Department of Planning and Budget 2005 Fiscal Impact Statement

1.	Bill Numbe	ber SB1154er			
	House of Orig	gin Introduced Substitute Engrossed			
	Second House	e In Committee Substitute Enrolled			
2.	Patron	Stolle			
3.	Committee	Passed both houses			
4.	Title	Number of district judges.			

- **5. Summary/Purpose:** Adds a new general district court judge to the 15th Judicial District (Fredericksburg, Essex, Caroline, Hanover, King George, Lancaster, Northumberland, Richmond, Spotsylvania, Stafford, Westmoreland), and a new juvenile court judge to the 20th Judicial District (Loudoun, Fauquier, Rappahannock).
- **6. Fiscal Impact Estimates are:** Final. See Item 8.

6a. Expenditure Impact:

Apenature impact.					
Fiscal Year	Dollars	Positions	Fund		
2005-06	\$422,556	2	General Fund		
2006-07	\$420,056	2	General Fund		
2007-08	\$420,056	2	General Fund		
2008-09	\$420,056	2	General Fund		
2009-10	\$420,056	2	General Fund		
2010-11	\$420,056	2	General Fund		

- 7. Budget amendment necessary: Yes. Item 33.
- **8. Fiscal implications:** According to the Supreme Court, this legislation will result in a fiscal impact of \$365,930 per fiscal year. Included in the \$365,930 is the salary and associated benefits for two judges, cost for clerk time, cost associated with substitute judges and equipment. The salary and related benefits for one additional district court judge is \$174,787. Estimated clerk, substitute judge and equipment costs are approximately \$8,178.

According to the Compensation Board, this legislation will also require \$56,626 in salary and related benefits for two court security officers, one for each new judge.

Not included in the out year projection are any pay increases or increases in related benefit costs that may apply.

The budget approved by the General Assembly provides funding for the new judgeship, but does not provide funding required by the Compensation Board.

- 9. Specific agency or political subdivisions affected: District Courts, Compensation Board.
- 10. Technical amendment necessary: No
- **11. Other comments:** This bill is identical to HB 2661er

Date: 03/10/05 / TMB