

BEFORE THE HEARING SUBCOMMITTEE
OF THE INTERIM LEGISLATIVE ETHICS COMMITTEE

In re: Representative Carl Trujillo,

Respondent.

RESPONDENT’S MOTION TO DISMISS

Respondent Representative Carl Trujillo, by and through undersigned counsel, respectfully moves the Committee to dismiss the Charging Party’s remaining claims¹ on three grounds.

First, by publicizing an open letter to the media, Ms. Bonar (a lobbyist) knowingly and intentionally violated the rules of confidentiality intended to protect Legislators from abuse of the Anti-Harassment Policy for political purposes. Ms. Bonar also purposely ignored virtually every procedure established to properly complain of harassment to this body – procedures enacted to protect both the rights of the complainant and the rights of publicly elected officials falsely accused of

¹ On July 27, 2018, the Investigative Subcommittee entered its *Findings and Recommendations of the Investigative Subcommittee to the Hearing Subcommittee of the Interim Legislative Ethics Committee Regarding Representative Trujillo* (the “Findings and Recommendations”) in which the Investigative Subcommittee adopted the findings and recommendations of the Special Counsel, and found no probable cause to support multiple claims made by Ms. Bonar against Representative Trujillo. Those claims have now been dismissed. *See, e.g.*, Legislative Council Policy No. 16(I)(2)(a) (“If the investigative subcommittee finds no probable cause to believe a charge is warranted, it shall recommend that the hearing subcommittee close the investigation or dismiss the charge.”); House Rule 9-13-4 (“If the subcommittee finds no probable cause to believe the charge is warranted, it shall recommend that the full committee dismiss the charge.”).

sexual harassment. No one should be allowed to invoke the Anti-Harassment Policy while simultaneously ignoring the confidentiality and other procedures intended to protect the process from political abuse.

Second, the Anti-Harassment Policy was not adopted until January 15, 2018, while Ms. Bonar claims that she was harassed in 2013 and 2014. As a matter of fact, Representative Trujillo adamantly and categorically denies that he sexually harassed Ms. Bonar at all. As a matter of law, the Committee cannot fairly apply a 2018 policy to conduct alleged to have occurred four and five years before the policy even existed. Using new policies to punish alleged past behavior is unlawful and unfair.

Third, Representative Trujillo's ability to defend himself is materially impaired by Ms. Bonar's significant delay in making the complaint. Had Ms. Bonar raised these issues in 2013 and 2014 at the time she claims she was harassed, Representative Trujillo could have better sought and secured witnesses and evidence to contradict her story. The five-year passage of time has significantly prejudiced his ability defend himself from these false claims. That is why both federal and state law require a party complaining of sexual harassment to make a formal charge within a year, otherwise such claims are forever barred. See New Mexico Human Rights Act, N.M.S.A. § 28-1-10(a) ("All complaints shall be filed with the division within three hundred days after the alleged act was

committed.”) (emphasis added). The time limitation and same rationale should apply here, and Ms. Bonar’s remaining complaints should be dismissed as untimely and/or under the doctrine of laches. *Garcia v. Garcia*, 1991-NMSC-023, ¶ 30, 111 N.M. 581, 588, 808 P.2d 31, 38 (“The doctrine of laches prevents litigation of a stale claim where the claim should have been brought at an earlier time and the delay has worked to the prejudice of the party resisting the claim.”)

Argument

In this case, allegations dating back to 2013 were made in an “open letter” by lobbyist Laura Bonar, which she disseminated to various websites and media outlets. This was done just weeks prior to Representative Trujillo’s primary election. Despite that most of Ms. Bonar’s allegations, including the most serious among them, have since been found not to be credible, the damage was done and Representative Trujillo lost his primary.

Representative Trujillo moves the Committee to dismiss the complaint and remaining charges of harassment against him because the Charging Party repeatedly and intentionally breached the requirement of confidentiality and for other reasons stated below.

A. The Charge Against Representative Trujillo Should Be Dismissed For Breach of Confidentiality.

Effective January 15, 2018, the New Mexico Legislative Council adopted a new Anti-Harassment Policy which admirably seeks to protect those in and around

the Legislature from sexual harassment. However, the potential for abuse of this policy was recognized when it was written, which is why it expressly requires that the complaint and investigation of it remain confidential prior to any finding of probable cause.²

The statute authorizing the Interim Legislative Ethics Committee (the “Committee”) to investigate Legislators mandates that the complainant (Laura Bonar) (1) follow a procedure intended to ensure that complaints are verified under oath from the outset; and (2) maintain confidentiality unless and until there is a finding of probable cause. Ms. Bonar purposefully violated both requirements.

