

LEGISLATIVE BUDGET BOARD
Austin, Texas

FISCAL NOTE, 78TH LEGISLATIVE REGULAR SESSION

April 21, 2003

TO: Honorable Will Hartnett, Chair, House Committee on Judicial Affairs

FROM: John Keel, Director, Legislative Budget Board

IN RE: HB1511 by Jones, Elizabeth (Relating to the appointment of certain judicial offices and a nonpartisan election for the retention or rejection of a person appointed to those offices.), **As Introduced**

Estimated Two-year Net Impact to General Revenue Related Funds for HB1511, As Introduced: a negative impact of (\$528,200) through the biennium ending August 31, 2005.

General Revenue-Related Funds, Five-Year Impact:

Fiscal Year	Probable Net Positive/(Negative) Impact to General Revenue Related Funds
2004	(\$528,200)
2005	\$0
2006	(\$845,200)
2007	\$0
2008	(\$528,200)

All Funds, Five-Year Impact:

Fiscal Year	Probable Revenue Gain/(Loss) from <i>GENERAL REVENUE FUND</i> 1
2004	(\$528,200)
2005	\$0
2006	(\$845,200)
2007	\$0
2008	(\$528,200)

Fiscal Analysis

This bill would require Supreme Court, court of criminal appeals, court of appeals, and district judges to stand for retention or rejection elections rather than running in a partisan election.

Methodology

This bill would eliminate filing fees associated with Supreme Court, court of criminal appeals, court of appeals, and district judge races. The fiscal impact to the state is determined by calculating the number of positions that candidates will no longer be filing for as follows:

Fiscal Year 2004 Total Loss \$528,200

Loss of filing fees for judges in 2004

6 statewide positions x 3 candidates x \$3,000 = \$54,000

9 appellate judge positions (population of 850,000 and under) x 2 x \$1,500 = \$27,000

8 appellate judge positions (population over 850,000) x 2 x \$2,000=\$32,000

124 district judge positions (population of 850,000 and under) x 1.5 x \$1,200=\$223,200

48 district judge positions (population over 850,000) x 2 x \$2,000=\$192,000

Fiscal Year 2006 Total Loss \$845,200

Loss of filing fees for judges in 2006

6 statewide positions x 3 candidates x \$3,000 = \$54,000

23 appellate judge positions (population of 850,000 and under) x 2 x \$1,500 = \$69,000

24 appellate judge positions (population over 850,000) x 2 x \$2,000=\$96,000

139 district judge positions (population of 850,000 and under) x 1.5 x \$1,200=\$250,200

94 district judge positions (population over 850,000) x 2 x \$2,000=\$376,000

Fiscal Year 2008 Total Loss \$528,200

Loss of filing fees for judges in 2008

6 statewide positions x 3 candidates x \$3,000 = \$54,000

9 appellate judge positions (population of 850,000 and under) x 2 x \$1,500 = \$27,000

8 appellate judge positions (population over 850,000) x 2 x \$2,000=\$32,000

124 district judge positions (population of 850,000 and under) x 1.5 x \$1,200=\$223,000

48 district judge positions (population over 850,000) x 2 x \$2,000=\$192,000

Technology

No significant fiscal impact to technology.

Local Government Impact

No significant fiscal implication to units of local government is anticipated. There will be minimal savings associated with printing costs, however, counties will need to reprogram their computers and retrain their election workers in order to implement this new system.

Source Agencies: 307 Secretary of State

LBB Staff: JK, GO, JF