	1
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	NEW MEXICO LAW ENFORCEMENT ACADEMY
8	VIRTUAL SPECIAL BOARD MEETING
9	August 19, 2021
L 0	9:00 a.m.
L1	
L 2	
L 3	
L 4	
L 5	
L 6	
L7	
L 8	
L9	
20	REPORTED BY: Cynthia C. Chapman, RMR, CRR NM CCR #219
21	Bean & Associates, Inc. Professional Court Reporting Service
22	201 Third Street, Northwest, Suite 1630 Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102
23	
24	
25	JOB NO.: 5525N CC













1	A.G. BALDERAS: Well, I believe it's about
2	9:00, 9:01. I want to welcome our Board members and
3	our members of the public, and, of course, our LEAB
4	administration and staff.
5	If there are no good reasons, I'd like to
6	maybe just get us going and hereby call the meeting
7	to order.
8	ITEM NO. 1: ROLL CALL
9	A.G. BALDERAS: Monica, if you could go
10	for the roll call at this time, I think we do have a
11	quorum.
12	MS. MEDRANO: Can you hear me?
13	A.G. BALDERAS: I can hear you.
14	MS. MEDRANO: Okay.
15	Honorable Hector Balderas.
16	A.G. BALDERAS: Present.
17	MS. MEDRANO: District Attorney Rick
18	Tedrow.
19	MR. TEDROW: Here.
20	MS. MEDRANO: Chief Tim Johnson.
21	CHIEF JOHNSON: Here.
22	MS. MEDRANO: Sheriff Adan Mendoza.
23	SHERIFF MENDOZA: I'm here.
24	MS. MEDRANO: Chief Naithan Gurule.
25	CHIEF GURULE: Here.



1	MS. MEDRANO: Sergeant Holly Anderson.
2	SERGEANT ANDERSON: Here.
3	MS. MEDRANO: Dr. Bobbie Green.
4	(No response.)
5	MS. MEDRANO: I believe that's it.
6	A.G. BALDERAS: Okay. Monica, how many
7	members did you confirm? Is that
8	MS. MEDRANO: That is six, sir.
9	A.G. BALDERAS: Six. Okay. Great.
10	ITEM NO. 2: APPROVAL OF AGENDA
11	A.G. BALDERAS: I'd like us to all maybe
12	put our eyes on Item No. 2, Approval of the Agenda.
13	And because this is a special meeting, I
14	want to make sure. I've got, I believe, six items
15	on the agenda, not counting obviously, the
16	adjournment.
17	So I've got the agenda, the minutes,
18	public comment, review and presentation of the LEAB
19	board budget, and our discussion for the next
20	scheduled board meeting.
21	Is that kind of what everybody else has?
22	Excellent.
23	So if everyone agrees that we're on the
24	same page with the agenda, I'll entertain a motion
25	to approve the agenda as laid out this morning.



1	SERGEANT ANDERSON: Hollie Anderson, sir.
2	I move to approve the agenda as presented.
3	A.G. BALDERAS: Thank you, Board Member
4	Anderson.
5	There's a motion. Is there a second?
6	CHIEF JOHNSON: Mr. Chair, Tim Johnson. I
7	will second.
8	A.G. BALDERAS: Thank you, Chief. There's
9	a motion and a second to approve today's agenda.
10	All in favor? We should do a roll call
11	because of the Zoom.
12	Go ahead, Monica.
13	MS. MEDRANO: Balderas.
14	A.G. BALDERAS: Yes.
15	MS. MEDRANO: Tedrow.
16	MR. TEDROW: Yes.
17	MS. MEDRANO: Gurule.
18	CHIEF GURULE: Yes.
19	MS. MEDRANO: Johnson.
20	CHIEF JOHNSON: Yes, ma'am.
21	MS. MEDRANO: Mendoza.
22	CHIEF MENDOZA: Yes.
23	MS. MEDRANO: Anderson.
24	SERGEANT ANDERSON: Yes.
25	A.G. BALDERAS: Great. Any in opposition?



1	(No response.)
2	A.G. BALDERAS: Roll call vote, all in
3	favor. Motion for Approval of Agenda, Item No. 2
4	for August 19th does pass. There is no opposition.
5	ITEM 3: APPROVAL OF THE MEETING MINUTES
6	June 24, 2021
7	A.G. BALDERAS: We can now move to Item
8	No. 3, the approval of the minutes. Minutes involve
9	a June 24th meeting. And copies of those minutes
10	should all be in front of you at this point, and
11	they're always on the LEAB website.
12	Taking a minute or so, if there are no
13	corrections, I'll also entertain a motion to approve
14	minutes as laid out.
15	MR. TEDROW: Mr. Chair, this is Rick
16	Tedrow. I will move to approve the minutes.
17	A.G. BALDERAS: Thank you, Board Member
18	Tedrow. There is a motion to approve the June 24th
19	minutes.
20	Is there a second?
21	SERGEANT ANDERSON: Hollie Anderson. I'll
22	second.
23	A.G. BALDERAS: Thank you, Board Member
24	Anderson.
25	There's a motion and a second to approve



Board member minutes of June 24th. Let's do a roll
call.
MS. MEDRANO: Balderas.
A.G. BALDERAS: Yes.
MS. MEDRANO: Tedrow.
MR. TEDROW: Yes.
MS. MEDRANO: Gurule.
CHIEF GURULE: Yes.
MS. MEDRANO: Johnson.
CHIEF JOHNSON: Yes, ma'am.
SHERIFF MENDOZA: Mendoza.
CHIEF MENDOZA: Yes.
MS. MEDRANO: Anderson.
SERGEANT ANDERSON: Yes.
MS. MEDRANO: Green.
DR. GREEN: Yes.
A.G. BALDERAS: Is there any opposition?
(No response.)
A.G. BALDERAS: So the motion to approve
the minutes from June 24th, Item No. 3 on the
agenda, does pass by a seven-zero roll call vote.
We can now move to Item No. 4, Public
Comment.
ITEM NO. 4: PUBLIC COMMENT
MR. MECHELS: I would like to comment.



A.G. BALDERAS: Great, Mr. Mechels. And is there anyone else? We usually allow three to five minutes for public comment.

Mr. Mechels, you have the floor.

MR. MECHELS: Thank you. Good morning to the Board and the Chair. I'm Chris Mechels. Of course, I've been attending these meetings for a while, a long time, years, in fact.

My comment this morning, I have taken the trouble to get the material that will be presented this morning. Looking at it, I think it might be useful to say I've got a bit of history on the Board. And what I see is going on hopefully is an attempt to return to the -- to the -- to a workable board that we had many years ago, is that back -- this -- the Board was actually functioning pretty well, and, as I've (inaudible) it was designed to function, until about 2003.

In 2003, the Board was actually broken by the governor and DPS to allow for the removal of the director at the time, Darrell Hart, who had been the director for about 12 years. I think -- my perception is, looking at the history of it, is that the Board really seized to function in the way that it was designed at that point in 2003.



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And the other big event that happened in 2013 under Governor Martinez and the DPS Secretary Eden at the time was that they broke the curriculum making process and installed the curriculum that is, in essence, the same curriculum you're running today. It was a curriculum that involved getting rid of a lot of community policing and good police practice and installing a lot more violence in the curriculum. And this was all done, apparently, with an illegal move.

So what I see going on, and, hopefully, we can go forward with, is just -- I'm hoping the history is a little bit helpful, because I think what is being proposed this morning is to try and kind of move back to that 2000 legal curriculum that ended in 2003. Very negative consequences.

And I think if this Board doesn't take a move back to what worked, I think that the Legislature, at some point, as of the last session, will intervene. And their interventions tend to be a bit messy.

