

**NOTE: As provided in LFC policy, this report is intended for use by the standing finance committees of the legislature. The Legislative Finance Committee does not assume responsibility for the accuracy of the information in this report when used in any other situation.**

**Only the most recent FIR version, excluding attachments, is available on the Intranet. Previously issued FIRs and attachments may be obtained from the LFC office in Suite 101 of the State Capitol Building North.**

## FISCAL IMPACT REPORT

SPONSOR: Campos DATE TYPED: 2/5/01 HB \_\_\_\_\_  
 SHORT TITLE: Guadalupe Magistrate District Appropriations SB 278  
 ANALYST: Belmares

### APPROPRIATION

Appropriation Contained		Estimated Additional Impact		Recurring or Non-Rec	Fund Affected
FY01	FY02	FY01	FY02		
	\$ 240.0			Recurring	General Fund
	\$ 16.0			Non-Recurring	General Fund

(Parenthesis ( ) Indicate Expenditure Decreases)

Relates to HB 215

### SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Administrative Office of the Courts  
 Fourth Judicial District Attorney  
 Public Defender Department

### SUMMARY

#### Synopsis of Bill

Senate Bill 278 appropriates \$256.0 from the general fund to the Administrative Office of the Courts for the purpose of adding an additional magistrate in the Guadalupe magistrate district and providing additional resources for the District Attorney and the Public Defender.

### FISCAL IMPLICATIONS

Senate Bill 278 appropriations \$256.0 in general fund to the Administrative Office of the Courts, the Fourth Judicial District Attorney, and the Public Defender Department. \$240,000 are recurring costs and \$16.0 are non-recurring. Any unexpended or unencumbered balance remaining at the end of fiscal year 2002 shall revert to the general fund. The appropriation is to be used as follows:

## **Senate Bill 278 -- Page 2**

(1) \$94.0 to the Administrative Office of the Courts to cover costs for salary and benefits, supplies, furniture and office equipment for an additional magistrate in the Guadalupe magistrate district. \$16.0 are non-recurring expenses.

(2) \$75.0 to the Fourth Judicial District Attorney due to the increased workload in the Guadalupe magistrate district to hire an additional senior trial prosecutor.

(3) \$87.0 to the Public Defender Department due to the increased workload in the Guadalupe magistrate district to contract for counsel. However, the department has indicated a \$15.0 appropriation would be sufficient to address the need.

### **ADMINISTRATIVE IMPLICATIONS**

The Administrative Office of the Courts has indicated the latest data (FY02) from the Guadalupe Court Magistrate Courts show a total caseload of approximately 1,900 new cases filed per year. This caseload is slightly less than the statewide average of 2,500 cases per magistrate judge per year. Additionally, the Administrative Office of the Courts indicated the Chief Judges Council reviewed all district, metropolitan, and magistrate judgeship requests statewide. The Weighted Caseload Study showed the Guadalupe Magistrate Court has the ability to absorb approximately twice the caseload with its existing judge.

### **RELATIONSHIP**

Senate Bill 278 is related to House Bill 215, which includes two magistrate judgeships in Las Cruces, one magistrate judgeship in Santa Fe, one magistrate judgeship in Roswell, as well as magistrate judgeships in district and Metropolitan Court.

EB/njw