why we conserve
Dear Fellow New Mexican,

Conservation Voters New Mexico (CVNM) works to turn your environmental values into our state’s public policies.

In the following pages, you can find out how your values are being represented at the State Capitol. Our Scorecard shows that electing environmental champions to office and holding them accountable are essential ingredients for protecting our air, land, water, and wildlife for future generations. This year, two of the environmental community’s top priorities – funding for river restoration projects throughout the state and an energy efficiency bill that will help reduce the need for new power plants – passed the legislature and were signed by Governor Richardson.

While we are proud to report another year of 100% defensive success – with no environmental rollbacks – powerful special interests have been mounting even tougher fights that require our fierce and rapid response to protect our environment. CVNM monitored and helped defeat dozens of nefarious bills, from attempts to roll back environmental regulations, to retaliatory efforts to strip environmental staff attorneys from state agencies, to corporate subsidies that put taxpayers on the hook for underwriting sprawl development. With the leadership and determination of our conservation champions in the legislature, you can rest assured that all these measures eventually failed.

Thanks so much for joining us in our efforts to make the environment a top priority at the Roundhouse. By letting legislators know we are keeping score, we’re helping to ensure the health and well-being of the communities and wild places that make New Mexico so special.

Sincerely,

Sandy Buffett
Executive Director

Please feel free to call me at (505) 992-8683 if you have any questions or would like to become more involved.
Conservation Voters New Mexico’s 2008 Legislative Scorecard provides objective, non-partisan information about the conservation voting records of all members of the 48th Legislature of the State of New Mexico. Scorecards are a clear and comprehensive way for voters to see how they are being represented.

Each vote was selected solely on the basis of environmental values embodied in the legislation. The results of the charts speak for themselves. In preparing this scorecard, we sought input from legislative and environmental leaders; however, responsibility for the decisions reflected in this document rests entirely with Conservation Voters New Mexico (CVNM).

There are literally thousands of votes taken during a legislative session in New Mexico. Most of these votes represent overwhelming or unanimous agreement on non-controversial issues or amendments. In many cases, CVNM selected measures that illustrate the key debates and fierce disagreement over conservation policy in the state; however, we also selected some votes that achieved near-unanimity to recognize significant legislative action on important conservation issues.

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 officer, and excused absences do not count against their scores. That being said, voters can assess the scores and determine how important any unexcused absences were, and hopefully encourage their legislators to cast votes on every conservation-related measure.

Wherever possible, the votes included in the scorecard were taken...
continued from previous page

on the floor of the House or Senate, where every legislator’s position can be represented. However, some of the most important actions are taken in legislative committees – on measures that never reach the floor. In these cases, CVNM has presented the committee’s vote, and the positions of legislators who do not serve on that particular committee are recorded as ‘not applicable’ (n/a) and are not factored into their overall scores. If the sponsor of a measure does not serve on the committee for which a vote is being scored, their sponsorship is considered representative of their position, and is recorded with a ‘+’ or ‘-’, as appropriate.

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, the only available record of legislators’ positions on issues is reflected in procedural motions. In these rare cases, the specific details are explained in the vote description.

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

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, we have included a column containing their 2007 score, as well as their cumulative score from the 47th Legislature of 2005 and 2006 (where applicable). For more information, our previous scorecards are also available on our web site at: [www.cvnm.org](http://www.cvnm.org).

How to Read the Scorecard

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Number</th>
<th>Legislator’s Name (Party)</th>
<th>2008 Score</th>
<th>2005-06 Score</th>
<th>Anti-Conservation Vote</th>
<th>Pro-Conservation Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Smith, Joe (D)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Martinez, Maria (R)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legislator’s District Number
Legislator’s Party Affiliation
2008 Score
2005-06 Score
Anti-Conservation Vote
Pro-Conservation Vote

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

New Mexico House and Senate District Maps available online now at [www.CVNM.org](http://www.CVNM.org)
CVNM Cycle of Accountability

Conservation Goals for the Legislature are Evaluated and Prioritized

LEGISLATIVE SESSION:
Legislature enacts or rejects conservation agenda

Endorsement of Pro-Conservation Candidates

Campaign Assistance and Grassroots Mobilization

ELECTION:
Public elects or rejects candidates

Lobbying and Grassroots Mobilization

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.
The 2008 legislative session was challenging for New Mexico’s environment. Although a few positive steps were taken on critical conservation issues, the magnitude of attempted assaults on the quality of our air and water was simply appalling.

Ultimately, none of the environmental rollbacks passed – thanks to the intense efforts of CVNM, our allies in the conservation and environmental justice communities, our legislative champions and Governor Richardson. But the number and scope of attacks on New Mexicans’ quality of life was surprising, and the threats are not subsiding. It reminds us all of the importance of holding our legislators accountable at the ballot box, and ensuring that the officials we elect represent our interests and values.

**Highlights**

One of the most important bills to be enacted this session addresses the complicated issue of energy efficiency. Utility Customer Load Management (HB305), sponsored by Speaker Lujan and pushed by Governor Richardson, requires that regulated electric utilities meet 10% of their energy demand with energy efficiency by 2020. The measure is both environment and consumer-friendly because it averts the need to build new power plants, which are costly from both financial and environmental standpoints. It will also generate thousands of new jobs in the areas of weatherization and design of high-performance energy management systems.

Other pro-conservation measures that passed include:

- **Pecos River Settlement Water Rights (SB227)** – this bill addresses some of the land management problems associated with meeting our water delivery obligations on the Pecos, by authorizing the state to acquire water rights without also purchasing the land. Besides saving money, this allows the land to be used for private landowner grazing, which helps ward off and reduce infestations of invasive non-native species.

- **Off-Road Motorized Vehicles (SJM13/SJM40)** – both of these measures are designed to tackle the threats that off-road motorized vehicles pose to private landowners, as well as public parks and wilderness areas.

- **Develop Official Acequia Registry (HJM17)** – this measure lays the groundwork for developing an official registry of acequias and community ditches in New Mexico, to preserve their historical, cultural and legal record.

