MINUTES OF THE
STATE COMMISSION OF PUBLIC RECORDS
REGULAR MEETING
August 23, 2011

The State Commission of Public Records convened at 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, August 23, 2011 at 1209 Camino Carlos Rey, Santa Fe, New Mexico 87507.

Members Present
Stanley Hordes, Ph.D. Chair, Historian
Christina Espinoza Designee for Honorable Dianna J. Duran, Secretary of State
Robert Mead State Law Librarian
Mark Reynolds Representative for Honorable Gary King, State Attorney General
Evan Blackstone Representative for Honorable Hector Balderas, State Auditor
Frances Levine, Ph. D. Director, Museum of New Mexico

Members Absent
Edwynn Burckle Cabinet Secretary, General Services Department

Staff Present
Sandra Jaramillo State Records Administrator
Judi Hazlett Deputy State Records Administrator
Antoinette L. Solano Administrative Assistant
Pete Chacon Information Technology, Chief Information Officer
John Martinez Director, Administrative Law Division
Jackie Garcia Records Management Analyst, RMD
Leo Lucero Chief, Agency Analysis Bureau, RMD
Melissa Salazar Director, Archives and Historical Services Division
Consuelo Pineda Electronic Records
Lloyd Leyba Records Management Analyst, RMD
Ruben Rivera Fiscal Officer
Tania Maestas Assistant Attorney General

Guests Present
Carolyn Spidal Public Employees Retirement Association, (PERA)
Albert Martinez PERA
Al Lucero Truchas Land Grant
John Chavez Truchas Land Grant
Markita Sanchez Legislative Finance Committee (LFC)
Randall Soderquist, Ph.D. LFC
CALL TO ORDER
The Chair called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA
The Chair entertained a motion to approve the agenda. Dr. Frances Levine so moved and Mr. Robert Mead seconded the motion. The motion carried. The agenda was approved.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – June 14, 2011
The Chair entertained a motion for approval of the minutes. Ms. Sandra Jaramillo stated that there was a correction on page 11 the August 3, 2011 the date should read August 23, 2011. The Chair entertained a reverted motion to include the correction. Mr. Mead so moved and Mr. Mark Reynolds seconded the motion. The motion carried. The minutes were approved.

APPROVAL OF SPECIAL MINUTES – August 11, 2011
The Chair entertained a motion to approve the minutes of the Special meeting held on August 11, 2011. Mr. Reynolds so moved and Ms. Christina Espinoza seconded the motion. The motion carried. The special minutes were approved.

The Chair welcomed Mr. John Martinez who is the new State Records Administrator designate.

ACTION ITEMS
A. Records Retention and Disposition Schedules

1.18.366 NMAC, ERRDS, Public Employees Retirement Association

Ms. Sandra Jaramillo stated that the first schedule for the Commission's consideration was repeal and replacement for 1.18.366 NMAC, ERRDS, Public Employees Retirement Association. This would be presented by Ms. Jackie Garcia. Ms. Jaramillo asked before Ms. Garcia precedes she introduced the two new agency staff members Mr. Lloyd Leyba, Records Analyst and Ms. Consuelo Pineda, Micrographics/Electronic Records Division. Ms. Garcia introduced Mr. Albert Martinez and Ms. Caron Spidal from PERA. Ms. Garcia informed the Commission that the replacement schedule for the existing Executive Records Retention and Disposition schedule for the Public Employees Retirement Association was due to a review of the schedule and was determined that there were necessary modifications needed that would benefit the existing schedule. Mr. Albert Martinez acknowledged that the changes were beneficial to the agency and acknowledged Ms Garcia’s assistance throughout the process.

Mr. Mark Reynolds asked what the agency was doing with the preservation of Meta data. Ms Jaramillo said that if descriptive or administrative data were to be erased it could be traced to the individual who did it and that the data is kept for the period of time that it is described in the schedule. Mr. Reynolds then asked if the data was part of the document. Ms. Jaramillo replied that it was part of the document to be preserved. However, she said that there had been times where the data had been stored separately from the document. Mr. John Martinez added that with electronic documents most documents will not function with out the Meta data, and also
would be irretrievable and the indexing would not be able to be accessed without the Meta data. Mr. Mead reiterated that the Law Library uses many electronic records to decrease the amount of paper documents. Ms. Jaramillo stated that the computer output microfilm is the official record and part of the plan requires an agency to include an index for the microfilm. This would serve as the Meta data if an agency would chose to keep the digital copies for access and the COM for preservation purposes. She said the digital in the data base management system would be considered the official records would be COM. Ms Hazlett added to the discussion that dealing with Meta data the issues that arise are being the most important is the redaction of information that takes place with confidential information. Mr. Reynolds reiterated that the courts had many issues with Meta data and were on the side of preservation and he concurred it should remain with the document for specific purposes. The Chair entertained a motion to accept the repeal and replacement. Mr. Mead so moved and Mr. Mark Reynolds seconded the motion. The Chair asked if there was further discussion; hearing none, the Chair called for a vote to approve the repeal and replacement of 1.13.366 NMAC. The motion passed unanimously, with no abstentions.

