

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

FISCAL IMPACT REPORT

BILL NUMBER: Senate Bill 50

SHORT TITLE: Law Enforcement Training Requirements

SPONSOR: Sens. Maestas and Brantley/Reps. Herndon and Chavez, N

LAST ORIGINAL
UPDATE: _____ **DATE:** 01/29/2026 **ANALYST:** Sanchez

ESTIMATED ADDITIONAL OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT* (dollars in thousands)

Agency/Program	FY26	FY27	FY28	3 Year Total Cost	Recurring or Nonrecurring	Fund Affected
DPS	No fiscal impact	No fiscal impact	Indeterminate but minimal	Indeterminate but minimal	Recurring	General Fund

Parenteses () indicate expenditure decreases.
*Amounts reflect most recent analysis of this legislation.

Sources of Information

LFC Files

Agency or Agencies Providing Analysis
Crime Victims Reparation Commission
Office of the Attorney General
Administrative Office of the Courts
Department of Public Safety

SUMMARY

Synopsis of Senate Bill 50

Senate Bill 50 (SB50) proposes amendments to Section 29-7-4.1 NMSA 1978, which governs domestic abuse incident training for police officers and public safety telecommunicators. The bill primarily seeks to eliminate existing statutory requirements for annual in-service training on two topics: domestic abuse incidents and missing persons cases. Under current law, domestic abuse incident training, including training specific to strangulation, is required as a component of both basic training for new officers and annual in-service training for certified officers. SB50 would strike the latter requirement, effectively removing the statutory obligation for recurring in-service training on domestic abuse response, while retaining the mandate that this content be included in the curriculum for basic police officer training.

Further, the bill proposes to amend Section 29-7-4.2 NMSA 1978, which requires all certified police officers and certified public safety telecommunicators to complete in-service training on handling missing-person reports, including those involving children with developmental disabilities, such as autism spectrum disorder. SB50 would remove this statutory requirement, thereby eliminating the obligation for officers and telecommunicators to receive annual or

periodic in-service training on this subject. Notably, these amendments do not affect officers' underlying responsibilities to respond to domestic violence or missing-person reports, but they would change the statutory framework requiring ongoing specialized training in these areas.

The effective date of this bill is January 1, 2028.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS

SB50 does not contain an appropriation and is not anticipated to result in a direct fiscal impact to the Department of Public Safety (DPS), the Law Enforcement Certification Board, the Administrative Office of the Courts, or the Crime Victims Reparation Commission (CVRC). The bill proposes to remove statutory mandates for various in-service training requirements for law enforcement officers and public safety telecommunicators, while retaining the Law Enforcement Standards and Training Council's (LESTC) authority to set training expectations through administrative rule. According to agency analysis, existing training infrastructure, including oversight bodies and certification mechanisms, would remain in place, and no new costs or savings are projected at the agency level under current implementation assumptions.

However, while removing these statutory mandates may not produce immediate or quantifiable changes to operating budgets, the bill could shift training-related responsibilities over time. DPS notes that existing curriculum development and accreditation efforts require ongoing resources and that aligning new rulemaking responsibilities with available capacity may influence future operational planning. Additionally, if the transition to rule-based standards reduces the frequency or depth of in-service training, some jurisdictions may realize minor cost savings from fewer required hours of instruction. These savings, if any, are not expected to be significant at the statewide level and would vary based on local agency decisions and training delivery models.

Conversely, reductions in recurring refresher training on topics, such as de-escalation, mental health response, child abuse, and domestic violence may have indirect cost implications over time if inconsistent training practices affect public safety outcomes, civil liability exposure, or officer certification compliance. While these downstream effects are not quantifiable for purposes of this fiscal impact report, several agencies highlighted potential long-term considerations related to risk management and performance monitoring. These factors, although outside the scope of direct fiscal scoring, may warrant additional examination as implementation progresses.

SIGNIFICANT ISSUES

SB50 removes numerous statutory mandates for in-service training previously required for certified law enforcement officers and public safety telecommunicators, delegating authority to LESTC to establish such requirements by rule. While the bill maintains these subject areas within basic certification training, it eliminates ongoing statutory obligations for refresher instruction in crisis intervention, mental health response, child and domestic abuse, missing persons, trauma response, and hate crime investigation.

DPS noted the bill shifts responsibility for in-service training oversight to LESTC, a volunteer body without a clearly defined statutory framework for curriculum development, rule adoption, or statewide enforcement. This transition may introduce ambiguity regarding which entity is

responsible for ensuring consistent statewide standards, particularly across the Law Enforcement Academy and its nine satellite academies. Without additional structure, the change could result in uneven implementation or gaps in training content during the transition period.

CVRC raised concerns that removing recurring in-service training could affect the quality and consistency of victim response. Law enforcement officers and telecommunicators are often the first point of contact for crime victims, and prior training mandates have supported awareness of trauma-informed practices and statutory victim rights. The absence of recurring training requirements could lead to variability in how officers identify and respond to victim needs, with implications for access to services, safety planning, and communication about compensation and legal protections.

Agencies also noted, without statutory benchmarks, maintaining consistent refresher training across evolving areas of law and public safety practice may depend heavily on administrative rulemaking timelines and enforcement capacity. While the bill increases flexibility, it also places greater reliance on non-statutory governance to maintain continuity in critical subject areas.

PERFORMANCE IMPLICATIONS

By eliminating statutory in-service training requirements and shifting authority to LESTC, SB50 may affect the state's ability to uniformly monitor, evaluate, and compare law enforcement training performance over time. While basic training content remains unchanged, the absence of codified in-service topics could reduce the consistency of performance indicators across agencies, particularly in areas where refresher training has been tied to specific public safety outcomes, such as de-escalation effectiveness or officer interactions with individuals experiencing mental health crises.

The decentralized approach to setting in-service standards may limit the availability of standardized data for statewide performance reporting or longitudinal tracking of training-related outcomes. This could affect the ability of oversight entities to assess systemwide trends, identify gaps, or evaluate whether training interventions are correlated with changes in officer behavior, use-of-force incidents, or community engagement metrics. Over time, variability in training implementation may present challenges for benchmarking and comparing performance across jurisdictions.

TECHNICAL ISSUES

SB50 removes numerous statutory references to specific in-service training requirements without addressing how these changes will align with existing administrative rules and compliance mechanisms. DPS notes related provisions in the New Mexico Administrative Code, certification documentation, and any programmatic eligibility criteria that rely on statutory training mandates may require revision to avoid conflicting obligations or enforcement uncertainty.