1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6		NEW MEXIC	O LAW ENFO	RCEMENI	F ACADEMY
7		TELEPHON	IC REGULAR	BOARD	MEETING
8		1	November 12	2, 2020	
9			9:02 a	.m.	
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23	REPORTED	BY: Jan A	Williams,	RPR, N	M CCR 14
24					
25					

1	
2	BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT
3	New Mexico Attorney General Hector Balderas, Chairman
4	Bobbie Jean Green, Vice Chairman
5	
6	Sheriff Adan Mendoza
7	Chief Clayton Garcia
8	Chief Tim Johnson
9	Sergeant Hollie Anderson
10	Connie Monahan
	Rick Tedrow, Esq.
11	
12	ALSO PRESENT
13	Kelly Alzaharna, Director
14	John Kreienkamp, Esq., Board Counsel
15	Monica Medrano, Case Manager
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1		AGENDA ITEM INDEX	
2	ITEM		PAGE
3	1	Roll Call	5
4	2	Approval of Agenda	6
5 6	3	Approval of Meeting Minutes, August 20, 2020	8
7	4	Election of New Vice Chair	9
8	5	Chairman's Report	12
o 9	6	Director's Report	21
10	7	Compliance Subcommittee Report	37
10	8	Public Comment	37
12	9	Law Enforcement Officer Certifications for Approval and Issue	38
13 14	10	Public Safety Telecommunicator Certifications for Approval and Issue	43
15	11	Interpretation of 12-Month Requirement	45
16	12	Martin Trujillo	74
17	13	Lorenzo Sanchez	79
18	14	Martin Trujillo	84
19	15	Lorenzo Sanchez	87
20	16	Lorenzo Sanchez	109
21	17	Brian Schamber	88
22	18	Jose Ojeda	90
23	19	William Gonzales	91
24	20	Brandon Nolen	92
24	21	Mark Tarantino	93

1		AGENDA ITEM INDEX (Cont'd)				
2	22	Frank Methola	94			
3	23	Jessica Turner	95			
4	24	Daniel Lopez	96			
5	25	Leonard Armijo	97			
6	26	Roslyn Vigil	98			
7	27	Joshua Marchand	99			
8	28	Joshua Flores	100			
9	29	Adalida Lopez	102			
10	30	Ryan Villegas	103			
11	31	Jordan Reyes	104			
12	32	Michael Romero	105			
13	33	Daniel Vasquez	106			
14	34	Cody Lattin	107			
15	35	Christopher McCord	108			
16	36	Adjournment	110			
17	$\lambda + + \gamma$	abod.				
18	Attached:					
19	Certification Ratifications Exhibits A through F - Law Enforcement Officers					
20	Exhibits A and B - Public Safety Telecommunicators					
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						

1 A.G. BALDERAS: Good morning, everyone. Ιt 2 is 9:02. And I'd like to call this meeting to order 3 of the New Mexico Law Enforcement Academy Board regular board meeting. Today is Thursday, 4 5 November 12. 6 ITEM NO. 1: ROLL CALL 7 A.G. BALDERAS: I'd like us to start off with 8 item No. 1. Monica, if you could please check our 9 roll count. 10 MS. MEDRANO: Honorable Hector Balderas. 11 A.G. BALDERAS: Present. 12 MS. MEDRANO: Rick Tedrow. 13 MR. TEDROW: Present. 14 MS. MEDRANO: Chief Tim Johnson. 15 CHIEF JOHNSON: Present. MS. MEDRANO: Sheriff Adan Mendoza. 16 17 SHERIFF MENDOZA: Present. MS. MEDRANO: Chief Clayton Garcia. 18 19 (No response.) 20 MS. MEDRANO: Sergeant Hollie Anderson. 21 SERGEANT ANDERSON: Present. 22 MS. MEDRANO: Ms. Connie Monahan. 23 MS. MONAHAN: Present. 24 MS. MEDRANO: Dr. Bobbie Green. 25 DR. GREEN: Present.

A.G. BALDERAS: I'm sorry. Monica, did you
 call Secretary Johnson?

3 MS. MEDRANO: Yes, sir. A.G. BALDERAS: My old age, my apologies. 4 ITEM NO. 2: APPROVAL OF AGENDA 5 A.G. BALDERAS: I'd like us to now address 6 7 item No. 2, which would be the approval of the agenda. 8 I would like everyone to quickly take a look at that. 9 And I'll also upon approval entertain a motion to 10 approve today's agenda. 11 MS. MONAHAN: This is Connie. I move to accept the agenda as submitted. 12 13 A.G. BALDERAS: Thank you, Board Member 14 Monahan. There is a motion to approve the agenda as 15 laid out. Is there a second to approve the agenda? 16 SERGEANT ANDERSON: Hollie Anderson. I'll 17 second. A.G. BALDERAS: Thank you, Board Member 18 Anderson. There is a motion and a second to approve 19 20 today's agenda. All in favor say aye. 21 (The Board Members voted unanimously.) 22 A.G. BALDERAS: Great. Is there any 23 opposition to today's agenda or to that motion? 24 MR. KREIENKAMP: Mr. Chair, if I could. So 25 just on these virtual meetings, my recommendation is

1 to conduct roll call votes.

2 A.G. BALDERAS: Okay. I mean I understood 3 every individual vote, but we can break those down. Why don't we take a roll call vote on that 4 5 motion and second to approve today's agenda. Monica, 6 could you run through the roll. 7 MS. MEDRANO: Balderas. 8 A.G. BALDERAS: In favor. 9 MS. MEDRANO: Tedrow. 10 MR. TEDROW: Yes. 11 MS. MEDRANO: Johnson. 12 CHIEF JOHNSON: Yes. 13 MS. MEDRANO: Mendoza. 14 SHERIFF MENDOZA: Yes. 15 MS. MEDRANO: Garcia. 16 CHIEF GARCIA: Yes. 17 MS. MEDRANO: Anderson. SERGEANT ANDERSON: Yes. 18 19 MS. MEDRANO: Monahan. 20 MS. MONAHAN: Yes. 21 MS. MEDRANO: Green. 22 DR. GREEN: Yes. A.G. BALDERAS: Great. The motion passes 23 eight to zero to approve today's agenda. 24 11 25

1 ITEM NO. 3: APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES 2 A.G. BALDERAS: I'd like us to go to item 3 No. 3, the approval of the August 20, 2020, minutes. We have provided copies in your binders and they were 4 5 distributed to all the Board Members. I'm assuming some of us have had a chance to take a look at those 6 7 minutes, but I'll give you a few more minutes to 8 review those minutes. 9 MS. MONAHAN: This is Connie Monahan. I move 10 to accept the minutes as submitted. 11 A.G. BALDERAS: There is a motion by Board 12 Member Monahan to accept the minutes as provided. Is 13 there a second? 14 DR. GREEN: Bobbie Green. I will second. 15 A.G. BALDERAS: Thank you, Dr. Green. There 16 is a motion and a second to approve the August 20, 2020, minutes. Why don't we do a roll call on that as 17 18 well. 19 MS. MEDRANO: Balderas. 20 A.G. BALDERAS: In favor. 21 MS. MEDRANO: Tedrow. 22 MR. TEDROW: Yes. 23 MS. MEDRANO: Johnson. 24 CHIEF JOHNSON: Yes, ma'am. 25 MS. MEDRANO: Mendoza.

1 SHERIFF MENDOZA: Yes.

2 MS. MEDRANO: Garcia.

3 CHIEF GARCIA: Yes.

4 MS. MEDRANO: Anderson.

5 SERGEANT ANDERSON: Yes.

6 MS. MEDRANO: Monahan.

7 MS. MONAHAN: Yes.

8 MS. MEDRANO: Green.

9 DR. GREEN: Yes.

10 A.G. BALDERAS: Item No. 3, there is a motion 11 and a second to approve the minutes of August 20. The 12 motion does pass and there was no opposition.

13 ITEM NO. 4: ELECTION OF A NEW VICE CHAIR

A.G. BALDERAS: We'll now move to item No. 4, election of a new Vice Chair. We had a wonderful Vice Chair serve with us a couple years. He is no longer on the Board to a well-deserved retirement.

And I would like to see if there are any nominations to serve as Vice Chair of the LEA Board. Mr. Secretary, did we lose you?

21 CHIEF JOHNSON: No, sir. I'm here. I'm 22 trying to stay hidden so I don't get that job. I 23 would nominate Dr. Green.

A.G. BALDERAS: Thank you. There is a nomination for Dr. Green's consideration to serve as

Vice Chair. Are there any other nominations? 1 2 Dr. Green, are you okay with you being 3 nominated? DR. GREEN: Yeah. I see how this works. You 4 guys nominate the new kid on the block because she 5 6 doesn't know any better. 7 A.G. BALDERAS: No. Not at all. I see the Secretary smiling. 8 9 DR. GREEN: I understand. Yes, I accept. A.G. BALDERAS: Great. I would be honored to 10 11 accept a second to that nomination. 12 SHERIFF MENDOZA: Sheriff Mendoza. I'll 13 second that nomination for Dr. Green serving as Vice 14 Chair. 15 A.G. BALDERAS: Thank you, Sheriff. There is 16 a motion and a second to nominate Dr. Green to serve 17 as Vice Chair. Shall we do a voice vote on this as 18 well, Counselor? 19 MR. KREIENKAMP: Yes. I would recommend 20 doing a roll call vote on this as well. 21 A.G. BALDERAS: Okay. Let's go ahead and go 22 through the roll call on that. Monica. 23 MS. MEDRANO: Balderas. 24 A.G. BALDERAS: In favor. 25 MS. MEDRANO: Tedrow.

1 MR. TEDROW: Yes.

2 MS. MEDRANO: Johnson.

3 CHIEF JOHNSON: Yes, ma'am.

4 MS. MEDRANO: Mendoza.

5 SHERIFF MENDOZA: Yes.

6 MS. MEDRANO: Garcia.

7 CHIEF GARCIA: Yes.

8 MS. MEDRANO: Anderson.

9 SERGEANT ANDERSON: Yes.

10 MS. MEDRANO: Monahan.

MS. MONAHAN: Yes, with sincere appreciation to Dr. Green. Thank you.

13 MS. MEDRANO: Green.

14 DR. GREEN: Yes. Thank you.

A.G. BALDERAS: Well, the motion carries.
Both congratulations and a debt of gratitude for
Dr. Green to serve as Vice Chair.

I don't have to remind this Board, as many of us have crucial roles in our community, but Dr. Green brings a wonderful background. And I think that she'll provide not only great energy, but an intellect that further makes our Board stronger and really reflects that the community is involved at these very important discussion levels.

25 And so congratulations, Dr. Green. And thank

you for being willing to give some extra time to be
 willing to serve as Vice Chair.

3 DR. GREEN: It's an honor. I appreciate your 4 consideration and your willingness to give me an 5 opportunity. Thank you.

6 A.G. BALDERAS: Great. I think that was item 7 No. 4 on our agenda.

8 ITEM NO. 5: CHAIRMAN'S REPORT 9 A.G. BALDERAS: We can go now to item No. 5, 10 the Chairman's report. I just want to give maybe a 11 brief update to the LEA Board in terms of what the 12 Chairman's activity has been in the community.

I want to congratulate the Board and the LEA. Just most recently there was a KRQE story that kind of framed out and highlighted more broadly the challenges that the law enforcement community is going through.

And many of your perspectives that you had already stated in Board meetings was reflected in that. Sheriff Mendoza's concern for greater investment in overtime resources was reflected in that statement.

Our Director's perspective that the Legislature needed to really look at expansion of staffing. If the State wants these roles in the areas of investigation and accountability and discipline, in

addition to the struggle to staff the LEA during a
 COVID crisis already being a challenge, KRQE picked up
 on the perspective that the Legislature overall is
 underfunding this entire capacity.

5 And I just thought that that was probably in 6 my five years the first time that a news outlet has 7 really taken a broad look at not only the importance 8 of training law enforcement, but also in this 9 environment critically I think they were opening the 10 door that that's a greater responsibility for the 11 Legislature to really weigh in on investing more 12 resources.

And then I think the other thing that came out in the story that I thought was finally kind of fair is that, if you want to identify challenges like a backlog or understaffing or even lack of appropriate compensation for these type of roles, there is a lack of statutory infrastructure.

19 The Legislature has not looked at the legal 20 framework in which they demand the best trained law 21 enforcement community in the country and also if they 22 want us to set a higher standard of accountability. 23 I think there was a little bit of 24 acknowledgment. I will say it publicly. But it is

25 being fleshed out in these stories that the

1 Legislature has not looked at what type of

2 accountability they are demanding and has not looked 3 at the statutory framework, the legal framework, the 4 top highest standard for which we have to govern in 5 this confusing and limited framework legally since 6 before the iPhone was invented.

7 And so they expect an iPhone type technology 8 parallel to accountability, yet the Legislature is 9 operating under an antiquated model. And so I think 10 putting good people in these Law Enforcement Board 11 oversight entities is helpful. Having hearings is 12 helpful.

But New Mexico as a whole is way behind in looking at how we proactively train and equip and discipline a law enforcement force that we expect more and more from every day. And I thought the KRQE story was a credit to you all as a Board and to the LEA staff that had been fighting kind of -- my visual is that you're fighting a great fight in guicksand.

And I think there was finally an acknowledgment that, no matter how controversial these issues are in the community, even the thought leaders have not thought to look at the front end of this model and finally go, okay, well, if we want 5,000 officers and deputies to act and perform a certain way

1 five or ten years from now, how do we begin to address
2 the culture.

And I think it's very easy to have an opinion once issues are controversial. But the KRQE story was really a credit to the narrative and the dialogue of you guys. And I appreciate it because this is a slow process.

8 But the issues of backlog, discipline, 9 curriculum, training, I know we feel like sometimes 10 we're not moving fast enough. But for now I thought 11 the focus was that the Legislature needs to look at 12 proper funding and what is the legal framework that 13 we're going to ask all of these public servants to 14 serve within.

And I thought it was finally an entry point to that dialogue rather than who should be fired, what city pays a lawsuit, who is upset, you know, whether it's police unions versus angry citizens. I thought this was a great story. And I want to give you all the credit for it.

If you haven't seen it, it was only about a week old. But I'll have my staff send you the link, because I do think that's where the Law Enforcement Board and the dialogue is going to be, in the Legislature.

1 And in that vein I also reached out to the 2 Municipal Police Chiefs Association the last week. 3 And Chief Hebbe has agreed to partner with the LEA Board at the upcoming Legislature so that the law 4 enforcement community and also individuals who are 5 6 shaping the law enforcement community, people like 7 Dr. Green, can be at the table. And so we can really 8 highlight where the Legislature should proactively 9 look at maybe helping in some of these critical areas.

And so Chief Hebbe was very amenable and excited and really welcomes the Law Enforcement Board's input. And so I think, as we move along closer to the session, I will encourage my staff to stay in touch with each and every one of you.

And you've already given me feedback where you would like to improve your particular issues as it relates to curriculum or discipline or training. But we'll try to help you synthesize a position that we can articulate to lawmakers that they should look at in terms of a priority.

And I can assure you, funding is going to be something that we should be very proactive with. And we shouldn't be shy about asking for resources for some of our partners that we partner with throughout the LEAB process.

1 Thirdly, just out of respect for all the 2 Board and some of these issues, there was also a 3 hearing on the backlog of the LEAB. And I want you all to know as Chair I asked my staff to do a review. 4 5 After the LEAB disciplines or recommends 6 discipline, an officer or a deputy has a right to 7 contest that. And then it goes to an administrative 8 trial. And that is when the A.G's Office then takes 9 over. And I made sure, number one, that we were also 10 making sure that we were positively contributing 11 enough resources, that the A.G's Office is ready to go to administratively prosecute. 12

13 So once the Board weighs in and that 14 recommendation is not accepted and officers choose to 15 fight the will of the Board, our Assistant A.G.s are 16 ready, willing, and steadfast in conducting a timely 17 prosecution. And I want you all to know that after 18 that review that will not be an area that we need to 19 focus on, that they are ready to go.

And in terms of handling other discipline cases, it's my perspective at this point that at least we know that back end of the A.G. function is not overwhelmed. We can handle the capacity. I think what we all need to work on is the front end, how we bring in a complaint, how we address it, and how we

1 put it before the Board.