B. Acceptance Deed of Gift

**Nuestra Senora Del Rosario San Fernando y Santiago Land Grant Records.**

Ms. Jaramillo stated that Ms. Melissa Salazar, Director, Archives and Historical Services will present the three deeds of gift. She said that the one gift that did not make the packet deadline was the Matthews and Duran deed of gift that was provided separately. Ms. Salazar informed introduced Mr. Al Lucero and Mr. John Chaves members of the Nuestra Senora del Rosario San Fernando y Santiago Land Grant. The Chair welcomed them and thanked them for their generosity. Ms. Salazar said that the Nuestra Senora de Rosario San Fernando y Santiago Land Grant members have voted to donate the records of the grant to the New Mexico State Records Center and Archives (SRCA). The records were previously on loan to the SRCA.

She said that the Nuestra Senora de Rosario San Fernando y Santiago Land Grant was petitioned by Nicolas Romero and twelve families in 1754. Governor Tomas Velez Cachupin approved the grant for 20,000 acres. Proceedings before the office of Surveyor General and the Court of Private Land Claims confirmed the grant for 14,786 acres. 'Truchas' was one of the first fortified plazas built under Governor Cachupin’s frontier defense policy. As a legal historian, he recognized the defensive advantages of the fortified village and tried to enforce the Spanish laws pertaining to settlements on the northern frontier. - Office of the State Historian, NMSCRA (http://www.newmexicohistory.org/filedetails_docs.php?fileID+23131). She said that most of the material being looked at will be digitized at a later date.

Ms. Jaramillo stated that she would like to bring to the Commissions attention that this particular deed of gift that had been brought to the Commissioners before and was asked for acceptance but had restrictions. This deed has no restrictions placed upon it and she was very pleased that the Board was donating this collection with no restrictions. Dr. Levine asked if there was a copy of any type of conveyance between the board and the SRCA stating that there were no restrictions on this deed of gift. Ms. Jaramillo reiterated that the deed of gift had no restrictions. She asked Ms. Salazar if she could provide the minutes of the meeting of the board of the land grant to the Commissioners at her earliest convenience.
Mr. John Chavez introduced himself as being the Secretary of the board for the last six years and the current custodian of the records for the land grant. He said that the members still abiding by statute that dates back to the early 1900's and remains today. He also wanted to note that the entire membership voted to donate the collection in concurrence with the board. Mr. Al Lucero the current President of the land grant stated that he would be willing to write a letter stating that the land grant is a gift with no restrictions. He was very pleased to make sure that the records are preserved for history for many years to come. He explained that it was a difficult situation to attend to a land grant this size but that they did rely on the efforts of many volunteers. Mr. Chavez stated that the land grant is surrounded by several government agencies. Dr. Levine asked if there were copies of past minutes that could be included as reference to the no restrictions that would suffice.

The Chair entertained a motion to accept the deed of gift of the Nuestra Senora Del Rosario San Fernando y Santiago Land Grant Records. Mr. Evan Blackstone so moved and Dr. Levine seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously, with no abstentions.

Baca-Booth Family Papers

Ms. Jaramillo referred to Ms. Salazar. She stated that Ms. Sandra J. Fitts wished to donate documents relating to the Baca-Booth Family. Ms. Fitts is the adopted daughter of Antonio Herbert "Tony" Baca. Her mother was Veta Mae Scott Baca. The documents were passed on to her after his death on September 20, 1978. Shortly after, Ms. Fitts sent the documents to a conservator to have them stabilized. Tony Baca was the son of Jose Herculano Baca and Anna Booth of the Las Vegas areas. Anna Booth was the daughter of William Booth and Maria Sostenes"; Sostena" Sanchez. William Booth was originally from Kentucky and was a clerk in Las Vegas when the 1880 census was taken. Maria was the daughter of Jose Gabriel Sanchez and Maria Balivina Blea. The papers include a title of possession of Sabina Sanchez, contracts, letters of condolence, and will. In the 1910 Federal Census, Sabina Sanchez, 64, is enumerated with Herculano and Anna Baca and is listed as his mother-in-law. However, other information provided suggests that Sabina Sanchez Samples was Anna's aunt. The material will be a wonderful addition to our genealogy collection and a significant resource for other researchers.

