

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 and previously issued FIRs are available on the NM Legislative Website ([www.nmlegis.gov](http://www.nmlegis.gov)) and may also be obtained from the LFC in Suite 101 of the State Capitol Building North.

## FISCAL IMPACT REPORT

ORIGINAL DATE 1/29/2020  
 SPONSOR HJC LAST UPDATED 2/17/2020 HB CS/184/aHAFC  
 SHORT TITLE Law Enforcement Officers at Schools SB \_\_\_\_\_  
 ANALYST Rabin

### REVENUE (dollars in thousands)

Estimated Revenue				Recurring or Nonrecurring	Fund Affected
FY20 – FY22	FY23	FY24	FY25		
NFI	(\$7,095.0 – \$7,490.0)	(\$7,168.0 – \$7,563.0)	(\$7,241.0 – \$7,636.0)	Recurring	General Fund
NFI	\$4,765.0	\$4,765.0	\$4,765.0	Recurring	Current LEPF beneficiaries (increased LEPF distribution)
NFI	\$163.0 – \$558.0	\$177.0 – \$572.0	\$191.0 – \$586.0	Recurring	County, municipal, and school district police departments that assign school resource officers (increased LEPF distribution)
NFI	\$167.0	\$226.0	\$285.0	Recurring	School district police departments (new LEPF distribution)
NFI	\$2,000.0	\$2,000.0	\$2,000.0	Recurring	DPS Operating Fund (new LEPF distribution)
NFI	\$163.0 – \$558.0	\$20.0 – \$34.0	\$20.0 – \$34.0	Recurring	DPS Operating Fund (SRO training)

(Parenthesis ( ) Indicate Revenue Decreases)

### ESTIMATED ADDITIONAL OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT (dollars in thousands)

	FY20 – FY22	FY23	FY24	FY25	6 Year Total Cost	Recurring or Nonrecurring	Fund Affected
DPS	NFI	Up to \$200.0	Up to \$200.0	Up to \$200.0	Up to \$600.0	Recurring	General Fund

(Parenthesis ( ) Indicate Expenditure Decreases)

Relates to Senate Bill 34

Duplicates the Senate Education Committee Substitute for Senate Bill 202 as amended by SFC

## **SOURCES OF INFORMATION**

LFC Files

LESC Files

### Responses Received From

Department of Public Safety (DPS)

Public Education Department (PED)

New Mexico State University (NMSU)

Department of Finance and Administration (DFA)

### No Response Received

Albuquerque Public Schools (APS)

## **SUMMARY**

### Synopsis of HAFC Amendment

The House Appropriations and Finance Committee amendment to the House Judiciary Committee Substitute for House Bill 184 delays the effective date of the revised Law Enforcement Protection Fund distributions to July 1, 2022 (FY23) and changes the date by which law enforcement officers already serving as school resource officers (SROs) when the bill takes effect (now the 2022-2023 school year) must complete their training to July 1, 2023, to correspond with this delayed effective date. Officers who are newly assigned to serve as SROs during the 2022-2023 school year and subsequent school years still have 12 months to complete their training.

The amendment also addresses a technical issue in Section 6 of this bill by changing a reference to “state patrol officers” to “state police officers.”

### Synopsis of Original Bill

The House Judiciary Committee Substitute for House Bill 184 adds a new section to statute with specific law enforcement certification and training requirements for law enforcement officers who serve as school resource officers (SRO). The bill also makes the following amendments to the Law Enforcement Protection Fund (LEPF) Act:

- Replaces population formulas for base allocations to municipal police and county sheriff departments with a base \$45 thousand allocation and adds school district police departments to this distribution;
- Increases the base distribution for university police departments from \$17 thousand to \$45 thousand;
- Increases the per-commissioned-officer distribution to county sheriffs and municipal, tribal, and university police departments from \$600 per officer to \$1,000 per officer and makes school district police officers also eligible for the per officer distribution;
- Provides \$1,000 per-commissioned-officer distribution to county, municipal, and school district police departments that assign officers as SROs to cover costs for that officer’s training; and
- Provides a distribution of up to \$2 million to the Department of Public Safety (DPS) for overtime, travel, fuel, per diem, and ammunition expenses related to governor-ordered special deployments.

There is no effective date of this bill. It is assumed the effective date is 90 days following adjournment of the Legislature.

**FISCAL IMPLICATIONS**

HB184/HJCS proposes to increase distributions from the LEPF by changing the formulas for calculating allocations for existing LEPF beneficiaries (county sheriff’s departments and municipal, tribal, and university police departments) and adding additional beneficiaries (school district police departments) and new distributions (training funding for departments that assign officers as SROs and a distribution to DPS to fund governor-ordered special deployments). This analysis assumes the same number of departments and officers for existing LEPF beneficiaries as FY20 for all subsequent fiscal years. Assumptions regarding new beneficiaries are outlined under ‘New Beneficiaries and Distributions,’ below. Because of the bill’s delayed effective date, no distributions will be made under the provisions of this bill until FY23.

**Status Quo.** Currently, LEPF allocations to municipal police and county sheriff departments are based on population:

- Class 1 entities (population 0 to 20 thousand) receive \$20 thousand
- Class 2 entities (population 20,001 to 160 thousand) receive \$30 thousand
- Class 3 entities (population 160,001 to 1.28 million) receive \$40 thousand

University police departments receive distributions of \$25 thousand each and the law enforcement academy receives \$24.5 thousand. County sheriffs and municipal, university, and tribal police departments are entitled to additional distributions of \$600 per commissioned officer.

