At Conservation Voters New Mexico, we consider the work that we do in the State Capitol a point of pride. We consider every bill introduced that has an environmental impact to be our business, and an opportunity to make sure that legislators understand what the environmental priorities of their constituents are. But that’s only one metric that we use to define “success” for ourselves during the legislative session.

In the past we’ve used different legislative outcomes to define the effectiveness of our work in the session, such as our “defense record” — our record of stopping legislation slated for opposition. Metrics like the defense record are important to use when evaluating success. However, these metrics often rely on factors out of our control, and don’t really tell the whole story of what we do. In the 2016 session, we made the decision to measure our success in different ways - How well did we connect community with their lawmakers to tell their story in their own voices? How effectively did we support the lawmakers who stand up for our issues? How well did we carry messages in to the Capitol that haven’t been heard there before?

These measurements represent a subtle but significant shift in our organizational approach to our advocacy work in the legislature. We can’t simply hope to replicate identical results year over year. Rather, it’s better to focus on honing excellent practices and habits, and letting the results flow from that.

The scores that you see in this 2015-2016 Scorecard are the result of what we believe to be excellent process in the identification and analysis of the bill introduced in this legislature. We hope that you’ll use this Scorecard to hold your elected officials accountable – look at how they voted and acted and note the actions that you don’t understand or disagree with. Ask yourself why they might have cast that vote, and then (just as importantly) look up their contact info at the back of this Scorecard, and ask them.

The overarching theme of the 2015 and 2016 sessions was a simple one: defense. The State House of Representatives became an incubator for extractive industry think-tank generated bills designed to weaken environmental protections, give away public land and water, sacrifice public health for corporate interests and generally threaten the wild places of New Mexico. We’ve gotten good at stopping bad bills, but be assured that we’re still looking for ways to continue to move proactive conservation legislation through the Capitol.

Thank you for being a Conservation Voter!
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Know the Score  

Take Action

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” link under the “Legislation” drop-down menu.

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 when we work together. 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 “Donate.”

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 she takes on legislation that affects our air, land, and water.

Calling 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 — but it depends on the individual legislator.

The Governor and Lieutenant 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 pages 18 and 19.
Since their inception in 2008, the solar tax credits have played a key role in creating about 2,000 new jobs in the state of New Mexico, spread across nearly 100 firms. As one of the sunniest states in the country, New Mexico possesses outstanding potential for generation of solar energy. By establishing the first national limits on carbon pollution from coal-fired power plants, the Clean Power Plan (CPP) will spark exponential growth and demand for renewable energy nationwide. At the federal level, tax credits for producing and investing in renewable energy production have recently been extended until 2020. We can expect to see a nationwide uptick in investments in renewable energy that should correspond with the increased demand as states begin to reduce their carbon pollution as required by the CPP. That means the window of opportunity for New Mexico to position itself as a nationwide leader in clean energy technology development and generation is upon us.

The residential and agricultural solar tax credits have been an unqualified success for the state of New Mexico. It is only in the last two years that the solar tax credit has faltered. In the 2015 legislative session, the conservation community and CVNM members and supporters banded together to get the rooftop solar tax credit extension all the way to the Governor’s desk. Despite broad bi-partisan support for the bill, Gov. Susana Martinez chose to completely ignore the measure – ignoring the benefits of solar to New Mexico’s economy, communities, health and environment. Increasing solar energy will decrease the demand and production of energy sources that pollute our air and have negative impacts on public health.

In the 2016 session, the bill introduced by Sen. Mimi Stewart, SB 13 (and its House companion, introduced by Rep. Sarah Maestas-Barnes, HB 26) would have done two simple things: raised the cap of available credits to $5 million per year and extended the credit until 2021. Sadly for New Mexicans, the measure to extend the tax credit was a casualty of a decimated state budget in 2016.

Consumer-based credits such as the Solar Market Development Tax Credit give homeowners a break when they put solar panels on the roof of their home. It’s a relatively simple tax mechanism that makes rooftop solar available to a more families. Nationwide, the average household income of families installing solar is $40-$90,000 per year.*

In addition to presenting excellent opportunities for homeowners, the growth of solar capacity is good for the overall price of electricity. The simple explanation for this is that generation from solar panels peaks at the same time as demand: during the hottest, sunniest parts of the day. Generally, when demand peaks above what the utility generates from baseload power sources like coal-fired power plants, the additional power must be generated or purchased at a much higher price, a cost which is incorporated into your power bill. By lowering or eliminating the amount of additional power that needs to be purchased at the premium peaking rates, the price of electricity goes down for everyone on the grid whether they have solar panels on their home or not.

The way that the residential tax credit works in New Mexico is by allowing homeowners to apply for the tax credit up to a certain overall monetary cap (generally a few million dollars). Once the available funds have been hit, the cap is exhausted and the tax credit isn’t available any more for that calendar year.

