

STATE OF NEW MEXICO
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL



HECTOR H. BALDERAS
ATTORNEY GENERAL

October 16, 2017

Stephen J. Ruger
City of Rio Rancho
3200 Civic Center Circle NE
Rio Rancho, NM 87144

Re: Inspection of Public Records Act Complaint – Dianne Goodman

Dear Mr. Ruger:

We have reviewed the complaint submitted by Dianne Goodman alleging that the City of Rio Rancho ("City") violated the Inspection of Public Records Act ("IPRA"), NMSA 1978, Sections 14-2-1 to -12 (as amended through 2013) and your response on behalf of the City to our inquiry regarding the complaint. The complaint alleges that the City (1) did not permit inspection of public records prior to charging for the cost of downloading copies of the records onto a Compact Disk ("CD"); and (2) refuses to provide a breakdown of the cost of \$30.00 for each individual 911 call, which the complainant claims exceeds the actual cost to copy the records. Based upon our review, as discussed below, we conclude that the City violated IPRA by failing to allow inspection of records prior to charging for downloading copies of the records and may have possibly violated IPRA when charging a \$30.00 fee for downloading copies of the records.

The information provided to our office confirms that on January 10, 2017, Ms. Goodman submitted a request to the City for "[a]ll calls and reports for calls for service to or from 510 Loma Linda Ct. from 2012 to current." In an email exchange, dated January 30, 2017, Ms. Goodman informed the City that she wished to view the record prior to paying the fee for copying. The City denied the request stating that the information requested "is not available to you to inspect in person and, in fact, it must be copied and provided to you in a format which you can access" and confirmed that the City requires the advanced payment of \$30.00 per 911 call prior to copying the record. *See email dated January 30, 2017.*

In the City's response to our office, the City further explains that "911 audio recordings are stored in a collective information base from which it is necessary to retrieve and reproduce excerpts, convert the data to an audio formation which someone . . . can listen to, redact protected information as needed, and produce a copy to disc." The City states that the \$30.00 fee is not arbitrary or exorbitant and that the fee has been consistently charged citizens for twenty years. The City explains that the \$30.00 "fee offsets costs incurred to identify, isolate and reproduce copies .

. . The City expends more in terms of public monies and public resources to copy and produce those records than it receives in return for the nominal fee.” However, the City’s “Request to Inspect Pubic Records” form indicates that the cost for an audio recording or video is \$5.00.

IPRA provides the right to every person to inspect public records of this state. NMSA 1978, Section 14-2-1(A). Inspection of records must be permitted no later than fifteen days after receiving a written request. NMSA 1978, Section 14-2-8(D). Agencies must provide requesters the opportunity to inspect records without charge. NMSA 1978, Section 14-2-9(A). There is no exception under the IPRA that permits agencies to deny requesters the opportunity to inspect records in favor of a policy requiring pre-inspection payment for copies of records due to the inability by the agency to reproduce the record without retrieving and reproducing excerpts and then converting “data to an audio format” which can be listened to by the requester. Agencies may only charge for records if copies are requested. NMSA 1978, Section 14-2-9(C). The City denied Ms. Goodman the opportunity to inspect the 911 audio recording prior to incurring the cost of obtaining a copy of the 911 audio recordings in violation of the IPRA.

The City also explains its \$30.00 911 audio recording fee structure as a long standing policy for offsetting costs incurred by the City for identifying, isolating and reproducing copies of audio records. IPRA permits agencies to charge “actual costs associated with downloading copies of public records to a computer disk or storage device, including the actual cost of the computer disk or storage device.” NMSA 1978, Section 14-2-9(C)(3). IPRA does not permit agencies to charge for identifying and isolating records responsive to the request. Inclusion of charges for such services violate the IPRA. The City charges \$5.00 for a c.d. Based upon the information presented to this office, it appears \$30.00, less the \$5.00 cost for the c.d., for downloading records onto a c.d. is excessive and may violate the IPRA.