- **Recycling Initiatives (SJM11/SJM20)** – both of these memorials recognize the importance of improved and expanded recycling. SJM11 directs the Environment Department to develop guidelines for electronics procurement and recycling by state agencies that are more environmentally-friendly, while SJM20 urges the legislature, other State agencies and public schools to increase and expand their recycling efforts.

Several other successful pro-conservation measures are described in the Conservation Vote Descriptions section of the Scorecard.

2008 saw more bipartisan support for conservation positions than previous sessions, particularly in the House of Representatives. An indicator of this shift is the differential between average conservation scores for Democrats and Republicans. In 2007, the partisan divide in the House was 55 percentage points (78% to 23%); but in 2008, that number was cut almost in half – to 29 percentage points. Given the shared importance of our environment to all New Mexicans, we applaud the greater bipartisanship and hope the trend continues.

**Lowlights**

This legislative session saw an unprecedented level of attacks on New Mexico’s regulatory process. The attacks included measures designed to prevent the adoption of new rules or enforcement of existing ones, as well as constitutional amendments that would have severely undermined rule-making and gutted many existing regulations.

Rules and regulations are designed to protect our health, safety and welfare. They cover every imaginable aspect of our lives—restaurant and meat inspections, nursing and foster homes, worker safety, day care facilities, health practitioners like chiropractors and dentists, building construction, financial...
services and institutions, alcohol, real estate and polluting industries. Attacks on the regulatory process jeopardize all of the rules that protect New Mexicans and keep us safe and healthy.

Also very disturbing is the intense pressure from the uranium industry to resume uranium mining activities in New Mexico. Despite the horrific repercussions still being suffered by communities that experienced the ‘uranium boom’ of the 1970s, the industry is pushing for renewed expansion of active mining and milling.

Uranium lobbyists advocated for SB487, which they touted as a means of tackling the cleanup of the abandoned uranium mines that continue to pose major human health and environmental risks to vulnerable communities. The bill would have assessed a paltry surcharge on mined uranium, and the revenue generated wouldn’t even begin to tackle the scale of the abandoned mine problem. In reality, SB487 was ‘Trojan horse’ legislation that encouraged new uranium mining by linking the cleanup of abandoned uranium mines to production from new uranium mines and mills.

On the bright side, the bill was vetoed by Governor Richardson – after intense advocacy by the Multicultural Alliance for a Safe Environment (MASE), an alliance of over a dozen groups who have been actively working against new uranium mining, and MASE’s supporters in the conservation and environmental justice community. However, the pressure to renew uranium mining is intensifying – so the fight will continue.

Another challenge faced by CVNM and our allies is the fight in the Legislature over tax increment financing – a mechanism that can be a good tool for community revitalization when used appropriately, but which is being distorted in New Mexico to subsidize private sector real estate developments on the fringe of urban areas. More information on this issue can be found on page 19.

The Environmental Alliance of New Mexico, of which CVNM is a member, was disappointed by the lack of progress on two important initiatives:

- **Leave No Child Inside: HB583** is designed to generate revenue for outdoor educational programming through a small levy on the purchase of televisions and video games. Administered through the Public Education Department, the fund will be directed to programs addressing unhealthy trends in New Mexico youth associated with excessive “screen time”, including obesity and poor school performance.

- **Resource & Energy Efficient Buildings: SB403** would relieve a significant burden in meeting the operating costs for public buildings, by requiring that construction projects funded with public tax dollars through the capital outlay process meet high standards for energy and resource efficiency.

**The Budget**

This year’s budget was a mixed-bag for the environment. Conservation advocates were successful in securing $2.8 million for river and ecosystem restoration projects statewide, and another $1.5 million for land and wildlife conservation projects. The budget also included $3.5 million for clean energy grants and innovative energy projects, as well as $500,000 for retrofitting park facilities to be more energy efficient.

At the same time, however, environmental agencies faced serious threats of budget cuts. As initially proposed by the Senate Finance Committee (SFC), staff attorneys for the Energy, Minerals and Natural Resources and Environment Departments would have been stripped and re-assigned elsewhere – jeopardizing regulation and enforcement of environmental laws. The SFC budget also included baseline budget cuts for the same agencies. After intensive efforts by the community and our legislative allies, the staff attorneys were restored in the final budget; however, some of the baseline budget cuts remained.
Health & Environment

✓ HB 583 (Chasey): TV & Video Game Excise Tax
The average American child now spends more time watching television than in school. The “Leave No Child Inside” Act will generate funding for outdoor education through a 1% excise (“sin”) tax on the purchase of new televisions and video games. DEFEATED in the House.
Conservation Vote: YES

✗ HB 276 (Silva): SunCal Tax Increment Project Bonds
HB 276 authorizes a massive ($629 million) bond issue to provide infrastructure to a sprawl development on Albuquerque’s west mesa. The bond would be serviced by diverting gross receipts tax revenues that would otherwise accrue to the state to spend on health care or education. These types of ‘greenfield’ Tax Increment for Development Districts (TIDDs) are bad public policy – not only for land use and water planning, but also from a fiscal perspective (for more information on TIDDs, see page 19). House members’ votes are scored on the bill itself; Senators’ votes are scored on a procedural motion that allowed HB 276 to be withdrawn from its final committee and moved immediately to the Senate floor. DEFEATED in the Senate.
Conservation Vote: NO

✗ SB 57 (B. Sanchez): Regulatory Process Task Force
SB 57 is one piece of a legislative package that constitutes a major assault on New Mexico’s regulatory process. Heavily lobbied by corporate special interests, SB 57 establishes a task force to review the regulatory structure of New Mexico. However, the composition of the task force – as well as the work the task force would conduct – is skewed towards big industry, instead of the public interests that our regulatory process is designed to protect. DEFEATED in the Senate.
Conservation Vote: NO