So I think the easiest thing for everyone, including the Board, is to act responsibly, take responsibility for the Board and your responsibility to the people of the state, and do this before the



1	Legislature reforms you. Reform yourself.
2	And I see this morning's presentation as a
3	move in that direction. I'm encouraged. So thank
4	you, and I encourage you to do the right thing.
5	I'll end there. Thank you.
6	A.G. BALDERAS: Thank you, Mr. Mechels,
7	for your comments. We appreciate it.
8	Are there any more public comments?
9	(No response.)
10	ITEM NO. 5: PRESENTATION/VOTE ON
11	PROPOSED FY23 NMLEA BOARD BUDGET
12	A.G. BALDERAS: Excellent. We can now
13	move to Item No. 5, Presentation of Fiscal Year '23
14	NMLEA Board Budget.
15	Madam Director, you have the floor.
16	DIRECTOR ALZAHARNA: Thank you, Chair,
17	Governing Board Members.
18	I'm going to share the screen with you
19	now. Am I good?
20	Okay. I'm just going to give a brief
21	overview. It's just for information purposes for
22	the Board as I move into how we got to the budget
23	that you're going to be taking a look at today.
24	It starts with 29-7-2, which identifies
25	that the Law Enforcement New Mexico Law



Enforcement Academy was established. And the role of the academy is to provide a planned program of basic law enforcement training and in-service training to police officers.

It doesn't mention in here telecommunicators. But the academy provides that same basic training and in-service training for telecommunicators as well.

It also provides advanced training. And that doesn't necessarily mean -- it covers the whole gamut of everything above and beyond basic training.

The next reference point is 29-7-3 of statute. And this is where the New Mexico Law Enforcement Academy Board was created.

Some of the responsibilities of the Board -- this section actually outlines some of what's covered in your NMAC. But, specifically, it says the academy should be controlled and supervised by policy set by the Board.

So it identifies that one of the Board's responsibility is to set the policy and guidelines, and that the New Mexico Law Enforcement Academy follows those guidelines, which is what happens.

And that's exactly what the other satellite academies do as well.



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The other sections in here just talk about the appointments and the members. And that's covered in our NMAC as well.

When we got to 9-19-8, this identifies administratively attached agencies. And that's what the New Mexico Law Enforcement Academy Board is.

It's an agency. And this section identifies that the Board is administratively attached, it says, "to a department in accordance with the Executive Reorganization Act".

The department that the Board is attached to is the New Mexico Department of Public Safety.

9-1-7 talks about the relationships
between an agency that is administratively attached
to a department. And, specifically, I highlighted
the ones that kind of moved us towards this budget
discussion.

Number one, it says, "The agency attached to a department..." -- so, in this case, the Board being attached to the Department of Public Safety -- "...shall exercise its functions independently of the department and without approval or control of the department."

And number two, it says that it'll submit its budgetary requests through the department.



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So that's what we're moving towards now. The subcommittee that was talking about funding regarding training and curriculum and how this discussion came up is attached to this particular section about, well, how do we submit our budget requests and how does the Board let it be known what is needed to accomplish their mission.

Section B here talks about the responsibilities of the department to which the agency is attached. So it talks about the responsibilities of DPS, to which the Board is attached. And, specifically, here, it just said that the agency -- "The department will include the agency's budgetary requests as submitted and without changes in the departmental budget."

So we've been trying to wind our way through it and figure out how the Board gets its request submitted, because it is -- what we have found in the past is we can't see that it has followed these statutes in the past.

So what we're trying to do is have the Board identify its budget requests so that I can move that forward so that DPS can attach that request to their budget, as identified here.

The budget that you're going to be



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

considering needs to take into consideration the powers and duties and the responsibilities of the Board.

And, again, in state statute, 29-7-4, it says, "The Board shall...," and things that there's probably a cost attached to are, "developing and implementing the planned program of basic training and in-service training," and, it says, "a portion of which may be conducted on a regional basis."

That would cover your satellite academies, but it also covers any training that could be put on at different agencies throughout the state. It covers the same thing for training for telecommunicators as well.

"The Board also prescribes qualifications for instructors and prescribes courses of instruction," which means you set the curriculum and the hours and the topics that go into the basic Law Enforcement Academy curriculum and the basic training and in-service curriculum.

Additional costs, of course, are the costs of -- as you rewrite, review, revise your Board rules, there are costs that are attached to the meetings, to publishing those changes, to making that happen.



And under G, there are costs to the day-to-day processing costs that the staff incurs to -- to process all the paperwork for issuing, granting, denying, reviewing, the whole disciplinary process regarding law enforcement officer and telecommunicator certifications.

And then part of the misconduct process, under H, is, of course, all of the paperwork that goes back and forth to properly notify the respondents and the involved parties during that process.

And then "any and other acts appropriate to the development and operation of the Academy" is what falls under part of the Board's responsibilities as well.

So all of those things are taken into consideration when trying to put a budget together.

This past legislative session, prior to that, in as far as technically, the Board has not had a budget. When I was first working trying to establish, okay, what -- how much does the Board have to spend, I wasn't successful in being able to be provided with a number: "The Board has this much money to spend."

And so I had asked for that initially so I



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

could identify where our needs were and what we needed to ask before.

Basically, my understanding of how it's been happening is our -- what we have incurred, the costs we have incurred, have been covered by the Department of Public Safety. But it wasn't a specific set-out budget, where the -- anybody on the Board could look at it and say, "Okay. How much do we have to spend on this?"

Let's say if we wanted a job task analysis or a curriculum review, it just wasn't detailed like that so we could identify it.

So in simple speak, we have a zero budget, but your costs were covered.

This past legislative session, the LFC proposed -- this was a proposal partway through the session. And it's down at the bottom of this second paragraph with the yellow, that says, "The LFC recommendation directs \$350,000 and 5 FTE..." -- or full-time -- "...positions for use by the Board to ensure it has a dedicated funding stream and full-time staff and to provide greater independence from DPS."

That was what their proposal was during the session.



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

e-mail: info@litsupport.com

And it's open to interpretation. 1 I have 2 learned that the wording is purposeful in how it can 3 be interpreted and how that money is actually 4 appropriated. 5 But that was the initial proposal. What was actually approved -- and this is 6 7 the section out of House Bill 2, the Department of Public Safety's budget that referenced that funding. 8 And that proposal turned into the General Fund 9 10 appropriations to the Statewide Law Enforcement 11 Supports Program -- which is a program under DPS, where the Board costs are held, basically -- include 12 13 \$350,000 for costs related to the operation and 14 activities of the Law Enforcement Academy Board. 15 So that \$350,000 was approved. But it 16 wasn't as specific as what was in the proposal. 17 So that amount is what the Board was given 18 starting July 1st. So for this fiscal year 2022. There's no other specifics as to how 19 20 that's spent or distributed. 21 I'm going to blow this one up just a 22 little bit. 23 So just based on that, in working --24 A.G. BALDERAS: Madam Director, can you --25 can -- just for the record, can you reference the



amounts, just for the record, that you're referring 1 2 to, in terms of totals? 3 DIRECTOR ALZAHARNA: When I get to this 4 particular sheet? 5 Well, just because you're A.G. BALDERAS: 6 describing the narrative, it would be nice if you 7 could just --DIRECTOR ALZAHARNA: 8 It's \$350,000. 9 A.G. BALDERAS: How much? 10 DIRECTOR ALZAHARNA: \$350,000. 11 A.G. BALDERAS: Okay. 12 DIRECTOR ALZAHARNA: And that highlighted 13 blue section right there, that's -- and Chief 14 Johnson may correct me. He works a lot more 15 detailed on this than I do. That's the general 16 wording of what was awarded: \$350,000 for costs 17 associated -- for costs related to the operation and 18 activities of the Law Enforcement Academy Board. 19 So starting July 1st of this year, the 20 Board had \$350,000. Initially, I -- when I inquired about it I 21 22 had been told that the intent was for \$50,000 set 23 aside for operational costs, and then the remaining 24 funding to be used for FTEs, while the remaining 25 funding would be \$300,000. And that doesn't cover



very many FTEs.

