

**MEETING MINUTES**  
**NEW MEXICO STATE GAME COMMISSION**  
Santa Fe Community College  
Board Room  
6401 Richards Avenue  
Santa Fe, NM 87508  
Thursday January 11, 2018 9:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.

**A P P E A R A N C E S**

Game Commissioner Thomas Salopek

Chairman Paul Kienzle

Vice Chairman Bill Montoya

Game Commissioner Craig Peterson

Game Commissioner Ralph Ramos

Game Commissioner Bob Ricklefs

Game Commissioner Elizabeth Ryan

**A B S E N T**

None

[Audio begins here]

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Roll call.

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission.  
Commissioner Peterson.

COMMISSIONER PETERSON: Here.

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: Commissioner Ramos.

COMMISSIONER RAMOS: Here.

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: Commissioner Ryan.

COMMISSIONER RYAN: Here.

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: Commissioner Ricklefs.

COMMISSIONER RICKLEFS: Present.

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: Commissioner Salopek.

COMMISSIONER SALOPEK: Present.

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: Vice Chairman Montoya.

VICE CHAIRMAN MONTOYA: Here.

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: Chairman Kienzle.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Present.

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: (Indiscernible) I believe we have a quorum.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Ralph, you want to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance?

Final Copy

COMMISSIONER RAMOS: It would be an honor.

COMMISSION AND ATTENDEES: I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: I need a motion to approve the agenda.

COMMISSIONER SALOPEK: So moved.

COMMISSIONER RAMOS: Second.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: All in favor?

COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: The Ayes have it. Let's go around the room and introduce who is here, guests.

GUEST SPEAKER: Commissioners, Director, public, my name is Donald Jaramillo, Deputy Director of the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish.

GUEST SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, public, my name's Jacob Payne. I'm General Counsel of Game and Fish.

GUEST SPEAKER: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, members of the public. My name is Jim Comins and I am Assistant Director (indiscernible) Department of Game and Fish.

GUEST SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, members of the audience, I am Chris Chadwick, Assistant Director, Support (indiscernible), Department of Game and Fish.

GUEST SPEAKER: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, Director Sandoval, members of the public. My name is Craig Sanchez. I am the Assistant Chief of Education, Game and Fish.

GUEST SPEAKER: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, Commissioners. I'm Lance Cherry. I'm the Chief of the Information and Education Division for Game and Fish.

GUEST SPEAKER: Good morning. I'm Robert Griego, Colonel in fields operations.

GUEST SPEAKER: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, members of the public. Stewart Liley, Chief of Wildlife, New Mexico Game and Fish.

GUEST SPEAKER: Morning. Chad Nelson, Licensing Operations manager.

GUEST SPEAKER: Good morning, members of the Commission. I'm Paul Varela. I'm the Chief (indiscernible/background noise).

GUEST SPEAKER: (Indiscernible) I'm John Crenshaw, President of New Mexico Wildlife Federation and state Game and Fish, long retired.

[Crosstalk/background whispering]

GUEST SPEAKER: Good morning. Elise Goldstein, Assistant Chief of Wildlife Management.

GUEST SPEAKER: Good morning. I'm Lara Marker [phonetic] Department of Game and Fish.

GUEST SPEAKER: Good morning. I'm Joe Miano. I'm the account auditor (indiscernible).

GUEST SPEAKER: William Tice [phonetic] Habitat (indiscernible).

GUEST SPEAKER: Good morning, Chairman, members of the Commission. Colleen Payne. New Mexico Regional Director of the Mule Deer Foundation.

GUEST SPEAKER: Good morning. Cody Johnston, Southeast area (indiscernible) informational (indiscernible).

[crosstalk/whispering].

SPEAKER: He's the dude that rolled up in the big truck this morning.

GUEST SPEAKER: Yes.

GUEST SPEAKER: Good morning. I'm Herb Atkinson of Roswell representing Safari Club International.

GUEST SPEAKER: Good morning, Chairman and Commissioners (indiscernible).

GUEST SPEAKER: (Indiscernible) Jacobsen, I'm just a citizen.

GUEST SPEAKER: Good morning, everybody. Colin Duff, southern major for the Department of Game and Fish.

GUEST SPEAKER: Morning. Michael Dax, Defenders of Wildlife.

GUEST SPEAKER: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. I'm Lyle Kuck. I'm a licensing supervisor.

[crosstalk/whispering]

GUEST SPEAKER: Good morning. I'm Elaine Jaramillo. I'm the I.T. Operations supervisor [Indiscernible/crosstalk].

GUEST SPEAKER: Good morning. I'm Mike Sylagi [phonetic] (indiscernible/crosstalk).

GUEST SPEAKER: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, members of the public. I'm Martin Perea. I'm the videographer with Information and Education Division.

GUEST SPEAKER: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and Commission. My name is Ross Morgan and I'm the northwest public information officer.

GUEST SPEAKER: Good morning, Chairman, Commission. I'm Sandra DuCharme. I'm the Executive Assistant to the Director.

GUEST SPEAKER: Good morning, everybody. I'm Dan Williams. I'm with the Information and Education Division.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Thank you, everyone, for introducing yourselves. Can I get the motion to approve the minutes of our November 16, 2017 regular meeting and the December 20, 2017 special meeting?

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: So moved, Mr. Chairman.

COMMISSIONER RAMOS: Second.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: All in favor?

COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: The Ayes have it.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: All right. Agenda item number 7, election of chair and vice chair of the State Game Commission. Nominations?

COMMISSIONER: I'll make a nomination, same name [phonetic]. The way I see it, I think they should all be, a lawyer running this show. (indiscernible).

SPEAKER: Wow.

COMMISSIONER: Right or wrong, I'd like to nominate Paul as our chairman and Bill Montoya as our Vice Chairman.

COMMISSIONER RYAN: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: All in favor?

COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: The Ayes have it. Thank you all. I'll be giving my best shot for another year. I appreciate your kindness. Thank you. Agenda item number 8, adoption of the open meetings resolutions. Marilou.

MARILOU POLI: You want me to move?

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Happy New Year.

MARILOU POLI: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: I saw you in (indiscernible) but I didn't say hello.

MARYLOU POLI: I saw you, too. I didn't say hello either.

[Laughter/crosstalk]

MARYLOU POLI: I think you put aside [phonetic] this first one here. Mr. Chair, Commissioners, is a, to each of you, (indiscernible), sorry let me show you the slide first. So they're saying you're familiar with it, these seals [phonetic] are old. So the reason that we're here today is because New Mexico's administrative code (indiscernible) middle of the meetings, says that each year the Commission will determine what's reasonable notice for meetings [phonetic] required by our State so that (indiscernible). They continue to say that at that meeting,

which is today, the Commission shall adopt a resolution to either continue or amend its existing practices. So with regards to existing practices, regarding notice, 10 days to a regular meeting and 3 days for a special meeting, 24 hours for an emergency meeting. The agendas, 72 hours for regular, 72 hours for a special meeting and 24 hours for an emergency meeting. Am I going too fast? Okay. Again, existing practices, your existing open meeting resolution says participation of the Commissioners can participate by phone but only if it's difficult or impossible to attend. Again, this practices in closed sessions [phonetic]. If part of an open meeting is closed to the public, it can only be done so by majority vote of the quorum [phonetic]. The reasons for closed session must be stated with specificity even if you have a meeting that is intended just for executive sessions, there still must be notice to the public as well as all the other meetings. So again, to continue with the open sessions, after closed sessions, the Commission shall state and the minutes shall reflect that only the items named in the motion to close were discussed in the closed session. There are limited exceptions to the items that can be discussed in Executive Session that do not need to be voted on in public. They very typically are referring to litigation. So in other words, for almost every other, for every other topic discussed in the Executive Session or closed session the vote (indiscernible) if there is any action take must take place in open session. So the purpose of this slide is to show you what you what your, as of yesterday, what your existing resolution says. And you can see where I put in blue and you'll see in a moment where I've highlighted those. Because of the proposed changes are only those blue items that I showed you this slide. So, the new resolution would be identical last year to all the changes are what you see in purple here are the dates. We recommend that you move to adopt this 2018 open meetings resolution. Are there any questions?

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: I don't think so. Seems to be pretty much the same as what we've done for the last few years.

MARYLOU POLI: That's correct, Mr. Chair. It's identical.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: This is an action item. Can I get a motion on this item, please?

COMMISSIONER RAMOS: Mr. Chairman, I move that we adopt the proposed 2018 Open Meetings Resolution as presented.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Do I hear a second?

COMMISSIONER SALOPEK: Second.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: All in favor?

COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: The Ayes have it. Thank you.

MARYLOU POLI: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Agenda item number 9, future meetings schedule and locations. Jump in here and . . .

COMMISSIONER SALOPEK: On the May 17th meeting, that's when I go to the Cleveland Clinic so I'm seeing, Mr. Chairman, if we can move the meeting of the 17th to May 3rd, if that would be in conflict with another Commissioner? And in that, me and Ralph were looking at Albuquerque and Gallup. If we could move Gallup to August 23rd and Albuquerque to October 4th, and the reason for that is that's right before usually the first elk hunt, whatever, and it's a

central location so that if we come to a meeting, everybody can get back to either go elk hunt or help somebody elk hunt.

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: So, Mr. Chairman, absolutely on a location switch that's not a problem. We can work through that. Regarding the date on May 3rd, I guess I need to defer to the Deputy Director because we have a number of open, of opening big game rules and we are following a 30-day time frame for posting and so [crosstalk] I see Stewart squirming in his chair over there [laughter].

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: We may need to push it forward instead of backwards.

SPEAKER: Mr. Chair, so yes, with the new House Bill that passed and the resolution—not the resolution but the bill that passed last legislative session—well, really, we built the schedule so we could approve rules and get them posted on the sunshine portal, etc. So moving it later would be easier. Moving it forward would preclude us . . .

COMMISSIONER SALOPEK: What about . . .

SPEAKER: . . . me posting.

COMMISSIONER SALOPEK: . . . the 24th even though it's the Thursday before Memorial? The next week would be fine.

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: So Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Salopek, I think what we need to look at is, do we meet the 30-day time frame posting to meet June 21st adoption. Are we, is the proposal, I guess, Deputy Director Jaramillo, that we are going to actually approve a rule on June, request approval of a rule on June 21st, there's two.

DONALD JAMARILLO: So Mr. Chairman, Director, for the June 21st, yes we are going to have for adoption two final rules. We'd just have to notice the rule. It would have to be a lot earlier. Typically right now that would have to be, that rule would have to be almost finalized April 26th with the current dates that we've got. If we decide to move, move the date to a later date in May we would just to have to follow that 30, we would have to require that those 30 days. So as long as we move it later, I think it would be fine because we are not going to talk about on the June one, that one is actually going to be posted probably in—well, let me see right here—in April it should be.

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: So Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Salopek, it looks like if we can move it later, would be better for us to be able to work in within the requirements of . . .

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: I defer both to the calendar and the Department and Commissioner Salopek. So it . . .

COMMISSIONER SALOPEK: Well, do we have to have it on Thursday? Could we do it on . . .

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Tuesday? Back it off?

COMMISSIONER SALOPEK: Twenty second?

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: 22nd?

DONALD JARAMILLO: Mr. Chairman, as long as we're not earlier than that date, then I think later would work. So Tuesday would work.

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: So if I'm hearing that correctly, then it would, are you looking for May 15th or are you looking for May 22nd?

[Crosstalk, multiple speakers] Twenty second, 23rd, 24th, something like that, I think.

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: We could do May 22nd.