The 2015 and 2016 legislative sessions were each dramatic and tumultuous in their own ways. They represented a sharp break with the recent past as the State House of Representatives changed from Democrat to Republican control for the first time since 1962, resulting in a very different strategy for CVNM and environmental allies in the State Capitol. The House saw a drastic increase in anti-conservation legislation beginning in 2015 and as a result the Senate became an important battleground to stop anti-conservation measures. This trend would likely have continued in the short budget session in 2016 had the state budget not collapsed. The lack of funding meant that both pro- and anti-conservation bills wound up together on the cutting room floor.

Despite the challenges, this legislature was not without its positive trends and compelling moments. In response to the introduction of a bill that would tie clean up funding for uranium legacy sites to new uranium mining and extraction, CVNM and the Environmental Alliance of New Mexico worked to bring organizers from the impacted communities to come to the Capitol and share their stories with the legislators who were sponsoring the bill. At the end of a long day of meetings, the advocates were able to secure commitments from both co-sponsors that the bill would not move in 2016. This represents a model approach for dealing with legislation that has environmental impacts on communities. Where the community is aware of the issue, and willing to speak about it, our role is to help facilitate, step back and listen.

Working with communities to ensure that their voices are the ones heard in the Capitol is key to addressing the myriad environmental injustices around the state. From the uranium legacy waste issues in Western New Mexico, to the respiratory health crisis in the South Valley of Albuquerque, to the methane hotspot in the Four Corners area, New Mexico communities are (and have been) desperately in need of more focus from legislators in Santa Fe. Finding more ways to elevate community voices is a priority for CVNM moving forward.

As difficult as the outlook may occasionally appear, the prospects for environmental policy in the State Capitol show clear paths forward to success. Renewable energy is starting to gain traction as a commonly accepted benefit for the state. We’re even seeing the occasional Republican step up to help ensure that New Mexico stays on track to be a national leader in renewable energy. But the most important advantage that we have is the fact that conservation values span all corners of the state, and all demographics. Conservation is a New Mexico value, and we’re proud to carry that message to the State Capitol.
State trust lands were granted to New Mexico by the federal government around the time it was granted statehood. The New Mexico State Land Office is in charge of managing 9 million acres of state trust lands to provide a stable source of funding for education, hospitals and other important public institutions in the state of New Mexico. In this respect, the state trust lands are like any other public land: they’re here for our shared benefit. The Land Office’s website confirms as much, saying “The Land Office seeks to optimize revenues while protecting the health of the land for future generations.”

Given the mandate and past practice of the Land Office, the role of the land office in the management of state trust lands is relatively simple: get the most value out in a way that doesn’t degrade the land or preclude other uses down the line.

In January 2016, the Bureau of Land Management proposed new rules that would require producers of oil and gas to take measures to minimize the amount of natural gas that they burn off (“flare”) or simply release (“vent”) into the air. This rule (and EPA’s supplementary rule) would have obvious benefits. It would help the state’s budget shortfall by directing more money into state coffers. The state currently collects a severance tax of 3.75% on oil and gas captured from state lands. Requiring the industry to capture a higher percentage of that gas (instead of burning or wasting it) will result in more taxable gas, helping the state dig out of its budget hole.

The rules would also have the effect of preventing more methane gas and carbon dioxide from reaching the atmosphere and contributing to global warming. Methane is currently responsible for approximately one quarter of the global warming that the world is currently experiencing. This is because methane is an atmospheric “super pollutant,” trapping heat in the atmosphere 80 times more efficiently than carbon dioxide. This is a crucial part of these rules. Climate change has already begun to hit New Mexico, and we can expect those impacts to intensify in the coming years unless drastic action is taken to curb emissions of methane and carbon dioxide.

In this respect, the state trust lands are like any other public land: they’re here for our shared benefit. The Land Office’s website confirms as much, saying “The Land Office seeks to optimize revenues while protecting the health of the land for future generations.”

Given the role of the Land Office, and the important role these methane rules will play in New Mexico, it was baffling and frustrating to hear State Land Commissioner Aubrey Dunn come out in opposition to these rules in April. Commissioner Dunn “strenuously objected” to the rules, but not out of any concern for the wellbeing of state trust lands or beneficiaries. Instead, Dunn fell back on Republican party talking points to defend his position, saying that the rules represented “federal overreach and intrusion” into state affairs. Dunn isn’t trying to protect New Mexico, he’s trying to protect the profit margins of wealthy oil and gas developers.

Dunn’s opposition to this common sense regulation of the oil and gas industry is particularly offensive given his comments on the potential necessity of gas tax increases on everyday New Mexicans in order to address the state’s budget crisis. Aubrey Dunn is saying that we should impose an additional tax burden on nearly every single person in the state of New Mexico, rather than require the oil and gas industry to clean up its act. These are not the words of someone who is looking out for the best interests of New Mexicans.