And so that I thought was good news. I want to make sure that I give everyone credit, from the LEA staff to the Assistant Attorneys General that are ready and willing.

6 But one of the things that I also in the 7 Chairman's report want to highlight is our Director 8 and my senior legal counsel, we also addressed the 9 Legislature kind of on your behalf with the Board's 10 feedback of what we do here.

And in the Legislature, quite frankly some of these individuals have served wonderfully in lawmaking for ten, 15, 20 years, some even 25, and have been leaders in the criminal justice area. Some have addressed death penalty, complicated issues.

16 And all of them were learning about the 17 complexity of the LEAB complaint process, how you all 18 sit and make determinations on discipline, and were also -- I don't want to say confused. But it was a 19 20 mystery, even from when it goes to the Board to the A.G's Office, why I don't sit in on discipline cases. 21 22 We had to explain that one of the reasons I 23 don't sit in and I defer to you all as Board Members 24 to make those calls is that my staff and I have to be

25 ready to prosecute and litigate those cases.

And so even with all of that mystery process, I don't ever think there's been kind of a flow chart of this mysterious process that I've asked that you all serve in every day.

5 So we were meeting with lawmakers, meeting 6 with budget individuals on trying to support the 7 Director in getting more staff, emergency funding. 8 And there were a lot of questions off some other 9 previous news stories, interest and curiosity from 10 lawmakers.

And then our Director did a good job and my staff did a good job of redirecting. Now that maybe you have some attention on the backlog, here are some areas that you can critically focus on, like stop underfunding this process.

And then I think another area that I will say in my Chairman's report is not something we have to solve today, but it has been a consistent problem. And I think the Legislature is the place to start sifting out a solution.

Even though I chair the Board and even though you serve off a governor's appointment or as an appointee, the LEA Academy, where the intake of discipline starts and where the training and curriculum are such a critical part of our mission, we 1 are an oversight board; but we don't have direct 2 management over the LEA.

And it's housed in DPS. So Secretary Johnson and myself and some others have been part of some discussions. At some point there will need to be a little bit more clarity I believe in terms of the financial operations, the day-to-day operations, versus the type of oversight between a cabinet official and the Board.

10 And I hope I don't leave you more confused 11 with my comments. But that's just to highlight that 12 as a chair I've had considerable discussions in 13 answering questions from a lot of good people that now 14 I think hopefully in good faith have an interest in 15 how we run in a process that's sometimes very 16 confusing.

And so I think overall the intensity of interest and questions from the municipal chiefs to the legislative bodies is really going to be a good thing.

21 So I guess I'm warning you all that this will 22 be a positive I think upcoming legislative session, 23 where the legislators admitted, who were learned 24 lawyers and have been practicing law for 20 years, 25 that they were unaware of how important the

responsibility is and the capacity to train law
 enforcement and especially under COVID.

I think the reception and the interest was very well-taken. I've never seen more interest and a willingness to try to maybe get involved. And I think that bodes well for all in terms of your leadership. I think that's a reflection of all of you.

8 So I don't have anything else from the 9 Chairman's report other than our staff will be in 10 touch with our Board Membership to make sure that you 11 weigh in on some of these critical issues in terms of 12 where the direction will be coming from the 13 Legislature in terms of how they can provide more 14 resources in this important function.

ITEM NO. 6: DIRECTOR'S REPORT 15 16 A.G. BALDERAS: I'll now move us to item No. 6, to our Director and her report. Good morning. 17 18 DIRECTOR ALZAHARNA: Good morning, Chairman 19 and Board Members. Thank you. I've got a little 20 longer report today but probably under the same 21 auspices as our Chairman, because there has been a lot 22 going on. And I hope I'll get feedback on what type 23 of this information you would like to continue to be 24 reported on; or if there's stuff you don't, I'll just 25 get feedback from you all in the future.

First, since our last Board meeting, we have had several academy graduations. We've had the Southeastern New Mexico Law Enforcement Academy graduate 21. We had our New Mexico Law Enforcement Basic Police Officer Academy graduate 39.

Las Cruces Police Academy graduated 13. Our
NMLEA Certification-By-Waiver Academy graduated 13.
San Juan County Criminal Justice Training Authority
graduated six.

10 The New Mexico State Police Academy graduated 11 22. The NMLEA, we just graduated over the last couple 12 months two PST academies. The first one graduated 24, 13 the second one graduated 20.

14 In between September 8 and November 25, which 15 will be the day before Thanksgiving, we will have run 16 five academies, two certification-by-waiver academies, 17 and three public safety telecommunicator academies. 18 And we did that purposefully.

Just with the COVID circumstances, we couldn't get a full BPOT academy up and running. So we filled it with these shorter academies and scheduled them back to back so we could get as many applicants in as possible and not have additional downtime.

25 As far as misconduct goes, since our last

1 meeting, we have received 18 misconduct reports. We 2 currently have 132 active cases. Twenty of those 3 cases are going to come before you today.

There had been discussion just in some of these topics about, you know, what does having that many cases open mean. And one of the things that I want to assure people of is we don't have a bunch of officers running around who shouldn't be officers with nobody tracking or aware of what's going on.

10 Currently, out of those 132 cases, we only 11 have 20 officers with misconduct reports who are still 12 actively employed. And that could be for a range of 13 reasons.

14 It could be because we just got the case and 15 their agency didn't feel the misconduct reached the 16 level of termination on their end and so it's going to 17 be reviewed by you all. It could be that the 18 misconduct reported wouldn't even reach the level of 19 revocation, it may be a lower level. So there are 20 several reasons.

21 On top of that, we have had the consistent 22 process of agencies contacting us when they're doing 23 their background checks to verify if somebody is 24 employed and whether or not they have a misconduct 25 allegation against them.

As far as compliance goes, we're coming up. There's annual training. The annual in-service training requirements are going to be due coming up at the end of the year, December 31. We have that constantly posted on the NMLEA website so agencies should be aware of that.

But out of those annual training hours, we have domestic abuse incident training which is required by statute, a minimum of one hour. I take that back. By statute it just requires that it's a component of annual in-service. The statute doesn't dictate how long it is. But the Board rules say that it will be a minimum of one hour.

We have child abuse incident training, which again all of these statutorily say that it will be a part of in-service. It's your regulations that identifies what the minimum hours are right now.

So for child abuse incident training, it's a 18 19 minimum of two hours. Ensuring child safety upon 20 arrest is a minimum of one hour. Missing person and 21 AMBER Alert training is a minimum of one hour. And 22 tourniquet and trauma kit training is a minimum of 30 23 minutes. So for your annual in-service training, 24 officers are required to have five and a half hours. 25 So besides that posting on our website, by

1 the end of this month, we are going to be sending 2 individual notifications out to each of the agencies, 3 reminding them of this requirement and that the 4 deadline is December 31 for this annual period. 5 Annual firearms requirements are also part of that.

6 Next, just to give you an idea of the 7 processing that's going on here with the staffing we 8 have, the amount of applications that we've been 9 processing that's been ongoing, for a student, for a 10 full academy training, which also includes our 11 satellite academies, we have processed 79 basic police officer applications, 51 certification-by-waiver 12 13 applications, 91 public safety telecommunicator 14 applications, 123 instructor applications, 35 advanced 15 applications, and 43 course accreditation 16 applications.

And these aren't, you know, one-page, check-the-box applications. Some of these are tens of pages long, reviewing medical documents, psychological documents, verifying background documentation that's been provided. So that's what's gone on since our last meeting.

As far as the NMLEA facility, the firearms range has been in use for 47 days out of the last three months. The EVOC track has been in use

1 approximately 12 days. And that's for training 2 purposes, that doesn't include the annual auction 3 that's held on the EVOC track.

We have a major HVAC project that's coming up that's going to start the week after Thanksgiving break. On the NMLEA side and the dorm side, during the summer the heat comes on in the offices and it's over 90 degrees, including the classrooms, when students are in there.

10 And right now, with the temperatures the way 11 they are, the air-conditioning is running in our 12 classrooms and running in our offices. So most 13 everybody has their coats and gloves and hats on. But 14 that is being addressed.

We purposely held off on that until after Thanksgiving so that we could get these academy classes in. It's going to be a big enough project that it would have interfered with any classes we had running. It's anticipated to take approximately three weeks. So our hopes are it's going to be up and running before we start the next calendar year.

22 Curriculum and training. We are requesting 23 through DPS special appropriation funding to do the 24 job task analysis that we've been talking about. And 25 also to work with IADLEST to do a curriculum review

1 and certification.

2	IADLEST has a program where they charge per
3	credit hour per class and will review and work with
4	your agency on upgrading and certifying basically all
5	of the curriculum. So we are taking a look at doing
6	that, starting with our basic police officer training
7	academy. That certainly doesn't include any topics
8	that we may want to add based on the current
9	circumstances that are going on.
10	DPS is currently transitioning to a new
11	vendor for the website. So that includes the NMLEA.
12	On that I've been working over the last couple weeks.
13	They are just in the initial stages of identifying
14	what our needs are. They're having individual
15	meetings to see what we would like our website to look
16	like, what functionality we would like it to include.
17	So that's good news for us. Right now
18	basically, on our old website, we were just posting
19	the basics. We're posting as you can see your meeting
20	information, academy meeting information. But to try
21	and get any other details on there is really futile
22	right now because of its operability. So as that
23	continues to improve, we'll keep you posted.
24	Our current food services contract for the
25	NMLEA is due to expire. So we've been in the process

of redoing that and making sure we have a vendor on
 board when that expires.

3 The reorganization and reclassification that had been mentioned in previous meetings, we have had a 4 5 verbal approval on that. We are still doing the final 6 paperwork to get what's called a job order. But it's 7 basically to get the posting information out for all 8 of the vacant positions so they can get it posted. So 9 we don't have an end all, be all date yet, but we're a 10 lot closer to doing that.

Acadis is our database as you're aware. They have provided us with a sandbox free of charge, which means that the staff that we do have can get in there and experiment with functionality that maybe they don't use regularly.

Most of our staff that's with us right now did go through the formal training when we implemented Acadis. But not all of them are using its full functionality. So we upped the sandbox so they can get in there and experiment with the different parts of our processes and get more familiar with it.

They're also providing us a three-month sandbox again, a free trial to their case management module, which is just another module that will interact with the other modules we have that will

allow us to start tracking our misconduct cases
 electronically instead of hard copy case by case.

3 Like I said, Monica and I are working with 4 that over the next few months just to see how well it 5 will work with the rest of the Acadis modules.

6 We are working on expanding the current 7 Envisage support. And this kind of crosses over into 8 the subcommittee report, but I'll update it.

9 We had asked for support quotes. The 10 subcommittee had asked just for additional information 11 at their meeting in September. We had Envisage 12 representatives there that answered their questions 13 and were able to ask them questions more on what we're 14 looking at.

So we are looking at being Envisage up the week of December 14 for what's called a rapid start. And they are going to meet with NMLEA staff to go over where we are now as opposed to where we were when they left us after the initiation of the program to kind of get a fresh starting point.

21 That's going to include I think the quote 22 that Dr. Green had requested. And they provided a 23 little more information. If we upgrade our current 24 support, it will be the silver support program. 25 And what it actually gives us is an Envisage

person part time for up to 20 hours a week to do stuff that our staff can't do, create these forms, identify these work processes that -- we can enter data. But we don't know where the data goes. And with a one-year subscription to that, their staff will handle that for us. They will also handle our concerns, the subcommittee's concerns.

8 We opened Acadis so agencies can start 9 entering their own information. But currently we 10 don't have the staff to answer questions if they have 11 questions when they get in and start working. The Envisage staff will do that, will handle that for us. 12 13 They will create the cheat sheets, guide 14 sheets, instruction sheets for these agencies to walk 15 themselves through each of the processes. And that's

But with them being able to do that for us, we will be able to leap forward a lot quicker than I believe we anticipated. We wanted to push it through and get them up here in December.

a bird's-eye view of what they're going to do.

16

21 We couldn't see waiting until after the 22 legislative session, we would have just been so much 23 farther behind. If our staff gets brought up to speed 24 and they are able to start doing this, then we can get 25 the agencies on board to start entering their own

1 information.

2 Presentations. I have given several 3 presentations. On October 7 I gave a presentation to the Criminal Justice Reform Subcommittee; on 4 5 October 15 to the Public Safety Law Enforcement 6 Committee, the Council for Racial Justice; on 7 October 23rd to the Civil Rights Commission; 8 October 22nd, the Public Safety Advisory Commission 9 meeting; and on November 4, the Dona Ana Community 10 College Criminal Justice Advisory Committee meeting. 11 And it was all right in line with what 12 Chairman Balderas was mentioning. I felt they were 13 very positive. I felt that the participants were 14 getting a lot better understanding of some of the 15 difficulties we have and how our processes go that 16 they just weren't as familiar as they thought they were. So I felt it was a positive experience on most 17 18 of those. 19 I'm not sure if some of you have been aware 20 of the Presidential Executive Order, 139-29.

21 Basically what it is is it requires that all state, 22 local, and university law enforcement agencies be 23 certified by independent credentialing agencies.

24 What that credentialing entails is that 25 agencies are required to meet two standards in order

to be successfully credentialed. One is that the agency's use-of-force policies prohibit chokeholds except in situations where the use of deadly force is allowed by law; and number two, that the agency's use-of-force policies adhere to all applicable laws.

6 What this is for is it requires that these 7 agencies be accredited before they are eligible to 8 apply for Department of Justice discretionary grant 9 funding. So it's not a requirement that you have to 10 do it across the board, it's a requirement that you do 11 it if you want to apply for eligible federal grant 12 funding.

I'll send you the updated information of just what that is, where it sits with us. They've identified two agencies in the State of New Mexico as credentialing agencies. They've identified the New Mexico Law Enforcement Academy and they've identified the New Mexico Association of Chiefs of Police. Chief Hebbe is the president of that.

I have spoken with Chief Hebbe. And he is on board, because what it identifies is that, out of those two, if either one of our agencies want to apply, there's a \$10,000 grant to help implement that. And it identifies that the Chiefs of Police

In talking about it, I am not sure that we need it;
 because basically the process will be one or two
 choices.

The agencies can send all of this stuff up to our staff to review and verify that they're credentialed or there can be an affidavit that the agency head signs that they are attesting to the fact that they meet that criteria.

9 I think Board Counsel Kreienkamp is going to 10 review all of that material that came in and then give 11 his input and a recommendation at the next Board 12 meeting. But I just wanted you to be aware that we 13 had received that notification. And I'll send that 14 information out to you all.

Finally, I have put together a draft on what I'm working on. Whether it's an integrity newsletter, an integrity bulletin, but I have drafted a mechanism for us to post after each Board meeting that identifies the actions that the Board has taken regarding individual certifications during the executive session.

I have drafted that up. My intent is to give that to Board Counsel Kreienkamp to review to make sure it includes what it should include and doesn't include what it shouldn't. And then hopefully, by the

1 next Board meeting, I will have that posted with the 2 results from these last couple Board meetings for you 3 all. And it will be put on the website. That's my 4 report for today.

A.G. BALDERAS: Are there any questions from the Board at this time? I don't know if I have necessarily a question, Director, more of maybe you can give me some insight.

9 A few meetings ago I know that there were 10 some direct Board Members that were inquiring 11 specifically about this curriculum and standards, that 12 they wanted to weigh in on some of the shaping of that 13 curriculum. Have you had an opportunity to have 14 dialogue with those members?

And then I know that they have just requested the curriculum. Before they could identify maybe areas that they wanted to see some modifications, they requested specifically the curriculum so that they could get a perspective.

Have you had an opportunity to provide that information and dialogue with some of those Board Members?

DIRECTOR ALZAHARNA: I have not spoken with Board Members individually. And I can get that curriculum out to them by the end of the day today. A.G. BALDERAS: Okay. There were two or three of them. So to our Board, I want you to know, we're going to try to facilitate -- I think that's an area where initially they had set some strategic goals as a Board to impact policy.

6 Some of these issues play out more commonly 7 with maybe use of force, cultural sensitivity, 8 training officers in a new era of mental health. So a 9 lot is evolving obviously. But I remember distinctly 10 that some of our senior members in law enforcement 11 wanted to learn a little bit more about the front end 12 curriculum.