✗ HJR 12/ SJR 7 (Foley/Ingle): Legislative Review of Regulatory Rules, CA
HJR 12 and SJR 7 are additional attempts to gut New Mexico’s regulatory processes, by pursuing a constitutional amendment (CA) that would allow the Legislature to override regulatory rules. Our administrative agencies are required to protect public peace, health, safety and welfare – by regulating everything from nursing homes and daycare facilities to inspections of meat, restaurants and polluting industries. Efforts to curtail regulatory activities threaten the quality of life of all New Mexicans. HJR 12 was DEFEATED in the House; SJR 7 was DEFEATED in the Senate.
Conservation Vote: NO

Land Use & Water

✓ HB 451 (Barela): Greenfield Tax Increment Districts
Tax Increment for Development Districts (TIDDs) are a new mechanism supposedly designed to help finance redevelopment in declining neighborhoods. However, most of the TIDDs proposed in New Mexico are for sprawl development on open space or undeveloped ‘greenfields’, as opposed to revitalization of existing developed areas (for more information on TIDDs, see page 19). HB 451 improves oversight and transparency of sprawl development TIDDs, while limiting their negative fiscal impacts. DEFEATED in the House.
Conservation Vote: YES

✓ SB 434 (McSorley): Tax Increment Development District Moratorium
Tax increment for development districts (TIDDs) on ‘greenfields’ pose major threats to the state’s financial health, as well as to thoughtful land use and water planning. Recognizing some of the dangers of using public tax dollars to subsidize private development of ‘greenfield’ TIDDs, SB 434 imposes a two-year moratorium on new greenfield TIDDs and creates a task force to study the issue and make recommendations. DEFEATED in the Senate.
Conservation Vote: YES

✓ SJM 17 (Beffort): State Engineer Review of Water Exports
SJM 17 recognizes the threat posed to the Estancia basin by proposed groundwater exports to other basins, and encourages the State Engineer to ensure that applications to export water from the Estancia basin are supported by proof of need and lack of alternatives. PASSED both chambers and signed.
Conservation Vote: YES

✓ SM 49 (Lopez): Study Need for Agricultural Districts
SM 49 requests a legislative interim committee to study the need to protect agricultural lands in New Mexico through the use of conservation easements, agricultural districts, limitations on the exercise of eminent domain powers, and other tools. PASSED the Senate and signed.
Conservation Vote: YES

Toxics

✗ SB 487 (Ulibarri): Abandoned Uranium Mine Reclamation Fees
SB 487 creates the “abandoned uranium mine reclamation fund” through a fee on new uranium mining. The bill inappropriately ties cleanup of old mining sites to production from new
uranium mines and mills, which many residents of impacted communities oppose. The fees would generate woefully insufficient revenues to address the problem, which could run into the billions of dollars. Passed both chambers, but VETOED by the Governor. 
Conservation Vote: NO

HJM 8 (Heaton): Change Waste Allowed in WIPP Site
HJM 8 urges the US Department of Energy to authorize greater-than-class C (GTCC) radioactive waste disposal at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP). If DOE were to authorize WIPP to accept higher-level radioactive waste, it would change the fundamental purpose of WIPP from limited nuclear weapons waste to commercial nuclear waste dump – opening the door for WIPP to replace Yucca Mountain as the disposal site for commercial nuclear waste. HJM 8 passed the House, but was DEFEATED in the Senate. 
Conservation Vote: NO

SM 46 (Komadina): Defeat Federal Clean Water Restoration Act
Recent court rulings have gutted clean water legislation adopted by Congress in the 1970s, stripping protections for numerous wetlands, streams, rivers, lakes, and other waters historically covered – which includes up to 90% of New Mexico’s waters. SM 46 seeks to keep these waters unprotected from polluters – by opposing the Clean Water Restoration Act of 2007, which restores the protections intended by Congress in 1972. DEFEATED in the Senate. 
Conservation Vote: NO

Energy

HB 305 (B Lujan): Utility Customer Load Management
Efficiency is the most reliable, least expensive source of “new” energy. HB 305 amends the existing Efficient Use of Energy Act to establish mandatory energy efficiency targets of 5% by 2014 and 10% by 2020. Increased energy efficiency is a critical tool in the fight against global climate change. PASSED both chambers and signed into law. 
Conservation Vote: YES

HJM 7 (Begaye): Study Coal Surtax
Almost every year, the Legislature considers measures that would affect the existing surtax on coal – usually supporting the elimination of the surtax. HJM 7 holds that the surtax is inequitable and flawed – appearing to tacitly support its repeal. In fact, eliminating the coal surtax would constitute a de facto $6.9 million subsidy to a thriving resource extraction industry. HJM 7 passed the House, but was DEFEATED in the Senate. 
Conservation Vote: NO

Wildlife & Wilderness

HJM 29 / SJM 21 (Anderson/Carraro): Enact Federal Public Lands & Education Act
HJM 29 and SJM 21 support the enactment of the Federal Public Lands & Education Act in Congress. The Act is an anti-public lands bill urging the disposition of federally-owned land in the West. Although the stated intent is to help generate revenues for education, the sponsors and proponents of the federal legislation are strident opponents of public lands, not advocates on behalf of education. HJM 29 was DEFEATED on the House floor, and SJM 21 was DEFEATED in the Senate. 
Conservation Vote: NO

SJM 40 (Feldman): Study Off-Road Motorized Vehicle Use
SJM 40 requests the appropriate state agencies to study and make recommendations for improved regulation of off-road vehicles in order to resolve user conflicts, prevent environmental damage and provide greater safety protections for users. PASSED both chambers and signed. 
Conservation Vote: YES
EANM is the Environmental Alliance of New Mexico, an informal coalition of more than 20 local, regional and statewide environmental organizations, facilitated by Conservation Voters New Mexico, which works throughout the year to prioritize environmental policy initiatives for the next legislative session.

By focusing on the most timely and important environmental bills, the conservation community can convey clear expectations to the Legislature and the Executive. The priorities of EANM help inform the legislative agenda of Conservation Voters New Mexico, and where we concentrate our lobbying efforts.