The Chair asked if the donor was present. She replied no. Ms. Jaramillo stated that this was an important collection being that the agency has so very few documents from the Mora County regarding land conveyances. She said it helps to fill in the gaps where there is no documentation and she would hope the Commission supports the deed of gift. The Chair entertained a motion to accept the deed of gift of the Baca-Booth Family papers. Mr. Mead so moved and Ms. Christina Espinoza seconded the motion. The chair asked if there was any further discussion; hearing none. The Chair called for a vote to accept the deed of gift for the Baca-Booth Family Papers. The motion passed unanimously, with no abstentions.

Patricia Duran and Sandra Matthews Collection of Rio Arriba County Documents

Ms. Jaramillo deferred to Ms. Salazar. She advised the Commissioners that the deed was not in the packet put provided for them separately. Ms. Salazar stated that Ms. Patricia Duran and Ms.
Sandra Matthews wish to donate documents of Rio Arriba County. She said the preliminary inventory dates back to 1806-1939. It is Ms. Salazar understands that the documents came from the El Rito area in New Mexico. Ms. Duran's grandmother was a teacher at a public school in El Rito and was asked to clean a house. She lived in a house owned by Mr. Duran who was no relation, and who later passed away. The materials and documents were part of his belongings. Since the documents were already being disposed of she was able to salvage a trunk with the materials. Ms. Salazar understood that sometime later in 1945 the materials were donated to the State History collection of the Capitol Building which experienced a flood, and some of the material was not salvageable. A small portion of the collection was returned to Ms. Duran who wished to donate the materials to the State Archives.

The Chair entertained a motion to accept the deed of gift of the Rio Arriba documents. Dr. Levine so moved and Mr. Mark Reynolds seconded the motion, the motion carried. The chair asked if there was further discussion. Ms Salazar said that she chose the documents that were beautiful to pass around the table for the Commissioners to review. Ms. Jaramillo stated she was thrilled to have the collection and thanked Ms. Salazar for her efforts in acquiring the collection.

FY 13 Appropriation Request
Ms. Jaramillo stated that Ms. Judi Hazlett, the Deputy State Records Administrator and CFO, would present the FY 13 appropriation request. Ms. Hazlett stated that in attendance was the agencies budget analyst, Ms. Markita Sanchez and Mr. Randall Soderquist. She went through the organization of the appropriation request. She said this was the first opportunity for the analysts in many years to get a glimpse of how this agency is budgeted. Ms. Hazlett stated that the agency has two budgeted funds, as well as a non budgeted fund which is only budgeted when needed by a Budgeted Adjustment Request (BAR) gift and donation fund and a capital project fund that is currently inactive. She said that the discussion would focus on the two budgeted funds; the first being 37100 that is an internal service revolving fund, which deals with the majority of revenue of the sales through governmental agencies and entities. It also is a revolving fund that doesn’t revert to the general fund and is established in statute are revenues that are generated through goods of sales and services which is collected and deposited daily.

Ms. Hazlett said that the appropriation request was based on expenditures which are directly or indirectly to the generated revenue or the replacement of capital equipment. She explained that the numbers reflected from FY 11 forward. She said that the agency has been forced to lineate its basic operating expenses to the revolving fund. She said that there was a single position as a management analyst advanced that is related to this particular fund. The employee records the revenue and activity for the New Mexico Register and the fund is generated in the appropriation request by either the revolving fund or both. She explained that the agency tries not to exhaust the fund balance each year however, the agency can revert for the high end equipment that is needed.

Ms. Hazlett stated that in the past the agencies appropriation requests have been met. She explained the 17900 fund which is the agency’s operating fund which is the principle operating source for agency operations. It requires two types of revenue, a gift fund and grants fund. In going through the appropriation request pages she explained the pertinent forms and said that they would be repeated through out the report.
She discussed the S-8 through the S-10 that are the summary forms which were summarize by dept and sources, which are the revenue, expenditures and the operating balances. She said that the E-4s identify exactly what the agency had requested by item. She went on to explain the E4 and E-5s which were by type.

