














# Senator Ken Salazar (D-CO)

NAM's Official 110th Congress Voting Record (Senate)		
Description	Preferred Position	This official's vote compared with the preferred position
<p>Energy Taxes. Vote on a procedural motion to limit debate and consider a \$32 billion energy tax package that would have renewed NAM-supported energy tax credits but also would have imposed more than \$30 billion of taxes on the U.S. oil and gas industry. Vote was 57-36, three votes shy of the 60 required under Senate rules to debate the bill, on June 21, 2007 (Roll No. 223). The NAM opposed the motion and the tax package, noting that it would discourage new oil and gas investments in the United States and result in higher energy costs for manufacturers. NAM POSITION: No.</p>	N	
<p>Energy Taxes, Electricity Mandates and Renewable Energy Tax Credits. Vote on a procedural motion to limit debate and move to final passage of energy bill H.R. 6. While the legislation included renewal of NAM supported energy efficiency language and renewable energy tax credits, it also would have created a federal renewable electricity mandate and levied billions of dollars of taxes on the domestic oil and gas industry. Vote was 53-42, seven votes shy of the 60 needed to debate the bill, on Dec. 7, 2007 (Roll No. 416). The NAM opposed the motion and the underlying bill, which would have resulted in higher energy costs for most manufacturers. NAM POSITION: No.</p>	N	
<p>Renewing Energy Tax Credits Without Tax Increases. Vote on the Ensign (R-NV)/Cantwell (D-WA) clean energy tax amendment, which would extend incentives for clean and renewable energy set to expire at the end of 2008 without burdensome tax increases on U.S. energy producers. Approved 88-8 on April 10, 2008 (Roll No. 95). The NAM supported the amendment, noting that the package of tax incentives represents an important step in securing our nation's energy security. NAM POSITION: Yes.</p>	Y	
<p>Expanding U.S. Energy Supplies. Vote on the McConnell (R-KY) energy amendment to flood insurance bill S. 2284. Rejected 56-42 on May 13, 2008 (Roll No. 123). The NAM supported the amendment, which would have begun to address U.S. energy supply needs by permitting environmentally safe energy development in the Outer Continental Shelf and the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, encouraging increased refinery capacity as well as commercial leasing of oil shale on federal lands. NAM POSITION: Yes.</p>	Y	

<p>Climate Change Mandates. Vote on a procedural motion to debate the Boxer (D-CA) Substitute to S. 3036, the Lieberman-Warner Climate Security Act. Vote was 48-36, 12 shy of the 60 required under Senate rules to debate the bill, on June 6, 2008 (Roll No. 145). The NAM opposed the procedural motion and the underlying bill, which would have mandated severe reductions in carbon emissions, resulting in millions of U.S. job losses, reductions in GDP and household income for most Americans and higher energy prices. NAM POSITION: No.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p></p>
<p>Windfall Profits Tax and Price Controls. Vote on a procedural motion to debate S. 3044, the "Consumer First Energy Act." Vote was 51-43, nine shy of the 60 required under Senate rules to debate the bill, on June 10, 2008 (Roll No. 146). The NAM opposed the procedural motion and the underlying bill, which included: a windfall profits tax; additional taxes on the domestic oil/gas industry; price controls/gouging language that would interfere with normal market forces; and ill-advised changes to U.S. antitrust law. NAM POSITION: No.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p></p>
<p><b>NAM's Official 109th Congress Voting Record (Senate)</b></p>		
<p>Description</p>	<p>Preferred Position</p>	<p>This official's vote compared with the preferred position</p>
<p>Prohibiting Oil/Gas Exploration in ANWR (Cantwell Amendment to the Budget Resolution) Vote on a Cantwell (D-WA) amendment to the FY 2006 Senate budget resolution that would have deleted legislative language permitting environmentally sound oil/gas exploration in Alaska's Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR). Amendment was rejected 51-49 on March 16, 2005 (Roll Number 52). The NAM opposed the amendment and strongly supports ANWR exploration, which provides the best opportunity to increase domestic production, decrease dependence on foreign oil and buy sufficient time for scientists, engineers and manufacturers to develop alternative energy sources. NAM POSITION: No.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p></p>
<p>Backdoor Implementation of Higher Fuel Efficiency Standards (Cantwell Amendment to Energy Bill H.R. 6) Vote on a Cantwell (D-WA) amendment to energy bill that would have required the U.S. to reduce dependence on foreign oil imports by 40 percent by 2025. Rejected 53-47 on June 16, 2004 (Roll No. 140). The NAM opposed the amendment, considering it to be a backdoor attempt at raising mandatory corporate average fuel economy standards. NAM POSITION: No.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p></p>