EANM also works hard during the session to coordinate our efforts – both in lobbying at the Roundhouse, as well as mobilizing the grassroots support that is so essential to passing pro-conservation measures.

In 2008, EANM focused on four priority initiatives:

- ✔ Energy Efficiency: a bill requiring regulated electric utilities to meet 10% of their energy demand with energy efficiency by 2020 instead of building new power plants (which are more expensive than efficiency). PASSED.

- ✔ River Ecosystem Restoration: a one-time funding request of $10 million for Statewide Ecosystem Restoration that will facilitate efforts to restore New Mexico’s fragile and iconic river ecosystems, including funding for water flows, technical studies and community outreach. PASSED - $2.8 million in budget.

- ✘ “Leave No Child Inside”: a bill seeking to generate revenue for an outdoor educational programming fund through a 1% excise tax (a “sin” tax) on the purchase of new televisions and video games. DIED.

- ✘ Resource-Efficient Buildings: a policy to ensure a 50% energy saving throughout the life of new and retrofitted public buildings through a 1-2% initial investment in the “sustainable” or “green” design of each public building. DIED.

Collectively, EANM represents members in every legislative district in the state – and many of you have volunteered to call your legislator on an issue that’s important to you. All of us at CVNM and our partners in EANM thank you for taking time out of your busy schedules to let your elected officials know that protecting our air, land, water and wildlife is important to you!
## 2008 Senate Scorecard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dist</th>
<th>Senator</th>
<th>2008 Score</th>
<th>2007 Score</th>
<th>2005 Score</th>
<th>SB57</th>
<th>SJR7</th>
<th>HB276</th>
<th>SB434</th>
<th>SJM17</th>
<th>SM49</th>
<th>SB487</th>
<th>SM46</th>
<th>HB305</th>
<th>SJM21</th>
<th>SJM40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Adair, Rod (R)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</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>34</td>
<td>Asbill, Vernon (R)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Beffort, Sue Wilson (R)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Boitano, Mark (R)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Campos, Pete (D)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Carraro, Joseph (R)</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cisneros, Carlos (D)</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Cravens, Kent (R)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Duran, Dianna (R)</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Feldman, Dede (D)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</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>36</td>
<td>Garcia, Mary Jane (D)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Griego, Phil (D)</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Grubesic, John (D)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>n/a</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Harden, Clinton, Jr. (R)</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Ingle, Stuart (R)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Jennings, Timothy (D)</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Kernan, Gay (R)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Komadina, Steve (R)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Leavell, Carroll (R)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Lopez, Linda (D)</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Papen, Mary Kay (D)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ryan, John (R)</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>n/a</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>26</td>
<td>Sanchez, Bernadette (D)</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Sanchez, Michael (D)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sharer, William (R)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>n/a</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pinto, John (D)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rainald, Lidio (D)</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Robinson, Shannon (D)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Rodriguez, Nancy (D)</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>n/a</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>10</td>
<td>Ryan, John (R)</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>n/a</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>26</td>
<td>Sanchez, Bernadette (D)</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Sanchez, Michael (D)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sharer, William (R)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Smith, John Arthur (D)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Snyder, H. Diane (R)</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Taylor, James (D)</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Ulibarri, David (D)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n/a * - legislator was not serving during this legislative session
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dist</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>2008 Score</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>HB 583</th>
<th>JHR 12</th>
<th>HB 276</th>
<th>HB 451</th>
<th>SJM 17</th>
<th>SB 487</th>
<th>HJM 8</th>
<th>HB 305</th>
<th>HJM 7</th>
<th>HJM 29</th>
<th>SJM 40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Anderson, Thomas (R)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Arnold-Jones, Janice (R)</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>n/a</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>3</td>
<td>Bandy, Paul (R)</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Barela, Elias (D)</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</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>7</td>
<td>Barreras, Andrew (D)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Begaye, Ray (D)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Berry, Richard (R)</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Bratton, Donald (R)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Campos, José (D)</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Cervantes, Joseph (D)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Chasey, Gail (D)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Chavez, Ernest (D)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Cote, Nathan (D)</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Crook, Anna (R)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Espinoza, Nora (R)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Ezzell, Candy Spence (R)</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Foley, Daniel (R)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Fox-Young, Justine (R)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Garcia, Mary Helen (D)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Garcia, Miguel (D)</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Garcia, Thomas (D)</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Gardner, Keith (R)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>E</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>42</td>
<td>Gonzales, Roberto “Bobby” (D)</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>n/a</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>54</td>
<td>Gray, William (R)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Gutierrez, Joni Marie (D)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Hall, Jimmie (R)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>n/a</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>38</td>
<td>Hamilton, Dianne Miller (R)</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>n/a</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>6</td>
<td>Hanosh, George (D)</td>
<td>n/a**</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Heaton, John (D)</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Irwin, Dona (D)</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>King, Rhonda (D)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>n/a</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>27</td>
<td>Larranaga, Larry (R)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>n/a</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>35</td>
<td>Lujan, Antonio (D)</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>n/a</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>46</td>
<td>Lujan, Ben (D)</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lundstrom, Patricia (D)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Madalena, James Roger (D)</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</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>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Maestas, Antonio “Moe” (D)</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</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>39</td>
<td>Martinez, Rodolfo “Rudy” (D)</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Martinez, W. Ken (D)</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2008 House Scorecard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dist</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>2008 Score</th>
<th>2007 Score</th>
<th>Health &amp; Environ.</th>
<th>Land Use &amp; Water</th>
<th>Toxics</th>
<th>Energy</th>
<th>Wildlife &amp; Wilderness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>McCoy, Kathy (R)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>61% n/a n/a n/a</td>
<td>+ n/a n/a</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>A +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Miera, Rick (D)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>93% n/a n/a n/a</td>
<td>- n/a n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Moore, Brian (R)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>54% n/a n/a n/a</td>
<td>- n/a n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Nunez, Andrew (D)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>67% n/a n/a n/a</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Park, Al (D)</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>87% †</td>
<td>100% n/a n/a n/a</td>
<td>+ + + + + +</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>+ +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pena, John (D)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>n/a *</td>
<td>n/a n/a n/a</td>
<td>- n/a n/a</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Picraux, Danice (D)</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>100% n/a n/a n/a</td>
<td>- + + n/a +</td>
<td>- +</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Powdrell-Culbert, Jane (R)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17% n/a n/a n/a</td>
<td>- n/a n/a</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A A A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Rehm, William (R)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>57% n/a n/a n/a</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Rodella, Debbie (D)</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>67% n/a</td>
<td>n/a + n/a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Saavedra, Henry &quot;Kiki&quot; (D)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>70% n/a n/a n/a</td>
<td>n/a + - -</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Salazar, Nick (D)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>69% n/a n/a n/a</td>
<td>- n/a E</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>E +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sandoval, Edward (D)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>74% n/a n/a n/a</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A E +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Silva, Daniel (D)</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>77% n/a</td>
<td>n/a n/a n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A +</td>
<td>E A A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Stapleton, Sheryl Williams (D)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>61% n/a n/a n/a</td>
<td>- n/a E</td>
<td>- +</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>- +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Steinborn, Jeff (D)</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>n/a n/a n/a</td>
<td>n/a + + + + +</td>
<td>- +</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Stewart, Mimi (D)</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100% n/a n/a n/a</td>
<td>+ + + + + -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Strickler, James (R)</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>n/a n/a n/a</td>
<td>n/a - - +</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Swisstack, Thomas (D)</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>70% n/a</td>
<td>E - E - + - +</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Taylor, Thomas (R)</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>25% E n/a n/a</td>
<td>n/a - + + - -</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Tripp, Don (R)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>40% n/a n/a n/a</td>
<td>- n/a + - -</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Trujillo, Jim (D)</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>70% - n/a n/a</td>
<td>n/a - n/a + - -</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+ +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Tyler, Shirley (R)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>n/a n/a n/a</td>
<td>n/a + - - + -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Varela, Luciano &quot;Lucky&quot; (D)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>92% n/a n/a n/a</td>
<td>n/a + + + + -</td>
<td>A +</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Vaughn, Gloria (R)</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>52% - -</td>
<td>+ - - + - + -</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Vigil, Richard (R)</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>67% n/a n/a n/a</td>
<td>- - + - - -</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Wallace, Jeannette (R)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>64% n/a n/a n/a</td>
<td>+ - - + + + -</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Williams, W.C. &quot;Dub&quot; (R)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>67% n/a n/a n/a</td>
<td>n/a + - - + -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Wirth, Peter (D)</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100% n/a n/a n/a</td>
<td>n/a + + + - +</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Youngberg, Eric (R)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>25% n/a n/a n/a</td>
<td>- - + - - +</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Zanetti, Teresa (R)</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>37% n/a n/a n/a</td>
<td>- - E + + - -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- legislator was not serving during this legislative session
- due to predominance of excused absences for personal reasons, these legislators were not scored
† as a result of mischaracterizing a procedural vote, Rep. Park’s score was reported inaccurately in our 2007 scorecard; it is corrected here.
Once again, Governor Richardson proved his **conservation mettle** by exercising his veto authority over a controversial bill (SB487) that was heavily pushed by uranium mining companies. The industry lobbied hard for Richardson to sign the legislation, but he was very responsive to community concerns raised by the Multicultural Alliance for a Safe Environment (MASE), CVNM, conservation and environmental justice groups, and concerned citizens from around the state.

