks and historic sites while not increasing the rate of the state sales and use taxes.”

EXPLANATION: Proposition 5 would require the Legislature to allocate the money raised from state sales taxes on sporting goods (i.e., hunting, fishing, outdoor equipment) to the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD) and the Texas Historical Commission (THC). Revenue from such taxes would be used to improve and manage state and local parks and historic sites, and to acquire new sites. Proposition 5 closes a loophole in the current law that prevents all the revenue raised by these sales taxes from being given to Texas Parks and Wildlife Department and the Texas Historical Commission, thus allowing some of the money to be used to balance the state budget.

For more information: [House Research Organization HJR 39](#)

ARGUMENTS:

For

- State and local parks are essential to industries such as fishing, hunting, and tourism that benefit Texas economy. Proposition 5 would require the government to support this vital economic sector more fully. It would allow these agencies to make long range plans based on a reliable funding source.
- Many parks and historic sites of Texas are decaying, and new parks are needed due to population growth in the state. Proposition 5 would provide a sustainable source of funding for their preservation and new park development so they could be enjoyed in the future.

Against

- Having a dedicated account, a fund used for a specific purpose, eliminates budget flexibility for the Texas Legislature.
- Dedicated accounts can cause unnecessary growth of the state budget by demanding funds in one area even though needs could be greater in another.

STATE OF TEXAS PROPOSITION 6 *(Cancer Prevention Research)*

BALLOT LANGUAGE: "The constitutional amendment authorizing the legislature to increase by \$3 billion the maximum bond amount authorized for the Cancer Prevention and Research Institute of Texas."

EXPLANATION: The proposed amendment would increase the maximum bond amount for the Cancer Prevention and Research Institute of Texas (CPRIT) from \$3 billion to \$6 billion. CPRIT provides grants and supports programs that advance cancer research. The organization, begun in 2007, is currently set up to receive \$3 billion in funding until 2022.

For more information: [House Research Organization HJR 12](#)

ARGUMENTS:

For

- The state is the second largest source of public funding for cancer research in Texas, behind the federal government. Increasing the bond amount would ensure that the state maintained its status as a hub for advancements in the cancer field, and continue Texas’ national leadership in cancer research and prevention.
- CPRIT has created thousands of jobs and brought in more than 170 researchers, including a Nobel Prize winner, to Texas. It has generated billions of dollars of economic activity.
- Increasing the bond amount would protect CPRIT’s future, because current funding for awards will run out in 2021.

Against

- Current funding of CPRIT is in place until 2022, so the issue is not an urgent matter. Voters may not want to consider it right now—three years in advance. Instead the legislature might consider developing a plan to make CPRIT become financially self-sufficient.
- CPRIT has a history of mismanaging funds. A ban was put on CPRIT grants in 2012 and was lifted in October 2013 after restructuring of the organization.
- The proposed amendment would cost the government \$12.5 million in general revenue funds during the first two years, assuming debt service payments based on the issuance of this new debt.

STATE OF TEXAS PROPOSITION 7 (*Funding Public Education*)

BALLOT LANGUAGE: “The constitutional amendment allowing increased distributions to the available school fund.”

EXPLANATION: The School Land Board, an independent entity of the General Land Office, oversees the management, sale and leasing of more than 13 million acres of land for the Permanent School Fund. The State Board of Education can then make distributions from this fund to the Available School Fund. The revenue generated from the land is used to purchase real estate and make investments to help fund public education through the Available School Fund. This proposition would increase from \$300 million to \$600 million the amount the General Land Office could distribute to the Available School Fund each year.

For more information: [House Research Organization HJR 151](#)

ARGUMENTS:

For

- This proposition will improve funding for public schools by doubling the distribution from the School Land Board to the Available School Fund.
- Were it not for the \$300 million cap in the Texas Constitution, this could have been happening already, making more money available for public education.
- As more money is available to school districts from the state Available School Fund, they will need to rely less on local property taxes.

Against

- Both the School Land Board and the State Board of Education have responsibilities for managing the Permanent School Fund. If the School Land Board makes larger deposits directly to the Available School Fund rather than into the Permanent School Fund, it changes the amount the State Board of Education is required to distribute from the Permanent School fund.
- The State Board of Education is required to make a percentage-based biennial distribution to the Available School Fund. If they have less money in the Permanent School Fund, it might result in lower overall school funding.
- In the past, the School Land Board made questionable investments at the expense of public education funding. With the opportunity to make larger contributions, it might increase the lure of debatable investments.

STATE OF TEXAS PROPOSITION 8 (*Flood Control*)

BALLOT LANGUAGE: “The constitutional amendment providing for the creation of the flood infrastructure fund to assist in the financing of drainage, flood mitigation, and flood control projects.”

EXPLANATION: Proposition 8 would create the Flood Infrastructure Fund (FIF) as a special fund outside of general revenue. A one-time distribution from the Economic Stabilization Fund, also known as the “rainy day fund,” would establish the FIF. The Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) would distribute FIF funds to local governments through loans or, in some cases, as grants. The money would be used to establish and maintain flood control structures and drainage infrastructure throughout the state, especially in economically distressed areas. If passed, Proposition 8 would require cooperation among all impacted parties. A local government would receive money from the FIF only if it worked with other governments in the region and listened to stakeholder concerns in public meetings. The local government would also have to submit a technical analysis of the plan, comparing it to other possible projects in the region, and a proposal to repay the loan.

