

Draft MEETING MINUTES

GOVERNOR'S COUNCIL ON FILM AND MEDIA INDUSTRIES MEETING

Wednesday, March 8, 2023 • 10:30 AM

[Zoom Link](#)

Call to Order – The Governor’s Council on Film and Media Industries (GCFMI) quarterly meeting was held via Zoom video conference. Chair James Gollin called the meeting to order at 10:37 a.m. The following Council members were present, constituting a quorum: James Gollin (Chair), Jo Edna Boldin, Ken Fischer, Ramona Emerson, Jocelyn Jansons, Sam Tischler, James Lujan, Harris Smith, Rajeev Nirmalakhandan, and Marc Comstock.

Film Council members not present are Liz Pecos, Paula Dal Santo, and Rebecca “Puck” Stair.

Also present are NMFO Director Amber Dodson and NMFO Senior Manager Rochelle Bussey. Members of the public include Nani Rivera, Ruby Garcia, Jon Sepp, and Suzanne Gollin.

Approval of Agenda – Chair James Gollin asked if there were changes to the agenda. None were proposed. Harris Smith moved to approve the plan, and Marc Comstock seconded the motion. The motion passed, and the project was approved.

Approval of Minutes from November 17, 2022, meeting – Chair James Gollin asked if there were changes to the minutes. Jo Edna Boldin moved to approve the minutes, and Marc Comstock seconded the motion. All were in favor, and the minutes were approved.

Chair James Gollin - Thank you, counselors, a few visitors, the public, and obviously, staff. I am going to start with some comments about SB12. I want to begin by expressing the disappointment that the Film Council's recommendations from December last year are almost absent from the Bill. We've been at this for three years since I've been involved. Some of you for longer, with a lot of Zoom calls and working group meetings and reaching out to colleagues here in New Mexico and beyond to come up with the recommendations, and most of them didn't make it into the Bill, which I think is a missed opportunity.

For New Mexico, it is a missed opportunity to grow the industry from, as many of you have heard me say, the bottom up and the middle out. I want people to know I was given an opportunity with Director Dodson and Secretary Keyes a few times to present the recommendations to those who drafted SB12. I did make some of those points, and they were not accepted. I did ask for a meeting of this group earlier so that we might be able to weigh in on when amendments would be added to the bill, but that didn't happen.

But here we are today. We have ten days left of the session. I do want to be, you know, fair to state several things. Nobody ever gets everything they want, of course, and some of our recommendations from last year wouldn't be in such a Bill anyway, such as we call for more full-time employees for the film office. You know, as the industry grows, they should have more employees and, but that's, that wouldn't be in, this kind of Bill that would be in the budget or were some issues about, shall we say less than robust consultation between educators and about plans for the New Mexico Film Academy.

There were some issues with the taxation and revenue department and some inconsistencies. But those are administrative rather than legislative issues, so that they wouldn't be in the Bill anyway. Furthermore, to admit that some of our recommendations might require rather complicated solutions, such as how would we pay out incentives for productions on native lands in a way that doesn't violate tribal sovereignty by subjecting them to GRT?

Or how would we reactivate the New Mexico Film Loan Fund? Or how would we legally figure out how to financially incentivize diversity the way, say, Illinois and Chicago do? Or how do we financially incentivize sustainability rather than just asking productions to create non-binding diversity and sustainability plans? So, you know, these are complex, and they could be hard to amend in the end because you got to think these things through. But just because something is complicated doesn't mean we shouldn't do it.

Some of the things we have recommended would be very simple, such as redefining the rural uplift territory to be 60 miles from Albuquerque and Santa Fe City halls from a single point rather than Santa Fe and Bernalillo County lines, for our safety recommendations, such as that are, armorers go through at least a minimal gun safety certification, as is done in other states, as to what is in the Bill, very little of it was recommended by us. Most of you probably have seen it by now and gone through it.

