NOTE: As provided in LFC policy, this report is intended only 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 (in HTML & Adobe PDF formats) is available on the Legislative Website. The Adobe PDF version includes all attachments, whereas the HTML version does not. Previously issued FIRs and attachments may be obtained from the LFC's office in Suite 101 of the State Capitol Building North.

FISCAL IMPACT REPORT

SPONSOR: R	ainaldi DATE TYPED: 01/30/02	НВ	
SHORT TITLE:	Chaves and San Juan Magistrate Judgeships	SB	94
	Hayes		

APPROPRIATION

Appropriation Contained		Estimated Additional Impact		Recurring or Non-Rec	Fund Affected
FY02	FY03	FY02	FY03		
	\$553.3			Recurring**	General Fund

(Parenthesis () Indicate Expenditure Decreases)

Duplicates/Relates to SB55

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) Judiciary *Unified Budget* Public Defender Department (PD) Office of the District Attorneys (OADA) LFC files

SUMMARY

Synopsis of Bill

Senate Bill 94 amends Section 35-1-6 NMSA 1978 to create and provide for an appropriation to the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) for an additional judgeship in the Chaves magistrate district and an additional judgeship in San Juan magistrate district.

The magistrate court judgeships are filled by appointment by the governor and serve until their successors have been elected in the next general election in 2002. The elected magistrates' term of office will begin on January 1, 2003.

The bill provides appropriations for salaries and benefits, supplies, furniture and equipment for the two additional judges. Moreover, there are further appropriations for the District Attorneys and Public Defenders in each of the respective districts affected by the two additional judgeships.

The act contains an emergency clause so that provisions of this bill become effective immediately.

Significant Issues

This bill embodies the policy that the Legislature requested and the Chief Judges Council has followed for the past five years in presenting judgeship requests endorsed by the judiciary's *Unified Budget*. In addition, the courts notify the District Attorney and Public Defender offices of judgeship requests so that they have an opportunity to assess and report their respective analyses for this bill.

In 1998, the AOC completed a study to provide the Legislature with a standardized methodology for determining the needs for additional judgeships – the Weighted Caseload Study. The study assigns a weight for each type of case heard in court. The weight represents the average amount of judge's time, expressed in minutes, that is necessary to process a case of that type. Each weight is multiplied by the number of new cases filed per category.

After updating the study with FY01 caseload data, the Chief Judges Council reviewed all district, metropolitan and magistrate judgeship requests statewide and considered the need for a judge as determined by the Weighted Caseload Study as well as additional narrative and testimonial information from those jurisdictions. In summary, the council voted to support the two judgeships as requested in this bill.

An additional table is attached highlighting the weighted caseload analyses.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS

**Of the appropriation of \$553.5 contained in this bill, \$394.1 is a recurring expense to the general fund and \$159.4 is for non-recurring expenses. Any unexpended or unencumbered balance remaining at the end of FY03 shall revert to the general fund.

The distribution of the appropriations is outlined in the table below.

JUDGESHIP AND RELATED APPROPRIATIONS

Judgeships	Appropriation for Magistrate Court	Appropriation to District Attorney	Appropriation to Public Defender	Total
Magistrate - Chaves (1 judge)	99,110	78,665	98,000	\$275.6
Magistrate - San Juan (1 judge)	99,110	78,665	100,000	\$277.7
Totals	\$198.2	\$157.3	\$198.0	\$553.3

ADMINISTRATIVE IMPLICATIONS

The primary long-term administrative effect on the magistrate courts with the passage of this legislation would be more efficient and expeditious disposal of cases. Without additional judges, these two courts will experience significant delays in hearings and disposition of both criminal and civil cases. This is true for the Public Defender and District Attorney offices too.

RELATIONSHIP

Senate Bill 55 is a more comprehensive judgeship bill and requests a total of 10 new judges: six for district courts; three for Bernalillo County Metropolitan Court; and one for the Santa Fe magistrate district.

POSSIBLE QUESTIONS

- 1. Typically, judgeship bills are effective at the commencement of the fiscal year. Why does this act have «emergency clause » language included?
- 2. Past judgeship bills have always included a court clerk to support the new judgeship. In these two magistrate courts, does the judiciary's Workload Measurement Study indicate whether or not there is a need for additional staffing as well as judges?

CMH/ar