

New Mexico Adult Parole Board Quarterly Meeting Minutes

Date: Tuesday, March 25, 2025

Time: 9:11 AM

Location: NM Department of Corrections Central Office Santa Fe In-person & Virtual

Call to Order

Chairman Anaya called the meeting to order at 9:11 AM.

Roll Call

Executive Director Roberta Cohen conducted the roll call:

Present Members:

- Dorothy Pough
- Janet Chandler
- Amy Lopez
- Mary Jaramillo Barraza
- Karen Apodaca
- Brandy Castillo
- Anne Murray
- Carol Slavens
- Charles Tully
- Roberta Lucero Ortega
- Christine Ring
- Colleen McCarthy
- Whitney Steinmetz
- Chairman Abram Anaya

APB Staff in attendance:

- Executive Director Roberta Cohen
- Parole Board Office Manager Lola Rael
- Financial Coordinator Rosan Duran
- Management Analyst Melissa Herrera
- Records Coordinator Katie Apodaca
- Representatives from the Department of Corrections and public attendees

Guests in attendance:

- Forrest Beard-NMCD
- Lyle Wieman-NMCD
- Dr. Kaisa Marshall-UNM
- Dr. Jen Perillo-UNM
- Doreen McKnight-Attorney

- Phoebe Lytle-(De)serving Life
- Andrea Sutphin-Wife of offender
- Kurt Mayer-(De)serving Life
- Stephen Taylor--(De)serving Life

Meeting Protocol Reminder

- Meeting conducted in accordance with the Open Meetings Act.
- Participants on Zoom must remain muted until called upon.
- Board members must identify themselves before speaking.
- All votes will be conducted via roll call.

Approval of Agenda

Motion to approve the agenda was made and seconded. The motion was made by Member Chandler and seconded by Member Apodaca passed unanimously via roll call vote.

Approval of December 3, 2024, Meeting Minutes

Motion to approve the previous meeting minutes was made and seconded. The motion was made by Member Chandler and 2nd by Member Apodaca passed unanimously via roll call vote.

Chairman's Report

Chairman Anaya expressed appreciation for board members' efforts during his legislative commitments. Key updates included:

- Completion of backlog for sex offender reviews, reducing hearing frequency to twice monthly.
- Resolution of serious youthful offender cases.
- Upcoming April hearings include 5 adult and 4 youthful offender cases.
- Welcome to new board members Whitney Steinmetz and Charles Tully.
- One remaining board vacancy.
- Senate Bill 17 (modernizing the board) passed the House and Senate but was vetoed.
- Senate Bill 375 (probation and parole changes) is awaiting the Governor's signature.

Executive Director's Report

Executive Director Cohen reported on:

- Staff dedication and successful workload management.
- No pending parole certifications from NMCD, indicating efficiency.
- Confirmation of board members anticipated later in 2025.
- Implementation of Senate Bill 375 and its impact.
- A 3% budget increase was approved, but further financial advocacy is needed.
- Overdue SO hearings are now up to date, it has taken a year and a half to complete

- Compliance with 30-day requirement for parole violation hearings.
- Ongoing discussions with Legislative analysts regarding performance measures.
- Upcoming April meeting to discuss conditions of supervision policy updates.

Financial Audit Report

Presented by CFO Rosan Duran. Key points include:

- Fiscal year 2025 budget adjustments.
- Financial standing and audit compliance.
- Future budget planning and allocation strategies.

Open Meetings Act – 2025 Update

- The Chair recognized that the Open Meetings Act requires annual updates.
- The only amendment to the existing act is the change of the year to 2025.
- No substantive changes were made.

Presentations

New Mexico Corrections and Public Relations – Probation & Parole Division

Presenter: Lupe Sanchez, Director of Probation and Parole Division

Mr. Sanchez introduced key staff members:

- The meeting opened with a welcome and introduction by the Chair, who then invited **Director Lupe Sanchez** to begin his presentation on the structure and operations of New Mexico Probation and Parole.
- Mr. Sanchez noted he was not expecting a formal introduction and had prepared a familiar presentation but opted instead to open the floor for questions after brief remarks.

