To: Interested Parties
From: Global Strategy Group
Date: November 2026
Re: POLL RESULTS: New Mexico voters want strong methane rules for oil and gas producers

A recent poll of likely 2026 voters in New Mexico, conducted by Global Strategy Group on behalf of the Environmental Defense Fund, finds broad support for strong rules to curb methane emissions from upstream oil and gas producers. Voters see clear benefits for health, future generations, reducing waste, and holding oil and gas companies accountable. As a result, they would reward candidates who support these protections on the ballot.

Key Findings

New Mexico voters overwhelmingly support stricter standards for upstream methane emissions. 71% are in favor of strong rules to reduce methane emissions from the oil and gas industry, compared to just 28% who oppose them. 35% strongly support these rules.

Support crosses demographic and party lines. Majorities from every major demographic group are in favor of stronger methane protections, including nearly all Democrats (92% support), as well as most Independents (70%); Republicans are divided with 46% in support and 53% opposed. In addition, these rules are extremely popular among Hispanic and white voters (with and without a college degree).

Do you support or oppose your state adopting strong rules to reduce methane emissions from the oil and gas industry, including requiring regular inspections of low-producing oil and gas wells?

	Support	Oppose	NET
Overall	71%	28%	+43
Dem	92%	7%	+85
Ind	70%	30%	+40
Rep	46%	53%	-7
White College+	74%	22%	+52
White Non-College	72%	28%	+44
Hispanic	74%	25%	+49

Voters overwhelmingly believe that stronger rules will have wide-reaching benefits. They expect these rules to have the biggest positive impact on reducing waste (+55), protecting families' health (+45), oil and gas accountability (+44), and future generations (+40), in addition to smaller gains for the New Mexico economy (+9), long-term energy costs (+3) and the competitiveness of US producers (+4).

Impact of New Mexico Adopting Strong Rules To Reduce Methane Emissions

	Positive	Negative	NET
Reducing waste from the oil and gas industry	67%	12%	+55
Accountability for oil and gas companies	64%	20%	+44
The health of families like yours	60%	15%	+45
Future generations of your family	59%	19%	+40
New Mexico's economy	44%	35%	+9
The cost of energy in the long term	42%	39%	+3
The economic competitiveness of oil and gas producers	37%	33%	+4

Strong methane rules are a significant political winner – especially with center-right voters – giving policymakers cover to pursue ambitious standards. The Democratic candidate currently leads a generic ballot in New Mexico by 11 points (50% to 39%). However, when we refocus the ballot around these methane rules by pitting a *Democrat who supports strong methane rules* versus a *Republican who opposes them*, that lead increases to 20 points (55% to 35%) – a net gain of 9 points for a supportive Democrat. The gains are actually largest with self-identified Republican voters.

If the election for Congress were today, for which candidate would you vote?

	Overall	Dem	Ind	Rep
A Democrat who supports strong rules…	55%	96%	48%	12%
A Republican who opposes strong rules…	35%	2%	29%	83%
Net "Infused" Ballot	**+20**	**+94**	**+19**	**-71**
Net Generic Ballot	**+11**	**+93**	**+7**	**-90**
Lift	**+9**	**+1**	**+12**	**+19**

Support extends to specific policies and ambitious standards – even when we acknowledge the possibility of slightly higher costs. We tested six different proposals, including two variations of two of the proposals (see table below). All enjoyed over 60% support with most earning over 70%. A requirement that oil and gas companies reduce methane emissions from oil and gas wells earns the same high support whether it requires a reduction to "near zero" or a 75% reduction (76% and 73%, respectively).

% Support	Overall	Dem	Ind	Rep	White College	White Non-College	POC
Require oil and gas operators to use commercially-available technologies to measure methane emission levels at a random sample of their well sites.	79%	95%	77%	63%	84%	78%	78%
Require oil and gas companies to reduce methane emissions from oil and gas wells to near zero by 2035.	76%	94%	73%	56%	69%	81%	75%
Require oil and gas companies to reduce methane emissions from oil and gas wells by 75% by 2035.	73%	95%	69%	51%	77%	73%	71%
Require oil and gas companies that fail to reduce methane emissions from oil and gas wells to near zero to pay a fee, with the proceeds used to offset energy costs for low-income households and upgrade equipment that cuts pollution.	74%	92%	74%	50%	69%	76%	74%
Require power companies to purchase natural gas from companies that have reduced methane emissions from oil and gas wells to near-zero, as long as the price is about the same as other sources of natural gas.	73%	94%	72%	50%	79%	71%	73%
Require power companies to purchase natural gas from companies that have reduced methane emissions from oil and gas wells to near-zero, even if that means a slight increase in the cost of natural gas.	62%	87%	62%	31%	65%	59%	63%

A debate on low-producing wells shores up support for stronger methane rules. After hearing a balanced debate on low-producing wells, voters say that they are more likely to support strong rules by a 51% to 26% margin (+25). *Full text of arguments in appendix.*

Support for methane rules is extremely stable, even in the face of pointed arguments against these proposals. After a balanced debate, overall support holds at 71%, while strong support increases from 35% to 41%.

ABOUT THIS POLL

Global Strategy Group conducted a multi-channel survey of 600 likely 2026 voters in New Mexico between September 14-24, 2026. Of the 600 interviews, 123 were conducted by telephone, 138 via text invitation to online survey, and 339 via web-based panel. The survey has a margin of error of +/- 4.0 for the total New Mexico sample and is higher among subgroups. Care has been taken to ensure the geographic, political, and demographic divisions of the likely electorate are properly represented.

APPENDIX

Full Text of Methane Rules Debate Arguments

Supporters of these policies say... Methane pollution is eighty times more potent than carbon pollution and toxic pollution released alongside methane increases the risk of cancer and worsens heart disease and asthma attacks, especially in children and the elderly. What's more, methane is the primary ingredient of natural gas. Methane leaks cause billions of dollars' worth of natural gas to be wasted every year. At a time when families already feel squeezed by high energy prices, this waste makes no sense. There are proven, cost-effective solutions to drastically reduce this waste and pollution. Other states have already adopted strong protections to cut pollution which have increased production and created jobs without increasing costs for consumers.

Opponents of these policies say... Stricter regulations of methane emissions will hurt [STATE]'s economy, raise energy prices, and cost jobs. Requiring oil and gas operators to virtually eliminate methane emissions at oil and gas wells would set an unrealistic and enormously expensive standard that would reduce domestic energy production, cause smaller operators to close, eliminate tens of thousands of jobs, and cause energy prices to skyrocket for families and businesses. That would mean higher prices on groceries, gas, and electricity at a time when Americans are already struggling with the cost of living.

Full Text of Low-Producing Wells Arguments

(Some/Others) say rules to limit methane pollution should include regular inspections at low-producing wells because those wells are responsible for about 60% of all methane pollution, despite only accounting for 5% of the nation's oil and gas production. And about 80% of these wells are owned by larger companies that can afford to do regular inspections.

(Some/Others) say the rules to limit methane emissions should NOT apply to low-producing oil and gas wells because these new burdensome regulations will force mom-and-pop producers in your state to cut jobs and raise energy prices for consumers, harming local businesses and working families.