

Second Annual Statistical Report on DWI Court Dispositions In New Mexico



**New Mexico Administrative
Office of the Courts**

**A report to the Legislative Finance
Committee on New Mexico Driving
While Intoxicated (DWI) court
dispositions, from 1997 through 2006.**

March, 2007

Contents

Introduction	1
DWI Overview	1
The DWI Court Process	2
Efforts to Improve the DWI Process	3
Statistical Differences	3

A Statistical Report on DWI in New Mexico

Prepared by the Administrative Office of the Courts

Introduction

This report consists of New Mexico Driving While Intoxicated (DWI) dispositional information from 1997 through 2006, for New Mexico magistrate courts, district courts, municipal courts, and the Bernalillo County Metropolitan Court. It includes breakdowns by disposition type and case dismissal status. The methods used to derive the statistical information in the report were reviewed by the Division of Government Research at the University of New Mexico for methodological validity.

DWI Overview

Since 1996, magistrate courts, statewide, handled between 6,500 and 7,500 DWI cases each year. Approximately 13% of these cases were transferred to district courts as felony cases. On average, 77% of the defendants in the remaining cases were convicted, acquitted or conditionally discharged. The other 23% of cases were dismissed, most as a result of motions filed by prosecutors.

During calendar year 2006, DWI cases were adjudicated by all courts in New Mexico. District courts throughout the state disposed of 2,350 felony DWI cases, magistrate courts disposed of 7,542 misdemeanor DWI cases, and the Bernalillo County Metropolitan Court disposed of 5,940 misdemeanor DWI cases. In addition, 1948 DWI cases were charged under municipal ordinances and disposed in municipal courts. For 2006, 82.7 percent of district court DWI defendants were convicted and 69.4 percent of magistrate defendants were convicted. Conviction rates for Bernalillo County Metropolitan Court and New Mexico municipal courts were 69.1 percent and 83.6 percent, respectively. The 2006 conviction rates for magistrate and district courts fell slightly, and the rate for the Bernalillo County Metropolitan Court, increased from 64.2 percent in 2005, to 69.1 percent in 2006. At least in part, the conviction rate increases at the Metropolitan court were due to improved case tracking capabilities.

The numbers in the 2005 DWI Report indicated that the rate of prosecutor-initiated dismissals increased over time and this trend continued in 2006. Prosecutor dismissals in magistrate courts, where the bulk of New Mexico DWI cases are tried, increased from 21.7 percent in 2005 to 25.3 percent in 2006, for an almost 15 percent increase in just one year.

In the 2005 DWI Report it was noted that part of the increase in prosecutor dismissals, over time, could be attributed to improvements in the quality of data entry between 1997 and 2005. Between 2005 and 2006, however, there were no significant changes in court data entry practices so the increase in prosecutor-initiated dismissals for that period cannot be attributed to data entry improvements.

The DWI Court Process

At the same time, court ordered dismissals in magistrate courts decreased by 25 percent; however, the number of such dismissals for both years was very small — 1.6 percent in 2005 to 1.2 percent in 2006. This illustrates that contrary to public perception judges rarely summarily dismiss DWI cases. Other types of magistrate court related dismissals also declined. For example, the magistrate court rate of DWI dismissals under the six month rule declined from 1 percent to .9 percent, for a 10 percent decrease.

The trend towards increased prosecutor dismissals could possibly indicate that prosecutor resources are strained or that the quality of cases brought to court by law enforcement has declined, or both. When AOC staff conducted field visits in 2005 to observe DWI procedures, it was observed that prosecutor resources are short and that despite the best efforts of individual prosecutors, the sheer volume of DWI cases made their jobs a difficult juggling act. Other factors that might cause increases in prosecutor initiated dismissals in magistrate courts include the refile of misdemeanor cases as felony cases in district courts subsequent to prosecutor misdemeanor dismissals; unavailability of a key witness or piece of evidence; unavailability of a defendant due to death or incarceration; or procedural legal issues.

As in most states, the New Mexico DWI court process is complex. At present, district courts, magistrate courts, municipal courts and the Bernalillo County Metropolitan Court hear all DWI cases. Preliminary hearings on misdemeanor cases upgraded to felonies will likely first be heard in a magistrate court or the Bernalillo County Metropolitan Court, and then be transferred to a district court. These transfers, called “bind-overs,” are not dismissals, but are a means of transferring the most serious cases from limited jurisdiction courts to courts that have the ability to try felonies. Since 1997, the bind-over rate has fluctuated between 8.5 and 14.5 percent.

