

Fiscal impact reports (FIRs) are prepared by the Legislative Finance Committee (LFC) for standing finance committees of the NM Legislature. The LFC does not assume responsibility for the accuracy of these reports if they are used for other purposes.

Current FIRs (in HTML & Adobe PDF formats) are available on the NM Legislative Website (legis.state.nm.us). Adobe PDF versions include all attachments, whereas HTML versions may not. Previously issued FIRs and attachments may be obtained from the LFC in Suite 101 of the State Capitol Building North.

## FISCAL IMPACT REPORT

ORIGINAL DATE 1/30/06  
 LAST UPDATED 1/30/06

SPONSOR Rawson HB \_\_\_\_\_

SHORT TITLE 3<sup>rd</sup> Judicial District Programs and Employees SB 328

ANALYST McSherry

### APPROPRIATION (dollars in thousands)

Appropriation		Recurring or Non-Rec	Fund Affected
FY06	FY07		
	\$811.0	Recurring	General Fund

(Parenthesis ( ) Indicate Expenditure Decreases)

Partially conflicts with appropriations included in the General Appropriations Act

### SOURCES OF INFORMATION

LFC Files

### SUMMARY

#### Synopsis of Bill

Senate Bill 328, “3<sup>rd</sup> Judicial District Programs and Employees” appropriates \$811,043 from the general fund to 3<sup>rd</sup> Judicial District Court for the purpose of funding a staff attorney, human resource specialist, network specialists, legal assistant and a district court judicial leadworker (\$299,328), replace federal funds for juvenile and family reunification drug courts (\$400,500), expand the family reunification drug court (\$68,000), fund increased insurance costs (\$35,000) and fund increased contributions to judicial retirement (\$8,215).

### FISCAL IMPLICATIONS

The appropriation of \$811,043 contained in this bill is a recurring expense to the general fund. Any unexpended or unencumbered balance remaining at the end of fiscal year 2007 shall revert to the general fund.

Both the LFC and executive recommendations include the \$400.5 thousand for replacement of federal drug court funds.

### SIGNIFICANT ISSUES

The LFC analysis of the judiciary staff study shows the 3<sup>rd</sup> judicial district with a greater than 100 percent staffing level because it counts all a court’s FTE when determining a particular

courts staffing need. The judiciary interpretation of the staffing study does not count term positions and thus results in the 3<sup>rd</sup> District showing a need for additional staff.

The bill proposes appropriating funds for increased group insurance costs, and judicial retirement. These expenses are requested as part of an agency's base request and were not funded to the full level requested by the 3<sup>rd</sup> Judicial District because the adopted LFC recommendation which was adopted by HAFC included a 1 percent vacancy savings and adjustments which funded vacant positions at the 0.80 compa-ratio level and all other positions at the salary level being funded by the agency. This funding approach is consistent with the LFC guidelines and was used for all district court budgets.

All district courts have increased judicial retirement costs and group insurance costs. These increased costs are included in the courts' base budgets.

### **PERFORMANCE IMPLICATIONS**

Additional funding for the district's family reunification drug court would likely have a positive effect on the districts "number of family reunification drug court graduates" performance outcome.

### **ADMINISTRATIVE IMPLICATIONS**

The positions funded with this bill would likely assist in administrative workload, particularly the human resource specialist, staff attorney and network specialist.

### **CONFLICT, DUPLICATION, COMPANIONSHIP, RELATIONSHIP**

The \$400.5 thousand is included in both the appropriation for replacement of drug court lapsing federal the Executive and LFC recommendations.

### **WHAT WILL BE THE CONSEQUENCES OF NOT ENACTING THIS BILL**

The federal funds replacement proposed would not occur twice if this bill passed. The proposed staff increases, family reunification drug court, group insurance and judicial retirement appropriations may not be funded the proposed amounts in addition to the court's operating budget. The court will have to maintain at least a 1 percent vacancy (less than one position open at any given time during the year, which is a lower than average vacancy rate) in order to remain within budget.

### **POSSIBLE QUESTIONS**

1. How was the amount for group insurance proposed in the bill determined?
2. Will the administrative workload for the court be significantly improved when a court administer is hired?
3. Has the family reunification court, proposed to receive \$68 thousand in expansion funding, reached its capacity for participants with its current level of funding? What is the demand for additional spaces and how was this demand determined?