So, just in generally talking about it, four positions were identified that, if -- if positions here out of the staff that we have were separated by what function they actually serve -- for example, our misconduct case manager position solely serves -- its function serves the Board. It has no function that's really attached to the Law Enforcement Academy.

Just like an instructor would serve for -would actually be better served attached to the Law
Enforcement Academy, because that's what they do is
the training, their service wouldn't be utilized
actually for the Board.

So we identified four positions that were Board positions, that their purpose serves the Board, and still couldn't get it down to under -- under the \$300,000. That total, personnel costs just for those four positions, was \$307,478.97.

And this is just all basic discussions. There's no way -- no place that it's specifically identified at the time.

So moving from that discussion, and then speaking with DPS, it was my understanding that the intent -- the legislative intent was that we





absolutely have five FTE positions.

Now, again, there's no designation. Is that five FTEs plus operational costs? Or just five FTEs? And it's open to interpretation.

So we moved and identified it and said, "Okay. Well, if we had five FTEs, what positions would those be?"

And we wanted to identify the costs. So the five positions identified were the director, which, by statute, is a Board position, operates under the Board. Three compliance officer positions, mainly because the Board is a compliance agency. I mean, the bulk of our staff, those compliance officers, that's all they do, and they will never stop doing that. They are the ones who process all of the satellite academy applications, all the accreditation packets for classes, for instructor certifications, for advanced certification. They are the compliance arm of what the Board does.

And then the one state investigator position, and that's tied to the misconduct portion, along with the Director.

So we identified those five positions.

And that still brings it to over \$350,000, if the





interpretation is that the whole total is 350, whether you break it down by operational and personnel costs or just do all personnel costs. It still is not enough funding to provide the Board with the staff or the operating costs to do what they're tasked with doing.

A.G. BALDERAS: Director, I'm going to defer to you. But you ask -- you tell me how you want to handle the rest of the presentation. I have some questions, too, a little bit more about the history in terms of your discussions and trying to get proper information of staffing levels, you know, over the past two years, four years, ten years.

I can wait till those que- -- hold those questions until the end of your presentation if you're going to include that. But I have a few questions about the history and whether or not this 350, to you, in your interpretation, is an increase.

And then, number two, these four or five positions, I'm assuming those include some of your support staff that you use to help, like Monica, in terms of building out some of the meetings.

And then I just want to clarify for the record, this doesn't even include all of the volunteer staff that the AG provides, like counsel,



administrative staff. That's not at all tied to those costs or FTEs as well.

So if you want to clarify that for us moving forward, or we can do it at the end of the presentation. So I'll defer to you how you want to handle that.

DIRECTOR ALZAHARNA: I am hoping to cover it as we move forward.

A.G. BALDERAS: Great.

DIRECTOR ALZAHARNA: So that's how we got to where we are right now, with looking at the fact that this is the first time, at least that I've been able to identify, that the Board is actually saying, "We -- we need funding to do our job." And it includes all of those things, Chair, that you just mentioned.

A.G. BALDERAS: Well, I just want to clarify that that -- this is not the first time. We've been echoing for years that not only do you need sufficient funding, but that the investigative, the disciplinary process, at least how we run our office at the AG's office, are nowhere near the proportional demand.

I think the history was that DPS viewed that they volunteered some of that funding without



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

any dedicated support from the Legislature. But I want to be aggressive. Because that was -- for five years, we've been telling the LFC that the investigative process and the discipline process have no case management investment from a direct -- so I don't know that I disagree with you.

But I just want to make sure that we're -that I clarify that piece of the record, that we've
done our own budget analysis at the AG's office.

The real question is why were we doing it instead of
the LFC? And so I just want to add that to the
historical narrative.

DIRECTOR ALZAHARNA: Yes. And I'm not intending -- I'm -- there were discussions. And I think people -- I agree. People have been pushing.

And I apologize. I'm a little more linear. I was thinking from a process standpoint in the fact that the Board, by statute, is supposed to actually submit a budget that DPS can include when they move their budget forward, because that is our process. That's the Board's process for requesting a budget.

And that's what I have not been -- I haven't been able to get anybody to say that that has been done in the past. They've talked about it.



And I don't think anybody denies that there is a need, and the Board needs it. But in following the formal process for requesting and identifying those funds, I wasn't able to find where this process has been followed.

So DPS worked -- their budgeting staff worked very well with me. I've been asking over the last year, you know, "This is what it says the process is. So if the Board puts together a budget, how should they submit it?"

Now, early on, there was reluctance. "Well, that's not the way it's done."

I understand that. But statute says this is how it's supposed to be done. So if the Board has no budget, one of the reasons they may not have one is because they've never submitted one the way the process identified that they should. So that's what we were trying to do at this point.

And, of course, one of the things is, once we recognized and knew the timelines, I believe by statute, the deadline to submit these budgets is September 1st.

And DPS started a long time ago, months ago, putting together the budget they do. So for now -- to have a big chunk like this added causes



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

stress and strain -- I contacted the budget director or interim director with DFA, who walked -- who, we walked through it, and said, "Yes, that makes sense. That seems to be the process."

But I never got a confirmation back. I don't know if anybody else was in contact with her. But I didn't get any follow-up.

But DPS has been very supportive of saying, "Okay. If that is the mechanism for doing it, then we need those numbers. We need that information to move it forward," because it's due, like, tomorrow.

So that was -- my reference was what the formal process is for the Board submitting their request. And this seems to be on the right track. Or it's the only track anybody has been able to identify.

SERGEANT ANDERSON: I apologize, Chairman. This is Hollie Anderson. We've had a situation here with our department, and I'm going to have to excuse myself from this meeting.

A.G. BALDERAS: Thank you, Sergeant. I hope everything is safe and well. But we appreciate your time.

SERGEANT ANDERSON: Thank you.





1	A.G. BALDERAS: Thank you.
2	CHIEF JOHNSON: Mr. Chair, Tim Johnson. I
3	may be headed to that same thing here shortly. I do
4	know that I need to try to get some of this I
5	have a huge hand, obviously, in this budget. So
6	A.G. BALDERAS: Yeah. I
7	CHIEF JOHNSON: we need to kind of move
8	along.
9	A.G. BALDERAS: I just want to make
10	sure I don't want to lose a quorum, Director. If
11	you need us to take a discretionary vote to support
12	your vision, I think if you could maybe get us
13	through some of the top lines and for our
14	consideration. But I'm worried that we're going to
15	lose our chief soon, as well.
16	Counselor, how many can we lose before we
17	lose quorum?
18	MR. ROMERO: Yes, Mr. Chair. It looks
19	like Dr. Green is has joined us.
20	A.G. BALDERAS: Okay.
21	MR. TEDROW: So I'm trying to crunch the
22	numbers now. We have DA Tedrow. We have Sheriff
23	Mendoza. We have Chief Gurule. Yourself.
24	A.G. BALDERAS: If we lose our state
25	police chief, will we still have quorum? I just



want to make sure we give enough time to our director in her budget presentation.

MR. ROMERO: Yes, Mr. Chair. We'd still have five, as long as Dr. Green, yourself, Sheriff Mendoza, Chief Gurule, and DA Tedrow.