To resolve the issues discussed above, our office recommends that the City make the audio recordings available to Ms. Goodman for inspection without charge. We also recommend that the City re-evaluate its fee structure for producing copies of 911 audio recordings to ensure the fee charged is aligned with permissible costs permitted under the IPRA.

If you have any questions regarding this determination or IPRA in general, please let me know.

Sincerely,



Lori Chavez
Assistant Attorney General

cc: Dianne Goodman

INSPECTION OF PUBLIC RECORDS ACT ("IPRA") COMPLAINT FORM

New Mexico Office of the Attorney General

Open Government Division

YOUR CONTACT INFORMATION:

First Name: Dianne Last Name: Goodman

Address: [REDACTED]

City: [REDACTED] State: [REDACTED] Zip Code: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

IPRA REQUEST TO THE PUBLIC BODY:

Name of the Public Body that is the subject of this complaint (including city/town, county or region, if applicable): City of Rio Rancho

Format of IPRA Request: Written Oral

Date IPRA Request was Submitted to the Public Body: 1/10/17 - this complaint is ONLY re: the cost of the 911 calls and their refusal to allow me to view/listen to the calls prior to prepaying a \$30 fee per EACH 911 call- all other responsive documents were provided _____

Date of all Responses Received from the Public Body: See attached email chains

ALLEGED VIOLATIONS OF IPRA BY THE PUBLIC BODY: Please select from the following list the violations you allege the public body committed. Check all that apply.

RECORDS

No records were provided.

The agency provided some but not all of the records responsive to the request.

Records were provided, but they were not responsive to the request.

The public body does not have custody or responsibility for the records, and the records custodian did not forward the request to the proper custodian.

The request was for records in electronic format and although the records are available in electronic format, the copies of the public records were not provided in an electronic format.

DENIED REQUESTS TO INSPECT PUBLIC RECORDS

Although some records were provided, the custodian did not include a written explanation for denying the production of exempt records or for redacting confidential information from records.

No records were provided and the records custodian did not deliver or mail a written explanation to the requester within fifteen (15) calendar days after receiving the request that included a description of the records sought, the names and titles of each person responsible for denying the request, and a description of the reasons for the denial.

NOTICE

Public body did not post in a conspicuous location at its administrative office or on the public body's website a notice setting forth: the rights of any person to inspect the public body's public records, the public body's responsibility to make public records available for inspection, the procedures for requesting inspection of public records, the procedures for requesting copies of public records, and/or reasonable fees for copying public records

DEADLINES (For purposes of deadlines imposed by the IPRA, the date the request is received is not counted)

_____ Inspection was not allowed within three (3) business days and the public body did not timely send a written “three-day letter” to the requester explaining when the records would be available or when the public body would respond to the request.

_____ The public body did not allow inspection or otherwise respond to the request within fifteen (15) calendar days from the date the custodian received the request.

FEEES

X The public body charged fees in excess and refused to provide a cost breakdown of their required \$30 prepay fee per 911 call. They charged fees that exceeded the actual costs to copy the records.

_____ The public body did not provide a receipt upon request.

DETAILED EXPLANATION OF ALLEGED IPRA VIOLATIONS (Required): Please provide a description of the actions taken by the public body that violated the IPRA, including specific dates and why you believe the IPRA has been violated.

I submitted my IPRA request to view/listen to four 911 calls via the City of Rio Rancho Records Custodian, as I have been directed to do. I did NOT submit my request via the Rio Rancho Police Department. The City of Rio Rancho refused to allow me to listen to the calls without charge. I requested a cost breakdown of their \$30 fee per 911 call to determine if I could reduce the \$120 fee via a cost savings. They refused to provide me a cost breakdown. I have not been able to view/listen to the calls as a result.

It should also be noted that the City of Albuquerque charges no fee to listen to a 911 call at the City Clerk's Office. If a citizen wants to purchase 911 calls via a request submitted via the City Clerk's Office, it will cost \$6.75 for as many calls as fits on a cd.