1. Filing a Complaint

The Anti-Harassment Policy states that “Sections 2-15-7 through 2-15-12 NMSA 1978; Senate Rules 9-13-1 through 9-13-6; House Rules 9-13-1 through 9-13-7; or Legislative Council Policy No. 16 shall apply to the process regarding complaints against legislators.” Where a complaint is received outside of the session, the Legislature delegated its power to investigate sexual harassment claims to the Interim Legislative Ethics Committee (the “Committee”) N.M.S.A. § 2-15-7(B) (“All matters arising in the interim pertaining to legislative ethics shall be

² The Anti-Harassment Policy contains a section on “Confidentiality” that requires, *inter alia*, that “[a] report or complaint of harassment and documents related to any investigation shall be maintained confidentially to the extent possible pursuant to applicable law, rule or policy, including the Inspection of Public Records Act.” (Emphasis added).

referred to this special interim legislative ethics committee.”). This same statute requires that “the New Mexico legislative council shall develop procedures to carry out the provisions of this section, in accordance with the existing procedures in the house and senate rules.” N.M.S.A. § 2-15-9(A) (emphasis added).

Legislative Council Policy No. 16 creates procedures for filing a complaint outside of the session, and requires that:

Any charge seeking the discipline of a member of the legislature during the interim shall be in writing, under oath or affirmation, signed by a member of the legislature or a member of the public, addressed to the legislative council and filed with the legislative council service at the state capitol. The complaint shall state with reasonable particularity the relevant facts upon which the charge is based and the substantive ethics rule or law which the legislator is charged with violating.

Legislative Policy No. 16(F) (emphasis added). As explained below, Bonar ignored all of these requirements.

Despite the express requirements of the applicable rules, Bonar did not provide a signed complaint, much less one sworn under oath, which is a basic threshold requirement for sexual harassment complaints filed with state and federal enforcement authorities. Bonar did not “file” any complaint, sworn or otherwise, with the Legislative Council Service, nor did her Open Letter distributed to the media “state with particularity the relevant facts” upon which her charge was based. Instead, the Open Letter made only vague allegations against Representative Trujillo. The Special Counsel investigating Ms. Bonar’s claims did

not disclose the specific allegations made by Ms. Bonar against Representative Trujillo until July 2, 2018. In other words, for two months after Ms. Bonar published her Open Letter, and during virtually the entirety of the Special Counsel’s investigation of it, Representative Trujillo was not fairly informed and had no idea what specific claims Ms. Bonar made against him.

If the Committee is going to consider complaints that ignore and purposefully violate the filing and confidentiality requirements, there are no real protections for anyone.

2. Confidentiality

Ms. Bonar ignored the procedures for filing a complaint because she had no intent of honoring this system’s confidentiality protections. The Policy provides that a “report or complaint of harassment and documents related to an investigation shall be maintained confidentially...” See Policy, p. 2-3. The Policy is governed and guided by other authorities, including House Rules 9-13-1 through 9-13-7, Legislative Council Policy 16 and N.M.S.A. § 2-15-9, all of which require that an ethics complaint against a member of the House be kept confidential.

By statute, “[t]he interim legislative ethics committee shall maintain rules of confidentiality, unless the legislator against whom a complaint is filed waives the rules or any part of them in writing.” N.M.S.A. § 2-15-9(E). There has been no such waiver. House Rule 9-13-2 expressly provides that: “Breach of

confidentiality by a complainant may result in dismissal of the complaint or the assessment of costs.” Legislative Policy No 16(I)(2) provides that a properly filed complaint shall be delivered to the appropriate investigative subcommittee and “[t]he investigative subcommittee shall conduct a confidential investigation” Legislative Policy No. 16(I)(2).

This Committee’s enabling statute provides that “the complainant ... shall not publicly disclose any information relating to the filing or investigation of a complaint, including the identity of the complainant or respondent, until after a finding of probable cause has been made that a violation has occurred.” N.M.S.A. § 2-15-9(E)(1).

The National Conference of State Legislatures has published model elements that a legislature should include in its anti-harassment policy, and confidentiality is one of those elements. See NCSL Policy Elements, attached as Ex. 1. The legislatures of Alabama, Colorado, Hawaii, Maryland and Oregon all require confidentiality as part of their harassment policies. Representative Trujillo is unaware of any State legislature with a harassment policy that does not require confidentiality.