There were some things we did recommend, such as a call for raising the FCAP budget and some of what is in the Bill, including some important points I think would have been recommended by this Council if we'd been asked our opinion on it, such as an important one, raising the annual cap for non-film partner payout. Some labor concerns were listened to late in the process and amended into a second version of the Bill, which is good news. We don't have; I think yeah, we do have Mark, we have Liz or Puck from our labor team here; today, some parts of the Bill are more concerning, such as raising the above line payout for non-New Mexicans from five million to fifteen million dollars per project and a concern is that is close to the definition of sending money to Hollywood and spending it here, growing the New Mexico economy. We asked whether that additional ten million dollars per project would be better finished, say, boosting the Pinto grants to native filmmakers that we have suggested or otherwise supporting the local industry.

Other sections in the Bill could prove expensive, such as adding another 5% payout towards the stack—a total 40% rebate for large-budget projects by film partners.

It's a series of 15 million dollars each with more than six or more episodes. So, the question is a series that spends a hundred million dollars in New Mexico so much better for our economy than, say, two series that spend fifty million dollars each that it's worth another five million dollars of public subsidy? Or would that five million dollars better be spent supporting projects that bundle pre-production and postproduction or other things in our recommendations? There may be data demonstrating the value of those high mega projects or for the out-of-state, above-the-line actors and directors; I have yet to see that data showing how valuable that would be to our economy; maybe it's there.

I have yet to be convinced personally; you know you'll have your own opinions. As to prospects for the Bill, take out your crystal ball. We have ten days left in the session. Anybody who says they know what's going to happen. People are still determining what's going to happen to anything. There are so many issues in front of the legislature these last ten days. The Bill did have a strong start through the Senate Taxation Committee. Since then, it has stalled, likely due to an unfavorable analysis of the Bill by the Legislative Finance Committee and its fiscal impact report.

It's a public document that concludes that the LFC has serious concerns. "Serious concerns" about significant risk to state revenues. Again, excellent data may be available to overcome the LFC's problems. Still, it doesn't seem that this data has been presented in a way to ease concerns in the Senate Finance Committee, which is where the Bill is theoretically going to be heard next. To the best of my knowledge, it has not yet been scheduled. As to what will happen again, I heard early rumors that the Bill will sail through.

I've heard people saying the Bill is already quite dead, and more recently, I've listened to from actually from NMFO staff and several others that there's a story going around that there will be an attempt to strip out the most essential elements of the Bill, especially what is considered by many to be the most important, which is raising the cap on non-partner expenses and, passing just that either in this Bill in an amended form or perhaps add it on to another Bill. Who knows?

I raised these issues not to rumor because, as I said, nobody knows, but I did want to say that you know since we are meeting today. We could weigh in; expressing our formal support for raising the cap might be helpful if that sentiment has a majority. Even unanimity among those on this call, since that is considered, I know by many to be the most timely aspect of this Bill and one which perhaps has the most excellent chances of getting through.

There are other things I'm sure many of us would like to see pass. Some of the nonresident crew issues negotiated by labor, some of the problems of about increasing support for rural

geographic diversity as we call it since Las Cruces is not rustic from 5 % to 10 %, my guess is it would probably be difficult for us in this 1-hour session, with no time for our meeting groups to meet and mull over the issues, to go through a whole checklist of these things. But I am confident we would make a statement to raise the cap.

So, with that said, and having heard from me. I will open the floor to Council members first for questions or comments. Let them roll or answer them back if something is directed at me. And then, after we've had everyone's had a chance to raise issues or make comments, I intend to hand the floor to Amber Dodson for her to respond to my words, to your comments or questions, and to anything else she'd like to say. And there are a few members of the public, only a few. But at the end, we would like to say we would like to observe time if members of the people did want to comment at the end. So, that concludes my opening statement and monologue. And I would ask if anyone from the Council would like to either make a comment or ask a question either to me or to Director Dodson.

Marc Comstock (he/him)

Thanks, everybody, for coming and joining. I favor raising that cap thirty-five percent above the line, the 15 million. I think that sometimes that gets lost in maybe actor revenue. But I think that there's the A-list directors aren't cheap either. And I believe that raising that above-the-line cap will attract more significant projects. And not having a cap on New Mexico talent, and I'm speaking for my actors, my union is that will create more opportunities for us if we don't count against that cap, so I think the fifteen million raise is a good thing because it's not going to go just to actors it's also going to go to above the line directors producers, etc. and how they want to break that payroll down and I think that'll bring more significant projects which will bring more opportunities so I'm in favor of the thirty-five percent. I'm in favor of the above-the-line cap raise to fifteen million.

