

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: Urioste DATE TYPED: 02/23/01 HB 688
 SHORT TITLE: Ninth Judicial District Operating Costs SB _____
 ANALYST: Hayes

APPROPRIATION

Appropriation Contained		Estimated Additional Impact		Recurring or Non-Rec	Fund Affected
FY01	FY02	FY01	FY02		
	\$ 155.3			Recurring	General Fund

(Parenthesis () Indicate Expenditure Decreases)

Duplicates and Relates to Appropriation in HB2/a.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

LFC budget files
 Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC)

SUMMARY

Synopsis of Bill

HB688 appropriates \$155.3 from the general fund to the Ninth Judicial District Court for the purpose of increasing its base budget for fiscal year 2002.

Significant Issues

The highest priority in the Judiciary Unified Budget is adequate funding for the basic costs of operating the courts. To that end, the LFC fiscal year 2002 recommendation for the Ninth Judicial District Court was \$1,782.2, a 6.2% increase over its FY01 budget. In comparison to other district court recommendations, the Ninth District's was the 2nd highest percentage increase. Included in that recommendation is \$45.0 for a security system. It is unclear why this bill is duplicating the security system budget request.

In addition, the HAFC added "operating costs" funding to the Ninth District's budget (see HB2/a or document 3 as approved by HAFC), thereby increasing its budget to \$1,817.3. In total, the budget for the Ninth District shows a recommended increase of 7.6%. This amount does not include salary increases yet.

House Bill 688 -- Page 2

It is suggested that House Bill 2 be the vehicle by which base budgets are funded. Both operating costs and the security system are already included in the Ninth District's recommended budget. In regards to "personnel" as noted in the bill, it is unclear what is being requested.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS

The appropriation of \$155.3 contained in this bill is a recurring expense to the general fund. Any unexpended or unencumbered balance remaining at the end of 2002 shall revert to the general fund.

CONFLICT/DUPLICATION/COMPANIONSHIP/RELATIONSHIP

HB2/a includes has more than half the amount requested in this bill (\$80.1).

TECHNICAL ISSUES

The bill needs to name the agency specifically as the "Ninth Judicial District Court." By only referring to the agency as "Ninth Judicial District," it could be confused with the Ninth Judicial District Attorney.

CMH/njw