COMMISSIONER SALOPEK: That's Wednesday or Thursday the 24th but it's right before Memorial Weekend.

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: Mr. Chairman, I think May 22nd might work a little bit better in terms of scheduling.

SPEAKER: (Indiscernible) away from the holiday.

SPEAKER 2: That would be fine with me, May 22nd.

SPEAKER 3: It would work better for me.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Does that work for the rest of the group? Last week of school.

[Laughter]

COMMISSIONER: Is that okay with you, Ralph? I know you said you couldn't do it the 24th.

COMMISSIONER RAMOS: That'll be fine.

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: Okay.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Twenty-second then.

COMMISSIONER: Thirty days between the May and the June meeting, exactly 30 days. And that's the requirement.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: That's sufficient then?

SPEAKER: Yes. That should be sufficient.

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: Mr. Chairman, then we would be right, Commissioner, it would be right on 30 days. So I'm assuming that's correct and okay.

MARYLOU POLI: Yes, that sounds good to me.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Okay. And then flip-flopping the Albuquerque and Gallup, not a problem for anybody? Anybody else have any other conflicts that they know of? Okay. So I will entertain, I think this is an action item, I'll entertain a motion to approve the schedule as amended. May 22nd, 2018 will be the Los Alamos meeting and then Albuquerque and Gallup, we will flip-flop the locations. I'll entertain the motion to that effect.

COMMISSIONER SALOPEK: So moved.

COMMISSIONER RICKLEFS: Second.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: All in favor?

COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: The Ayes have it. All right.

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Sandra, October 4th, balloons?

[Crosstalk] . . . posting of the rules.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Albuquerque. Probably get started sooner rather than later. Find her a place to stay.

SPEAKER: Sorry about that.

SPEAKER 2: Oh, no, that's fine. We'll just have (indiscernible).

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: You know, I could accommodate a modest number of people, in fact the same amount of people that are here today. I could probably fit them all in there. Beyond that, no.

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: So Mr. Chairman, on that note, perhaps the Albuquerque office will be open and ready for business by that time. So . . .

SPEAKER: Tah-dah [phonetic].

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: It might be that opportunity. And they're shaking their head no and they're freaking out that I just said that but we will certainly try to make that happen.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: I don't mind parking in dirt, so if it's . . .

COMMISSIONER: We can rent heaters.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: If it's close to open let's do it. I think that'd be . . .

COMMISSIONER: [Crosstalk] August.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: That'd be great.

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: Okay. We will certainly strive for that, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: All right. So now there's a line in the sand.

SPEAKER: Ouch.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: That's good news. Okay. Agenda item number 10, State Game Commission Award, Commission to designate a Commissioner to review and select the 2018 recipient.

CHRIS CHADWICK: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, you know as you may recall every year we have a banquet, a Governor's Banquet, where we have an auction and . . .

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: When is the date of that banquet this year? Do you know?

CHRIS CHADWICK: This year's banquet will be February 17th. That's a Saturday. Again, it'll be at the New Mexico Expo Creative Arts Building.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Have we lined out a speaker for that yet? The guy last year was great.

CHRIS CHADWICK: Yes. We've got our contractor that's handling that, is in charge of that, but we're in the planning stages. They're very well along with the planning. And it's going to be a wonderful event. I mean, it really is. I think everybody has a good time.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: For people here who haven't gone, I'd recommend going. I know it's no fun spending your Saturday with people you already work with [laughter] but it's a pretty cool event. So I'd recommend taking the time to go one of these years anyway. I interrupted you.

CHRIS CHADWICK: Mr. Chairman, anytime you want that's fine. So the banquet again will be held on Saturday, February 17th in Albuquerque. It will be a fun event. Last year we had up to close to 500 people attend. And I think by all accounts it was a great time. Each year I think it continues to get more refined and it is an opportunity for people to get together, for the Department to really showcase what we do and to thank the public for the support that we get. This year again, we will be presenting, in addition to the event itself we will be presenting three different awards in recognition for those folks that, who have over the years shown a great deal of effort and support for the Department. We have three different awards. The first one is a Governor's Conservation Lifetime Achievement Award. You know this is really recognition of somebody who has spent, you know, an entire career or significant portion of their life in support

of conservation in New Mexico. The second one which is the primary reason I am coming before you today, is the Commissioners' Wildlife Conservation Partnership Award which recognizes primarily organizations that, through their efforts, have worked closely with the Department in support of our efforts and in support of wildlife here in New Mexico. And then the third one, it's the honor of the Director herself to provide an award for, you know, a conservation professional of the year. And that would be one that she would accept and make that determination on. So as far as these awards, the process to submit is through a letter of nomination no more than 1500 words. We ask that individuals submit biography or a resume outlining either what the individual does or the organization in support of their nomination. We have a dedicated email address which is up on the screen. Questions can be asked. We can respond to that and we certainly encourage members of the public to participate in this and if they know somebody or an organization they want to nominate we encourage them to do so. The deadline to make this nomination is February 5th. So today what we're looking to do, like years in the past, we are coming, I am coming before the Commission to ask by way of vote that you select one member of the Commission to review those nominations and on behalf of the Commission make a selection for the Commissioner's Partnership Award. So this is a task that will require the Commission to nominate that person here today. So with that I will stand for any questions.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: I don't think I've got any questions. I think that, you did this last year, right?

COMMISSIONER RAMOS: The last two years. Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: And did one or two Commissioners, I don't . . .

COMMISSIONER RAMOS: Normally what I did was I would review the documents and then shared it with Mr. Montoya, Vice Chairman Montoya and we went ahead and made that decision.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: I think we're all willing to volunteer you again for that. [Laughter]

COMMISSIONER RAMOS: Okay.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: (Indiscernible) if you guys want to do it again.

COMMISSIONER RAMOS: And Craig, would you like help us with it?

COMMISSIONER PETERSON: Betcha.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: All right. Anything else you need from us? We'll do a vote on it but is there any, other than the three of them?

CHRIS CHADWICK: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, I think that's all I needed.

COMMISSIONER RICKLEFS: The email address said 2016awards. Is that still correct?

CHRIS CHADWICK: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Ricklefs, yes that is correct. The Deputy Director pointed that out to me prior to the preparation of this but we couldn't get it changed in time, so.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Next time we'll make it more generic, okay, I guess but good enough.

COMMISSIONER RICKLEFS: That address was 2016awards.

CHRIS CHADWICK: Mr. Chairman, that email address is valid, so.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Okay. I'll entertain a motion to appoint Commissioner Ramos with the assistance of Commissioner Montoya and Commissioner Peterson to choose—is it one or two people?

CHRIS CHADWICK: Mr. Chairman, the recipient will be one organization or one individual.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Okay, to choose one recipient, individual or organization, for receipt of an award at the Governor's Banquet this year. I'll entertain a motion to that effect.

COMMISSIONER RICKLEFS: So moved.

COMMISSIONER SALOPEK: Second.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: All in favor?

COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Thank you. Then you'll, somebody will, direct those emails with those nominations to Commissioner Ramos, right?

CHRIS CHADWICK: Yes, we will make sure that they get them.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: How did you receive them last year?

COMMISSIONER RAMOS: I believe that Mr. Cherry did that.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Did you get them in hard copy or were they emailed to you?

COMMISSIONER RAMOS: I think it was a drive that he sent me.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Okay.

COMMISSIONER RAMOS: But however you want to do it.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: All right. Right on. Good luck.

CHRIS CHADWICK: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Seems like very meeting I get to approve another organization.

Agenda item number 11, approval of department procedures for donation of license to qualified non-profit organizations to receive donated licenses or permits and a request to recognize the Mule Deer Foundation as a qualified non-profit organization to receive donated licenses.

Gentlemen?

CHAD NELSON: Mr. Chairman, I am the licensing operations manager for Game and Fish.

Today we are going to present our proposed procedures, internal procedures for license donation requests and also present an application from the Mule Deer Foundation for approval as a non-profit organization to accept donated licenses.

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: So, Mr. Chairman, as he walks through that procedure, I would just point to your books. You have that procedure in item tab number 11, so you can follow along if you want to make any notes. Thank you.

CHAD NELSON: So NMAC 19.31.3 specifies that non-profit organizations must demonstrate that their history and ability to promote hunting, fishing and trapping in New Mexico to be approved as a non-profit to accept donated hunting licenses for transfer to eligible recipients which includes youth hunters and resident veterans and first responders. The proposed procedure which we believe will eliminate any preferential treatment for any organization or recipient: Number one, all donation requests must be received in writing. We will maintain a list of non-profit organizations that is organized by date of approval. If organizations are approved on the same date, which there were four approved the last meeting, we will rank them alphabetically

and add them to the bottom of the list. Donated opportunities will be provided then to the next non-profit organization in the list. We will not give any preference. We will just go to the next organization. Non-profit organizations will be required to provide documentation proving the recipient's eligibility in cases of veterans and first responders and must provide an eligible recipient within a reasonable time frame. This will probably come into play in the coming year since we will have carcass tags. We will need to get those requested transfers done so that the recipient will be able to get their license and tag. Once we receive an eligible recipient, the license will be transferred once we verify eligibility and all other licensing requirements are met, game hunting licenses, stamps, et cetera. So that's pretty much the procedure that we are proposing.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Did we do, I recall the last meeting or two, we talked about by quadrants. But we've done away with that part of it, right?

CHAD NELSON: Mr. Chairman, the way that we used to do it when there were only two organizations, we would ask them if they had a preference and if they didn't we would go with whichever was geographically closest to the hunt location.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: So we've taken that out?

CHAD NELSON: We are taking that out, yes.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Well, I think what you've described is, as you point out, fair and equitable under the circumstances. Any comments, questions, or suggestions from the Commission.

COMMISSIONER RYAN: I just appreciate the Department making this a fair and equitable procedure for everybody. In the past few meetings we've had organizations step up to the

microphone and ask for preferential treatment on how these licenses are divvied out and that's just not fair to everybody. And so I appreciate the Department committing to a fair procedure the whole way down. So thank you.

COMMISSIONER RAMOS: I do have a question and I know first responders is very open ended. Is it defined a little bit for that? I mean a first responder to a middle school fight or something you know that goes on, I mean, it's got to be narrowed down a little bit and defined. You know, is it law enforcement? Is it game wardens? Is it ambulance emergency crew? I don't know. I need some direction here.

CHAD NELSON: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Ramos, we are using the definition provided by state law which essentially is EMTs, law enforcement and fire fighters. There is a little bit more to that but that is generally what we are using.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: So what I would suggest that we do, it's not quite an audit, but you'll keep track of who's getting what and who fits in what category. So probably in a year it makes sense to come back and show us, you know, this is where licenses went. This is who got them, who received. So kind of like what we did with the youth hunters and we found out that very young kids were perhaps getting tags when it was kind of on the (indiscernible) list whether they should get them or not. So I think let's let it ride for a year, come back and see how it all shakes out. So can you put that on the to-do list?

COMMISSIONER RICKLEFS: (Indiscernible).

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER RICKLEFS: Could I ask, in an average year, how many licenses become available through this?

CHAD NELSON: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Ricklefs, normally we would get about a little over 100. This past year we had about 200 because we publicized the program.

COMMISSIONER RICKLEFS: So you've gone through this several times as these ranked organizations get a chance at providing these licenses (indiscernible).

CHAD NELSON: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Ricklefs, yes. As more organizations are approved they would go to the bottom of the list and we would distribute to more organizations.

COMMISSIONER RICKLEFS: So each organization gets a chance several times throughout a year if there's 200.

