

TEXAS FFA ASSOCIATION

LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT EVENTS



AG ISSUES AND CURRENT EVENTS
BRIEFS
2024-2025

Contents

Texas Ag Agency Says Climate Change Threatens State's Food Supply.....	3
We Can't Stand Still: How U.S. Farmers and Ranchers Depend on Trade.....	4
Feeding Texas Calls for State and Federal Action to address Massive Increase in Food Insecurity Across Texas and the Nation.....	6
It's Time To Rethink Food Labels.....	7
Immigration And Agriculture.....	9
Eminent Domain Victory for Landowners Supreme Court Victory for Texas Landowners Changes How Condemned Property Will Be Valued.....	10

Texas Ag Agency Says Climate Change Threatens State's Food Supply

by Jayme Lozano, The Texas Tribune on Tue, January 3, 2023

On the heels of a historic drought that devastated crops from the High Plains to South Texas, a new Texas Department of Agriculture report released Tuesday linked climate change with food insecurity and identified it as a potential threat to the state's food supply. The food access study, coordinated by the TDA and the University of Texas Rio Grande Valley, notes that "climate instability" is strongly associated with soil loss, water quality, droughts, fires, floods and other environmental disasters. 2022 was one of the driest years on record for Texas, and about 49% of the state was still in drought conditions at the end of December. The drought resulted in failed crops, low yields for farmers and diminished grazing, which forced ranchers to cull their cattle and led to the highest amount of livestock sales — nearly \$2.7 million — in more than a decade.

"From the agricultural perspective, concerns were expressed regarding droughts, drying up of artisanal wells, water use restrictions, fire threats and dangerous conditions for farm workers," the report says. Extended dry periods devastated Texas' agricultural production, said Victor Murphy, a climate service program manager with the National Weather Service. "We're seeing longer periods without any precipitation, then when it does come, it's in shorter, more intense bursts," he said. In total, Texas received a similar amount of precipitation in 2022 as in 2021, but most of that precipitation came all at once at the end of the summer.

Much of the state went through the worst of the drought conditions from June to August, during the high heat of the summer while plants are still growing. This was a sharp contrast to the torrential rainfall totals that followed. At the end of August, the Dallas-Fort Worth area was hit with a 1,000-year flood that brought 13 inches of rainfall in 18 hours.

"It is very difficult being a producer to have high and consistent yields with this kind of weather whiplash of extremes," Murphy said. "It's extremely difficult to prepare for a precipitation pattern that features long periods of near zero rainfall and short periods of extreme precipitation." The report recommends several actions, including having farmers work alongside researchers and policymakers, creating more food forests that allow trees to restore soil health and improve water quality, and strengthening bonds between local farmers and businesses to boost the farm-to-school infrastructure.

Food affordability and living wages - The report, which was submitted to the Texas Legislature on Dec. 31, also points to other factors that are making it harder for Texans to access and afford food, such as wages falling behind rising costs of living and lack of access to food in rural areas. Another issue is organizations being unaware of others with similar goals; for example, the report notes that certain grocers are interested in expanding delivery services into rural markets, while several food banks have acquired trucks to do the same.

The study includes suggestions that lawmakers could consider to help more Texans have consistent food access, such as expanding online and delivery options for Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program participants and allowing more stores to accept those benefits. Lawmakers have already filed some bills to address food insecurity during this year's legislative session. State Rep. Shawn Thierry, D-Houston, filed House Bill 1118, which would offer tax credits to grocery stores that open in food deserts.

The report also recommends raising the minimum wage, citing the Massachusetts Institute of Technology's living wage model, which estimates the hourly rate individuals must earn to support

themselves and their families in each state. According to MIT, in a Texas household with two parents and a child, each adult needs to make \$17.44 an hour to meet their basic needs. The minimum wage in Texas is \$7.25 an hour.

According to the report, meeting the living wage draws the line between “the financial independence of the working poor and the need to seek out public assistance or suffer consistent and severe housing and food insecurity.” The report acknowledges that raising wages is an energized and politicized topic. “The important take-away here is that there are significant gaps that need to be addressed between what researchers calculate to be a living wage in Texas, the wages that Texans are actually receiving, and many of the poverty thresholds that determine eligibility for assistance programs,” the report says.

The report also highlights how many families’ incomes have remained flat at the same time they’re having to spend more on food, housing and utility costs. In 2021, 13.7% of Texas households faced food insecurity, the sixth-highest rate in the nation. According to a 2021 report from the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, almost 79% of Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program participants in Texas were families with children, and more than 27% of them are families with older and disabled adults.