The state trust lands are ours, and have considerable value beyond our ability to extract mineral profit for public institutions. New Mexicans deserve to have our state trust lands administered carefully, responsibly, and in a politically neutral manner.

Aubrey Dunn isn’t doing that, and is instead indicating that he’s more interested in protecting oil and gas shareholders than New Mexicans.

Grade: F
Conservation 2015
Vote Descriptions

ENERGY & CLIMATE CHANGE
HB 366 (Gentry)
Oil & Gas State Preemption would have invalidated any county and municipality ordinance relating to oil and gas laws.
Conservation Vote: Oppose
Outcome: HB 366 passed the House (37-28) and died in the Senate Conservation Committee.

HB 445 (Scott)
Reduce Renewable Portfolio Standards sought to weaken the state’s renewable portfolio standard by removing the requirement that utilities produce 20% of their energy from renewable sources by the year 2020.
Conservation Vote: Oppose
Outcome: HB 445 passed the House (33-32) and died in the Senate Conservation Committee.

SB 94 (McSorley)
Industrial Hemp Farming Act
This bill would provide for licensing of the growing, selling and processing of industrial hemp in New Mexico.
Conservation vote: Support
Outcome: SB 94 passed the Senate (33-8) and passed the House (54-12) but was vetoed by the Governor on April 10, 2015.

SB 391 (Stewart)
Extend Solar Market Development Tax Credit would extend the existing 10% tax credit for the installation of commercial, residential and agricultural solar systems, which is set to expire December 31, 2016.
Conservation vote: Support
Outcome: SB 391 passed the Senate (37-5) and passed the House (39-24) but was pocket vetoed by the Governor.

SB 421 (Ingle)
Limit Local Gov’t & Zoning Commissions would have removed municipal or county governments’ authority to regulate mining and agricultural operations in addition to oil and gas activities.
Conservation vote: Oppose
Outcome: SB 421 died in the Senate Conservation Committee.

WATER
SB 455 (Cervantes/Rue)
New Mexico Unit Reports to Legislature
• SB 455 required that the Interstate Stream Commission (ISC) provide a written report to the Legislature by November 1, 2015 that demonstrates the NM CAP Entity has the technical, legal and financial capacity to design, build, operate and maintain the Gila River diversion project (“NM Unit”) under the Arizona Water Settlements Act (AWSA).
• SB 542 would have required public participation, greater transparency and accountability from the Interstate Stream Commission in its expenditures of AWSA federal funding. A Senate Conservation Committee substitute for SB 455 was offered which included provisions of SB 542.
Conservation Vote: Support
Outcome: The Conservation Committee Substitute for SB 455 died in Senate Judiciary Committee.

AIR QUALITY
HB 186 (McQueen)
Pesticide Application Notices would have required notice of pesticide application in public buildings or on public grounds, except those used for commercial agriculture.
Conservation Vote: Support
Outcome: HB 186 died in the House Energy, Environment and Natural Resources Committee.

EFFECTIVE GOVERNMENT
HB 299 (Larrañaga)
Public-Private Partnership Act was a sweeping measure that would privatize public entities that are most appropriately developed and maintained by public entities such as water and sewage systems.
Conservation Vote: Oppose
Outcome: HB 299 passed the House (38-27) and died in the Senate Judiciary Committee.

HB 340 (Brown)
Change Certain Voter ID Requirements would have likely disenfranchised voters, especially minority and elderly voters who are often most disproportionately impacted by the effects of pollution and environmental injustice.
Conservation Vote: Oppose
Outcome: HB 340 passed the House (37-29) and died in the Senate Rules Committee.

SB 219 (Cotter)
Expiration of Rules Under SB 219, all rules on the books (except taxation rules) would have been repealed unless state agencies chose to retain them, potentially depriving New Mexicans of their fundamental right to express support or opposition to the wholesale repeal of rules that govern critical functions of state government.
Conservation Vote: Oppose
Outcome: SB 219 passed the House (37-29) and died in the Senate Rules Committee.
WILDLIFE & HABITAT
CONSERVATION

HB 154 (Steinborn)
Local Gov’t Review of Business Leases
sought to provide needed oversight and transparency for state land business leases by requiring that the affected local government(s) review them and make appropriate recommendations before the Commissioner of Public Lands can finalize them.

Conservation Vote: Support
Outcome: HB 154 died in the House Business and Employment Committee.

HB 291/SB 483 (Herrell, Sharer)
NM Federal Land Management Study Commission
HB 291 and SB 483 would have created a 17-member commission to study the possibility of transferring federal public lands to state control. HB 291 and SB 483 attempted to violate the Constitution by promoting the transfer of federal public lands to state control.

Conservation Vote: Oppose
Outcome: HB 291 died in the House Judiciary Committee. SB 483 died in the Senate Conservation Committee.

HB 468 (Roch)
State Sovereignty Over State Trust Wildlife
attempted to unconstitutionally remove the federal government’s ability to protect the Lesser Prairie Chicken under the Endangered Species Act or any other treaty or regulation.