On March 3, the Governor signaled his commitment to environmental protection by vetoing SB487. In his veto statement, Richardson indicated that he believes “New Mexico deserves better” – he is right.

Governor Richardson’s efforts to make New Mexico a clean energy leader have been a resounding success. He added to his legacy by working with energy advocates, utilities, the Public Regulation Commission and Speaker Lujan to pass HB305, which mandates **energy efficiency** for electric utilities. As a result, we will offset the need for construction of new power plants – which saves the environment and consumers.

One of the fiercest fights of the session was over New Mexico’s regulatory process – and Richardson stood firm against efforts to strip agencies of their authority to regulate and **enforce environmental standards**. Under Governor Richardson, agencies have followed the requirements under law to protect air quality by regulating vehicle emission standards, and protect groundwater and wildlife by restricting the disposal of toxic waste from oil and gas development.

The Governor advocated for **environmental funding** to be included in the statewide capital outlay budget; together, he and legislators appropriated $2.8 million for river and ecosystem restoration statewide, and an additional $1.5 million for land and wildlife conservation projects. The statewide capital outlay budget also included $3.5 million for clean energy grants and innovative energy projects. Advocates were disappointed that the Governor didn’t elect to use any of his discretionary money to fund requested environmental projects, but his consistent push for statewide funding for conservation is a step in the right direction.

A critical issue facing the Legislature in this and future sessions is **tax increment financing** proposals (for more information, see page 19). Despite the land use and water planning problems created by tax increment districts for sprawl developments, Governor Richardson took no public position on the issue. Environmental impacts aside, the potentially devastating impacts on the state general fund should have spurred Governor Richardson to oppose the inappropriate application of tax increment financing.

Finally, we wish to thank Governor Richardson for strengthening the capacity of the Oil Conservation Division during his tenure. Oil is at an all-time high, the relentless pressures of development are being felt throughout the state, and threats of litigation would make many elected officials simply back down. We salute Governor Richardson’s bold efforts to **balance energy development** with common-sense approaches to protecting our groundwater and environment. We look forward to building upon this progress in future years with this and future Governors.
In past years, when faced with a tie-breaking vote on a critical environmental issue, Lt. Governor Denish has consistently cast the pro-conservation deciding vote.