CHAD NELSON: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER RICKLEFS: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER RAMOS: So it's just going to rotate through that.

CHAD NELSON: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER RAMOS: As you get them. Now if you could just clarify just so, someone donates a tag. Let's say, Wednesday, and the hunt's on Saturday. Is that, what's the last minute that that can be done. And I think that really needs to be specified.

CHAD NELSON: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Ramos, that's going to be a little difficult. And we do get last minute requests. What we will do, what we normally do now, is we route the request to an organization and we indicate that it's time sensitive and we need a recipient as soon as possible. It is going to be a little more complicated this year because of the tag requirement so they are likely going to have to go and get the tag in person. So a reasonable time frame we're saying generally last minute requests are going to be more difficult to accommodate.

COMMISSIONER RAMOS: So you'll be mailing the tag, right? I mean, how other way are you going to get them [crosstalk] they're going to have a vendor or something.

CHAD NELSON: They're going to have to go to a vendor or a Game and Fish office and get the tag in person.

COMMISSIONER RAMOS: So I'm sure all these organizations will receive a letter, you know, with all the procedures and deadlines and kind of just what we're talking about right now.

CHAD NELSON: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER RAMOS: Thank you, sir. Good job.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Any other questions or comments on this particular part of it? And you do have the request to recognize the Mule Deer Foundation. So let's break this up into two. And I had one more comment. On number 5, in terms of an audit, your procedure number 5, it does look like we will be receiving information that shows that someone is an eligible recipient so it should be pretty easy to figure out who's getting what. So, anyway, we'll circle back around in a year and get a report on how this procedure has worked out. Can I get a motion to approve the—actually, do we, we have a motion already? Somebody give me a motion on the Department procedures, please.

COMMISSIONER RAMOS: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER RAMOS: Mr. Chairman, I move to approve the Department's established procedures for the donation of licenses to approved non-profit organizations . . .

COMMISSIONER SALOPEK: Second.

COMMISSIONER RAMOS: . . . as presented today.

COMMISSIONER SALOPEK: Second.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Any further discussion or comments? All in favor?

COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: The Ayes have it. Thank you. And then Mule Deer Foundation.

CHAD NELSON: So the Mule Deer Foundation has applied to be a qualified non-profit organization to accept designated licenses. They have provided us with the necessary documentation demonstrating their history and ability to promote hunting, fishing and trapping in New Mexico and also documentation of their non-profit status which meets our requirements. So respectfully I would request that you would approve them as a qualified non-profit.

COMMISSIONER RICKLEFS: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER RICKLEFS: I move to approve the Mule Deer Foundation as a qualified non-profit organization to receive donated hunting licenses.

COMMISSIONER RAMOS: Second.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Any questions, comments, discussion? All in favor?

COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: The Ayes have it. Thank you.

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: Mr. Chairman, just a point there. I appreciate Colleen reaching out and wanting to participate in this . . .

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Oh, I'm sorry. You wanted to talk on this one? Anything you want to say?

SPEAKER: I didn't fill in a card.

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: I just wanted to say thank you to all the organizations that have stepped up and wanted to be a participant. Thank you, Herb, for the support there at SCI and the continued support of getting those licenses out on the ground.

SPEAKER: We appreciate you (indiscernible/poor mike pick up).

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Right on. Thank you. Number 12. Mr. Liley. Discussion for potential rule changes on the bighorn rule 19.31.17 NMAC for the 2019 through 2022 seasons. Hard to believe we're that far in the future. I'll be really old then.

COMMISSIONER: (Indiscernible).

STEWART LILEY: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, I can't believe we're in the next 4-year rule cycle again, so be prepared for a busy year. As you well know, those who sat on the Commission the last time we went through all the big game rules, this happens once every four years so we're getting ready to start and I do appreciate moving that Commission date one week later. It really will help out as we meet our deadlines for making rule processes. So I appreciate that and thank you very much. We are going to open up two rule for discussion today, bighorn and Javelina bighorns in front of you. We have already opened up one rule. If you recall, we opened up the pronghorn rule last fall. We were trying to get an early start on that almost year round. So you'll see, all the rules from now on, you'll see three times. You'll see initial presentation like this. You'll see kind of a fleshed out where we're going to ask the Commission with the new rule making process at that time. You see the second presentation, we need to get

more or less any ideas or what changes you would like to see in the rule. Once we leave that meeting, the Department will develop the rule, put it on the sunshine portal, put it through all the posting requirements we have. Then you will come back in front of you for a final. So really, if you have recommendations or guidance you'd like to see, this opening of the rule and the second time we present is really going to be important because after that it's going to be very difficult for us to change a rule without having to extend the rulemaking process. So with that, I start with bighorn for the next 4-year rule cycle. So just a little bit of background history. As many of you know, we continue to increase bighorn population throughout the state and last year we had our record license numbers. So we had 58 ram tags across the state which is remarkable. You know, 10 years ago we were less than 20 ram licenses across the entire state. To go to 58 licenses for rams across the state is a pretty huge success story. Not only that, we're hunting ewes in some of these populations for management because, especially in the Rockies, we've almost fulfilled or filled all suitable habitats and historic habitat without [phonetic] the State of New Mexico throughout and so we're using ewe harvest as a management tool. We are harvesting ewes this last season in the Pecos Wilderness and you'll see before you today some of our initial recommendations are to expand some of our ewe hunting opportunities as these populations have grown. Real quick here, I just want to give you a trajectory, a trend since 2003 in both desert sheep and in Rockies. And you'll see since our last 4-year rule cycle came in which is, hard to believe, not too long ago but right about in this region here, we've seen some substantial growth in the populations of both Rockies and deserts. At the last rule cycle Rockies were estimated about 1200 sheep and deserts at about 900. Now we're at 1700 Rockies and over 1200 desert sheep. So really it's a huge success story and we continue to build upon it. One of the graphics that we always put up when we do rule development is just to orient ourselves where our

populations are across the state. Red is Rockies and blue is deserts. Since the last, when we last talked about the rule development for bighorn sheep, we created a new population. We are in the midst of creating that population. That's this one right here just outside of Santa Fe. And Jemez and Cochiti Canyon population is doing extremely well. We're over a hundred animals in that and during this rule cycle we're going to actually ask for the Commission to allow for a season to be put as a temporary holder in there. We want to put a season in. We're not ready to harvest it the first year but by the end of the rule cycle we think we'll be harvesting rams in that population. So again another success story there. So really the current proposals that we have in front of you are what we're looking at right now is, just like every big game rule, you'll see we adjust the seasons for calendar days because that one-day shift or two days depending on the leap year so we start hunts on a Saturday. So you're always getting a calendar shift. You get a creep of one day every single year. So within 5, 6, 7 years you're almost a full week ahead so we move all those hunts back sometimes. So we'll do that. The other thing that we're going to do is modify hunt dates for a few of these hunts that we currently have. Last rule cycle, the Rio Grande Gorge and the Dry Cimarron hunts were hunts that were just coming on, never hunted populations. We started hunting those. We didn't know how the hunt would be so they were one long contiguous season because we didn't know how the animals would react to hunting. We are going to propose at this time splitting those seasons into multiple seasons now that we know how the harvest is going and how those hunts are. So we will be doing that or proposing those into split hunts. And because our population trends continue to increase what you're going to see is in all of our sheep it's up-two numbers in rule. It's not a set number in rule because the populations do have a tendency to fluctuate more so than some of our other species. But we will be increasing all the up-to numbers both for desert and Rocky rams. So we're hoping that we

continue to see this trend of increasing tags throughout the state for sheep. Like I said at the beginning, we're going to ask for some additional Rocky ewe hunts. Those are going to be establishing some ewe hunts in the Rio Grande Gorge population that we're going to see there and addressing the Rio Grande Gorge herd expansion. That population has done extremely well, so well, so much it's gone where we're about at 350 animals right now, expanding the center of the herd is right about where the Taos High Bridge is going almost all the way to the Ute Mountains. Some of the sheep have actually gone into Colorado and come down into Pilar [phonetic]. Because of that, it's great success that they've utilized all the habitat. But we do have some disease risk with that herd because there are domestics north in Colorado on allotment, on a BLM allotment. And we do have some small flocks down by Gila [phonetic] where those sheep, we're worried about coming into contact. We see when we're about 300 animals in that herd, we didn't see much expansion so we're probably going to be working with the Commission and do some proposals to maintain the herd at approximately 300 animals is probably what we're going to look at so we don't get those big movements and have the big disease risk of those sheep moving back. We'll probably also have to look at maybe some population management hunts in that herd in the interim while we're waiting for the rule to come on because we have had some recent movement of sheep towards domestics that has caused us some concern. With deserts we really don't see many changes. In terms of hunt dates, just numbers going up in terms of licenses. We've done really well with deserts and we're continuing to expand and look to expand populations where feasible and possible. When we last came to the rule cycle we discussed shoring up our extant [phonetic] herds. We've done that with the exception of we have one more herd that we have to shore up and that's the Ladrones before we start a new herd. So

we're doing really well. Populations are stable or growing and everything with the exception of the Ladrones where we need to shore up that herd. And with that, I would take any questions.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Questions or comments? When do we hear this again?

STEWART LILEY: Mr. Chairman, I believe you will hear this again at the next meeting. Let me look real quick.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: And it's still a discussion item at that point, right.

STEWART LILEY: Yes. The next meeting it will be a discussion item. That it will be the final time it can be discussed. And right after that meeting we will go into developing the rule and posting it for rule making.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Let's take public comment first. Mr. Crenshaw. Happy New Year. Good to see you again.

JOHN CRENSHAW: John Crenshaw with New Mexico Wildlife Federation, president of the organization. Good morning, Commissioners. Good to see you all again, too. I did kind of want to open the conversation on the bighorn sheep again. And as it's developed I would really hope that the Department and the Commission keeps in mind what the statutes actually say about units and how they're defined and let me get to some of those. Because the current rule, in my opinion and that of others who actually know something, it's probably in violation. In 1996 the legislature adopted a statewide system for hunting activities 17-2A-2 and the relevant wording was, the State Game Commission shall adopt a statewide system for hunting activities that increases participation by New Mexico residents. The current rule goes against that. And in definitions, A, a code means a description used to identify and define the species, weapon type and time frame authorized for specific hunt and 17-2A-1C, quote, "hunt code means a

geographically bound area in the state that is used to manage game species” and as we saw on the map geographically bound I don’t think goes all the way from Clayton at [phonetic] the Dry Cimarron down to the Gila around the San Francisco box [phonetic] and reserve. They are on the same planet but they don’t meet the criteria. Please do address this and bring it back within the statutes. And yes, it does favor residents and I think that’s the way it should be.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Does that make sense? Can you address that a little bit? I’m . . .

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, I appreciate Mr. Crenshaw’s—we’ve had this discussion. The way that rule was put together was thoroughly vetted with that consideration of definition and statute. We respectfully do not agree with their perspective. This was a conversation, multiple conversations with legal counsel and with biologists on how best to manage. I think you can see the results of our management program over the last 4 years. It has been extraordinarily successful and we continue to see a climb in bighorn sheep population. So I, we are happy to have those discussions with the Wildlife Federation and we’ll continue to do that. We just respectfully disagree with their assessment.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Okay. So the Department says X. The Wildlife Federation says Y. What’s the difference between X and Y? Can someone explain that to me?

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: So Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, what they’re asking us to do right now: On the application for bighorn sheep, you are able to pick three locations in which you can go hunt and they are stating that that doesn’t fit within the designation of a hunt code or the definition of a hunt code and . . .