Conservation Vote: Oppose
Outcome: HB 468 died in the House Judiciary Committee.

SB 253 (Moores/Steinborn)
Prohibit & Define Coyote Killing Contest
prohibited contests for the purposes of coyote killing. It would have had no effect on hunting for fur or even trophies.

Conservation Vote: Support
Outcome: SB 253 passed the Senate 27-13, then died in the House Agriculture, Water and Wildlife Committee.

HM 74 (Roch)
Protect State Land from Chicken Listing
represented an attempt to prevent the listing of the Lesser Prairie Chicken from listing under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in order to protect revenues from state trust lands.

Conservation Vote: Oppose
Outcome: HM 74 passed the House (31-22). Memorials and resolutions do not require action by the Governor.

ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

HB 188 (Smith/Sapien)
Sand & Gravel Mining Violation Penalties
would have strengthened penalties for violation of county ordinances regulating the mining of sand, gravel and related materials. Currently, these are some of the more poorly-regulated and least-enforced extractive industries.

Conservation Vote: Support
Outcome: HB 188 died in the House Energy, Environment and Natural Resources Committee.

HB 494/SB 610 (Louis, Shendo)
Community Health Study Fund & Uranium Mining
There is currently no process in place to study the impacts that uranium contamination has had on the quality of health over time. HB 494 and SB 610 began to address this by creating a community health study fund, paid for by fines assessed to companies directly responsible for contamination.

Conservation Vote: Support
Outcome: HB 494 died in the House Health Committee. SB 610 died in the Senate Conservation Committee.

SB 564 (Wooley)
Right to Farm and Operations as Nuisance
would have weakened a citizen’s right to legally respond when they have been impacted by the effects of pollution caused by agricultural operations.

Conservation Vote: Oppose
Outcome: HB 564 passed the House (35-29) and died in the Senate Judiciary Committee.

SB 677 (McSorley)
Private Right of Action
afforded landowners or other affected parties a private right of action to pursue enforcement of environmental laws against violators or agencies who are failing to enforce existing law.

Conservation Vote: Support
Outcome: SB 677 died in the Senate Conservation Committee.

SB 467 (Wirth)
Change Interstate Stream Commission Members
would have depoliticized water planning and management in New Mexico by limiting the number of appointments from the Governor’s office to the Interstate Stream Commission to four members and by requiring that no single political party have more than four members. Additionally, the bill required professional qualifications of appointees in water resources fields and representation by a variety of water users across the state.

Conservation Vote: Support
Outcome: Passed Senate (28-13) — died on House Calendar.
Solar Market Development Tax Credit
Changes has helped many New Mexicans invest in solar energy, improving the environment and public health by reducing the demand for coal-fired electricity. **Conservation Vote: Support**
Outcome: HB 26 died in the House Ways and Means Committee. SB 13 died in the Senate Corporations and Transportation Committee.

**HB 107** (Strickler)
**Reduced Tax Rate For Certain Oil & Gas Wells** would have given a tax break to operators of oil and gas wells that are late in their production life cycles and produce very small amounts of oil and gas. This was a bail out of the oil and gas industry at the expense of the tax-paying public. **Conservation Vote: Oppose**
Outcome: HB 107 died in the House Ways and Means Committee.

**HB 175/SB 104** (D. M. Gallegos/Dodge; C. Sanchez)
**Renewable Energy Tax Credit Eligibility** HB 175 and SB 104 would have encouraged an increase in the production of renewable energy. This bill made important changes to and extended the state version of the Production Tax Credit. **CVNM Position: Support**
Outcome: HB 175 died in the House Ways and Means Committee. SB 104 died in the Senate Corporations and Transportation Committee.

**HB 285/SB 34** (Gentry; Kernan)
**Tax Rate Differential For Certain Oil** These bills would have extended a reduction in the severance tax to oil and other liquid hydrocarbons removed from natural gas produced from a recovery project that involved the application of anthropogenic (human produced) carbon dioxide. **Conservation Vote: Oppose**
Outcome: HB 285 passed the House (59-7) but died in the Senate Finance Committee. SB 34 died in the Senate Finance Committee.

**SB 76** (Neville)
**Lead in Sale of Recycled Metals Act** This bill adds lead and lead-based products (such as lead-acid batteries) to the products regulated by the Recycled Metals Act. It helps to ensure that lead is disposed of in a way that minimizes its environmental impact. **Conservation Vote: Support**
Outcome: SB 76 passed the Senate (41-0) and the House (59-0). The bill was signed by the Governor on March 4, 2016.

**SB 248:** (Morales)
**Fund Grant County Water Supply From NM Unit** SB 248 would have improved and augmented water supplies to serve 26,000 people in central Grant County. This bill was revenue neutral and met the long-term water supply needs of 90% of Grant County population at a fraction of the cost of the Gila River diversion project. **Conservation Vote: Support**
Outcome: SB 248 died in the Senate Finance Committee.