In 2004, she cast the deciding vote on a bill (SB89) that would have closed the domestic well loophole in state water law; although the bill didn’t pass, her support was critical in raising the profile of an emerging conflict over New Mexico’s precious water resources. In 2006, the Lieutenant Governor’s deciding vote moved legislation (SB407) that would establish a fund for land and wildlife conservation and clean energy projects.

Although there were no tied votes on environmental issues in the Senate this session, Denish did rule on procedural issues that had enormous environmental implications. In many of these cases, she ruled correctly – regardless of conservation impact. However, on the last morning of the legislative session, she made several decisions that could have had devastating impacts on our environment.

On two very environmentally-damaging bills, Denish allowed them to proceed based on an essentially anonymous ‘voice vote’, when a number of Senators were requesting roll call votes (where individual legislators’ votes are noted for the record; Senate Rules 21-1, 21-3). Although HB276 didn’t make it to a final vote and SB487 was vetoed by Governor Richardson, the Lieutenant-Governor’s rulings provided cover for legislators casting anti-conservation votes, since the public has no way of knowing how their Senators voted.

On the positive side, Lt. Governor Denish worked with conservation advocates and key Senators on efforts to restore funding for environmental agencies. She also expressed concern about efforts to undermine New Mexico’s regulatory structure. She has been a strong public advocate of outdoor education programs.

However, like many elected officials (including Governor Richardson), she has not so far supported any mechanisms that would ensure long-term funding for robust programs. For example, Lt. Gov. Denish did not support a proposal to tax video games and equipment to generate revenue for children’s outdoor education.

We understand the courage it takes to step up and advocate specific funding mechanisms – particularly when they involve taxes or user fees. But the environmental community looks forward to working with the Lieutenant Governor in future sessions to help secure funding for programs that would protect children’s health and the environment.
Conservation Champions

These legislators have earned CVNM’s highest honors for scoring 100% on conservation measures during the 2008 legislative session!

CVNM’s 100% Club

“Heroes are not giant statues framed against a red sky. They are people who say, “This is my community and it’s my responsibility to make it better.”

-Tom McCall, former Governor of Oregon (1967-1975)

Conservation Allies: These legislators were solid allies in defending New Mexico’s environment, earning scores between 85% and 100% during the 2008 session.

- Rep. Elias Barela (90%)
- Rep. Antonio “Moe” Maestas (90%)
- Rep. Al Park (90%)
- Rep. Mimi Stewart (90%)
- Rep. Nathan Cote (89%)
- Sen. Linda Lopez (88%)
- Rep. Antonio Lujan (88%)
- Rep. Danice Picraux (88%)
- Rep. Jeff Steinborn (88%)
- Rep. Peter Wirth (88%)
- Sen. Gerald Ortiz y Pino (86%)
- Rep. Miguel Garcia (86%)

1 Governor McCall, a Republican, enacted the country’s first “bottle bill” (refundable bottle deposits) and successfully pushed comprehensive land use planning laws that established urban growth boundaries.
Champions / Green Deeds

Profile in Courage:
Sen. Cisco McSorley (D), Albuquerque

All New Mexicans owe a debt of gratitude to Senator McSorley – whose courage in the final hours of the session prevented passage of a bill (HB276) that would have poured public tax money into sprawl development, at the expense of critical needs like education and health care. The bill involved tax increment financing, a complicated issue that is described in greater detail on page 19. It was being pushed by a large, out-of-state development company, SunCal, which was trying to get authorization for $629 million in bonds. Minutes away from passing, Sen. McSorley held his ground on behalf of taxpayers and the environment by filibustering until the legislation was set aside. Despite efforts by the bill’s backers, it wasn’t brought up again. Thank you, Sen. McSorley!

Sen. Carlos Cisneros (D), Questa

During the 2008 session, one of the greatest threats to New Mexico’s air, land and water came in the form of proposed budget cuts that would have stripped key environmental agencies of their staff attorneys. Without in-house legal counsel, the ability of state agencies to regulate and enforce key environmental protections would be severely compromised. When CVNM and our allies learned of the cuts, our first stop was the office of Senator Carlos Cisneros, Vice-Chair of Senate Finance. Sen. Cisneros immediately engaged key colleagues in both the House and the Senate, and worked diligently with Governor Richardson’s office, the affected agencies, and environmental advocates to restore funding for the staff attorneys. Thank you, Senator Cisneros!

Sen. John Ryan (R), Albuquerque

Senator Ryan, a knowledgeable and dedicated supporter of clean energy solutions, played a crucial role in passing major energy efficiency legislation during the 2008 session. Speaker Ben Lujan sponsored HB305, which sets a new requirement that regulated utilities achieve 10% energy efficiency savings by 2020. When HB305 hit roadblocks in Senate committees, Sen. Ryan was a critical ally in helping move the bill forward. He carried the bill on the Senate floor for Speaker Lujan – relying on his own expertise in renewable energy development to make the case for energy efficiency as the most cost-effective and common-sense means of addressing our energy problems. Thank you, Senator Ryan!
Rep. Elias Barela (D), Belen & Rep. Keith Gardner (R), Roswell

In yet another policy battle over tax increment financing (for more info, please see page 19), Rep. Barela worked with advocates to craft legislation (HB451) that would reduce risks to the state general fund, require basic transparency and oversight of the approval of tax increment-financed projects, and study the implementation of TIDDS. Despite powerful opposition, Rep. Barela fought aggressively for his bill, joining forces with cosponsor Rep. Gardner in calling for common-sense reform of TIDDS. Together, they made a compelling case for taking small steps towards protecting taxpayers and the state general fund from these potentially disastrous boondoggles. Thank you, Reps. Barela and Gardner!