A.G. BALDERAS: Okay. Okay, Madam

Director, I'll shut up and let you kind of get

through this.

DIRECTOR ALZAHARNA: Thank you, Chair.

So based on all of that discussion, what you'll see here on this sheet is if -- the way I looked at it was if the Board is going to make this form- -- this request formally for the first time, then the request should readily identify what is needed to perform the functions.

And I'll say, right off the bat, because I was looking at it in the terms of how -- the costs that DPS have covered in the past, which haven't included the costs to the OAG's office for the administrative prosecutors and the staff and costs that you've identified, Chair, those are not on here, because it was looked at from the DPS perspective. But they certainly could be added on here, and most likely should, since this is an overall Board cost.



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So these costs that are -- you're looking at on this first page are just positions. What I've reviewed there are 16 positions, not including the OAG office positions, that would give the Board at least adequate staff to perform the functions that they're required to perform right now.

It includes the director, two operations managers. One of them would be the curriculum manager overseeing all of the functions that have to do with updating, writing, revising curriculum, keeping that constantly up to date.

The other manager would be over the accreditation and compliance, which is all of the compliance functions that the Board does. That would include three instructional coordinators, which are your curriculum development specialists; so you have people on staff who are actually doing that.

The remaining bulk of them are the compliance officers, the ones who are working with the satellite academies and the agencies to make sure they're meeting the compliance standards.

And information and records clerks. We are inundated with requests, from IPRA requests to, now, due to the climate of law enforcement, when



people are looking for jobs out of state, we are getting overrun by background checks, not official like criminal background checks, but your state post-check. They want to know the background of misconduct and their training. And those requests all come to us.

There would be no problem having an information and records clerk having full-time responsibility doing that.

And then state investigator positions, one of them currently, like we have, who is the misconduct case manager processes, makes sure all the hearings are set up, all the notices are sent out.

And the second one would be specifically to do the follow-up investigation that we're really not able to manage right now. Those personnel costs right there put it at closer to \$1.1 million for personnel costs, not including OAG costs.

And then the remainder of these costs are broken down. You'll see the personnel costs right there. All the other costs that go down put it closer to -- between \$1.3 and \$1.4 million are the operational costs, which include all of the Board -- the costs for having a meeting venue when the Board



actually meets in person, the travel and per diem costs for Board members to go to those meetings, the costs for setting up meetings like this through Microsoft, costs for training for Board members.

I think an example are when our counsel, Mr. Romero, participated in a virtual meeting with other POST -- with other POST counsels, with other attorneys who actually do what he does and represent their POSTs with other states and those operational costs that were included in there.

So that's just real basic -- a basic overview and a start-up request, not including the OAG's request, that puts you between \$1.3 million and \$1.4 million.

What's on here in red is what it doesn't include -- and it's because that is a separate request -- but the timing for that is right now as well, is special appropriation. And that's where the request for the funding for the job task analysis would be. Right now the estimate is probably close to \$1.5 million.

And I've just put that on there, because it wouldn't be part of the General Fund; it wouldn't be part of your annual budget. It would be a one-time request.



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And I would say that is part of what stemmed this was your curriculum and training subcommittee saying, you know, "We need to do a job task analysis before we touch the curriculum. And this is how much is cost. Where does that funding come from?"

So I would put that in as a special request for the Board as a special appropriation request for the FY23.

So are there additional questions? That is my initial proposal. If -- and I think there should be numbers included from the OAG's office.

That would bump up these costs or projections.

DPS has to have these numbers by tomorrow morning at the latest, because they have their first meeting -- correct me if I'm wrong, Chief -- on Monday, regarding the budget.

CHIEF JOHNSON: Yes, that is correct. We present to the executive and DFA on Monday.

SHERIFF MENDOZA: This is Sheriff Mendoza, I have a couple of questions. I'm a little confused here as to what we're talking about. You first referenced that \$350,000 that was allocated for the Board; is that correct?

And are you saying that -- that that's



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

insufficient and that your estimate is \$1.3 million 1 2 for the needs of the Board? Is that what I'm 3 understanding? 4 DIRECTOR ALZAHARNA: Yes and no. \$350,000 is what the Board has already been given for this 5 fiscal year, from July 1st of 2021 until June 30th 6 7 The Board already has that. of 2022. It's a done deal. We have that. 8 9 What we're doing now is working on your 10 budget request for Fiscal Year '23, which would 11 start next July, July 1st, 2022. And we want to get 12 this request in to cover what we think the projected 13 needs are of the Board. 14 SHERIFF MENDOZA: Okay. So I see. this is Sheriff Mendoza. I see that what we're 15 16 talking about is a budget request, not the 17 allocation of the \$350,000 that's already been 18 allocated for '21-'22; is that correct? 19 DIRECTOR ALZAHARNA: Correct. I just gave 20 you that lead-in to let you know how we got to where 21 we are right now. 22 SHERIFF MENDOZA: Okay. I quess I was 23 confused. I thought we were going to be talking 24 about the allocation of the \$350,000. But I see.



DIRECTOR ALZAHARNA: That could be part

of -- I mean, there certainly could be comments as far as that as well, because right now, all it is is identified that the Board received \$350,000. And what that leaves us with is how is that allocated?

If you said you want two FT- -- well, I don't want to speak out of turn, because I -- I wasn't involved in the discussions as to -- if there's any other mandates short of that generic paragraph that says, you know, that you get \$350,000. I don't know if there are any particular mandates on how the Board allocates that.

A.G. BALDERAS: Okay. Well, yes. So we're definitely in the phase of questions.

I want to make sure I prioritize the list of questions. I will maybe -- maybe add a comment, hopefully, that clarifies, that doesn't make things more confusing.

So as I understand it, the Board's mandate, Director, that maybe you're looking for some feedback on, is that we definitely approve or disapprove the appointment of the Director by the Secretary.

And what's difficult is, I also think -- as we're playing out through this budgetary process, I think you're seeing a healthy tension that, at





some point, will still need to be clarified by the New Mexico Legislature. We're playing it out in some of the line of questioning that you're already getting, Director.

And it may color some of the narrative history and the struggle of -- there's the LEAB board. Then there's the LEAB board's authority and duties.

And we are not management. We do not have day-to-day management. The only powers that we have are to -- to develop and implement a program and -- of which, then, that -- over a department, which is the LEAB. And then the LEAB -- and I want to applaud the director -- because she is now within her own duties trying to build a budget out that can only be requested through DPS.

So even though the LEAB agency is administratively attached to DPS, I think what she's trying to propose is some guidance from us on what is an appropriate budget request.

And I think the reason that past boards struggled and there's not a direct appropriation request from the LEAB board is we are not management. We don't manage the employees at DPS. We set policy.



Of course, in identifying the gaps, the Board has taken past positions that -- that the LEAB executive functions, which are the training and the discipline, is severely underfunded.

So I do want to applaud the Director for trying to carve out what her resources are. What we really only have a say in the Director and how she implements the program that we -- so I do think that the budget discussion should -- definitely has a goal that I want all our Board to give her guidance and direction on your priorities.

I know that a job task analysis was a priority for this Board. I know that we need many more investigators to investigate the backlog of cases.

And so whether it's 350 or over a million dollars in the request, I think we're -- we -- I want to make sure that our Board weighs in on where they think the budget request should be focused on the justifications of why we need either more investigators, more trainers.

And, yes, Madam Director, I do think that we could give you an estimate of the prosecutorial function of the Board's decision-making. Even though we're a different agency, we do believe that



DPS could at least request those funds, and then we could work it out later how those funds are appropriated later.

So I hope I didn't confuse the Board. I just want to give the Board some historical guidance.

