

SUPPLEMENT
Dated: July 27, 2026

to

PRELIMINARY REMARKETING MEMORANDUM
Dated: July 14, 2026

RELATING TO

\$44,805,000*

Texarkana Independent School District
(A political subdivision of the State of Texas located in Bowie County, Texas)
Adjustable Rate Unlimited Tax School Building Bonds, Series 2024

In connection with the above-captioned issuance, the Preliminary Remarketing Memorandum (the *PRM*) is supplemented to add and modify the following (as evidenced in bold and underlined) to the “STATE AND LOCAL FUNDING OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN TEXAS” section of the PRM:

STATE AND LOCAL FUNDING OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN TEXAS

Litigation Relating to the Texas Public School Finance System

On seven occasions in the last thirty years, the Texas Supreme Court (the “Court”) has issued decisions assessing the constitutionality of the Texas public school finance system (the “Finance System”). The litigation has primarily focused on whether the Finance System, as amended by the Texas Legislature (the “Legislature”) from time to time (i) met the requirements of article VII, section 1 of the Texas Constitution, which requires the Legislature to “establish and make suitable provision for the support and maintenance of an efficient system of public free schools,” or (ii) imposed a statewide ad valorem tax in violation of article VIII, section 1-e of the Texas Constitution because the statutory limit on property taxes levied by school districts for maintenance and operation purposes had allegedly denied school districts meaningful discretion in setting their tax rates. In response to the Court’s previous decisions, the Legislature enacted multiple laws that made substantive changes in the way the Finance System is funded in efforts to address the prior decisions declaring the Finance System unconstitutional.

On May 13, 2016, the Court issued its opinion in the most recent school finance litigation, *Morath v. The Texas Taxpayer & Student Fairness Coal.*, 490 S.W.3d 826 (Tex. 2016) (“*Morath I*”). The plaintiffs and intervenors in the case had alleged that the Finance System, as modified by the Legislature in part in response to prior decisions of the Court, violated article VII, section 1 and article VIII, section 1-e of the Texas Constitution. In its opinion, the Court held that “[d]espite the imperfections of the current school funding regime, it meets minimum constitutional requirements.” The Court also noted that:

Lawmakers decide if laws pass, and judges decide if those laws pass muster. But our lenient standard of review in this policy-laden area counsels modesty. The judicial role is not to second-guess whether our system is optimal, but whether it is constitutional. Our Byzantine school funding “system” is undeniably imperfect, with immense room for improvement. But it satisfies minimum constitutional requirements.

Current Litigation Relating to the Texas Public School Finance System

On July 24, 2026, Midland Independent School District filed a suit in a district court of Travis County, Texas, styled *Midland Independent School District, et al. v. Mike Morath, Commissioner of Education, et al.* (Cause No. TBD), against Mike Morath, in his official capacity as Commissioner of Education, and the State of Texas (“*Morath II*”). The suit is an original action for declaratory judgment and challenges the constitutionality of the Finance System.

The District is not a party to this litigation, and at this time, the District is reviewing the same. The District can make no representations or predictions concerning the outcome of this litigation or the effect, if any, that this litigation may have on the Finance System, or on the District’s financial condition, revenues, or operations. See “CURRENT PUBLIC SCHOOL FINANCE SYSTEM” and “TAX RATE LIMITATIONS” herein.

* Preliminary, subject to change.

Possible Effects of Changes in Law on District Bonds

The Court's decision in *Morath I* upheld the constitutionality of the Finance System but noted that the Finance System was "undeniably imperfect". While not compelled by the *Morath I* decision to reform the Finance System, the Legislature could enact future changes to the Finance System. Any such changes could benefit or be a detriment to the District. If the Legislature enacts future changes to, or fails adequately to fund the Finance System, or if changes in circumstances otherwise provide grounds for a challenge, the Finance System could be challenged again in the future. In its 1995 opinion in *Edgewood Independent School District v. Meno*, 917 S.W.2d 717 (Tex. 1995), the Court stated that any future determination of unconstitutionality "would not, however, affect the district's authority to levy the taxes necessary to retire previously issued bonds, but would instead require the Legislature to cure the system's unconstitutionality in a way that is consistent with the Contract Clauses of the U.S. and Texas Constitutions" (collectively, the "Contract Clauses"), which prohibit the enactment of laws that impair prior obligations of contracts.

* * *