Introductions of Staff: Mr. Sanchez introduced key division staff:

- **Wes Hadley** – Region Manager, Special Programs, Albuquerque (Region 2)
- **Deputy Director Andrea Sandoval**
- **Blake Pollard** – Supervisor, Sex Offender Unit, Albuquerque
- **Forrest Beard** – Administrator, Community Corrections Unit (CCU)
- **Lyle Weiman** – Region Manager, Standard Supervision
- **Adam Baum** (Online) – Region Manager, Santa Fe (Region 1)

Overview of Division Structure and Caseload:

- The division operates four regions covering the entire state:
 - Region 1: Northern NM (Santa Fe and surrounding)
 - Region 2: Albuquerque Metro (including Valencia and Bernalillo Counties)
 - Region 3: Las Cruces, Alamogordo, Ruidoso, etc.)
 - Region 4: Hobbs, Roswell, Carlsbad)
- 289 probation and parole officers work across **29 district offices** (previously misreported as 46 due to overlapping specialized units).
- The division supervises **14,000–14,500 individuals** statewide, including those on probation, parole, or dual.

Specialized Programs and Units:

- A wide range of specialized programs are available statewide.
- **STIU Fugitive Apprehension Unit:** ~21 officers, many cross-commissioned with US Marshals, focus on high-profile absconders.
- **Community Corrections** under **Forrest Beard** provides:
 - Transitional housing
 - Reentry programs
 - Life skills support
 - Housing assistance and other services via local partnerships

Discussion and Q&A Highlights:

1. **Community Corrections Program Access:**
 - Every supervised person has access to services regardless of region, though CCU programs may vary by location.
 - Services (e.g., mental health, substance use treatment) are assigned based on **COMPAS assessments**.
2. **Mental Health & Release Medication Coordination:**
 - DOC now ensures individuals are released with at least **30 days of medication**, with protocols for emergency refills if needed.
 - Staff work to coordinate continuity of care with local providers.
3. **Parole Housing Requirements:**
 - Parolees are generally required to stay at their approved residence for **six months**, but early changes can be coordinated if circumstances warrant.
 - For **Transitional Living Facilities (TFLs)**, the six-month stay is typical, but exceptions are made for those demonstrating stability and independence.
4. **Homelessness and Emergency Housing:**
 - Emergency housing partnerships exist in **every region**.
 - Officers may use shelter placements or emergency hotel stays as needed.
5. **Parole Plan Investigations (PPI) and TFL Placements:**
 - Inconsistency noted in whether PPI reports recommend **Intensive Supervision Program (ISP)** for those paroling to TFLs.

- Mr. Sanchez confirmed that **ISP is preferred** for TFL placements due to higher risk levels and environmental concerns.
 - GPS monitoring should be recommended at **PPO discretion**, except in high-risk cases (e.g., sex offenses, domestic violence), where **board orders for full duration monitoring** may be appropriate.
6. **File Notes and Communication:**
- Board members asked about a digital mechanism to share historical context or rationale for conditions like GPS.
7. **Coordination on Conditions of Parole:**
- Clarified that field officers do respect conditions set by the board and that special conditions are reviewed in accordance with state statute.
 - Communication between the board and field offices is essential to ensure shared understanding of justifications behind conditions.

Discussion on Communication and Request Protocols

- **Staff Manager Rael emphasized the importance of offenders going through their parole officers (POs)** for requests like GPS removal or discharges. She noted she gets numerous calls directly from offenders and consistently redirects them to their assigned POs.
 - **Offenders seeking discharge paperwork from as far back as 2007** are being instructed to go through their PO. If the discharge isn't on file, the PO can make the request to Ms. Rael directly, and she'll process and return it with consistent formatting.
 - Ms. Rael wants all parties to be aligned and not act on calls or emails unless they've been verified by the PO. The process helps avoid confusion and ensures PO involvement in all decisions.
 - **Offenders should not bypass their PO by calling the Parole Board or other administrators directly.** If they do, it often suggests they've already received a response they didn't like and are attempting to go around it.
 - Requests such as GPS removal should come from the PO. If the PO agrees with the offender's request, it will be passed to Ms. Rael, then to the Parole Board Chair, and routed back to the PO for final communication with the offender.
-

Clarification on GPS Monitoring Timeframes

- One board member asked about including a **"6-month minimum" GPS requirement** and whether the PO can make a decision after that period.
- Chairman Anaya confirmed that a **6-month review** is appropriate. If an officer believes the individual is doing well at the 6-month mark, a brief letter with a recommendation to the board is sufficient.
- The preferred process includes: short statement of compliance by the PO, a recommendation, and then submission via OMNI for approval/disapproval from the board.