And also there's been a lot of discussion about standards and training. So I would encourage you, if you could, to provide those. I think individually would be fine so that we're not trying to go back and figure out who those Board Members were. But I think there would be considerable interest.

And then especially now I think I would give advice to my Board and to the staff at the LEA that, as I've hinted and I've stated pretty specifically through anecdotes, I would be very fearful if lawmakers, including the Courts, Corrections & Justice Committee, the Legislature, is going to look at legal framework, then I would want to make sure that my

Board was able to provide their perspective, because,
Director, they might be able to impact regulation
change and they might be able to impact policy change
through your curriculum, which is much I guess less
scary than having the Legislature tinker with the
legal framework.

7 I know that the law enforcement community and 8 even the civil rights community would probably rather 9 have the Board and you strengthen the curriculum, 10 where you have flexibility and control and there's 11 authority at the academy level and at the department 12 level rather than run the risk of the Legislature 13 trying to address cultural sensitivity in statute or 14 equipment or training.

15 So I want you to know that I think it's an 16 opportunity for you to provide that curriculum and get 17 the feedback from the Board now so that way we can 18 figure out where the best ways to make the adjustments 19 are as opposed to opening up all of those topics to 20 the New Mexico Legislature when they could probably be 21 better addressed at your more departmental level.

22 So that would be probably also the request, 23 that I am emphasizing an urgency that you get our 24 feedback before January comes. It would probably be 25 strategic for all of us to be on the same page.

1 The other thing is I think the Board can 2 serve as wonderful ambassadors to you, Director, where 3 you do make improvements on the curriculum with the 4 advice and consent of the Board.

5 We can be wonderful ambassadors for you as 6 well to educate lawmakers, members of the press, and 7 other stakeholders, mayors, county commissioners, 8 where it is that we've made improvement on the 9 curriculum and then we've taken a look at, you know, 10 national law enforcement standards.

11 So that's just a thank you for agreeing to 12 follow up on that information for the Board.

13 ITEM NO. 7: COMPLIANCE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

A.G. BALDERAS: I think, if that concludes your report, I think we can go into your compliance section as well.

DIRECTOR ALZAHARNA: That would just basically review what I covered in part of my Director's report.

A.G. BALDERAS: Great. You combined them.
Okay. Awesome. I thought that's what you did. Okay.
So we are now through item Nos. 6 and 7.
ITEM NO. 8: PUBLIC COMMENT

A.G. BALDERAS: And now we get to my favorite part, public comment. I don't have a list of my 1 members. Let me see. Monica, do we have any

2 wonderful members of the public wishing to address the 3 Board?

4 MS. MEDRANO: I haven't received any private 5 messages or anything for public comment.

A.G. BALDERAS: Okay. And then I actually failed. The members of the subcommittee related to compliance, not to be jumping between items 7 and 8, but are there any other Members of the Board involved in our subcommittee that would like to address the Board? No. Okay. Well, we have now gone through item No. 7 and No. 8, public comment.

13 ITEM NO. 9: LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER CERTIFICATIONS 14 FOR APPROVAL AND ISSUE

A.G. BALDERAS: We are now at our important role of approving certifications for law enforcement members, item No. 9. Director Alzaharna, you have the floor.

DIRECTOR ALZAHARNA: Thank you, Chairman.
Item No. 9 are the law enforcement officer
certifications for approval. We have Exhibit A, which
includes Certification Nos. 20-0190-P through
20-0210-P.

Item B is NMLEA BPOT, Exhibit B,
Certification Nos. 20-0211-P through 20-0249-P.

A.G. BALDERAS: Director, are you moving
 these in beyond Exhibit A; in other words, are we
 going to Exhibits A through F? I'm sorry to be
 confusing. Are we moving in individual exhibits or
 are you going A through F?
 DIRECTOR ALZAHARNA: However you would

7 prefer. I went from A to B. But if you would like to 8 do them individually.

9 A.G. BALDERAS: I think we have kind of done 10 it both ways. Counselor, do you have anything you 11 would like to say?

MR. KREIENKAMP: I think you can do it all as one agenda item 9, especially given that you're doing roll call votes with these virtual meetings. I think just have the motion specify that the Board is voting to approve the certifications listed in A through F.

A.G. BALDERAS: All right. We'll do that.
Okay, Director. I'll let you go through your program.
DIRECTOR ALZAHARNA: Exhibit C is

20 Certification Nos. 20-0250-P through 20-0262-P.

Exhibit D is Certification Nos. 20-0263-P
through 20-0269-P, 85-0065-P, 94-0196-P, 92-0002-P,
05-0036-P, 79-0237-P, and 94-0369-P.

24 Exhibit E is Certification Nos. 20-0270-P25 through 20-0275-P.

Exhibit F is Certification Nos. 20-0276-P
through 20-0297-P. Those are exhibits for item No. 9.
A.G. BALDERAS: Thank you, Director. I would
like to see if I could entertain a motion to move and
approve Exhibit A, beginning at 20-0190-P, through
Exhibit F, ending in 20-0297-P.

7 And for the members of the public, that 8 motion that I'm looking forward to entertaining 9 includes officers throughout the State of New Mexico. 10 And I would like to reference just a few of the 11 locations.

One is from my alma mater, New Mexico Highlands University Police Department; tribal communities such as Pojoaque; and wonderful far-off places that need law enforcement, such as Colfax County on the Colorado border; and then, of course, including State Police and some of the bigger departments such as Las Cruces Police Department.

I just offer that because I want to commend not only the academies, but these communities also accomplishing another certification of badly needed law enforcement in communities that are already difficult to police. But it's good to see some of these smaller departments and tribal communities. SERGEANT ANDERSON: Mr. Chair, I have a

question before we do the motion on Exhibit D. 1 2 A.G. BALDERAS: Sure. Go ahead. 3 SERGEANT ANDERSON: On Exhibit D, Certification No. 94-0196-P, there's no agency listed. 4 5 A.G. BALDERAS: Director, did you hear that 6 question? 7 DIRECTOR ALZAHARNA: Yes. That means that, when they went through, they were a self-sponsor. 8 9 SERGEANT ANDERSON: Okay. Thank you. 10 A.G. BALDERAS: I guess, for the civilian community, does that mean that they're just not 11 12 assigned a department yet, but they are certified? 13 DIRECTOR ALZAHARNA: Yes, sir. On that 14 particular one, if they have already been employed and have a certification number, then when they go through 15 16 that, their previous certification number is reinstated. 17 18 If they're a brand-new person having never 19 been certified, they wouldn't be assigned a 20 certification number until they were picked up by an 21 agency. 22 A.G. BALDERAS: Great. Thank you. Are there any other questions? 23 24 SERGEANT ANDERSON: That answers my question. 25 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

A.G. BALDERAS: Thank you, Sergeant. Even
 Albuquerque Public Schools Police Department is
 referenced in some of these exhibits.

4 I will now entertain a motion as previously 5 stated to approve Exhibit A, beginning at 20-0190-P, through Exhibit F, ending in 20-0297-P. Is there a 6 7 motion to approve all individuals in these exhibits? 8 MS. MONAHAN: Chair, this is Connie Monahan. 9 I move to accept the certifications for approval and 10 issue as you listed and as outlined on the agenda. I 11 dare not try to repeat the numbers.

A.G. BALDERAS: Thank you, Board Member
Monahan. There is a motion to approve. Is there a
second to approve Exhibits A through F?

15 CHIEF JOHNSON: I'll second, sir.

A.G. BALDERAS: Thank you, Secretary. So now there is a motion and a second to approve Exhibits A through F as previously stated. We can now take a roll call vote.

20 MS. MEDRANO: Balderas.

21 A.G. BALDERAS: In favor.

22 MS. MEDRANO: Tedrow.

23 MR. TEDROW: Yes.

24 MS. MEDRANO: Johnson.

25 CHIEF JOHNSON: Yes, ma'am.

1 MS. MEDRANO: Mendoza. 2 SHERIFF MENDOZA: Yes. 3 MS. MEDRANO: Garcia. CHIEF GARCIA: Yes. 4 5 MS. MEDRANO: Anderson. 6 SERGEANT ANDERSON: Yes. 7 MS. MEDRANO: Monahan. 8 MS. MONAHAN: Yes. 9 MS. MEDRANO: Green. 10 DR. GREEN: Yes. 11 A.G. BALDERAS: The motion and second to approve Exhibits A through F on item No. 9 on the 12 13 agenda passes with no opposition. 14 ITEM NO. 10: PUBLIC SAFETY TELECOMMUNICATOR 15 CERTIFICATIONS FOR APPROVAL AND ISSUE 16 A.G. BALDERAS: Director, we can go now to 17 item No. 10. 18 DIRECTOR ALZAHARNA: Thank you. Item No. 10 19 is public safety telecommunicator certifications. Exhibit A, Certification Nos. 20-0027-PST through 20 21 20-0050-PST; and Exhibit B, Certification 22 Nos. 20-0051-PST through 20-0070-PST. 23 A.G. BALDERAS: Thank you, Director. I would 24 like to entertain a motion to approve public safety 25 telecommunicator certifications as Director Alzaharna

has presented, Exhibit A, No. 20-0027-PST, ending in 1 2 Exhibit B, No. 20-0070-PST. Is there a motion to 3 approve? 4 CHIEF GARCIA: Chairman, this is Chief Garcia. I make a motion to approve the certifications 5 6 for the public safety telecommunicators. 7 A.G. BALDERAS: Thank you, Board Member 8 Garcia. Is there a second to Board Member Garcia's 9 motion to approve Exhibits A and B? 10 SHERIFF MENDOZA: Sheriff Mendoza. I'll 11 second that motion. 12 A.G. BALDERAS: Thank you, Board Member 13 Mendoza. There is now a motion and a second to 14 approve item No. 10 on the public agenda referencing 15 public safety telecommunicator certifications as laid 16 out by Director Alzaharna, Exhibit A, beginning at No. 20-0027-PST, to Exhibit B, ending in 17 No. 20-0070-PST. There is a motion and a second. Can 18 19 we entertain a voice vote. 20 MS. MEDRANO: Balderas. 21 A.G. BALDERAS: In favor. 22 MS. MEDRANO: Tedrow. 23 MR. TEDROW: Yes. 24 MS. MEDRANO: Johnson. 25 CHIEF JOHNSON: Yes, ma'am.

1	MS. MEDRANO: Mendoza.
2	SHERIFF MENDOZA: Yes.
3	MS. MEDRANO: Garcia.
4	CHIEF GARCIA: Yes.
5	MS. MEDRANO: Anderson.
6	SERGEANT ANDERSON: Yes.
7	MS. MEDRANO: Monahan.
8	MS. MONAHAN: Yes.
9	MS. MEDRANO: Green.
10	DR. GREEN: Yes.
11	A.G. BALDERAS: The vote passes with no
12	opposition to public safety telecommunicator
13	certifications, item No. 10 on the agenda. Does that
14	conclude, Director Alzaharna, the certification
15	matters at this point?
16	DIRECTOR ALZAHARNA: Yes, Mr. Chairman.
17	A.G. BALDERAS: Great. Thank you.
18	ITEM NO. 11: INTERPRETATION OF 12-MONTH REQUIREMENT
19	A.G. BALDERAS: We can now go to item No. 11,
20	interpretation of the 12-month requirement for
21	officers and telecommunicators to obtain a
22	certification in light of the closure of the academy
23	due to COVID. And I'd like to yield to our counselor,
24	Board Counsel John Kreienkamp, to lead this
25	discussion.

1 MR. KREIENKAMP: Thank you, Mr. Chair. 2 Members of the Board, just so that you are all aware, 3 this is the same item of business that was on the 4 previous meeting agenda.

5 There was sort of a small concern that was 6 raised by a member of the public on our meeting agenda 7 at the last meeting to the effect that maybe on that 8 agenda it was possible that it wasn't entirely 9 specific as to what this item of business was.

10 I don't know that I agreed with that 11 conclusion. In fact, I disagreed with it. But just 12 in the interest of making sure that there's no sort of 13 follow-up on this and that there's not going to be, 14 you know, any further disagreement, at least as to the agenda component of this, I did advise the Director to 15 16 put this back on the agenda just for the purposes of sort of reiterating the Board's perspective on that. 17

And again, just as sort of an overview, this issue relates to the requirement in the two separate statutes that are both cited on the agenda for officers and then telecommunicators, respectively, to obtain their certifications within 12 months of their hiring and sort of the complications that have arisen due to COVID-19 and the closure of the academy.

25 You know, some of these officers have an

inability, therefore, to obtain their certification
 within 12 months. It has been a bit of an issue. And
 we as you know discussed it at the previous meeting.

4 Several Board Members, in particular the 5 Chair and the then Vice Chair, Mr. Romero, and Board Member Tedrow, you know, I think sort of led that 6 7 discussion and sort of focused on the practical 8 implications, the fact that this was a statute, that 9 these statutory provisions are really intended to make 10 sure that officers are obtaining their training and 11 their initial training and their certifications in a timely manner. But it is very clear in the statutory 12 13 scheme and through the case law that this is not 14 intended to be a requirement that is burdensome on 15 agencies and their ability to have officers.

16 The other side of it as well is that, you 17 know, we have these provisions that relate to public 18 health emergencies like the one we're going through 19 right now. And what those statutes very clearly 20 outline is that the State needs to be able to marshall 21 all of its resources to combat a pandemic or, you 22 know, a comparable health emergency.

And so forcing officers to relinquish their commissions due to something that was beyond their control is not something that we would interpret those

1 statutes to say.

2	And, you know, as I outlined I think in the
3	previous meeting and as I explained to the members of
4	the public, the Board does not have a direct role in
5	terms of these statutes insofar as the Board has
6	authority over issuing and then, you know, revoking or
7	suspending certifications but not necessarily the
8	commissions that these officers are issued by their
9	respective agencies. Those are two separate things.
10	So the Board's opinion on this is sort of
11	persuasive I think. But in any event the Board's
12	interpretation that it voted on at the previous
13	meeting was that the 12 months are effectively tolled
14	while the academy is closed because that's not
15	something that is within the control of those officers
16	or those agencies.
17	So that's I think where the Board left it at
18	the previous meeting. I would ask that you vote to
19	sort of reaffirm that interpretation of those
20	requirements and the Board's rules to that effect.
21	But if you would like to discuss it further or have
22	any questions, I would be happy to, you know, assist
23	you as best I can.
24	DR CREEN. Mr Counselor I have a question

DR. GREEN: Mr. Counselor, I have a question.This is Bobbie Green. Since the pandemic, this is

1 like a once-every-100-years or at least that's what 2 the trend has been so far. Is there a need to adjust 3 and make amendments to this statute to accommodate 4 should this occur again or is this just subject to the 5 interpretation in the best light possible given the 6 circumstances?

7 MR. KREIENKAMP: Well, I mean I believe the -- for the policy question of whether the statute 8 9 should be amended to the Board and to the DPS 10 Secretary and to the A.G. But I mean I quess I would 11 say that certainly, to make this an easier issue from a legal standpoint, the easiest issue would be to 12 13 amend a statutory provision like this and to provide 14 for that sort of clarity in the statute.

But one of the things that I mentioned at the previous meeting is this statute has been viewed once before and interpreted once before by our State courts. And that was in the context of an officer who was originally employed by one agency and then he left within those 12 months.

And the question was essentially, if he's starting up at another agency, does he get another 12 months or, you know, does that 12 months sort of run immediately from the date of initial hire by the agency.

1 And the courts took a broad interpretation of 2 that exception there or that statutory provision 3 there, you know, again with the understanding that 4 this was not a provision that was intended by the 5 Legislature to arbitrarily sort of restrict their 6 ability to hire officers. And I think in a pandemic 7 that's persuasive.

8 I do think to an extent this is a matter of 9 interpreting these statutes as best that we can in 10 light of our current situation. But certainly, if 11 they were amended later on to provide more clarity, 12 you know, from a legal standpoint, that would make 13 things easier.

MR. TEDROW: Hey, John, what is the emergency clause or the statute that we were looking at last time, do you have that?