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: So do they chop into smaller pieces? The hunt?

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: Essentially to remove the ability of the applicant to pick three locations within a hunt code to go hunt. Right now the way, Mr. Chairman, the way the rule was set up, you have a hunt code in which is for bighorn sheep or desert—excuse me, Rocky or desert—and then you're able to pick those locations. That is the issue on which they are concerned about, is that you can actually pick your location versus what we traditionally have. With all other hunt codes, it's you have a hunt code and you have a location that's specific, you know, GMU 6 or whatever it may be. And so that is the distinction that they are requesting, that we put it back to multiple hunt codes for each, or A hunt code for A area.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: And as you mentioned earlier, you've vetted it both under statute through legal?

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, that is correct.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: And how long is the, and we have that system currently in place, correct?

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: Mr. Chairman, that is correct.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: How long has that been in place?

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: Mr. Chairman, it's been four years.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: And from a management perspective, that's been successful?

STEWART LILEY: Mr. Chairman, that is correct.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: I think I understand the issue. Any further questions or comments? I have one more public comment from Mr. Wynn [phonetic] You ready to go?

GUEST SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, Director Sandoval, so on what you were just asking about there is the reason they did that was when Terk was vacated a few years ago—well it was more than a few years ago . . .

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: You're not going to go back to that are you? [Laughter]

GUEST SPEAKER: No, no, no. I'm going to explain why this is a weird thing, why the hunt code is for the entire state was because under Terk and under the quota statute when Terk was vacated depending on the way you read it but generally people believe and the Department believed or they wouldn't have changed this rule to make it so weird on the draw on just sheep was there aren't any hunt codes with enough sheep to generate an outfitter set aside tag or any (indiscernible/cough) tag so that's why it was done. And basically you end up with the, you know, the quota number. The difference is most states for sheep, things where there's very few permits in a given hunt code, most states have a special quota for sheep. Like in Arizona the non-residents get 10 percent statewide or up to 50 percent in any given hunt code. And so no one wanted to open the civil war of SB196 again so this was a way to get around that. That's just why it was done.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: So I got a question for you. So there's Department X, there's Wildlife Federation Y. Are you in favor of X or Y or is there a Wynn [phonetic] system that you prefer?

GUEST SPEAKER: Well, what I would favor is that the quota statute is corrected. I think that the heavy lifting needs to be done to go back to open the quota, to redo the quota and write a specific quota for sheep and these, and the Oryx and Ibex. But like I said, that's a civil war that no one wants to enter. I think both sides are afraid if we go back and revisit that in the legislature

that outfitters and non-residents, no one knows what you're going to end up with. I can see why people don't want to do it but that's what needs to be done to correct that.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: That's a legislative fix, you think?

GUEST SPEAKER: It has to be, because the quota statute, and correct me if I'm wrong, you know, but that's from the legislature, quotas set by the legislature and they didn't foresee there was no quota on sheep, Oryx or Ibex at the time. And so when Terk was vacated, all of a sudden we don't have a proper quota to deal with the very small permit number hunt codes. So what they did is they just lumped all the Rocky ram hunt codes together. I mean, it was a pretty slick thing to do. It worked, right?

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Worked from what perspective?

GUEST SPEAKER: (indiscernible) if you want non-residents to hunt sheep in New Mexico, you had to do that. If you wanted non-residents and outfitters to draw tags or (indiscernible) outfitter, if you want them to draw tags, that's what it was done for. I mean, that's right, right?

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: Mr. Chairman . . .

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Hold on a second. Are you opposed to that?

GUEST SPEAKER: Yes. I am. I think that what they could have done is they said, well, gee whiz. We don't have, you know, Terk was vacated so no longer will there be an outfitter set aside and a non-resident draw of sheep in New Mexico because you've got to have, it depends on how you do the math, 13 permits in a hunt code to generate those tags, right? So if it's 10 percent, you've got to have 10 to get one, right?

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: All right.

GUEST SPEAKER: Or five, you get point-five, however you want to round you know. That gets into, you know, how you want to do things.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: And I enjoyed the, while I can't say I fully understood the math lesson you gave me on Terk, so, but I . . .

GUEST SPEAKER: Well, I don't understand it either so we're on equal footing there.

[Laughter/crosstalk] You know, honestly I think non-residents should have permits, should be able to draw permits. So you know, actually I'm in favor of it because non-residents should be able to draw some of our tags. I think non-residents should be able to hunt everywhere. I wish it was 80-20 across the United States, to tell you the truth. But we're not going to get that.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: So let's ignore resident and non-resident. From a management perspective are you satisfied with the results?

GUEST SPEAKER: Yes. It doesn't, it's irrelevant to management standpoint. I mean the number of sheep that get killed doesn't care if it gets shot by a Texan or a New Mexican. You know, so for management it's irrelevant I would think.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: That's why I asked the question.

GUEST SPEAKER: For management, it doesn't matter.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Okay. Yes, sir?

GUEST SPEAKER: What I really came up to talk about was, on the bighorn rule one thing that I would like to see the Commission look at is feeding of sheep on private land because now they have these private land permits. It's causing some problems between different landowners. Like one landowner that has a sheep permit is feeding sheep and another one's not and if you talk to,

you know, the biologists and wild sheep foundations generally it's not thought to be a good idea to concentrate sheep around feeders and so it's something that maybe you could address in rules. Say if you're going to get a private land permit, you're not going to be feeding sheep and just put it in rule and then there's no, there's a lot of stuff going on in this stuff. So it's something to consider. It's probably not a good idea from a management standpoint. And Stewart would be able to obviously be an expert on that.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: I'm going to leave that question for another day. Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER: I just want to commend the Department for doing a super job with the desert bighorn and Rockies and I like the pilot that you're using, you know, how you're going to make changes based on like up in Dry Cimarron, you know, that area and whatnot. But I think that's a great way of thinking. I like the pilot and change and always reflecting and changing as the data comes in. So good job on that.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: I have a question for Mr. Crenshaw, then. We have X and we have your Y. Under Y, then, would any non-residents be eligible for tags?

JOHN CRENSHAW: Sir, I'd have to look at the numbers under the current rule  
(indiscernible/background noise).

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: I can guarantee you that ends up in a lawsuit.

JOHN CRENSHAW: (Indiscernible/crosstalk and background noise) can also end up in a lawsuit.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Yes.

JOHN CRENSHAW: [Indiscernible/crosstalk and background noise] go back, the unit system applies to (indiscernible) bighorn sheep up until the Terk decision was reversed.

(indiscernible/faint mike pickup). We are all very proud of the (indiscernible) and the way this bighorn sheep population (indiscernible) grown. It's just been a joy to watch.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: So let me ask the question again. If we go back as you say to the system with hunt codes that you just described, would that box out all non-residents then?

JOHN CRENSHAW: Probably [phonetic] the numbers of licenses increases at some point there could be enough, and they are increasing, at some point under the unit system as it's always been until this particular system. At some point there would be enough tags in any given unit to (indiscernible) non-residents and outfitters. I don't believe there are enough now (indiscernible).

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: I think we've heard enough for today. Any other questions or comments?

COMMISSIONER: Mr. Chairman, just—and this is in general for all the new rules that we're fixing to tackle this next busy year—I really want to encourage, you know of course we're always seeking public input with our new electronic system that Lance and the I.T. Department continue with all these emails and stuff that are going out and letting us know for the public input. It's nice to base some decisions on data. Data drives need and need drives changes, and just makes it easier for all of us. So again, we welcome that.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: I have one question somewhat unrelated to this. I recall that in the last, since I've sat on the Commission the last five years, we were sued by non-residents outfitters. Jason Bowles was the lawyer that sued us as I recall. Do you recall that lawsuit?

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: Mr. Chairman, I do. I was involved in that lawsuit. It was actually regarding the initial implementation of the outfitter requirements, what it requires to be a New Mexico outfitter because that, when Senate Bill 196, as Mr. Wynn pointed out, was implemented it changed the requirements to be in the outfitting pool and what it meant to be a New Mexico outfitter. And so that was the basis of that lawsuit.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: And did that box out a number of non-resident outfitters?

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: So, Mr. Chairman, it really required non-resident outfitters to take a look, a hard look, at how they define themselves, whether they're an LLC or a single or sole proprietorship, excuse me. And so it forced outfitters to take a look at how they would define themselves.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Okay. Something in the back of my mind says it's relevant somehow, somehow. But I'm going to have to puzzle through it. Is there anything else you would like to add? I'll give you the last word.

STEWART LILEY: Mr. Chairman, no.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Okay. We will see you next time around. I would suggest, be prepared to address some of the issues we talked about today because it seems to me that they're not going to go away the easy way. So make sure that . . . Mr. Payne, you know you may need to step up and visit on some of the legal issues just to give peace of mind to the Commission on this, okay? All right. Thank you. You're not going anywhere are you? Next, agenda item 13, discussion for potential rule changes on the Javelina rule, 19.13.21 NMAC for the 2019 through 2022 seasons.

STEWART LILEY: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, again this is just opening up the Javelina rule for initial discussions and initial Department proposals. Again if the

Commission (indiscernible/background) guidance or any direction they'd like the Department to go, we would take any input at this time. Real briefly, just want to go through the harvest data. I do not expect anyone to read line-by-line on that. But if you recall, we did a mid-rule cycle amendment to the Javelina rule for those units outside of Boot Hill to allow over-the-counter sale of Javelina licenses and outside the core area and mainly the southeast area with an up-to cap. Those licenses are being fully sold out so the up-to cap is met. But our harvest has not changed at all. So really, as we discussed this at the mid-rule cycle, we proposed that we want to change our harvest it would be a lot less burden in terms of hunters having to apply for those outside of the core unit areas, having to seek a unit and then the Department sell it on the fire sale basically as an over-the-counter license anyway. What we've seen is that we do sell all those licenses over-the-counter and we haven't changed our harvest rate. So that's kind of what we were suspecting which is good. But our harvest maintains about a 30 percent success rate across the state for Javelina which is about typical. Javelina in general, you know, hunting mortality is not a big cause of Javelina population dynamics. Javelina can have two litters in one season depending on how conditions are outside. They are really driven by their environmental conditions, how the habitat is. If they have two litters, we're going to see bigger growth. If they have one litter, we're going to see less. And if it's real poor conditions, they may not even have a litter that survives. So it really is environmental factors that drive Javelina population dynamics. Habitat (indiscernible) reproductive potential of any native North American big game animal because of that. Really, the Department's proposed changes at this time is just adjusting the calendar dates given the shift in the on-a-Saturday start. We think that the way that we're harvesting and implementing management of the Javelina at this time with over-the-counter in the southeast units and managing how we are in the Boot Hill region is working really well and we do not

have any proposed changes into the management of that. It's just proposing changes to opening dates based on calendar date shifts. So with that we would take any questions or any input that the Commission has on anything to look at.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: I don't see any public comment cards on this. I guess we'll just circle back around next month. Next month?

SPEAKER: February?

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Yes. All right. Let's get to the fun stuff. Agenda item number 14, fiscal year 2017 department audit results and review. Mr. Varela.