Cases initially filed in magistrate courts or the Bernalillo County Metropolitan Court are frequently dismissed as a result of a prosecutor's dismissal motion, particularly when prosecutors learn of prior cases or other information that lead them to believe that the case should be charged as a felony. Unfortunately, when cases are dismissed in lower courts and refiled as felony DWI cases in district courts, it is very difficult for the AOC to know that the case has been refiled since there is no linkage between the dismissed case and a later felony filing. These cases are not truly dismissed, but for the purposes of this report, they are counted as dismissals. This causes the overall dismissal rate to appear higher than it really is, which slightly distorts the overall DWI disposition picture.

Past site studies at magistrate courts have shown that many DWI cases that are counted as DWI non-convictions actually contain convictions on underlying non-DWI traffic charges. This frequently results when a person is stopped by police for a

traffic infraction and the police officer smells alcohol or observes that the driver appears intoxicated. When the police officer charges the driver with DWI the general practice is to also cite the driver for the offense that initiated the traffic stop. If the DWI charge is ultimately dismissed, the judge may still convict on the underlying traffic charge.

A very small percentage of DWI cases had a sentence of “deferred,” pending satisfactory completion of court-ordered treatment or other court-ordered interventions. For purposes of this report, these cases were counted as convictions since the offenders were sanctioned and many were subsequently sentenced to greater sanctions when they failed to abide by the conditions of their deferrals.

Efforts to Improve the DWI Process

As noted in the 2005 DWI Report, the Judiciary has taken significant action to ensure that DWI cases are heard on the merits of each case, and significant actions have been taken to address DWI problems. During 2006, several new steps were initiated to increase judicial effectiveness including the broadcast of DWI expert training over the Judiciary's video arraignment network to magistrate judges, and formal mentoring programs and legal training, with testing, for new magistrate judges. In addition, the AOC has developed new computerized methods for providing timely feedback to clerks and judges on proper DWI case procedures.

Now pending are significant procedural rule changes for handling DWI cases at the Bernalillo County Metropolitan Court. If adopted, these changes should greatly reduce DWI dismissals in the one court that has the greatest DWI volume in New Mexico.

Statistical Differences

Court statistics are not in complete agreement with statistics derived from data provided by the MVD to the New Mexico DWI Resource Center. The reasons for this are three-fold:

1. The MVD relies mostly on manual reporting for its data. Dispositions reported on paper are manually entered into the MVD system and may be either entered incorrectly, under-reported to MVD by the courts disposing of DWI cases, or lost during the manual transfer process. The figures provided in this report are derived from a transaction-based court case management system that captures all case initiations and dispositions as they occur, which helps ensure data completeness, timeliness and accuracy.

2. The statistics contained in this report were not derived by comparing arrests with dispositions in a single year since a DWI case is not always adjudicated in the same year that the case was initiated. In contrast, DWI Resource Center statistics are calculated by comparing all DWI arrests for a particular year with all court dispositions for that same year. On average, a DWI case will take 109 days to complete in magistrate court, and 251 days in district court, thus many DWI arrests for a

particular year will actually be disposed in a later year. Because DWI dispositions frequently do not occur in the same year as the underlying arrest, court dismissal figures will never entirely agree with statistics published by the DWI Resource Center, which are derived from the MVD system.

3. Any DWI arrest that is not formally charged as a DWI by a prosecutor and filed with the court will not be factored into the court statistics. It is possible for a DWI arrestee to be released by the arresting police agency without being charged. Such releases may be counted as non-convictions by MVD. Of course, the courts do not receive arrest information unless the alleged offender is formally charged; therefore, formal charging is used by the Judiciary to indicate the initiation of a new DWI case.

