

## Chavez, Georgette, SRCA

---

**From:** Hendricks, Rick, SRCA  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 29, 2020 2:13 PM  
**To:** Chavez, Georgette, SRCA  
**Subject:** FW: 1.24.10 Public Hearing Comments #2

Georgette,

I don't think you were copied.

Rick

Rick Hendricks, Ph.D.  
State Records Administrator  
1205 Camino Carlos Rey  
Santa Fe, NM 87507  
(505) 476-7955



Follow us! [Facebook](#)

---

**From:** Chris Mechels [mailto:cmechels@q.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 29, 2020 2:07 PM  
**To:** Ortiz, Matt, SRCA <Matt.Ortiz@state.nm.us>  
**Cc:** CPR, RMD, SRCA <RMD.CPR@state.nm.us>; Hendricks, Rick, SRCA <Rick.Hendricks@state.nm.us>; Sally Malave <smalave@nmag.gov>; John Kreienkamp <jKreienkamp@nmag.gov>  
**Subject:** [EXT] RE: 1.24.10 Public Hearing Comments #2

Hi Matt,

On taking a closer look at your email, I suggest something is missing.

It is appropriate, but not sufficient, to include my comments in the Exhibits of a hearing on this matter.

But it does not address the other requirement, for NMAC 1.24.25 as follows;

**1.24.25.12**

**WRITTEN COMMENT PERIOD:**

1. The public comment period must be at least 30 calendar days, beginning after publication of the notice in the New Mexico register and issuance of the rulemaking notice. The agency shall not adopt a proposed rule before the end of the public comment period.

2. A person may submit, by mail or electronic form, written comments on a proposed rule, and those comments shall be made part of the record. Written comments may be submitted through the end of the public comment period.
3. The agency may decide to amend the comment period if it provides to the public, as defined in Section 14-4-2 NMSA 1978, notice of the changes.
4. The agency shall post all written comments on its website, if one exists, as soon as practicable, and no more than 3 business days following receipt to allow for public review. All written comments received by the agency shall also be available for public inspection at the main office of the agency.

[[1.24.25.12](#) NMAC - N, 04/10/2018]

This requires posting the comments, within 3 days of receipt. This is important, as it allows other participants to read, and respond, to comments prior to the hearing, thus allowing a more productive process.

In my experience with Public Hearings, most recently at the DOH, Rules Act compliance is a real problem, and 1.24.25 is not followed. I assume that SRAC follows it?

Lots of work to be done!

Regards,

Chris Mechels

----- Original Message -----

From: Ortiz, Matt, SRCA <[Matt.Ortiz@state.nm.us](mailto:Matt.Ortiz@state.nm.us)>

To: Chris Mechels <[cmechels@q.com](mailto:cmechels@q.com)>, CPR, RMD, SRCA <[RMD.CPR@state.nm.us](mailto:RMD.CPR@state.nm.us)>

Cc: Hendricks, Rick, SRCA <[Rick.Hendricks@state.nm.us](mailto:Rick.Hendricks@state.nm.us)>, Sally Malave <[smalave@nmag.gov](mailto:smalave@nmag.gov)>, John Kreienkamp <[jKreienkamp@nmag.gov](mailto:jKreienkamp@nmag.gov)>

Sent: Tue, 29 Sep 2020 14:09:50 -0400 (EDT)

Subject: RE: 1.24.10 Public Hearing Comments #2

@font-face

{font-family:Calibri;  
panose-1:2 15 5 2 2 2 4 3 2 4;}

@font-face

{font-family:Tahoma;  
panose-1:2 11 6 4 3 5 4 4 2 4;}

p.MsoNormal, li.MsoNormal, div.MsoNormal

{margin:0in;

margin-bottom:.0001pt;

font-size:12.0pt;

font-family:"Times New Roman","serif";}

a:link, span.MsoHyperlink

{mso-style-priority:99;

color:blue;

text-decoration:underline;}

a:visited, span.MsoHyperlinkFollowed

{mso-style-priority:99;

color:purple;  
text-decoration:underline;}  
p.MsoAcetate, li.MsoAcetate, div.MsoAcetate  
{mso-style-priority:99;  
mso-style-link:"Balloon Text Char";  
margin:0in;  
margin-bottom:.0001pt;  
font-size:8.0pt;  
font-family:"Tahoma","sans-serif";}  
span.EmailStyle17  
{mso-style-type:personal-reply;  
font-family:"Calibri","sans-serif";  
color:#1F497D;}  
span.BalloonTextChar  
{mso-style-name:"Balloon Text Char";  
mso-style-priority:99;  
mso-style-link:"Balloon Text";  
font-family:"Tahoma","sans-serif";}  
.MsoChpDefault  
{mso-style-type:export-only;  
font-size:10.0pt;}  
@page WordSection1  
{size:8.5in 11.0in;  
margin:1.0in 1.0in 1.0in 1.0in;}  
div.WordSection1  
{page:WordSection1;}  
-->

Hi Chris,

Your 9/29 email entitled "1.24.10 Public Hearing Comments #2" will be included as an exhibit to the rule hearing to be held on the above administrative rule.  
Thank you for taking time to provide your input and for your comments.