**Existing Beneficiaries.** If the provisions contained in HB184/HJCS had been in place for the FY20 LEPF distribution, the total distribution would have been increased between \$7.1 million and \$7.5 million, and current beneficiaries of the law enforcement protection fund would have realized increases of \$4.8 million, which would have been distributed as outlined in the following table:

**Change in Law Enforcement Protection Fund (LEPF) Distributions to Existing Beneficiaries under HB184/HJCS Proposed Scenario (if applied to FY20)**  
(in thousands)

Beneficiary	Number of Departments	Number of Officers	Current Law FY20 Total LEPF Distribution	HB184/HJCS Proposed Scenario Estimated Total LEPF Distribution	Increase (Dollars)	Increase (Percent)
County Sheriffs	33	1,271	\$ 1,522.6	\$ 2,756.0	\$ 1,233.4	81%
Municipal Police Departments	96	2,540	\$ 3,564.0	\$ 6,860.0	\$ 3,296.0	92%
Tribal Police Departments	N/A	85	\$ 51.0	\$ 85.0	\$ 34.0	67%
University Police Departments	6	84	\$ 152.4	\$ 354.0	\$ 201.6	132%
<b>Total:</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>3,980</b>	<b>\$ 5,290.0</b>	<b>\$ 10,055.0</b>	<b>\$ 4,765.0</b>	<b>90%</b>

Note: Distributions received by fund beneficiaries are less the amount of any loans made by the New Mexico Finance Authority against LEPF revenues; however, because total distributions from the fund are unchanged, those loan amounts are not reflected in this comparison. As a result, FY20 total distributions for county sheriffs and municipal police departments do not reflect FY20 distributions received by beneficiaries, but do reflect distributions made from the fund for those beneficiaries and/or associated loans.

To estimate the out-year impact of this bill, this analysis assumes the same number of departments and officers are eligible for LEPF distributions in FY23 and subsequent fiscal years as were eligible in FY20; these numbers are unlikely to change significantly from year to year. Additionally, county sheriffs and municipal police departments would receive additional funding for SRO training under this bill, but because the distribution of SROs between county sheriffs and municipal and school district police departments is not known, that impact is analyzed separately below.

**New Beneficiaries and Distributions.** HB184/HJCS would add per-department and per-officer distributions from the LEPF for school district police departments, a distribution for SRO training, and a distribution for governor-ordered special deployments of the state police. Overall, the cost of these new LEPF distributions is anticipated to range between \$2.3 and \$2.7 million in FY23, between \$2.4 million and \$2.8 million in FY24, and between \$2.5 million and \$2.9 million in FY25, as illustrated in the following table:

**New Law Enforcement Protection Fund (LEPF) Distributions under HB184/HJCS Proposed Scenario (FY23 - FY25)**  
(in thousands)

Distribution	FY23			FY24			FY25		
	Number of Depts.	Number of Officers	HB184/HJCS Proposed Scenario Est. Total LEPF Distribution	Number of Depts.	Number of Officers	HB184/HJCS Proposed Scenario Est. Total LEPF Distribution	Number of Depts.	Number of Officers	HB184/HJCS Proposed Scenario Est. Total LEPF Distribution
School District Police Departments	2	77	\$ 167.0	3	91	\$ 226.0	4	105	\$ 285.0
School Resource Officer Training	N/A	163 – 558	\$ 163.0 – \$ 558.0	N/A	177 – 572	\$ 177.0 – \$ 572.0	N/A	191 – 586	\$ 191.0 – \$ 586.0
DPS	N/A	N/A	\$ 2,000.0	N/A	N/A	\$ 2,000.0	N/A	N/A	\$ 2,000.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>240 – 635</b>	<b>\$ 2,330.0 – \$ 2,725.0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>268 – 663</b>	<b>\$ 2,403.0 – \$ 2,798.0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>296 – 691</b>	<b>\$ 2,476.0 – \$ 2,871.0</b>

Source: Department of Finance and Administration, LFC files

HB184/HJCS would add school district police departments to the set of beneficiaries that receive distributions of \$45 thousand per department. DPS and the Department of Finance and Administration (DFA) report only two school districts currently have their own police departments: Albuquerque Public Schools (APS) and Los Lunas Public Schools (LLPS). Assuming no additional school district police departments are established before the FY23 LEPF distributions are made, the cost of expanding LEPF per department distributions to include school district police departments is \$90 thousand. However, with increased funding available on a per-department and per-officer basis, additional school districts may be incentivized to establish their own police departments. This analysis assumes one additional school district police department is established in each subsequent fiscal year, increasing the cost of this LEPF distribution to \$135 thousand in FY24 and \$180 thousand in FY25.

Under the provisions of this bill, school police departments would also be eligible for a \$1,000 per-officer distribution. DPS and DFA estimate APS’s police department has 60 commissioned officers, while the Public School Insurance Authority (PSIA) reported LLPS employed 17 commissioned officers as of fall 2019. Assuming the existing school district police departments maintain these staffing levels and no new school district police departments are established before the FY23 LEPF distributions are made, the cost of expanding LEPF per officer distributions to include these departments is \$77 thousand. However, as noted above, increased

funding may incentivize the creation of new school district police departments and hiring additional officers. The most average membership count of the five largest school districts after APS is about 22.5 percent of APS’s membership count. Since large school districts are more likely to establish their own police departments, this analysis assumes each new school district police department adds about 22.5 percent of the 60 officers employed by APS—approximately 14 officers. Adding one new department with 14 officers each year increases the cost of this LEPF distribution to \$91 thousand in FY24 and \$105 thousand in FY25.