In this case, the complainant initiated this process in a manner that was specifically calculated to be publicized. Because there was some question whether Ms. Bonar’s “open letter” was intended to initiate the Policy’s process, she

instructed her counsel to send an email to Raul Burciaga, the Director of the Legislative Council Service. In that email, dated May 8, 2018, the complainant “formally request[s] that the Legislature initiate an anti-harassment investigation into the conduct of Representative Carl Trujillo”, and references her May 2, 2018 open letter as her formal complaint. In direct contradiction of every relevant statute, rule, and policy, Ms. Bonar’s counsel copied that email to at least twenty-six members of the print, internet, and television media. *See* Email from Monagle, dated May 8, 2018, attached as Exhibit 2.

Despite the express requirement to “conduct a confidential investigation,” the Legislative Council Service immediately issued a press release the same day, May 8, publicizing that Legislature would investigate the claims made against Representative Trujillo in the Bonar’s Open Letter. Despite repeated express requirements and controlling rules, Representative Trujillo has never received any confidentiality during this entire proceeding from the Ms. Bonar, her lawyer, and not even the Legislative Council Service.

On June 5, 2018, the Santa Fe New Mexican reported that Representative Trujillo lost his primary in a “race marred by scandal.” *See* Exhibit 3. It was further reported that Ms. Bonar’s highly publicized accusation “resulted in a slew of negative mailers, including one that compared Trujillo to disgraced media mogul Harvey Weinstein...” Two days later, the New Mexican quoted the

Legislative Council Service's Director in another story, reporting that the investigation into Ms. Bonar's allegations would continue despite the outcome of the primary election.

The behavior of Ms. Bonar and her counsel make it clear that this matter was never about any legitimate feeling of intimidation or harassment by Ms. Bonar, but was calculated to publicly embarrass Representative Trujillo just before his election. This is precisely the misuse of the policy that the requirement of confidentiality seeks to prevent. If this Committee is going to allow Ms. Bonar to completely ignore filing and confidentiality requirements, why would anyone ever follow the filing and confidentiality rules? The Committee should dismiss this matter because the proceeding has never been, nor did Ms. Bonar ever intend it to be held confidential as required by law.

B. The 2018 Policy Cannot Penalize Past Conduct.

The Policy was adopted in January 2018. Every allegation made by Ms. Bonar occurred in 2013 or 2014. The only allegations that remain for this Committee to consider occurred in February 2014, nearly four years before the Legislature had any policy that would have prohibited or provided for the punishment of behavior alleged by the Complainant. The Policy cannot and should not be applied retroactively.

New Mexico courts have repeatedly and consistently held that legislative enactments will not be given retroactive application unless the Legislature expressly states as much. *See, e.g., Psomas v. Psomas*, 1982-NMSC-154, ¶ 14, 99 N.M. 606, 609 (recognizing settled New Mexico law that a statute only operates prospectively absent “clear intention on the part of the legislature to give the statute retroactive effect.”); *see also, Southwest Distrib. Co. v. Olympia Brewing Co.*, 1977-NMSC-050, ¶ 24, 90 N.M. 502, 508 (holding that where a new statute creates new rights and obligations and is remedial in nature, it is prospective only unless the Legislature clearly indicates in the language of the statute that it be applied retroactively.)

In this case, the Policy makes no indication whatsoever that it should be used to address conduct that occurred prior to January 15, 2018. As a basic matter of fairness, this Committee should find that the Policy was only intended to cover acts that occurred after it was enacted. This matter should be dismissed.

C. This Claim Should Be Dismissed Because Of Delay in Making the Claim and Age Of The Allegations.

Every legal claim in New Mexico comes with a time period in which the claim must be made. Our courts have held that the “underlying purpose of a statute of limitation is to compel the exercise of a right of action within a reasonable time so that the party against whom the action is brought will have a fair opportunity to defend.” *Moncor Trust Co. v. Feil*, 105 N.M. 444, 446 (1987).

The “important policies served by statutes of limitations [include] basic fairness to defendants... [and to] help avoid stale or fraudulent claims, avoid inconvenience, and avoid loss of evidence.” *Duncan v. Campbell*, 1997-NMCA-028, ¶ 15, 123 N.M. 181, 184.

While the Policy does not have a clear limit on the time that a complainant has to come forward with a claim of harassment, it does recognize that “early reporting and intervention have proven to be the most effective way to resolve actual or perceived incidents of harassment. *See* Policy, p.2. The Policy further notes that “delays in reporting harassment can affect the ability to take appropriate action... reports of harassment should be made as soon as possible after experiencing or observing the harassment... *See* Policy, p.2.