MR. KREIENKAMP: Yes. Let me pull that up. The statute that I think I was referring to was -- I believe the primary one that I was referring to was the All Hazard Emergency Management Act, which as I recall provides for -- and I think I mentioned this at the previous meeting.

It's the statute that sort of provides that, you know, the State, at the declaration of one of these emergencies by the governor, is required to use

1 all of its resources, you know, in coordination with 2 the Governor's Office to address that health 3 emergency. That's the primary one.

There are other statutes that also would come 4 The Public Health Act would be one of them. 5 in. But 6 I think, as I looked at it, the clearest language I 7 think was in this All Hazard Emergency Management Act. 8 MR. TEDROW: What's the annotation? Not the 9 annotation. What's the statute number on the All 10 Hazard Emergency Management Act? 11 MR. KREIENKAMP: It starts in Section 12-10-1. And I think the key statutory 12 13 provision you would be looking at is Section 12-10-9 and then Section 12-10-10. And, you know, I guess I 14 would just sort of reiterate that, you know, sort of 15 the question of the interpretation of those statutes 16 is sort of a baseline issue. 17

I mean any discussion of sort of the possibility of an emergency rule or anything like that would ultimately come back to the statutory provision. If it were to be interpreted as a strict requirement, then, you know, nothing like that would be within the realm of possibility.

24 SHERIFF MENDOZA: Mr. Chair, Counsel, I just 25 have a question. Are we voting on something and

1 exactly what are we voting on? Are we voting on the 2 interpretation or what is the exact wording that we're 3 voting on?

MR. KREIENKAMP: So what I'm asking for you to do, Board Member Mendoza, is essentially what you did at the previous meeting, to vote on your interpretation of this statute as not requiring these officers to forfeit their commissions due to their inability to attend the academy when the academy was closed.

Essentially it's not really -- I would not say that it is a formal action. It's more just, you know, determining your interpretation of those statutes.

DR. GREEN: Mr. Counselor, in that case does it require a length of time after the crisis is over for these certifications to move forward? I mean is there a deadline or do we leave it open-ended or how would we do that?

20 MR. KREIENKAMP: I mean I think the actual 21 deadlines would depend on how long the academy is 22 closed. I was under the impression at the previous 23 meeting that the academy was sort of imminently about 24 to reopen. And since then I've been I guess dissuaded 25 of that illusion. But I do think that it would operate as a toll. There is still a 12-month period. So while the academy was effectively closed and officers were unable to attend starting with its closure in April I want to say, then, you know, once the academy is reopened, then that time I think would logically begin to tick again.

8 DR. GREEN: Thank you.

9 SHERIFF MENDOZA: Mr. Chair, Counsel, I would 10 just like the Board to take into consideration also 11 the backlog of cadets. Even though the academy is 12 open, it has been shut down for quite a bit and 13 there's going to be a backlog. They can only take in 14 so many students at a time. So to be fair there is a 15 backlog effect that this has created.

MR. TEDROW: Hey, John, have any of the public health orders addressed this? Has the governor given any such authorities allowing us to circumvent the statutory laws?

20 MR. KREIENKAMP: No. There hasn't been any 21 sort of formal action from the Governor's Office. I 22 know that I was asked at one point -- I forget who 23 asked me.

24 But someone asked, you know, if the governor 25 sort of had the ability to sort of suspend the

statute, you know, or take an action like that. We haven't seen that. I don't know that I would say that a formal action like that -- I'll reserve my opinion on what that would look like. But no. There hasn't been anything like that.

6 DIRECTOR ALZAHARNA: Mr. Chair. 7 A.G. BALDERAS: Go ahead, Director. 8 DIRECTOR ALZAHARNA: Counsel Kreienkamp, a 9 clarification on my part, kind of a clarifying 10 statement and question. The NMLEA Academy was the 11 only academy that was closed. And we closed for four months and then reopened as far as a full academy and 12 13 the academy that was in session completed.

We have our next academy on schedule tentatively for January. So basically we missed one academy. But there were other full academies operating in state. And they had availability for officers to get in.

So maybe to help on my part when I'm getting asked, is this generally just applicants who say, yeah, we didn't get in because of COVID versus when there were slots available in nine other academies or -- I'm just looking for clarification on that part.

Because I have had agencies who have said,

25

1 well, we hired our guy before this and we just didn't 2 submit it. So now COVID has happened. And it wasn't 3 really because of COVID and COVID didn't affect it, 4 but they're coming up on the time when they can get 5 their applicants in and they're not.

6 MR. KREIENKAMP: So I would say, if this 7 issue was litigated, you know -- and I would imagine, 8 given the length of the shutdown of the academy or at 9 least the missed class there, that there's a 10 likelihood that at some point this will go to court.

You know, if it does, then I think that would certainly be a complicating factor that a court would have to look at in terms of the availability of those other academies, you know, whether it was something that that officer could have done or that agency could have done to send them there.

17 You know, I myself am not aware of, you know, 18 the specific factual circumstances there. But I would 19 imagine that would be something that a court would 20 look at.

A.G. BALDERAS: Also, to maybe address Board Member Mendoza's question as well, I think what John is maybe just asking us to do is to vote on supporting an interpretation of the 12-month rule; that you, Director, should just consider factors on a

1 case-by-case.

I think we're trying to balance the threat of litigation by an individual applicant versus not violating State law, which I think Board Member Tedrow has raised as well. We only have a certain amount of authority within the statutory framework.

But I think what I'm hearing is in having litigated -- we have litigated many attacks on the governor's emergency authority. We've also litigated the special exceptions for first responders in terms of budgeting and staffing under these very rare declarations of emergency.

And because the academy closed those four months, I think it would be up to you and the department working with each applicant to see if directly any of the closure factors or the declarations of emergency, which have been held up in the Supreme Court -- it's almost like the fourth branch of government.

Because of the pandemic, the court has allowed the governor a little bit of limited flexibility to regulate areas where traditionally she didn't have authority and the Legislature had not weighed in like in these COVID pandemic responses. So I think it's more of a policy position,

that we are at least acknowledging I think three 1 2 things that I'm hearing from the Board. We are 3 acknowledging that at least, if an applicant raises it, if they were negatively impacted by a declaration 4 of emergency -- which has been held to absolutely 5 balance with State law. Even if they conflict, the 6 7 court has been allowing the governor on a very limited 8 timely basis, for as long as that declaration exists 9 during COVID, to override other areas of law.

10 And I think that this could be one of those 11 circumstances where some of the applicants might have 12 been impacted. But in order to mitigate potential 13 litigation, I think the Board is just saying that we 14 would acknowledge a potential tolling without 15 violating statutory law.

16 That might be impacted by declarations of 17 emergency. There could be departmental hardships. If 18 supposedly a governor ordered all of Lea County law 19 enforcement, I could see that certifying their 20 officers, there could be a potential hardship that was 21 unforeseeable. And again I'm just throwing stuff out 22 as a lawyer.

23 So at least recognizing and acknowledging 24 case by case that we should review declarations of 25 emergency, if that impacted the process. I think you 1 eloquently reference your closure, you were willing to
2 look at four months.

They probably don't apply to everyone. It doesn't give a blanket invitation to violate State law. But potentially, in order to mitigate litigation or violating other areas of law, we might consider the time that you were closed.

8 And then for me number three is just -- and 9 it's already been stated. I'm just restating it. It 10 seems like there's a concern to really understand the 11 legislative intent. Some of this intent is not to 12 necessarily be punitive.

But maybe, on a case-by-case, there is a commitment by the Legislature to say we want this process to be done within 12 months. I mean that law enforcement agencies have a duty as well to assist. So I think we're just looking for I guess some common ground where the Board is apprised and that we are suggesting and directing you, Director

Alzaharna, that you have a little bit of flexibility within that statutory interpretation based on those two or three factors that I think have been held up in a court of law, that they might supersede or balance current State law.

25 John, please weigh in if my interpretation is

1 off base in any way. Is that kind of where we're at 2 as a Board?

3 MR. KREIENKAMP: I think so, yeah.
4 A.G. BALDERAS: To any of our other Board
5 Members that raised those issues, did I misstate kind
6 of your concerns or did we not address those
7 appropriately? That is kind of the tension I think
8 we're all trying to balance here.

9 MS. MONAHAN: If I may, the question that I 10 have is are you asking us to interpret or to agree to 11 your interpretation? Because I'm not a lawyer. 12 There's no way I can interpret it. But if what you're 13 saying, as a Board Member, am I nodding that your 14 interpretation is rational, I could agree to that.

A.G. BALDERAS: Board Member Monahan, I know I I'm not asking for you to support my interpretation. I think counsel has looked at this. And all of you have raised important concerns in how we all read that statute.

And I think the only thing I have tried to do is identify two or three factors that the Director can consider. She has to make those calls.

And we didn't endorse her to violate State Haw, but we're not also endorsing that she do such a rigid, blanket 12-month decision without advising her 1 to consider some of these other emergency conditions.

The only thing I added was that some of these factors have been already held up in the Supreme Court. And Tedrow is a much better lawyer than I am. But just to consider those factors in her interpretation I think.

7 Hopefully that answers your question, Board 8 Member Monahan. I think that's what we're trying to 9 consider, getting a directive or policy position for 10 the Director to give her some guidance. Tedrow or 11 Counsel, anything?

MR. TEDROW: John, how do you interpret 13 12-10-13?

MR. KREIENKAMP: There are several statutes in New Mexico that sort of provide for the State to sort of call up certain professionals, some of whom like the ones that I've seen, calling up doctors or nurses who aren't maybe licensed in New Mexico to come in here and render aid during a pandemic.

I guess I would interpret this similarly. I mean I would interpret this as it looks like this is a requirement that, if the Department of Health or the Department of Homeland Security & Emergency Management approve -- and I think that they do have a process for that as I understand it. 1 That those folks can come in and render aid 2 during a pandemic and be considered a public employee. 3 I think it is probably looking more at the Tort Claims 4 Act like it says.

5 But I think that, you know, I would look at 6 that statute as -- I think that the intent behind all 7 of this statute is that the State needs to utilize its 8 maximum resources during a pandemic.

9 And this sort of gives the Department of 10 Health and the Department of Homeland Security & 11 Emergency Management that ability to approve those. I 12 think that that's a separate process, but I do think 13 that they have a process in place for that.

MR. TEDROW: John, that's what I was going to say. At first glance, I mean I'll tell you, if I'm reviewing the statutes, 12 months is 12 months. Simple as that. We don't have an out.

However, under 12-10-13, it suggests to me that the Department of Health or Department of Homeland Security & Emergency Management has the authority possibly to use in-state people that may have a license, certificate, or other permit.

I think that could apply to law enforcement. But I think it needs to be something expressly stated by Emergency Management before we could say that the 12-month does not apply at this time. So, in other
 words, I think without something expressly from
 Emergency Management, my first recommendation is we
 follow the statute. And that's 12 months.

5 SHERIFF MENDOZA: Mr. Chair, I just think I 6 agree with counsel. And I agree with the fact that 7 there's a lot of statutes and deadlines that should be 8 abided by.

9 But I think, due to this pandemic and the 10 issues here, I think the interpretation that it's not 11 meant to be a penalty, it's put there so there's a 12 reasonable amount of time that somebody gets certified 13 so they don't just hang out there and continue to be 14 employed for an indefinite amount of time.

But due to the pandemic, I think we may lose good officers that are there waiting on departments, on finances, on a lot of different things that the pandemic has affected and not being able to become certified.

20 So I think I disagree that we hold fast on 21 the 12-month rule, even though it is in statute. I 22 think we're in a different time here. And we have to 23 be flexible enough to allow officers to become 24 certified in a reasonable amount of time due to this 25 situation. 1 DIRECTOR ALZAHARNA: Mr. Chair.

2 MR. KREIENKAMP: I think we may have lost the 3 Chair. I don't see him.

4 DIRECTOR ALZAHARNA: Counsel Kreienkamp.
5 MR. KREIENKAMP: Sure.

6 DIRECTOR ALZAHARNA: The Board's 7 interpretation based on the last meeting was very 8 helpful to me. I have not had really any major 9 issues. I have had one or two who gave specific 10 details just like you explained. They gave me enough 11 information to make a determination as to whether or 12 not something was actually COVID related.

So it hasn't been an issue. And a reaffirmation of your interpretation from the last meeting will continue to give me the support and the ability to articulate what to expect moving forward.

Again we have another academy tentatively scheduled to start in January. I don't anticipate, especially just with it being this time of year, that we're going to fill that academy and have people standing by saying we can't get in because of COVID.

I think this interpretation will help us get those candidates sorted out to where they need to be without violating anything.

25 MR. KREIENKAMP: Yeah. And I would just say,

you know, to Board Member Tedrow's point, I mean I
 completely agree that this is a very tough issue.

And this is a tough position for the Board to be in, although I think it's really a tougher position for law enforcement agencies to be in because they're the ones who are sort of dealing with the brunt of this issue.

8 And to the extent that there are concerns 9 that the Board has, I would be happy to sort of 10 exhaustively look at this issue and provide you, you 11 know, a lengthy memorandum that goes through all the different arguments; or even if it's just to you, 12 Board Member Tedrow, I would be happy to do that, you 13 14 know, if that would help, you know, sort of facilitate 15 this as an issue. But I recognize this is a tough 16 spot.

MR. TEDROW: And, John, this is why I always say, especially when I'm down in Santa Fe looking at legislation, I hate the word shall. I really do. But the statute flat out says a person employed as a police officer by any law enforcement agency in this state shall forfeit.

And shall and must take away the wiggle rooms. But I think that there is an avenue under the health emergency.

I would just like to see something expressed from Emergency Management saying that at this time we're allowing law enforcement, because we consider them to be essential to the public safety, you know, time to complete. Many, many times I argued against that word shall.

7 CHIEF JOHNSON: I think we talked about this. 8 I was looking back in the minutes. And it may be 9 somewhat of a separate topic. But I think we kind of 10 lined this out in the last meeting so I'm a little 11 unclear as to why we're talking about this again.

But if we think the easiest route for everybody to feel comfortable with this is to get a letter or some kind of acknowledgment from the Department of Homeland Security, like I can have that done pretty quick.

If a lawyer wouldn't mind typing that, like what we think the language would be that would protect us and protect the agencies, then I can get that over to the Cabinet Secretary for DHSEM. I could get it over there in ten minutes if somebody could type it. DIRECTOR ALZAHARNA: Mr. Tedrow. MR. TEDROW: Yeah. I second John typing

24 something up to get to Tim.

25 DIRECTOR ALZAHARNA: Mr. Tedrow.

1 MR. TEDROW: Yes. 2 DIRECTOR ALZAHARNA: Yes. I just had a 3 question and clarification with reading that. Section 12-10-13 says, "During an emergency a person 4 5 who holds a license, certificate, or other permit that 6 is issued by the state and that evidences the meaning 7 of qualifications for professional, mechanical, or 8 other skills may be credentialed, if appropriate and 9 approved by one of those two agencies." 10 And most of what we're dealing with, these 11 people don't have a license. They don't have a certificate or other permit. The people who do have 12 13 gotten into our CBW academies and we're getting them 14 certified. 15 But if we're getting brand-new recruits who 16 don't have any of that, is that what that says or am I not reading it correctly? 17 MR. TEDROW: The way I see that is we're 18 19 looking at a year anyway where people -- we're giving 20 them the qualifications the first 12 months while they're doing the academy or to get to the academy. 21 22 So we are implicitly saying that they're 23 qualified to be doing the job they're doing right now. 24 That's just where I think we can bypass -- you know, 25 I'm going to say there is no license, certificate, or

1 other permit.

2	But we are currently, as a State and as law
3	enforcement agencies, allowing people to be police
4	officers during that 12 months prior to. So I think,
5	because as a State we already allow it, I think that
6	that gives us the viability to continue the other
7	statute on the 12 months. So that's how I look at it.
8	I would also say I do like Chief Johnson's
9	idea. I would love to see something expressed from
10	Homeland Security & Emergency Management saying that
11	during this time we're tolling that so we can keep
12	people protecting the streets. I think that would
13	give us something at least for now. And I think it
14	operates under the All Hazard Emergency Management
15	Act.
16	CHIEF JOHNSON: So who is typing?
17	SHERIFF MENDOZA: I mean do we need it typed?
18	I would just like to make a motion to interpret that
19	statute to include what's happening in the pandemic.
20	And the Board can determine if they want to go a
21	different route. But I'll make a motion. And if
22	there's no second or approval, then that's fine, we'll
23	go that route.
24	So I'd like to make a motion that the LEA

25 Board interprets the 12-month rule for officers to

obtain certification as tolled in those circumstances where the officer was unable to obtain his or her certification due to the issues with the COVID-19 pandemic.