DWI Cases Disposed For Calendar Years 1997 Through 2006

District Courts By Year

	Total Cases	Total Convictions	Total Acquittals	Conditionally Discharged	Other Dispositions	Total Dismissed	Dismissed by Prosecutor	Dismissed by Court	Dismissed 6 Month Rule	Dismissed Failure To Appear	Other Dismissals
1997	1221	84.7%	0.4%	0.0%	3.8%	11.1%	6.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.2%
1998	1458	82.3%	0.3%	0.0%	2.7%	14.7%	8.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.0%
1999	1700	83.6%	0.5%	0.0%	2.7%	13.2%	8.4%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	4.6%
2000	1751	78.5%	0.5%	0.1%	1.1%	19.9%	9.0%	0.1%	0.3%	0.0%	10.5%
2001	1687	84.7%	0.4%	0.1%	0.5%	14.3%	7.3%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	6.8%
2002	1938	84.4%	0.5%	0.2%	2.0%	13.0%	5.7%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	6.9%
2003	1961	85.3%	0.5%	0.2%	0.7%	13.3%	10.2%	0.6%	0.3%	0.0%	2.2%
2004	2224	86.5%	0.5%	0.8%	0.1%	12.1%	10.1%	1.2%	0.5%	0.0%	0.4%
2005	2331	83.4%	0.9%	0.7%	0.1%	14.9%	11.5%	2.6%	0.5%	0.0%	0.4%
2006	2350	82.7%	1.2%	1.0%	0.0%	15.1%	12.6%	1.7%	0.4%	0.0%	0.3%

Magistrate Courts By Year

	Total Cases	Total Convictions	Total Acquittals	Conditionally Discharged	Other Dispositions	Total Dismissed	Dismissed by Prosecutor	Dismissed by Court	Dismissed 6 Month Rule	Dismissed Failure To Appear	Other Dismissals
1997	7459	80.2%	0.8%	0.2%	0.5%	18.4%	5.9%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	12.0%
1998	7152	77.5%	0.6%	0.1%	0.6%	21.2%	6.2%	0.1%	0.5%	0.0%	14.3%
1999	7392	77.0%	0.7%	0.1%	0.9%	21.3%	7.5%	0.1%	1.0%	0.0%	12.6%
2000	7399	76.5%	0.5%	0.3%	0.3%	22.4%	8.0%	0.1%	0.8%	0.1%	13.4%
2001	7109	76.1%	0.6%	0.2%	0.6%	22.5%	8.9%	0.2%	0.9%	0.1%	12.3%
2002	6700	77.8%	0.8%	0.2%	0.9%	20.3%	8.3%	0.1%	0.9%	0.1%	10.8%
2003	7516	76.9%	0.6%	0.2%	1.1%	21.2%	9.9%	0.2%	0.7%	0.0%	10.3%
2004	8176	75.5%	0.9%	0.1%	0.9%	22.6%	12.6%	0.4%	1.3%	0.2%	8.0%
2005	7637	72.4%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	26.9%	21.7%	1.6%	0.9%	0.9%	1.8%
2006	7542	69.4%	0.8%	0.0%	0.1%	29.6%	25.3%	1.2%	0.8%	0.7%	1.6%

Bernalillo Metropolitan Court By Year

	Total Cases	Total Convictions	Total Acquittals	Conditionally Discharged	Other Dispositions	Total Dismissed	Dismissed by Prosecutor	Dismissed by Court	Dismissed 6 Month Rule	Dismissed Failure To Appear	Other Dismissals
1997	2869	58.3%	1.9%	0.0%	0.1%	39.7%	5.5%	5.0%	3.1%	23.0%	3.1%
1998	5119	67.0%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	31.0%	3.9%	5.2%	2.1%	17.3%	2.6%
1999	4980	64.4%	2.6%	0.0%	0.1%	33.0%	3.3%	5.0%	4.1%	17.2%	3.4%
2000	4899	69.5%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	28.9%	4.3%	3.9%	3.7%	14.7%	2.3%
2001	6073	70.6%	1.4%	0.0%	0.1%	28.0%	4.7%	3.9%	4.0%	12.9%	2.5%
2002	6144	66.1%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	32.2%	4.7%	5.0%	4.6%	15.3%	2.7%
2003	6706	62.6%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	35.7%	6.9%	5.9%	5.5%	14.9%	2.5%
2004	6407	60.0%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	38.0%	5.0%	5.5%	5.3%	18.8%	3.3%
2005	6536	64.2%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.7%	4.7%	4.5%	2.8%	19.4%	2.3%
2006	5940	69.1%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	28.9%	8.4%	1.0%	1.3%	17.9%	0.4%