Source: <https://www.sacurrent.com/news/texas-ag-agency-says-climate-change-threatens-states-food-supply-30717130>

We Can’t Stand Still: How U.S. Farmers and Ranchers Depend on Trade

by John G. Murphy

What are the benefits of trade and trade agreements for the United States? ... the world is charging ahead in pursuit of new market-opening trade agreements, while Washington policymakers have been sitting on the sidelines. In that context, it’s worth taking a moment to assess the benefits of trade - and trade agreements - for American agriculture. American farmers and ranchers benefit tremendously from international trade. About 25% of U.S. farm products by value are exported each year, according to the American Farm Bureau Federation. Agricultural exports are expected to reach nearly \$200 billion in fiscal year 2023, according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA).

For many crops, such as wheat or almonds, more than half the U.S. harvest is sold abroad. U.S. farmers and ranchers are so productive there’s no way Americans could consume this bounty alone: The Farm Bureau estimates that one American farm produces enough food to feed 166 people annually — making exports essential to the prosperity of the U.S. farm and ranch economy.

For U.S. farmers and ranchers, America’s free-trade agreements (FTAs) have been a bonanza. According to a report by USDA looking at the 2003-2013 period — during which the United States entered into new FTAs with a dozen nations — exports of U.S. farm and food products to FTA partner countries increased by more than 130%.

America’s most recent FTAs are front-loaded to eliminate foreign tariffs rapidly, especially in the case of key exports, and this is evident in the following results reported by USDA:

- Under the U.S.-Chile FTA, U.S. agricultural exports to Chile grew by more than 525%, increasing from less than \$145 million in 2003 to more than \$900 million in 2013.
- Under the U.S.-Peru FTA, U.S. agricultural exports to Peru grew by 230%, rising from less than \$215 million in 2005 to more than \$700 million in 2013.
- Under the U.S.-Central America-Dominican Republic FTA (CAFTA-DR), U.S. agricultural exports to Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua doubled from \$1.9 billion in 2005 to \$3.8 billion in 2013.
- Under the U.S.-Australia FTA, U.S. agricultural exports to Australia rose by nearly 240%, increasing from \$410 million in 2004 to \$1.4 billion in 2013.
- Under the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) — which maintained significant agricultural tariffs for some products until 2008, when they were phased out — U.S. exports to Canada and Mexico rose by nearly 50% between 2007 and 2013 as the benefits of this more complete market opening took hold. By 2013, U.S. agricultural exports to Mexico had quintupled since NAFTA entered into force even as Mexican agriculture also enjoyed steady growth.

The North American success story deserves special attention. Mexico and Canada are, respectively, the second and third largest export markets for U.S. agriculture (after China, with its population of 1.4 billion). Together they purchased 29% of all U.S. agricultural exports in 2021. The United States is the source for 70% of Mexico's agricultural imports and 58% of Canada's.

This boom in North American exports for U.S. farmers and ranchers is due in large part to the NAFTA's elimination of all Mexican tariffs and nearly all Canadian tariffs on agricultural products. The USMCA, which entered into force in 2020, maintained this invaluable market access. The USMCA also introduced some improvements on NAFTA with important provisions upholding agricultural biotechnology. It also provides new access to Canada's market for U.S. dairy, poultry, and eggs while eliminating non-tariff barriers relating to wheat and wine.

Indeed, it's often the case in trade policy that the "devil's in the details," and little publicized rules and regulations can become significant barriers to the export of "made-in-the-USA" products. For agricultural exports, these barriers often involve sanitary and phytosanitary standards (SPS) — having to do with animal and plant products, respectively — and are addressed in U.S. trade agreements' SPS chapters. These chapters require transparent, non-discriminatory rules to ensure that SPS measures don't become disguised protectionism or stealth barriers to trade. SPS chapters like the one in the USMCA "encourage the development and adoption of science-based international standards, guidelines, and recommendations" and aim to "advance science-based decision making."

In sum, American farmers and ranchers depend on trade. Their incredible productivity produces an impressive harvest that's simply too large not to share — and to sell around the globe. Entering into new trade agreements to help them do so should be a top priority.

Immigrant Farmworkers and America's Food Production

Note: On March 18, 2021, the U.S. House of Representatives passed the Farm Workforce Modernization Act (H.R. 1603), introduced by Representatives Zoe Lofgren (D-CA) and Dan

Newhouse (R-WA), with strong bipartisan support. The bill would modernize the H-2A visa program and establish a pathway to legal status and citizenship for certain undocumented farmworkers.