5 CHIEF JOHNSON: I think we put an expiration 6 date on it at the last meeting. Do we want to do that 7 again, Sheriff? We ran through the end of February.

8 DIRECTOR ALZAHARNA: Secretary Johnson, the 9 end of February was the date I put on I believe for 10 the instructor certifications. I may be wrong.

11 CHIEF JOHNSON: But it was again along these 12 lines, right? Because they were unable to receive the 13 necessary training because of COVID-19 to keep their 14 certifications up-to-date, right? That was like the 15 genesis of why we made that decision at the time or 16 why we were discussing it, which is obviously very 17 similar to this topic.

18 SHERIFF MENDOZA: Tell me the date again,19 Secretary.

20 CHIEF JOHNSON: We said we would reassess 21 February 28.

22 SHERIFF MENDOZA: Okay. Well, with this 23 interpretation to be reassessed February 28, if that 24 makes everybody feel a little bit more comfortable. 25 CHIEF JOHNSON: Let me go back and read that 1 motion really quick.

.

2	SHERIFF MENDOZA: Does anybody need me to
3	repeat the motion or did everybody understand it? If
4	I can't get a second and we don't get a vote, then I
5	guess we move on to other options.
6	MS. MONAHAN: This is Connie. This topic is
7	just over my expertise. I hesitate to weigh in.
8	That's my concern. It's not that I oppose what you're
9	saying, I just am not an expert on this one.
10	MR. KREIENKAMP: Well, what I might suggest,
11	you know, given the concern, you know, I can certainly
12	look at this issue exhaustively and, you know, report
13	back to the Board.
14	And, you know, in the short term I can follow
15	up with Chief Johnson, you know, and Board Member
16	Tedrow. I think that there is the possibility of
17	going this route with the statute that Board Member
18	Tedrow has talked about, this 12-10-13.
19	You know, I can certainly work to draft
20	something and reach out to the appropriate departments
21	to try to set something up like that, you know, with
22	his guidance, if that's how you would like to proceed.
23	CHIEF JOHNSON: So we have another meeting in
24	December, right? Is that accurate?
25	MR. KREIENKAMP: Yes, it is.

1 CHIEF JOHNSON: Sheriff, does that 25 or 30 2 days put you in a bad spot or any agency that you're 3 aware of if we kind of hold off on this until we have 4 a little bit more in hand?

5 SHERIFF MENDOZA: It doesn't put me in a bad 6 spot. I can't speak for every agency in the State of 7 New Mexico. But I'm sure there are people who are 8 pushing the envelope on the 12 months.

9 CHIEF JOHNSON: Director, are you getting any 10 inquiries into that topic that 25 days would hurt? 11 DIRECTOR ALZAHARNA: No, it wouldn't. Nobody 12 who puts in right now anyway could get into an academy 13 until January. So it wouldn't be an issue with me 14 working off of what the Board decided at the last 15 meeting.

MS. MONAHAN: So is what we decided at the NS. MONAHAN: So is what we decided at the last meeting sufficient for now? Why is there an extra level of attention to this now? Counselor, I think that would be a question to you.

20 MR. KREIENKAMP: Yes. So this is only an 21 agenda item because a member of the public basically 22 suggested that the agenda might not have been as 23 specific as he would have liked it to have been at the 24 previous meeting. So that's the reason it's being 25 brought up again.

1 So I'm not sure exactly where we are right 2 now. But I guess just to sort of outline the two 3 options that I would see to resolve this, the Board could move to interpret the statute as it did at the 4 previous meeting or you could maybe move to direct 5 6 your counsel to research this issue and report back to 7 you before the December meeting. That sounds like the 8 two options that are on the table.

9 CHIEF JOHNSON: I suggest we hold off the 25 10 days and try to get that letter if it makes DA Tedrow 11 more comfortable.

MS. MONAHAN: Chief Mendoza, are you willing to retract the motion that you put forth?

14 SHERIFF MENDOZA: I'll retract the motion 15 that I put forth. And we'll talk about it at the next 16 meeting.

MR. TEDROW: John, if I may suggest -- and just so you guys know, I'm not a fan of doing this. And I know Tim knows that. But, man, we operate every day off the statutes. So as law enforcement that's where we get our guidance.

So I think it's important. However, I see an easy fix to this under the emergency clause. And it's like Tim mentioned, if he can have something over there in 15 minutes, I think it gives us all the 1 direction we need at that point.

2 MR. KREIENKAMP: Yeah. I'll start by looking 3 at that and see if that's possible. If it is, I'll run that by the Chair and I'll reach out to the 4 5 Secretary and we'll go from there. CHIEF JOHNSON: So do we need to make a 6 7 motion to push this back until the December meeting? 8 And in the meantime we agree that we're going to try 9 to type up a letter to try to have Homeland Security 10 approve, is that what you're asking for, John? 11 MR. KREIENKAMP: That is one way to resolve 12 I would just ask for just a little bit of it. 13 flexibility. I'm just not sure that I would recommend 14 reaching out to them at this point. But let me look 15 at it and I'll get back to you very quickly on that. 16 But yes, you could make that motion. 17 CHIEF JOHNSON: Okay. I make that motion. 18 MR. TEDROW: John, does such a motion make it 19 so we're automatically on the agenda next month for 20 it, it takes care of public notice and all that? 21 MR. KREIENKAMP: Sure. I mean I think the 22 Director and I are both very clear that this is 23 supposed to be an item of business. So it will be 24 again. But we will need a second and then a roll call 25 vote.

1	MR. TEDROW: Okay. I second.
2	MR. KREIENKAMP: So the Chair has dropped
3	off. I don't think he's able to join us again.
4	Monica, can we get a roll call vote now.
5	MS. MEDRANO: Balderas.
6	(No response.)
7	MS. MEDRANO: Tedrow.
8	MR. TEDROW: Yes.
9	MS. MEDRANO: Johnson.
10	CHIEF JOHNSON: Yes, ma'am.
11	MS. MEDRANO: Mendoza.
12	SHERIFF MENDOZA: Yes.
13	MS. MEDRANO: Garcia.
14	CHIEF GARCIA: Yes.
15	MS. MEDRANO: Anderson.
16	SERGEANT ANDERSON: Yes.
17	MS. MEDRANO: Monahan.
18	MS. MONAHAN: Yes.
19	MS. MEDRANO: Green.
20	DR. GREEN: Yes.
21	MR. KREIENKAMP: Like I said, the Chair is no
22	longer able to be here. So at this point the meeting
23	will be run by the new Vice Chair, Dr. Green.
24	I guess I would just ask for maybe a
25	ten-minute recess so that everybody can take a break.

And I would like to be able to talk to Dr. Green 1 2 before we move to the disciplinary portion of the 3 agenda. 4 DR. GREEN: We're going to take a ten-minute break. We'll resume at 11:01. 5 6 (Recess.) 7 ITEM NO. 12: MARTIN TRUJILLO 8 DR. GREEN: We're moving to item No. 12 on 9 the agenda, which is a hearing on notice of intent to 10 suspend. And the first item No. 12 is Martin 11 Trujillo. Is Martin Trujillo or his counsel present? 12 (No response.) 13 DR. GREEN: This is a matter on the agenda 14 for Martin Trujillo who seeks to address the Board 15 regarding a possible immediate suspension. Pursuant 16 to 10.29.1.11B(1) NMAC, "The director upon being 17 notified that a certified police officer or 18 telecommunicator has been arrested or indicted on any 19 felony charge shall immediately notify the individual 20 of the intent to suspend the certification." 21 Pursuant to the Board's rules, upon receipt 22 of notice, the certified police officer may request to be heard at the next meeting of the Board to present 23 24 any evidence, witnesses, or argument as to why their 25 certification should not be suspended.

1 The formal rules of evidence do not apply to 2 this hearing. But the Board does reserve the right to 3 exclude evidence that is incompetent, irrelevant, or 4 unduly cumulative. Testimony shall be taken under 5 oath. And hearsay evidence shall be considered and 6 given its due weight.

7 The hearing will be conducted in the 8 following manner: First, I will ask the 9 Administrative Prosecutor to identify the felony 10 charges on which the Respondent has been arrested or 11 indicted and to present any necessary supporting 12 documentation as to the fact of that arrest warrant or 13 indictment.

14 Next, the Respondent may present any 15 evidence, witnesses, and argument as to why their 16 certification should not be suspended. I will then 17 permit the Administrative Prosecutor to give a brief 18 argument in response, if he should choose to do so.

This hearing is being held telephonically due to the COVID-19 state of emergency and the executive orders mandating social distancing. Although this hearing is being recorded and will later be transcribed, so that we can keep an accurate record, I am issuing the following instructions.

25 Most importantly, please speak slowly and

enunciate clearly so that the court reporter can hear 1 2 you. Before speaking please state your name first. 3 In general please be respectful of the recording at all times during the hearing. 4 Will the Administrator Prosecutor please 5 6 enter your appearance for the record. 7 MR. DWORAK: Thank you, Dr. Green. My name is Joseph Dworak and I'm the Administrative Prosecutor 8 9 today for these two cases. 10 DR. GREEN: Thank you, Prosecutor Dworak. 11 Will the Respondent please enter your appearance for 12 the record. 13 (No response.) 14 DR. GREEN: Is counsel for the Respondent here for the record? 15 16 (No response.) 17 DR. GREEN: Is the Respondent or counsel here for the record? 18 19 (No response.) 20 DR. GREEN: If they are not here, Administrative Prosecutor, do you have a 21 22 recommendation? 23 MR. DWORAK: Thank you, Madam Vice Chair. 24 I'll provide a very brief factual summary of this case 25 and cite the felony charge that is the reason why

1 we're here today against Mr. Trujillo.

2	Martin Ray Trujillo, Certification
3	No. 93-0194-P. This came while he was a Rio Arriba
4	undersheriff. And on May 21, 2020, law enforcement
5	officers from the Espanola Police Department and the
6	Taos County Sheriff's Department executed a lawful
7	search warrant against Sheriff Lujan in Espanola.
8	Mr. Trujillo, who was the undersheriff at the
9	time, arrived on the scene but was instructed to stay
10	in his vehicle outside the security perimeter.
11	Mr. Trujillo disregarded these instructions,
12	directed his subordinate deputies to respond, and used
13	the code 10-33, indicating that it was a threat or an
14	emergency, requiring that the other officers arrive
15	with lights and sirens activated.
16	Upon the deputies' arrival, Mr. Trujillo
17	instructed his deputies to surround the other law
18	enforcement officers with weapons drawn.
19	I would ask, Madam Vice Chair, that the
20	disciplinary file of the Board, including
21	Mr. Trujillo's Warrant for Arrest and Criminal
22	Complaint, be admitted into the record of this case.
23	And these actions resulting in Mr. Trujillo
24	being charged with criminal solicitation, which is a
25	fourth-degree felony in New Mexico, justifies that the

certification be summarily suspended under the Board's 1 2 rules, 10.29.1.11B(1), pending the outcome of 3 Mr. Trujillo's criminal prosecution. And that's all I have, Madam Vice Chair. 4 5 DR. GREEN: Do I need to receive a motion for this? 6 7 MR. TEDROW: Madam Vice Chair, if I may ask a question for Joseph real quick. Joseph, did they 8 9 receive notice of today's hearing? 10 MR. DWORAK: I believe so. But that would be 11 a procedural question I would direct to the Board's counsel. Our office does not provide notice for these 12 13 hearings. Those all come as an administrative 14 function from the Board. And I believe that they 15 have, but I can't testify to that. 16 MR. TEDROW: John, do you know if notice was sent and received of today's hearing? 17 18 MR. KREIENKAMP: No, Board Member Tedrow. So I would not be involved in sending that notice. I 19 20 would defer to the Director on that. 21 MR. TEDROW: Okay. Madam Director, are you 22 aware? 23 DIRECTOR ALZAHARNA: I'm aware that a 24 separate notice isn't received. That has been the 25 past practice, that when they request it, they are put

1 on the agenda. I followed up and no separate notice 2 was sent. Their request was accepted and put on the 3 agenda.

4 MR. TEDROW: Okay. Thank you. ITEM NO. 13: LORENZO SANCHEZ 5 DR. GREEN: So we will move on to the next 6 7 notice of intent to suspend. And that is item No. 13 8 on the agenda, Lorenzo Sanchez. Is Lorenzo Sanchez here in attendance today? 9 10 (No response.) 11 DR. GREEN: Is the counsel for Lorenzo 12 Sanchez here today? 13 (No response.) 14 DR. GREEN: Mr. Administrative Prosecutor, do 15 you have a statement? 16 MR. DWORAK: Yes, Madam Vice Chair. Thank you very much. This case is Lorenzo Sanchez, 17 Certification No. 18-0104-P. At the time of the 18 19 incident, Mr. Sanchez was a Taos County deputy 20 sheriff. 21 The brief factual summary of the case is that 22 on October 3, 2020, Respondent, Mr. Lorenzo Sanchez, 23 was arrested and charged with four felonies as well as

24 several misdemeanors from an incident where

25 Mr. Sanchez while off duty pursued his girlfriend and

her family in his patrol car with lights and sirens
 on.

Respondent struck the front end of the other vehicle with his patrol car. Respondent also appeared to be intoxicated and refused a breathalyzer test after he was stopped by another law enforcement officer.

8 The four felony charges for Mr. Sanchez 9 included two counts of aggravated assault, a count of 10 aggravated assault against a household member, and 11 battery upon a police officer.

I would ask that the Amended Criminal Complaint and the Board's disciplinary file be submitted into the record for this case. And these four felony charges justify Mr. Sanchez's certification to be suspended under the Board's rules, 10.29.1.11B(1), pending the outcome of Mr. Sanchez's criminal prosecution.

DR. GREEN: Thank you, Mr. Prosecutor.
Director Alzaharna, did this gentleman receive notice
of the hearing today?

22 DIRECTOR ALZAHARNA: No, he did not. Not a 23 separate notice after his request to be heard.

24 DR. GREEN: Yes, Officer.

25 CHIEF JOHNSON: Dr. Green, just real quick, I

1 think before we move on, I find it kind of odd that 2 neither one of them are here today. And I just want 3 to ask, without knowing the exact rules, have we 4 followed everything we were supposed to to make sure 5 that they were made aware of this and that they knew 6 this was happening?

7 DR. GREEN: You're asking the Director? 8 CHIEF JOHNSON: Anybody that has that 9 memorized, either John or Director Alzaharna, yes, 10 ma'am.

DR. GREEN: Is there a requirement to send this certified mail or to acknowledge that they have received the notice of the hearing?

MR. KREIENKAMP: Members of the Board, if I may, I would recommend us discussing this issue in closed session. I think the question right now should be a factual one to the Director, if she's aware the notice was sent. And I will have guidance for you in the closed session on that issue.

DR. GREEN: Okay. In that case I believe that we will now move to closed session. Is that where we are now, sir?

23 MR. DWORAK: Madam Vice Chair, there's one 24 additional point that I would like to make before 25 closing the record on these two cases and before the

1 Board deliberates in closed session.

And I would just ask that in deliberation the Board refer to its rule regarding summary suspensions. Specifically it does state that, when requesting a hearing, that the matter shall be set at the next Board meeting.

7 Our file does not have any notice of hearing, 8 at least not the one that I was provided. But we 9 understood that, because of the request from the 10 Respondents in this case, that it would be set 11 pursuant to the Board's rules for the next Board 12 meeting, which obviously is today.

13 So I don't know how much that will come into 14 play here in your deliberations. But I think that 15 that may assist with some of your discussion in this 16 matter. That's all I have. Thank you.

DR. GREEN: Thank you, sir. At this time do I need a motion to move to closed session? I will entertain a motion to move to closed session.