The law most similar to the Legislature’s Anti-Harassment Policy is the New Mexico Human Rights Act (“HRA”), which addresses sexual harassment in the workplace. The HRA requires that a complaint be filed within three hundred days of the alleged act of harassment. N.M.S.A. § 28-1-10(A). Even the general statute of limitations for civil claims requires that claims be made within four years of the alleged act. *See* N.M.S.A. § 37-1-4. Ms. Bonar’s claims, based on things that allegedly happened in February 2014 at the latest, are untimely by any standard found in the law.

The Policy was intended to deal with allegations of harassment immediately after the behavior occurs. Allegations as old as those in this case are inherently unreliable and claims based on such allegations are inherently unfair. Because Ms. Bonar delayed making these complaints more than 4 years, evidence that might have existed to prove that Ms. Bonar's allegations are false, such as video recordings of the committee hearing, no longer exist. Had Ms. Bonar promptly raised these issues, there might be witnesses who remember who sat where in a committee meeting, but because of the passage of time, memories fade, and witnesses who could have supported Representative Trujillo's defense no longer remember exactly who sat where and when. Ms. Bonar should not benefit from her own delay.

The Complainant's failure to promptly raise these issues is an additional and alternative basis to dismiss this matter.

Conclusion

This matter is the first time that the Legislature's anti-harassment policy is being applied. As such, the Committee should be mindful that the procedures followed here will likely become a roadmap for future cases. If the Committee does not dismiss this matter, it will encourage future complainants to ignore the confidentiality provisions of the Policy, thereby encouraging abuse of the policy for political gain. Not dismissing this matter now will also encourage more

allegations to be made from years gone by, all of which will be inherently unreliable and contrary to the Policy's preference of immediate reporting. This matter should be dismissed.

Respectfully submitted,

**JACKSON LOMAN STANFORD
& DOWNEY, P.C.**

/s/Travis G. Jackson

Travis Jackson

Eric Loman

Counsel for Representative Carl Trujillo

201 Third St. N.W., Ste. 1500

Albuquerque, NM 87102

(505) 767-0577

(505) 242-9944 (fax)

travis@jacksonlomanlaw.com

eric@jacksonlomanlaw.com

We hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing pleading was emailed this 4rd day of October, 2018, to:

Thomas M. Hnasko
Hinkle Shanor LLP
PO Box 2068
Santa Fe, NM 87504
thnasko@hinklelawfirm.com

Hearing Subcommittee of the Interim
Legislative Ethics Committee
c/o Raul Burciaga, Director
Legislative Council Service
State Capitol Building, 4th Floor
Santa Fe, NM 87503
raul.burciaga@nmlegis.gov

JACKSON LOMAN STANFORD & DOWNEY, P.C.

By: /s/Travis G. Jackson
Travis G. Jackson



Sexual Harassment Policies in State Legislatures

1/2/2018



In October 2017, NCSL conducted a survey to learn more information on legislative policies on sexual harassment. After reviewing the policies we've received, reading materials by experts in the field—including general harassment guidelines promoted by the EEOC—NCSL has concluded that a strong legislative sexual harassment policy should include the following elements.

Policy Elements

- A clear definition of "sexual harassment."
- Examples of what behaviors are considered inappropriate in the workplace.
- A policy that applies to legislators and staff, as well as nonemployees, such as lobbyists and outside vendors.
- A diversity of contacts within the legislature to whom sexual harassment can be reported, allowing the complainant to bypass reporting to his or her direct supervisor.
- A clear statement prohibiting retaliation for the filing of any claim.
- A statement providing for confidentiality, to the extent possible, for all parties involved.
- Specific examples of potential discipline, if warranted.
- The possibility of involving parties outside the legislature to assist in the investigation, if it is warranted or requested.
- An appeal procedure.
- A statement informing the complainant that she or he can also file a complaint to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and/or the state's Human Rights Commission.

State Policy Examples

Every state legislature is unique, and states have tailored their policies to reflect the special concerns within the state, as well the structure of their organization. The following states provide examples of the above-mentioned criteria:

- The Alabama House of Representatives
- The Colorado General Assembly
- The Hawaii Senate
- The Maryland General Assembly
- The Oregon Legislature

Nothing in this document should be construed to constitute legal advice. The examples and language are for informational purposes only.