PAUL VARELA: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, Commissioners. Agenda item 14 is the presentation of the fiscal year 2017 financial statements and audit report. The state auditor has approved and released the Department's fiscal year 2017 financial statements. State rule requires that the Department present the approved financial statements for State Game Commission Approval. So a little brief overview of now getting the financial statements. The first section is the management discussion and analysis. This provides a narrative representation of the information provided in the financial statements. The next section is the financial statements themselves which is essentially the numbers and the detail. It provides information regarding the agency's revenue, expenditures, assets and liabilities. The next section will be the supplemental information and schedules. Essentially it's just more data related to financial statements of the agency. And the last section is the single audit and this is an audit done on our Federal awards. So the results of the audit, and you can see a brief summary on pages 58 to 63 in the audit books that are provided to you. With regard to the basic financial statements for 2016, we resolved all non-compliance issues. We did have one single finding in the 2017 audit which I will describe in

the next couple of slides. And there were no audit findings regarding the Federal single audit. So the first finding in 2016 that was resolved is related to terminated employees' access to SHARE which is our statewide accounting system. During the test work in 2016 it was identified that two terminated employees maintained access to SHARE and other Department network systems after they were terminated. We have put procedures in place to make sure that this doesn't happen for 2018 and it was resolved in 2017.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Did they, even though they maintained access did they actually access?

PAUL VARELA: Mr. Chairman, no they did not. But just because the access wasn't eliminated on the date that they were terminated, it's considered a finding.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: (Indiscernible).

PAUL VARELA: On the second finding that was resolved in 2016, that was related to a budget overage. Essentially the Department overspent the personal services in the employee benefits category in our game protection fund. We resolved this issue in 2017 and we will ensure that it doesn't happen in future years. The only finding for 2017 is related to a lack of control over work in progress for capital assets and depreciation. Essentially the Department was depreciating assets prematurely. Depreciation started at the time the cost was incurred instead of when the asset was placed into service. So we have implemented processes and procedures to make sure that when we capitalize assets that they are depreciated at the proper time.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Can you go back to the previous slide? What does that mean?

PAUL VARELA: I did overage?

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Yes.

PAUL VARELA: Mr. Chairman, essentially we have a budget that's appropriated for each category in each program and in one program we overspent our personal services in Employee Benefits Category. So we overspent the amount in one program but not for the entire Department.

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: Mr. Chairman, if I may. On the audit finding for this year, I just want to point out the depreciation was a matter of months, not necessarily a matter of years that they're talking about in the difference. So I think that's an important distinction. You know, we weren't taking depreciation years ahead of time. It was a matter of months.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: I understand appreciation and I understand getting it right but it's just numbers on a page, right? I mean it's not like money is missing. Money is misspent. I mean it's just auditors going to find something and if I recall correctly, I went to the—was it the Exit Conference? Some of this was discussed if I recall at that and the impression I got from that meeting was the auditors were very satisfied with the way the Department conducted itself over the fiscal year and I won't say that this wasn't a big deal but none of this was like the house is on fire or anything else and so I'll say as I say every year. In order to get an audit and the result of an audit like this. This is hard work every day, every week of a fiscal year and it's not like you can get ready for an audit and say, all right, let's hurry up and get all this done in this week or this month. So this means that the people accounting for this are doing a great job. Really day in and day out which is very important. So I applaud the Department's efforts again on what I would consider a clean audit and some of the depreciation, I never like to see significant deficiency but from where I sit you know, some of that is a judgement call and so I know the Director and Mr. Varela probably fought like heck to say that's not accurate or it's judgement

call but at the end of the day it still remains a judgement call. So I don't see that as a black mark. Again, I applaud the Department's efforts from the top down to come out clean on this. So anyway, I interrupted you.

PAUL VARELA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So overall, the auditors expressed an unmodified opinion for the basic financial statements and they also expressed an unmodified opinion for the Department's Federal Awards. For 2017 it was the first year of our new independent auditor which is Moss Adams. The previous six years we had CliftonLarsonAllen. So the next two fiscal years we will be working with Moss Adams and we'll be improving our relationship with that audit firm.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: I will say they seem pretty easy to deal with. Looks like we've got a normal bunch of auditors. As normal as auditors are but they were pleasant to work with and you know, I felt that they were fair in the way they were treating the Department.

PAUL VARELA: With that Mr. Chairman, I will stand for any questions.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: I've talked enough. Anybody else have any other questions or comments?

COMMISSIONER: Good job.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Good work. This is an action item. Can I get a motion on this, please? Yes, Sir? Oh, I'm sorry Mr. Crenshaw. You wanted to congratulate them as well.

JOHN CRENSHAW: You stole my thunder Mr. Chairman. John Crenshaw, President of New Mexico Wildlife Federation and yes. We at the Federation really want to second what you just said. After I became president of a nonprofit I've learned more about audits than I really wanted

to know and yes, it makes people's eyes glaze over but they've done a very fine job with a very, very complex system with tens of thousands of licenses to keep track of in the Federal Aid Programs. It's really, really a challenge and they show that they're up to it and this kind of arcane sort of eye glazing work really sets the solid platform that makes the rest of the outfit work and I'm really happy to see this. It's good for the Department, the Commission and all of us fortunate too. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Thank you for your kind words. Can I get a motion on this, please?

VICE CHAIR MONTOYA: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Yes, sir.

VICE CHAIR MONTOYA: I move to approve the Departments Audit for the Fiscal Year 2017.

COMMISSIONER SALOPEK: Second.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Any further questions or comments? Discussion? All in favor?

COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Ayes have it. Why don't we take a quick break?

[Return from break]

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Okay. We're back on the record and now we've got a couple of rule hearings. Agenda Item Number 15a: Informational Rule Hearing on Proposed New Rule on Rulemaking 19.30.17 NMAC per the State Rules Act Section 14-4-1 NMSA 1978. Okay. On this script portion of this opening the hearing. Is that only for the rulemaking portion or for the informational portion?

MARYLOU POLI: Mr. Chair, this would be for the Rulemaking Process. So at this point you will actually begin with that opening statement. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: This Hearing will please come to order. My name is Paul Kienzle. I'm the Chairman of the State Game Commission. I will be serving as a Hearing Officer and be advised by the Commission's Council for office of the Attorney General, Marylou Poli. The purpose of this Hearing is to address a new part in Rule and Amendments to an existing rule. First Agenda Item 15a of the Hearing is for the Commission to receive public comment and propose new part in Title 19, Chapter 30, Part 17 of the New Mexico Administrative Code regarding establishing procedural rules for public rule hearings for use by the Commission and the Department of Game and Fish consistent with the State Rules Act and to facilitate public engagement with the administrative rulemaking process in a transparent organized and fair manner. This is a result from new language and Statute Section 14-4-5.8 NMSA 1978 which was passed in the 2017 Legislative Session and became effective in July, 2017. I will pick up the second one. Second Agenda Item 16a of the Hearing is for the Commission to receive public comment on an amendment in Title 19, Chapter 31, Part 4 of the New Mexico Administrative Code regarding amending a, change language in Item 2, sub-paragraph a, paragraph 4, subsection a, Dear God, of 19.31.4.11 NMAC to add a 2.5 mile portion of the Rio de los Pinos from the USSF Boundary 24 at the junction of the Forest Road 284 and 87a upstream to the private property boundary. Stretch of rivers being added to the Special Trout Water List with a two trout limit and tackle restrictions. Registrations on this stretch are unchanged from previous years. And b, change in language in Item 2, subparagraph a, paragraph 4, Subsection a of 19.31.4.11 NMAC to add a portion of the Rio Grande from the New Mexico/Colorado Border to the Taos Junction Bridge. A stretch of river is being added to the Special Trout Water List with a

two-trout limit and no tackle restrictions. This change represents reduction in bag limit from three trout to two trout to protect the fishery resource and improve consistency of regulations.

This Hearing is being conducted in accordance with the provisions of the Game and Fish Act and the State Rules Act. The hearing is being audiotape recorded. Anyone interested in a copy of the audiotape record should contact Sandra DuCharme with the Game and Fish Department. Public notice of this hearing was advertised in the New Mexico Register, the Albuquerque Journal and the Santa Fe New Mexican, Mexico Sunshine Portal and on the Department's Website. Copies of the proposed new rule have been available on the Department's Website and at the Department Office. Those here today, please sign the Attendance Sheet at the back of the room which will later be entered into the record as an exhibit. So I think that concludes the informational or the prelude into the informational part. I believe we hear from you on that and then we'll go on to the formal Rulemaking Hearing portion. Correct?

MARYLOU POLI: Mr. Chair, there's one more section that for the record. The instructions, it starts with- this Rule Hearing will be conducted in the following manner.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Oh, so you want me to explain that now rather than in the next section?

MARYLOU POLI: Correct. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Okay. No problem. I'm easy. This Rule Hearing will be conducted in the following manner. Staff will present pre-filed exhibits, exhibits admitted into evidence are available for review by the public but exhibits may not be removed from this room. Colonel Griego will enforce that rule strenuously. After all exhibits are entered we will proceed to the presentation of the proposed rule. Afterwards, testimony will be taken from the audience.

Typically, there will be a limit on the amount of time for testimony but we'll handle that on the fly. Usually it's a two to three minute time limit. In order to ensure that the Hearing is accurately recorded, only one person at a time shall be allowed to speak. Any person recognized to speak is asked to number one, identify yourself by name and who you are affiliated with for the record each time that you are recognized to speak and two, speak loudly and clearly so the recorder can accurately record your comments. After a person has offered comment, you will stand for questions from the Hearing Officer or other Commission Members. The audience may also ask questions of anyone offering comments after being recognized by me. This Hearing is not subject to Judicial Rules of Evidence. However, in the interest of efficiency, I reserve the right to limit any testimony deemed irrelevant, redundant or unduly repetitious. Commission may discuss the proposed rules after public comment. A portion of the Hearing, final Commission action including adoption of the rules may occur after the conclusion of the presentation and public comment period of the hearing. With that, I think you can now do your informational portion of this.

DONALD JARAMILLO: Mr. Chair, so I would have some exhibits to enter.

MARYLOU POLI: Mr. Chair, there's one more line that starts with-This Hearing is now open.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: More preliminary matters. Okay. Sooner or later we're going to get this right. New Rule Procedure for Public Hearings. This Hearing is now open. Are there any exhibits for Proposed New Rule, Proposed New Part in Rule to 19.30.17 for the record?

DONALD JARAMILLO: Mr. Chairman, there is. I would like to produce three exhibits. The first exhibit is a Notice of the Rulemaking Hearing that was published on December 12<sup>th</sup> on the New Mexico Resister. The second exhibit will be the actual Initial Proposed Rule which you

should have in front of you in your books as well in regards to rulemaking and then a copy of the slide show, that presentations that you're going to see today.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Okay. Is there three?

DONALD JARAMILLO: Yes and just as a note. The comment period was 30 days. We have received no email comments or written note comments through the Department at this time which usually is part of the record.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: So Exhibits 1, 2 and 3 are admitted into the record. Thank you. Now you can tell me about the Proposed New Rule for 19.30.17.