- Total Cases** All cases disposed in a year
- Total Convictions** Total conviction rate for all cases filed
- Total Acquittals** Total acquittal rate for all cases filed
- Conditionally Discharged** Total conditional discharge rate for all cases filed
- Other Dispositions** Cases that were not dismissed but do not fit into heading categories
- Total Dismissed** Dismissal Rate for All Cases Filed
- Dismissed by Prosecutor** Cases filed that were dismissed by prosecutor
- Dismissed By Court** Cases filed that were dismissed by a judge
- Dismissed 6 Month Rule** Cases filed that were dismissed under the six month rule
- Dismissed Failure To Appear** Cases filed that were dismissed due to failure of an officer/witness to appear
- Other Dismissal** Cases filed that were dismissed but do not fit into heading categories

Note: Approximately 12% of Magistrate Court Cases are bound over to District Court and approximately 10% of the Dismissed cases are refiled in District Court

DWI Cases Disposed For Calendar Years 1997 Through 2006

Municipal Courts By Year

	Total Cases	Total Convictions	Total Acquittals	Conditionally Discharged	Other Dispositions	Total Dismissed	Dismissed by Prosecutor	Dismissed by Court	Dismissed 6 Month Rule	Dismissed Failure To Appear	Other Dismissals
1997	2267	98.1%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
1998	2411	98.4%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
1999	2223	98.1%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	0.5%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%
2000	2446	96.9%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%	1.3%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%
2001	2326	98.2%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2002	1711	97.8%	0.2%	0.0%	1.8%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2003	1745	98.5%	0.1%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2004	2215	97.3%	0.6%	0.0%	2.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2005	2109	96.0%	0.7%	0.0%	1.8%	1.6%	1.3%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%
2006	2199	84.5%	0.9%	0.0%	3.6%	11.0%	6.9%	2.0%	0.5%	0.3%	1.4%

Total Cases	All cases disposed in a year
Total Convictions	Total conviction rate for all cases filed
Total Acquittals	Total acquittal rate for all cases filed
Conditionally Discharged	Total conditional discharge rate for all cases filed
Other Dispositions	Cases that were not dismissed but do not fit into heading categories
Total Dismissed	Dismissal Rate for All Cases Filed
Dismissed by Prosecutor	Cases filed that were dismissed by prosecutor
Dismissed By Court	Cases filed that were dismissed by a judge
Dismissed 6 Month Rule	Cases filed that were dismissed under the six month rule
Dismissed Failure To Appear	Cases filed that were dismissed due to failure of an officer/witness to appear
Other Dismissal	Cases field that were dismissed but do not fit into heading categories

Note: Approximately 12% of Magistrate Court Cases are bound over to District Court and approximately 10% of the Dismissed cases are refiled in District Court

DWI Cases Disposed For Calendar Year 2006

District Courts By Location

County	Total Cases	Total Convictions	Total Acquittals	Conditionally Discharged	Other Dispositions	Total Dismissed	Dismissed by Prosecutor	Dismissed by Court	Dismissed 6 Month Rule	Dismissed Failure To Appear	Other Dismissals
BERNALILLO	567	89.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	10.4%	8.8%	0.9%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%
CATRON	1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
CHAVES	91	79.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.9%	17.6%	0.0%	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%
CIBOLA	31	83.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.1%	12.9%	3.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
COLFAX	14	78.6%	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	14.3%	7.1%	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%
CURRY	149	85.9%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	13.4%	12.8%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
DE BACA	2	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
DONA ANA	428	85.7%	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%	11.0%	9.3%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%
EDDY	32	96.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.1%	3.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
GRANT	24	58.3%	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%	29.2%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.2%
GUADALUPE	7	71.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	28.6%	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
HARDING	1	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
HIDALGO	9	66.7%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	22.2%	22.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
LEA	25	48.0%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	48.0%	44.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.0%
LINCOLN	40	77.5%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	17.5%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
LOS ALAMOS	1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
LUNA	22	72.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	27.3%	27.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
MCKINLEY	88	72.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	27.3%	19.3%	8.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
MORA	6	66.7%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
OTERO	66	74.2%	4.5%	0.0%	0.0%	21.2%	15.2%	4.5%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%
QUAY	8	87.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
RIO ARRIBA	30	70.0%	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%	26.7%	26.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
ROOSEVELT	10	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	80.0%	80.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
SAN JUAN	341	90.0%	0.9%	0.9%	0.0%	8.2%	7.3%	0.6%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%
SAN MIGUEL	45	82.2%	2.2%	2.2%	0.0%	13.3%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.2%
SANDOVAL	112	67.0%	0.0%	2.7%	0.0%	30.4%	25.9%	3.6%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%
SANTA FE	80	77.5%	1.3%	12.5%	0.0%	8.8%	5.0%	2.5%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%
SIERRA	11	72.7%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%	18.2%	18.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
SOCORRO	31	77.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	22.6%	22.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
TAOS	19	84.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	15.8%	10.5%	5.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
TORRANCE	23	91.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.7%	4.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.3%
UNION	8	87.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
VALENCIA	28	39.3%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	57.1%	28.6%	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	2350	82.7%	1.2%	1.0%	0.0%	15.1%	12.6%	1.7%	0.4%	0.0%	0.3%