Use of Counseling Certificates and Assessments

- When offenders present counseling certificates from prison, **they should take them to the assessment provider**. The treatment provider will determine what, if any, additional services are necessary.
- The only program **not typically counted** from prison completion is **Domestic Violence Prevention**, as it requires 52 weeks and must be completed in the community.
- **Other programs like parenting, anger management, and education** can be evaluated by the provider based on prior completion.

Travel Permits and County Borders

- There was discussion on **travel between closely connected counties (e.g., Bernalillo to Sandoval or Valencia)**.
- **Physical travel permits are no longer used**, but **travel outside the county still requires PO permission**, as per standard conditions. Permission is now notated in the OMNI system.
- For work-related travel (e.g., commuting to a job), a **simple notation in the OMNI system is enough**, provided it's approved.

Housing Verification and Sponsor Identification

- A case was brought up where a **sponsor (the brother) agreed to take in the offender**, but the **brother's wife was unaware** and objected upon arrival.
 - Officers were reminded to **confirm with all household members** that they approve of the parole plan.
 - Officers should also **clearly identify who the sponsor is**, including relationship and how long they've known the offender—especially in cases involving romantic partners met during incarceration.
-

Clarification on Mental Health vs. Standard Assessments

- When deciding between a **standard assessment** and a **mental health assessment**, Board member Ortega Lucero explained her approach:
 - If an offender has mental health diagnoses (e.g., bipolar, depression) or is on medication, a **mental health assessment** should be ordered.
 - Otherwise, offenders receive a standard substance abuse or behavioral assessment.
 - Probation & Parole officers confirmed they interpret and apply the two assessment types similarly.
-

Concerns with PVR (Parole Violation Reports) Quality

- **Janet Chandler emphasized the importance of clear, detailed PVRs.**
 - Some PVRs are excellent, but many lack specific details or only mention “conduct” or “arrest” without context or evidence.
 - Board members struggle with vague reports, particularly when no investigation or follow-up is included.
 - Officers should include **multiple conditions violated if applicable**, not just one vague mention.
- High-quality PVRs allow the board to consider technical violations separately from pending criminal cases.
- Regional managers are actively addressing these issues and providing guidance through supervisory meetings.

Violation Reports and Evidentiary Hearings

- Board members expressed challenges with incomplete or vague violation reports.
 - Emphasis placed on ensuring reports clearly explain the *evidence* and *facts* behind each violation.
 - Supervisors are encouraged to properly prepare POs for evidentiary hearings. Many POs are unfamiliar with the process and their prosecutorial role.
 - After hearings, board members often provide informal coaching to POs due to lack of preparation.

Itemization of Violations

- Request for better itemization of behavioral violations (e.g., curfew, failure to find employment) to aid discussion and clarify with clients what behaviors contributed to the violation.
- The issue will be brought up at the upcoming Regional Manager meeting to standardize expectations.

Supervision Conditions & Treatment Facility Naming in Minutes

- Discussion on ensuring supervision conditions give officers flexibility without overly restricting them.
- Concerns raised about naming specific facilities in board conditions (e.g., “successfully complete Darren’s Place”).
 - Recommendation: Use generic descriptions such as “residential treatment program” to avoid privacy issues and public safety concerns.

Housing and Plan Changes

- Concerns about residents being approved for one location (e.g., NM Men's Recovery), then attempting to change their plan last minute.
 - Board stressed that unless a facility communicates a breakdown in placement, conditions will remain tied to the original approved site.
 - Case managers and board members must maintain clear communication.
 - Exception examples: If a family member offers a better alternative that improves likelihood of success, the board may approve adjustments.

Preliminary vs. Full Violation Reports

- Clarification requested regarding whether preliminary reports are reviewed or approved by the board.
 - Response: Preliminary reports are no longer used for monitoring post-policy change. Full Violation Reports must include all prior steps/violations to show progression.
 - New gradation sanction program affects when and how violations are escalated to the board.