DONALD JARAMILLO: All right. So a Rule on Rulemaking. I think we talked about this back in November. So what the Department has proposed to do is when House Bill 58 passed the Legislative Session last year, it was signed into governor by law. During that bill there was new amendments and new sections added to the rule. One section in particular, which brings us here today, is that it allows each agency that adopts, each agency to adopt a Procedural Rule which you have in here for conducting the Rule Hearings. So for those agencies that chose not to adopt a rule, it allows or it requires that they follow a defont [Phonetic] or not defont but a Standard Rule that's going to be proposed by the Attorney General's Office or a Default Rule, excuse me, is what I'm looking for. So we're here today to present to you a rule, initial proposed rule for final adoption that is specific to our agency which follows the State Rules Act. So the objective, the Department is requesting the adoption of the rule for public hearings. Much like the one we're having today and the ones that we had in the last three meetings. So we have a, what we did was we petitioned the Mexico Records Act for a new part in rules. So will be under our administration and since it's a new rule there is no strikethrough. We're not changing

anything. It's a complete new rule into NMAC basically. So what the rule does and it follows basically the additions, the amendments to the House Bill 58. It's going to describe the initiation process of the rule. What the requirements for initiating a rule and basically what that involves is when the Department actually provides notice and notice is going to be required to publish it on the register and provide to the public. That is when we are starting the initiation process of the rule. So I know we heard earlier when we started talking about meeting dates and Stewart and how we're planning these things out. So the register only publishes twice a month. Then it has another 14 day delay, 14 day requirement that we get them proposed rules in front of them before it's actually published. Hence, setting the meeting dates and the occurrences in time because there has to be at least a 30 day window for the public which we would publish on the website. We send it to the Sunshine Portal notifying them that we're amending the rule or making a new rule and stuff, such like that but that notice itself is the initial proposed of rulemaking process. The second part of that is describe what is actually in the notice. So as we go through the rule down here I know we've referenced a lot of the statute here but basically what the notice, the requirement in the notice is that one, we're saying we're going to have a public hearing. We're going to describe the date and time. We're going to describe what the purpose of the hearing is, of the rule changes that are going to be entered. We could also provide the whole rule or we can give a synopsis. Which typically we're doing just a synopsis on that and the third part of the Rulemaking Notice as it is a requirement is how the public can comment to that rule. So within those 30 days we put up a website. We put it on our website. We send it to our district, our field offices. We also send it to the Sunshine Portal. We send it to the Legislative Finance Council and any other interested persons that have requested to see the rule. That's part of the Senate Bill 50 or House Bill 58 requirements for us to do that preloading before we have a hearing. For the

written comment period which is the next section in part of that rule. It just pretty much describes you know, how individuals can submit comments. Obviously through the email. It's a requirement that we provide an email method to for people to comment. They could also write letters through snail mail and send them to us but it also describes that they're at the hearing itself. Much like today there would be a potential to hear oral comments at the hearing.

Obviously, you hear that 30 days. So prior to any kind of Rule Hearing we do have to let the 30 days elapse to receive those public comments and again, on this particular Agenda Item we have received no email comments through their website unless you have a stack of cards up there. I'm not sure how many we're going to have today if any at all.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: There's a ton of them.

DONALD JARAMILLO: There's a ton of them. So the next section of that rule is the procedure for conducting a public hearing. So much like the script that you're reading today. We're going to describe how the hearing goes. We're going to set a venue. We're going to advertise to the public and let them know when it's going to occur. How to submit exhibits into the record and we have followed it-like I said, we followed it the last three or four. I think we're getting a little better at it as we go along and maybe it's something that we can do but a lot of it is giving the opportunity for the public to have a chance at the hearing to provide comment and concerns.

Then we have the actual records. If the Commission so choses to adopt the record or adopt the rule that sets in a sequence of events of what is contained in the record. We provide the record.

We are required by these rule processes to keep that record at the Department. We are required again, send it out to provide to the public which is meaning sending it to the Sunshine Portal.

Sending it to the Legislative Finance Council and anybody that has requested to receive that record. Then the filing and publication dates. After the adoption of rule, unless a written order is

made by this Commission or during the hearing, the adoption date is typically the date that you guys vote on it. Unless a written order is, we have 15 days to adopt that rule which means 15 days we've got to go to the New Mexico Register and get the rule filed on the register. Along with the rule itself, we also have to supply to them a concise explanatory statement which is none more than the date that the Commission adopted the rule. It's our legal authority for adopting the rule. Then any findings of fact or findings per that rule. And the last section of this is rules, Emergency Rules. So I guess the only thing that I would say in significant aspect is the statute requires is there's three items that allow for an Emergency Rule. One is for public safety and health. If the rule has any kind of affect that would affect t the public you're allowed to do an Emergency Rule. The second is if you run out of funding for a particular program of the agency. That would be considered an emergency and allowable to do an Emergency Rule by that. The third would be any kind of a conflict with any kind of Federal Law. I guess the biggest thing I would make about Emergency Rules is they are temporary. The way they're stated, as soon as they become effective. So as they either filed with the New Mexico State Register with whatever that effective date is, they're only valid for 180 days. So if that was something that the Commission let's say passed an Emergency Rule and they want it to be permanent. The Emergency Rule couldn't take effect pretty immediately but if it was something they wanted to be prolonged or after 180 days, we would have to start the whole regular process for rulemaking allowing the whole comment period and stuff like that. I think with that, I'll try to answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: So who wrote this set of rules?

DONALD JARAMILLO: Mr. Chairman, that was collaboration between myself, the Director, Marylou Poli, our Attorney General and Jacob.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: So the Department and the Attorney General's Office have weighed in on this set of rules?

DONALD JARAMILLO: Mr. Chairman, that is correct.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: And without absolutely binding the Attorney General's Office, this passes muster at least today under the Attorney Generals standards?

MARYLOU POLI: Mr. Chair, that is correct.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Let me say from a Chairman's perspective and Hearing Officers perspective, I've read the rule. It's not perfect but nothings ever perfect. I think it does provide for some flexibility in dealing with issues that do come up during hearings. Of most concern to me is on issues that do draw a lot of public comment and maybe have a meeting where there's a lot of people that wish to comment. I think it does allow the flexibility to limit how much time people speak. Basically, to have the hearing conducted in a simple and efficient manner. So it's never necessarily my intention to cut people off midsentence but I do think this set of rules does give the flexibility to handle those types of situations where but for some limit on testimony we may be here for a week. So that's of concern to me as a Hearing Officer. As for the timing of when you post and all the other things, that's largely out of our hands and so I think that the rules basically track with what's required by statute. I will tell the public as I've told them before. The best way to have meaningful input into decisions of the Commission and proposals that are generated by the Department is submit written comments. It gives both, the Department and the Commission the opportunity to fully and calmly reflect on what people are concerned about. A public meeting, while very valuable for transparency purposes and the ability to say what you wish to say is not always the best place to make policies so I would encourage the public to do

both. Submit written comments prior to a meeting during the written comment period and then show up at a meeting if you chose to do so but I firmly believe that written comments are the best way to get your initial point across. Certainly public comment at a meeting can drive home a few important points but it's not always the best place to make policy. I'll also say from a federal standpoint which I think House Bill 58 sort of tracks the federal model on this. People routinely submit written comments. Sometimes in the tens of thousands on particular rule changes and that's a pretty good model because it allows the professionals that deal with these issues every day to digest those and under the heading of you know, more heads are better than one. When the public does win on these issues the professionals that deal with this can say, oh, you know. I hadn't thought of that or that's a good idea and it's at that point in time when a proposal is under development that it can be easily changed before it gets to us for final rulemaking. So I would encourage the public to get involved in the rulemaking process early rather than later in the process. It's much easier to get things changed and get things on the right track early rather than later. So anyway, that's my two-cents.

COMMISSIONER RYAN: I have a couple of questions for the Department. I'm not sure who the best to answer is. So generally speaking, is it clear from the way this is worded on who can show up? You know who is an interested person and are they a party to the rulemaking or are they only there for public comment? I've run into this issue sitting on other administrative boards. You know there's a big difference between the public showing up and giving public comment and their information that they want to give through public comment and then there is somebody showing up wanting to present evidentiary exhibits or information that may or may not be authenticated or I mean, maybe we just decide what's relevant and where it's coming from but you know I have been involved in instances where people just show without ever

entering appearance and expect to start to not be in the public comment side of things and be you know, attorneys' are present and really to have an additional level of participation over and above public comment. So my question is, is that clear in the way this is written now? That they can't do that or if someone wants to participate in the rulemaking process like as a party and present evidence or something. How is that handled?

MARYLOU POLI: I'll give it a shot first and then Donald. So Mr. Chair and Commissioner, interested person I think that's what you're asking. Is there, is it been defined, if it hasn't. The AG's Office views it very, very broadly and that an interested person would be anybody for example, today who showed up for this Rulemaking Hearing and put their name down and if they provided an email address than the results of what happened here today would then be emailed to them. Anybody that, even during the 30 day comment period makes an email, you know makes a comment during that 30 day period they're considered an interested party. Literally, if you're interested, you're an interested person. I think I said party but it's –

COMMISSIONER RYAN: That's really public comments. Right?

MARYLOU POLI: Yes--

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: So what I would further add to that and I'm not with the Attorney General's Office but if you're an interested person you're going to be treated like anyone else and so I see interested person the same way you do. It's whoever shows up and wants to speak but you don't get a special privilege just because you think you've got more of a dog in the hunt than somebody else.

COMMISSIONER RYAN: Right.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: I think everyone is treated the same. So there's no hey, I'm a lawyer for this person. I'm going to speak for 30 minutes on this issue. It doesn't work that way. I think if you want to get your 30 minutes out there, you submit that as a written comment long before it ever gets here. You don't get the floor in a manner that's different than the rest of the public.

COMMISSIONER RYAN: And there's no opportunity for anyone really to like enter an appearances in the proceeding, present evidence in a rulemaking, nothing like that. If you're an interested person you can show up and give public written or oral public comment and that's the extent of anyone else's participation.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: I think if you're an interested person and you show up with a stack of paper as I took five minutes before earlier, I say, you know this is a really poor time to provide this much information which is not to say we'll ignore it or won't consider it but I think it's very hard to digest that kind of information on the fly.

COMMISSIONER RYAN: Right.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: So I think, let's get it out there--

COMMISSIONER RYAN: But this limits people's ability to be able to show up and expect some kind of ability to present things for the record and argue for or against.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Let me just jump in one more time and say on rulemaking its things that are generally a broad explicability to everybody. So to take the example of the—what was the name of the dam we dealt with just recently?

MARYLOU POLI: La something.

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: Mr. Chairman, Laguna ville compo.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: That's it. So on that one, which isn't strictly rulemaking, I would expect people to get up and speak kind of at length on that. More so than on a general, a rule of general applicability and so yeah. I just don't think anyone gets a special privilege no matter what the issue is.

COMMISSIONER RYAN: And then when these interested persons show up, from what this says here that the Commission may if we so desire, ask them a question. But I want to confirm that they don't have the ability to start interrogating the Department or the Commission on anything.

MARYLOU POLI: Mr. Chair, Commissioner, that's correct. If I may take a moment just to back up on the discussion between yourself and Mr. Chair and for example, Mr. Chair gave you an example of somebody showing up with a stack of papers. Whatever somebody shows up with it will be entered. It is required by law to be entered as an exhibit but logically speaking of course, could somebody digest that during the hearing? No. So it would be extremely unfortunate if somebody has valuable information for them to show up with it the day of the hearing. To clarify, it is required to be a part of the record.

COMMISSIONER RYAN: It would be admitted part of the record.

MARYLOU POLI: That's correct. That's correct. Everybody gets equal treatment.

COMMISSIONER RYAN: Okay. My only note and I don't think that this hurts the notice issue but you can advise on that. That in subsection 14, right after NMSA it needs to be inserted 1978. It's just a typographical fix.

MARYLOU POLI: Mr. Chair, Commissioner --

COMMISSIONER RYAN: I think that's just a --

MARYLOU POLI: Yes, it is and we'll make that correction. I don't believe that's a substantive change and we can make that today and move it forward.