Part of the problem is that you, as board members, don't build out the budget, because you don't have day-to-day operational management over the Board -- I mean over the LEAB. The LEAB is only administratively attached to DPS. And so I think that is where, in the past, some of the statutory functions are confusing.

We control the Director. We control
the -- we give her guidance. But the LEAB budget
process, the LFC is expecting DPS to request that
funding. So she's correct that the -- my position
is that we're glad that the director is requesting
appropriate funding that she thinks she needs to
carry out the program that statutorily we're
requested to provide guidance and feedback on.

The program meaning, Madam Director, do you think that \$1-point-some million is enough to fund the law enforcement training and the investigations that are necessary for the Board to



make those decisions? And I guess that's more of a question.

We'll get you the number that we think we need for the prosecution of those cases. We think that DPS is a good partner for us to start to educate the LFC on how much money we're expending out of our own budget, which comes out of child abuse investigations, corruption investigations. They have never independently funded those functions.

And so this -- I want to give you some credit that I think this is a good approach. But I do think the Board is asking questions, because they don't have day-to-day operational functions in terms of how big your caseloads are and whatnot.

So -- and then, Chief, if you would weigh in to give us some clarity as well on the history.

But the other question that I'm not understanding from the Board is how much fiduciary responsibility we have beyond your function, Director, if maybe the chief or the director would weigh in on that as well.

But I'm all for the Department of Public Safety asking for as much money as you think you need, Director.



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

DIRECTOR ALZAHARNA: Chief, did you --1 2 CHIEF JOHNSON: Go ahead. This is Counselor Romero. 3 MR. ROMERO: 4 just wanted to follow up. The Chair is correct that 5 the budget that we're submitting, right, is Board-specific; so things like curriculum 6 development and things that would fall under the 7 responsibility of the Board, not necessarily the 8 9 management stuff. So that is a correct analysis. 10 DIRECTOR ALZAHARNA: I would also -- and 11 now -- and I'm not -- I'm not disagreeing. I'm just 12 speaking from my experience in working with other boards and how other states do it. 13 14 It may not have been done that way in the But statute identifies. There is an intent. 15 past. 16 Your board is a stand-alone agency by statute. 17 is an agency, just like other agencies. 18 attached to DPS, because the Board doesn't have a 19 budget section. The Board doesn't have payroll. 20 The Board doesn't have HR. So they are attached to 21 an agency that has those functions and has agreed to 22 perform those functions. Those -- the staff that the Board needs 23 24 are not -- or should not be considered DPS staff. 25 DPS has a division, which is the Law Enforcement



Academy. And they can hire staff to run that academy, which is the instructors and whatever else.

Again, it has not been done that way, but your regulations and statutes are designed for it to be set up that way. The academy is a separate division of DPS. The Board is a separate agency, a stand-alone agency from DPS.

And the Board -- in answer to the question about the budget, this budget that I have proposed only covers the Board's functions. I'm working with DPS on the division side on the Law Enforcement Academy side to do the same thing and separate out the costs that are only applicable to the academy as a division of DPS.

So I've been separating them. So they are operationally and identifiably separate as designed.

As far as the Board not having management abilities, I don't find that to be the case, either. There are a board -- all kinds of boards, not just state agency boards, that you hire the director and the director hires the staff.

But the staff still belong to the Board.

And the Board doesn't oversee that staff, you're correct, any more than the chief of police directly oversees the line-level staff. There's supervision



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

in between that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So the director answers to the Board, and I, as the director, follow out the Board's direction. It's my responsibility -- or the director's responsibility -- to supervise any staff that's hired.

And in 29-7-5, when it talks about the powers and duties of the Director, it says, "The director is the chief executive officer of the academy and will employ necessary personnel."

So the personnel that are identified that just perform the Board's functions, like compliance officers, fall under that. And because also, statutorily, the Director is the CAO of the academy, then oversees, you know, the instructors or whatever staff that are particularly attached to the academy.

So other states that operate this way, there is a separation. And the only reason there's an attachment is because you, as a board, as an agency, don't have those day-to-day administrative functions.

A.G. BALDERAS: Right. I think we're saying the same thing, Madam Director. Under 29-7-4, I'm still trying to find where the actual board submits the budget, versus the agency, which



would be the LEA.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Counselor?

MR. ROMERO: Yes, Mr. Chair. So I think where the Director is pulling that from is from the -- 9-1-7, in the statutes. Because the agency, which is administratively attached, which would be the Board, under (A)(2), would submit its budgetary requests through the department.

A.G. BALDERAS: Right. Right. I'm just -- what I'm trying to clarify is some of the questions from our Board, as of today what they're approving or weighing in on is do they have the authority to actually approve or override the Director if they think the request is too small or too big?

Or, is the Board evaluating the Director's budget request, which we support, and then providing guidance on where she should punch up the priorities related to the program of services which the Board totally agrees under 29-7-4. We hire -- we approve or disapprove of the director. We know we do that.

We also know that we're supposed to assist in the development and implementation of a planned program. And we're committed to evaluating her budget request in that -- in that frame.

SANTA FE OFFICE 119 East Marcy, Suite 110 Santa Fe, NM 87501 (505) 989-4949 FAX (505) 843-9492



We also know that we have a say in the type of qualifications the instructors should have. And also we know that our number one priority in supporting her program administratively is to suspend or revoke licenses. That is really also a very important function.

So I just want to make sure I know what we're voting on.

Are we -- are we voting on that we think her budget request reflects those priorities in our statute? Or are we trying to identify whether her budget is too small or large to carry out the Board's vision as well in terms of where they provide guidance?

I think we're getting circular. But I hope I narrowed it down to what -- why I'm trying to make sure that I assist with the Board's responsibility today.

MR. ROMERO: Yes, Mr. Chair. So the Board can direct the Chair -- or can direct -- I'm sorry -- the Director to -- you know, to carry out the budget as the Board would like. And the Board can ask Director Alzaharna to put forth the budget -- the Board can approve the budget that she's presented, and then she would pass that on



1 through DPS as outlined in the statutes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A.G. BALDERAS: To -- to the -- to DPS that they're administratively attached to; is that right? That's the way I understand the statute as well.

MR. ROMERO: Yes, Mr. Chair.

A.G. BALDERAS: Okay.

clarify that, or Chief.

Hey, Chief, do you have any questions?

And, Director, I welcome you to kind of go back -- I'm sorry I interrupted. Some of our other Board members I know had some questions about to whether -- what we're approving today, if you could

I think we understand the process -- at least today the top lines are we want to make sure that the LEAB gets a complete budget request to DPS before the deadline, number one.

Number two, before we get too nuanced into what the statute says and doesn't say, I think a Board priority today is are there any projects or priorities, like some of this job task analysis, that is sufficiently included in the Director's budget.

And, then, number three, I will be providing, Madam Director, the prosecutorial piece



e-mail: info@litsupport.com

as well in terms of our estimated costs.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So that would be helpful. I'll defer to the Board if there are any other questions.

CHIEF JOHNSON: Mr. Chair, Tim Johnson. I don't necessarily have any questions, but just a couple of statements.

I don't think we're talking too much about the \$350,000 that was appropriated, and I won't get into that too deep.

But basically what happened there was they stripped that money from one portion of DPS and put it over there, which I don't agree with. So I'll make that known, and I have already.

I give this. Yeah. And, again, we meet -- we have our budget presentation, our first one, on Monday. So, you know, whatever is obviously approved today, we will present to that -- to that first piece.

One thing I do think -- I can't see the -- I can't see the positions -- I printed out the documents that the Director sent. I can't see the positions that she's asking for. My eyes -- I don't know -- aren't working that well these days. The print was very small. If we could go back to that.