**HB 111** (Townsend)
**Crop Dusting Tanks as Above Ground Storage** HB 111 would have exempted above ground tanks used to store airplane fuel from environmental protection laws if each tank was less than 10,000 gallons. **Conservation Vote: Oppose**
Outcome: HB 111 died in the Senate Judiciary Committee.

**HJR 8:** (Bandy/Ca. Trujillo) **Appointment of PRC Members, CA**
HJR 8 called for a constitutional amendment to replace the elected Public Regulation Commission (PRC) with a commission appointed by the governor, with certain safeguards in place to prevent overtly-political appointment. **Conservation Vote: Oppose**
Outcome: HJR 8 was defeated in the House Judiciary Committee (8-3).

**HJR 9:** (Bandy/Tripp) **Convention of States**
HJR 9 sought to amend the Constitution of the United States to impose certain restraints on the federal government. By limiting the power and jurisdiction of the federal government, one possibility was that the state may have revoked the federal jurisdiction over public lands, and thus gained control to manage, develop or sell public lands. **Conservation Vote: Oppose**
Outcome: HJR 9 passed the House (36-27), but died in the Senate Judiciary Committee.
About the Scorecard

Conservation Voters New Mexico’s 2015-2016 Conservation Scorecard provides objective, non-partisan information about the conservation voting records of all members of the 51st Legislature of the State of New Mexico. Scorecards are a clear and comprehensive way for you to see how you are being represented on issues that matter to you.

Vote Selection
Each vote was selected solely on the basis of the conservation values embodied in the legislation. In preparing this Scorecard, we sought input from legislative and conservation 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 tends 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 procedural motion is the only public indication of a legislator’s position on a measure. In all cases, the actual vote included in the Scorecard is detailed in the vote description.

We encourage you to read the descriptions of each vote to determine how well your legislators represented you on the issues and bills that are most important to you.

CVNM Priority Votes
Let’s face it: not all votes are equal. Some votes are more critical than others, either because of the issues at stake or the personal courage required of legislators who take the pro-conservation position. Here, we try to represent the most critical measures by classifying them as “priority” votes, with this symbol: !. The value of these priority votes is doubled in the Scorecard.

Recording the Votes
If a legislator voted in support of the pro-conservation position, his or her vote is recorded on the chart as ‘+’; votes against the conservation position are indicated with ‘-’. 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 excused from voting but chose not to vote, they are recorded as ‘absent’ (a). Unexcused absences are calculated in the legislator’s score as an anti-conservation vote.

Wherever possible, the votes included in the Scorecard were taken 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 relevant committee votes, and the positions of legislators who do not serve on those particular committees are not indicated.

If the sponsor of a measure does not serve on a committee for which a vote is being scored, their sponsorship is considered representative of their position, and is recorded with a ‘+’ or ‘-’, as appropriate. If a legislator was excused from the vote included in the Scorecard, but previously cast a vote on the measure—in committee, for example—their prior position is recorded in the Scorecard, as long as the vote is substantially the same.

How to Read the Scorecard

The table and symbols used in the Scorecard are as follows:

- **Legislator’s District Number**: The district number of the legislator.
- **Legislator’s Party Affiliation**: The political party of the legislator.
- **2013-14 Score**: The voting score for the current legislative session.
- **Lifetime Score**: The voting score for the legislator’s career in office.
- **Anti-Conservation Vote**: Votes cast against conservation, recorded as ‘-’.
- **Pro-Conservation Vote**: Votes cast in support of conservation, recorded as ‘+’.
- **Excused Absence**: Absences excused by the legislator, recorded with an ‘e’.
- **Unexcused Absence**: Absences not excused by the legislator, recorded as ‘a’.
- **Legislator did not cast a vote on this measure**: Indicates the legislator did not vote on the measure.
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<thead>
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<th>District</th>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Barela, Ted (R)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Beffort, Sue Wilson (R)</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Brandt, Craig (R)</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Burt, William (R)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Campos, Pete (D)</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Candelaria, Jacob (D)</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Cervantes, Joseph (D)</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cisneros, Carlos (D)</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Cotter, Lee (R)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Grego, Phil (D)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Griggs, Ron (R)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Ingle, Stuart (R)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ivey-Soto, Daniel (D)</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Kernan, Gay (R)</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Leavell, Carroll (R)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Lopez, Linda (D)</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Martinez, Richard (D)</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>McSorley, Cisco (D)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Moores, Mark (R)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Morales, Howie (D)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Munoz, George (D)</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neville, Steven (R)</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>O'Neill, Bill (D)</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ortiz y Pino, Gerald (D)</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Padilla, Michael (D)</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Papen, Mary Kay (D)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Payne, William (R)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pinto, John (D)</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Pirtle, Cliff (R)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Rodriguez, Nancy (D)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Rue, Sander (R)</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ryan, John (R)</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Sanchez, Clemente (D)</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Sanchez, Michael (D)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sapien, John (D)</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sharer, William (R)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Shendo, Jr., Benny (D)</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Smith, John Arthur (D)</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Soules, Bill (D)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Stewart, Mimi (D)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Torraco, Lisa (R)</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Wirth, Peter (D)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Woods, Pat (R)</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each of the following legislators earned a 100% score in the 2015-2016 Conservation Scorecard. We applaud their commitment to protecting the air we breathe, the water we drink and the land where we live and play!