Ms. Hazlett pointed out that there was only a base request and not an expansion request, being that the request was far from being a flat request being that the agency was a non-gubernatorial agency we are not bound by the Governor. However, the request was for what the agency needed. She then explained the personal services and benefits. She said there was a significant increase in the FY 12 operating budget number of $2,800,450.00 and $2,800,38000.00. She pointed out that all but 25.300 were in personal services and also requesting for funding for all 42 full time positions in the agency. Dr. Levine asked since there were so many vacancies in the agency over the last several years she wondered if any of those vacancies had been swept or if the agency had been stopped from filling any of the positions.

Ms. Hazlett replied that to her knowledge none of the vacancies had been swept. She said that the agency has had 9 vacancies still showing and the two positions of the new employees that were mentioned earlier had been filled. This leaves the agency with 11 positions being brought over into the next fiscal year. She said that what had prevented the agency from hiring were future year appropriations. The agency had ended up with a substantial surplus in personal benefits and services. She explained that the reasons for not hiring were the appropriation for FY 12 at the time had no support for additional hires. She said when the agency is looking at hiring it will have to project whether it can afford to support the positions in future years. She stated that there might be money in the current FY 12 but that the funding that the agency was projecting was unreliable. She added that there was going to be a huge reversion, bigger than she had ever seen in general services and that the FY 12 budget reflected what the agency could afford. She said if money is free in the current year will affect whether the agency can responsibly fill the positions it needs, and will depend on appropriation levels for FY 13.

Ms. Hazlett pointed out that the majority of the vacant positions the agency is enduring go back to the fall of FY 09 and have accelerated to FY 11. She stated that in all the reports the agency has provided to budget analysts, in budget reports is that the agency does require all the vacant positions. She said that the Archives division has down sized considerably and is only open half time for public services. She pointed out that the retention and disposition schedules are being well reduced due to improper staffing in Records Management. This also affects key performance measure. Across the board all the divisions are down. She said that the independent contractor that was brought in a few years ago suggested that the agency needed to functions at its peak with an average of 18 more staffing positions than it has at the current time. She then explained the FY 11 and FY 12 actual budget numbers. She said that in the FY 11 budget the agency was down considerable numbers and in projected FY 12. But she said in terms of available funds from the general operating expenses the FY 12 budget is less than the FY 11 due to the addition of the restored fine arts premium.
Ms. Hazlett went on to say that in the FY 13 budget the unfortunate trend in pressing most of our operating expense other than fixed critical costs in the hope of getting some of the vacant positions filled. However, she said you could move everything back to the operating budget but that the revenue picture was grim leaving the request rather leaning heavily on the personal services and benefits. She reiterated that the problem issues were the increase in the operating budget for personal services and benefits with the exception of 25,000 with 20,000 of that a match of a special grant. And the rest of the 5000.00 was for an incremental in the Albuquerque lease and the maintenance for the service equipment. She advised that the F-9 forms on the operating budget the numbers reflected the base of the FY12 and FY13. She said that the travel budget was reverted back into the budget as well as the insurance and the Albuquerque maintenance. She said the telecommunications, and the advertising was added because those were essential to the day to day operations. And that the issue with the shift is that you have to keep tabs on everything you have chosen to input into the budget. If the revenues do not materialize then the agency has to revert to the fund balances. She said it is of no use to support revenue generation or requests for capital equipment. If the agency had extended at the full amount it would be using a substantial portion of the fund balance. She noted that it was thought initially that the agency was going on a depleted fund balance this year. However, that the Department of Finance had chosen to reclassify some of its codes and accounts at the end of the fiscal year which cleared the additional 60,000 of the fund balance.

Ms. Hazlett stated that the agency over the past years had tried very hard to monitor this fund because of the revenue stream and wanted to have authority to buy what is needed for the agency. She explained that the Federal fund was 50,000 that represented the first year of a two year new grant, that amount being given each year. That money is used to support 20% of the Historical Records Advisory Board grants Administrator who is located with the Archives and Historical Services Division. And in addition had 30,000 of the re-grant money for the historic records preservation project. As well as going to eligible repositories. She said that they are not large grants but often provided many of these repositories the only source of funding of historic preservation grants. She stated that in these economic times these projects may not get the priority they deserve so that the agency tries to accommodate some of them to protect the historical documented history of New Mexico. She stated that this would conclude the review of the budget structure.