And so, you know, saying that this is



completely detached from DPS, which that's what the law says, I would suggest that she adds those support positions that we're talking about: finance, procurement, right? If it's completely detached, it's -- it should be completely detached.

So she could -- she can touch base with budget and the internal folks on what those position titles are, how much those cost.

And then I don't know if you recall, sir.

But I think during some of the committees last year,

some of those legislators were -- I think they were

a little -- they were questioning or a little wonky.

I don't -- I wouldn't pretend to know why they were

asking such questions, but kind of commingling what

you need in your office versus what, you know, DPS

or the LEA Board needs to kind of make the

discipline process a little more functional and

staffed.

So including yours in there, I don't know if that's going to help or hurt. So I don't know if we maybe need to think about that a little bit more. I'm not trying to be a downer. But I know you recall those -- those questions that they had for us.

A.G. BALDERAS: Sure.





CHIEF JOHNSON: I do believe -- I have to check. I do believe the joint -- or the JTA is in the request that we have for Monday. So that will be on there again, whether that's approved or not, I don't know.

And then I do know that there's a ton of traction and support for a newer version, a little bit better version of 375, the Senate bill, which will be introduced again. And even if that does happen, I think what's lined out here could be a good operational plan to go by for that group, once -- if that's passed and kind of all this is moved anyways.

But, yeah, whatever -- whatever we vote on, we'll need to know pretty quick, because --

A.G. BALDERAS: Got it.

CHIEF JOHNSON: -- because, yeah, it's Monday.

A.G. BALDERAS: Okay. I'd love to hear from the rest of the Board. I think -- you know, this is a complicated process that is being undertaken, so there are only helpful, informative questions. And so I'd love to get some feedback.

I -- I think what the Chief is also saying -- he raises a great point.





I think, for us, we would just give the costs -- we would probably request it as part of the other agency that's involved. DPS is attached to the LEAB, but we would just -- but I think getting the Director the number just gives the LFC some -- wherever they put it in, whatever agency, it doesn't necessarily matter, we can reroute it, but just to start building out the actual costs of the LEAB program is a good step forward moving forward.

So that, I think, was some of the confusion last time. But we'll be available to make sure that we don't bottleneck the proposal.

What I'm hearing, Madam Director, is the Chief is also suggesting building out some of your core management functions so that you truly are only attached, but that you are truly independent from DPS, outside of the budget request.

And so -- again, I'm going to also kind of throw out a -- more of a Socratic question. I want to make sure that this is the first time that I think we're trying to push for full funding of these law enforcement oversight functions. And that, I know the LFC has never gotten a \$2 million or a \$3 million function. So I would love any opinions on policy where the priorities should definitely be.



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I'll give you a good example the way I think.

In terms of -- the LEAB has never had a truly independent, fully funded oversight function in terms of training and discipline from the perspective of looking at how many licensed police officers there are in the State of New Mexico.

So even where the budget request is at right now, I would provide my context for -- unless you're going to steal money from the LFC -- I mean, the DPS budget or the AG budget, which I'm not advocating for -- and I would also want to make my position very vocal, that in this budget process, the LFC can shuck and jive a lot of shifting of resources.

But we want to make sure that this budget is truly independent, and it's funded by General Fund dollars, that we are not advocating requesting over a million dollars for the Director, only to be stolen from the DPS budget or the AG budget, that invests in prosecution and investigation of other cases.

But I would say that it's a good start, and we're going to be supportive. But I don't want any money stolen from other budgets in law



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

enforcement. This has to be new money, number one.

And, number two, I would fully fund or support a budget that, Director, gives you true independence. That means HR functions; that means other accounting functions that are either being -- we are providing some legal counsel for -- at a net loss to our agency. And I think that's what the secretary -- I mean the Chief -- is getting at is that he's not supporting -- he wants to support an increase in budget. But it's -- we don't want funds taken from an agency to fund this particular function.

And then, finally, I would just say that, Director, I want to make sure -- my feedback on the budget is supportive. But I want to look at it from the amount of licensed officers we have in the State of New Mexico who could come into your jurisdiction needing more training, or there could be some directive related to our program related to suspension and revocation, and that even this budget is severely underfunded if you're talking about a -- if you're talking about, in terms of the clients, our officers or our clients, how many law enforcement officers could come into your services and jurisdiction on any given week.



It's in the thousands; am I correct?

And maybe, Chief, you can tell us how many licensed officers you think we have that could come into the LEAB service jurisdictional process.

CHIEF JOHNSON: I mean, I think -- sir, I think Director Alzaharna probably has the exact number. But I think the last we polled was 5,000-some-odd. In one way or another, they probably touch LEA in a given year, in service qualifications, all the required items needed.

A.G. BALDERAS: So 5,000, you know,

A.G. BALDERAS: So 5,000, you know, divided by the larger budget amount, Director, how much are you estimating per licensed officer to keep them trained, safe, and keep that force operating with the highest level of integrity, which means we have to get the bad officers out and litigate and investigate those cases. How much does this larger budget request reflect per a licensed officer if we're talking about the 5,000-officer or a 6,000-officer number?

DIRECTOR ALZAHARNA: Well, number one, this includes telecommunicators as well. So we're talking 8,000-plus. And we're talking about, on the Board side of things, we touch probably in the high hundreds every day. Because every time there's an



employment action on an officer or a

telecommunicator, whether they get a promotion,

whatever happens, an employment action, that is

reported to us. So at the very detailed level,

we're dealing with that every day.

On top of that, this does not include

training costs. Training is not a function of the

Board. Training is a function of the Law

training costs. Training is not a function of the Board. Training is a function of the Law Enforcement Academy. So that doesn't include any of that. This includes the development of the programs. But the academy is the one that actually provides that training. And so those costs are attached to the academy, not to the Board.

A.G. BALDERAS: No, Madam Director, I understand that. What I'm saying is the Legislature wants robust oversight from the Board and the Director; right? Is that -- I'm just saying, do the -- can you do the math for us and do -- this is a ballpark estimate. This is more talking for legislative-speak.

Your budget divided by the 8,000 licensed professionals, what would that be per licensee? And if you could indulge me. I'm just going to make a policy position.

DIRECTOR ALZAHARNA: Yes. \$168.75?



9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24



A.G. BALDERAS: That's my point. Yeah.

So I don't want to belabor -- I support your budget request. I still think the Legislature has to give you many more resources to increase the level of training oversight, curriculum development, and licensing, either professionalism -- professional development or discipline of officers, I think.

But this is a great starting point. I support it. And so you kind of tell us what you need from us at this point.

But I think it is a good start, because think about it from the perspective of -- the first offer out of the gate was the \$350,000. And now you're exponentially increasing it.

But that was my whole point is, I think, for the expectation of the public and the level of professionalism that the Board is asking for and that you've shared in your own vision, there's still -- it's still severely underfunded as an oversight agency.

But that's a debate that the -- a political conversation for the LFC and the legislators. But I just wanted to make sure that -- that the per licensee that we're servicing, that constituency, that this is a decent step forward.



But, you know, we -- I will say, as Chair,
I look forward to exponential growth so that you
have sufficient resources. But we do appreciate you
professionalizing some of these services.

DIRECTOR ALZAHARNA: If I may, in a discussion with the Chief, when we talk about the staffing we need -- and I'm not looking at it right now.

But the way the statute reads, the administrative attachment, it isn't -- it is separate. But the reason it's attached administratively is so that agency doesn't have to hire their own HR people and their own budget people.

And I think the wording is there -- in there is that it talks about "if the agency agrees."

