

LFC Requester:	Eric Chenier
-----------------------	---------------------

**AGENCY BILL ANALYSIS
2015 REGULAR SESSION**

WITHIN 24 HOURS OF BILL POSTING, EMAIL ANALYSIS TO:

LFC@NMLEGIS.GOV

and

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 February 19, 2015
Bill No: SB95a-305

Sponsor: Sen. Sander Rue
Short Reorganize Department of
Title: Public Safety

Agency Code: Attorney General's Office
Person Writing Jennifer Salazar, AAG
Phone: 827-6990 **Email** jsalazar@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)

	FY15	FY16	FY17	3 Year Total Cost	Recurring or Nonrecurring	Fund Affected
Total						

(Parenthesis () Indicate Expenditure Decreases)

Duplicates/Conflicts with/Companion to/Relates to: N/A

Duplicates/Relates to Appropriation in the General Appropriation Act: N/A

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:

The Senate Judiciary Committee (“Committee”) recommends a “do pass” of Senate Bill 95 subject to some minor amendments to the Law Enforcement Training Act. Specifically, the Committee proposes amending NMSA 1978, Section 29-7-3 (found at Section 22 of the bill) to clarify that the Law Enforcement Academy Board (“LEAB”) shall be composed of eight members, not six. In addition, the Committee proposes adding language to clarify that the two “citizens-at-large” members can neither be police officers or retired police officers, nor can they have “familial or financial connections” to a police officer or police agency/department.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS

N/A

SIGNIFICANT ISSUES

There are no significant legal issues posed by the Committee’s amendments.

PERFORMANCE IMPLICATIONS

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE IMPLICATIONS

N/A

CONFLICT, DUPLICATION, COMPANIONSHIP, RELATIONSHIP

N/A

TECHNICAL ISSUES

N/A

OTHER SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES

N/A

ALTERNATIVES

N/A

WHAT WILL BE THE CONSEQUENCES OF NOT ENACTING THIS BILL

Status quo

AMENDMENTS

N/A