She reiterated that the agency did not have any expansions. However, the new Administrator may be looking at a special or supplemental appropriation. She said that in prior discussions there was funding in the capital bill that was not passed. Her understanding was that it was coming forward once again with the particular items included. If it passes and not vetoed it would include the shelving but no funding to lease the extra space that is needed in Albuquerque. She said depending on the action the bill takes and how the funding will be available; the agency may be looking at the special or supplemental appropriation to provide funding for the additional space which is still currently available adjacent to the current space. And the agency would not have to not worry about relocation which would be costly.
This space has been the only bid response that the agency has had. She stated that the Special session should be thoroughly looked at for being that this will be of significance to the agency. She said that the concurrence of the Commission at the last meeting of the ICIP request was to include these issues based on the recommendations of the Property Control Division. This has left the shelving as the first priority and secondly the expansion of the record center.

She stated that finally the agency is submitting the Information Technology request for the Centralized Electronic Records Repository (CERR) which had been passed by the Legislature last year but did not transpire. She said with concluding she would take any comments.

Mr. Mead asked what the overall expenditure increase was. Ms. Hazlett replied 18%. She said that the only alternative was to not request funding for authorized positions and they would probably be swept. She stated that it was tried the year before and the agency had to go back and request and restore the funding. All but 25,000 are in personal services and benefits with a small amount going to the increase in retired health care.

Ms. Jaramillo stated that it was very critical that we acquire all the positions especially in Archives. She said even though the hours were decreased the requests are still coming in. She said in particular the IPRA requests related to the former Governor Richardson as well as former Governor Gary Johnson who is now running for President. So the requests are coming from all over the Country. She said the requests include DUI and domestic violence request files. With these requests in high demand there was no way the staff could accommodate the entire number of requests in a timely manner. Chair Hordes replied to Mr. Mead that as the Commission member’s responsibility would be to assist the agency in asking and supporting what the agency needs to operate. Mr. Mead replied that he didn’t think the numbers were completely honest. And he felt that if the agency asked for that type of increase at this point in time it would look like it doesn’t know what its doing. He said he was quite concerned with this issue.

Dr. Levine had a response to Mr. Mead’s question. She said if there was a place in the budget to justify an increase that is specific to the agency’s dealing with the work load increases and with asking for the 18% to accommodate all the vacant positions. Ms. Hazlett replied that the 18% is for the non existing positions that were recommended by the Consultant on top of the 42 positions that is adjusted to the current jobs. She said the agency has 42 authorized positions with nine of those remaining vacant. Dr. Levine asked on those positions how many of those were archivists to help with the level of increased work. Ms. Hazlett said one advanced archivist, one other position in archives, one administrative law position, and the rest being in the records management division. And in electronic records there were two positions vacant. Dr. Levine asked how many of those positions would the agency need in Archives to assist the demand of the requests in a timely manner. Ms. Jaramillo stated that there were three positions needed be filled in order to comply with the requests. Dr. Levine said she is concurrent with Mr. Mead’s earlier suggestion.
Ms. Hazlett stated that the request included the archival request, but that the agency’s records management division was down many staff positions. As well as the electronic record bureau, the whole agency is depleted in staff. She said what the agency tried to do last year in the lines of trying to go in and request funding for a portion of the vacancies, but were told no and the suggestion was that you have to include all the positions. The alternative was to pick and choose which ones were essential. She said that she realizes that it is a substantial increase for these economic times and the agency is not asking for an expansion or for those 18 positions that the consultant said were needed. The agency is just asking to build on the positions that are there. She stated that all the instructions for the request were followed and that the agency needed all the positions that it asked for. And if we let go of most of the positions the agency will never be able to restore the level of positions that it currently has.

Mr. Blackstone commented that the analysts at other levels need to know that if the agency requests the positions they are needed. Ms. Markita Sanchez, Legislative Finance Committee analyst replied that the positions that the agency had requested are justified and that she will speak on the agency’s behalf that the positions are crucial to the operation of the agency.

Mr. Randall Soderquist said he concurs that the number of vacancies that are needed should be included. Mr. Blackstone also asked if adding some language to the cover letter stating the increases that the agency is asking for and explaining the crucial financial crisis it is in. And the aggressive need to fill these positions. Ms. Hazlett replied that it would be done. She said that there is a P-1 form that will acknowledge the request and what it includes. Mr. John Martinez said that our budget is so small that the 18% is not relatively a small amount compared to other requests. Ms. Hazlett commented on the fact that it seems to be true and that small agencies do take hits but other agencies may argue that a proportional hit that it will receive would be equally damaging. She said that agencies have to be careful in there requests. With smaller agencies they usually have no back up when dealing with positions. She explained that many of the positions are unique rather singular to this agency and that most of the divisions are smaller.

