LFC Requester:	Scott Sanchez
----------------	---------------

AGENCY BILL ANALYSIS - 2025 REGULAR SESSION

WITHIN 24 HOURS OF BILL POSTING, UPLOAD ANALYSIS TO

<u>AgencyAnalysis.nmlegis.gov</u> and email to <u>billanalysis@dfa.nm.gov</u>
(Analysis must be uploaded as a PDF)

Date Prepared:	te Prepared: 7 February 2025			Check all that apply:				
Bill Number:			Original X Correction					
		Aı	mendmen	t Subs	titute			
Sponsor: Dixon		Agency Nar and Code Number:		M Sentenci	ng Con	nmission 354		
			n Writing Douglas Carver					
tle: Applications Phone: 50			5-239-836	2 Email o	dhmcar	ver@unm.edu		
APPROPRIA' Appropriation		24	Recurring or Nonrecurring		Fund Affected			
FY25	FY	FY26 Or N		on ecurring		Affected		
(Parenthesis () indicate expenditure		E (dollars in t	housand	s)				
			housand	Recurri	ng	Fund		
	REVENU			<u></u>		Fund Affected		

ESTIMATED ADDITIONAL OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT (dollars in thousands)

	FY25	FY26	FY27	3 Year Total Cost	Recurring or Nonrecurring	Fund Affected
Total						

(Parenthesis () Indicate Expenditure Decreases)

Duplicates/Conflicts with/Companion to/Relates to: Duplicates/Relates to Appropriation in the General Appropriation Act

SECTION III: NARRATIVE

BILL SUMMARY

Synopsis:

HB 286 amends a part of the Crime Reduction Grant Act, Section 31-28-4 NMSA 1978, regarding applications for crime reduction grants, to remove one of the purposes for which crime reduction grants can be awarded. The purpose being removed is "recruit or retain law enforcement officers, prosecutors, public defenders, corrections officers and mental health workers."

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS

Note: major assumptions underlying fiscal impact should be documented.

Note: if additional operating budget impact is estimated, assumptions and calculations should be reported in this section.

SIGNIFICANT ISSUES

The Crime Reduction Grant Act was passed as part of a crime package in 2019. Since then, the Sentencing Commission has implemented a highly successful grants program under the Act. From small beginnings — a handful of grants totaling approximately \$170,00 a year — the Commission now awards 30 or more grants a year with totals in the \$2 to 3 million range. Grants range in size from the tens of thousands of dollars to the hundreds of thousands of dollars. Grants have been awarded to entities in all but one judicial district in the state (the Seventh, from which the Commission has never had an application), and most counties in the state.

The Crime Reduction Grant Act was created to help support local innovation in strategies to reduce crime and recidivism. The theory was that people in communities across the state would have a better sense of what needs they have, or what strategies might work, than a top-down strategy implemented from state government. To foster this aim, grants are awarded to members of Criminal Justice Coordinating Councils (CJCC), which were also established in law as part of the Act. Each judicial district in the state has a CJCC. CJCCs are made up of the various actors in the criminal justice arena in their judicial district.

The recruitment and retention purpose has always been an awkward fit in the Act. While the need to recruit or retain law enforcement officers, prosecutors, public defenders, corrections officers, and mental health workers is vital, the need for people in these roles is not necessarily a new or local innovation. Additionally, in the years since the Act was passed, the state has provided a great volume of resources for these areas, for instance the law enforcement workforce capacity building fund (Section 9-6-17); the public attorney workforce capacity building fund (Section 9-6-18), and the detention and corrections workforce capacity building fund (Section 9-6-19), all created in 2023.

Part of the Commission's duties under the Crime Reduction Grant Act is to monitor and evaluate the grants. It is exceedingly difficult to evaluate what effect workforce recruitment and retention has on crime and recidivism rates. Furthermore, the data that the Commission has gathered from the recruitment and retention grants is mixed as to whether they have had significant impact on recruitment and retention in these areas.

Removing the recruitment and retention purpose from the Act will not harm the functioning of the Act, and would help to focus potential grantees on applications the foster local innovations, which was the original purpose of the Act.

PERFORMANCE IMPLICATIONS

ADMINISTRATIVE IMPLICATIONS

CONFLICT, DUPLICATION, COMPANIONSHIP, RELATIONSHIP

TECHNICAL ISSUES

OTHER SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES

ALTERNATIVES

WHAT WILL BE THE CONSEQUENCES OF NOT ENACTING THIS BILL

AMENDMENTS