For decades, immigrant farm workers have helped feed America. But the agriculture industry faces a chronic labor shortage that has been exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic, and the conditions for and rights of farmworkers and their families must be improved. The critical importance of farmworkers, including those who are undocumented, has never been clearer. Modernizing the temporary visa program, and establishing a pathway to citizenship for long-term undocumented agricultural workers, is urgently needed to protect farmworkers and their families and ensure the future of America's essential agriculture industry.

Source: <https://www.uschamber.com/international/we-cant-stand-still-how-u-s-farmers-and-ranchers-depend-on-trade>

Feeding Texas Calls for State and Federal Action to address Massive Increase in Food Insecurity Across Texas and the Nation

by Wesley Story, Published October 27, 2023

USDA's latest report shows nearly 1 in 6 Texas households are food insecure.

TEXAS – This week, the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) released its annual study measuring food security in the U.S., *Household Food Security in the United States in 2022*. The report shows that Texas has the second-highest rate of food insecurity at 15.5%, more than 4% higher than the U.S. average.

According to the report, food insecurity increased significantly across the nation from 2021 to 2022. The number of people living in food insecure households in 2022 increased to 44 million, including 13 million children. This is an increase of 31% for all individuals and 44% for children from the previous year, the highest rate and number of individuals and children since 2014 and the largest one-year increase in food insecurity since 2008.

In Texas, nearly 1 in 6 households are food insecure. This means that more than 1.7 million families—including approximately 4.6 million Texans—are at risk for hunger.

“Behind these sobering statistics are our neighbors struggling to put food on the table, pay rent, and keep the lights on,” said Celia Cole, CEO of Feeding Texas, the state association of food banks. “These staggering numbers reflect the growing need food banks are seeing in communities across our state. The end of pandemic-era relief efforts, inflation and the high cost of food is making it harder for Texans to afford basic necessities.”

The Feeding Texas network is calling for action at both the state and federal level to address this increase in food insecurity. We are advocating for:

1. Resources and flexibility to fix delays in processing SNAP applications: The end of the Public Health Emergency (PHE) has put tremendous strain on staff and resources at the Texas Health and Human Services Commission (HHSC), creating an overwhelming backlog of SNAP applications. This means many Texans are facing wait times of 100+ days before being approved for food assistance. HHSC is a long-time partner of Feeding Texas and we are working closely with the agency to support Texans applying for benefits, alleviate strain on

HHSC staff, and connect families caught in the backlog to food bank resources. Both food banks and HHSC will need additional resources and flexibility to tackle these challenges and prevent more Texans from going hungry.

2. A strong Farm Bill with increased investment in SNAP and The Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP): Congress has an opportunity to pass legislation that could reduce food insecurity with the 2023 Farm Bill. While SNAP is the backbone of hunger relief in our nation, TEFAP is the cornerstone of emergency food assistance, accounting for over 20% of our network's food supply. We urge elected officials to reauthorize a bipartisan Farm Bill package that strengthens SNAP and TEFAP while protecting investments already made in these critical hunger-fighting programs.
3. Summer EBT implementation in 2024: Summer EBT is a new summer feeding program that will allow low-income families with children to receive additional benefits during the summer months, when childhood hunger typically spikes due to the loss of school meals. Feeding Texas estimates that 2.9 million Texas students could receive approximately \$348 million in food aid under the new program. We urge HHSC leadership to allocate the staff and IT resources to implement Summer EBT in 2024. Texas must affirm its participation by the federal deadline of January 1, 2024.

"It is unacceptable that hunger is so deep and persistent in a nation as wealthy as ours. We have the tools and resources to end hunger, but our vision of a hunger-free Texas can only be realized through policy change and collective action from the public, private and charitable food sectors," Cole said. "Food banks alone cannot end hunger."

Source: <https://www.feedingtexas.org/feeding-texas-calls-for-state-and-federal-action-to-address-massive-increase-in-food-insecurity-across-texas-and-the-nation/>

It's Time To Rethink Food Labels

by Victor Katch, Published April 25, 2024

Rising prices are not the only challenge consumers face in today's grocery aisle. It seems one needs to be a linguist, scientist, and mind reader to comprehend the myriad terms cluttering the labels on the most popular packaged foods. A recent consumer survey revealed that the perception of healthfulness is a key driver of food purchases for most individuals. But gauging the health quality of foods can be daunting. The latest United States Food & Drug Association (FDA) food label is confusing at best, particularly for shoppers seeking "healthier" options. A recent consumer survey revealed that the perception of healthfulness is a key driver of food purchases for most individuals. But gauging the health quality of foods can be daunting — made all the more difficult by misleading nutrition information that appears on most food labels.