HB184/HJCS would also distribute an additional \$1,000 per commissioned officer working as an SRO (whether they are employed by school district police departments, municipal police departments, or county sheriffs) to fund SRO training. Excluding the 60 officers employed by APS’s police department, PSIA reports 498 school-based law enforcement officers were working statewide as of fall 2019, 103 of which the agency identified as SROs. It is unclear if any of the other officers identified by PSIA meet the definition of SRO contained in HB184/HJCS. Assuming between 163 and 558 officers currently meet HB184/HJCS’s definition of SRO and that those numbers will remain steady until FY23, the distribution for SRO training contained in this bill would increase LEPF distributions by \$163 thousand to \$558 thousand for county, municipal, and school police departments that assign officers as SROs. Assuming growth in SROs consistent with adding one 14-officer school district police department each year, the SRO training distribution would increase to \$177 thousand to \$572 thousand in FY24 and \$191 thousand to \$586 thousand in FY25.

Section 29-13-4(D) NMSA 1978 provides that, should the amount of funds in the LEPF be insufficient to cover total allocations, DFA shall reduce the allocations to the maximum amount permitted by available funds. DPS is entitled to a distribution of up to \$2 million only if there is sufficient funding in the LEPF after all other distributions have been made. DFA anticipates revenue to the LEPF of \$15.1 million in FY21, which would be sufficient to support all the increased distributions outlined in HB184/HJCS if the provisions applied in FY21; this analysis assumes similar revenues in subsequent fiscal years, which would be similarly sufficient. As a result, the estimated fiscal impact of this bill includes the entire \$2 million allocation to DPS.

However, LEPF revenue is volatile and, historically, the fund would not always have been able to handle these increased distributions, resulting in decreased allocations. The LEPF is funded from 10 percent of all money received for fees, licenses, penalties, and taxes from life, general casualty, and title insurance business pursuant to the New Mexico Insurance Code. The nature of the insurance business means revenue received will fluctuate from year to year depending on the volume of related insurance business activity. LFC analysis of the last 10 years of LEPF revenue shows the fund would have been unable to sustain these distributions in FY13 and FY14, when revenues were significantly lower (\$9.8 million and \$9 million, respectively).

**Historical LEPF Revenues and Reversions**  
(in thousands)

Fiscal Year	Revenue	Reversion
FY10	\$ 15,573.1	\$ 9,768.3
FY11	\$ 14,544.7	\$ 9,089.3
FY12	\$ 13,471.4	\$ 8,290.8
FY13	\$ 9,846.0	\$ 4,497.7
FY14	\$ 9,012.1	\$ 3,936.3
FY15	\$ 13,229.0	\$ 7,646.9
FY16	\$ 21,053.6	\$ 15,277.2
FY17	\$ 19,382.6	\$ 18,382.6
FY18	\$ 19,425.9	\$ 13,704.5
FY19	\$ 17,202.0	\$ 11,967.1
<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$ 165,335.1</b>	<b>\$ 102,560.7</b>

Source: DFA audits

**General Fund Impact.** Funds not distributed from the LEPF are reverted to the general fund. Reversions from the LEPF are significant. Over the last 10 years, the LEPF collected a total

\$165.3 million, an average \$15.3 million per year. In the same time period, the LEPF reverted \$102.6 million to the general fund, an average \$10.3 million per year. If distributions from the LEPF are increased, reversions to the general fund will be decreased by a corresponding amount; if the provisions of HB184/HJCS are enacted, reversions to the general fund will decrease by an estimated \$7.1 million to \$7.5 million in FY23, \$2.4 million to \$2.8 million in FY24, and \$2.5 million to \$2.9 million in FY25.

**Operating Budget Impact.** HB184/HJCS requires the New Mexico law enforcement academy, a component of DPS, to provide or approve SRO training in consultation with PED. In its analysis of a duplicate bill (Senate Education Committee Substitute for Senate Bill 202), DPS estimates developing and implementing a training curriculum will require two new staff and incur a recurring annual cost of \$200 thousand. However, the requirements of the bill do allow DPS to approve training rather than provide it. If DPS were to elect to only approve SRO training, the department anticipates it could fulfill this requirement within existing resources.

If DPS provides SRO training, it can also be anticipated to receive some revenue from county sheriffs, municipal police departments, and school district police departments funded by the new LEPF distribution for SRO training. Because all existing SROs must complete training by the first day of FY24 (July 1, 2023), this analysis assumes approximately all existing SROs will complete their training in FY23. Based on the average percent of force strength made up of new officers in the New Mexico State Police between FY17 and FY19 (3.6 percent), this analysis assumes similar turnover at other law enforcement agencies and estimates between 6 and 20 officers (depending on the current total number of SROs) will replace existing SROs (and require SRO training) each year following FY23. Finally, this analysis assumes training for an additional 14 officers each year in FY24 and FY25 to align with the anticipated increase in school district police departments discussed under ‘New Beneficiaries and Distributions,’ above.

The anticipated number of officers requiring training and the resulting potential revenue to DPS is outlined in the following table:

**Estimated Revenue to the Department of Public Safety for School Resource Officer Training under HB184/HJCS (FY23 - FY25)**  
(in thousands)

Officers Requiring Training	FY23		FY24		FY25	
	Number of Officers	HB184/HJCS Est. Increased Revenue	Number of Officers	HB184/HJCS Est. Increased Revenue	Number of Officers	HB184/HJCS Est. Increased Revenue
Existing SROs at the beginning of FY23 (163 - 558)	163 - 558	\$163.0 - \$558.0	0	\$ -	0	\$ -
New SROs replacing existing SROs (6 – 20 per year)	0	\$ -	6 - 20	\$6.0 - \$20.0	6 - 20	\$6.0 - \$20.0
Additional SROs due to school district police department expansion (14 per year)	0	\$ -	14	\$ 14.0	14	\$ 14.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>163 - 558</b>	<b>\$163.0 - \$158.0</b>	<b>20 - 34</b>	<b>\$20.0 - \$34.0</b>	<b>20 - 34</b>	<b>\$20.0 - \$34.0</b>

Source: Department of Finance and Administration, LFC files

Because HB184/HJCS currently does not require ongoing training, this analysis assumes training after FY23 is only required for new SROs. Requiring ongoing training would result in a larger revenue stream for DPS in FY24 and subsequent fiscal years.