NCSL Member Toolbox

Members Resources

- Get Involved With NCSL
- Jobs Clearinghouse
- Legislative Careers
- NCSL Staff Directories
- Staff Directories
- StateConnect Directory
- Terms and Conditions

Policy & Research Resources

- Bill Information Service
- Legislative Websites
- NCSL Bookstore
- State Legislatures Magazine

Accessibility Support

- Tel: 1-800-659-2656 or 711
- Accessibility Support
- Accessibility Policy

Meeting Resources

- Calendar
- Online Registration

Press Room

- Media Contact
- NCSL in the News
- Press Releases

Denver

7700 East First Place
Denver, CO 80230
Tel: 303-364-7700 | Fax: 303-364-7800

Washington

444 North Capitol Street, N.W., Suite 515
Washington, D.C. 20001
Tel: 202-624-5400 | Fax: 202-737-1069



Exhibit 2

From: Levi Monagle [mailto:levi@bhallfirm.com]

Sent: Tuesday, May 8, 2018 11:30 AM

To: Burciaga, Raul <Raul.Burciaga@nmlegis.gov>; pives@cuddymccarthy.com

Cc: Matt Grubs <mattgrubs@sfreporter.com>; elizabeth@sfreporter.com, andy@nmpoliticalreport.com,
lanews@lamonitor.com; jill@lamonitor.com; tris@lamonitor.com; bjgordon@ladailypost.com;
caclark@ladailypost.com; moswald@abqjournal.com; editor@taosnews.com; chooks@taosnews.com;
eric@valleydaily.com; tlast@abqjournal.com; community@gallupindependent.com;
koatdesk@hearst.com; Ramirez, Chris <cramirez@kob.com>; news@kobtv.com; newsdesk@krqe.com;
mdemarco@kunm.org; megankamerick@gmail.com; Lee, Morgan <mlee@ap.org>; Ellen Berkovitch
<eberkovitch@ksfr.org>; Hannah Colton <hannahcolton@gmail.com>; nmindepth@gmail.com;
Andrew Oxford <aoxford@sfnewmexican.com>; bravnewmexico@gmail.com

Subject: Laura Bonar Formally Requests Initiation of Legislative Anti Harassment Investigation of Rep. Carl Trujillo

Mr. Burciaga,

I represent Laura Bonar. Ms. Bonar has authorized me to formally request that the Legislature initiate an anti-harassment investigation into the conduct of Representative Carl Trujillo. Ms. Bonar wishes me to submit her letter dated May 2, 2018, as her formal complaint. I have attached a copy of that letter below, and request that you consider it Ms. Bonar's formal complaint. I have also submitted signed corroborating statements from Jessica Johnson, Lisa Jennings, and Deborah Condit, all of whom worked with Ms. Bonar in 2014.

If you have any questions or if I can be of further assistance to you, please give me a call

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Levi Monagle
Attorney at Law
Law Offices of Brad D. Hall, LLC
320 Gold Ave SW, Suite 1218
Albuquerque, NM 87102
(505) 255 6300

1

Advertisement

SANTA FE NEW MEXICAN

Exhibit 3

Advertisement

http://www.santafenewmexican.com/elections/romero-overcomes-trujillo-in-race-marred-by-scandal/article_foa92758-cedo-59e7-baaf-95af0089d726.html

HOUSE DISTRICT 46

Romero overcomes Trujillo in race marred by scandal

By Daniel J. Chacón | dchacon@sfnewmexican.com Jun 5, 2018



Political newcomer Andrea Romero scored a stunning upset Tuesday, ousting three-term incumbent state Rep. Carl Trujillo in a fiercely competitive and remarkably nasty Democratic primary race in House District 46.

“We got into this race because we believed we could have it better, and we will — we will,” a teary-eyed Romero told a roomful of family members and supporters gathered at Opuntia Cafe in the Baca District of the Santa Fe Railyard.

“When we started this movement — and now it’s begun — it was because we believed in the future New Mexico deserves,” said Romero, a 31-year-old Stanford University graduate who vowed to be a champion for progressive causes. “It deserves to have legislators who stand strong for what they believe in, where convictions for women, children, family and core Democratic values are uncompromising.”

Despite lingering questions about her past financial dealings, Romero edged out Trujillo, who was dogged by sexual harassment allegations.

“Taking on an incumbent is always a challenge, and for so many, this was extra special,” Romero said, generating laughs.

Trujillo did not return a message seeking comment late Tuesday.