The growing recognition that poor food choices are linked to a prevalence of obesity and chronic disease globally has inspired public health leaders to market the benefits of healthful eating.

Step one: More readable and revealing food labels.

The FDA was officially established in 1906 with the signing of the Food and Drugs Act by President Theodore Roosevelt. This act marked the beginning of federal regulation of food and drugs in the U.S., aiming to ensure the safety, effectiveness, and labeling of consumer products.

Food labeling regulations in the U.S. evolve with the times to address concerns related to food safety, nutrition, consumer information, and public health. The aim has been to ensure that

consumers have access to accurate and comprehensive information about the foods they purchase and consume.

Modern times

In 2023, the Food Labeling Modernization Act (FLMA) directed the FDA to establish a standard front-of-package nutrition (FOP) label that includes symbols and a rating system for all packaged food it regulates. This system would highlight nutrients that are overconsumed and linked to chronic diseases, much like other countries have done (see below). Use of FOP systems and symbols are not without controversy, however. With enormous profit in highly processed, nutrient-poor foods, it seems logical that food industry advocacy groups — the American Beverage Association and Sugar Association, among others — would favor labels that make it harder for consumers to determine the healthiness of a product. Many of these same food companies have been fighting consumer-friendly FOP labels for nearly two decades.

The goal of any FOP nutrition label is to increase the proportion of consumers who can easily notice, comprehend, and use available food-label information to make more nutritious choices. The whole point is to prevent or reduce obesity and other diet-related chronic diseases and promote a healthy lifestyle.

Deciding what information should be presented on the FOP label is a conundrum. Food manufacturers, science experts, consumer advocates, and public health officials all compete to prioritize their respective agendas and insights. Since there is so much possible information to display, reaching a consensus on a FOP system that most stakeholders would adopt has proven difficult. Rarely is everyone satisfied.

More than 40 countries have employed easy-to-understand, FOP nutrition information that reveals at a glance which foods are more — or less — healthful. For example, the U.K.'s FOP label sets forth a recommended format using red, amber, and green color-coding, and percentage-reference intakes (RIs). This FOP label is also known as “traffic light” labeling in which green indicates the specific nutrient content is “low” and is a “healthy” choice; amber means the product is neither high nor low in the specific nutrient – in other words, you can eat these foods most of the time; and red warns the food is high in fat, saturated fat, salt, or sugar, and consumers should limit their intake.

Anticipated American FOP label

Thus far, the U.S. does not require FOP labeling, relying instead on the food industry's voluntary efforts, laden with confusing numbers and percentages. Thus far, we know that the U.S.-FOP label will complement a newly condensed Nutrition Facts label, by displaying simplified, at-a-glance nutrition information to help consumers quickly and easily make more healthy food selections.

As of April 2024, based on all of the available data, the following information will most likely appear on the soon-to-be-released U.S.-FOP label.

1. Calorie content either as per serving, or per package, regardless of size.
2. Descriptive information about serving size in order to reinforce and highlight the actual quantity of food associated with the calorie content.
3. Number of servings for packages that contain three or more servings.
4. Indicate whether a product is high or low for the following nutrients: saturated fat, sodium, added sugars, fiber content, and calcium. It most likely will be similar to the U.K. traffic light symbol.

5. In response to concerns about the high prevalence of overweight and obese children and teens, the FDA is considering nutrition standards for the FOP label to indicate which products might appropriately be marketed to children.

A “high in” label (similar to Canada’s) has been proposed by the FDA and is superior to the food-industry-backed “per serving” label. It avoids numbers and percentages and helps the consumer focus on key information. As for label colors, the agency has suggested using them, by assigning colors to individual nutrients.

Critics have argued that the proposed label would be confusing since it would be like pulling up to a traffic light that is red, yellow, and green all at the same time. How could a driver possibly know what to do?

Source: <https://michigantoday.umich.edu/2024/04/25/its-time-to-rethink-food-labels/>

Immigration And Agriculture

by New American Economy Research Fund , Published August 16, 2021

Agriculture is a cherished part of American identity and remains an important part of the U.S. economy. In 2020, the agriculture, fishing, and forestry industries contributed more than \$175 billion to U.S. GDP and supported more than 2.3 million workers. The health of America’s farms and the agriculture industry, however, is tied directly to immigration.