## SIGNIFICANT ISSUES

HB184/HJCS has a significant, recurring negative fiscal impact to the state general fund of approximately \$7.1 million to \$7.5 million in FY23, which will likely be similarly significant in future fiscal years. In its analysis of a similar bill during the 2019 legislative session (House Bill 330), DFA noted that “reversions from LEPF to the state general fund in the past three years have been significant and contributed towards balancing the general fund budget when revenues generated by the oil and gas industry dramatically declined.”

Section 29-13-4(B) NMSA 1978 requires transfers to the peace officers’ survivors fund be made from LEPF balances as necessary to maintain a minimum \$350 thousand balance in the peace officers’ survivors fund. It is difficult to project the transfer amount needed for a given fiscal year. For example, in FY17, \$1 million was transferred from LEPF to the peace officers’ survivors’ fund. When a law enforcement officer is killed in the line of duty, the officer’s family receives a \$350 thousand payment. Any additional requirements on the LEPF could impact the ability to support the survivors’ fund.

HB184/HJCS sets requirements for when SROs must complete their initial training, but does not specify ongoing training requirements. It may be desirable to direct DPS and PED to establish rules governing such ongoing requirements.

## ADMINISTRATIVE IMPLICATIONS

If HB184/HJCS is enacted, DFA’s Local Government Division would be required to update the LEPF Rule, 2.110.3 NMAC, to include new distribution amounts.

PED anticipates it would be able to fulfill its obligations under HB184/HJCS within existing resources.

In its analysis of a duplicate bill (Senate Education Committee Substitute for Senate Bill 202), DPS notes the training identified in HB184/HJCS would be submitted to the law enforcement academy for course accreditation, and anticipates it would see an increase in requests for course accreditations for SRO training if this bill is enacted.

## DUPLICATION, RELATIONSHIP

Duplicates the Senate Education Committee Substitute for Senate Bill 202 as amended by the Senate Finance Committee.

Relates to Senate Bill 34, which allows cost-of-living adjustment increases to retired law enforcement officers hired as school security personnel.

## TECHNICAL ISSUES

***SRO Definition.*** HB184/HJCS defines a school resource officer as “a commissioned and certified law enforcement officer who is designated to be responsible for school safety and crime prevention and the appropriate response to crimes in public schools and has completed the training specified in Subsection B of this section.” However, Subsection B requires SROs to complete the same training, making the specification that the officer “has completed the training specified in Subsection B of this section” redundant. Additionally, this definition may impact the distributions provided for in Section 4 of the bill (which does not contain a separate definition of the term); it could be interpreted to read that distributions for SROs can only be made for officers who have already completed the training.

Because Subsection B of Section 1 already requires SROs to complete this training (“A law

enforcement officer who is or will be assigned as a school resource officer *shall* receive specific training for the duty”), the addition of that specification to the definition of SRO is unnecessary. The potential issues created by its inclusion could be revised by striking the words “and has completed the training specified in Subsection B of this section” from lines 4 and 5 of page 2.

***Effective Date and Training Deadlines.*** Under the provisions of the original HJC substitute for HB184, expanded LEPF distributions (including the distribution for SRO training) would have gone into effect in FY21, and existing SROs would have been required to complete their training by the end of FY22, giving them two years to complete their training. As amended, expanded LEPF distributions will go into effect in FY23, but existing SROs will be required to complete their training by the end of FY23, giving them only one year with increased distributions for training to complete that training. It is unclear if the amendment intended to reduce the time for existing SROs to complete their training; if that was not the intent, this can be resolved by amending “2023” on page 3, line 15, to read “2024.”

## OTHER SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES

***SRO Definition.*** Retired or former law enforcement officers serving as school security personnel would not meet the definition of school resource officer contained in HB184/HJCS and would therefore not be required to complete the training specified in the bill or be eligible to receive LEPF distributions pursuant to the bill. To meet the definition of SRO in this bill, a law enforcement officer must be both commissioned and certified. Only officers currently employed by a public law enforcement agency are commissioned; officers who separate from those agencies lose their commission. Certification is granted by the New Mexico law enforcement academy, and may be maintained by officers who separate from a public law enforcement agency in good standing if they meet the requirements set by the academy. Retired or former law enforcement officers serving as school security personnel can maintain their certification, but not their commission.

***SRO Training.*** DPS anticipates an SRO training curriculum would include both end-use and instructor-level courses, with basic training requiring 24 to 30 hours and an instructor level course or set of courses requiring about 32 hours. About half of the instructor course time would be scenario- or reality-based training. The department believes the best method to spread this training statewide would be to focus on instructor-level courses that would allow instructors from other law enforcement agencies to train other officers in their department or geographic area.

In its analysis of 2019 HB330, which contained similar training requirements for school resource officers, DFA noted such requirements would help school resource officers be better prepared to provide law enforcement in a school setting, which has very specific needs related to providing school safety and crime prevention and appropriate response to crimes.