DWI Cases Disposed For Calendar Year 2006

Magistrate Courts By Location

County	Total Cases	Total Convictions	Total Acquittals	Conditionally Discharged	Other Dispositions	Total Dismissed	Dismissed by Prosecutor	Dismissed by Court	Dismissed 6 Month Rule	Dismissed Failure To Appear	Other Dismissals
CATRON	43	69.8%	4.7%	0.0%	0.0%	25.6%	18.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.0%
CHAVES	189	69.3%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	30.2%	30.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
CIBOLA	333	67.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	32.1%	26.4%	1.8%	1.5%	0.0%	2.4%
COLFAX	64	79.7%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	18.8%	17.2%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
CURRY	301	63.5%	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%	34.2%	32.6%	0.3%	0.3%	0.0%	1.0%
DE BACA	9	66.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	11.1%	22.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
DONA ANA	1198	58.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	41.2%	40.6%	0.5%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%
EDDY	157	89.8%	3.2%	0.0%	0.6%	6.4%	5.1%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
GRANT	148	73.6%	1.4%	0.0%	2.0%	23.0%	15.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	6.8%
GUADALUPE	36	80.6%	0.0%	0.0%	2.8%	16.7%	13.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.8%
HARDING	5	80.0%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
HIDALGO	68	85.3%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	13.2%	8.8%	0.0%	2.9%	1.5%	0.0%
LEA	139	87.1%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	12.2%	11.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%
LINCOLN	169	80.5%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	18.3%	14.8%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	3.0%
LOS ALAMOS	16	43.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	56.3%	56.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
LUNA	115	77.4%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	20.9%	9.6%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	10.4%
MCKINLEY	866	72.9%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	26.8%	23.9%	0.9%	1.4%	0.2%	0.3%
MORA	24	50.0%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	45.8%	37.5%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
OTERO	155	89.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.0%	8.4%	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%
QUAY	67	80.6%	4.5%	0.0%	0.0%	14.9%	14.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
RIO ARRIBA	302	50.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	49.3%	38.7%	4.3%	1.0%	0.7%	4.6%
ROOSEVELT	136	87.5%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	11.8%	10.3%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.7%
SAN JUAN	719	83.9%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	15.4%	12.7%	2.2%	0.3%	0.0%	0.3%
SAN MIGUEL	257	84.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	15.6%	12.8%	1.9%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%
SANDOVAL	327	66.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	32.7%	18.7%	2.8%	3.1%	5.8%	2.4%
SANTA FE	693	60.8%	0.9%	0.0%	0.1%	38.2%	36.5%	0.3%	0.7%	0.0%	0.7%
SIERRA	78	74.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.6%	20.5%	0.0%	5.1%	0.0%	0.0%
SOCORRO	265	63.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	36.2%	30.6%	0.4%	0.4%	3.0%	1.9%
TAOS	174	51.7%	1.1%	0.0%	1.1%	46.0%	37.9%	5.2%	2.3%	0.0%	0.6%
TORRANCE	117	84.6%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	13.7%	11.1%	0.9%	0.9%	0.0%	0.9%
UNION	32	59.4%	3.1%	0.0%	0.0%	37.5%	37.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
VALENCIA	340	60.4%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	37.8%	18.5%	1.2%	1.2%	5.3%	11.7%
Total	7542	69.4%	0.8%	0.0%	0.1%	29.7%	25.3%	1.2%	0.8%	0.7%	1.6%