As recently as 2019, almost half—or 48.9 percent—of all agricultural workers were foreign-born and more than one-fourth (27.3 percent) were undocumented. Among workers in crop production, the share of foreign-born workers is even higher. In 2019, almost 57 percent of crop production workers were immigrants, including 36.4 percent who were undocumented.

In many states where agriculture is especially important, immigrants make up even larger shares of the farm workforce. In California, immigrants make up more than 80 percent of the state’s agricultural workforce. Other states like Washington State (72.6%), Florida (65.4%), and Oregon (60.7%), also have higher than average shares of immigrants in their agricultural workforce. Worryingly, the data suggests that immigrant workers are not being replaced by new, younger immigrant workers.

While less than 3 out of 10 foreign-born agricultural workers were over 45 years old in 2014, by 2019 this number had increased to 37.5 percent. Meanwhile the share of foreign-born agricultural workers under the age of 25 decreased from 17.1 percent in 2014 to 10.7 percent in 2019.

This is added on to farmers’ perennial worries about finding enough workers as few Americans seem willing to take on the most difficult and physical farm jobs—particularly those harvesting fresh fruits and vegetables. Yet the H-2A visa, the only agricultural visa currently available to American farms, is too expensive and cumbersome to work for many U.S. growers.

In 2020, the total number of all workers needed by U.S. farms applying for H-2A workers was 314,028. The total number of farm workers certified to work in the U.S. was 275,430. The H-2A visa program provided 87.4% of the labor needs for farms applying for H-2A visas.

Florida had the highest number of H2A workers, with more than 39,000 in 2020. Other top states include Georgia (27,600), Washington (26,800), California (25,400), and North Carolina (22,000).

Inadequate workforces have contributed to sluggish growth in the volume of crops produced in the United States. This is especially worrying as consumer demand and consumption for fresh fruits and vegetables has increased in the past few decades. This has led to a higher reliance on food imports to meet American consumer demands for fresh produce.

Source: <https://research.newamericaneconomy.org/report/immigration-and-agriculture/>

Eminent Domain Victory for Landowners Supreme Court Victory for Texas Landowners Changes How Condemned Property Will Be Valued

by Victoria G. Myers, Progressive Farmer Senior Editor June 6, 2022

Texas landowners had an unexpected victory recently in their state Supreme Court, giving them more power in future valuation negotiations over their condemned property. Attorney Brian McLaughlin, based at Midland, Texas, closely follows the issue of condemnation, also known as eminent domain. His roles include private counselor, as well as chairman of the Texas & Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association's Property Rights and Tax Committee, and its Legal Advisory Committee. He spoke to DTN about the Texas Supreme Court's opinion in *Hlavinka v. HSC Pipeline P'ship*, released May 27, calling it "a huge victory for landowners" there.

"I'm curious to see how this will be received by those who condemn land, because it shifts the advantage away from the pipeline companies and to the landowners in these negotiations," he said of the ruling's impact.

SUPREME COURT SPEAKS - Justice Jane Bland delivered the opinion of the Texas Supreme Court on the *Hlavinka* case, which first made its way through the trial court and then through the Court of Appeals for the First District of Texas. There were several issues put before the court, but the one that has landowners encouraged today was how the court viewed valuation of a condemned property easement. Here the difference was huge between what the landowners said the easement was worth (about \$3.3 million) and what the pipeline company wanted to set the price at (just over \$23,000).

In remanding the case back to the trial court, Justice Bland wrote: "A condemnation should not be a windfall for a landowner. Nor should it be a windfall for a private condemnor. A condemnor must pay a fair price for the value of the land taken. Evidence of recent fair market sales to secure easements running across the property that precede the taking are admissible to establish the property's highest and best use, and its market value, at the time of the taking."

McLaughlin, who is familiar with the court documents in the case, explained that the *Hlavinkas* had negotiated for, and been paid for, two private pipelines prior to a condemnation by HSC for a pipeline easement. Those earlier negotiations were not eminent domain cases. HSC said the value paid under those third-party agreements was not admissible as evidence as to the value of the condemned easement they wanted to take, but the Supreme Court disagreed.

The Texas attorney hopes that moving forward, this ruling can help landowners who often have to deal with land brokerage companies he says are often rude, arrogant and treat them poorly where condemnations are sought.