COMMISSIONER RYAN: Yeah, okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: And as I said at the outset, this is not perfect from my perspective and if it's not working out for us we'll change it down the road or we'll tweak it here and there but I think it's a reasonable start for a process where we're still finding our feet on how it shakes out. And I share your concerns certainly as a lawyer or somebody hires me and says go do this. To be limited to a certain amount of time isn't necessarily appealing. It might make my job easier but it's not appealing if I have a lot to say but I think there is the opportunity during this written comment period to really get out everything that you want to say and get it out much more effectively than if you were to speak at a public meeting. I think it may show a, up the feeling or interest in the issue to hire council and have them show up because I does drive home perhaps the point to the Department and the Commission that somebody really cares about this. But again, the better way to do it is probably handle it through written comments. Any questions or comments from the public or anything else from Commissioners? So if there's no more public comment or comment questions from the Department I'll close that part of it. Are there any other exhibits anyone wants to enter into the record? We have Exhibits 1, 2 and 3 that were entered.

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: I have those.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: You do have those? Okay. So no additional exhibits. So we just got 1, 2 and 3. So I think that then closes the informational portion of this?

MARYLOU POLI: Mr. Chair, except for public comment if there is any.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: And I asked. I don't think there is. Nobody. You got? Changed your mind. Here to speak. Okay.

MICHAEL DAX: It's based on something you said. Michael Dax with Defenders of Wildlife. Chairman, Commissioners, Chairman you had mentioned and you have mentioned this to me before that the best way is written comment prior to when we get in this room. I don't believe your email addresses are currently on the Departments Website. I believe there is a P.O. Box which I think makes it more difficult for the public if they do have a comment to be able to contact you or any of you ahead of time. So I don't know if that is something that you've considered or if that's something that could be remedied. I think it's all the same P.O. Box so I assume that's handled by the Department and for you guys down south, I imagine your obviously not personally checking it and I don't know how that system might work but I think email would make it more accessible for the public if they want to comment on something. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Thank you.

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: Mr. Chairman, Michael, don't walk away. Per the rules, we need to have you fill out that form and that will be Exhibit Number 4 Mr. Chairman if that's okay with you?

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Works for me. You know an email address, there is a written email address for comments to go to that eventually gets summited.

DONALD JARAMILLO: Mr. Chairman, that is correct.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: I've really enjoyed having email comments in the past that included death threats. So that's not necessarily appealing to me. Now to the extent death threats come in to a common email address, somebody else can read them first and be alarmed rather than me by

myself but there is a means for getting those written comments to Commissioners in advance of a Rulemaking Hearing.

DONALD JARAMILLO: Mr. Chairman, we'll be sure to do that.

COMMISSIONER RICKLEFS: I would ask if we do get comments on a particular issue. Is that part of the public record?

DONALD JARAMILLO: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Ricklefs yes it is. Any comments that were received through the email we collect and we disseminate that and then it does become part of the public hearing.

COMMISSIONER RICKLEFS: If it's identified as a particular issue that is before the Commission then that's part of the public record.

DONALD JARAMILLO: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Ricklefs that is correct. It is part of the record.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Well I think, was your question if you get an email?

COMMISSIONER RICKLEFS: Personally, yes. Yes, a personal email. Public interested party.

MARYLOU POLI: Mr. Chair, Commissioner it's a good question and it's one that hasn't been presented through the AG's Office that I'm aware of. However, I whole heartedly would opine that it would not be a part of the record. That it would need to go to whatever designated email address the Department has provided.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: I would add along those lines that we're a Citizen Commission and you know, I'm not strictly set up to handle, at least from in House Bill 58 perspective, you know the written comments that may come in on a particular issue. So I think that's why during the

written comment period they need to come to a central email address so there's organization to the cast. So you get one comment. No big deal. You end up with 500 comments, I don't want to be wading through those as a Citizen Commissioner wondering you know, do I need to preserve this? Do I need to send this to somebody? So I think in order to have I guess what I would call a valid written comment, it needs to go to that common identified email address to make it legitimate. Okay. So I think I can close Item 15a and move on to--

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: Mr. Chairman, we do have Exhibit Number 4 which is Mr. Dax's --

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: It's admitted. Yeah, it's admitted. Okay. I'm going to do the rule. I'm going to vote on 15. Do the actual rulemaking on 15b and then move on to 16 after that.

MARYLOU POLI: Of course Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Okay. So you signed the sign-in sheet. Is that also part of? Would that be Exhibit 5?

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: Mr. Chairman, I believe it goes with Exhibit 4.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: 4? Okay. And you took care of that? All right. I've admitted that then as Exhibit 4. The comments submitted and testimony heard during this Rule Hearing will be reviewed by the Commission and discussed during the open session of today's meeting. The Commission will vote on the proposed rule in 15a and b at this time. Thank you for your participation. Let the record show that this particular portion of the Rulemaking Hearing was adjourned at-what time is it?

COMMISSIONER: 11:00.

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: 11:00 Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: 11 am. Thank you. Okay, so that concludes 15a, the informational portion. 15b is the actual action item on this and let's see- I don't think I have anything else that I need to read in particular definite to this. Correct?

MARYLOU POLI: So I would like to clarify please, Mr. Chair. You had said that it closed the Rule Hearing and just for the record, everything that you gave in the preliminary statement will apply to the next amendment that's to the rule that's proposed. So the Rule Hearing is technically still open and we've closed the record on that one particular rule regarding the Rulemaking Procedure and we'll move on to the next rule and vote after both have been heard.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Okay. 15a and so I'm going to vote on 15b at this point in time.

MARYLOU POLI: If you wish.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: I would prefer to do a vote on that now at the close. So let's do a motion, yes.

COMMISSIONER SALOPEK: I move to adopt New Rule 19.30.17 NMAC Procedural Rule for Public Rule and Hearings as p[resented and allow the Department to make minor corrections to comply with filing this rule with State Records and Archives.

COMMISSIONER RICKLEFS: Second.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Questions, comments, discussion from Commissioners? All for a vote? All in favor?

COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Ayes have it. All right. Great new world under House Bill 58. Okay. So what pre-file exhibits do you have? The Hearing is now open. Are there any exhibits that you've got that you wish to pre-file?

MIKE SLOANE: Mr. Chairman, there are. I have a CD containing the Notice of Rulemaking. The data relied upon in developing the rule. Public meeting materials including sign-in sheets and public comments. The Statewide Fisheries Management Plan. Responses to public comments and the Proposed and Final Rule as well as a copy of my presentation today.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Exhibit-what numbers are those?

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: Mr. Chairman, I believe it would be Exhibits 1 through 8.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: 1 through 8. Okay. Exhibits 1 through 8 are admitted into the record.

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: Mr. Chairman, just to verify. You have 7 there on your list. Is that correct? 6. Excuse me. Exhibits 1 through 7 have now been admitted to me.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: 6 or 7?

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: Mr. Chairman, he has 6 on the CD and there is 1 in my hand.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Understood. All right, Exhibits 1 through 7 are entered. You can go ahead and introduce the Proposed Amendment for Rule 19.31.4.

MIKE SLOANE: Thank you. As you'll recall, you adopted the rule for the Fisheries Rule in your November Meeting but due to an omission on my part, I needed to come back and amend that rule and it's a very simple amendment adding the Rio de los Pinos and the Rio Grande from the Colorado Border to the Taos Junction Bridge as special trout waters. Both the Rio de los Pinos and the Rio Grande have been special trout waters. The only change in their regulation is

putting them into the Green Chili for the Los Pinos and Christmas for the Rio Grande and a reduction in bag limit on the Rio Grande from three to two. As we discussed before, we had multiple public meetings. We've received approximately 23 public comments prior to the amendment and then one specific to the amendment that was a blanket disapproval of any special trout waters. We've posted on the web and done a news release so we've met all those requirements. So with that I would stand for any questions.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Any public comment on this? I don't have any comment cards. Any questions or comments from—

COMMISSIONER RICKLEFS: I've got one question. Mike, on the Los Pinos, it's going to be at the Green chili two bag. So at the private property what's above that? Does that apply to that too or is it?

MIKE SLOANE: No, the normal regulations that apply above.

COMMISSIONER RICKLEFS: I was just wondering. Thank you. Could you make it apply or is it because of private property we can't?

MIKE SLOANE: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner in general we could make it apply although we would work with the private property owner to make sure they were comfortable with that.

COMMISSIONER RICKLEFS: Right. Thank you

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Any other questions, comments? Any other exhibits from anybody or from you?

MIKE SLOANE: None from me Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Out of exhibits. Okay. No other comments. No other exhibits. We've admitted Exhibits 1 through 7 into the record already. I don't think we've had anyone sign in so there should be no attendance sheet other than a blank one. Do you want to do? We won't do one. Let's see. The comments submitted and testimony heard during this Rule Hearing will be reviewed by the Commission and discussed during the open session of today's meeting. The Commission will vote on the proposed rule at that time. Thank you everyone for your participation today. Let the record show that this Rulemaking Hearing was adjourned at –

MARYLOU POLI: 11:07.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Okay.

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: Mr. Chairman, I would request that you fill out a card in the sign-in sheet.

SPEAKER: (Indiscernible) sign-in sheet but I didn't know that was one I had to fill out. I'll do that. It's just a comment. Nothing crazy.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Have at it.

SPEAKER: Okay. So I just wanted to say as a citizen's advisor thank you very much for everything but being I'm going—

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: Please state your name for the record. Thank you.

JULIAN GONZALES: Julian Gonzales [Phonetic]. We did approve a vault restroom for the Rio de los Pinos because that was something that a lot of sportsmen-I'm like where the rubber meets the road for the Game Commission and I go out there into the field and I get all of as much information as I can for the game and Fish and we've fund-of course you know the system but

we're looking at maintenance on the road up there. That was a big concern of sportsmen and a rest room. So you're getting one. Thank you. That's all.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Thank you. So will now enter the Attendance Sheet as Number –

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: 8, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: 8.

COMMISSIONER: Is that not going to make the (Indiscernible) longer?

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Okay. So record closed. We will show that we are adjourned at—what time now?

COMMISSIONER: 11:09

MARYLOU POLI: 11:09.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: 11:09. Okay, a.m., all right. Then we will move to the actual rulemaking. Can I get a motion on this item please?

COMMISSIONER RAMOS: Mr. Chairman, I move to adopt the Amendment to the Fisheries Rule 19.31.4 NMAC as presented and to allow the Department to make minor corrections to comply with filing this Rule with State Records and Archives.

VICE CHAIR MONTOYA: Second.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Any further discussion, question or comment? Seeing none, all in favor?

COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Ayes have it. Okay, there you go Mike.

MIKE SLOANE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Agenda Item Number 17: Closed Executive Session. We need a roll call on this.

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: Mr. Chairman, I believe we need a motion.

COMMISSIONER RYAN: I move to adjourn to Executive Session closed to the public pursuant to Section 10-15-1(H)(2) NMSA 1978 to discuss limited personnel matters relating to complaints and discipline and pursuant to Section 10-15-1(H)(7) on matters subject to attorney- client privilege relating to threatened or pending litigation in which the Commission and or the Department is or may become a participant as listed in Agenda Items 17, subsections A and B.

COMMISSIONER RAMOS: Second.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: All in favor-roll call.

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: Commissioner Peterson.

COMMISSIONER PETERSON: Aye.

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: Commissioner Ramos.

COMMISSIONER RAMOS: Aye.

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: Commissioner Ricklefs.

COMMISSIONER RICKLEFS: Yes.

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: Commissioner Ryan.

COMMISSIONER RYAN: Yes.

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: Commissioner Salopek.

COMMISSIONER SALOPEK: Yes.

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: Vice Chairman Montoya.

VICE CHAIRMAN MONTOYA: Yes.

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: Chairman Kienzle.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Yes.