I believe that the City of Rio Rancho is charging an exorbitant amount to view/listen to 911 calls, possibly generating a profit center, which would be in violation of IPRA.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION: Please provide a copy of your original inspection request (if written), and any documentation or evidence you have regarding the alleged IPRA violation

Time Sensitive Re: no response again RE: Breakdown cost of \$30 fee for each 911 call as required per IPRA

Sent:  February 21, 2017 4:20 PM

From: Jourdanandourya jourdanandourya@protonmail.com

To: Gregg Hull ghull@rrnm.gov, SANDRA DAVISON SDAVISON@RRNM.GOV, MONTE ROBERTS MROBERTS@rrnm.gov, Greg Lauer glauer@rrnm.gov, stephen ruger sruger@rrnm.gov

BCC: Rush505 rush505@protonmail.com

Mayor Hull,

I still have not received a response re: resolution on viewing the 911 calls or the cost breakdown for those calls. I actually just got off the phone with Sanda Davison, who hung up on me on a recorded line. That should be completely unacceptable. If I don't get an answer as to the cost breakdown of 911 calls or notification when I can listen to those 911 calls **by close of business today**, I'll interpret that as the City's preference that I file a complaint with the Attorney General's Office or other avenues I choose to take in order to obtain an acceptable answer.

Citizens deserve better public service than this.

Dianne Goodman

Sent with [ProtonMail](#) Secure Email.

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

Subject: no response again RE: Breakdown cost of \$30 fee for each 911 call as required per IPRA
Local Time: February 4, 2017 3:32 PM
UTC Time: February 4, 2017 3:32 PM
From: jourdanandourya@protonmail.com
To: Gregg Hull <ghull@rrnm.gov>

Mayor Hull,

Could you please poke a response? I would like to get this resolved so I can view the 4 911 calls via an IPRA request dated 1/10/17.

Dianne Goodman
505 323 2307
14112 Grand Ave NE
Albuquerque, NM 87123

Sent with [ProtonMail](#) Secure Email.

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

Subject: RE: Breakdown cost of \$30 fee for each 911 call as required per IPRA
Local Time: February 1, 2017 1:35 PM
UTC Time: February 1, 2017 8:35 PM
From: jourdanandourya@protonmail.com
To: STEPHEN RUGER <SRUGER@rrnm.gov>
Greg Lauer <glauer@rrnm.gov>, SANDRA DAVISON <SDAVISON@RRNM.GOV>, MONTE ROBERTS <MROBERTS@rrnm.gov>, SARAH OWENS <SOWENS@RRNM.GOV>, Gregg Hull <ghull@rrnm.gov>

Steve,

Thanks for your response. Did you confirm this with the AG as I suggested? I believe you are incorrect. If we can not come to an agreement, there is another option. I could file a complaint with the AG and then they will make a determination as to what is correct. **Please let me know if we are agreeing to disagree and your preference for me to file a complaint with the AG.** Please also note that Albuquerque charges \$6.75 per cd for 911 calls. Therefore, if I requested 10 911 calls with APD, it would cost \$6.75 total since they will combine all the 911 calls on one cd.

Since you have refused to provide me a cost breakdown for a 911 call, which is required per IPRA, you may want to revisit your response in this email chain when you state:

There is no requirement to itemize the costs to produce the copies; and, in all likelihood, those costs will dwarf the thirty dollar (\$30.00) fee.

This could easily be settled if you contact the AG as I have done. Dylan Lange or Patricia Salazar are customer-service oriented and will answer any questions you may have. Their number is (505) 490-4060. Patricia's email address is at the link below. Here is their website link for your reference:

<http://www.nmag.gov/oma-and-ipra-complaints.aspx>

Dianne Goodman
505 323 2307

Sent with [ProtonMail](#) Secure Email.