***Allowable Uses of LEPF.*** In FY20, LEPF made allocations to all 33 county sheriffs and 96 municipal police departments around the state, as well as six tribal police departments and six university police departments. Currently, by statute (29-13-7 NMSA 1978), the funds allocated to police departments are allowed to be spent on:

- The repair and purchase of law enforcement apparatus and equipment, including the financing and refinancing thereof, that meet minimum nationally recognized standards;
- The purchase of law enforcement equipment, including protective vests, for police dogs;
- Expenses associated with advanced law enforcement planning and training;



- Maintaining the balance of the peace officers', New Mexico mounted patrol members', and reserve police officers' survivors fund at a minimum amount of \$350 thousand;
- Complying with match or contribution requirements for the receipt of federal funds relating to criminal justice programs;
- No more than 50 percent of the replacement salaries of law enforcement personnel participating in basic law enforcement training; and,
- Contingent on the availability of funding and until June 30, 2021, a law enforcement officer retention payment in the amount of \$7,500; provided that
  - The distribution is requested by a municipality or county law enforcement agency that on January 1, 2018, had a staffing vacancy rate of at least 10 percent to retain a law enforcement officer who is certified in accordance with the Law Enforcement Training Act and has at least 20 years of actual service credit earned under a municipal police member coverage plan as determined by the public employees retirement association;
  - The municipality or county law enforcement agency provides \$7,500 in matching funds to the law enforcement officer; and
  - The distribution and the matching funds paid to a law enforcement officer shall not constitute the officer's base salary or wages and shall not be considered to be salary or otherwise be used to determine a pension for the purposes of the Public Employees Retirement Act.

HB184/HJCS would not change the restrictions on existing distributions, but would create new distributions with new uses, including funding school resource officer training for county sheriffs and municipal and school district police departments.

LEPF distributions to the law enforcement academy can be expended only on providing tourniquet and trauma kits and training on their use, which would not be altered by HB184/HJCS. The new \$2 million distribution to DPS could only be used for overtime, travel, fuel, per diem, and ammunition expenses related to Governor-ordered special deployments.

Attachments:

1. Change in LEPF Distributions to County Sheriffs under HB184/HJCS Proposed Scenario
2. Change in LEPF Distributions to Municipal Police Departments under HB184/HJCS Proposed Scenario
3. Change in LEPF Distributions to Tribal Police Departments under HB184/HJCS Proposed Scenario
4. Change in LEPF Distributions to University Police Departments under HB184/HJCS Proposed Scenario

ER/rl/al/sb

**Change in Law Enforcement Protection Fund (LEPF) Distributions to County Sheriffs under  
HB184/HJCS Proposed Scenario**

County	Population <sup>1</sup>	Number of Certified Officers <sup>2</sup>	Current Law FY20 Total LEPF Distribution <sup>3</sup>	HB184/HJCS Proposed Scenario Estimated Total LEPF Distribution	Increase (Dollars)	Increase (Percent)
1 Bernalillo	110,688	354	\$ 242,400	\$ 399,000	\$ 156,600	65%
2 Catron	4,014	7	\$ 24,200	\$ 52,000	\$ 27,800	115%
3 Chaves	14,320	32	\$ 39,200	\$ 77,000	\$ 37,800	96%
4 Cibola	14,786	15	\$ 29,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 31,000	107%
5 Colfax	3,037	11	\$ 26,600	\$ 56,000	\$ 29,400	111%
6 Curry	8,713	14	\$ 28,400	\$ 59,000	\$ 30,600	108%
7 De Baca	991	1	\$ 20,600	\$ 46,000	\$ 25,400	123%
8 Dona Ana	84,195	122	\$ 103,200	\$ 167,000	\$ 63,800	62%
9 Eddy	14,872	55	\$ 53,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 47,000	89%
10 Grant	13,888	33	\$ 39,800	\$ 78,000	\$ 38,200	96%
11 Guadalupe	1,393	5	\$ 23,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 27,000	117%
12 Harding	602	2	\$ 21,200	\$ 47,000	\$ 25,800	122%
13 Hidalgo	2,097	7	\$ 24,200	\$ 52,000	\$ 27,800	115%
14 Lea	13,829	65	\$ 59,000	\$ 110,000	\$ 51,000	86%
15 Lincoln	7,168	22	\$ 33,200	\$ 67,000	\$ 33,800	102%
16 Los Alamos <sup>4</sup>	17,950	34	\$ 40,400	\$ 79,000	\$ 38,600	96%
17 Luna	8,576	29	\$ 37,400	\$ 74,000	\$ 36,600	98%
18 McKinley	49,814	30	\$ 48,000	\$ 75,000	\$ 27,000	56%
19 Mora	4,567	5	\$ 23,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 27,000	117%
20 Otero	29,878	40	\$ 54,000	\$ 85,000	\$ 31,000	57%
21 Quay	2,352	7	\$ 24,200	\$ 52,000	\$ 27,800	115%
22 Rio Arriba	32,250	21	\$ 42,600	\$ 66,000	\$ 23,400	55%
23 Roosevelt	7,369	12	\$ 27,200	\$ 57,000	\$ 29,800	110%
24 Sandoval	26,752	50	\$ 60,000	\$ 95,000	\$ 35,000	58%
25 San Juan	69,292	100	\$ 90,000	\$ 145,000	\$ 55,000	61%
26 San Miguel	14,248	7	\$ 24,200	\$ 52,000	\$ 27,800	115%
27 Santa Fe <sup>5</sup>	72,973	83	\$ 79,800	\$ 128,000	\$ 48,200	60%
28 Sierra	3,633	15	\$ 29,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 31,000	107%
29 Socorro	7,877	13	\$ 27,800	\$ 58,000	\$ 30,200	109%
30 Taos	24,905	24	\$ 44,400	\$ 69,000	\$ 24,600	55%
31 Torrance	11,890	14	\$ 28,400	\$ 59,000	\$ 30,600	108%
32 Union	1,370	4	\$ 22,400	\$ 49,000	\$ 26,600	119%
33 Valencia	46,901	38	\$ 52,800	\$ 83,000	\$ 30,200	57%
<b>Total</b>	<b>727,190</b>	<b>1,271</b>	<b>\$ 1,522,600</b>	<b>\$ 2,756,000</b>	<b>\$ 1,233,400</b>	<b>81%</b>