Ken Fischer

I had a question: Do we know when this will come up for a vote, or does nobody have a clue?

James Gollin

Well, I'll answer that the process is that it started in one committee of the Senate, and it got through quickly. Next should be Senate finance. It still needs to be scheduled after Senate finance. Assuming it passes, it would go to the Senate floor, then to the House, probably two committees. And then to the House floor. Assuming there is some amendment, some difference between the Senate and the House passed, it would then have to go into what's called concurrence, where they agree about the differences, and then it's passed.

There is no date. If it doesn't happen, if all of that or some alternate version of that, doesn't occur within ten days, then it doesn't pass because the session is over, and we're on, you know, presumably for next year. There's no date—theoretically, the next would-be Senate Finance. At last, I heard it's not scheduled.

Ken Fischer

Thank you. And at this point, is it still possible to get amendments to the bill, or are we just looking at stripping out the essential things?

James Gollin

So again, I'll answer quickly and later, Amber, if you want to comment when we return the floor to you. It is always possible to offer amendments right through the end of the process, and sometimes, things happen during the session's closing hours. It becomes increasingly complicated, though, the longer it goes on. From experience watching other bills, it's best not to put very complex things on the fly. Like, and as I said, some of our recommendations would be a bit complicated because you need help to think through the consequences of what changing these words would mean or, you know, how it might open to a lawsuit. A better time to do it, as you know, months ago, we went through 50 days of the session, and so far, we have 10 left. So technically, yes, it is very much possible. It gets more complicated. Is that good, Ken?

Ken Fischer

Yes, thank you.

James Gollin

Okay, others from the council. Ramona.

Ramona Emerson

Hello everyone. I think I have raised my concerns in the past about the absolute lack of any tribal representation, any film Bill, or any concern about bringing tribal communities into the film industry again. Again, this has happened. This Bill is a massive coddling to corporations in big Hollywood studios, and it adds nothing to our local family industry. It throws all the local filmmakers under the bus as well. There has been no talk of any Senator John Pinto extension. The money we acquired from the Cultural Affairs and Indian Affairs completely dropped. Nobody followed up on that. And we lost a million dollars in funding that could have gone to local filmmakers. If somebody needed help, I would have been there to get that money through, to stand up at the legislature and make sure that funding happened, to find to help some, to help us disperse financing, to keep the program going. But again, the ball was dropped. I'm not very happy about this Bill at all. I feel like it does it. I've been wasting my time on the Governor's Council. Because why do we come and donate our time? We take big chunks out of our day. We think about this during our off hours. We put our time, passion, and love for our film industry into these meetings, and then nobody gives a shit, and nothing happens. And on all the things that we are concerned about, it doesn't, it doesn't matter. And so I feel like the Governor's Council is a waste of time at this point because the, you know, the film office, the Office of Economic Development, they have deaf ears to what we're trying to ask for. And you know, as far as the Senator John Pinto, that thing didn't have to be a part of

the film Bill. It could have been something different. We could have gone to various committees to get that done. And it could have helped many local filmmakers, not Native filmmakers, but we're talking local filmmakers that could have used that money to make their film. And it's a disappointment to me and local filmmakers everywhere. That's all I have to say.

James Gollin

Thank you, Ramona. It is from the Council. Harris, James, Jo Edna, Raj, Jocelyn?

Harris Smith

The only thing I wanted to bring up, and I can't remember if it's in the Bill or not, was the term, the kickback that the program's Higher Ed would receive; my understanding was that it might be taken away, frozen, or diverted. So that was just a concern for the Higher Ed institutions who rely on it. Again, we're going to be okay here, but there are other Higher Eds and the two-year programs that depend on that kickback money to help move their film programs, and the training that everyone wants to see take place in the state of our students rely on that money. So, I would like to see that be addressed or at least make a note of that, that again, that's impacting the training and employing New Mexicans in the state and keeping our students and other people in the condition through the film industry. I apologize that I must jump off for another meeting. That's something I wanted. Thank you, and thank you, everyone, for your time and commitment to this.