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

Subject: RE: Breakdown cost of \$30 fee for each 911 call as required per IPRA
Local Time: February 1, 2017 12:35 PM
UTC Time: February 1, 2017 7:35 PM
From: SRUGER@rrnm.gov
To: Jourdanandourya <jourdanandourya@protonmail.com>
Greg Lauer <glauer@rrnm.gov>, SANDRA DAVISON <SDAVISON@RRNM.GOV>, MONTE ROBERTS <MROBERTS@rrnm.gov>, SARAH OWENS <SOWENS@RRNM.GOV>

Ms. Goodman,

As I had indicated it is not possible for you to "inspect" or "view" the 911 calls in their current

format for multiple reasons. It is necessary to protect exempt information from the 911 calls. Also, the 911 calls are computer data which do not exist in a hardcopy format so, pursuant to Section 14-2-9 (B), it is not possible nor is it necessary to produce a "printout" from which to redact exempt information. The only format available is electronic and it is only possible to provide you with an electronic copy.

Moreover, section 14-2-9 (C)(1) allows the custodian to charge reasonable fees for copying the public records, unless a different fee is otherwise prescribed by law. The applicable fee schedule is posted on the City's website. In the present instance, the City has refrained from exercising its other options to request actual costs pursuant to sections 14-2-9 (C) (3) and (4). Because your request does entail costs in terms of work time and materials, the City is within its rights under 14-2-9 (C) (5) to "require advance payment of the fees before making copies of public records." There is no requirement to itemize the costs to produce the copies; and, in all likelihood, those costs will dwarf the thirty dollar (\$30.00) fee.

Therefore, if you still want copies of the 911 calls, please confirm and remit the fee in advance.

--Steve

Steve Ruger

City Clerk

Office of the City Clerk

City of Rio Rancho

(505) 891-5004

www.rnm.gov

From: Jourdanandourya [<mailto:jourdanandourya@protonmail.com>]

Sent: Monday, January 30, 2017 1:29 PM

To: STEPHEN RUGER

Cc: Greg Lauer; SANDRA DAVISON; SARAH OWENS

Subject: RE: Breakdown cost of \$30 fee for each 911 call as required per IPRA

Steve,

I've spoken with Dylan Lange at the AG re: this. You may want to contact him also to ensure you

are complying with IPRA. He has indicated to me that a citizen can view records without charge. We specifically spoke about these 911 calls when I asked the questions. I will also need a breakdown of the \$30 fee per 911 call as required per IPRA. Please let me know if you will cooperate with my requests.

Dianne Goodman

505 323 2307

Sent with [ProtonMail](#) Secure Email.

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

Subject: RE: Breakdown cost of \$30 fee for each 911 call as required per IPRA

Local Time: January 30, 2017 12:27 PM

UTC Time: January 30, 2017 7:27 PM

From: SRUGER@rrnm.gov

To: Jourdanandourya <jourdanandourya@protonmail.com>

Greg Lauer <glauer@rrnm.gov>, SANDRA DAVISON <SDAVISON@RRNM.GOV>, SARAH OWENS <SOWENS@RRNM.GOV>

Ms. Goodman,

The information you have requested to access is not available for you to inspect in person and, in fact, it must be copied and provided to you in a format which you can access.. Therefore, please confirm as to whether you wish to access the information; and, if you do, please be aware that it will have to be copied and thus it will entail advance payment of \$30 before it will be copied.

--Steve

Steve Ruger

City Clerk

Office of the City Clerk

City of Rio Rancho

(505) 891-5004

www.rrnm.gov

From: Jourdanandourya [<mailto:jourdanandourya@protonmail.com>]

Sent: Friday, January 27, 2017 2:17 PM

To: STEPHEN RUGER

Cc: Greg Lauer; SANDRA DAVISON; SARAH OWENS

Subject: RE: Breakdown cost of \$30 fee for each 911 call as required per IPRA

Steve,

I have copied below the section you refer to in IPRA for your convenience. There is nothing that states that a fee needs to be prepaid to **view** a public record. Please let me know when I can view the 911 calls or provide the specific reference to charge \$30 to view a 911 call. Please also note that the \$30 fee cannot be arbitrary. Therefore a cost breakdown shall be provided when requested.