**Senate 100% Champions**

- Cisco McSorley
- Howie Morales
- Nancy Rodriguez
- Michael Sanchez
- William Soules
- Mimi Stewart
- Peter Wirth
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Adkins, David (R)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Alcon, Eliseo Lee (D)</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>76%</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>Armstrong, Deborah (D)</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Baldonado, Alonzo (R)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>-</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>10%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Brown, Cathyrnn (R)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</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>94%</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>4</td>
<td>Clahchischilliage, Sharon (R)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Cook, Zachary (R)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Crowder, Randal (R)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Dines, Jim (R)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Dodge, George (D)</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Egolf, Brian (D)</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Espinoza, Nora (R)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</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>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fajardo, Kelly (R)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Gallegos, David (R)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Gallegos, Doreen (D)</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Garcia Richard, Stephanie (D)</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Garcia, Miguel (D)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Gentry, Nate (R)</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Gomez, Bealquin (D)</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>-</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>70%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</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>6%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>-</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>n/a</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Harper, Jason (R)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</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>51</td>
<td>Herrell, Yvette (R)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Irwin, Donna (D)</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>James, Conrad (R)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Johnson, D. Wonda (D)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Larrañaga, Larry (R)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>26%</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>Lechuga-Tena, Idalia (D)</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Lewis, Tim (R)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Little, Rick, (R)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Louis, Georgene (D)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Representative</td>
<td>2015-2016 LIFETIME</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>------------------------</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy &amp; Climate Change</td>
<td>Hazardous Waste</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>Effective Government</td>
<td>Water</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>Air Quality</td>
<td>Environmental Justice</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>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Numbers</th>
<th>HB 299</th>
<th>HB 340</th>
<th>HB 154</th>
<th>Habitat &amp; Wildlife Conservation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HB 291</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 468</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 253</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM 74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 188</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 188</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 494</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 564</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>Energy &amp; Climate Change</td>
<td>Hazardous Waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lundstrom, Patricia (D)</td>
<td>67% 64%</td>
<td>- + - e + + + + + + -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Madalena, James Roger (D)</td>
<td>100% 78%</td>
<td>- + - e + + - + e + + e</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Maestas, Antonio &quot;Moe&quot; (D)</td>
<td>95% 83%</td>
<td>- + + + - + + + + + + + +</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Maestas-Barnes, Sarah (R)</td>
<td>36% 38%</td>
<td>+ - + e + - - + + + e</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Mace, Stephanie (D)</td>
<td>100% 100%</td>
<td>+ + + - - + + + + + + + + -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Martinez, Javier (D)</td>
<td>96% 95%</td>
<td>+ + + - + + + + + + + + +</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Martinez, W. Ken (D)</td>
<td>89% 84%</td>
<td>- e - e + + + + + + + +</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>McCamley, Bill (D)</td>
<td>80% 74%</td>
<td>- e a + + + + + + a</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>McMillan, Terry (R)</td>
<td>15% 14%</td>
<td>- e - - + - - + a</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>McQueen, Matthew (D)</td>
<td>92% 91%</td>
<td>+ + + - - + + + + + + + +</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Montoya, Rod (R)</td>
<td>6% 10%</td>
<td>- + - - - - - - - - -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Nunez, Andy (R)</td>
<td>9% 25%</td>
<td>- + - - - - - + - -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Pacheco, Paul (R)</td>
<td>37% 28%</td>
<td>- + - + - - - - + - -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Powdrell-Culbert, Jane (R)</td>
<td>11% 17%</td>
<td>- + - + - - - - + - -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Rehm, William &quot;Bill&quot; (R)</td>
<td>6% 29%</td>
<td>- e - - - - - + a</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Roche, Dennis (R)</td>
<td>28% 24%</td>
<td>- + - - - - + +</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Rodella, Debbie (D)</td>
<td>89% 70%</td>
<td>- + - + + + + + + +</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Romero, G. Andres (D)</td>
<td>94% 90%</td>
<td>- + + + + + + + +</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Roybal Caballero, Patricia (D)</td>
<td>100% 100%</td>
<td>+ + + + + + + + +</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ruiboba, Patricio (D)</td>
<td>75% 67%</td>
<td>- + - e + + + + - + -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Salazar, Nick (D)</td>
<td>60% 65%</td>
<td>- + - e + + e e e e e e</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Salazar, Tomás (D)</td>
<td>93% 77%</td>
<td>- + + + + + e e e e e e</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Scott, Larry (R)</td>
<td>13% 14%</td>
<td>- - + - - - + - - - - - -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Smith, James (R)</td>
<td>24% 21%</td>
<td>- + - - - - - - -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Stapleton, Sheryl Williams (D)</td>
<td>80% 72%</td>
<td>- a - + + e + + + + +</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Steinborn, Jeff (D)</td>
<td>100% 98%</td>
<td>+ + + + + + + + + + + +</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Strickler, James (R)</td>
<td>8% 14%</td>
<td>- - + + + - - - - - - - -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Townsend, James (R)</td>
<td>13% 14%</td>
<td>- - + - + - - - - - - - -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Tripp, Don (R)</td>
<td>11% 28%</td>
<td>- + - - - - - - -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Trujillo, Carl (D)</td>
<td>72% 62%</td>
<td>- + - + + + + + + +</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Trujillo, Christine (D)</td>
<td>94% 87%</td>
<td>- + + e + + + + + +</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Trujillo, Jim (D)</td>
<td>82% 65%</td>
<td>- a - + + + + + + +</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Varela, Luciano &quot;Lucky&quot; (D)</td>
<td>80% 87%</td>
<td>- + + + + e e e e e</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Wooley, Bob (R)</td>
<td>10% 21%</td>
<td>- + - - - - + a</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Youngblood, Monica (R)</td>
<td>0% 4%</td>
<td>- e - - - - -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Zimmerman, John (R)</td>
<td>11% 14%</td>
<td>- + - - - - - + -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### HOUSE 100% CHAMPIONS

