

**ADDENDUM TO OFFICIAL STATEMENT DATED
July 27, 2026**

Relating To

\$7,500,000

**LAKE DALLAS INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
(A political subdivision of the State of Texas located in Denton County)
UNLIMITED TAX REFUNDING BONDS, SERIES 2026**

PLEASE BE ADVISED that the above referenced Official Statement, dated July 9, 2026, relating to the above captioned bonds is hereby revised as follows:

The caption “STATE AND LOCAL FUNDING OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN TEXAS,” beginning on page 11 of the Official Statement, is hereby deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

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 22, 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 still in the process of obtaining documentation regarding this litigation and 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.

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.

Although, as a matter of law, the Bonds, upon issuance and delivery, will be entitled to the protections afforded previously existing contractual obligations under the Contract Clauses, the District can make no representations or predictions concerning the effect of *Morath II* or any future legislation, or any litigation that may be associated with such legislation, on the District’s financial condition, revenues or operations. While the enactment of future legislation to address school funding in Texas could adversely affect the financial condition, revenues or operations of the District, the District does not anticipate that the security for payment of the Bonds, specifically, the District’s obligation to levy an unlimited debt service tax would be adversely affected by any such legislation. See “CURRENT PUBLIC SCHOOL FINANCE SYSTEM”.

All other provisions of the Official Statement shall remain as originally stated in the Official Statement and are not affected by this Addendum.