James Gollin

Thank you, Harris and others who haven't spoken. James, Jo Edna, James.

James Lujan

I share your remote concerns, so I want to add to that. You may ask an existential question about what the function of the film council is to be. What exactly are we needed for?

James Gollin

Excellent question, Jo Edna.

Jo Edna Boldin

What can we do at this point? Is there anything we can do? Like I would like to see the above, the line doubled rather than tripled. I mean, we can come back in another year or so and add another 5 million, as far as raises go and everything; I don't know of anyone that comes and triples the amount, you know, doubling sounds generous enough for right now. So yeah, there are some disappointments, too, but what can we do? How can we positively affect this rather than, you know, not like it? What can we do?

James Gollin

Excellent, I see. Jocelyn, your hand up?

Jocelyn

Hi everyone, Sorry, I'm not putting the video on today, but I 2nd what Ramona is saying, just that these are crucial. The funding for New Mexico filmmakers, these grants, these Governor's Cups, all these things that were eliminated over the years and have yet to return. I think we're a little, in my opinion, a little soft in our ask, like we're the way it's worded in the document is like, we hope that these things will show up someday, but there's no clear path to how that's going to happen. When we had the New Mexico Filmmakers Intensive, we funded filmmakers ten grand a pop, giving them real money to make actual films. Those people are all still in the industry, still making films. A lot went off to the filmmaker's institutes, and as you know, we have to train in a hands-on way. And I know we have the Academy coming, but above-the-line is a particular thing that Ramona can speak to, I'm sure, as well, which is you must put money behind it to allow them to make the films. Many people are ready to do that today within the Native communities, within women. Many women are out here ready to make films, but we need a clear path because there's no funding. It comes down to money in the hands of directors and money in the hands of local producers and writers. So, it's probably, you know, too late to see that, but I was disappointed by the wording being sort of we hope we aspire. It didn't feel like there was anything tangible I could chew on within the document's language.

James Gollin

Thank you, Jocelyn. And, um, Raj, did you want to add anything?

Rajeev Nirmalakhandan

I agree that there could be some of the grand stuff for the local filmmakers, but I'm supportive of raising the rural cliff by 5 % because it will help. Many parts of this state and some people were concerned about the boundaries, and I don't think we should squash that just because of the limitations. I think it's going to help significant parts of the state and in raising, you know, the above, the line, I agree with Marc that, you know, it's not just actors, and it will bring more significant projects and grow the industry even more. And that will still help a lot of, you know, local New Mexico residents. So that's my point.

James Gollin

Thank you, Raj. Also, I heard the news from Raj offline, but he has, you know, been at NMSU on the educator side, and now he's on the production side, having taken a position with the film partner down there, 828. So, congratulations on that.

Rajeev Nirmalakhandan

Thank you. I'm doing both sides.

James Gollin

Thank you for that, thank you, everybody, and thank you, Director Dodson, for listening to all this. Nobody here desires to be antagonistic, and I think people understand that you, Rochelle, and the others have a job to do, and you're trying to do it, and you don't get to make all the

decisions. You must necessarily live by and defend. But you've also heard some significant expressions of frustration. The people on the Council and what are we doing here? You know, a few people said, if what we do is not going to get integrated into the process, so uh, if you could, you know, obviously answer, say anything you want to say. I would specifically ask, though, if you could answer the question of do you think it would be helpful a resolution to support lifting the cap as detailed in the draft Bill and any thoughts you might have as to the role of the Council in the future in the future, ten days plus from now or in the following days.