Rep. Ben Lujan (D), Santa Fe

The most important environmental policy to pass the Legislature in 2008 was a measure mandating that regulated utilities achieve a 10% energy efficiency savings by 2020. Sponsored by Speaker Ben Lujan and pushed aggressively by Governor Richardson, HB305 was heavily negotiated by many different stakeholders prior to the start of the session. Nonetheless, the bill ran into trouble in the Senate, where it would have died were it not for the tenacity of Speaker Lujan. Working with Senators on both sides of the aisle, he kept up the pressure and refused to give up; the bill finally passed in the very final days of the session. Thank you, Speaker Lujan!
Issue Spotlight
Tax Increment Financing

A noteworthy “David and Goliath” battle took place during the 2008 session, with CVNM and our grassroots allies on one side, and a large team of high-powered lobbyists pushing massive taxpayer subsidies on the other.

The fight was over the issue of “tax increment financing”, which is a complicated mechanism for financing development. The process allows private developers to establish specialized districts – Tax Increment for Development Districts (TIDDs) – which can bond up front to pay the infrastructure costs for their project. The bonds are then serviced by diverting new or additional tax revenues, i.e. the tax ‘increment’.

Historically, tax increment financing has been used to support revitalization efforts in blighted areas. In theory, TIDD financing addresses the costly investments necessary for redevelopment of economically distressed neighborhoods and provides incentives to minimize the risks to investors interested in revitalizing those areas. In other words, TIDDs are great tools for encouraging development in places where revitalization would not happen “but for” such subsidies. This is not the case in areas where development has already been “sprawling.”

Based on this stated intent, CVNM and other environmental organizations supported the 2006 legislation (SB495/HB462) that authorized the establishment of TIDDs. We were mistaken in doing so, because we failed to recognize the loophole that this legislation created. Instead of being used as a tool for desperately-needed redevelopment of blighted areas in existing neighborhoods, the enabling legislation has been used almost exclusively to push massive new sprawl developments on ‘greenfields’ (vacant land) outside existing developed areas and to redraw the boundaries of our metropolitan areas. Unlike risky and challenging redevelopment projects, these ‘greenfield’ TIDDs could be funded privately, without diverting precious tax dollars. Worse yet, New Mexico is taking the unprecedented step of allowing the diversion of state Gross Receipts Tax (GRT) revenues (not just local property taxes) for these ‘greenfields’ TIDDs.

Given the opportunity, it is easy to see why big, out-of-state developers would jump at the chance to use bond money to pay for infrastructure for their new ‘greenfield’ projects – bonds that will be serviced using public tax dollars. It’s a great deal for the developers. But what about New Mexicans?

Unfortunately, ‘greenfield’ TIDDs do not serve the public interest. They displace jobs and businesses from elsewhere in the city. They promote massive sprawl and ‘leapfrog’ development – dramatically impacting our transportation infrastructure, air quality and water resources. They also siphon massive amounts of public tax money away from critical needs, into the pockets of big developers. All in all - not such a great deal for New Mexicans.

During the session, one of these TIDDs (HB276/SB398) was a very controversial topic. According to the Albuquerque Journal, SunCal Companies recently defaulted on a number of loans in California and Nevada1 - yet SunCal sought authorization for $629 million in bonds (that’s 1/10th of the annual New Mexico state budget!). The bonds would have funded the infrastructure for a small chunk of their 55,000 acre proposed development on Albuquerque’s west side, but they also would have left the state on the hook for nearly three decades of subsidies in the form of bond repayments.

Many Representative and Senators on both sides of the aisle recognized the financial risks of the SunCal TIDD. But sadly, a majority of legislators still seem willing to let taxpayers foot the bill for sprawl development. Thanks to the courage of Senator Cisco McSorley, with the assistance of Senators John Grubesic and Dede Feldman, among others, the SunCal TIDD never came to a vote on the Senate floor. Although it didn’t pass this session, SunCal’s team of lobbyists will most certainly be back next year.

That’s why it’s so important that we all understand and speak out on this issue. It is up to each of us to tell our legislators how we want them to spend our money. It will be up to our elected officials to safeguard our tax dollars for the priorities of all New Mexicans.

1 “SunCal Defaults on Loans”, March 17, 2008 Albuquerque Journal
Process Spotlight: Dummy Bills

It’s an understatement to say that New Mexico’s legislative process is not very accessible to the public. The sheer quantity of bills, coupled with the extremely short session, make public participation a daunting endeavor. Matters are only complicated by the wildly unpredictable scheduling of hearings, labyrinthine procedures, and the lack of web-casting of committee hearings or floor sessions.

One of the more problematic and poorly-understood rules, however, relates to dummy bills. Dummy bills are basically blank pieces of legislation with a generic title; “Public Peace, Health, Safety & Welfare” that are assigned to Committee Chairs and members of leadership on both sides of the aisle. They appear on the last day that legislation can be introduced – approximately halfway through the session.

At any point after this, the sponsor can request a hearing – often in a committee of their choosing. Prior to the hearing, there is no obligation for the sponsor to disclose their intent for the dummy bill, and there are no restrictions whatsoever on the use of these bills.

Many times, the first chance the public has to see the content of a dummy bill is at the committee hearing where the sponsor introduces substitute language for the blank bill. Even then, it is sometimes difficult to secure a copy of the substitute bill – meaning that members of the public may have to wait until the bill is reported out of the committee before they even know what the bill does!

Invariably, dummy bills only get one committee assignment, after which they go directly to the floor for a vote. Given that dummy bills are most frequently used in the waning days of the session, the entire process of substituting language for the blank bill, getting passed out of committee and going to the floor for a vote will often happen in only 24 to 48 hours – sometimes less.

There are many examples of dummy bills moving through an entire chamber before a member of the public or an advocate has actually seen the language of the bill. This lack of transparency does little to stimulate public confidence in the legislative process.

In concept, dummy bills are undemocratic; in practice, these long held and accepted procedures at the New Mexico Legislature exclude public participation and involvement in the legislative process.
Know the Score, Take Action

It's not 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 record 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 your legislators got low scores, 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.

Support pro-conservation candidates

Use the scorecard to make informed decisions about which candidates deserve your support in the primary and general elections. For information on CVNM’s endorsements, please visit our web site at: www.cvnm.org.

Become a Conservation Voters New Mexico member today!