For more information: [House Research Organization HJR 4](#)

ARGUMENTS:

For

- Severe flooding events such as Hurricane Harvey show the necessity of being prepared to prevent future damage. Access to federal funding and grants often requires local governments to match the amount of money the federal government would provide. This amendment would allow the TWDB to give loans to local governments so they could access federal funds.
- Because removing money from the Economic Stabilization Fund to create the FIF would be a one-time expense, rather than ongoing, it would not drain the “rainy day fund.”

Against

- A local government could default on a TWDB loan, thereby costing the state income meant to replenish the FIF. Taxpayers might ultimately be liable for repayment of loans.
- Historically, state government has not played a heavy role in funding flood-control infrastructure. Flood control is the responsibility of both local and federal governments, rather than state government.

STATE OF TEXAS PROPOSITION 9 *(Tax Exemption of Precious Metals)*

BALLOT LANGUAGE: “The constitutional amendment authorizing the legislature to exempt from ad valorem taxation precious metal held in a precious metal depository located in this state.”

EXPLANATION: Texas opened a precious metals depository in 2018, run by a private company but overseen by the state government. The Constitution requires all real and tangible personal property to be taxed on its value unless exempted. These ad valorem (property) taxes are imposed at the time of purchase or exchange of precious metals. Proposition 9 would exempt from taxation precious metals held in a precious metal depository in the state.

For more information: [House Research Organization HJR 95](#)

ARGUMENTS:

For

- Other states do not tax precious metals, so creating this exemption would allow Texas depositories to be more competitive.
- The proposed amendment would increase chances that the Texas depository could join COMEX, the leading marketplace for precious metals exchange.

Against

- Texas counties do not enforce the property tax on precious metals, so a constitutional amendment is unnecessary.
- The proposed amendment gives preference through a tax break for precious metals over other investment choices.

STATE OF TEXAS PROPOSITION 10 *(Law Enforcement Animals)*

BALLOT LANGUAGE: “The constitutional amendment to allow the transfer of a law enforcement animal to a qualified caretaker in certain circumstances.”

EXPLANATION: Proposition 10 would allow law enforcement animals to retire, and their former handlers or other qualified caretakers to adopt them with no fee. Law enforcement animals are currently considered as surplus property of the county, which means the county can only auction, donate, or destroy them. Proposition 10 would change the property laws to allow the animals to retire and be transferred to their original handler or another qualified caretaker with no adoption fee.

For more information: [House Research Organization HJR 96](#)

ARGUMENTS:

For

- Proposition 10 would ensure the wellbeing of law enforcement animals in their later years by allowing them to retire.
- Proposition 10 would remove the legally required fee for law enforcement officers, or other qualified caretakers, who generally adopt their own retired law enforcement animals.
- Proposition 10 recognizes the longstanding bond developed between a law enforcement animal and the animal’s handler, a bond that would be ignored in a government auction.

Against

- Proposition 10 may reduce state income. A government auction might raise more money than the free adoption of a law enforcement animal.
- If the animal’s handler retires before the animal is ready to retire, it might be difficult to determine which of the animal’s handlers had priority.
- It is unfortunate that such a common sense action would require a constitutional amendment.

CITY OF COPPELL SPECIAL ELECTION

CITY OF COPPELL PROPOSITION A

The reauthorization for a four (4) year period the local sales and use tax in Coppell at the rate of one-fourth of one percent to continue providing revenue for maintenance and repair of municipal streets or sidewalks.

(La reautorización por un periodo de cuatro (4) años para el impuesto local a las ventas y uso de una tasa de un cuarto del uno por ciento en la ciudad de Coppell para continuar proporcionando ingresos para el mantenimiento y reparación de calles o aceras municipales.)

Vote For or Against

Explanation

In 2007, Coppell voters originally authorized levy of a ¼ cent sales tax for a four-year period to provide funding for maintenance and repair of municipal streets and sidewalks. It was reauthorized in 2015 and is set to sunset in 2020. Reauthorization of the sales tax collection would be for an additional four years and will NOT result in an increase in the sales tax rate. This sales and use tax will continue to provide a dedicated funding source for streets and sidewalks during the collection period. Since the inception of the one-quarter cent sales tax, more than \$43 million dollars has been collected for this purpose. The city also charges a ¼ cent voter approved sales tax for crime control and prevention and a ½ cent voter approved sales tax for the Coppell Recreation Development Corporation, and a 1 cent voter approved sales tax for the General Fund.

Reasons to Vote For	Reasons to Vote Against
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The use of a ¼ cent sales tax for maintenance of streets and sidewalks has worked effectively for a number of years and should continue to do so in the future.2. A citizens committee reviewed the issue and recommended approval, and the city council approved the item unanimously.3. Use of sales tax revenue for this purpose relieves some of the burden on property tax payers.	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Taxes are already too high. The city should allow this authorization to expire, providing relief to taxpayers.2. The city should fund street maintenance and repair from property taxes, a less regressive type of tax.

