Conservation Voters New Mexico (CVNM) works to turn your environmental values into New Mexico priorities.

This scorecard is a tool for you to gauge how your elected officials are performing as stewards of what we love most about New Mexico. It also reveals the story of little-known battles that are waged at the “Roundhouse” that have huge implications for our air, land, water, wildlife, communities and quality of life.

Our organization sends a unified message to legislators and the executive branch on behalf of the broader NM conservation community and all New Mexicans who care about protecting the Enchantment. We ensure that New Mexico voters know whether their elected officials are voting to protect our environment.

Notably, throughout this legislative session, we were asked, “Will this be a scorecard vote?” or “How will this affect my CVNM score?” Increasingly, policy makers are paying attention because they know that New Mexico VOTERS are paying attention.

Although we have made considerable progress, there is still work to do before we enjoy a bi-partisan “conservation majority” in the Legislature. While we strongly defended against attempted environmental rollbacks, it is still disappointing that our greatest victories are mostly stopping proposed bills that seek to roll back public health and environmental protections. For example, several bills introduced this session sought to severely gut water quality standards (our most precious resource!), but thankfully none of them passed. In the end, though, our defense remains strong and 23 great pro-environment bills passed both chambers and became law with the Governor’s signature.

Your support of CVNM makes possible our vigilance and our effectiveness. If you are a current member, THANK YOU. If it has been awhile, or if this is the first time you’ve heard of us, we hope you’ll review this scorecard and consider that supporters like YOU make our work possible.

Please visit our website and contact us at 505-992-VOTE if you would like to get involved. We are counting on you to help us hold our elected officials accountable and to build a pro-conservation majority with the vision to create a safe, clean and healthy New Mexico for future generations.

With gratitude,

Sandy Buffett
CVNM Executive Director

320 Aztec Street, Suite B, Santa Fe, NM 87501
505-992-8683
info@cvnm.org
www.cvnm.org
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Conservation Voters New Mexico’s 2009 Legislative Scorecard provides objective, non-partisan information about the conservation voting records of all members of the 49th Legislature of the State of New Mexico. Scorecards are a clear and comprehensive way for you to see how you and other New Mexicans are being represented on issues that matter to you.

**Vote Selection**
Each vote was selected solely on the basis of environmental values embodied in the legislation. In preparing this scorecard, we sought input from legislative and environmental leaders; however, responsibility for the final set of selected votes rests entirely with Conservation Voters New Mexico (CVNM).

Thousands of votes are taken during a legislative session in New Mexico. Many of these votes represent overwhelming agreement on non-controversial issues or amendments. To provide better insight into the various positions of our legislators, CVNM tended to select measures that illustrate the key debates and fierce disagreement over conservation policy in the state.

CVNM selected the most critical votes on each issue. In some cases, a vote on an amendment to a bill or a procedural motion was more important than voting on the bill itself. In others, a bill was so critical from a conservation perspective that we added a second vote on the measure – such as a procedural vote or amendment. Including two votes on a single measure serves a dual purpose: first, it represents the importance of the bill, and second, it recognizes legislators who might have taken the anti-conservation position on the bill itself, but supported the pro-conservation position on a procedural vote or amendment.

Please read the vote descriptions and compare them against the scorecard to determine how well your legislators represented you on the issues and bills that are most important to you.

**Recording the Votes**
If a legislator voted in support of the pro-conservation position, his or her vote is recorded on the chart as a ‘plus’ (+); votes against the conservation position are indicated with a ‘minus’ (-). If a legislator was excused from voting, this is noted by an ‘e’, and the vote does not count positively or negatively towards their final score. If a legislator was not excused from voting but chose not to vote, they are recorded as ‘absent’ (a). Unexcused absences count against legislators’ scores because they demonstrate that the bills did not appear to be important enough to the legislators for them to cast their vote, despite their significance to the conservation community. If an absence is necessary, a legislator can easily be excused by the presiding

---

*continued next page…*
Conservation policy goals are communicated to legislators during a legislative session where the legislature enacts or rejects the conservation agenda endorsed by Conservation Voters New Mexico (CVNM). Public endorsement of pro-conservation candidates during an election cycle is another important aspect of CVNM’s conservation goals.

Conservation Record
CVNM recognizes that no single session perfectly captures the conservation voting record of an elected official. To better evaluate the voting history of legislators who served in prior sessions, CVNM has included a column containing the average of their scores from 2005 through 2008, where applicable. For more information, previous scorecards are also available on their website at www.cvnm.org.

It is important to remember that scores provide only one component of each legislator’s conservation record. Factors such as leadership in committee, in caucus, and on the floor, as well as vision and determination, also play a crucial role. These other factors are certainly considered by CVNM when making endorsements.
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It was the Best of Times…

In many ways, 2009 was a successful legislative session for New Mexico’s environment, and we celebrate those victories!

Progress
All told, at least 23 great pro-conservation bills were enacted, including measures to:

➤ help safeguard deep groundwater from irresponsible exploitation (HB 19, Stewart);

➤ require consultation with affected Indian nations, tribes and pueblos on new real estate development subdivisions (HB 37, Begaye);

➤ place some limits on cities’ ability to condemn agricultural and environmental water far outside their boundaries (HB 40, Bandy);

➤ give state and regional boards more authority to regulate ozone emissions (HB 195, Taylor);

➤ authorize mechanisms to provide low- or no-cost financing to property owners who install renewable energy infrastructure (HB 572, Egolf; SB 647, Wirth);

➤ promote clean, ‘green’ jobs and industries in New Mexico (HB 622, B Lujan; SB 288, MJ Garcia; SB 318, EGriego); and

➤ enhance renewable energy and sustainable building tax credits (SB 237, Cisneros; SB 257, Keller; SB 291, Feldman).

Several other environmental bills that passed are included in this scorecard, and can be found in the Vote Descriptions (page 7).