So administratively attached, I'm not sure how having an HR person -- giving us two budget people -- you know, the Board -- the way it works, at least with us attached to DPS right now, we do have a budget person that funnels our invoices and all of that stuff. And DP- -- and we process it through DPS guidelines.

Going in the opposite way -- so we're an agency. If you totally separated it that way,





then -- then we'd have to request -- I would see a request to repeal that language that says we would be administratively attached to DPS, if it was requested that all of those positions be given to the Board as an agency.

Does that make sense?

Here, number one, it says that, "The department would provide, if mutually agreed, the budgeting, record-keeping, and related administrative and clerical assistance to the agency," which is, I think, how, in that one area, it's been operating, those administrative functions. The Board utilizes those functions of DPS.

Like when I was preparing this budget, I worked with the DPS budget people to provide that, because we don't have that, and it would take more than just one person to do it.

CHIEF JOHNSON: That makes sense to me. A bit shortsighted I think, but, yeah, if that's the way the law reads. But, again, assuming all that is free, that we have enough people, which we all know that we don't, on the budget side, HR side, shorthanded already, based on the amount of people. So, I don't know. Maybe -- maybe I need to add some to the DPS budget to kind of make sure we can cover



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

these additional personnel, if this is approved. 1 2 A.G. BALDERAS: Okay. 3 DIRECTOR ALZAHARNA: And that was one of 4 my thoughts, that in the way I -- the -- where I'm 5 sitting working with DPS and working with the OAG and their functions that are tied to Board costs, 6 7 that we do have that communication, so that if this is presented, and I'm able to say, "Guess what? 8 9 These are the Board costs. I'm putting this 10 together for the Board." 11 But for this to work, then they do have to 12 consider the costs to DPS to provide that administrative function for the Board, and they do 13 14 have to provide that funding to the OAG for the 15 administrative services that -- they as well. So I 16 wouldn't want it to be, at least from my 17 perspective, just representing the Board to say that 18 these costs are all-inclusive, that, no, it's going 19 to absolutely affect the other agencies we're 20 administratively involved with. 21 And, Mr. Chair? 22 A.G. BALDERAS: Yes. 23 DIRECTOR ALZAHARNA: I -- I just lost that 24 thought. 25 A.G. BALDERAS: Okay. So are there any



other questions?

If there are none, I think, Mr. Tedrow, maybe I'll call on you to kind of present a carefully articulated, maybe, motion to take action on this. I will just say that any motion constructed, I will direct us to consider that we are giving the Director feedback and support on either -- whether or not this budget is at least a sufficient basis for the development and implementation of the planned program that we oversee, number one.

Number two, that we think this budget reflects the value set, giving her enough resources to prescribe qualifications for instructors and courses of instruction. And that -- that this will give her enough resources, at least in -- providing us a process to issue, grant, deny, renew, suspend, or revoke law enforcement licenses.

So those are the critical three areas that I think we've had some discussion of this budget.

And we have a little bit better understanding of what she's going to do with the budget request. She will build it into DPS's formal request, which will occur tomorrow.

I think that's how I understand it,



Mr. Tedrow. But I'll defer maybe to someone like you as to whether or not we want to take action to be supportive.

But understanding the Board's statutory role over -- as fiduciaries, but more importantly over the budget process, seems a little bit limited. But I'm -- I think I welcome our oversight and feedback.

MR. TEDROW: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think you very eloquently laid out, and it is now part of our record, where the Law Enforcement Academy Board sits when it comes to oversight of the budgetary process by the academy.

I think the record speaks for itself as presented by the Director. And, personally, I believe that as an oversight committee and the Board members that we are, at this time it would be appropriate for us to have a motion that would approve the budget, as submitted by the Director, to be presented to both the LFC and the DFA in the budgetary process as we always see.

I think we all know that when it comes to the budget, just because it's presented by September 1st, and then we'll see a hearing date later before the interim committees, especially the



budget committee, there's no guarantees that the 1 2 budget ends up being what it is. 3 I think over the past 16 years, we've seen 4 recessions throughout the State of New Mexico, and 5 recessions in our budgets. So it's probably very 6 likely that even the requested amount may not 7 happen. However, it's important to -- and I think 8 9 it's vital to both the legislators to be able to see 10 that when the legislators want oversight, you know, 11 they need to be able to back that with the budgets 12 as they're being presented. 13 I think this is a great step forward that 14 the Director is taking with the budget so that she 15 can effectively do her job of oversight. And at this time, I would like to make a 16 17 motion that we, as a Board, approve and support the 18 budget recommendations as being submitted in the 19 2022 budget request due September 1st. 20 DIRECTOR ALZAHARNA: Mr. Chair? 21 A.G. BALDERAS: Thank you, Board Member. 22 There is a motion -- yes. Do you have a 23 question? 24 DIRECTOR ALZAHARNA: Yes. I would just



like to correct that that's for the FY23 budget.

A.G. BALDERAS: I'll note that, 1 2 Mr. Tedrow, that that includes '23. 3 MR. TEDROW: I'm sorry. My correction to 4 It's going to be for the following year. We 5 are now in 2022. So for FY2023, as submitted this 6 September 1st. 7 A.G. BALDERAS: Great. There is a motion to support your presentation of the budget for 8 9 Fiscal Year '23. 10 Before I call for a second, I just want to 11 make sure, does this include any special project 12 money, for instance, like the job task analysis that had been discussed by the Board? Or is this 13 14 strictly a base budget for staffing? 15 DIRECTOR ALZAHARNA: That budget will 16 include the -- it's noted in red on that page. When 17 the time comes for the special appropriation, it'll 18 include the request for that \$1.5 million. 19 A.G. BALDERAS: Thank you for that clarification. 20 21 A motion to support Member Tedrow to 22 support Fiscal Year '23 presentation of the budget 23 now being our statutory role, is there a second to 24 Board Member Tedrow?



SHERIFF MENDOZA: Mr. Chair, I hate to

hold up the process. This is Sheriff Mendoza. 1 2 wanted to make one comment. With the positions, I 3 noticed the hourly rate. And I want to make sure 4 that we're not requesting the base starting salaries on those positions, and maybe mid-range, or else 5 6 we're going to put ourselves in a position there, I 7 think, when it comes to recruitment. 8

But I just want to make that comment before we get the second.

A.G. BALDERAS: Well, Madam Director, are these midpoints?

DIRECTOR ALZAHARNA: Good question. It's how DPS budgeting does it. The Chief may be able to do that. What I do is ask for projections when I give it.

I know if the positions are filled, they are based on what the actual person in that position right now is making. If it's vacant or a position that doesn't exist yet, I don't know if it's at minimum or midpoint.

CHIEF JOHNSON: Yeah. I mean, it's -most of you know, it's a wonky system, in that the
budget folks know how to do it, and they put it in
there how they see it.

And then -- so there's never really any



9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

exact dollar amount. It's a projection based on the category. And so, yeah, I mean that's what it is.

And one question I did have, and I think maybe the Director can answer, when we get to the vote -- I'm sorry, Tedrow. You're going to lose your train of thought. I apologize.

Obviously, some of these positions are created; is that correct? We don't have these on the books currently.

DIRECTOR ALZAHARNA: We don't have any of them on the books as far as the Board. They are listed as DPS positions.

CHIEF JOHNSON: Okay. So that we all understand that this has a SPO approval component as well. Just so everybody understands that, too; so...

A.G. BALDERAS: Yeah, I -- Mr. Tedrow -- and I lean on you, because I know we go way back as friends. So I'm really just giving you a problem here that I wouldn't want to present.