I've noted that you wish to receive notice of the rescheduled rulemaking hearing. I promise to email you as soon as that rescheduled rulemaking notice is published.


matt

**Matthew Ortiz**

Administrative Law Division Director

[matt.ortiz@state.nm.us](mailto:matt.ortiz@state.nm.us)

505-476-7941



Follow us on  
[Facebook](#)

>>> CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE <<<

This electronic mail message, including any and/or all attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s), and may contain confidential and/or privileged information, pertaining to business conducted under the direction and supervision of the sending organization. All electronic mail messages, which may have been established as expressed views and/or opinions (stated either within the electronic mail message or any of its attachments), are left to the sole responsibility of that of the sender, and are not necessarily attributed to the sending organization. Unauthorized interception, review, use, disclosure or distribution of any such information contained within this electronic mail message and/or its attachment(s) is(are) strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by replying to this electronic mail message, along with the destruction all copies of the original electronic mail message (along with any attachments).

---

**From:** Chris Mechels [<mailto:cmechels@g.com>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, September 29, 2020 10:41 AM

**To:** CPR, RMD, SRCA

**Cc:** Hendricks, Rick, SRCA; Ortiz, Matt, SRCA; Sally Malave; John Kreienkamp

**Subject:** [EXT] 1.24.10 Public Hearing Comments #2

Dear Sir,

This email is to make further comments on this Public Hearing.

On examining the following language, from the Notice of Public Hearing on the SRCA webpage, it seems there is actually an INTENT to mislead.

It claims the focus of the proposed change is the "digital signal" and that this was due to the Governor's declaration. In fact the Emergency Rule in April made NO mention of the digital signature, its focus was on the rules filing. So, the REAL effect of the proposed change is that it continues the changes to the rules filing, and eliminates the tie to the public health thus making the change permanent. This all seems a rather shifty dodge, with the real purpose of the change screened from view.

Synopsis:

Due to the governor's declaration of a public health emergency, the SRA issued an emergency amendment on April 29, 2020, to section 15 allowing for transmittal form filing with a digital signature. The proposed amendment of

[1.24.10.15](#) NMAC consists of continuing to accept digital signature by eliminating the public health emergency predicate language.

Looking back to the history of this proposed modification, on March, it seems intent to bypass the filing provisions contained in the Rules Act statute.

"In light of the governor's executive order 2020-004 declaring a public health emergency and in the interest of the health and safety of our staff and rule filers, all rule filings will take place on submittal deadline dates only, until further notice. See,

<http://www.srca.nm.gov/nmac/nmregister/pdf/2020-schedule.pdf>. If your agency needs to file on a different date, pursuant to Subsection D of Section 14-4-5 or Section 14-4-5.6 NMSA 1978, alternate arrangements can be made on a case by case basis. If you

need to file anytime other than on a submittal deadline date, please send your request to Matthew Ortiz at 505-476-7941 ([matt.ortiz@state.nm.us](mailto:matt.ortiz@state.nm.us)).

Thus, under cover of the emergency, bypasses the filing requirements contained in the Rules Act.

Then, in the 29 April Emergency Rule, the UNSUPPORTED claim is made; "Despite this notice and change in rule filing protocols, additional changes are needed to mitigate against the imminent threat to public health and safety during the public health emergency."

The 24 March modification now becomes part of the Rule, but still has the linkage to the emergency, which provides cover for bypassing the Rules Act requirement, on a temporary basis.

Now, with the current proposal, the emergency language is stripped from the language, making it permanent, under the guise of dealing with the "digital signature", when in fact the real effect is to bypass the filing requirements of the Rules Act.

This all seems very calculated, and making use of the "emergency" to modify the Rules Act filing requirement to the liking of the Administrative Law Division (ALD). They would no longer have to file submittals reflecting their date and time, but at the convenience of ALD.

However, this seems to encounter some legal problems. Without the cover of the emergency, this seems to fall under NMSA 14-4-5.7.A which reads;

A. No rule is valid or enforceable if it conflicts with statute. A conflict between a rule and a statute is resolved in favor of the statute.

Without the cover of the emergency, which is stripped from the current proposal, the rule conflicts with the statute, and is invalid.

I hope that this is sufficiently clear. Troubling is that SRCA/ALD seems intent on using the "emergency" to justify the use of an Emergency Rule (with no public input), then presenting that change as fact.

This pattern is seen throughout the Rules changes under the current Administration. The Dept of Health is one of the worst offenders. Overall, this administration used 23 Emergency Rules in 2019, before Covid. This contrasts with 10 per year in the 7 years prior to 2019. Thus far in 2020 some 26 Emergency Rules have been filed. Like the current 1.24.10 change, most of those Emergency Rules seem inappropriate, and simply efforts to get desired changes without public input.

The SRCA effort is disappointing, as rather than standing against the overuse of Emergency Rules to bypass the Rules Act, they have chosen to join in. This sets an extremely bad precedent, in the "pot calling the kettle black" for future Rules Act compliance, which is a duty of SRCA.

SRCA has submitted a rule with egregious violations of procedure, false statements of fact, and apparent intent to bypass the Rules Act filing requirements.

This should be noted by their superiors, and dealt with.

Regards,

Chris Mechels

505-982-7144