Protection
Once again, Conservation Voters New Mexico (CVNM) and our allies were successful in defeating every effort to roll back environmental protections. Although the intensity of the attacks by industry is alarming, we are proud that we’ve been able to hold the line against better-funded and more powerful opponents. A great example of one of these ‘David v. Goliath’ fights was over a massive tax subsidy to SunCal, a sprawling development on the west side of Albuquerque. SunCal waged an unprecedented media and lobbying campaign – spending hundreds of thousands of dollars on contributions to candidates, a team of lobbyists, television and radio advertising, billboards and mail pieces.

Clearly, CVNM, along with a few dedicated legislators and a small group of advocates and citizen activists, were outgunned. Few thought we could succeed. But thanks to the efforts of our members, our allies, and the many private citizens who contacted their legislators – along with the Herculean efforts of some key legislators (see Champions on page 14) – common sense prevailed.

Unfortunately, the fight over sound tax and environmental policy isn’t over, and SunCal will be back, along with industry’s continuing and coordinated efforts to strip New Mexico of the protections we need for public and environmental health.

Passion
2009 saw a bright new crop of passionate, pro-conservation legislators – including Representatives Ben Rodefer, Brian Egolf, Jr., Karen Giannini, Eleanor Chavez and Bill O’Neill, and Senators Eric Griego, Steve Fischmann, Tim Eichenberg and Tim Keller. Not only have the newcomers provided much needed support and energy to our incredible champions already serving in the Roundhouse, they’ve come prepared with bold ideas and plans for protecting New Mexico and moving us forward.

Continued…
...It was the Worst of Times.

Unfortunately, in many ways, the 2009 session was also the most difficult one we’ve faced.

Peril
Although we were successful in defeating efforts to undermine environmental protections, those fights are increasingly challenging. It seems that each session, these attacks on our Land of Enchantment are increasing in number, scope and aggressiveness.

This year, most of the attacks seemed targeted at the Water Quality Act – a critically important law designed to protect one of New Mexico’s most precious and limited natural resources. Most of our communities are completely dependent on groundwater. Once an aquifer is contaminated, it is prohibitively expensive and difficult to restore to drinking water quality. Surface water contamination travels with water flows, and can affect communities and ecosystems downstream. Attempts to gut the Water Quality Act jeopardize the health of our families and communities.

Pain
In past years, most attacks on the environment have failed to progress out of legislative committees onto the “floor” for a vote. However, this year, almost every single environmental rollback passed the Senate Floor. We saw a devastating failure of leadership in the Senate – both in appointing the composition of committees and in ensuring that bills were thoroughly analyzed and adequately vetted by the appropriate committees.

The results were shocking.

In the end, it fell to the House of Representatives to apply common sense in the consideration of proposed legislation. Ultimately, the House defeated almost every effort of special interests and the Senate to jeopardize the health and safety of New Mexicans and the quality of our environment. So while the end results were satisfactory, the lessons about the impact of failed conservation vision by leadership were painful. (see Process Spotlight on page 18).
Wildlife & Wilderness

✔ HB 68 (J Campos): Non-Game Fish Capture or Killing
HB 68 expands the authority of the Game Commission to regulate the methods and devices used to capture non-game fish species. This bill is intended to reduce the use of cruel and wasteful killing techniques. DEFEATED in the Senate.
Conservation Vote: YES

✔ SB 379 (P Griego): Off-Highway Vehicle Regulations
Recognizing the negative impacts of off-highway vehicles (OHVs) on natural ecosystems, private landowners and non-motorized recreationists, SB 379 makes the Department of Game and Fish responsible for the administration of the Act and requires greater enforcement actions.
PASSED both chambers and signed into law.
Conservation Vote: YES

✗ Senate Floor Amendment #2 to SB 391: Landowner Takings of Certain Animals
Under current law, landowners can kill any wildlife if they pose an immediate threat to life, property, or crops. The current law has allowed tragic and wasteful killing of wildlife that were grazing on crops. SB 391 (M Sanchez), which CVNM supports, would change that law, and require that the Dept. of Game & Fish provide assistance and/or compensation to landowners to prevent or remedy crop damage or harm resulting from wildlife. However, on the Senate Floor, Sen. Jennings offered a so-called ‘poison pill’ amendment that would have killed the bill by adding compensation for damage to grazing grasslands – something that is practically impossible to quantify or compensate. The scored vote is on the amendment, which FAILED. The bill was DEFEATED in the House.
Conservation Vote: NO

Health & Environment

✔ HB 520 (Chasey): Consolidated Environmental Review Act
By establishing a proactive and comprehensive environmental assessment process, HB 520 aims to streamline environmental permitting processes, reduce costly litigation and protect public and environmental health. DEFEATED in the House.
Conservation Vote: YES

✗ HB 824 (Heaton): Solid Waste Permit Fees
HB 824 would allow solid waste landfill facilities to choose a ‘life of site’ permit, which could extend to 80 or 90 years. Allowing a facility to receive a lifetime permit with only modest agency reviews prevents the state from adequately monitoring or modifying permits to reflect compliance history, changes in the technical merits of the application, or community and public input. DEFEATED in the Senate.
Conservation Vote: NO

✗ HB 520 (Chasey): Consolidated Environmental Review Act
By establishing a proactive and comprehensive environmental assessment process, HB 520 aims to streamline environmental permitting processes, reduce costly litigation and protect public and environmental health. DEFEATED in the House.
Conservation Vote: YES

✗ HB 379 (P Griego): Off-Highway Vehicle Regulations
Recognizing the negative impacts of off-highway vehicles (OHVs) on natural ecosystems, private landowners and non-motorized recreationists, SB 379 makes the Department of Game and Fish responsible for the administration of the Act and requires greater enforcement actions.
PASSED both chambers and signed into law.
Conservation Vote: YES

✗ SB 16 (Leavell): Underground Gas Storage Tank Compliance
In order to maintain state primacy in the regulation of petroleum storage tanks, New Mexico’s laws must be at least as stringent as federal law. SB 16 is a fix that amends state statute to be consistent with federal law, allowing us to access millions of dollars in federal stimulus money to clean up underground storage tanks that threaten water quality. DEFEATED in the House.
Conservation Vote: YES

✗ SB 206 (Harden): Water Quality Act Rulemaking Limits
SB 206 would put a stranglehold on water quality regulations, preventing agencies from meeting their responsibilities to
Conservation Vote: NO
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protect public health and safety. The bill prohibits the state from imposing conditions on discharge permits under the Water Quality Act. The result may be that permits will be issued without the necessary conditions to protect human and environmental health. Alternately, permits will simply be denied because the agency can’t tailor the approval to reflect site or project-specific conditions.