Geriatric & Long-Term Incarcerated Supervision

- Question raised on how older individuals, especially those incarcerated for decades, are being supervised in the field.
 - All Officers receive 6 weeks of comprehensive training, including special populations.
 - Emphasis placed on compassion, social-work-style supervision, and individualized support to assist with reentry into modern society (e.g., use of phones, shopping, transportation).

Sex Offender Housing Placement Challenges

- Ongoing difficulty placing sex offenders due to proximity restrictions to schools, parks, etc.
- Standardized interpretation: distance measured from the **physical residence** to the restricted zone boundary (not property line to property line), especially in complex housing scenarios (e.g., apartment complexes, trailer parks).

- Goal: prevent blanket denials and use more flexible, context-aware evaluations.

Cameras at Sponsor Residences

- Previous policies denied housing if sponsor had surveillance cameras.
 - Now being reviewed on a case-by-case basis.
 - Cameras are no longer an automatic denial unless there's a strong safety concern (e.g., drug trafficking).
 - Officers trained to approach homes with cameras safely; grandmother's house with basic security no longer disqualifies.

Appreciation for District Office Support

- Board members extended thanks to Probation & Parole Division for accommodating board hearings post-COVID at district offices.
 - Field staff recognized for professionalism and supportiveness during these sessions.

Open Meetings Act Resolution – Motion and Vote

Chairperson noted that during the introductions, they had been remiss in formally introducing the Board's new legal counsel. Appreciation was expressed for the presence of the Assistant Attorney General from the Department of Justice, who provided timely guidance earlier in the meeting.

The Chair acknowledged an oversight during the Open Meetings Act discussion—specifically, that the only change in the revised resolution was updating the year to 2025. The Chair then called for a motion to adopt the updated resolution for the 2025 Open Meetings Act.

Motion:

Board Member Apodaca moved to adopt the resolution as presented.

Second: Board Member McCarney seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote:

- Board Member Chandler – Yes
- Board Member Lopez – Yes
- Board Member Jaramillo Barraza – Yes
- Board Member Apodaca – Yes
- Board Member Castillo – Yes
- Board Member Murray – Yes
- Board Member Pouges – Yes
- Board Member Slavens – Yes
- Board Member Tully – Yes
- Board Member Lucero Ortega – Yes
- Board Member Ring – Yes
- Board Member McCarney – Yes

- Board Member Stienmetz – Yes

Outcome: Motion passed unanimously. The Board has voted to adopt the 2025 Open Meetings Act resolution.

The Chair expressed thanks to all members and again acknowledged the support of the Board's legal counsel.

Presentation by (De)serving Life & UNM Health Center

- **Chair Update:** While in legislative session, Chair Anaya was approached by representatives from a UNM-affiliated group conducting a **pilot training program** aimed at understanding parole board processes. The goal is to **support board members** in their decision-making by learning directly from them through **interviews and shadowing**.
 - **Voluntary Participation:** Participation in the program is completely **voluntary**. Board members interested in joining are encouraged to meet with the group following the meeting.
 - **Stephen Taylor, Executive Director of (De)serving Life**, discussed the group's **expanded advocacy efforts**, thanks to renewed funding.
 - Formerly focused on **juvenile lifers**, the organization will now assist **adult lifers** (those under 25 at the time of offense) who have already been **denied parole**.
 - Serving Life attorneys (Phoebe Lytle and Kurt Mayer) are identifying eligible individuals and providing legal and reentry support.
 - **Partnership with UNM & National Institute of Justice (NIJ):**
 - Serving Life and UNM applied for and received a **Field-Initiated Action Research Grant** from NIJ.
 - The research will involve **parole board members and incarcerated individuals**, aiming to:
 - Understand parole decision-making processes.
 - Identify needed supports for board members.
 - Assess the barriers and successes experienced by those preparing for and exiting parole.
-

Dr. Jen Perillo – UNM Health Center

- **Research Objectives:**

- Investigate how board members make decisions, especially under flexible statutes (e.g., “other information deemed appropriate”).
 - Identify **types of support** board members need for improved decision-making.
 - Gather feedback from incarcerated individuals about **reentry challenges and needed support**.
 - Collaborate with **(De)serving Life** to develop programs tailored to those needs.
 - **Methodology:**
 - **Surveys and interviews** with both board members and parole-eligible individuals.
 - **Co-development of resources** based on findings (e.g., decision-making guides, benchmarks).
 - **Testing and feedback cycles** to evaluate the usefulness of new tools.
-

