

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 1/26/09

SPONSOR Campos LAST UPDATED _____ HB _____

SHORT TITLE State Ethics Commission Act SB 139

ANALYST Wilson

APPROPRIATION (dollars in thousands)

Appropriation		Recurring or Non-Rec	Fund Affected
FY09	FY10		
	\$500.0	Recurring	general fund

Relates to Relates to HB 151, HB 99, HB 252, SB 49, SB 94, SB 116, SB 140 & SB 163

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

LFC Files

Responses Received From

Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC)
 Administrative Office of the District Attorneys (AODA)
 Attorney General's Office (AGO)
 Corrections Department (CD)
 Secretary of State (SOS)

SUMMARY

Synopsis of Bill

Senate Bill 139 appropriates \$500,000 from the general fund to the State Ethics Commission (SEC) for expenditure in fiscal year 2010 to carry out the provisions of the State Ethics Commission Act.

This bill establishes the State Ethics Commission Act (Act) and creates a ten member SEC as an adjunct agency. The bill defines the membership, terms, powers and duties of the commission. The SEC is required to receive and investigate complaints against state officials, state employees, government contractors and lobbyists alleging ethics violations, report its findings and maintain public records as required pursuant to the act.

The SEC may offer annual ethics training to all state officials, state employees, government contractors and lobbyists and may provide both an ethics guide and a business ethics guide for all state officials, state employees, government contractors and lobbyists. The SEC may also issue subpoenas to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of information. The SEC may issue public reprimands or censures or recommend disciplinary actions in accordance with the Act for ethics violations committed by state officials of the executive branch and state employees and issue advisory opinions.

SB 139 allows the SEC to appoint an executive director, and provides for the duties of the director. The director may hire a general counsel for the SEC and all other personnel required to enable the SEC to carry out its responsibilities.

The effective date of this Act is July 1, 2009.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS

The appropriation of \$500,000 contained in this bill is a recurring expense to the general fund. Any unexpended or unencumbered balance remaining at the end of fiscal year 2010 shall revert to the general fund.

According to the December 2008 revenue estimate, FY10 recurring revenue will only support a base expenditure level that is \$293 million, or 2.6 percent, less than the FY09 appropriation. All appropriations outside of the general appropriation act will be viewed in this declining revenue context.

There will be a minimal administrative cost for statewide update, distribution and documentation of statutory changes. Any additional fiscal impact on the judiciary will be proportional to the enforcement of this law.

SIGNIFICANT ISSUES

This legislation is a result of recommendations of a task force on ethic reform in its report submitted on October 4, 2006. The task force was established to study the issues of governmental ethics and campaign finance reform in an attempt to improve ethical behavior in state government.

The task force recommended establishing an independent SEC to promote increased accountability for ethical behavior among state officials and employees, lobbyists and those that conduct business with the state. In the 2007 and 2008 legislative session similar bills were introduced, but failed to pass.

This bill establishes the SEC as an adjunct agency, which is defined in Section 9-1-6 NMSA 1978 as an agency that is excluded from direct or administrative attachment to a department, and which retains policy making and administrative autonomy separate from any other instrumentality of state government.

The task force found that the SEC's political, administrative and legal independence will be of critical importance to the effective functioning and administration of the SEC.

The AODA believes prosecution of violations should be in the AGO office, not the district attorneys' offices. DA offices do not have the staff in attorneys and investigators to take on these complex cases in addition to their existing criminal case loads.

The AGO notes that 40 other states that have established independent ethics commissions like this bill proposes to review ethics issues. It can be strongly argued that the most important function of such a SEC will be education and training to help change the culture of government and awareness of ethical issues.

ADMINISTRATIVE IMPLICATIONS

The legislation does not specify an approved level of staff for the agency, but allows for an executive director, a general counsel and all other personnel as may be necessary to carry out the responsibilities of the SEC.

Until the staffing requirements of the agency are determined and the agency will begin operation, it is difficult to assess whether this appropriation level will be sufficient to adequately fund the agency and SEC operations.

The DFA has noted in the past that the creation of the SEC as an adjunct agency to maintain the independence of the agency from any direct or administrative attachment to a department may have negative administrative ramifications for the agency. Although the agency is given the authority to hire staff as necessary to carry out its responsibilities, with an appropriation of \$500,000 that must cover operating costs, publications of ethics manuals, training for all State officials, State employees, government contracts and lobbyists, as well as mileage and per diem for SEC members, the agency will be limited in its staff size.

The SOS suggests amending the Campaign Reporting Act and the Lobbyist Reporting Act as both acts currently assign investigation duties to the SOS.

DUPLICATION, RELATIONSHIP

SB 139, is similar to HB 151 & SB140, but does not cover an executive branch code of ethics or involve the AGO in the subpoena process.

The bill also relates to:

HB 99, Prohibit Former Legislators as Lobbyists

HB 252, Political Contributions to Candidates

SB 49, Governmental Conduct Act For Public Officers

SB 94, Prohibit Former Legislators as Lobbyists

SB 116, Limit Contributions to Candidates & PACs

SB 163, Prohibit Former Legislators as Lobbyists

ALTERNATIVES

The AODA suggests removing language on page 17, line 7 and 8 referring to the district attorneys so that the AGO will handle all the legal cases.

OTHER SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES

The CD has provided the following:

While the SEC cannot order state agencies to take disciplinary action against state employees it finds to have committed ethics violations, CD and other state agencies can and should use the SEC's records to pursue disciplinary action against its employees when appropriate.

It is unclear if this new law will conflict with the collective bargaining agreement (CBA) between the State and AFSCME, or the Public Employee Bargaining Act. For example, Article 24, Section 4 of the CBA normally requires employers to serve all disciplinary actions within 45 days of when the employer acquired knowledge of the employee's misconduct. If the SEC investigates a CD employee under this new law, it would not be acting as the employer, but it would be in essence acting as the state. So whether or not the commission would have to conclude its investigation and recommend any discipline within 45 days or whether or not CD would have to act on the SEC recommendation and impose disciplinary action on its employee within 45 days of the beginning of the commission's investigation might be litigated or challenged by AFSCME. It must be assumed that AFSCME will challenge the new law, even though the CBA does exempt the agency from the 45-day rule whenever an outside agency such as the SEC is involved.

DW/mc