**Conservation Vote: NO**

After negotiations, the bill was amended in the House Energy and Natural Resources Committee to the point that CVNM withdrew our opposition, but the votes scored reflect the original, anti-conservation version. PASSED both chambers and signed into law.

**SB 479 (Ingle): Dept. of Agriculture for Water Quality**

SB 479 is an effort to circumvent permitting and enforcement under the Water Quality Act, by transferring these responsibilities for the agricultural sector from the Environment Department to the Department of Agriculture. It would be impossible for two different agencies to apply the Act consistently, which creates equal protection issues and undermines the purpose of the water quality standards. DEFEATED in the Senate.

**Conservation Vote: NO**

**SB 607 (Ulibarri): Water Quality Control Commission Members**

Dramatically altering the composition of the Water Quality Control Commission (WQCC), SB 607 reduces the membership of the commission from 14 to 5, and makes it entirely a public board. The WQCC has sweeping responsibilities to protect precious surface and groundwater from contamination. Currently, Secretaries (or their designees) of relevant agencies serve on the WQCC alongside public members. Eliminating these positions, while not requiring any qualifications of the public members, creates a political body ill-equipped to address the highly technical issues for which the WQCC is responsible. DEFEATED in the House.

**Conservation Vote: NO**

**SB 732 (Ulibarri): License Application Time Frame Rules**

Introduced as a “dummy bill” (for more information on dummy bills, please see p. 20 of our 2008 Legislative Scorecard at www.cvnm.org), SB 732 requires that all state entities promulgate rules on time frames for the majority of their operations. This sweeping measure, if enacted, would have brought New Mexico government to a standstill, putting regulatory protections of public health and safety at risk. DEFEATED in the House.

**Conservation Vote: NO**

In addition to the votes on the bill itself, a second vote on SB 249 in each chamber is included. In the Senate, the second vote is on a failed floor amendment offered by Sen. E. Griego that would have reduced the fiscal impacts of the measure – critically important at a time when state environmental agencies are facing severe budget cutbacks (pro-conservation vote = YES). The second vote in the House is on a failed procedural motion to reconsider the bill after the first vote failed (pro-conservation vote = NO).

**SB 540 (Fischmann): Require Development Lease Notice & Bidding**

Along with its House companion (HB 606, sponsored by Rep. Steinborn), SB 540 is one of several bills that attempts to reform the policies and procedures of the State Land Office to make them more objective and transparent. This measure requires the Land Commissioner to open up business leases of public land for real estate or development purposes to public notice and a competitive bidding process. PASSED both chambers and signed.

**Conservation Vote: YES**

**SB 249 (Lopez): Westland Tax Increment Project Bonds**

SB 249 authorizes a massive ($408 million) bond issue to provide infrastructure to a sprawl development on Albuquerque’s west mesa. These types of ‘greenfield’ Tax Increment for Development Districts (TIDDs) aren’t just bad tax policy – they are bad environmental policy. Not only do they undermine responsible land use and water planning, but they also subsidize a huge increase in vehicle-miles-traveled – New Mexico’s fastest-growing contributor to climate change. DEFEATED in the House.

**Conservation Vote: NO**

SB 607 was modified several times during the legislative process. The scorecard vote reflects a version of the bill that restored some agency representatives, but prevented them from voting on important appeals – one of the most critical functions of the WQCC. The Senate Floor substitute also set criteria for the appointed members of the commission that heavily favored industry over public interest representation.
Energy

**✓ HB 219 (Egolf): Free Market Energy Restoration Act**
HB 219 expands the notice required to surface owners by oil and gas companies that plan to develop their mineral rights – providing the surface owner with sufficient time to contract with the mineral rights holder to avert or limit oil and gas operations. HB 219 also requires the State Land Commissioner to provide notification to surface owners when offering certain mineral leases for sale. DEFEATED in the House.

**Conservation Vote:** YES

**✗ HB 340/SB 548 (Nuñez/P Griego): New Emission Standards to Take Effect in 2015**
HB 340 and SB 548 delay the effective date of New Mexico’s “clean cars” rule until 2015 (amended during the legislative process to 2013). Along with 13 other states representing roughly half of the American population and vehicle fleet, New Mexico has adopted sensible standards for vehicle emissions that are flexible for manufacturers, cost-effective for consumers, and help combat greenhouse gas emissions that are responsible for climate change. Delaying the implementation of New Mexico’s rule would be taking a step backward while the rest of the country is moving forward. Both bills passed, but were VETOED by Governor Richardson.

**Conservation Vote:** NO

**✓ HB 653 (Rodefer): Environmental Board Greenhouse Gas Rules**
Joining many other states in tackling the climate crisis, HB 653 directs the Environmental Improvement Board to adopt rules for reducing greenhouse gas emissions and to establish a greenhouse gas cap-and-trade program in coordination with other states, regional programs (e.g. the Western Climate Initiative) and the federal government. DEFEATED in the House.

**Conservation Vote:** NO on the procedural vote, which represents a YES on the bill
The scored vote is on a procedural motion rejecting an unfavorable committee report; it was the only floor vote taken on the measure.

**✓ HB 732 (B Lujan): Low Income Energy Utility Fund Distributions**
HB 732 provides funding for home energy assistance and efficiency to help low income families in New Mexico manage rising energy costs. Implementing energy efficiency measures in a low-income home can save families up to 30% on their energy bills, in addition to generating the most cost-effective reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. DEFEATED in the Senate.

**Conservation Vote:** YES

**✓ SB 420 (E Griego): Severance Tax Investment in Green Industries**
Recognizing the economic and environmental benefits of investing in clean, green technologies, SB 420 encourages state investment in New Mexico’s clean, green industries by authorizing the State Investment Council to invest up to 2% of the market value of the Severance Tax Permanent Fund in qualifying companies. DEFEATED in the House.

