

LEGISLATIVE BUDGET BOARD
Austin, Texas

FISCAL NOTE, 84TH LEGISLATIVE REGULAR SESSION

April 6, 2015

TO: Honorable John T. Smithee, Chair, House Committee on Judiciary & Civil Jurisprudence

FROM: Ursula Parks, Director, Legislative Budget Board

IN RE: **HB2774** by Smithee (Relating to the annual state salary supplement for certain county judges.), **As Introduced**

Estimated Two-year Net Impact to General Revenue Related Funds for HB2774, As Introduced: a negative impact of (\$8,680,000) through the biennium ending August 31, 2017.

The bill would make no appropriation but could provide the legal basis for an appropriation of funds to implement the provisions of the bill.

General Revenue-Related Funds, Five-Year Impact:

Fiscal Year	Probable Net Positive/(Negative) Impact to General Revenue Related Funds
2016	(\$4,340,000)
2017	(\$4,340,000)
2018	(\$4,340,000)
2019	(\$4,340,000)
2020	(\$4,340,000)

All Funds, Five-Year Impact:

Fiscal Year	Probable Savings/(Cost) from General Revenue Fund
	1
2016	(\$4,340,000)
2017	(\$4,340,000)
2018	(\$4,340,000)
2019	(\$4,340,000)
2020	(\$4,340,000)

Fiscal Analysis

The bill would amend the Government Code to increase the county judge salary supplement for eligible county judges where 40 percent of the judge's functions are judicial. The bill would increase the salary supplement for these judges from \$15,000 each year to an amount equal to 25 percent of a district judge's state salary (\$140,000), or \$35,000 as set forth in the General

Appropriations Act.

The bill would take effect September 1, 2015.

Methodology

The Office of Court Administration reports that 217 county judges have positions where at least 40 percent of the functions they perform as county judges meet the qualifications of being judicial functions. A salary supplement increase from \$15,000 to 25 percent of a district judge's state salary, or \$35,000, would be an increase of \$20,000 per judge. The total annual increased cost for 217 judges would be \$4,340,000 each year.

The supplement is funded through a mix of General Revenue and Judicial Fund No. 573 funding; however, for the past several years Judicial Fund No. 573 revenues have not been sufficient to meet state judicial salary obligations. Therefore, this estimate assumes General Revenue funding would be needed to cover this supplemental obligation.

Local Government Impact

No significant fiscal implication to units of local government is anticipated.

Source Agencies: 212 Office of Court Administration, Texas Judicial Council, 304
Comptroller of Public Accounts

LBB Staff: UP, FR, MW, GDz, KVe