20 SERGEANT ANDERSON: Hollie Anderson. I move 21 to move the meeting to the closed session, please.

22 MR. KREIENKAMP: So, Members of the Board, 23 just to clarify the motion to enter into closed 24 session, I think ideally should say that you move that 25 the Board go into closed session to discuss those

matters listed on the agenda under executive session 1 2 pursuant to NMSA 1978 and the licensing and pending 3 adjudications exceptions to the Open Meetings Act. 4 DR. GREEN: Do I have a motion on what he just said? 5 6 MR. KREIENKAMP: You could just say so moved. 7 DR. GREEN: So moved. Do I have a second? 8 CHIEF JOHNSON: I'll second, Dr. Green. 9 DR. GREEN: Do we need a roll call vote on 10 that? 11 MR. KREIENKAMP: Yes. 12 DR. GREEN: Monica, can you give us a roll 13 call vote please, ma'am. MS. MEDRANO: Tedrow. 14 15 MR. TEDROW: Yes. 16 MS. MEDRANO: Johnson. 17 CHIEF JOHNSON: Yes, ma'am. MS. MEDRANO: Mendoza. 18 19 SHERIFF MENDOZA: Yes. 20 MS. MEDRANO: Garcia. 21 CHIEF GARCIA: Yes. 22 MS. MEDRANO: Anderson. 23 SERGEANT ANDERSON: Yes. 24 MS. MEDRANO: Monahan. 25 MS. MONAHAN: Yes.

1 MS. MEDRANO: Green.

2 DR. GREEN: Yes. So it has been moved and seconded. We will move to closed session and we will 3 reconvene at some point to be determined. 4 5 (Recess from 11:20 a.m. to 2:05 p.m.) 6 DR. GREEN: The Board is now in open session. 7 I affirm that while in closed session we discussed 8 only those matters specified in the motion and listed 9 on the agenda under executive session in accordance with NMSA 1978 Section 10-15-1(H). 10 11 ITEM NO. 14: MARTIN TRUJILLO 12 DR. GREEN: All right. Regarding the issue 13 of Martin Trujillo, do I have a motion? 14 SERGEANT ANDERSON: Yes, Ms. Vice Chair. This is Hollie Anderson. I move that the Board 15 16 temporarily and immediately suspend the certification of Martin Trujillo pursuant to 10.29.1.11B(1) NMAC up 17 18 until the conclusion of the Board's full disciplinary 19 process and notify the Respondent that he may again 20 request to be heard at the next meeting of the Board 21 in December. 22 The issue before the Board is the fact of the 23 Respondent's felony charge. The felony charges are 24 serious allegations. And the fact of the Respondent's

25 arrest impairs his ability to perform the duties of a

1 law enforcement officer.

2	I further move to direct the Board's counsel
3	to prepare and the Vice Chair to sign a written order
4	summarizing this decision, including findings of fact
5	and conclusions of law. The suspension shall begin on
6	the date of service of the order.
7	DIRECTOR ALZAHARNA: Vice Chair.
8	DR. GREEN: Yes.
9	DIRECTOR ALZAHARNA: I didn't know if we
10	needed a voice roll call to go back into open session.
11	DR. GREEN: We do. My apologies. Roll call,
12	please. Monica Medrano, would you please call the
13	roll. I apologize.
14	MS. MEDRANO: Tedrow.
15	MR. TEDROW: Yes.
16	MS. MEDRANO: Johnson.
17	CHIEF JOHNSON: Yes, ma'am.
18	MS. MEDRANO: Mendoza.
19	SHERIFF MENDOZA: Yes.
20	MS. MEDRANO: Garcia.
21	CHIEF GARCIA: Yes.
22	MS. MEDRANO: Anderson.
23	SERGEANT ANDERSON: Yes.
24	MS. MEDRANO: Monahan.
25	MS. MONAHAN: Yes.

1 MS. MEDRANO: Green. 2 DR. GREEN: Yes. Thank you, Director. 3 All right. There is a motion on the floor 4 from Sergeant Anderson regarding Martin Trujillo. Do I have a second for that motion? 5 6 CHIEF JOHNSON: Dr. Green, this is Tim 7 Johnson. I second that. 8 DR. GREEN: All right. Thank you. It has 9 been moved and seconded. Do we need a roll call for 10 these motions? 11 MR. KREIENKAMP: Yes. Unfortunately, we do. 12 DR. GREEN: Okay. Ms. Medrano, could you 13 please call the roll. MS. MEDRANO: Tedrow. 14 15 MR. TEDROW: Yes. 16 MS. MEDRANO: Johnson. 17 CHIEF JOHNSON: Yes, ma'am. MS. MEDRANO: Mendoza. 18 19 SHERIFF MENDOZA: Yes. 20 MS. MEDRANO: Garcia. 21 CHIEF GARCIA: Yes. 22 MS. MEDRANO: Anderson. 23 SERGEANT ANDERSON: Yes. MS. MEDRANO: Monahan. 24 25 MS. MONAHAN: Yes.

1 MS. MEDRANO: Green. 2 DR. GREEN: Yes. The motion. 3 ITEM NO. 15: LORENZO SANCHEZ 4 DR. GREEN: Lorenzo Sanchez, that's item 5 20-046, do I have a motion regarding Lorenzo Sanchez? CHIEF JOHNSON: Dr. Green, this is Tim 6 7 Johnson. I move that the Board temporarily and 8 immediately suspend the certification of Lorenzo 9 Sanchez pursuant to 10.29.1.11B(1) NMAC up until the 10 conclusion of the Board's full disciplinary process 11 and notify the Respondent that he may again request to 12 be heard at the next meeting of the Board in December. 13 The issue before the Board is the fact of the 14 Respondent's felony charges. The felony charges are serious allegations. And the fact of the Respondent's 15 16 arrest impairs his ability to perform the duties of a 17 law enforcement officer. I further move to direct the Board's counsel 18

19 to prepare and the Vice Chair to sign a written order 20 summarizing this decision including findings of fact 21 and conclusions of law. The suspension shall begin on 22 the date of service of the order.

23 DR. GREEN: I have a motion. Do I have a 24 second?

25 MS. MONAHAN: This is Connie Monahan. I

1 second that motion.

2	DR. GREEN: All right. It's moved and
3	seconded. Ms. Medrano, please call the roll.
4	MS. MEDRANO: Tedrow.
5	MR. TEDROW: Yes.
6	MS. MEDRANO: Johnson.
7	CHIEF JOHNSON: Yes, ma'am.
8	MS. MEDRANO: Mendoza.
9	SHERIFF MENDOZA: Yes.
10	MS. MEDRANO: Garcia.
11	CHIEF GARCIA: Yes.
12	MS. MEDRANO: Anderson.
13	SERGEANT ANDERSON: Yes.
14	MS. MEDRANO: Monahan.
15	MS. MONAHAN: Yes.
16	MS. MEDRANO: Green.
17	DR. GREEN: Yes. All right.
18	ITEM NO. 17: BRIAN SCHAMBER
19	DR. GREEN: Regarding the matter of Brian
20	Schamber, I will accept a motion on item No. 17. Do I
21	have a motion?
22	SHERIFF MENDOZA: Vice Chair, this is Sheriff
23	Mendoza. In the matter of Brian Schamber, I would
24	like to make a motion to acknowledge his
25	relinquishment and deny his appeal.

1 DR. GREEN: Say that again, Sheriff Mendoza. 2 SHERIFF MENDOZA: I make a motion to 3 acknowledge his relinquishment of his certification and deny his appeal. 4 DR. GREEN: Thank you, sir. Do I have a 5 6 second? 7 MS. MONAHAN: This is Connie Monahan. I 8 second that motion. 9 DR. GREEN: Ms. Medrano, please call the 10 roll. 11 MS. MEDRANO: Tedrow. MR. TEDROW: Yes. 12 13 MS. MEDRANO: Johnson. 14 CHIEF JOHNSON: Yes, ma'am. 15 MS. MEDRANO: Mendoza. 16 SHERIFF MENDOZA: Yes. 17 MS. MEDRANO: Garcia. 18 CHIEF GARCIA: Yes. 19 MS. MEDRANO: Anderson. 20 SERGEANT ANDERSON: Yes. 21 MS. MEDRANO: Monahan. 22 MS. MONAHAN: Yes. 23 MS. MEDRANO: Green. DR. GREEN: Yes. Thank you. 24 11 25

1	ITEM NO. 18: JOSE OJEDA
2	DR. GREEN: We're moving on to item No. 18
3	regarding Jose Ojeda. Do I have a motion regarding
4	Jose Ojeda?
5	CHIEF JOHNSON: Dr. Green, this is Tim
6	Johnson. I would like to make a motion to accept the
7	voluntary relinquishment by Jose Ojeda.
8	CHIEF GARCIA: This is Chief Garcia. I
9	second.
10	DR. GREEN: All right. It's been moved and
11	seconded. Ms. Medrano.
12	MS. MEDRANO: Tedrow.
13	MR. TEDROW: Yes.
14	MS. MEDRANO: Johnson.
15	CHIEF JOHNSON: Yes.
16	MS. MEDRANO: Mendoza.
17	SHERIFF MENDOZA: Yes.
18	MS. MEDRANO: Garcia.
19	CHIEF GARCIA: Yes.
20	MS. MEDRANO: Anderson.
21	SERGEANT ANDERSON: Yes.
22	MS. MEDRANO: Monahan.
23	MS. MONAHAN: Yes.
24	MS. MEDRANO: Green.
25	DR. GREEN: Yes.

1 ITEM NO. 19: WILLIAM GONZALES 2 DR. GREEN: Moving on to item 19 regarding 3 William Gonzales, before I proceed with the motion, I would like to recuse myself. And then I'll proceed 4 with the motion regarding William Gonzales. Do I have 5 6 a motion? 7 SERGEANT ANDERSON: Yes, Madam Vice Chair. 8 Hollie Anderson. I move not to accept the voluntary 9 relinquishment of the certification and refer for a 10 hearing. 11 DR. GREEN: Do I have a second? 12 CHIEF JOHNSON: Dr. Green, this is Tim Johnson. I second that. 13 14 DR. GREEN: All right. It's been moved and seconded. Ms. Medrano, please call the roll. 15 16 MS. MEDRANO: Tedrow. 17 MR. TEDROW: Yes. MS. MEDRANO: Johnson. 18 19 CHIEF JOHNSON: Yes. 20 MS. MEDRANO: Mendoza. 21 SHERIFF MENDOZA: Yes. 22 MS. MEDRANO: Garcia. 23 CHIEF GARCIA: Yes. 24 MS. MEDRANO: Anderson. 25 SERGEANT ANDERSON: Yes.

1 MS. MEDRANO: Monahan. 2 MS. MONAHAN: Yes. 3 MS. MEDRANO: Green. DR. GREEN: Green recuses. 4 ITEM NO. 10: BRANDON NOLEN 5 DR. GREEN: Regarding item 20, Brandon Nolen, 6 do I have a motion? 7 8 CHIEF JOHNSON: Dr. Green, this is Tim 9 Johnson. I would like to make a motion to revoke the 10 certification of Brandon Nolen. 11 DR. GREEN: Thank you, Chief. Do I have a 12 second? 13 SHERIFF MENDOZA: This is Sheriff Mendoza. I 14 second the motion. 15 DR. GREEN: Thank you, Sheriff Mendoza. 16 Ms. Medrano, please call the roll. 17 MS. MEDRANO: Tedrow. 18 MR. TEDROW: Yes. 19 MS. MEDRANO: Johnson. 20 CHIEF JOHNSON: Yes. 21 MS. MEDRANO: Mendoza. 22 SHERIFF MENDOZA: Yes. 23 MS. MEDRANO: Garcia. 24 CHIEF GARCIA: Yes. 25 MS. MEDRANO: Anderson.

1 SERGEANT ANDERSON: Yes. 2 MS. MEDRANO: Monahan. 3 MS. MONAHAN: Yes. MS. MEDRANO: Green. 4 DR. GREEN: Yes. 5 ITEM NO. 21: MARK TARANTINO 6 7 DR. GREEN: Item 21, Mark Tarantino, do I have a motion regarding Mark Tarantino? 8 MR. TEDROW: Madam Vice Chair Green, this is 9 10 Board Member Rick Tedrow. At this time I would move 11 that we dismiss the allegations and the charge brought 12 before Mr. Tarantino as recommended by the prosecutor 13 in this case. 14 DR. GREEN: I have a motion. Thank you, DA 15 Tedrow. Do I have a second? 16 SHERIFF MENDOZA: This is Sheriff Mendoza. I second that motion. 17 18 DR. GREEN: I have a motion and a second. 19 Thank you, Sheriff Mendoza. Ms. Medrano, please call 20 the roll. 21 MS. MEDRANO: Tedrow. 22 MR. TEDROW: Yes. 23 MS. MEDRANO: Johnson. 24 CHIEF JOHNSON: Yes, ma'am. 25 MS. MEDRANO: Mendoza.

1 SHERIFF MENDOZA: Yes. 2 MS. MEDRANO: Garcia. 3 CHIEF GARCIA: Yes. MS. MEDRANO: Anderson. 4 SERGEANT ANDERSON: Yes. 5 6 MS. MEDRANO: Monahan. 7 MS. MONAHAN: Yes. 8 MS. MEDRANO: Green. 9 DR. GREEN: Yes. ITEM NO. 22: FRANK METHOLA 10 DR. GREEN: Item No. 22 is the matter 11 12 regarding Frank Methola do I have a motion regarding 13 Frank Methola? 14 CHIEF JOHNSON: Dr. Green, this is Tim 15 Johnson. I would like to make a motion to dismiss. 16 DR. GREEN: Thank you, Chief Johnson. Do I have a second? 17 SERGEANT ANDERSON: Yes, ma'am. Hollie 18 19 Anderson. I'll second. 20 DR. GREEN: Thank you. It's been moved and seconded. Ms. Medrano, please call the roll. 21 22 MS. MEDRANO: Tedrow. 23 MR. TEDROW: Yes. MS. MEDRANO: Johnson. 24 25 CHIEF JOHNSON: Yes, ma'am.

1 MS. MEDRANO: Mendoza. 2 SHERIFF MENDOZA: Yes. 3 MS. MEDRANO: Garcia. CHIEF GARCIA: Yes. 4 5 MS. MEDRANO: Monahan. 6 MS. MONAHAN: Yes. 7 MS. MEDRANO: Anderson. 8 SERGEANT ANDERSON: Yes. 9 MS. MEDRANO: Green. 10 DR. GREEN: Yes. 11 ITEM NO. 23: JESSICA TURNER 12 DR. GREEN: All right. We're moving on to 13 item 23 regarding Jessica Turner. Do I have a motion 14 on Jessica Turner? 15 SHERIFF MENDOZA: Ms. Vice Chair, this is 16 Sheriff Mendoza. I make a motion to accept the relinquishment of certification for Jessica Turner. 17 18 DR. GREEN: All right. Thank you, Sheriff 19 Mendoza. Do I have a second? 20 MS. MONAHAN: Madam Vice Chair, this is 21 Connie. I second that motion. 22 DR. GREEN: Thank you, Board Member Monahan. 23 Ms. Medrano, please. 24 MS. MEDRANO: Tedrow. 25 MR. TEDROW: Yes.