Can you -- is there a way to retract

the -- just modify the -- the voting approval of the

budget presentation, but with maybe some of those -
maybe contingencies or factors that -- where Sheriff

Mendoza -- and you were alluding to it in your



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

motion -- the understanding that the budget may shift, that we're supportive of real equity in salary levels, the AG is noting that this is a severely underfunded budget as to our priorities as a board in terms of the adequacy of oversight and training, but -- or if you believe that it weighs in some of those protest positions from the Board as far as direction. I'll defer to you if you think that motion is adequate.

I just -- I want to make sure that the Board knows that it's not voting on the exact, that we endorse the salary levels, or that we are somehow endorsing that this is full funding of this agency, because I don't believe it's full funding. But it is an important start.

So I just convey those concerns to Board Member Tedrow for his brilliant assessment of the motion.

MR. TEDROW: Well, thank you, Mr. Chair.

And I think being that it's my motion, I can go
ahead and amend my own motion or accept something as
a friendly amendment.

I would like to amend my motion on approval. And I don't like to use the word "contingency." I would like to say that it is





the -- the Board's recommendation that not only we approve the motion as being presented, but we also ask that the Director, in reviewing salaries, keep in mind that it's important for recruitment and retention purposes that when we're talking salaries, at least, that we're basing it off of a next year's midpoint range.

I think every agency can tell you that,
Director, that it's important to have that
flexibility. And that flexibility would be there
just based off of the general number. But what it
could affect is your ability of hiring the people
you want. It may mean you can pay up to mid.
However, it may mean you're only getting four
instead of five people that you wanted to be able to
do that.

So I think based on the motion as I've requested from this Board, I think just a little guidance that goes with it.

We would ask that before September 1st, the numbers be checked and that we're looking at a midpoint, at least in the recommendations when it comes for salaries. That way, the Board -- excuse me. That way, the Director has the ability to adjust and hire appropriately.



1	So I think that that's where I would leave
2	my motion at this point, and I think it addresses
3	Sheriff's concerns as well.
4	A.G. BALDERAS: Thank you, Board Member.
5	There is a motion to support from the
6	Board, support Director Alzaharna's budget request,
7	also with the advisement and direction that she
8	confirm appropriate salary levels and make those
9	adjustments throughout the budget process as she
10	deems fit.
11	Is there a second to supporting Board
12	Member's motion pertaining to the Fiscal Year '23
13	budget?
14	DR. GREEN: Mr. Chair, this is Bobbie
15	Green. I second that motion.
16	A.G. BALDERAS: Thank you, Board Member
17	Green.
18	There is a motion and a second to support
19	Director Alzaharna's budget for Fiscal Year '23.
20	If we can do now a roll call vote.
21	MS. MEDRANO: Balderas.
22	A.G. BALDERAS: For.
23	MS. MEDRANO: Tedrow.
24	MR. TEDROW: For.
25	MS. MEDRANO: Gurule.



1	CHIEF GURULE: For.
2	MS. MEDRANO: Johnson.
3	CHIEF JOHNSON: We are not golfing. So
4	yes.
5	MS. MEDRANO: Mendoza.
6	SHERIFF MENDOZA: Yes.
7	MS. MEDRANO: Green.
8	DR. GREEN: Yes.
9	A.G. BALDERAS: Well, thank you, Director.
10	You have our support. Good luck with the beginning
11	of this budget process.
12	And I do I want to commend you.
13	There's going to be a lot of as the Chief said,
14	there's a lot of interest from the Legislature on
15	priorities. And I think that we are all willing to
16	support increased resources.
17	And so we look forward to working with you
18	during the legislative session and the budgetary
19	process.
20	ITEM NO. 6: NEXT SCHEDULED BOARD MEETING
21	SEPTEMBER 2, 2021
22	A.G. BALDERAS: I'd like us to now go to
23	Item No. 6. We have a date for September 2nd. If
24	there is no opposition to that, I just wanted to
25	offer that as a friendly target for our next



1 meeting.

2 CHIEF JOHNSON: Mr. Chair, Tim Johnson.

3 | Can I make a quick -- I've got to get.

4 But if we could just make sure -- we're

5 | meeting internally tomorrow, so I'm going to need

6 Director Alzaharna to give the write-up to me by

7 close of business today.

8 Like we normally do it here, obviously the

9 dollar figure, the positions, what they will

10 | actually do and how they will benefit the program,

11 just a short write-up on all of that so I have some

12 | justification come Monday.

A.G. BALDERAS: Great.

14 Director, you can be assistive of that

15 request, right, to get him the info today?

16 DIRECTOR ALZAHARNA: Yes, I'll give him a

call right after this to get an example so I can get

18 | it to him.

13

17

19

A.G. BALDERAS: Excellent.

20 Okay. Well, before I take a motion to

21 adjourn, I understand that some officers were

22 | involved in their line of duty in an active shooting

23 at this point, and there's some concern for the

24 | safety of officers in the State of New Mexico as

25 | we're speaking.



SANTA FE OFFICE

So we appreciate you, Chief, hanging in 1 2 there with us, as there's a critical emergency right 3 now playing out involving APD. And so our well 4 wishes and our hopes and thoughts go with Sergeant 5 Anderson as well, who was not able to conclude this 6 meeting. But it is a real reminder of how important 7 it is to fully fund this function. But there is a 8 9 serious matter pending at this point. 10 ITEM 7: ADJOURNMENT 11 A.G. BALDERAS: And so with that, I'll entertain a motion to adjourn. And I want to thank 12 13 you all for your time and this thoughtful discussion 14 on the budget process. MR. TEDROW: Mr. Chair, this is Rick 15 At this time, I will go ahead and make a 16 Tedrow. 17 motion to adjourn. 18 And I would just like to reach out to the Director and let her know that if she needs 19

And I would just like to reach out to the Director and let her know that if she needs assistance with the budget, just let me know.

You're going down a path that we do every year. So I'm -- I'm quite familiar with it. If you need assistance, just reach out.

DIRECTOR ALZAHARNA: Thank you.

A.G. BALDERAS: Thank you, Board Member



20

21

22

23

24

1	Tedrow.
2	He's made a motion to adjourn. Is there a
3	second?
4	DR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Chair. This is
5	Bobbie Green. I second.
6	A.G. BALDERAS: Thank you, Dr. Green.
7	There is a motion and a second to adjourn.
8	We might as well finish with a roll call vote. I'm
9	in favor of adjourning.
10	MS. MEDRANO: Tedrow.
11	MR. TEDROW: Yes.
12	MS. MEDRANO: Gurule.
13	CHIEF GURULE: Yes.
14	MS. MEDRANO: Johnson.
15	CHIEF JOHNSON: Yes, ma'am.
16	MS. MEDRANO: Mendoza.
17	SHERIFF MENDOZA: Yes.
18	MS. MEDRANO: Green.
19	DR. GREEN: Yes.
20	A.G. BALDERAS: Motion to adjourn passes.
21	We'll see you soon at the next meeting. And like I
22	said, thank you guys for all your hard work and
23	these important discussions. Have a good morning.
24	Bye-bye.
25	(This meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m.)



REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Cynthia C. Chapman, RMR, CCR #219, Certified Court Reporter in the State of New Mexico, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages constitute a true transcript of proceedings had before the said NEW MEXICO LAW ENFORCEMENT ACADEMY BOARD, held in the State of New Mexico, in the matter therein stated.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand on September 7, 2021.

BEAN & ASSOCIATES, INC.

License Expires:

Cynthi# C. Chapman# RMR-CRR, NM CCR #219

12/31/21

201 Third Street, NW, Suite 1630

Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102

10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Job No.: 5525N

SANTA FE OFFICE 119 East Marcy, Suite 110 Santa Fe, NM 87501 (505) 989-4949 FAX (505) 843-9492