Emphasis on Support & Rehabilitation

- Board Chair and speakers emphasized that this collaboration aims to shift focus from **past offenses to current rehabilitation and readiness**.
 - **Senate Bill 17**, though vetoed, reflected the board's existing practices of considering rehabilitation factors for adult lifers.
 - **(De)serving Life's** new role includes mentoring adult lifers in the same way they've supported juvenile lifers.
 - **Example Provided:** An adult lifer with excellent conduct but no program participation was denied parole due to having “given up.” This case highlights the need for **hope, preparation, and support**, which this partnership aims to provide.
-

Dr. Kaisa – Use of Structured Decision Support Tools

- Described how **Structured Professional Judgment (SPJ)** and similar tools are used in other fields to support decisions.
 - Emphasized tools must be **appropriate for the specific population** and developed **in collaboration** with those who use them.
 - The goal is not to replace human judgment but to **enhance and standardize** decision-making with **validated support tools**.
-

Questions & Discussion

- **Whitney Steinmetz (Board Member)** asked about the use of existing validated tools like the **PRA (Parole Readiness Assessment)** and **SPJ**, expressing concern about reinventing the wheel.

- Dr. Kaisa responded that the team does **not intend to recreate existing tools** but rather adapt or develop supports **in collaboration with the board**. She acknowledged the **subjectivity of assessing maturation** but stated they hope to provide **guidance and standardization** based on input from board members.
- **Research on Parole Decision-Making:** Steven noted that there's very little research into parole board decision-making nationwide. Much of the system remains a "black box," with limited transparency or standardized approaches.
- **Juvenile Lifer Studies:** Two significant studies were referenced:
 - **Pennsylvania Study:** Focused retrospectively on factors linked to reentry success, primarily examining parole revocation and recidivism rates.
 - **California Study:** Offered a more holistic approach, analyzing community-based protective factors (e.g., relationships, religion) that support successful reentry. However, this was a smaller-scale study.
- **Research Gaps & Broader Focus:** While recidivism remains a key outcome, the project aims to assess broader quality-of-life outcomes post-release. This includes improving personalized services and strengthening support through initiatives like community advisory boards made up of formerly incarcerated individuals.
- **Use of Risk Assessments:** There was discussion about the potential value of integrating risk assessments into parole decisions. These could provide the board with insights into an individual's risk level and identify protective factors that could be supported through parole conditions.
- **Local Relevance:** While existing studies offer useful insights, it's important to understand how these factors play out in New Mexico, which has different resources and contexts compared to states like California.
- **Post-Release Support Model:**
 - Support is ongoing with no set end date.
 - Currently supporting 9–10 individuals who served life sentences for crimes committed as juveniles.
 - Services are expected to scale as more individuals are released.
- **Reentry Challenges Noted by Board Members:**
 - Individuals often overwhelmed by conditions and basic technology (e.g., cell phones) after decades of incarceration.
 - Board members expressed concerns about the realistic capacity of long-incarcerated individuals to adapt without support.

- **Statewide Outreach:** While no team members are based in Las Cruces, support staff are distributed across New Mexico (e.g., Bloomfield, P.O.S., Tucson), providing varying levels of support depending on client needs.

- **Case Management and Reentry Support:**

- Each client is assigned a reentry coordinator and success advocate who provide regular contact and problem-solving support.
- Grant funds allow for travel across the state to provide in-person support and gather feedback.

- **Pre-Release Engagement:**

- Engagement typically begins a year before the parole hearing.
- Meetings become more frequent as the hearing approaches, building strong trust and rapport that carries over post-release.

- **Youthful Offender Context:** The speaker noted that some board members may not have been involved in the youthful offender initiative and implied that this background might inform their understanding of current practices.

Serious Youthful Offender Program as a Model

- The **Serious Youthful Offender program** equips parole board members with detailed information, including legal support and life stories that are often absent in DOC-prepared packets.
- This enables more **informed decisions**, offering parole candidates either a path forward or a clear roadmap for what to improve over the next five years before becoming eligible again.
- Importantly, **board discretion remains intact**—this program adds insight but doesn't limit judgment.