1. Populations of municipalities served by police departments are subtracted from county populations to determine net county population for LEPF purposes.
2. Includes full-time officers who are certified or will be certified by July 1. Officer numbers are maintained by the Department of Public Safety's Training and Recruiting Division.
3. Distributions received by fund beneficiaries are less the amount of any loans made by the New Mexico Finance Authority against LEPF revenues; however, because total distributions from the fund are unchanged, those loan amounts are not reflected in this comparison. As a result, FY20 total distributions listed here may not reflect FY20 distributions received by beneficiaries, but do reflect distributions made from the fund for those beneficiaries and/or associated loans.
4. Los Alamos has a combined county and municipal government and will receive only one LEPF distribution.
5. 3,250 of Espanola's 10,224 population reside in Santa Fe county and are subtracted from Santa Fe's total population in computing the county's net population for LEPF purposes.

Source: Department of Finance and Administration, LFC files

**Change in Law Enforcement Protection Fund (LEPF) Distributions to Municipal Police  
Departments under HB184/HJCS Proposed Scenario**

	<b>Municipality</b>	<b>Population</b>	<b>Number of Certified Officers<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Current Law FY20 Total LEPF Distribution<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>HB184/HJCS Proposed Scenario Estimated Total LEPF Distribution</b>	<b>Increase (Dollars)</b>	<b>Increase (Percent)</b>	
1	Alamogordo	30,403	55	\$ 63,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 37,000	59%	1
2	Albuquerque	545,852	951	\$ 610,600	\$ 996,000	\$ 385,400	63%	2
3	Angel Fire	1,216	5	\$ 23,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 27,000	117%	3
4	Anthony	9,470	11	\$ 26,600	\$ 56,000	\$ 29,400	111%	4
5	Artesia	11,301	31	\$ 38,600	\$ 76,000	\$ 37,400	97%	5
6	Aztec	6,763	14	\$ 28,400	\$ 59,000	\$ 30,600	108%	6
7	Bayard	2,328	3	\$ 21,800	\$ 48,000	\$ 26,200	120%	7
8	Belen	7,269	18	\$ 30,800	\$ 63,000	\$ 32,200	105%	8
9	Bernalillo	8,320	19	\$ 31,400	\$ 64,000	\$ 32,600	104%	9
10	Bloomfield	8,112	16	\$ 29,600	\$ 61,000	\$ 31,400	106%	10
11	Bosque Farms	3,904	13	\$ 27,800	\$ 58,000	\$ 30,200	109%	11
12	Capitan	1,489	2	\$ 21,200	\$ 47,000	\$ 25,800	122%	12
13	Carlsbad	26,138	65	\$ 69,000	\$ 110,000	\$ 41,000	59%	13
14	Carrizozo	996	2	\$ 21,200	\$ 47,000	\$ 25,800	122%	14
15	Causey <sup>3</sup>	N/A	N/A	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	N/A	15
16	Chama	1,022	0	\$ 20,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 25,000	125%	16
17	Cimarron	1,021	3	\$ 21,800	\$ 48,000	\$ 26,200	120%	17
18	Clayton	2,980	4	\$ 22,400	\$ 49,000	\$ 26,600	119%	18
19	Cloudcroft	674	3	\$ 21,800	\$ 48,000	\$ 26,200	120%	19
20	Clovis	37,775	45	\$ 57,000	\$ 90,000	\$ 33,000	58%	20
21	Columbus	1,664	0	\$ 20,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 25,000	125%	21
22	Corona <sup>3</sup>	N/A	N/A	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	N/A	22
23	Corrales	8,329	15	\$ 29,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 31,000	107%	23
24	Cuba	731	3	\$ 21,800	\$ 48,000	\$ 26,200	120%	24
25	Deming	14,855	36	\$ 41,600	\$ 81,000	\$ 39,400	95%	25
26	Des Moines	143	0	\$ 20,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 25,000	125%	26
27	Dexter	1,266	5	\$ 23,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 27,000	117%	27
28	Dora <sup>3</sup>	N/A	N/A	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	N/A	28
29	Eagle Nest	290	0	\$ 20,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 25,000	125%	29
30	Edgewood	3,735	11	\$ 26,600	\$ 56,000	\$ 29,400	111%	30
31	Elephant Butte	1,431	0	\$ 20,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 25,000	125%	31
32	Elida	197	1	\$ 20,600	\$ 46,000	\$ 25,400	123%	32
33	Encino <sup>3</sup>	N/A	N/A	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	N/A	33
34	Espanola	10,224	20	\$ 32,000	\$ 65,000	\$ 33,000	103%	34
35	Estancia	1,655	2	\$ 21,200	\$ 47,000	\$ 25,800	122%	35
36	Eunice	2,922	8	\$ 24,800	\$ 53,000	\$ 28,200	114%	36
37	Farmington	45,877	135	\$ 111,000	\$ 180,000	\$ 69,000	62%	37
38	Floyd <sup>3</sup>	N/A	N/A	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	N/A	38
39	Folsom	56	0	\$ 20,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 25,000	125%	39
40	Ft. Sumner	1,031	1	\$ 20,600	\$ 46,000	\$ 25,400	123%	40
41	Gallup	21,678	62	\$ 67,200	\$ 107,000	\$ 39,800	59%	41
42	Grady	107	0	\$ 20,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 25,000	125%	42
43	Grants	9,182	17	\$ 30,200	\$ 62,000	\$ 31,800	105%	43
44	Grenville	143	0	\$ 20,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 25,000	125%	44
45	Hagerman	1,257	4	\$ 22,400	\$ 49,000	\$ 26,600	119%	45