With no Republican running for House District 46, which includes the northern end of Santa Fe County, four pueblos, a portion of Española and several small communities in between, Romero is virtually assured victory in the November general election.

It was a bitter and cutthroat race chock-full of mudslinging, acerbic campaign mailers and advertisements, and spending by political action committees representing vastly different interests, from Planned Parenthood to the oil and gas industries.

“When all was stripped away from the controversies, people really understood who were the people who were standing with Andrea: firefighters, our mayor, labor, pueblos,” said Neri Holguin, Romero’s campaign manager. “There were folks across this community that were saying, ‘We stand with her.’”

Holguin acknowledged that Romero, a government consultant and fledgling ostrich farmer who is also the director of MIX Santa Fe, did better in the more urban parts of the district.

Though she lives in the city, Romero, who attended school in Santa Fe but grew up in Nambé and Chimayó, said she is well suited to unite the rural and urban areas of the district because of her background.

“I’m from the *norte*,” she said. “Those are my *gente*.”

Holguin said a last-minute push in support of Trujillo by an independent expenditure group funded largely by Chevron and Mack Energy “reinforced our message that Andrea stands with working families and Carl is too closely aligned with corporate interests.”

The backlash from the #MeToo movement also played a factor in Trujillo’s defeat. Trujillo called his accuser, a female lobbyist, a liar. And at one point, he described a fellow legislator leveling other sexual harassment charges against him as “a witch hunt.”

Trujillo went so far as to take a lie detector test, which he said he conclusively passed, though the questions Trujillo answered in the polygraph were not specific to the allegations lodged against him.

“It was largely how he responded,” Holguin said. “That was his undoing.”

A 51-year-old Los Alamos National Laboratory material science researcher who is also a homebuilder, Trujillo appeared to be coasting toward re-election until he was hit with sexual harassment allegations that prompted calls for his resignation, including from four Democrats in the Legislature.

The damage was swift and hard, especially in the midst of the #MeToo movement. The accusations resulted in a slew of negative mailers, including one that compared Trujillo to disgraced media mogul Harvey Weinstein and Republican President Donald Trump, who also have been accused of sexual misconduct.

The married father of four, Trujillo still faces an investigation by a House subcommittee under the Legislature's new anti-harassment policy.

Romero, meanwhile, gave her critics plenty of ammunition over improper reimbursements she received for alcohol and Major League Baseball tickets during her tenure as executive director of the Regional Coalition of LANL Communities.

When a watchdog group unearthed the coalition's travel policy violations, Romero asked the board of the public agency to investigate two of its members. Critics called her vindictive. Romero later apologized for how she handled the situation, though she was adamant that she was the target of a bigger political attack carried out by Trujillo's supporters.

Romero tried to paint Trujillo as a politician who was out of sync with Democratic Party values. She pointed to his 2015 vote on a bill that would have banned certain late-term abortions, as well as what she called an "NRA-backed" bill that would have eliminated a fingerprint requirement and a two-year refresher firearms training course to renew a concealed carry license.

Trujillo countered the attacks by saying he has always supported *Roe v. Wade*, the U.S. Supreme Court decision that legalized abortion, and that his record reflects that he has "consistently voted for bills that further gun control."

The back-and-forth between the two candidates and their supporters made the race one of the most closely watched — and perhaps the nastiest — in New Mexico.

The intense jockeying for votes, though, left a sour taste in some voters' mouths.

The baggage each candidate brought to the race left some voters, such as local electrical contractor Don Gorman, 53, conflicted about their choices.

"I don't know if what they're bringing up against Carl Trujillo is accurate or not, but it seems to me that our media seems to exploit things and people take advantage of it," he said. "And whether the lady Romero is running with good reason to want to run, to really improve, or if someone encouraged her to run because of Carl Trujillo having the Native American tribes going against him [and Romero] might back their interests, I'm not sure. All I know is it's really ugly."

Gorman said he ultimately sided with Trujillo.

"As far as him representing New Mexico, I think he's done a good job," Gorman said after voting at Montezuma Lodge in Santa Fe. "And I don't know about Romero other than that there's scandal

against her, too.”

The race was so toxic that neither the editorial boards of *The New Mexican* nor *Albuquerque Journal North* endorsed either candidate.

Romero’s grandmother, Delfina Romero, said she always knew who would win the race.

“She’s done so many things in her short life that, let me tell you, I never doubted that she would get this because she gets what she goes for,” Delfina Romera said.

Follow Daniel J. Chacón on Twitter @danieljchacon.

Daniel Chacon