DIRECTOR SANDOVAL: So Mr. Chairman, Members of the Public, Commissioners, we will be adjourning onto that small room off there on the wing I believe. Sandra, is that correct?

[Adjourned for Closed Executive Session]

[Returned from Closed Executive Session]

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: This Commission had adjourned into Executive Session closed to the public. During the Executive Session the Commission discussed only those matters specified under its motion to adjourn and it took no action as to any matter. I've got one public comment. David Mayahersee [Phonetic]? Medacuchi [Phonetic]?

DAVE MENICUCCI: Ready?

CHAIRMAN MAXWELL: Yes, sir.

DAVE MENICUCCI: Okay. Chairman, Commissioners, thank you for allowing me to speak. My name is Dave Menicucci and I'm going to speak today about an issue of mobility access at the Valles Caldera National Preserve. Now I understand there's a jurisdictional issue. You all manage the game. They manage the property. Well it means we have to cooperate. Let me tell

you a little bit about me and then I'm going to tell you about the problem. I only have a couple minutes so I'll be very brief but I'll hang around afterwards and talk to you in more details if you want. I am a retired engineer from Sandia labs [Phonetic] and UNM Professor and since I've retired I've done a lot of writing on outdoor issues. Mobility issues being the key one. My wife and I own property south of Valles Caldera and in La Cueva and I've also done a research out on the preserve. I am a Registered New Mexico Guide although I don't guide for fee anymore. The issue at hand is the problem that the Park Service has encountered with maintenance. Park Service overall is twelve billion dollars in a hole. Twelve billion dollars in the hole on maintenance throughout their system. They can't maintain roads. They can't maintain buildings and it's hitting the Valles Caldera. One of the problems is that the Valles Caldera looks in porai, looks at the situation and says we can't maintain these roads. They're sometimes dangerous. Especially during icy and muddy conditions. Therefore, we're going to close them. Well that's a very good deal if you're a hiker. If your young and your mobil and you can get in there but your mobility hunter, you're having a very difficult time because what has been left is just two roads open. One is VZO-201, VZO-2 and VZO-1. It goes right down north and south through the middle of the preserve and the VZO-9 that goes along the northern edge. Now the elk as most of you know, have pretty good intelligence and when they see a lot of people on those roads they skedaddle up to the Cerros and they're gone. So it's very difficult to hunt in there if you're not fully mobil. I think there's some simple solutions. One of them I articulated in the article that I wrote about this in the Albuquerque Journal. You have a copy of that. It's from Dennis Trujillo who suggest a private public partnership between the Park Service and the grazers and I have talked to a couple of lawyers about this including Bill Calahur [Phonetic]. You probably know Bill Calahur and we don't think there are any SFR or prohibitions against the Valles Caldera to

engage in this kind of a partnership, set fees as responsible, as appropriate so that the ranchers would then exchange a lower fee for say, maintaining roads but I talked to Dennis yesterday about a possible solution involving El Cajete. I don't know if you know about the preserve but El Cajete is a very nice mobility area in the southwest part of the reserve. We think that that could be opened for the mobility hunts and for mobility hunters. It wouldn't cost the preserve. Neither one of these would cost the preserve anything. It would just cost them a little bit of effort in doing something outside the ordinary. Now what I would recommend is that we sit down with (Indiscernible). I would like to get a representative of the Commission, the Department, the mobility community. Let's sit down with the Commission and let's talk about these issues. Let's see if we can start getting some of these reopened for the mobility hunters and let's really not turn this place into an exclusive elite area only for young mobil hunters. I'm not officially disabled but I sure can't walk like I used to and I sure don't drag elk out of the forest like I used to. So we deserve an opportunity to use this preserve that we've paid into for many years and I think with the weight and the influence of the Commission and the Department and the cooperation of (Indiscernible) and his team, I think we can do something. So I'd invite you to work with us. Dennis said he would help. Tom Arvest [Phonetic] I talked to yesterday. He said he was interested in helping and there's a number of people in the mobility community that were interested and see if we can solve this problem.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: I've got a few comments on this. We've fought this battle already some years ago. There's some organizations in this room that opposed the Department affectively managing this particular piece of property and so while I'm never one to say no for all time. We fought this battle already and we lost and so someone else can go fight the battle and not quite bring it to me gift wrapped but you'll get our cooperation when we see from other

folks that they're ready to cooperate and you know, give us some measure of management and if not control. I mean we're happy to spend our money and our resources to make all those things happen but I'm not going to go tilt against windmills again when again, some of the organizations, at least one organization in this room opposed control or any management by the Department back in the day. So if you're able to get buy-in from those groups and organizations, give the Department management. You know, we'll sit down at the table and hammer that out but I'm reluctant to commit Department resources today in an effort that we already tried and were unsuccessful at. So call it sour grapes or what you will but you know, we offered up that some years ago and it was rejected and I'm sympathetic to you. You're not the first one to come to us and say this is being if not mismanaged, not managed according to best practices or you know in a way that's most user friendly to the public and I'm totally sympathetic to that but cracking through that federal wall and getting done the things you suggest is not, unfortunately it's not just a bunch of people sitting around a table and shaking hands. I mean it's not an easy thing to get done. So if someone wants to do the spade work or if there's a Commissioner or someone at the Department that the Director wants to dedicate to this and try and solve the problem. You know I'm totally in favor of it but I'm not going to say you know, you have to go do this because as I recall we tried this once before and their like, I don't even think it was thanks or no thanks. I think it was just dead silence on the part of the people that were in charge of it. And I'll say again, everyone seems, not everyone. There is some segment of the public and organizations that are definitely afraid of management by the state. They see that as you know, the dark side of federalism if you will where we're going to close things or we're going to you know, sell it off to oil interest or something else and I just don't think that's the case. This Commission, this Department does not have a history of doing that. So we tried to say well we'll

be good stewards of this particular piece of property. You know, give us the opportunity to do just what you've suggested and again, I think we we're met with silence and not even a no. We just never got an answer to the question. So if someone can demonstrate for me. I'd say this time in writing. You know a series of friendly emails or something like that saying you know, we'd like to solicit the Department or the Commission's assistance in this. Sure we'll sit down but I'm reluctant to commit Commission and Department resources to an effort that's already failed before. So it's probably more than you wanted to hear but that's kind of where I stand. I don't know about the rest of the Commissioners.

COMMISSIONER RAMOS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment a little bit on that and I agree with you exactly what you just said. We definitely fought that battle but one of the things that I'm afraid of as we move on down the road that they do away with the hunting and fishing opportunities there and this might be a deterrent to close roads where our constituents and people that put in you know, aren't going to put in there because they're not going to get a quality experience but I would hope that I could wrap my brain around the different hunts that are there currently with a situation and see what we could do with a new rule. Whether we and I don't know how many permits we allow in there. Handicap permits. Stewart, just off the top of my head. If there's 25 or whatever but if we can maybe break them down or--

DAVE MENICUCCI: I think there's 15 on the mobility.

COMMISSIONER RAMOS: 15 mobility. You know, like I said, I'd need to wrap my brain around it but I hope that we don't just give up on that but I hope that there could be some conversations to open up an area as you recommended within that Park Service Property.

COMMISSIONER RICKLEFS: Is that, are the hunts there still by lotto or did we switch it like statewide.

STEWART LILEY: It's been switched to statewide draw.

COMMISSIONER RICKLEFS: Shows you I haven't put in there and I'll shut up.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Any other questions or comments on this issue? I sympathize with you completely but if someone can demonstrate for me that federal governments ready to engage in this. Not just anecdotally but you know, sends us something formally that says we'd like to sit down with you then I think that's a good invitation to go down that road. So it sounds like you've made some of those inroads and I think we're happy to participate once we show a willingness on the other side but we made a lot of effort back in the day to get this done and in fact, I sat down with Senator Udall's staff at one point to protect the right to hunt, fish and trap in that area and that was in doubt until it wasn't and so you know, even on the top line item. You know, can you hunt, fish and trap in this area? That was a tough sell and so shared management, if you want to call it that, is an even tougher sell but we do have the , we will make the resources, the people and the dollars available I believe to get that done but I've got to see a willingness on the other side. Much more so than we saw the last time where we were just sort of flatly rejected on that issue. So I appreciate you bringing it up. That help?

DAVE MENICUCCI: You haven't said anything that I disagree with. I kind of look at it this way. We got dealt a bad hand of cards and now I think what we have to do is just suck it up and see what we can do.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: And I would venture to guess with most federal lands around the country, their chronically underfunded and so under the heading of you know, bring the problem

as close to home as possible. Whether it's state or local government, we're in a great position to help stop that gap or fix that problem but it requires willingness in the federal government to share some of that control and I know from having just tussled over the wolf for, depend upon your timeline perspective but five years or 35 years. The getting that hand shake of cooperation doesn't come easy and so I don't know if they're looking at me sideways going who's this guy and you know, can we trust him or do we not want to give away any of our power or whatever the mindset is but I know the Department and this Commission, we stand ready to cooperate with anybody who is willing to visit with us and sit down and shake hands. So what I would suggest as I've told other person in your position is don't give up on this. Continue to do the hard work. Try and put people together via email. You know, loop. Whether it's looping me in, the Director in. You know, loop us in and we can start the process of trying to come to terms on tis but I would suggest don't give up. Work harder to get it done.

DAVE MENICUCCI: No, we won't and I just appreciate you listening to this and ralph, I appreciate your comments and Dennis Trujillo is very much with us on this along with others and Miss Sandoval I wanted to compliment you on the Department. I'm doing some research right now and writing an academic article on the benefits of hunting and the more I look into this, this is a-the hunting. The conservation model. The North American Conservation model is really a good model to use to be applied to our public lands which are really in disarray. So you've done a good job and I think with one exception. A Miss Morgan, one in your Department claimed that I could only talk to the department in writing but I got to Dan Williams and he was, he provided me with a lot of info. So thank you very much. I really appreciate what you do. You provide very, very valuable service to our community and we appreciate it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Thank you. Seeing no more public comment. I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

VICE CHAIRMAN MONTOYA: So moved.

COMMISSIONER SALOPEK: Second.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: All in favor?

COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN KIENZLE: Ayes have it.

NEW MEXICO STATE GAME COMMISSION

January 11, 2018  
Santa Fe Community College  
Board Room  
6401 Richards Avenue  
Santa Fe, NM 87508  
9:00 a.m. –5:00 p.m.

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, Cheryl Melgarejo and I, Rose Leonard  
DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the  
above captioned transcription was prepared by me;  
that the RECORDING was reduced to typewritten  
transcript by me; that I listened to the entire  
RECORDING; that the foregoing transcript is a  
complete record of all material included thereon,  
and that the foregoing pages are a true and correct  
transcription of the recorded proceedings, to the  
best of my knowledge and hearing ability. The  
recording was good.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither employed  
by nor related to nor contracted with (unless  
excepted by the rules) any of the parties or  
attorneys in this matter, and that I have no  
interest whatsoever in the final disposition of this  
matter.

Rose Leonard    Cheryl Melgarejo  
(Name of Transcriptionists)

Quality Assurance and transcript provided by:

Premier Visual Voice, LLC

www.premiervisualvoice.com: 216-246-9477

**APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES  
NEW MEXICO STATE GAME COMMISSION**

January 11, 2018  
Santa Fe Community College Board Room  
6401 Richards Avenue  
Santa Fe, NM 87508  
9:00 a.m. –5:00 p.m.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**Alexandra Sandoval, Director and Secretary**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**Date**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**Paul M. Kienzle III, Chairman  
New Mexico State Game Commission**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**Date**

**AS/scd**