**Change in Law Enforcement Protection Fund (LEPF) Distributions to Municipal Police  
Departments under HB184/HJCS Proposed Scenario**

	<b>Municipality</b>	<b>Population</b>	<b>Number of Certified Officers<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Current Law FY20 Total LEPF Distribution<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>HB184/HJCS Proposed Scenario Estimated Total LEPF Distribution</b>	<b>Increase (Dollars)</b>	<b>Increase (Percent)</b>	
46	Hatch	1,648	7	\$ 24,200	\$ 52,000	\$ 27,800	115%	46
47	Hobbs	34,122	72	\$ 73,200	\$ 117,000	\$ 43,800	60%	47
48	Hope	105	0	\$ 20,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 25,000	125%	48
49	House	68	0	\$ 20,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 25,000	125%	49
50	Hurley	1,297	2	\$ 21,200	\$ 47,000	\$ 25,800	122%	50
51	Jal	2,047	7	\$ 24,200	\$ 52,000	\$ 27,800	115%	51
52	Jemez Springs	250	5	\$ 23,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 27,000	117%	52
53	Kirtland <sup>4</sup>	N/A	0	\$ 20,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 25,000	125%	53
54	Lake Arthur	436	0	\$ 20,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 25,000	125%	54
55	Las Cruces	97,618	182	\$ 139,200	\$ 227,000	\$ 87,800	63%	55
56	Las Vegas	13,753	33	\$ 39,800	\$ 78,000	\$ 38,200	96%	56
57	Logan	1,042	4	\$ 22,400	\$ 49,000	\$ 26,600	119%	57
58	Lordsburg	2,797	8	\$ 24,800	\$ 53,000	\$ 28,200	114%	58
59	Los Lunas	14,835	41	\$ 44,600	\$ 86,000	\$ 41,400	93%	59
60	Los Ranchos	6,024	0	\$ 20,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 25,000	125%	60
61	Loving	1,413	4	\$ 22,400	\$ 49,000	\$ 26,600	119%	61
62	Lovington	11,009	26	\$ 35,600	\$ 71,000	\$ 35,400	99%	62
63	Magdalena	938	1	\$ 20,600	\$ 46,000	\$ 25,400	123%	63
64	Maxwell	254	0	\$ 20,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 25,000	125%	64
65	Melrose	651	0	\$ 20,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 25,000	125%	65
66	Mesilla	2,196	8	\$ 24,800	\$ 53,000	\$ 28,200	114%	66
67	Milan	3,245	8	\$ 24,800	\$ 53,000	\$ 28,200	114%	67
68	Moriarty	1,910	9	\$ 25,400	\$ 54,000	\$ 28,600	113%	68
69	Mosquero	93	0	\$ 20,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 25,000	125%	69
70	Mountainair	928	3	\$ 21,800	\$ 48,000	\$ 26,200	120%	70
71	Pecos	1,392	0	\$ 20,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 25,000	125%	71
72	Peralta	3,660	0	\$ 20,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 25,000	125%	72
73	Portales	12,280	17	\$ 30,200	\$ 62,000	\$ 31,800	105%	73
74	Questa	1,770	2	\$ 21,200	\$ 47,000	\$ 25,800	122%	74
75	Raton	6,885	13	\$ 27,800	\$ 58,000	\$ 30,200	109%	75
76	Red River	477	4	\$ 22,400	\$ 49,000	\$ 26,600	119%	76
77	Reserve	289	0	\$ 20,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 25,000	125%	77
78	Rio Communities <sup>4</sup>	N/A	0	\$ 20,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 25,000	125%	78
79	Rio Rancho	87,521	119	\$ 101,400	\$ 164,000	\$ 62,600	62%	79
80	Roswell	48,366	76	\$ 75,600	\$ 121,000	\$ 45,400	60%	80
81	Roy <sup>3</sup>	N/A	N/A	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	N/A	81
82	Ruidoso	8,029	22	\$ 33,200	\$ 67,000	\$ 33,800	102%	82
83	Ruidoso Downs	2,815	5	\$ 23,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 27,000	117%	83
84	San Jon	216	0	\$ 20,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 25,000	125%	84
85	San Ysidro	193	2	\$ 21,200	\$ 47,000	\$ 25,800	122%	85
86	Santa Clara	1,686	3	\$ 21,800	\$ 48,000	\$ 26,200	120%	86
87	Santa Fe <sup>5</sup>	67,947	149	\$ 119,400	\$ 194,000	\$ 74,600	62%	87
88	Santa Rosa	2,848	7	\$ 24,200	\$ 52,000	\$ 27,800	115%	88
89	Silver City	10,315	29	\$ 37,400	\$ 74,000	\$ 36,600	98%	89
90	Socorro	9,051	12	\$ 27,200	\$ 57,000	\$ 29,800	110%	90

**Change in Law Enforcement Protection Fund (LEPF) Distributions to Municipal Police  
Departments under HB184/HJCS Proposed Scenario**