Amber Dodson

Thank you. Chair members: Hi, it's good to see all of you. I want to first start with a thank you to you. All your recommendations were thoughtful. They come from so many of you who have expertise in this industry in different areas, representing various unions, guilds, and industry sub-sectors. And I want to make it clear in a public meeting that your recommendations were read, considered, and put on the table in front of all of the stakeholders and the decision-makers. Jim also sent them all, and we invited him to the negotiation body for legislation. Jim was invited to those meetings. He further elucidated all of those recommendations with all the decision-makers there. As you all know, what ends up in a Bill differs from the measure of success. These recommendations that you all so beautifully put together can apply to the film industry, and the fact that certain things did not end up in the Bill is not a litmus test for success. It's an incredibly complicated process, and there are so many different variables as to why things end up in statute and why they are not in law. Many of those things in the recommendations, things regarding like, off the top of my head, diversity, we did end up putting something in variety in the Bill that we could get support for, that we would start building a database around diversity, requiring diversity reports, sustainability reports, all of that. Because it's not word for word, it is not a personal offense to any of you or the recommendations. If it doesn't end up in a Bill, it doesn't mean it isn't successful or not a good idea. Some of these things are much better if they're not in statute. Still, if they're done in contract, rule or regulation, or general practice, things and recommendations can be made. We don't need to put this in a Bill and try and push it down the complicated football field of getting something in statute. So, I want to start with that general comment that your recommendations were very thoughtful. They went all the way up to the governor and all the decision-makers. Thank you for those. Thank you for your expertise, Thank you for your interest, Thank you for your time. I know it's volunteer time, and we appreciate all of you.

The point of the council, Governor's Council, is a recommending body. You guys did a beautiful job of that. I want to clarify that this is not a negotiating body regarding legislation. As a courtesy and because of our respect for the Council, Jim was a part of the negotiating at the negotiating table. Again, these recommendations are for the film industry, not just film policy. More importantly, we need recommendations for the film industry as a whole.

All of the recommendations up to this point they're not necessarily dead. There are still things in there that we can implement in different ways to further flesh out. There are issues. Jim

presented some information here, but much data needs to be included. Things regarding certain decisions, and it goes far above me, it goes far above Secretary Keyes. Putting something in a Bill could get stuck in a committee, and we don't pass anything, including the cap.

If we don't get the cap raised, our industry will go through a backlog in one year, which is the truth. And everything hinges on that. However, there are other critical things in the Bill that are just as important to continue to bring production, to get companies like 828 to obtain bigger budget productions from Netflix that want to hire residents, they pay better wages, they're on the ground longer, they spend more on our businesses. So, some of these adjustments are based on many strategies.

Many people's recommendations, including yours, data, discussion, none of these are flippant. These were all taking the best of everything, coming to many versions of what it is today and getting buy-in. So, here's the update on the Bill, as of now, but anything can change, and ultimately, I think it's good, and we'll see what we're going to do now. As you know, Jim mentioned, we got through the first committee with flying colors. We even got a Republican to change his mind about the film industry during the presentation, and he voted yes.

We got unanimous support. Other things have come into play. We will now roll some critical pieces of Senate Bill 12 into a different package.

I cannot because we're still in negotiations right now. It was a very late night. I must keep going right after this meeting, but we will take some key things from the film from SB12, roll them into another package, and get what we need to be done to keep the industry sustaining but growing, and that's where we are.

So, I will reveal more when I can. But again, we're in negotiation right now. I appreciate each one of you. I respect each of you and your expertise. And a quick note on native filmmakers: we did not ask for 1 million for native filmmakers; we asked for 3 million for Latinx, Black, Native, LGBTQ+, and women filmmakers. Before the session, the executive gave us a "no" for that 3 million. Some of these things are not always in our control.

We are absolutely behind those programs as well. We are continuing to find other avenues. We are looking at grants. We are looking at other streaming fund sources to support filmmakers. We also support workforce development dollars toward a second Screenwriter Incubator with Stowe Story Lab. We actively recruit from tribal lands for that. Regarding giveback funds, the model in Senate Bill 12, we would have accrued a lot more funding for our school for the academy and, as a result, all of the film programs. But it looks like that will not come into play. What is in place now with the approximately \$20K for each phone school every so often will remain in place. Again, to be determined. That's too bad; we could have had much more funding with the new model, but I hear your concerns today. We recorded this meeting so we can refer to it. I genuinely appreciate your support. Your recommendations,

again, being in a Bill, differ from the test for success. We, the film who work with this legislation, had probably a hundred recommendations for that Bill, and, you know, maybe ten ended up in it, and now not many. It's a collaborative effort and not about who gets credit for what.

