

**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: Marquardt DATE TYPED: 02/24/01 HB 650  
 SHORT TITLE: Magistrate Security and Video Conferencing SB \_\_\_\_\_  
 ANALYST: Hayes

### APPROPRIATION

Appropriation Contained		Estimated Additional Impact		Recurring or Non-Rec	Fund Affected
FY01	FY02	FY01	FY02		
	\$ 3,149.0			Non-recurring	General Fund

(Parenthesis ( ) Indicate Expenditure Decreases)

### SOURCES OF INFORMATION

LFC budget files  
 Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC)  
*Facility Standards for Magistrate Courts in New Mexico* document

### SUMMARY

#### Synopsis of Bill

HB650 appropriates \$3,149.0 from the general fund to the Administrative Office of the Courts for the purpose of continuing to install and expand the Magistrate Court security and video conferencing project.

#### Significant Issues

For fiscal year 2001, the magistrate courts received a non-recurring appropriation of \$1.0 million for magistrate court security and video conferencing project. This funding is being used to place video conferencing equipment in ten magistrate courts and ten jails throughout the state for video arraignments. Another goal of the project is to inspect the security and safety features of all magistrate courts, to install certain security and safety features, and to roll out personal safety training for all court employees as needed.

The additional funding would enable AOC to put video conferencing and arraignment equipment in all remaining magistrate courts (except in those courts which are too close in miles to other magistrate courts to justify placing equipment in).

## House Bill 650 -- Page 2

The Chief Judges Council has voted to support this bill although it is not listed in the top priorities of the *Judiciary Unified Budget*.

Until such time that the magistrate courts conclude phase I of this project, it may be prudent to delay additional funding and expansion for one year. At this time, the magistrate courts have not even completed the phase I installation. Therefore, it is uncertain how or if the video arraignments will work. Protocols and procedures still need to be developed. It would be more prudent and fiscally sound to determine first whether or not the project itself is successful before tripling the funding and expanding these systems into 30 other courts.

### **FISCAL IMPLICATIONS**

The appropriation of \$3,149.0 contained in this bill is a non-recurring expense to the general fund. Any unexpended or unencumbered balance remaining at the end of 2002 shall revert to the general fund.

### **ADMINISTRATIVE IMPLICATIONS**

The AOC's Magistrate and Judicial Information Division staff have been coordinating with ISD, DPS, Association of Counties, jails and prison directors as well as other state agencies regarding the access to and shared use of bridgeable video conferencing capabilities. In the future, it is conceivable that all named agencies will be able to utilize the video arraignment process and expands its usage as the system develops. Moreover, certain courts could assist other courts with arraignments, but only if AOC is able to connect court facilities with jail facilities around the state.

CMH/jsp/njw