	<b>Municipality</b>	<b>Population</b>	<b>Number of Certified Officers<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Current Law FY20 Total LEPF Distribution<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>HB184/HJCS Proposed Scenario Estimated Total LEPF Distribution</b>	<b>Increase (Dollars)</b>	<b>Increase (Percent)</b>	
91	Springer	1,047	1	\$ 20,600	\$ 46,000	\$ 25,400	123%	91
92	Sunland Park	14,106	20	\$ 32,000	\$ 65,000	\$ 33,000	103%	92
93	Taos	5,716	23	\$ 33,800	\$ 68,000	\$ 34,200	101%	93
94	Taos Ski Valley	69	3	\$ 21,800	\$ 48,000	\$ 26,200	120%	94
95	Tatum	798	2	\$ 21,200	\$ 47,000	\$ 25,800	122%	95
96	Texico	1,130	3	\$ 21,800	\$ 48,000	\$ 26,200	120%	96
97	Tijeras <sup>3</sup>	N/A	N/A	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	N/A	97
98	T or C	6,475	13	\$ 27,800	\$ 58,000	\$ 30,200	109%	98
99	Tucumcari	5,363	10	\$ 26,000	\$ 55,000	\$ 29,000	112%	99
100	Tularosa	2,842	4	\$ 22,400	\$ 49,000	\$ 26,600	119%	100
101	Vaughn	446	1	\$ 20,600	\$ 46,000	\$ 25,400	123%	101
102	Virden <sup>3</sup>	N/A	N/A	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	N/A	102
103	Wagon Mound	314	0	\$ 20,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 25,000	125%	103
104	Willard <sup>3</sup>	N/A	N/A	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	N/A	104
105	Williamsburg	449	0	\$ 20,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 25,000	125%	105
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,336,980</b>	<b>2,540</b>	<b>\$ 3,564,000</b>	<b>\$ 6,860,000</b>	<b>\$ 3,296,000</b>	<b>92%</b>	

1. Includes full-time officers who are certified or will be certified by July 1. Officer numbers are maintained by the Department of Public Safety's Training and Recruiting Division.
2. Distributions received by fund beneficiaries are less the amount of any loans made by the New Mexico Finance Authority against LEPF revenues; however, because total distributions from the fund are unchanged, those loan amounts are not reflected in this comparison. As a result, FY20 total distributions listed here may not reflect FY20 distributions received by beneficiaries, but do reflect distributions made from the fund for those beneficiaries and/or associated loans.
3. Municipality does not have a police department. Populations of municipalities not served by a municipal police department are assigned to the county.
4. There is no population data shown for Kirtland and Rio Communities because they were incorporated after the 2010 Census was published.
5. 3,250 of Espanola's 10,224 population reside in Santa Fe county and are subtracted from Santa Fe's total population in computing the county's net population for LEPF purposes.

Source: Department of Finance and Administration, LFC files

**Change in Law Enforcement Protection Fund (LEPF) Distributions to Tribal Police Departments  
under HB184/HJCS Proposed Scenario**

Tribal Police Department	Number of Certified Officers <sup>1</sup>	Current Law FY20 Total LEPF Distribution	HB184/HJCS Proposed Scenario Estimated Total LEPF Distribution	Increase (Dollars)	Increase (Percent)
1 Acoma Pueblo PD <sup>2</sup>	N/A	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	N/A
2 Isleta Pueblo PD	21	\$ 12,600	\$ 21,000	\$ 8,400	67%
3 Jemez Tribal PD*	N/A	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	N/A
4 Jicarilla Apache PD	1	\$ 600	\$ 1,000	\$ 400	67%
5 Navajo Dept. of Public Safety <sup>2</sup>	N/A	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	N/A
6 Ramah Navajo PD	7	\$ 4,200	\$ 7,000	\$ 2,800	67%
7 Sandia Tribal PD	24	\$ 14,400	\$ 24,000	\$ 9,600	67%
8 Santa Ana Tribal Police	16	\$ 9,600	\$ 16,000	\$ 6,400	67%
9 Taos Tribal PD <sup>3</sup>	N/A	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	N/A
10 Zuni Pueblo PD	16	\$ 9,600	\$ 16,000	\$ 6,400	67%
<b>Total</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>\$ 51,000</b>	<b>\$ 85,000</b>	<b>\$ 34,000</b>	<b>67%</b>

- Includes full-time officers who are certified or will be certified by July 1. Officer numbers are maintained by the Department of Public Safety's Training and Recruiting Division.
- Acoma Pueblo PD, Jemez Tribal PD and Navajo DPS did not apply as they no longer qualify since they will be issuing citations to non-Native Americans through tribal court.
- Taos Tribal PD did not apply.

Source: Department of Finance and Administration, LFC files

**Change in Law Enforcement Protection Fund (LEPF) Distributions to University Police Departments  
under HB184/HJCS Proposed Scenario**

University	Number of Certified Officers <sup>1</sup>	Current Law FY20 Total LEPF Distribution	HB184/HJCS Proposed Scenario Estimated Total LEPF Distribution	Increase (Dollars)	Increase
1 Eastern NM University	8	\$ 21,800	\$ 53,000	\$ 31,200	143% 1
2 NM Highlands	5	\$ 20,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 30,000	150% 2
3 NM State University	18	\$ 27,800	\$ 63,000	\$ 35,200	127% 3
4 NM Tech (Institute of Mining & Tech)	9	\$ 22,400	\$ 54,000	\$ 31,600	141% 4
5 University of NM	37	\$ 39,200	\$ 82,000	\$ 42,800	109% 5
6 Western NM University	7	\$ 21,200	\$ 52,000	\$ 30,800	145% 6
<b>Total</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>\$ 152,400</b>	<b>\$ 354,000</b>	<b>\$ 201,600</b>	<b>132%</b>

1. Includes full-time officers who are certified or will be certified by July 1. Officer numbers are maintained by the Department of Public Safety's Training and Recruiting Division.

Source: Department of Finance and Administration, LFC files