1 MS. MEDRANO: Garcia. 2 CHIEF GARCIA: Yes. 3 MS. MEDRANO: Johnson. CHIEF JOHNSON: Abstain. 4 5 MS. MEDRANO: Mendoza. 6 SHERIFF MENDOZA: Yes. 7 MS. MEDRANO: Anderson. 8 SERGEANT ANDERSON: Yes. 9 MS. MEDRANO: Monahan. 10 MS. MONAHAN: Yes. 11 MS. MEDRANO: Green. 12 DR. GREEN: Yes. ITEM NO. 24: DANIEL LOPEZ 13 14 DR. GREEN: Moving to item 24 regarding 15 Daniel Lopez, do I have a motion regarding Daniel 16 Lopez? 17 MR. TEDROW: Madam Vice Chair Green, this is 18 Board Member Rick Tedrow. At this time I would move 19 that we dismiss the allegations as brought forth on 20 Daniel Lopez. And I would cite the dismissal based 21 off the prosecutor's lack of sufficient evidence to 22 proceed. 23 DR. GREEN: All right. Thank you. Do I have 24 a second? 25 CHIEF JOHNSON: Dr. Green, this is Tim

1 Johnson. I second that.

2	DR. GREEN: Thank you. It's been moved and
3	seconded. Ms. Medrano, please call the roll.
4	MS. MEDRANO: Tedrow.
5	MR. TEDROW: Yes.
6	MS. MEDRANO: Johnson.
7	CHIEF JOHNSON: Yes.
8	MS. MEDRANO: Mendoza.
9	SHERIFF MENDOZA: Yes.
10	MS. MEDRANO: Garcia.
11	CHIEF GARCIA: Yes.
12	MS. MEDRANO: Anderson.
13	SERGEANT ANDERSON: Yes.
14	MS. MEDRANO: Monahan.
15	MS. MONAHAN: Yes.
16	MS. MEDRANO: Green.
17	DR. GREEN: Yes.
18	ITEM NO. 25: LEONARD ARMIJO
19	DR. GREEN: All right. Regarding the matter
20	of Leonard Armijo, do I have a motion regarding
21	Leonard Armijo?
22	CHIEF JOHNSON: Dr. Green, this is Tim
23	Johnson. I make a motion to dismiss similar to what
24	DA Tedrow indicated. I make this motion to dismiss
25	based on how the prosecutor articulated that there's a

1 lack of evidence to proceed.

2 DR. GREEN: Thank you, Chief Johnson. Do I 3 have a second? MS. MONAHAN: Madam Vice Chair, this is 4 Connie Monahan. I second that. 5 6 DR. GREEN: Thank you, Board Member Monahan. 7 We have a motion and a second. Ms. Medrano. 8 MS. MEDRANO: Tedrow. MR. TEDROW: Yes. 9 10 MS. MEDRANO: Johnson. 11 CHIEF JOHNSON: Yes. 12 MS. MEDRANO: Mendoza. 13 SHERIFF MENDOZA: Yes. MS. MEDRANO: Garcia. 14 15 CHIEF GARCIA: Yes. 16 MS. MEDRANO: Anderson. 17 SERGEANT ANDERSON: Yes. MS. MEDRANO: Monahan. 18 19 MS. MONAHAN: Yes. 20 MS. MEDRANO: Green. 21 DR. GREEN: Yes. 22 ITEM NO. 26: ROSLYN VIGIL 23 DR. GREEN: Moving to item No. 26, Roslyn 24 Vigil, do I have a motion regarding Roslyn Vigil? 25 SERGEANT ANDERSON: Yes, ma'am. Hollie

1 Anderson. I move to revoke the certification for 2 Roslyn Vigil. 3 DR. GREEN: All right. Thank you, Sergeant Anderson. We have a motion. Do we have a second? 4 CHIEF GARCIA: This is Chief Garcia. I 5 6 second. 7 DR. GREEN: We have a motion and a second. 8 Ms. Medrano. 9 MS. MEDRANO: Tedrow. 10 MR. TEDROW: Yes. 11 MS. MEDRANO: Johnson. 12 CHIEF JOHNSON: Abstain. 13 MS. MEDRANO: Mendoza. 14 SHERIFF MENDOZA: Yes. 15 MS. MEDRANO: Garcia. 16 CHIEF GARCIA: Yes. 17 MS. MEDRANO: Anderson. SERGEANT ANDERSON: Yes. 18 19 MS. MEDRANO: Monahan. 20 MS. MONAHAN: Yes. MS. MEDRANO: Green. 21 22 DR. GREEN: Yes. ITEM NO. 27: JOSHUA MARCHAND 23 24 DR. GREEN: Item 27 regarding Joshua 25 Marchand, do we have a motion on Joshua Marchand?

1 SHERIFF MENDOZA: Vice Chair, this is Sheriff 2 Mendoza. In the matter of Joshua Marchand, I make a 3 motion to accept the recommendation of revocation. 4 DR. GREEN: Thank you. We have a motion. Do 5 we have a second? 6 CHIEF JOHNSON: Dr. Green, this is Tim Johnson. I second that. 7 8 DR. GREEN: Thank you, Chief Johnson. 9 Ms. Medrano. 10 MS. MEDRANO: Tedrow. 11 MR. TEDROW: Yes. MS. MEDRANO: Johnson. 12 13 CHIEF JOHNSON: Yes. 14 MS. MEDRANO: Mendoza. 15 SHERIFF MENDOZA: Yes. 16 MS. MEDRANO: Garcia. CHIEF GARCIA: Yes. 17 18 MS. MEDRANO: Anderson. 19 SERGEANT ANDERSON: Yes. 20 MS. MEDRANO: Monahan. 21 MS. MONAHAN: Yes. 22 MS. MEDRANO: Green. 23 DR. GREEN: Yes. ITEM N. 28: JOSHUA FLORES 24 25 DR. GREEN: Item 28 is regarding Joshua

Flores. Do I have a motion regarding Joshua Flores? 1 2 CHIEF JOHNSON: Dr. Green, this is Tim 3 Johnson. I would like to make a motion to accept the pre-settlement agreement of a 200-day suspension for 4 5 Mr. Joshua Flores. 6 DR. GREEN: Thank you, Chief. Do I have a 7 second? 8 MS. MONAHAN: Madam Vice, I second that 9 motion. 10 DR. GREEN: Thank you, Board Member Monahan. 11 Ms. Medrano, please call the roll. 12 MS. MEDRANO: Tedrow. MR. TEDROW: Yes. 13 MS. MEDRANO: Johnson. 14 15 CHIEF JOHNSON: Yes. 16 MS. MEDRANO: Mendoza. SHERIFF MENDOZA: Yes. 17 18 MS. MEDRANO: Garcia. 19 CHIEF GARCIA: Yes. 20 MS. MEDRANO: Anderson. 21 SERGEANT ANDERSON: Yes. 22 MS. MEDRANO: Monahan. 23 MS. MONAHAN: Yes. 24 MS. MEDRANO: Green. 25 DR. GREEN: Abstain.

1	ITEM NO. 29: ADALIDA LOPEZ
2	DR. GREEN: All right. Item No. 29 regarding
3	the matter of Adalida Lopez, do I have a motion on
4	Adalida Lopez?
5	SERGEANT ANDERSON: Yes, ma'am. Hollie
6	Anderson. I would move to suspend Adalida Lopez's
7	certification for a period of 90 days.
8	DR. GREEN: Thank you, Sergeant Anderson. Do
9	I have a second on that motion?
10	SHERIFF MENDOZA: This is Sheriff Mendoza.
11	I'll second that motion.
12	DR. GREEN: Thank you, Sheriff Mendoza.
13	Ms. Medrano, please call the roll.
14	MS. MEDRANO: Tedrow.
15	MR. TEDROW: Yes.
16	MS. MEDRANO: Johnson.
17	CHIEF JOHNSON: Yes, ma'am.
18	MS. MEDRANO: Mendoza.
19	SHERIFF MENDOZA: Yes.
20	MS. MEDRANO: Garcia.
21	CHIEF GARCIA: Yes.
22	MS. MEDRANO: Anderson.
23	SERGEANT ANDERSON: I'm sorry. I'm having
24	some internet issues, if you called for me.
25	MS. MEDRANO: Yes.

1 SERGEANT ANDERSON: Yes, ma'am. 2 MS. MEDRANO: Monahan. 3 MS. MONAHAN: Yes. MS. MEDRANO: Green. 4 DR. GREEN: Yes. 5 6 ITEM NO. 30: RYAN VILLEGAS 7 DR. GREEN: Moving on to item 30 regarding 8 the matter of Ryan Villegas, do we have a motion on 9 Ryan Villegas? 10 SHERIFF MENDOZA: Ms. Vice Chair, Sheriff 11 Mendoza. I make a motion to reject the proposed 12 settlement agreement and refer for prosecution. 13 DR. GREEN: Thank you, Sheriff Mendoza. Do I 14 have a second? 15 SERGEANT ANDERSON: Yes, ma'am. Hollie 16 Anderson. I second. 17 DR. GREEN: Thank you, Sergeant Anderson. Ms. Medrano, please call the roll. 18 19 MS. MEDRANO: Tedrow. 20 MR. TEDROW: Yes. MS. MEDRANO: Johnson. 21 22 CHIEF JOHNSON: Yes. 23 MS. MEDRANO: Mendoza. 24 SHERIFF MENDOZA: Yes. 25 MS. MEDRANO: Garcia.

1 CHIEF GARCIA: Yes. 2 MS. MEDRANO: Anderson. SERGEANT ANDERSON: Yes. 3 MS. MEDRANO: Monahan. 4 MS. MONAHAN: Yes. 5 MS. MEDRANO: Green. 6 7 DR. GREEN: Yes. 8 ITEM NO. 31: JORDAN REYES 9 DR. GREEN: Item 31 regarding Jordan Reyes, 10 do I have a motion on Jordan Reyes? 11 CHIEF JOHNSON: Dr. Green, this is Tim 12 Johnson. I would like to make a motion to dismiss. 13 DR. GREEN: Thank you, Chief Johnson. Do I 14 have a second? 15 MR. TEDROW: Madam Vice Chair Green, this is Board Member Rick Tedrow. I would second that motion. 16 17 DR. GREEN: Ms. Medrano. MS. MEDRANO: Tedrow. 18 19 MR. TEDROW: Yes. 20 MS. MEDRANO: Johnson. 21 CHIEF JOHNSON: Yes. 22 MS. MEDRANO: Mendoza. 23 SHERIFF MENDOZA: Yes. 24 MS. MEDRANO: Garcia. 25 CHIEF GARCIA: Yes.

1 MS. MEDRANO: Anderson. 2 SERGEANT ANDERSON: Yes. 3 MS. MEDRANO: Monahan. MS. MONAHAN: Yes. 4 MS. MEDRANO: Green. 5 DR. GREEN: Yes. 6 7 ITEM NO. 32: MICHAEL ROMERO 8 DR. GREEN: Regarding item 32, Michael 9 Romero, do I have a motion regarding Michael Romero? 10 CHIEF GARCIA: This is Chief Garcia. I make 11 a motion to uphold revocation. 12 DR. GREEN: Thank you, Chief Garcia. Do I 13 have a second? 14 MS. MONAHAN: Madam Vice Chair, this is 15 Connie Monahan. I second that. 16 DR. GREEN: Thank you, Board Member Monahan. Ms. Medrano. 17 18 MS. MEDRANO: Tedrow. 19 MR. TEDROW: Yes. 20 MS. MEDRANO: Johnson. 21 CHIEF JOHNSON: Yes. 22 MS. MEDRANO: Mendoza. 23 SHERIFF MENDOZA: Yes. 24 MS. MEDRANO: Garcia. 25 CHIEF GARCIA: Yes.

1 MS. MEDRANO: Anderson. 2 SERGEANT ANDERSON: Yes. 3 MS. MEDRANO: Monahan. MS. MONAHAN: Yes. 4 MS. MEDRANO: Green. 5 DR. GREEN: Yes. 6 7 ITEM NO. 33: DANIEL VASQUEZ 8 DR. GREEN: Item 33 is Daniel Vasquez. Do I 9 have a motion regarding Daniel Vasquez? 10 CHIEF JOHNSON: Dr. Green, this is Tim 11 Johnson. I'd like to make a motion to approve the 12 default revocation. 13 DR. GREEN: Thank you, Chief Johnson. Do I 14 have a second? 15 MR. TEDROW: Madam Vice Chair Green, this is Board Member Rick Tedrow. I will second that motion. 16 17 DR. GREEN: Thank you, DA Tedrow. 18 Ms. Medrano. 19 MS. MEDRANO: Tedrow. 20 MR. TEDROW: Yes. 21 MS. MEDRANO: Johnson. 22 CHIEF JOHNSON: Yes. 23 MS. MEDRANO: Mendoza. 24 SHERIFF MENDOZA: Yes. 25 MS. MEDRANO: Garcia.

1 CHIEF GARCIA: Yes. 2 MS. MEDRANO: Anderson. SERGEANT ANDERSON: Yes. 3 MS. MEDRANO: Monahan. 4 MS. MONAHAN: Yes. 5 MS. MEDRANO: Green. 6 7 DR. GREEN: Yes. 8 ITEM NO. 34: CODY LATTIN 9 DR. GREEN: Item 34 regarding Cody Lattin, I 10 need a motion on Cody Lattin. Do I have a motion? 11 MR. TEDROW: Madam Vice Chair Green, this is 12 Board Member Rick Tedrow. At this time I would move 13 this Board to dismiss on Cody Lattin. 14 DR. GREEN: Thank you, DA Tedrow. Do I have 15 a second? 16 CHIEF GARCIA: This is Chief Garcia. I 17 second. 18 DR. GREEN: Thank you, Chief Garcia. 19 Ms. Medrano. 20 MS. MEDRANO: Tedrow. MR. TEDROW: Yes. 21 22 MS. MEDRANO: Johnson. 23 CHIEF JOHNSON: Yes. 24 MS. MEDRANO: Mendoza. 25 SHERIFF MENDOZA: Abstain.

1 MS. MEDRANO: Garcia. 2 CHIEF GARCIA: Yes. 3 MS. MEDRANO: Anderson. SERGEANT ANDERSON: Yes. 4 5 MS. MEDRANO: Monahan. 6 MS. MONAHAN: Yes. 7 MS. MEDRANO: Green. 8 DR. GREEN: Yes. 9 ITEM NO. 35: CHRISTOPHER McCORD 10 DR. GREEN: Item No. 35 regarding Christopher 11 McCord, do I have a motion on Christopher McCord? 12 MR. TEDROW: Madam Vice Chair Green, this is 13 Board Member Rick Tedrow. At this time I would move 14 to dismiss the complaint against Christopher McCord. 15 DR. GREEN: Thank you, DA Tedrow. Do I have 16 a second? 17 CHIEF GARCIA: This is Chief Garcia. I second the motion. 18 19 DR. GREEN: Thank you, Chief Garcia. 20 Ms. Medrano, please. 21 MS. MEDRANO: Tedrow. 22 MR. TEDROW: Yes. 23 MS. MEDRANO: Johnson. 24 CHIEF JOHNSON: Yes. 25 MS. MEDRANO: Mendoza.

1 SHERIFF MENDOZA: Abstain. 2 MS. MEDRANO: Garcia. 3 CHIEF GARCIA: Yes. MS. MEDRANO: Anderson. 4 SERGEANT ANDERSON: Yes. 5 6 MS. MEDRANO: Monahan. 7 MS. MONAHAN: Yes. 8 MS. MEDRANO: Green. 9 DR. GREEN: Yes. We have reached the end of our items on the 10 11 agenda. And I believe, if I'm not mistaken, Counsel, 12 that concludes our meeting. And I'll take a motion to 13 adjourn. Yes. Chief Johnson. CHIEF JOHNSON: Dr. Green, I think we missed 14 15 one and I think I might have messed this up. 16 ITEM NO. 16: LORENZO SANCHEZ 17 CHIEF JOHNSON: So if we look at agenda item 18 No. 16, that was the second case involving Mr. Lorenzo 19 Sanchez. That was a case that we had heard 20 previously. 21 But regarding agenda item No. 16, I would 22 make a motion that we remove or revoke our stipulated agreement with him regarding item No. 15. 23 DR. GREEN: Okay. Thank you for the 24 25 clarification. It's been moved on item 16 by Chief

109

1 Johnson. Do I have a second? 2 SERGEANT ANDERSON: Hollie Anderson. I'll 3 second. 4 DR. GREEN: Thank you, Sergeant Anderson. So we have a motion and a second on item 16. 5 Ms. Medrano. 6 7 MS. MEDRANO: Tedrow. 8 MR. TEDROW: Yes. 9 MS. MEDRANO: Johnson. 10 CHIEF JOHNSON: Yes. 11 MS. MEDRANO: Mendoza. 12 SHERIFF MENDOZA: Yes. 13 MS. MEDRANO: Garcia. 14 CHIEF GARCIA: Yes. 15 MS. MEDRANO: Anderson. 16 SERGEANT ANDERSON: Yes. MS. MEDRANO: Monahan. 17 MS. MONAHAN: Yes. 18 19 MS. MEDRANO: Green. 20 DR. GREEN: Yes. ITEM NO. 36: ADJOURNMENT 21 22 DR. GREEN: I believe that now really does 23 conclude our items. I would like to say thank you to 24 the Board Members for making my first attempt at this 25 very pleasant. I appreciate your support. And,

110

1 Counselor John, I thank you too.

Do we have any other things that we need to discuss? That's it. A motion to adjourn. MR. TEDROW: So moved. DR. GREEN: It's been moved. Do I have a second? All in favor. Do we need a roll call? MR. KREIENKAMP: No. You can just say we're adjourning. DR. GREEN: We're out of here. Thank you. I appreciate it. (The meeting adjourned at 2:35 p.m.)

