

<b>LFC Requester:</b>	<b>ARMSTRONG, JONAS</b>
-----------------------	-------------------------

**AGENCY BILL ANALYSIS  
2015 REGULAR SESSION**

**WITHIN 24 HOURS OF BILL POSTING, EMAIL ANALYSIS TO:**

**[LFC@NMLEGIS.GOV](mailto:LFC@NMLEGIS.GOV)**

*and*

**[DFA@STATE.NM.US](mailto:DFA@STATE.NM.US)**

*{Include the bill no. in the email subject line, e.g., HB2, and only attach one bill analysis and related documentation per email message}*

**SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION**

*{Indicate if analysis is on an original bill, amendment, substitute or a correction of a previous bill}*

Check all that apply:  
**Original**     **Amendment**      
**Correction**     **Substitute**   

**Date** January 12, 2015  
**Bill No:** S 68

**Sponsor:** Senator Michael Padilla  
**Short**    Division of Conservancy  
**Title:**    District Districts

**Agency Code:** Attorney General's Office  
**Person Writing**    Mona Valicenti  
**Phone:** 827-6994    **Email** mvalicenti@nmag.gov

**SECTION II: FISCAL IMPACT**

**APPROPRIATION (dollars in thousands)**

Appropriation		Recurring or Nonrecurring	Fund Affected
FY15	FY16		

(Parenthesis ( ) Indicate Expenditure Decreases)

**REVENUE (dollars in thousands)**

Estimated Revenue			Recurring or Nonrecurring	Fund Affected
FY15	FY16	FY17		

(Parenthesis ( ) Indicate Expenditure Decreases)

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

	<b>FY15</b>	<b>FY16</b>	<b>FY17</b>	<b>3 Year Total Cost</b>	<b>Recurring or Nonrecurring</b>	<b>Fund Affected</b>
<b>Total</b>						

(Parenthesis ( ) Indicate Expenditure Decreases)

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

**SECTION III: NARRATIVE**

This analysis is neither a formal Attorney General’s Opinion nor an Attorney General’s Advisory Letter. This is a staff analysis in response to an agency’s, committee’s, or legislator’s request.

**BILL SUMMARY**

Synopsis: Senate Bill 68 amends Chapter 262, Section 2, by increasing the membership on the board of directors of a conservancy district to seven and by including a third requirement of residency for a director from a single member district if elected to represent the most populous county. In a new section B, SB 68 apportions the representation on the board of directors to reflect that three members shall be elected from the most populous county within the conservancy district, one member shall be elected by and from the qualified electors of the conservancy district at large, and the remaining members shall be elected from those portions of the remaining counties of the conservancy district. In a new section C, SB 68 requires that by January 1, 2017, the portion of the most populous county within the conservancy district be divided into three compact single-member districts, as equal in acreage as possible. One director shall be elected from each single-member district and any director still serving before this provision takes effect shall serve the remainder of the director’s term before being required to comply with the new residency requirements.

SB 68 also repeals Chapter 262, Section 5.

**FISCAL IMPLICATIONS**

None

**SIGNIFICANT ISSUES**

N/A

**PERFORMANCE IMPLICATIONS**

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE IMPLICATIONS**

N/A

**CONFLICT, DUPLICATION, COMPANIONSHIP, RELATIONSHIP**

N/A

**TECHNICAL ISSUES**

Adding “either” in Section A(2) after “resides” makes for easier reading comprehension

**OTHER SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES**

N/A

**ALTERNATIVES**

N/A

**WHAT WILL BE THE CONSEQUENCES OF NOT ENACTING THIS BILL**

None

**AMENDMENTS**

N/A