<p>Renewable Portfolio Standards (Bingaman Amendment to Energy Bill H.R. 6) Vote on a Bingaman (D-NM) amendment to energy bill H.R. 6 that would have required utilities to generate 10 percent of all electricity from renewable sources by 2025 or pay fees to the Energy Dept. Approved 52-48 on June 16 (Roll No. 141). The NAM opposed the renewable portfolio standard amendment, noting that its aggressive timetables were unrealistic for most regions of the country and would ultimately act as a tax on electricity for both consumers and industry. Provision was removed from the final energy bill by a House-Senate conference committee. NAM POSITION: No.</p>	<p>N</p>	
<p>Banning an Offshore Oil/Gas Resources Assessment (Nelson Amendment to Energy Bill H.R. 6) Vote on a Nelson (D-FL)/Martinez (R-FL) amendment to energy bill H.R. 6 that would have deleted bill language requiring the Interior Dept. to conduct a scientific inventory and analysis of oil and gas resources beneath the waters of the Outer Continental Shelf. Rejected 52-44 on June 21, 2005 (Roll. No. 143). The NAM opposed the amendment, which would have denied policymakers the scientific data needed to assess the nation's oil and gas supply. NAM Position: No.</p>	<p>N</p>	
<p>Mandatory Reductions in Greenhouse Gas Emissions (McCain/Lieberman amendment to energy bill H.R. 6) Vote on a McCain (R-AZ)/Lieberman (D-CT) amendment to energy bill H.R. 6 that would have imposed draconian limits on emissions of carbon and other greenhouse gas emissions, raising U.S. energy costs and increasing fuel switching from coal to natural gas. Rejected 60-38 on June 22, 2005 (Roll No. 148). NAM POSITION: No.</p>	<p>N</p>	
<p>Energy Policy Act (H.R. 6) Vote on final passage of energy bill H.R. 6. Approved 85-12 on June 28, 2005 (Roll No. 158). The NAM supported the legislation, which represents a major step toward achieving a long-term national energy policy that encourages voluntary energy efficiency initiatives, voluntary conservation, improvements to the energy infrastructure and increases in the supply of all sources of cost-effective renewable, alternative and conventional energy sources. Signed into law (P.L. 109-58) on Aug. 8, 2005. NAM POSITION: Yes.</p>	<p>Y</p>	
<p>Rescinding EPA's Clean Air Mercury Rule Vote on S.J. Res. 20, a resolution of disapproval to rescind EPA's Clean Air Mercury Rule. Rejected 51-47 on September 13, 2005 (Roll 225). The NAM opposed S.J. Res. 20 and urged senators to preserve the rule, which uses a market-oriented cap-and-trade program that allows industry the necessary flexibility to develop and implement appropriate pollution reduction technology while significantly reducing mercury emissions. NAM POSITION: No.</p>	<p>N</p>	

<p>Domestic Energy Development in the Outer Continental Shelf (S. 3711). Vote on final passage of S. 3711, legislation that would permit environmentally sound oil/gas development in key areas of the Eastern Gulf of Mexico. Approved 71-25 on August 1, 2006 (Roll No. 219). NAM POSITION: Yes.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
--	----------	--