This is about, at the end of the day, looking at legislation, looking at the strategy, looking at the impact, looking at how things will drive the business, and doing what's best for creating jobs for New Mexicans and driving the business and sustaining our and getting buy-in to support the film credit. So, I would love for this group to reconvene again, specifically regarding diversity and sustainability, and now what is likely lost in SB12 regarding diversity reporting and goals and tactics and sustainability tactics and goals. All of that was going to be in statute. We can do that without law, and it would be great to have input from this group about what that should look like and we can implement that. We can also look at other things that make sense for New Mexicans for the industry and see what we can implement without statute. And there are many benefits to not having something in law. We are not boxing ourselves in, limiting ourselves to funding, not allowing for growth, or pivoting the ability to shift as the industry changes. Thank you so much; I have to run. Rochelle will continue here. It's lovely to see you, and I genuinely appreciate your time and thought.

Rajeev Nirmalakhandan
Amber, you for all your work.

James Gollin

Thank you, Amber. I don't need to go over the point by point, you know, I've made some points, you all, all have made some points. You know, there's the issue of being in, you know, being given access to a negotiating body about what goes into a film versus the, in the end, I guess you could say the power to get your things that you're pushing into the Bill. There was a power dynamic there that favored certain elements and not others, and I think that is one of the reasons why this Bill and I were implying it; Amber stated it so that this Bill is essentially dead as itself, that the plan now is, because this Bill is finished, to take some elements of it and pull them out and put them in another Bill. I had been hearing that, but it was more of a rumor. Now, it's a statement. I must believe that if there was more broad support, if we had our Native communities, had our local filmmakers, if we had others coming, supporting this, it would have perhaps gone further. So, some of those decisions to not incorporate our recommendations were terrible policy and politics. I have many precise details about that if anyone wants to know. But you know, should we get another crack at this either, you know, as Amber says, administratively or next year and legislatively? Hopefully, some will go in terms of my role and your roles in the future. Once this is all over, we see where the dust settles. I intend to converse with the Governor and say, look, you know, I mean I, and I think most of us are not here to have a title. We have busy lives, so what do you want from us? And you know, is that something we all agree to deliver? So, I'm popping into the chat. We don't have too much time left; a resolution saying that the Governor's Council on Film and Media Industries

expresses its support for increasing the non-partner film cap as proposed in SB12, along with its disappointment that so few of our other recommendations were incorporated into the Bill. In other words, it is this to weigh into the extent that some are deciding whether or not to accept this process of taking the cap raise. Maybe some other elements not specified go into some other Bill to say, you know, to make the statement to help get the cap raise. So at least there will be a headline at the end of the session, at a minimum, if this works, that New Mexico supports the film industry when others like Georgia are looking cutting back there, their cap and uh, you know, it would give a good headline. You know, something good, practical on the ground, I believe so is there, would there be support for that?

Jocelyn says yes. By text or by chat. Does that sound for those of you who are still on, you know, Ken, Joanna, James, Mark, Raj, Ramona, Ken?

Ken Fischer
Yes, I support it.

James Gollin
Jo Edna is raising; Marc is giving a thumbs up. It looks like James is giving a nod. Raj she's giving a raised hand, and Ramona, raising both hands. Well, we'll take that as an abstention or something. Okay, so I'll say it's been moved for the minutes. If there is, I'll do it properly. Is there, is there a motion to make this resolution?

Ken Fischer
Motion to approve.

James Gollin
Is there a second?

Marc Comstock (he/him)
Second.

James Gollin
All in favor, say eye. Any opposed? Okay, it passes. So, I'm glad we did this. It's a way to do something positive in these ten days. As I said, after these next ten days, we'll have an opportunity to look at what happened and didn't happen and how the world often goes; an enormous amount occurs in the legislative session in the last two or three days, so keep um, keep your eyes peeled now there are a few uh members of the public we'd like to reserve a room. There is Jon Sepp, there's Nani Rivera, and there is a number and Ruby Garcia.

James Gollin
Would any of you like to speak?