1	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
2	
3	I, JAN A. WILLIAMS, New Mexico CCR #14, DO
4	HEREBY CERTIFY that on November 12, 2020, the
5	proceedings in the above matter were taken before me,
6	that I did report in stenographic shorthand the
7	proceedings set forth herein, and the foregoing pages
8	are a true and correct transcription to the best of my
9	ability.
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	JAN A. WILLIAMS, RPR New Mexico CCR #14
23	License Expires: 12/31/20
24	
25	

Exhibit A

Certification #	Name	Academy	Agency
20-0190-P	Benard, Nevil R.	SNMLEA #44	Mountainair PD
20-0191-P	Brito, Enrique Jr.	SNMLEA #44	Hidalgo County SO
20-0192-P	Budrow, Timothy	SNMLEA #44	Lovington PD
20-0193-P	Careri, Frank	SNMLEA #44	Clovis PD
20-0194-P	Cargile, Quinn	SNMLEA #44	Hobbs PD
20-0195-P	Carreon, Roberto	SNMLEA #44	Hobbs PD
20-0196-P	Chavez, Damon	SNMLEA #44	Hobbs PD
20-0197-P	Hellwege, Patrick	SNMLEA #44	NM Dept. Game & Fish
20-0198-P	Hill, Kyle	SNMLEA #44	Hobbs PD
20-0199-P	Honorato, Elijio	SNMLEA #44	Clovis PD
20-0200-P	Kennard, John G.	SNMLEA #44	Chaves County SO
20-0201-P	Kirby, Chase	SNMLEA #44	Hobbs PD
20-0202-P	Lopez, Alexis	SNMLEA #44	Clovis PD
20-0203-P	Nava, Isaac	SNMLEA #44	Chaves County SO
20-0204-P	Pierpoint, Daniel	SNMLEA #44	Lea County SO
20-0205-P	Reyes, Isaac	SNMLEA #44	NM Dept. Game & Fish
20-0206-P	Rice, Kerry A.	SNMLEA #44	NM EMNRD - State Parks
20-0207-P	Rodriguez, Iris	SNMLEA #44	Portales PD
20-0208-P	Saffell, Corey	SNMLEA #44	Jal PD
20-0209-P	Trudeau, Daniel J.	SNMLEA #44	Clovis PD
20-0210-P	Wilson, Jenny R	SNMLEA #44	Portales PD

Certification #	Name	Academy	Agency
20-0211-P	Ahlheim, Justin	NMLEA BPOT #200	Grants PD
20-0212-P	Baeza, Brandon	NMLEA BPOT #200	Luna County SO
20-0213-P	Bowman, Elijah T.	NMLEA BPOT #200	Gallup PD
20-0214-P	Branch, Nicholas	NMLEA BPOT #200	Santa Fe County Sheriff's Office
20-0215-P	Carreon, Alejandro I	NMLEA BPOT #200	Truth or Consequences PD
20-0216-P	Conway, Cody	NMLEA BPOT #200	Ruidoso Downs PD
20-0217-P	Corriz, Johnnie R.	NMLEA BPOT #200	Pojoaque Tribal PD
20-0218-P	Corriz, Marcos	NMLEA BPOT #200	Pojoaque Tribal PD
20-0219-P	DeLa Torre, Xavier J.	NMLEA BPOT #200	NM EMNRD - State Parks
20-0220-P	Dillinger, Justin V.	NMLEA BPOT #200	Santa Fe County SO
20-0221-P	Eden, Jessica L.	NMLEA BPOT #200	Santa Fe PD
20-0222-P	Fasanella, Elia J.	NMLEA BPOT #200	Las Vegas PD
20-0223-P	Forkner, Patrick J.	NMLEA BPOT #200	Cibola County SO
20-0224-P	Frentzel, Dylan J.	NMLEA BPOT #200	NM EMNRD - State Parks
20-0225-P	Gonzalez, Hugo	NMLEA BPOT #200	Roswell PD
20-0226-P	Harvey, Austin	NMLEA BPOT #200	Colfax County SO
20-0227-P	Jones, Kaleb	NMLEA BPOT #200	Otero County SO
20-0228-P	Juarez, Joel S.	NMLEA BPOT #200	Roswell PD
20-0229-P	King, Gerald D.	NMLEA BPOT #200	Las Vegas PD
20-0230-P	Long, Cameron	NMLEA BPOT #200	Gallup PD
20-0231-P	Manzanares, Paul M.	NMLEA BPOT #200	Santa Fe PD
20-0232-P	Martinez, Anthony G.	NMLEA BPOT #200	Espanola PD
20-0233-P	Martinez, Yvonne	NMLEA BPOT #200 Otero County SO	
20-0234-P	Myrick, Jonathan A.	NMLEA BPOT #200	Moriarty PD
20-0235-P	Naranjo, Antonio G.	NMLEA BPOT #200	Santa Fe County SO
20-0236-P	Ovalle, Charles	NMLEA BPOT #200	Santa Fe PD
20-0237-Р	Quintana, Cesar	NMLEA BPOT #200	Torrance County SO
20-0238-P	Rankin, Alex	NMLEA BPOT #200	Otero County SO
20-0239-P	Romero, Anna A.	NMLEA BPOT #200	Chaves County SO
20-0240-Р	Saavedra, Kyle	NMLEA BPOT #200	Grants PD
20-0241-P	Salazar, Estevan	NMLEA BPOT #200	San Miguel County SO
20-0242-P	Salvador, Nemie J.	NMLEA BPOT #200	Tucumcari PD
20-0243-P	Silva, Dominic W.	NMLEA BPOT #200	NM IMT PD
20-0244-P	Totman, Richard L.	NMLEA BPOT #200	Taos County SO
20-0245-P	Ulm, Aria T.	NMLEA BPOT #200	Santa Fe County SO
20-0246-P	Wall, Bowe	NMLEA BPOT #200	Ruidoso PD
20-0247-P	Sewell, Dalton	NMLEA BPOT #200	Self-Sponsor
20-0248-P	Ramos, Raul	NMLEA BPOT #200	Self-Sponsor
20-0249-P	Requejo, Marina	NMLEA BPOT #200	Self-Sponsor

Certification #	Name	Academy	Agency
20-0250-P	Badillo, Jaime	LCPD #49	Las Cruces PD
20-0251-P	Borden, James	LCPD #49	Las Cruces PD
20-0252-P	Castaneda, Edwin	LCPD #49	Las Cruces PD
20-0253-P	Duarte, Luis	LCPD #49	Las Cruces PD
20-0254-P	Figueroa, Jacob	LCPD #49	Las Cruces PD
20-0255-P	Heredia, Luis	LCPD #49	Las Cruces PD
20-0256-P	Keyson, David	LCPD #49	Las Cruces PD
20-0257-P	Kinney, Dalton	LCPD #49	Las Cruces PD
20-0258-P	Rodriguez, Jesus	LCPD #49	Las Cruces PD
20-0259-P	Salazar, Diego	LCPD #49	Las Cruces PD
20-0260-P	Torres, Matthew	LCPD #49	Las Cruces PD
20-0261-P	Udero, David	LCPD #49	Las Cruces PD
20-0262-P	Vitale, Christian	LCPD #49	Las Cruces PD

Certification #	Name	Academy	Agency
20-0263-P	Abeita, Leandra	NMLEA CBW #101	Isleta Tribal PD
20-0264-P	Best, Michael	NMLEA CBW #101	Roswell PD
20-0265-P	Blanco, Christopher	NMLEA CBW #101	Jicarilla Apache Tribal PD
20-0266-P	Notsinneh III, Eli	NMLEA CBW #101	Jicarilla Apache Tribal PD
20-0267-P	Schwartz, Cody	NMLEA CBW #101	Roswell PD
20-0268-P	Soto, Justin	NMLEA CBW #101	Alamogordo PD
20-0269-P	Wilson, Devin	NMLEA CBW #101	Curry County SO
85-0065-P	Caroland, Howell	NMLEA CBW #101	Bernalillo PD
94-0196-P	Coraci, Jack	NMLEA CBW #101	
92-0002-P	Lepori, Jeff	NMLEA CBW #101	Santa Ana Tribal PD
05-0036-P	Martin, Kenneth	NMLEA CBW #101	Isleta Tribal PD
7 9 -0237-P	Nevarez Jr, Carlos	NMLEA CBW #101	NM Highlands University PD
94-0369-P	Timm, Michael	NMLEA CBW #101	Albuquerque Public Schools PD

Certification #	Name	Academy	Agency
20-0270-P	Anderson, Casey	SJCCJTA CBW #2	DeBaca County SO
20-0271-P	Dezendorf, Joseph	SJCCJTA CBW #2	Los Alamos PD
20-0272-P	Hein, Patrick	SJCCJTA CBW #2	Sandoval County SO
20-0273-P	Ray, Monique	SJCCJTA CBW #2	San Juan County SO
20-0274-P	Schichtle, Mark	SJCCJTA CBW #2	NM EMNRD – State Parks
20-0275-P	Leon, Valita	SJCCJTA CBW #2	Sandia Pueblo Tribal PD

Certification #	Name	Academy	Agency
20-0276-P	Arrieta, Jonathan	NMSP BPOT #97	New Mexico State Police
20-0277-P	20-0277-P Baca, Myranda		New Mexico State Police
20-0278-P	Bamber, Braxton	NMSP BPOT #97	New Mexico State Police
20-0279-P	Cedillo-Sandoval, Jorge	NMSP BPOT #97	New Mexico State Police
20-0280-P	Cordero, Marcos A	NMSP BPOT #97	New Mexico State Police
20-0281-P	Cruz, Everson	NMSP BPOT #97	New Mexico State Police
20-0282-P	Ferran, Leticia	NMSP BPOT #97	New Mexico State Police
20-0283-P	Franklin, Christopher	NMSP BPOT #97	New Mexico State Police
20-0284-P	Frietze, Dominik	NMSP BPOT #97	New Mexico State Police
20-0285-P	Gil, David	NMSP BPOT #97	New Mexico State Police
20-0286-P	Gonzalez, Manuel III	NMSP BPOT #97	New Mexico State Police
20-0287-P	Hernandez, Carlos	NMSP BPOT #97	New Mexico State Police
20-0288-P	Manzanares, Anthony	NMSP BPOT #97	New Mexico State Police
20-0289-P	Martinez, Jerome	NMSP BPOT #97	New Mexico State Police
20-0290-P	Martinez, Jonathan	NMSP BPOT #97	New Mexico State Police
20-0291-P	Navar, Julio Jr.	NMSP BPOT #97	New Mexico State Police
20-0292-P	Porras, Christopher	NMSP BPOT #97	New Mexico State Police
20-0293-P	Reyes, Adriane	NMSP BPOT #97	New Mexico State Police
20-0294-P	Rodriguez, Gabriela	NMSP BPOT #97	New Mexico State Police
20-0295-P	Solis-Torres, Alejandro	NMSP BPOT #97	New Mexico State Police
20-0296-P	Valdez, Noah	NMSP BPOT #97	New Mexico State Police
20-0297-Р	Whitlow, Steven	NMSP BPOT #97	New Mexico State Police

Certification #	Name	Academy	Agency
20-0027-PST	Amaya, Ariel	NMLEA PST #147	Albuquerque Public Schools PD
20-0028-PST Apodaca, Serenity A.		NMLEA PST #147	Cibola Regional Communications
			Center
20-0029-PST	Baca, Glorianna	NMLEA PST #147	Las Vegas Police Department
20-0030-PST	Berzi, Tracey	NMLEA PST #147	Department of Information and
			Technology (DoIT)
20-0031-PST	Dawson, Keith	NMLEA PST #147	Mesilla Valley Regional Dispatch
			Authority
20-0032-PST	Duran, Kassandra	NMLEA PST #147	Luna County Central Dispatch
20-0033-PST	Gibson, Alice M.	NMLEA PST #147	Tucumcari/Quay Regional
			Emergency Communications Center
20-0034-PST	Gonzales, Marissa	NMLEA PST #147	Albuquerque Police Department
			Communications Division
20-0035-PST	Greene, Beth	NMLEA PST #147	Albuquerque Police Department
			Communications Division
20-0036-PST	Hausam, Elizabeth	NMLEA PST #147	Cibola Regional Communications
			Center
20-0037-PST	James, Chelsea	NMLEA PST #147	Portales Communications Center
20-0038-PST	Lucero, Bernadette	NMLEA PST #147	New Mexico State Police - NORCOM
20-0039-PST	Maria, Lorraine	NMLEA PST #147	Ramah-Navajo PD
20-0040-PST	Mize, Alessa N.	NMLEA PST #147	Ruidoso PD
20-0041-PST	Munoz, Irene J.	NMLEA PST #147	Regional Emergency Dispatch
			Authority
20-0042-PST	Ortegon, Trina	NMLEA PST #147	Albuquerque Police Department
			Communications Division
20-0043-PST	Roybal, Andrew M.	NMLEA PST #147	Santa Fe Regional Emergency
			Communication Center
20-0044-PST	Samson, Emily T.	NMLEA PST #147	San Juan County Communications
			Authority
20-0045-PST	Shannon, Liam Michael	NMLEA PST #147	McKinley County Metro Dispatch
			Authority
20-0046-PST	Sharp, Dylan	NMLEA PST #147	Mesilla Valley Regional Dispatch
			Authority
20-0047-PST	Spear, Robert C	NMLEA PST #147	Santa Fe Regional Emergency
			Communication Center
20-0048-PST	Thomason, Heather M	NMLEA PST #147	Raton Police Department
20-0049-PST	Valencia, Joshua N	NMLEA PST #147	Cibola Regional Communications
			Center
20-0050-PST	Valencia, Valerie J	NMLEA PST #147	New Mexico State Police - NORCOM

Certification #	Name	Academy	Agency
20-0051-PST	Argumedo, Carmen	PST #148	Mesilla Valley Regional Dispatch Authority
20-0052-PST	Baca, Nicholaus A	PST #148	Santa Fe Regional Emergency
			Communication Center
20-0053-PST	Barga, Haley	PST #148	Alamogordo Police Department
20-0054-PST	Bennett, Tatianna	PST #148	Albuquerque Police Department
			Communications Division
20-0055-PST	Cabrera, Amanda J	PST #148	San Juan County Communications
			Authority
20-0056-PST	Escobar, Fernando J	PST #148	Taos Central Communications Authority
20-0057-PST	Ghan, Michael	PST #148	San Juan County Communications
			Authority
20-0058-PST	Gonzales, Natasha K	PST #148	Sandoval County Regional Emergency
			Communications Center
20-0059-PST	Guardado, Daisy	PST #148	Albuquerque Police Department
			Communications Division
20-0060-PST	Holman, Dakota	PST #148	Sierra County Regional Dispatch Authority
20-0061-PST	Johnson, Cortney	PST #148	San Juan County Communications
			Authority
20-0062-PST	Kee, Deandra Lynn	PST #148	McKinley County Metro Dispatch
			Authority
20-0063-PST	Martinez, Jennie	PST #148	Tesuque Tribal Police Department
20-0064-PST	Martinez, Sonya	PST #148	Sandoval County Regional Emergency
			Communications Center
20-0065-PST	Ortiz, Syramad	PST #148	Mesilla Valley Regional Dispatch Authority
20-0066-PST	Pennington, Linda C	PST #148	Torrance County 911 Dispatch Center
20-0067-PST	Plowman, Anissa	PST #148	Hidalgo County Central Dispatch
20-0068-PST	Quintana, Samantha	PST #148	Albuquerque Police Department
			Communications Division
20-0069-PST	Rodriguez, Desiree	PST #148	Clayton Police Department
20-0070-PST	Trujillo, Robby	PST #148	Espanola/Rio Arriba 911 Dispatch