Disparities in Information Quality

- Board members emphasized the **inconsistencies** in the parole packets, which vary significantly by facility.
- Often, critical details like programming, service, or family background are **missing or incorrect**, affecting decision quality.
- In contrast, packets for youth or serious youthful offenders tend to be **richer and more complete**, which helps in assessment.

Training and Resource Development

- One goal of the current project is to use this research to **develop training materials** for attorneys and representatives. This would help standardize how parole cases are prepared and presented.

- There's hope that future improvements might be implemented at the DOC level, but **resource constraints** are acknowledged.

Need for Broader Research

- Some members raised the question of whether **similar life-course information** could be gathered for adults who have cycled in and out of the system for years—not just those serving life.
- Long-term patterns of **recidivism, addiction, and trauma** could be better understood with qualitative research and shared narratives.

Desire for Systemic Support

- There's interest in learning how to **better use tools like GPS tracking**, and **when** certain tools support public safety or are counterproductive.
- Research could help refine **when tools are helpful vs. harmful**, adding nuance and evidence-based discretion to supervision practices.

Personal Accounts and Transformation

- Stories like that of **Matthew Pettit**, a former repeat offender who broke a cycle of addiction and incarceration after confronting childhood trauma, underscore the need for **meaningful therapeutic engagement**.
- Understanding **why people reoffend** is not always available in violation hearings, but could be integral to building effective reentry strategies and policies.

Board Member Comments and Concerns regarding the information provided by the facilities

NMCD-Facilities will be present next Board meeting:

- **Disciplinary and History Information:** A board member raised concerns about missing disciplinary information in inmate progress reports, which can lead to inaccurate or incomplete assessments during hearings. Specifically, there was mention of a situation where a violation was not properly reflected in the progress report. The board discussed the importance of having all relevant information, such as disciplinary records and prior violations, included up front in reports to avoid delays.
- **Time Calculations for Concurrent and Consecutive Sentences:** There was also a discussion about the challenges in understanding and handling concurrent and consecutive sentences. The board member mentioned that there was sometimes confusion about which sentences should be considered together or separately when calculating an inmate's total time

served. This confusion has caused issues in parole planning and case review. A new piece of legislation, however, mandates that time calculations are now done upfront when an individual enters prison. This change aims to eliminate confusion and ensure clarity in how sentences are calculated, helping to improve scheduling and parole planning.

- **Process and Clarity in Records:** The discussion included how sometimes records are not always consistent, and that board members have to go back through files and prior minutes to ensure all prior decisions and sentence modifications are accounted for. This process can be time-consuming and lead to delays. Board members expressed frustration about the inconsistencies in how records are maintained, especially when it comes to concurrent and consecutive sentences.
- **New Legislation:** A new law that mandates time calculations be completed upfront upon entry into prison was highlighted. This change aims to streamline the process and resolve issues related to back-end time calculations that had caused problems in the past. This is seen as a positive development that should reduce confusion and improve efficiency in handling inmate cases.
- **Acknowledgments and Thanks:**
 - A board member expressed gratitude to the staff and colleagues who helped during a particularly challenging period, including during the sex offender hearings. The member thanked those who had supported their efforts and assisted with administrative tasks, especially when there were scheduling or procedural issues.
- **Next Steps:**
 - The board is hopeful that the new legislation will reduce confusion around time calculations and make the parole review process more efficient.
 - Ongoing discussions about improving how records are maintained and how disciplinary actions are tracked will continue to be addressed, with a focus on ensuring that all necessary information is provided upfront and in a consistent manner for future hearings.
- **Public Comment:**

My name is Andrea Sutphin, and I'd like to speak about two main issues I've encountered regarding parole and probation.

1. **Issue with My Son, Eric Brayman:** My son has been on both parole and probation. Last year, he was released from MDC, and despite me clearly expressing to his parole officer that he could not come to my house due to his significant ADHD and mental health issues, he was placed in a community program. However, the program ended up not providing the necessary support, and he showed up at my door late at night with nowhere else to go. I allowed him to stay, but when I spoke with his parole officer about the lack

of help from the program, she said she was unaware of how it operated. As time went on, his situation worsened, and he ended up using drugs and violating his parole. I've constantly tried to work with parole officers to help him, but the system doesn't seem to provide adequate support. There needs to be more family involvement and accountability. I'm willing to do everything I can to help my son, but I feel like the system is not listening to me, and it puts me in a dangerous position at times.