C. A custodian:

(1) may charge reasonable fees for copying

the public records, unless a different fee is

otherwise prescribed by law;

(2) shall not charge fees in excess of one

dollar (\$1.00) per printed page for documents

eleven inches by seventeen inches in size or

smaller;

(3) may charge the actual costs associated

with downloading copies of public records to a

computer disk or storage device, including the

actual cost of the computer disk or storage device;

(4) may charge the actual costs associated with transmitting copies of public records by mail, electronic mail or facsimile;

(5) may require advance payment of the fees before making copies of public records;

Dianne Goodman

Sent with [ProtonMail](#) Secure Email.

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

Subject: RE: Breakdown cost of \$30 fee for each 911 call as required per IPRA

Local Time: January 27, 2017 1:48 PM

UTC Time: January 27, 2017 8:48 PM

From: SRUGER@rrnm.gov

To: Jourdanandourya <jourdanandourya@protonmail.com>

Greg Lauer <glauer@rrnm.gov>, SANDRA DAVISON <SDAVISON@RRNM.GOV>, SARAH OWENS <SOWENS@RRNM.GOV>

Ms. Goodman,

We do not have a "breakdown." Our fees are set in accordance with Section 14-2-9C of the Inspection of Public Records Act.

--Steve

Steve Ruger

City Clerk

Office of the City Clerk

City of Rio Rancho

(505) 891-5004

www.rnm.gov

From: Jourdanandourya [<mailto:jourdanandourya@protonmail.com>]

Sent: Friday, January 20, 2017 7:38 AM

To: STEPHEN RUGER

Subject: Breakdown cost of \$30 fee for each 911 call as required per IPRA

Steve,

Please provide a breakdown of each cost associated with the \$30 fee for each 911 call.

Thanks for your public service,

Dianne Goodman

505 323 2307

14112 Grand Ave NE

Albuquerque NM 87123

Sent with [ProtonMail](#) Secure Email.



RE: Respecting IPRA Re: Receipt for \$30 payment for 911 calls RE: 1/10/17 IPRA REQUEST - All calls and all reports for calls for service to or from 510 Loma Linda Ct from 2012 to current

Received:  January 19, 2017 10:59 PM

From: STEPHEN RUGER SRUGER@rrnm.gov

To: Jourdanandourya jourdanandourya@protonmail.com

Ms. Goodman,

Yes, you have Mr. Maldonado's email address correct.

--Steve

Steve Ruger

City Clerk

Office of the City Clerk

City of Rio Rancho

(505) 891-5004

www.rrnm.gov

From: Jourdanandourya [<mailto:jourdanandourya@protonmail.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, January 18, 2017 1:43 PM

To: STEPHEN RUGER

Cc: Gregg Hull; KEITH RIESBERG; Greg Lauer; MICHAEL GEIER; SARAH OWENS

Subject: RE: Respecting IPRA Re: Receipt for \$30 payment for 911 calls RE: 1/10/17 IPRA REQUEST - All calls and all reports for calls for service to or from 510 Loma Linda Ct from 2012 to current

Steve,

You have not indicated what public records are available for the 1/10/17 IPRA request or when I should expect the response as per IPRA. I realize there is a lot of confusion and this may have been an oversight. However, please understand with the drama that has gone on-which I will explain as part of this response- it does need to be clear what RR's position is re: providing the responsive documents. Please respect IPRA, as you expect me to do the same, and **provide the compliant response.**

Re: hostility, I have the recording of those phone calls. It will be evident to anyone who listens to them that the lack of cooperation, deception and misdirection by RR employees should be unacceptable. It took 30 minutes of drama and runaround to get a response to my simple request for the price list for the RRPD IPRA requests. Furthermore, there was additional drama with Sarah because she refused to be cooperative re: the application of the \$30 paid on 1/13/17 for the correct 911 calls, i.e. 1/10/17 which is part of this email chain. She refused to allow me to provide her the evidence of what communication to RRPD Records I had re: what IPRA request the payment was for and has refused to provide me the proof of why the City applied it to the wrong IPRA request. That snowballed from a call I made to Corita on 1/13/17 to ensure that the \$30 was applied to the correct IPRA. Corita clearly had no interest in applying it as was requested which is evident by the recorded phone call I had with her.