**Conservation Vote:** YES

---

How to Read the Scorecard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislator’s District Number</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>2005-08 Score</th>
<th>Anti-Conservation Vote</th>
<th>Pro-Conservation Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Smith, Joe (R)</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Martinez, Maria (D)</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Legislator’s District Number:** The legislator’s district number.
- **Legislator’s Party Affiliation:** The legislator’s party affiliation.
- **2009 Score:** The legislator’s score.
- **2005-08 Score:** The legislator’s score from 2005-2008.
- **Anti-Conservation Vote:** The legislator’s vote on anti-Conservation measures.
- **Pro-Conservation Vote:** The legislator’s vote on Pro-Conservation measures.

**Legislator’s Party Affiliation:**
- **R:** Republican
- **D:** Democrat

**2009 Score:**
- **Excused absence:** Not calculated in the legislator’s score.
- **Unexcused absence:** Calculated in the legislator’s score as an anti-conservation vote.

**2005-08 Score:**
- **Excused absence:** Not calculated in the legislator’s score.
- **Unexcused absence:** Calculated in the legislator’s score as an anti-conservation vote.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dist</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>05-08 Avg</th>
<th>HB 68</th>
<th>SB 379</th>
<th>HB 520</th>
<th>HB 824</th>
<th>HJR 6</th>
<th>SB 249</th>
<th>SB 249 (2)</th>
<th>SB 540</th>
<th>HB 219</th>
<th>HB 340</th>
<th>HB 653</th>
<th>HB 732</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Jeff, Sandra (D)</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Berry, Richard (R)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Begaye, Ray (D)</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bandy, Paul (R)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Barela, Elias (D)</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Barreras, Andrew (D)</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Arnold-Jones, Janice (R)</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Anderson, Thomas (R)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Alcon, Eliseo Lee (D)</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Chasey, Gail (D)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Chavez, Eleanor (D)</td>
<td>n/a **</td>
<td>n/a *</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>e/a</td>
<td>e/a</td>
<td>e/a</td>
<td>e/a</td>
<td>e/a</td>
<td>e/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Chavez, Ernest (D)</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Cook, Zachary (R)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Cote, Nate (D)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>e/a</td>
<td>e/a</td>
<td>e/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Crook, Anna (R)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Egolf, Brian (D)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Espinoza, Nora (R)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Ezzell, Candy Spence (R)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Garcia, Mary Helen (D)</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Garcia, Miguel (D)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Garcia, Thomas (D)</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Gardner, Keith (R)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Giannini, Karen (D)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Gonzales, Roberto &quot;Bobby&quot; (D)</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Gray, William (R)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Gutierrez, Joni Marie (D)</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Hall, Jimmie (R)</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Hamilton, Diane Miller (R)</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Heaton, John (D)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Irwin, Dona (D)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Jeff, Sandra (D)</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>King, Rhonda (D)</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Kintigh, Dennis (R)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>-/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>+/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - legislator was not serving during these legislative sessions  ** - due to predominance of excused absences for health reasons, this legislator was not scored
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dist</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>05-08 Avg</th>
<th>HB 68</th>
<th>SB 379</th>
<th>520</th>
<th>824</th>
<th>HJR 6</th>
<th>SB 249</th>
<th>SB 249 (2)</th>
<th>SB 540</th>
<th>HB 219</th>
<th>HB 340</th>
<th>HB 653</th>
<th>HB 732</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Larrañaga, Larry (R)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Lujan, Antonio (D)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Lujan, Ben (D)</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lundstrom, Patricia (D)</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Madalena, James Roger (D)</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>+***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Maestas, Antonio &quot;Moe&quot; (D)</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Martinez, Rodolfo &quot;Rudy&quot; (D)</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Martinez, W. Ken (D)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>McCoy, Kathy (R)</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Miera, Rick (D)</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Nunez, Andy (D)</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>O’Neill, Bill (D)</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Park, Al (D)</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Picraux, Danice (D)</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Powdrell-Culbert, Jane (R)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Rehn, William “Bill” (R)</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Roch, Dennis (R)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Rodefer, Benjamin (D)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Rodella, Debbie (D)</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Saavedra, Henry Kiki (D)</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Salazar, Nick (D)</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sandoval, Edward (D)</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Stapleton, Sheryl Williams (D)</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Steinborn, Jeff (D)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Stewart, Mimi (D)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Strickler, James (R)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Taylor, Thomas (R)</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Thomas, Jack (D)</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Tripp, Don (R)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Trujillo, Jim (D)</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Tyler, Shirley (R)</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Varela, Luciano &quot;Lucky&quot; (D)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Vaughn, Gloria (R)</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Vigil, Richard (D)</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Wallace, Jeanette (R)</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - legislator was not serving during these legislative sessions
*** - legislator cast anti-conservation vote in first committee, but supported pro-conservation position in second committee
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dist</th>
<th>Senator</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>05-08 Avg</th>
<th>wildlife &amp; wilderness</th>
<th>health &amp; environment</th>
<th>growth &amp; land use</th>
<th>energy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Adair, Rod (R)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Asbill, Vernon (R)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Befort, Sue Wilson (R)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Boitano, Mark (R)</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+ e</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Campos, Peter (D)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cintron, Carlos (D)</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Cravens, Kent (R)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Duran, Dianna (R)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Eichener, Tim (D)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>n/a *</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Feldman, Ded (D)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Fischmann, Stephen (D)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>n/a *</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Garcia, Mary Jane (D)</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Griego, Eric (D)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>n/a *</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Griego, Phil (D)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Harden, Clinton, Jr. (R)</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Ingle, Stuart (R)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Jennings, Timothy (D)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Keller, Timothy (D)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>n/a *</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Kernan, Gay (R)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Leavell, Carroll (R)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Lopez, Linda (D)</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Lovejoy, Lynda (D)</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Martinez, Richard (D)</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>McCorley, Cisco (D)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Morales, Howie (D)</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Munoz, George (D)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>n/a *</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Nava, Cynthia (D)</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neville, Steven (R)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ortiz y Pino, Gerald (D)</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Papen, Mary Kay (D)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Payne, William (R)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pinto, John (D)</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Rodriguez, Nancy (D)</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Rue, Sander (R)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>n/a *</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ryan, John (R)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Sanchez, Bernadette (D)</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Sanchez, Michael (D)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sapien, John (D)</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>n/a *</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sharer, William (R)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Smith, John Arthur (D)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Sotelo, David (D)</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Wirth, Peter (D) **</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n/a * - legislator was not serving during these legislative sessions  ** - in previous sessions, legislator served in the House; scores listed represent those received as a Representative
During his final 60-day legislative session, Governor Richardson continued to build his **strong conservation legacy**. Over the past seven years, his administration has been bold and diligent in its approach to environmental protection, and New Mexicans will continue to benefit in years to come.