Ruby Garcia

Good morning. I am Ruby Garcia, the Background Actors' Association of New Mexico president. Many of you know that we introduced House Bill twenty-three, the Background Artist Act, which is stalled now. I want to thank all of you for your support for all that you do; you're much appreciated. I asked our members to read just a letter that was sent to the Governor recently. If I may read it, I'll go quick. Thank you, guys, of course. The Background Actors Association is dedicated to our background actors and the New Mexico film industry and expanding opportunities for everyday New Mexicans to live their dreams. To be in movies as background actors, our dreams can become a nightmare due to set safety issues. We know the difference the New Mexico Governor's Council on film recommendations in its 2021 and 2022 annual reports can make to improve rigid safety standards. Yet, these changes have not been offered to the twenty-three state legislation. These three bills proposing changes to strengthen set safety appear to be stalled. Please do what you can and suggest the legislation to Make New Mexico Set safety bulletins mandatory. Provide an anonymous New Safe Set Safety Hotline phone number. Ban live ammunition on set, et cetera. Also, please support all these bills that include safety training safe sets. We appreciate your support in the New Mexico food industries and your efforts to ensure set safety in New Mexico. Thank you so much, and we ask that you consider the Background Actors Association of New Mexico HB23 as well. Thank you all so much.

James Gollin

Thank you, Ruby. And for the note-takers and or Rochelle to note, Sam Tischler is on. He's on location, but he's on the phone. He's the four seven nine three number. He votes yes on expressing the resolution. You can mark him present. He's working hard on location, but he's here. By the way, I also heard from a few of the others who are missing that they are working on-site. So, Nani Rivera, I see a hand raise.

Nani Rivera – the audio was not clear.

James Gollin

She missed being on location somewhere. I think we lost her. Oh, it looks like she's back. Nani, are you back? Okay, I'm sure that's frustrating for her. I'm just looking around to see if Jon Sepp from Film Las Cruces is on there, in case. Oh, here we go, Nani, saying she's supporting our efforts in the chat. Sorry, Nani, if you can hear us, sorry. We would have loved to hear your voice, but it was pretty garbled. But she's supporting our efforts, as she says in the chat.

James Gollin

I think we have approximately 4 min left. Does anybody have anything else they want to say, questions, comments, or closing thoughts? Well, then I'll say, you know, thank you to those who have contributed; I found it frustrating and challenging to be given mixed signals and to have, you know, trying to promote a mixed message. We all have our hearts in the right place and, you know, the interests of New Mexico and New Mexicans and the New Mexico film

industry upfront. Hopefully, something good will come this legislative session. Hopefully, something good will come administratively between now and the next session, and there's always another year and another year for legislation. As to how we will be constituted and how will we be heard in future years? That's an open question.

Ramona Emerson

We should start advocating now, talking about administrative changes, and doing things non-legislatively. If they're saying that, then let's start it now because next year, they're not going to have any other excuse not to put, you know, all this stuff on the side. If we're going to start to change it, we better start pushing right this second.

James Gollin

Thank you, Ramona. A lot can happen administratively, whether it will or not, we'll see, and perhaps we can have some influence; things like money must come from the legislature. The next session is, most of, you know, there's, this is a 60-day session which anybody can put up any Bill, the next session is the budget only plus whatever the governor chooses to address. So that'll be up to her, and I'll check in with her about that soon after this session ends. However, I'll allow everybody to catch up on their sleep. We are at the end of our time. Is there any further business?

Jo Edna Boldin

When is our next meeting?

James Gollin

We're supposed to do this quarterly. Let's get through the first legislative. Then there is a signing period when, you know, the governor doesn't have to sign things; she gets to make decisions, and she can pocket veto. So it's still the session, but once that's over, without just waiting three months, we should have another session, especially after seeing where the dust settles. I'm not quite ready to pick a date, but we should. I think we, you know, maybe in like April or so, not to wait too long and certainly not going all the way till summer, and I think we should try and circulate more dates and times because everybody is busy, and I know sometimes it's easier for people. I don't think it is possible for staff, but sometimes weekends are better for people too. So, I'd like to give, you know, people, the options, multiple options for our next meeting, instead of saying, here's the meeting, can you make it, so any other questions? Final comments? Do I have a motion to adjourn?

Marc Comstock (he/him)

I moved to adjourn.

James Gollin

Is there a second?

Ken Fischer
I second.

James Gollin

Mark motions, Ken seconds. All in favor, say I. All opposed say no. The activities have it that we are adjourned at 11:31 a.m. Thank you everybody.