Re: your comment: "[I would much rather you vent your frustrations on me than one of my staff members who did nothing to deserve that level of aggression from you.](#)" Perhaps you will have a clearer perception of the truth now that I have provided you what happened which cannot be perverted by anyone since those calls were recorded. At this point it is best to communicate in writing. **Please let me know if you agree to communicate in writing re: records rather than have them call me.**

Re: your attachment, I requested from Sarah the document that was proof for the payment made on 1/13/17 for \$30. As you can see by your attachment, it is not proof. More deception. As I told Sarah yesterday and Corita on 1/13/17, the \$30 payment for the four 911 calls was for the IPRA request done on 1/10/17. Please see this email chain. Here is the timeline:

1/10/17 IPRA request: All calls and **all reports** for calls for service to or from 510 Loma Linda Ct from 2012 to current.

1/12/17 Pricilla calls me and indicates the only responsive document is 4 pages which has the log of the calls. Charles Arasim purchases the 4 pages which shows four calls. *Note there are no other records that Pricilla indicates I should expect.*

1/13/17 Charles Arasim pays Corita the \$30 for the four calls. She appears confused. He calls me and indicates I'd better call Corita to ensure that there is no confusion. I call Corita to confirm she knows the \$30 is for the four 911 calls.

1/17/17 Dispatch calls to let me know that the cd is ready. She indicates it's only for the 10/31/16 call. I try to discuss it with her and she literally hangs up on me. I then spend 45 minutes on the phone getting bounced around to at least three different people with the last person being Sarah. Nothing gets resolved. Sarah indicates she will provide the document created on 1/13/17 for proof of what the \$30 payment was for, although she waffles on how long it would take and indicates it could be three days.

1/18/17 You provide in your email an attachment that is irrelevant as proof of my direction for the payment made on 1/13/17 for \$30.

As I have made clear to Corita and Sarah, that payment was for the four 911 calls as a response to my 1/10/17 IPRA request.

Whew! I hope I have been able to unravel the web of deception that has occurred. If you want the recordings of the phone calls, please let me know if there is any doubt as to any of my statements or the truth of the matter.

Please advise if the \$30 payment made on 1/13/17 will be honored for the four 911 calls for the 1/10/17 IPRA request as I have always directed.

Additionally, if the 10/31/16 incident had been handled properly, respectfully and not been another perversion of the truth, there would have been no need for me or RR to have spent as much time as we have unraveling the perversions. It's important that the truth is revealed. It takes an enormous amount of time to obtain the information, especially when RR employees are uncooperative and deceptive. I'll do what I have to do because I will not let any RR employee taint my good name and reputation.

I'm just a grandmother very concerned about my grandchildren. Observing the culture and especially after my experiences with Leroy as a RR police officer, who is my grandchild's father, the way the 10/31/16 service call was handled and now my interactions trying to obtain responsive documents to my IPRA requests, it confirms that I should be very concerned. Truth matters.

I look forward to a fresh start with a clear understanding of the importance of telling the truth, being conscientious about accuracy in speech and words and civility.

Please also confirm that Leroy's email address is lmaldonado@rrnm.gov. I've previously asked Greg to confirm since he provided it to me verbally, but he ignored my question when he replied to my email.

Thanks for your patience,

Dianne Goodman

Sent with [ProtonMail](#) Secure Email.