One of Governor Richardson’s greatest environmental contributions has been his dedication to ensuring that state agencies fulfill their mandate to protect public health, safety and welfare through regulation and enforcement. As a result, the Environment (ED) and Energy, Minerals and Natural Resources (EMNRD) Departments have stepped up inspections, more aggressively pursued violators and, where necessary, have adopted rules to protect against toxics and pollutants that would jeopardize New Mexicans.

Lately, these efforts have been undercut by the State Legislature. ED and EMNRD have faced disproportionately greater budget cuts than other agencies, weakening inspections and enforcement to a dangerous degree. Worse, many legislators have made serious efforts to strip agencies of their regulatory authority - a trend that should worry the public.

Fortunately, Governor Richardson has **held strong in defense of our air, land, water and wildlife**. Fighting during the legislative session to safeguard environmental protections, the conservation community – working with the Governor’s office and state agencies – was able to defeat all but one environmental rollback. That rollback consisted of two measures (HB 340 and SB 548) that would have delayed implementation of stricter vehicle emission standards, a significant intrusion on executive authority. Governor Richardson rightly vetoed the measures, but directed the Environment Department to work with interested parties on a revised implementation schedule.

A dedicated wildlife preservationist, Governor Richardson also led the charge to reform an existing law that allows landowners to kill wildlife fairly indiscriminately. SB 391, sponsored by Senator Michael Sanchez, would create a compensation fund for landowners experiencing crop losses from wildlife. Although the measure ran out of time in the House this session, the Governor appears committed to passing it before he leaves office.

One problem arose over the proposed SunCal tax increment development district (TIDD). After the session, where the $408 million tax subsidy was defeated through a strong grassroots and bi-partisan effort, Governor Richardson indicated support for the proposal and said he was considering bringing it up again in a special session expected this fall. Given the size and location of the proposed development, SunCal would **massively increase the vehicle-miles-traveled** (VMTs) in Bernalillo County – a major problem, since VMTs are New Mexico’s fastest-growing contributor to climate change. The Governor has made huge strides in tackling the climate change crisis; but dedicating public money to subsidize a sprawling development that would make state climate change targets nearly impossible to meet threatens to undermine his legacy on this issue.

In the end, the legislative session yielded tremendous progress on critical conservation issues – due in no small part to Governor Richardson’s support and vision. He signed **23 pro-conservation measures** into law, and our state will be much the better for his efforts.
The biggest fight of the session was over a $408 million tax subsidy to the SunCal corporation for a massive sprawl development on the west side of Albuquerque. Although common sense prevailed over the special interests, it was a nail-biter until the bitter end. The measure failed on two successive 33-33 tied votes.

Far too many legislators contributed to the effort to list them all here… However, a few key Representatives played invaluable roles:

Rep. Benjamin Rodefer led the charge in the House, and this victory would not have been possible without his passion and perseverance. As a result of his single-minded dedication to defeating SB 249, precious tax dollars will go where they belong – health care, education and environmental protection – instead of subsidizing out-of-state developers and the substantial increases in
greenhouse gas emissions that result from such a sprawling development. 

Representatives Debbie Rodella, Mimi Stewart and Elias Barela also made tremendous contributions, and SB 249 could not have been defeated without them. All New Mexicans owe these Representatives a debt of gratitude for their efforts. Thank you!

Although the SunCal measure failed in the House, we also want to recognize some of our Senate champions, who fought valiantly on behalf of New Mexico’s taxpayers and environment: Senators Eric Griego, Steve Fischmann, Dede Feldman and Cisco McSorley. Thank you, Senators!

Preserving Rural Water

Water is one of New Mexico’s most scarce, precious resources. For growing communities, limited water supplies pose a challenge, and the unfortunate result is increasing pressure to transfer water from farms and rural areas to supply thirsty cities.

With a diverse group of supporters, Representative Paul Bandy worked diligently to craft and pass legislation (HB 40) that places limits on the authority of municipalities to condemn water rights outside their boundaries – protecting rural communities, and prioritizing water conservation over massive water transfers. Thank you, Rep. Bandy!

Consolidated Environmental Review Act

New Mexico’s failure to join other states in implementing a comprehensive environmental review process for proposed projects and permits has created uncertainty for industry, unnecessary and costly litigation, and an inability to assess the cumulative impacts of polluting facilities on our communities.

Rep. Gail Chasey is tackling this issue head-on, and is courageously sponsoring the Consolidated Environmental Review Act (HB 520). The bill passed House Energy & Natural Resources Committee, but ran out of time in House Appropriations & Finance. However, Rep. Chasey is keeping up the fight, and plans to introduce the bill again. Thank you, Rep. Chasey!

Thanks also to Rep. Kiki Saavedra, who was a principal co-sponsor of HB 520. Representing a community that has suffered from a heavy concentration of polluting facilities, he understands the importance of assessing the potential health impacts of new industry in close proximity to schools and community centers.

Rollbacks of Environmental Protections

As mentioned elsewhere in this scorecard, New Mexico’s environment is facing increasing attacks from industry on the regulations that protect the quality of our air and water. This session, most of these continued…
rollback measures passed the Senate, but fortunately were defeated in the House. A big reason for our success in holding the line on regulatory protections is Speaker Ben Lujan—who was vigilant and firm in his defense of New Mexico’s environment. Thank you, Speaker Lujan!