I also want to note the struggles he has faced with finding stable housing. Even though he had been on a housing list, he missed his opportunity due to his rearrest. When I tried to help with a down payment for a place to live, I was told I wouldn't be reimbursed, despite being told otherwise by his parole officer. Though things are improving for him now—he's working and has support from his girlfriend—his journey has been filled with miscommunication and inadequate support.

2. **Issue with My Husband's Parole Denial:** My husband was denied parole in 2022, despite meeting the required five years of clear conduct. The reason given was that he's a habitual offender, though he's never been convicted of such, and it was claimed that he failed to program—this is incorrect. He has over 40 certificates and has participated in numerous programs, including the dog program and suicide watch. He's been a mentor to other inmates, as evidenced by letters written by both inmates and staff. Despite all of this, his parole was denied with no clear explanation or recommendation for improvement.

The information used in the decision seems to have been confused, as some of it wasn't even from his file. Additionally, there was a mental health professional's letter confirming that no further counseling was necessary for him. We are confused by the decision and unable to find a clear process for appealing it or requesting a reconsideration. There needs to be transparency and clearer guidance on how to address such decisions and seek fair reconsideration.

I hope these issues are taken into account, as they have significant impacts on families trying to navigate the parole system. Thank you for your time.

- Doreen McNight
 - A representative of the ACLU-NM raised concerns on behalf of inmates in medium or higher-level correctional facilities. They addressed several issues related to parole planning, violation hearings, and the role of both the Parole Board and the Department of Corrections (DOC) in managing these matters.
 - **Key Issues Raised:**
 - **Credit for Time Waiting for Violation Hearings:** It was noted that inmates are not being credited for the time they spend in custody waiting for their violation hearings, which the representative questioned as being improper or possibly illegal.
 - **Denial of Address Approvals:** There were concerns about parolees being denied approved addresses, especially when they have family support, leading to prolonged periods without supervision. The representative

encouraged the Board to review its authority to override these denials and ensure proper oversight.

- **Parole Board Orders and Reconsiderations:** Issues were raised about how parole board orders are interpreted by the DOC, specifically when a technical violation occurs. There was an example of an inmate whose parole violation order was misinterpreted, leading to confusion about their eligibility for parole and the potential for a revocation that was not the Board's intent.
- **Reconsideration of Parole:** It was also noted that different correctional facilities interpret the process of parole reconsideration differently, which leads to inconsistent handling of cases, particularly with regard to inmates who are sanctioned but could begin parole planning before completing their sanctions.

▪

- **Responses from the Board:**

- **Department of Corrections Responsibility:** The Board clarified that many of the issues raised, including time calculations, parole planning approvals, and address denials, fall under the jurisdiction of the Department of Corrections rather than the Parole Board.
- **Collaboration and Training:** The Board acknowledged the concerns and discussed the possibility of working with the DOC to ensure clearer communication and training for classification officers to improve consistency in handling these matters.
- **Potential for Future Discussions:** It was suggested that a more thorough conversation could be held in the future regarding the issues raised, particularly with regard to time credits and the interpretation of parole board orders.

○

- **Next Steps:**

- The Board recommended that future issues be submitted for review, and stakeholders can work together to find solutions. It was also mentioned that discussions could continue in upcoming meetings, with particular attention to addressing concerns about time credits and clarity in violation hearings.

- **Motion to Adjourn:**

- **Motion:** A motion was made to adjourn the meeting.
- **Vote:** The motion to adjourn was unanimously approved by the following board members:

- Board Member Chandler
- Board Member Lopez
- Board Member Jaramillo Barraza
- Board Member Apodaca
- Board Member Castillo
- Board Member Murray
- Board Member Pouges
- Board Member Slavens
- Board Member Tully
- Board Member Lucero Ortega

- Board Member Ring
- Board Member McCarney
- Board Member Stienmetz
- Chairman Anaya

- **Time Adjourned:** The meeting was adjourned at **1:10 PM**.