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

Subject: RE: Respecting IPRA Re: Receipt for \$30 payment for 911 calls RE: 1/10/17 IPRA REQUEST - All calls and all reports for calls for service to or from 510 Loma Linda Ct from 2012 to current

Local Time: January 18, 2017 9:53 AM

UTC Time: January 18, 2017 4:53 PM

From: SRUGER@rrnm.gov

To: Jourdanandourya <jourdanandourya@protonmail.com>

Gregg Hull <ghull@rrnm.gov>, KEITH RIESBERG <KRIESBERG@RRNM.GOV>, Greg Lauer <glauer@rrnm.gov>, MICHAEL GEIER <MGEIER@RRNM.GOV>, SARAH OWENS <SOWENS@RRNM.GOV>

Ms. Goodman,

Please understand that we navigate though and process your requests as best we can while balancing the needs of the 93,000 plus residents who we serve. We have spent many hours responding to you, which we're happy to do if it is helpful, but I would ask for a little patience. As always, and I cannot emphasize this enough, if you feel we have not responded appropriately, you may pursue the legal remedies available to you under the Inspection of Public Records Act.

It also came to my attention that you were hostile to one of my staff members on the phone yesterday, and other members of our Police Department staff. When calling the Clerk's Office, please ask for me directly. I would much rather you vent your frustrations on me than one of my staff members who did nothing to deserve that level of aggression from you.

With that, I am attaching the receipt you requested. Sarah Owens will follow up with you on your other concerns regarding this payment and the records you received.

--Steve

Steve Ruger

City Clerk

Office of the City Clerk

City of Rio Rancho

(505) 891-5004

www.rnm.gov

From: Jourdanandourya [<mailto:jourdanandourya@protonmail.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, January 18, 2017 7:15 AM

To: STEPHEN RUGER

Cc: Gregg Hull

Subject: Respecting IPRA Re: Receipt for \$30 payment for 911 calls RE: 1/10/17 IPRA REQUEST - All calls and all reports for calls for service to or from 510 Loma Linda Ct from 2012 to current

Steve,

You have asked me to respect IPRA by requiring me to put my address on all IPRA requests even though you already know it. I have no problem with complying with IPRA. However, I expect the same from you.

I have not received from you a response to this IPRA request. Please respect IPRA, as you expect me to do the same, and provide the compliant response.

Dianne Goodman

Sent with [ProtonMail](#) Secure Email.

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

Subject: Receipt for \$30 payment for 911 calls RE: 1/10/17 IPRA REQUEST - All calls and all reports for calls for service to or from 510 Loma Linda Ct from 2012 to current

Local Time: January 17, 2017 12:34 PM

UTC Time: January 17, 2017 7:34 PM

From: jourdanandourya@protonmail.com

To: SARAH OWENS <SOWENS@RRNM.GOV>

Sarah,

Due to the confusion re: the \$30 payment made on 1/13/17 for the 911 calls, please provide the receipt for payment. I hope it won't take 3 days to provide it as it should be readily available and will clear up any confusion re: what was purchased for that \$30 along with my telecom with Corita on 1/13/17 to ensure the RRPD understood what was purchased.

Dianne Goodman

Sent with [ProtonMail](#) Secure Email.

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

Subject: RE: 1/10/17 IPRA REQUEST - All calls and all reports for calls for service to or from 510 Loma Linda Ct from 2012 to current

Local Time: January 11, 2017 3:31 PM

UTC Time: January 11, 2017 10:31 PM

From: jourdanandourya@protonmail.com

To: STEPHEN RUGER <SRUGER@rrnm.gov>

14112 Grand Ave NE
Albuquerque, NM 87123

I'll make a better effort to remember to include it in the future.

Sent with [ProtonMail](#) Secure Email.

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

Subject: RE: 1/10/17 IPRA REQUEST - All calls and all reports for calls for service to or from 510 Loma Linda Ct from 2012 to current

Local Time: January 11, 2017 2:49 PM

UTC Time: January 11, 2017 9:49 PM

From: SRUGER@rrnm.gov

To: Jourdanandourya <jourdanandourya@protonmail.com>

SARAH OWENS <SOWENS@RRNM.GOV>

Ms. Goodman,

In order to complete your request, please provide your address as required by Section 14-2-8C of the Inspection of Public Records Act.