We also want to applaud Representatives Mimi Stewart and Al Park for their efforts to help defeat anti-conservation measures, as well as Secretary Ron Curry and his staff at the Environment Department for their incredible diligence in carrying out their mission.

State Land Office Reform

Recently, a number of concerns have been raised about the way that the State Land Office carries out its responsibilities to manage our state’s public lands for the benefit of all New Mexicans.

This session, three Dona Ana legislators fought hard to reform the practices of the State Land Office, by increasing transparency and accountability—particularly with respect to the lease and sale of public lands. Although only one of the various measures passed (SB 540, see Vote Descriptions on page 8), it represents significant progress. We know that these legislators will keep up the fight in future sessions. Thank you Representatives Steinborn and Cote, and Senator Fischmann!

Off-Highway Vehicles

Off-Highway Vehicles (OHVs) represent an increasing threat to wildlife, wilderness, non-motorized recreation and private property. For some time now, Senators Phil Griego and Dede Feldman have been working with different constituencies to attempt to resolve conflicts and reduce damages. The result is SB 379, which was enacted this session. Although modest in many ways, SB 379 is nonetheless a huge step forward. We know how much time and effort went into negotiations on the bill, and we’re grateful to both Senators for their commitment. Thank you, Senators Griego and Feldman!

Protecting Air Quality

Several counties in New Mexico face challenges in controlling ozone pollution. Previously, the state lacked effective tools to prevent ozone emissions from exceeding federal standards—a problem that triggered federal intervention in air quality regulation.

As a result of the efforts of Representative Tom Taylor to pass HB 195, New Mexico will now be able to more aggressively regulate and enforce ozone emissions in excess of 95% of the federal standards—keeping our air cleaner and our future brighter. Thank you, Rep. Taylor!

Renewable Energy Districts

One of the biggest obstacles to expanding renewable energy infrastructure on residential, commercial and industrial buildings is the up-front costs for installation, which put clean energy investments out of reach for everyday New Mexicans.

This session, Senator Peter Wirth and Representative Brian Egolf both passed bills that allow local governments to establish mechanisms to help property owners finance solar and other renewable energy infrastructure, and then repay the costs through special assessments.
on their property tax bills. The long-term costs are more than offset by the utility savings and the payments from the utility companies to purchase excess energy not needed by the property.

These measures represent an innovative way of tackling a significant problem, and we applaud Sen. Wirth and Rep. Egolf for their efforts. Rep. Ben Rodefer has been working hard on this issue as well, and contributed heavily to the success of these bills. Thanks to each of you!

A number of other clean energy bills were enacted this session, and we want to express our appreciation of Senators Keller, Cisneros and Feldman, and Speaker Lujan and Representative Gonzales for their sponsorship of these key measures. Thank you!

**Green Jobs**

New Mexico has a bright future as a hub for “green industries” that provide high-paying, career-track jobs in businesses that reduce waste or pollution, or produce sustainable products. Green industries include renewable energy production, energy efficiency, environmentally-friendly building construction, large-scale reuse and recycling, and sustainable manufacturing and food production.

A key prerequisite for New Mexico’s growth of green industries is the development and training of skilled workers. Several measures in the 2009 session used different mechanisms for incentivizing homegrown green jobs and the training of workers to fill those positions.

**Senator Eric Griego** and Speaker Lujan led the charge with their suite of “green jobs” bills (SB 318 and HB 622 both passed; SB 420 ran out of time). **Senator Mary Jane Garcia** was also a significant contributor with her SB 288, which was enacted. All of these legislators were dogged in their efforts, and New Mexico’s future is far brighter as a result. Thank you, Senators Griego and Garcia, and Speaker Lujan!
In the 2008 elections, voters in New Mexico demanded change. They elected environmental candidates up and down the ballot. In the State Senate, at least four pro-conservation candidates defeated anti-environment incumbents. In the House, it was a similar story.

Despite this, 2009 marked a new low for conservation in the New Mexico State Senate.

For years, the Senate has lagged behind the House in protecting New Mexico’s environment. This session, however, revealed a deliberate and coordinated effort by a number of key Senators to strip environmental protections and tilt the scales in favor of polluting industries.

An unprecedented number of the most extreme anti-conservation bills passed the Senate – many without proper notice, public testimony, a fiscal analysis or even a hearing by the appropriate committee.

One example is SB 732, which would have crippled all state agencies so that they would have little capacity or resources to regulate polluters or enforce environmental laws. Although the potentially exorbitant cost to the state was unknown and the threat to the environment severe, SB 732 sailed from introduction of the substance of the bill, through the Senate Conservation Committee, to passage by the full Senate in just 48 hours. From a conservation perspective, this appeared to be a calculated attempt to keep the public from weighing in on this grave threat to their families and their quality of life.

So how did we get here?

Senate committee appointments are made by the Senate President Pro Tempore. In 2009, committees were arranged to be openly hostile to environmental protection. Only one out of eight members of the Senate Conservation Committee managed to exceed a CVNM score of 46%, the record-low average for the entire Senate. The median score for this committee plummeted 24 points from 2008 to 2009 — down to 32%.

The Conservation Committee is only one example: it is abundantly clear that the composition of many critical Senate committees has dramatically shifted power to special interests – to those industries that advocate de-regulation and increased exploitation of natural resources.

Moreover, some of the most provocative, anti-environmental bills were inexplicably assigned to committees that didn’t have the appropriate jurisdiction and expertise to adequately evaluate them. The assignment of bills to particular committees is the responsibility of the Senate Majority Leader.
In the end, the House of Representatives was forced to defeat attacks on our environment launched by the Senate. Fortunately, for the most part, the House held the line and chose clean air and water over exploitation of our Land of Enchantment.

So when New Mexico voters are demanding stronger environmental policies, and demonstrating those demands at the ballot box, how is the State Senate so out of touch with the will of the voters?

It comes down to the Senators who lead the chamber. In 2009, a few Democrats joined with Republicans to accomplish what they couldn’t achieve in the elections. They elected Senate leaders who fostered an aggressive anti-conservation climate, and seemingly used all of the procedural tools at their disposal to do so.

They appear to have succeeded. For now, at least.