"When a landowner is sued, they live and breathe that suit every day, moment to moment. It wears on them and it's a financial drain. And at the end, even if they win, they are not allowed to recover attorney fees, so they can be out a lot of money," McLaughlin said. He added there is a lot of inequity in the way condemnations have been handled over the years, and it's something he has seen firsthand with his own family's ranch.

"These companies come in and they leave a scar on the land," he said. "This is a personal issue to me. After they damage your land, they don't have to pay to restore it because that valuation is capped at the market value of the land. It isn't anywhere close to the cost of the damages they can do. In our case, for example, a lakebed was damaged to the point that it won't hold water anymore."

HOW HLAVINKA GOT TO THE SUPREME COURT - The Hlavinka case was first appealed on several issues. Included was whether HSC Pipeline was a "common carrier," as defined by Texas law, and whether the product their pipeline would carry, propylene, was an oil product. There was also the issue of whether HSC could prove the pipeline was for public use, and lastly whether the trial court had erred when it refused to allow Terrance Hlavinka, one of the plaintiffs, to testify as to the market value of the condemned land.

In Texas, in order to condemn property, an entity must be considered a common carrier. The Appeals Court in the Hlavinka case held HSC was a common carrier. The court also held that propylene is an oil product and a liquified mineral, and thus is a proper "common carrier product." A common carrier cannot take private property unless it is "for public use," and this bar was also met by HSC.

As for value of the land, the Appeals Court noted that compensation for land taken by eminent domain is measured by the market value of the land at the time of its taking. The court pointed out that this does not require expert testimony, but rather that a landowner can testify as to the value of the property -- as the Hlavinkas attempted to do in the trial court.

The Appeals Court said: "The object of the inquiry is always to find the fair market value of the property; an appraisal method is valid only if it produces an amount that a willing buyer would actually pay a willing seller." That price should be at the land's "highest and best use."

HSC said the highest and best use of the condemned easement was as agricultural/recreational or rural/recreational land. The Hlavinkas had, however, specifically purchased the land in 2001, for the purpose of selling pipeline easements, due to its unique location near the Texas Gulf Coast, directly between refinery and industrial centers in Texas City and the Oyster Creek and Freeport areas.

At the time of HSC's condemnation of the easement across the property, there were 25 pipelines across the acreage. In addition, Terry Hlavinka, who was not allowed to testify at the trial court, had been negotiating pipeline easements and oil and gas leases for more than 30 years at the time of trial. He planned to use the two previous sales of pipeline easements across the property as comparables, reporting a value in acres and in "rods" -- a common measurement for pipelines. A rod is a linear measure, void of width, of 16.5 feet in length.

Hlavinka's testimony would have placed the value of HSC's condemned easement at \$3.3 million. HSC, however, valued the easement at just \$23,326. It was roughly 6 acres in total size.

The Appeals Court found that Hlavinka's use of a price per rod factor in determining the easement's value was not improper and that his overall valuation testimony was relevant. The Appeals Court said, "He used comparable sales to support his opinions regarding the fair market value of the easement" and that the trial court abused its discretion by not allowing the testimony. It was on this point, and the others noted above, that the case went to the Texas Supreme Court for a final decision.

LEGISLATIVE UPDATES ON EMINENT DOMAIN - On the legislative side, five bills were approved last year in Texas that will affect eminent domain issues in the state: HB 2730, HB 4107, SB 721, SB 725 and SB 726. All five bills were signed by the governor and are now in effect. Briefly, those bills include the following (to read the bill, click on the provided link):

- HB 2730 creates what is known as the "Landowner's Bill of Rights" in Texas. It outlines the process that all condemning authorities must follow and the landowner's rights.
- HB 4107 provides rules for common carrier pipeline entities exercising eminent domain power, including the notice and indemnification they are required to provide the property owner.
- SB 721 requires entities with eminent domain power to disclose to the property owner any and all current and existing appraisal reports produced or acquired by the entity that relate specifically to the owner's property and were used in determining the entity's opinion of the value.
- SB 725 requires a condemning entity to pay any additional taxes/expenses if a subject property with an agricultural tax exemption loses that tax exemption due solely to the condemnation.
- SB 726 requires a condemning entity to complete at least three actions (it had been two) to show "actual progress" on a condemned property.

Source: <https://www.dtnpf.com/agriculture/web/ag/news/business-inputs/article/2022/06/06/supreme-court-victory-texas-changes>