Thanks,

Steve

Steve Ruger

City Clerk

Office of the City Clerk

City of Rio Rancho

(505) 891-5004

www.rnm.gov

From: Jourdanandourya [<mailto:jourdanandourya@protonmail.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, January 10, 2017 9:14 AM
To: STEPHEN RUGER
Subject: 1/10/17 IPRA REQUEST - All calls and all reports for calls for service to or from 510 Loma Linda Ct from 2012 to current

IPRA Request:

All calls and all reports for calls for service to or from 510 Loma Linda Ct from 2012 to current.

Please advise the fees if viewed, delivered electronically or if picked up at RRPD.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Dianne Goodman

505 323 2307

Sent with [ProtonMail](#) Secure Email.



Salazar, Patricia <psalazar@nmag.gov>

Amended Re: IPRA Compliant Re: City of Rio Rancho required prepaid fee of \$30 per 911 call to view/listen

Government Ethics <govethics@protonmail.com>
Reply-To: Government Ethics <govethics@protonmail.com>
To: "Salazar, Patricia" <psalazar@nmag.gov>
Cc: "glauer@rrmm.gov" <glauer@rrmm.gov>

Thu, Feb 23, 2017 at 4:46 PM

Ms. Salazar,

I forgot to include the City of Rio Rancho's IPRA fee schedule. Note it states that a cd is \$5. I attach it for your convenience. You can find this document at their website,

<http://rrmm.gov/index.aspx?nid=1634>

and download the [City of Rio Rancho Request to Inspect Public Records Form](#)

Dianne Goodman
505 323 2307

Sent from [ProtonMail](#), encrypted email based in Switzerland.

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

Subject: IPRA Compliant Re: City of Rio Rancho required prepaid fee of \$30 per 911 call to view/listen
Local Time: February 23, 2017 11:35 PM
UTC Time: February 23, 2017 11:35 PM
From: govethics@protonmail.com
To: "Salazar, Patricia" <psalazar@nmag.gov>
glauer@rrmm.gov <glauer@rrmm.gov>

Ms. Salazar,

Please see attached IPRA complaint and supporting evidence re: the City of Rio Rancho's refusal to allow me to listen to 911 calls without prepaying a \$30 fee per call and their refusal to provide a cost breakdown of their \$30 fee.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Thanks for your public service,
Dianne Goodman

Sent from [ProtonMail](#), encrypted email based in Switzerland.

4 attachments




City of Rio Rancho IPRA Fee schedule REQUEST TO INSPECT PUBLIC RECORDS Updated March 2011.doc
281K



EMAIL CHAIN ASKING FOR BREAKDOWN OF FEE PER 911 CALL 012017 thru 022117.pdf
44K

 **INSPECTION OF PUBLIC RECORDS ACT complaint City of Rio Rancho 022317.pdf**
14K

 **ORIGINAL IPRA REQUEST 011017 email chain 011017 through 011917.pdf**
43K



Salazar, Patricia <psalazar@nmag.gov>

IPRA Compliant Re: City of Rio Rancho required prepaid fee of \$30 per 911 call to view/listen

Government Ethics <govethics@protonmail.com>
Reply-To: Government Ethics <govethics@protonmail.com>
To: "Salazar, Patricia" <psalazar@nmag.gov>
Cc: "glauer@rrnm.gov" <glauer@rrnm.gov>

Thu, Feb 23, 2017 at 4:35 PM

Ms. Salazar,

Please see attached IPRA complaint and supporting evidence re: the City of Rio Rancho's refusal to allow me to listen to 911 calls without prepaying a \$30 fee per call and their refusal to provide a cost breakdown of their \$30 fee.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Thanks for your public service,
Dianne Goodman

Sent from [ProtonMail](#), encrypted email based in Switzerland.

3 attachments

 **EMAIL CHAIN ASKING FOR BREAKDOWN OF FEE PER 911 CALL 012017 thru 022117.pdf**
44K

 **ORIGINAL IPRA REQUEST 011017 email chain 011017 through 011917.pdf**
43K

 **INSPECTION OF PUBLIC RECORDS ACT complaint City of Rio Rancho 022317.pdf**
14K