The impact on our public health and environment by what is generally considered an internal issue – who leads the Senate – cannot be overstated. This is unfortunate, because for New Mexicans who care about our families and quality of life, it makes an internal issue very, very public.

The stakes are high. The threats to our environment are serious and real. And New Mexicans have a right to know why decisions are being made that sacrifice our Land of Enchantment for the power and benefit of a few. And they need to do something about it.
In the course of an average day, you encounter thousands of different regulations. You may not see them, but they are there to keep you and your family safe: the car you drive, your vitamins and medicines, the ingredients in your meals, the bank that handles your finances, the cleanliness of your favorite restaurant and the elevator you take to your office.

We tend not to notice these regulations when everything is functioning smoothly. However, when the regulatory system fails – as with the recent financial crisis, tainted peanut butter and spinach, and toys contaminated with lead – people get hurt.

Frequently, representatives of industry argue that regulation interferes with free-market capitalism: that excessive regulation hurts business, makes products more expensive and costs jobs. Since our economy has thrived for decades with very few setbacks – the most recent crisis being caused not by regulation, but by de-regulation – these arguments seem specious at best. Moreover, it is difficult to weigh financial motives against protecting people’s lives.

Industry interests also argue that the market self-regulates, in that companies have a financial incentive not to put dangerous goods on the market – partly because of the financial penalties that might result, but also because they can’t sustain an economic profit if the public doesn’t trust their product. To a certain extent, this is true; however, that constraint only applies when it involves regulation of the product itself.

Environmental protections involve ‘externalities’. If a company pollutes the environment, it doesn’t affect the safety of their products. However, it does jeopardize the safety of the public – the same as tainted peanut butter or lead-contaminated toys. But while you can choose not to eat peanut butter or buy new toys, you don’t have a choice about breathing air or drinking water.

Over the past decade, for example, the City of Lovington has been fighting to protect its water supply from contamination as a result of oil production wastes. In at least a dozen documented instances, contaminants have leaked into the soil immediately above the aquifer from which the community of Lovington draws 100% of its water.

In many such cases, the cost of cleaning up those wastes is borne by state taxpayers, because no responsible companies can be found. This is a small price to pay, considering the alternative if these contaminants were to reach the aquifer. Nonetheless, what if there were adequate regulation and enforcement to prevent such threats in the first place?

Not surprisingly, when Lovington proposed a very common-sense ordinance that would have required comprehensive waste disposal for drilling operations immediately over their community water supply, the oil and gas industry lobbied against it.

It is always in the interests of industry to fight regulation that will cost companies even a miniscule amount of money. Their responsibility to their shareholders is to maximize profits. It saves industry a lot of money if the costs for contamination – both human and financial – are borne by the public instead of their shareholders.

However, it is the responsibility of lawmakers and regulators to protect the public. They have to anticipate the worst in order to prevent it. When asthma rates are skyrocketing among children, we have to reduce the pollution that is aggravating the problem. When mercury from power plants has made fish in many New Mexico rivers and lakes dangerous to eat, we have to control emissions to safeguard the public. And when a community’s water supply is threatened by contamination, we have to take action to prevent catastrophe. But “we” can’t – legislators and regulators can.

Our elected officials are our only line of defense. It is their responsibility to regulate polluting industries - for the sake of our children, our families, our communities…

After all, this is our New Mexico. And we have the right to feel safe breathing our air, drinking our water and playing or praying on our land.

---

...an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

- Benjamin Franklin
It’s never too late to say ‘thanks’! (or ‘no thanks’…).
Tell your legislators that you ‘know the score’

One of the best ways to influence the voting records of your elected officials is to communicate regularly with them. If your legislators scored well, it’s important to thank them and to support them. If you feel you weren’t well-represented by your legislators’ votes, it’s important to hold them accountable by letting them know what you think about their votes.

If you don’t know who your legislators are, visit www.cvnm.org and click on the “Find your Legislator” button.

Join Conservation Voters New Mexico today!

We take on tough fights to protect New Mexico, but these efforts in the Roundhouse and around the state require financial resources. We can only win with your support. Please join other New Mexicans in becoming a Conservation Voter – today! Membership is easy: just submit the enclosed envelope with your membership contribution, or join online at www.cvnm.org and click “Support CVNM”.

Communicate with the Governor and your Legislators

Whether you’re congratulating your legislators on their score or expressing your disappointment, be direct, courteous and polite. The most important part of your communication is letting them know that you are paying close attention to how they vote or, in the case of the Governor, what actions he takes on environmental legislation.

Phoning your legislator directly and sending letters through regular mail remain by far the most effective ways to communicate with your legislators. Due to mass volume, e-mail is generally a less effective method to communicate your views.

The Governor and Lt. Governor can always be contacted at the Roundhouse. Except during the legislative session, state legislators should be contacted in their home districts, as listed on the following pages.
Legislative Contact Information

Governor Bill Richardson
Office of the Governor
490 Old Santa Fe Trail
Room 400
Santa Fe, NM 87501

State Legislators
During legislative sessions (January to March in odd-numbered years; January and February in even-numbered years), your State Senators and Representatives can be contacted at the State Capitol, Santa Fe, NM, 87501, or by phone at 986-4300.

Outside the legislative sessions, legislators can be contacted in their home districts:

SENATE

Adair, Rod (R - 33)
Box 1796
Roswell, NM 88202
(575) 627-8372 / (575) 622-7085

Ashill, Vernom D. (R - 34)
1502 Mountain Shadow
Carlsbad, NM 88220
(575) 302-8135 / (575) 887-1844

Belfort, Sue Wilson (R - 19)
67 Raindance Road
Sandia Park, NM 87047
(505) 232-7116

Boitano, Mark (R - 18)
3615 Horacio Court NE
Albuquerque, NM 87111
(505) 798-1092

Campos, Pete (D - 8)
500 Reynolds Avenue
Las Vegas, NM 87701
(505) 454-2501 / (505) 425-0508

Cisneros, Carlos R. (D - 6)
Box 1129
Quetta, NM 87556
(505) 670-5610

Cravens, Kent (R - 21)
12062 Irish Mist Road NE
Albuquerque, NM 87122
(505) 898-2673 / (505) 858-0799