We take on tough fights to protect New Mexico’s natural heritage, but these fights in the Roundhouse and around the state require financial resources. We can only win with your support. Please join with other New Mexicans by becoming a Conservation Voter – today!

Membership is easy – just send in the attached 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.

Telephone calls or sending a letter through regular mail remain by far the most effective ways to communicate with your legislators. Due to mass volume, e-mail is generally the least effective method to communicate your views.

The Governor can always be contacted at his address in the Roundhouse. Except during the legislative session, state legislators should be contacted in their home districts, as listed on the next page.
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, they can be contacted in their home districts:

SENATE
Adair, Rod (R - 33)
Box 96
Roswell, NM 88202
(505) 627-8372

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

Befort, Sue Wilson (R - 19)
67 Raindance Road
Sandia Park, NM 87047
(505) 292-7116

Boitano, Mark (R - 18)
3615 Horacio Court NE
Albuquerque, NM 87111
(505) 799-1092

Campos, Pete (D - 8)
500 Raindalls Avenue
Las Vegas, NM 87701
(505) 454-5700 / (505) 425-0508

Carraro, Joseph J. (R - 23)
10216 Carraro Place NW
Albuquerque, NM 87114
(505) 838-8369

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

Cravens, Kent (R - 21)
12062 Irish Mist Road NE
Albuquerque, NM 87122
(505) 586-2675 / (505) 586-0799

Duran, Dianna J. (R - 40)
505 8th Street
Tularosa, NM 88352
(575) 585-9896 / (575) 585-9896

Feldman, Dede (D - 13)
1821 Meadowview NW
Albuquerque, NM 87104
(505) 242-1997

Garcia, Mary Jane M. (D - 36)
Box 22
Dona Ana, NM 88032
(575) 523-0440 / (505) 526-5048

Griego, Phil A. (D - 39)
Box 10
San Jose, NM 87565
(505) 893-6382 / (505) 421-2863

Grubesic, John T.L. (D - 25)
1322 Paseo De Peralta
Santa Fe, NM 87501
(505) 920-1925

Harden, Clinton D., Jr. (R - 7)
1348 CRH
Cruis, 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
(575) 623-8331 / (575) 623-9378

Kernan, Gay G. (R - 42)
926 W Mesa Verde
Hobbs, NM 88240
(575) 570-1835 / (575) 397-2536

Kumagai, Steve (R - 9)
Box 2065
Corrales, NM 87048
(505) 893-2840 / (505) 898-0864

Leavell, Carroll H. (R - 41)
Drawer D
Jal, NM 88252
(575) 395-2535 / (575) 395-3154

Lopez, Linda M. (D - 11)
912 Suncrest SW
Albuquerque, NM 87121
(505) 831-4149

Lovejoy, Lynda M. (D - 22)
Box 705
Crownpoint, NM 87313
(505) 352-0867 / (505) 786-7498

Martinez, Richard C. (D - 5)
Box 934
Española, NM 87532
(505) 753-8027

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

Morales, Howie C. (D - 24)
4285 North Swain
Silver City, NM 88061
(505) 574-0042

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

Nevile, 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) 766-4932 / (505) 243-1509

Pappen, Mary Kay (D - 38)
904 Conway Avenue
Las Cruces, NM 88005
(575) 524-4462

Payne, William H. (R - 20)
Box 14823
Albuquerque, NM 87191
(505) 884-8672 / (575) 283-5703

Pinto, John (D - 3)
Box 103
Tohatchi, NM 87325
(928) 871-6952

Rainaldi, Lidio G. (D - 4)
1101 Martinelli
Gallup, NM 87301
(505) 863-3643

Rawson, Leonard Lee (R - 37)
Box 996
Las Cruces, NM 88004
(505) 528-1801

Robinson, Shannon (D - 17)
716 Indama SE
Albuquerque, NM 87108
(505) 988-6660 / (505) 262-0815

Rodriguez, Nancy (D - 24)
1830 Camino La Canada
Santa Fe, NM 87501
(505) 983-8913

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

Sanchez, Bernadette M. (D - 26)
3301 Coors Blvd NW, Suite R
Albuquerque, NM 87120
(505) 352-6684

Sanchez, Michael S. (D - 29)
3 Bunton Road
Belen, NM 87002
(505) 865-0868 / (505) 865-5583

Sharpe, William E. (R - 1)
Box 203
Farmington, NM 87499
(505) 325-5055 / (505) 564-8640

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

Snyder, H. Diane (R - 15)
7008 Elia Court NE
Albuquerque, NM 87110
(505) 930-1669

Taylor, James G. (R - 14)
3909 Camino Del Valle SW
Albuquerque, NM 87105
(505) 977-4966

Ulbrich, David (D - 30)
1829 Chaco
Grants, NM 87020
(505) 297-8241

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

Arnold-Jones, Janice E. (R - 24)
7713 Sierra Azul NE
Albuquerque, NM 87110
(505) 379-0902

Bandy, Paul C. (R - 3)
386 County Road 2900
Albuquerque, NM 87110
(505) 334-0865

Barela, Elias (D - 8)
1191 John Road
Belen, NM 87002
(505) 966-1262

Barreras, Andrew J. (D - 7)
Box 267
Toms, NM 87060
(505) 315-7493

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

Berry, Richard J. (R - 20)
Box 39566
Albuquerque, NM 87111
(505) 293-1130

Bratton, Donald E. (R - 62)
2012 North McKinley
Hobbs, NM 88240
(505) 393-5325 / (575) 397-4093
Conservation Voters New Mexico

Turning Environmental Values into State Priorities

Conservation Voters New Mexico, a nonpartisan, non-profit 501c(4) organization, works to protect New Mexico’s natural environment and our cherished way of life. Our mission is to make sensible conservation policies a top priority for elected officials, political candidates, and voters across the state. We do this 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.

Our Principles and Values:

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.

Conservation Voters New Mexico
320 Aztec St. Suite B
Santa Fe, NM 87501