She said it would be difficult to move staff around due to the skill sets that were not easily transformable and added that the administrative and admin law division skills are set as well. She said also in the Historians division that it requires special knowledge and skill. She reiterated that the positions that are needed are important to the agency and to get service levels returned to where they should be. She pointed out that you cannot leave an agency with out a retention schedule that is outdated and unbeneifical. All records must reflect its index of records and if it not correct may cause increased in the riffs of records that are not being maintained, and would could be misplaced or lost. And if at some point those records were part of any type of litigation there would be many issues that could arise.

The Chair entertained the motion of the floor to approve the budget. Ms. Hazlett requested the motion allow staff to make technical changes if needed. Mr. Robert Mead so moved and Ms. Christina Espinoza seconded the motion. The Chair asked if there was any further discussion; Hearing none. He called for a vote to approve the budget. The motion passed unanimously, with no abstentions.
Old Business
A. Infrastructure Capital Improvement Plans (ICIP)

Ms. Jaramillo stated the next item is the ICIP plan that was in the Commission packet. She said that priority one was the shelving. And on the second page of the plan in terms of the local government agency plan for your operating expenses for the project when it is completed there is a statement stating that if the agency does receive the shelving it will need additional funding to increase the lease of new space in the amount of 67,200. She said if the Capital bill is included in the special session and passed and not vetoed. Then it would be requested.

She stated that the second priority was the expansion request for the Santa Fe Record Center and the dollar amount came from discussions with the Property Control Division, which includes funding for design and construction. If it is all funded the process would take around 40 months with the amount of 5.7 million. She said that this would include the high density shelving that is needed. Mr. Mead asked if this was going to be included in the Special session capital outlay bill. Ms. Jaramillo stated, yes that was correct. And that it would go under General Services, Property Control being that it would be a GSD Building.

B. Albuquerque Record Center

Ms. Jaramillo stated that the Albuquerque Record Center was still at full capacity. So any records that met retention are replaced with other agencies, with the excess of the records coming into the Santa Fe Record Center. Ms. Jaramillo stated that the Santa Fe Record Center is at 92% capacity. She said the Record Center in Santa Fe is currently doing destruction and that would alleviate about five thousand pieces of available space after completion. Mr. Mead asked what would happen to records once the both centers are at capacity, and would they have to be place somewhere else. Ms. Jaramillo replied that the records centers would not be able to take in any more records. The various agencies would have to find other space or pay for additional space off site. She said that a private vendor was very costly. The charges stem for every withdrawal and receiving every box or record, destruction and or monthly fee for storage space.

Executive Session
The Chair said that the next item on the agenda was the Executive Session. But all the personnel issues were discussion and resolved in the Commissions Special meeting so it can be dispensed of.

Director’s Report
Ms. Jaramillo informed the Commission that Ms. Hazlett has announced her retirement effective November 1, 2011. However, she will be taking annual leave for the month of October. With Mr. John Martínez as the new appointment to the State Records Administrator’s position the Administrative Law division will have a vacant position. The agency is reviewing the budget so that advertisements for the Chief Financial Officer, Records Management Division Director, Administrative Law Division Director, and an Archivist could be placed. She said based on the budget the agency can due a salary increase for Mr. Martínez being effective on October 1, 2011.
The Chair asked about how many vacant positions will be filled. Ms. Jaramillo replied, four. He asked if there was going to be a Deputy position being asked for. She said that would be Mr. Martinez’s responsibility to acquire. Also he will have to look at if he elects to have the Chief Financial officer as the Deputy Administrator. The Chair asked if all these issues were being reviewed and discussed for consideration. Ms. Jaramillo replied that was correct the current budget projections were being reviewed. She said that Mr. Martinez and she were going through the transition process, reviewing the budget and meeting with each of the agency’s divisions to review any issues, concerns, budgets, job specifications and the defining of duties. Ms. Jaramillo said that she would also like to report on the IPRA request for former Governor Richardson’s papers. The agency has received 31 requests, which 24 of those are completed. She said that four of the requests would not be accessible until December. And that two had just recently been received.

SCHEDULING OF NEXT MEETING
The Chair asked the Commission members if the November 15, 2011 at 9:30 am would be acceptable time for the next meeting. There were no conflicts with the date; the Chair scheduled the meeting for November 15, 2011 at 9:30 am.

ADJOURNMENT
The Chair entertained a motion for adjournment. Mr. Reynolds so moved and Mr. Mead seconded the motion. The motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 11:10 a.m.