Duran, Dianna J. (R - 40)
305 8th Street
Tularosa, NM 88352
(575) 585-8896 / (575) 585-8896

Eichenberg, Tim (D - 15)
7800 Charger Trail NE
Albuquerque, NM 87109
(505) 828-9474

Feldman, Dede (D - 24)
1821 Meadowview NW
Albuquerque, NM 87104
(505) 242-1997

Fischmann, Stephen H. (D - 37)
4848 Deadwood Camp Ct
Las Cruces, NM 88011
(575) 635-9522

Garcia, Mary Jane M. (D - 36)
Box 22
Dona Ana, NM 88032
(575) 526-5048

Griego, Eric (D - 14)
1903 Santa Fe Ave SW
Albuquerque, NM 87102
(505) 259-7600

Griego, Phil A. (D - 39)
Box 10
San Jose, NM 87555
(505) 983-6383 / (575) 421-2863

Harden, Clinton D., Jr. (R - 7)
1348 CRH
Clovis, NM 88101
(575) 389-1248

Ingle, Stuart (R - 27)
2106 West University Drive
Portales, NM 88130
(575) 356-3088

Jennings, Timothy Z. (D - 32)
Box 1797
Roswell, NM 88202-1797
(505) 623-8331 / (505) 623-3378

Keller, Timothy M (D - 17)
11023 Vistazo Pl SE
Albuquerque, NM 87123
(505) 332-9441

Kearns, Gay G. (R - 42)
928 W Mesa Verde
Hobbs, NM 88240
(575) 397-2536

Leavell, Carroll H. (R - 41)
11300 San Cristobal SW
Albuquerque, NM 87121
(505) 831-4148

Lovejoy, Lynda M. (D - 22)
Box 795
Crownpoint, NM 87331
(505) 352-0967 / (505) 786-7498

Martinez, Richard C. (D - 5)
Box 762
Espanola, NM 87532
(505) 753-8027

McSorley, Cisco (D - 16)
415 Wellesley Place NE
Albuquerque, NM 87106
(505) 266-0588

Morales, Howie C. (D - 28)
4285 North Swan
Silver City, NM 88061
(575) 574-0043

Muñoz, George K. (D - 4)
Box 2670
Gallup, NM 87305
(505) 722-9570 / (505) 722-0191

Nava, Cynthia (D - 31)
3002 Broadmoor
Las Cruces, NM 88001
(575) 882-6200 / (575) 526-4111

Neville, Steven P. (R - 2)
Box 1570
Aztec, NM 87410
(505) 327-5450 / (505) 334-8726

Ortiz y Pino, Gerald (D - 12)
400 12th Street NW
Albuquerque, NM 87102
(505) 243-1509

Pappen, Mary Kay (D - 38)
904 Conway Avenue
Las Cruces, NM 88005
(505) 524-4462

Payne, William H. (R - 20)
Box 14823
Albuquerque, NM 87191
(505) 884-6872 / (505) 293-5703

Pinto, John (D - 3)
Box 163
Tohatchi, NM 87325
(928) 871-6952

Rodriguez, Nancy (D - 24)
1838 Camino La Canada
Santa Fe, NM 87501
(505) 983-9513

Rue, Sander (R - 23)
7500 Rancho Solano Ct NW
Albuquerque, NM 87120
(505) 899-0288

Ryan, John C. (R - 10)
1020 Salamanca NW
Albuquerque, NM 87107
(505) 343-1400

Sanchez, Bernadette M. (D - 26)
Contact Senator by phone for address
(505) 352-6864

Sanchez, Michael S. (D - 29)
3 Bunton Road
Belen, NM 87002
(505) 865-0688 / (505) 865-5583

Sapien, John M. (D - 9)
1600 W Ella Dr
Corrales, NM 87048
(505) 765-5662

Sharer, William E. (R - 1)
Box 203
Farmingtown, NM 87498
(505) 325-5055 / (505) 564-8640

Smith, John Arthur (D - 35)
Box 998
Doming, NM 88031
(575) 546-4979 / (575) 546-8546

Ulubari, David (D - 30)
1629 Chaco
Grants, NM 87020
(505) 287-8241

Wirth, Peter (D - 25)
790 Paseo de Peralta
Santa Fe, NM 87501
(505) 988-1668 / (505) 989-8667

HOUSE

Alcon, Eliseo Lee (D - 6)
PO Box 2134
Milan, NM 87021
(505) 285-6387

Anderson, Thomas A. (R - 29)
10013 Plunkett Drive NW
Albuquerque, NM 87114
(505) 897-2593

Arnold-Jones, Janice E. (R - 24)
7175 Sierra Azul NE
Albuquerque, NM 87110
(505) 538-3141 / (505) 379-0902

Bandi, Paul C. (R - 3)
388 County Road 2900
Aztec, NM 87410
(505) 334-0865

Barela, Elias (D - 8)
1191 John Road
Belen, NM 87002
(505) 866-1252

Barreras, Andrew J. (D - 7)
Box 257
Tuba, NM 87050
(505) 720-8580

Begaye, Ray (D - 4)
Box 609
Shiprock, NM 87420

Berry, Richard J. (R - 20)
Box 59065
Albuquerque, NM 87181
(505) 293-1130
**Turning Environmental Values into New Mexico Priorities**

Conservation Voters New Mexico, a nonpartisan, non-profit 501(c)(4) organization, works to protect our Land of Enchantment by:

- Educating legislators and the public on critical conservation issues;
- Lobbying on behalf of pro-conservation legislation;
- Holding legislators accountable for decisions that impact the environment; and
- Endorsing and electing pro-conservation candidates to public office.

At Conservation Voters New Mexico, we value responsible stewardship of our water, our land and our natural resources. We believe that ecological health and social equity among New Mexico’s diverse and culturally rich communities protects our cherished quality of life. We are dedicated to ensuring democratic accountability and access for all New Mexicans to participate in the political process. We support policies and lawmakers that promote long-term ecological and economic sustainability.

This is our responsibility to future generations.

---

If “HD” and “SD” appear on your address label, the numbers correspond with your House District and Senate District for your reference.