Each of the following legislators earned a 100% score in the 2015-2016 Conservation Scorecard. We applaud their commitment to protecting the air we breathe, the water we drink and the land where we live and play!

**House:**
- Gail Chasey
- Miguel Garcia
- D. Wonda Johnson
- Georgene Louis
- James Roger Madalena
- Patricia Roybal Caballero
- Jeff Steinborn
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 505-986-4300.

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

**SENATE**

Beffort, Sue Wilson (R – 19)
67 Raindance Rd.
Santa Fe, NM 87504
505-292-7116

Brandt, Craig W. (R – 40)
craig.brandt@nmlegis.gov
7012 Tampico Rd. NE
Rio Rancho, NM 87144
505-503-5001

Burt, William F. (R – 33)
Alamogordo, NM 88311
575-434-6140 / 575-434-1414

Campos, Pete (D – 8)
pete.campos@nmlegis.gov
418 Raynolds Ave.
Las Vegas, NM 87701
505-425-0508 / 505-454-2501

Candelaria, Jacob R. (D – 26)
jacob.candelaria@nmlegis.gov
3501 Atico Dr. NW #423
Albuquerque, NM 87120
505-847-5079

Cervantes, Joseph (D – 31)
CervantesLawfirm.com
2610 S. Espina
Las Cruces, NM 88001
575-522-2352 / 575-526-5600

Cisneros, Carlos R. (D – 6)
carlos.cisneros@nmlegis.gov
Box 1129
Queretaro, MX
505-670-5610

Cotter, Lee S. (R – 36)
6670 Butterfield Rd.
Las Cruces, NM 88007
575-525-3200

Craig, Phil A. (D – 39)
senatarngiego@yahoo.com
10 Box
Belen, NM 87002
505-469-9470

Griggs, Ron (R – 34)
ron.griggs@nmlegis.gov
2700 Birdie Loop
Alamogordo, NM 88310
575-459-1331

Griggs, Stuart P. (R – 27)
steve.griggs@nmlegis.gov
2160 W. University Dr.
Portales, NM 88130
575-356-3088

Greene, Steven P. (R – 2)
steven.greene@nmlegis.gov
505-588-6765

Ivey-Soto, Daniel A. (D – 15)
daniel.ivey-soto@nmlegis.gov
1420 Carlisle Blvd. NE Ste. 208
Albuquerque, NM 87110
505-384-4757

Kernan, Gay G. (R – 42)
gkgern@valornet.com
928 W. Mesa Verde
Hobbs, NM 88240
505-629-8801

Leavell, Carroll H. (R – 41)
leavell@leavellaco.net
Drawer D
Jal, NM 88052
575-395-3154 / 575-393-2550

Lockert, Mary Kay (D – 38)
mk2006@comcast.net
904 Conway Ave.
Las Cruces, NM 88005
575-524-4462

Martinez, Richard C. (D – 5)
richard.martinez@nmlegis.gov
Box 762
Espanola, NM 87532
505-747-2377

Moore, Mark (R – 27)
mark.moore@nmlegis.gov
9641 Seligman Ave. NE
Albuquerque, NM 87106
505-266-6588

Morales, Howie C. (D – 28)
hcm260@gmail.com
4285 Swan St.
Silver City, NM 88061
575-574-0043

Munoz, George K. (D – 4)
munozgeorge@gmail.com
Box 2679
Gallup, NM 87010
505-722-8911 / 505-722-6570

Neville, Steven P. (R – 2)
steven.neville@nmlegis.gov
Box 1570
Aztec, NM 87410
505-327-5460

O’Neill, Bill B. (D – 13)
onel11d3@billoneillinfom.com
343 Sarah Ln. NW
Albuquerque, NM 87114
505-405-9263

Ortiz y Pino, Gerald (D – 12)
ortizjp@msn.com
300 12th St. NW
Albuquerque, NM 87102
505-243-1509

Padilla, Michael (D – 14)
michael.padilla@nmlegis.gov
Box 67545
Albuquerque, NM 87193
505-977-6247

Payne, William H. (R – 20)
william.payne@nmlegis.gov
Box 14823
Albuquerque, NM 87191
505-986-4703

Pinto, John (D – 3)
509 W. Morgan Ave.
Gallup, NM 87301
505-577-8342

Porter, Cliff R. (D – 32)
crporter@nlisweb.com
5507 T.D. Rd.
Roswell, NM 88051
575-626-7046

Rodriguez, Nancy (R – 24)
nancy.rodriguez@nmlegis.gov
1839 Camino La Canada
Santa Fe, NM 87501
505-983-8913

Rue, Sander (R – 23)
sander.rue@nmlegis.gov
7500 Rancho Solano Ct. NW
Albuquerque, NM 87120
505-899-0288

Ryan, John C. (R – 10)
john.ryan@nmlegis.gov
5000 Los Poblanos Lane NW
Los Ranchos de Albuquerque, NM 87107
505-258-3733

Sanchez, Clemente (D – 30)
clemente.sanchez@nmlegis.gov
612 Inwood Ave.
Grants, NM 87020
505-287-2515

Sanchez, Michael S. (D – 29)
senatormcsanchez@aol.com
3 Juncton Rd.
Belen, NM 87002
505-865-5583 / 505-865-0688

Sapien, John M. (D – 9)
john.sapien@nmlegis.gov
1600 W. Elia
Corrales, NM 87048
505-765-5662

Shearer, William E. (R – 1)
bill@williamsharer.com
Box 203
Farmington, NM 87499
505-436-0553

Shendo, Jr., Benny (D – 22)
benny.shendo@nmlegis.gov
Box 634
Jemez Pueblo, NM 87024
505-883-2564

Smith, John Arthur (D – 35)
john.smith@nmlegis.gov
Box 998
Doming, NM 88031
505-546-8546 / 505-546-4979

Soules, William P. (D – 37)
bill.soules@nmlegis.gov
5054 Silver King
Las Cruces, NM 88001
575-522-3521

Stewart, Mimi (D – 17)
mimi.stewart@nmlegis.gov
313 Moon St. NE
Albuquerque, NM 87123
575-275-2355

Torrez, Lisa A. (D – 18)
ltorre@nmlegis.gov
1019 2nd St. NW
Albuquerque, NM 87102
505-294-0530

**HOUSE**

Adkins, David E. (R – 29)
david.adkins@nmlegis.gov
P.O. Box 92918
Albuquerque, NM 87199
505-289-3987

Alcon, Eloise Lee (D – 6)
eelope.alcon@nmlegis.gov
Box 2134
Milan, NM 87011
505-285-6387

Armstrong, Deborah A. (R – 17)
deborah.armstrong@nmlegis.gov
2050 Riel Place NW
Albuquerque, NM 87107
505-795-5164

Baldonado, Alonzo (R – 8)
Alonzo.baldonado@nmlegis.gov
Box 370
Los Lunas, NM 87031
505-363-6214

Bandy, Paul C. (R – 3)
paul@paulbandy.org
388 C.R. 290
Aztec, NM 87510
505-334-0865

Brown, Cathryn N. (R – 55)
cathryn@brownbanc.com
1814 N. Guadalupe St.
Carlsbad, NM 88220
575-885-0624 / 575-796-4420

Chasey, Gail (D – 18)
gail@gailchasey.com
1206 Las Lomas Rd. NE
Albuquerque, NM 87106
505-266-5191 / 505-246-2221

Governor Susana Martinez
Office of the Governor
490 Old Santa Fe Trail, Room 400
Santa Fe, NM 87501
505-476-2200

Legislative Contact Information
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PROTECTING OUR LAND OF ENCHANTMENT, ONE VOTE AT A TIME

www.CVNM.org

Our vision is for a New Mexico where decision-makers and public policies represent the conservation values of our people.

Our mission Conservation Voters New Mexico, a nonpartisan, non-profit 501(c)(4) organization, is connecting the people of New Mexico to their political power to protect our air, land, and water for a healthy Land of Enchantment.

We do this by:
Mobilizing voters,
Winning elections,
Holding elected officials accountable, and
Advancing responsible public policies.
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