



Courtesy Saguaro Pictures at wikipedia.org



Arizona League of Conservation  Voters

Arizona Legislative

# SCORE CARD 2011

**50th State Legislature**  
1st Regular Session

**[www.azlcv.org](http://www.azlcv.org)**

*Arizona Conservation Voter*  
Volume 20, Number 1 Summer 2011



## In this Scorecard:

**Actions Used for Scoring**  
**4-9**

**Map of District Scores**  
**10-11**

**House Voting Tally**  
**12-15**

**Senate Voting Tally**  
**16-17**

**Redistricting in Arizona**  
**18**

**What's Next**  
**19**

**Legislator's 2011 & Lifetime Scores**  
**20**

## Dear Friends and Members,

In a word, the 2011 legislative session was a disappointment. Because of the disappointing results of the 2010 elections the AZLCV did not expect a top notch environmental session; however the 50th legislature exceeded even our expectations by attacking popular and successful federal environmental protections like the Endangered Species Act, the Clean Water Act and the Clean Air Act. These attacks attempted to create more loopholes for polluters in our state and did what they could to take us back to the bad old days of environmental disregard.

For the most part our legislature did what they did under the banner of economic development and growth. Their actions seemed to imply that a beautiful and sustainable Arizona is not a part of our economic recovery plan, they ignored the fact that tourism generates more dollars and jobs than the construction industry ever did and felt that the real answer was to deregulate, shrink government and cut services. Sadly, in this ideological fight about the role of government, our state environmental agencies, our state parks and the development of Arizona's vast tourism sector were caught in the crossfire. Once again our legislature ignored the fact that tourism is a major economic driver in Arizona. Even though tourism numbers are down in recent years, Arizona still plays host to 35 million visitors each year and almost half a million Arizona jobs are directly or secondarily dependent on tourism.

This year our state legislature, instead of working to revitalize tourism by protecting and re-opening our state parks or working to improve access to Arizona's scenic beauty and to improve the quality of life for all Arizonans, our legislature did exactly the opposite. The legislature shifted more money away from our parks, continued to neglect our environmental watchdog agencies and launched an unprecedented attack on successful and popular federal laws that protect our air, our water and the biodiversity of our state.

Among the bad bills this session was the Orwellian "Freedom to Breathe Act" (SB 1394) that directly attacks the federal Clean Air Act. There were bills to eliminate the Clean Water Act protections from most of Arizona's waterways, bills to remove the imperiled Mexican Grey Wolf from the Endangered Species List, a bill to allow hunting within cities (as close as ¼ mile from your home or business), more defunding of our state parks and much more. Fortunately the House of Representatives did not take up nearly as many bills as the Senate and many bills that passed the Senate were never heard in the House.

Arizona deserves better than this kind of leadership and we hope all of our members, friends and supporters use this legislative session as an opportunity to educate their friends, family, coworkers and neighbors about the important role that state government can play in building (or preventing) a sustainable Arizona. With redistricting happening this year all of us have a once-in-a-decade opportunity to shake things up at the legislature in next year's elections.

Thank you to all of our members, friends and supporters. Our work would not be possible without all of your support.

Sincerely,

Steven C Arnquist  
Executive Director

# Our Mission

**The Arizona League of Conservation Voters (AZLCV) is one of Arizona's largest statewide member-supported conservation groups.**

- ★ We work to protect our land, air, water and quality of life for all Arizonans, present and future.
- ★ We do this by electing pro-conservation leaders and advocating for good conservation policy.
- ★ We are non-partisan and non-profit, and our work includes:
  - ★ *Endorsing and working to elect pro-conservation candidates, including state legislators and statewide candidates including corporation commissioners,*
  - ★ *Educating elected officials and their constituents on conservation issues important to the AZLCV members,*
  - ★ *Lobbying on behalf of reasonable, common-sense conservation measures,*
  - ★ *Holding elected officials accountable for their performance with our annual Legislative Scorecard,*
  - ★ *Maintaining a political action committee (PAC) that supports pro-conservation candidates.*

**The Arizona League of Conservation Voters publishes an annual Scorecard following the legislative session. Contents are copyrighted, but articles may be reprinted provided credit is given to authors and the League.**

**Annual membership for the League begins at \$35. All members, if they choose, receive a hard copy of this Scorecard and regular email updates.**

**[www.azlcv.org](http://www.azlcv.org)**

**Contact us at [info@azlcv.org](mailto:info@azlcv.org) or**

**in Tucson: 738 N. Fifth Ave., Suite 218, 85705**

**in Phoenix: 825 N. Third Ave., 85003**

**Mailing address: PO Box 40154, Tucson AZ 85717**

## Arizona League of Conservation Voters

### Staff

Steve Arnquist

*Executive Director*

Melissa Ramsey

*Membership Coordinator*

*& Administrator*

### Board of Directors

Roselyn O'Connell, *President, Scottsdale*

Paul Burkhardt, *Vice President, Prescott*

Roberta Voss, *Secretary, Phoenix*

Michael Jette, *Treasurer, Tucson*

Tina Beattie, *Gilbert*

William Roe, *Tucson*

Scorecard design by Julie St. John

## 100% Honor Roll

### House of Representatives

Tom Chabin (D-2) – 100%  
Steve Farley (D-28) – 100%  
Ruben Gallego (D-16) – 100%  
Sally Ann Gonzales (D-27) – 100%  
Matt Heinz (D-29) – 100%  
Katie Hobbs (D-15) – 100%  
Eric Meyer (D-11) – 100%  
Catherine Miranda (D-16) – 100%  
Daniel Patterson (D-29) – 100%  
Macario Saldate IV (D-27) – 100%  
Anna Tovar (D-13) – 100%

### Senate

Linda Lopez (D-29) – 100%  
David Schapira (D-17) – 100%  
Kyrsten Sinema (D-15) – 100%

### Top Scoring District:

LD 29 – 100% Represented by Senator Linda Lopez, Representative Daniel Patterson, & Representative Matt Heinz

## Top Scorers

### House Democrats

Debbie McCune Davis (D-14) – 94%  
Lela Alston (D-15) – 93%  
Ben Arredondo (D-17) – 93%  
Bruce Wheeler (D-28) – 92%

### Senate Democrats

Steve Gallardo (D-13) – 96%  
Olivia Cajero Bedford (D-27) – 95%  
Jack Jackson Jr. (D-2) – 95%  
Paula Aboud (D-28) – 95%  
Robert Meza (D-14) – 90%

### House Republicans

Bob Robson (R-20) – 31%

### Senate Republicans

Linda Gray (R-10) – 23%



## Bottom Scorers

### House of Representatives

Debbie Lesko (R-9) – 4%  
Brenda Barton (R-5) – 4%  
Steve Court (R-18) – 4%  
Andrew Tobin (R-1) – 4%

### Senate

Sylvia Allen (R-5) – 0%  
Frank Antenori (R-30) – 0%  
Scott Bundgaard (R-4) – 0%  
Lori Klein (R-6) – 0%  
Al Melvin (R-26) – 0%  
Don Shooter (R-24) – 0%



## Averages

**House Average Score: 39%**

Democrats: 95% — Republicans: 12%

**Senate Average Score: 33%**

Democrats: 94% — Republicans: 7%

# Actions Used for Scoring



Each legislator's score is based on his or her total pro-conservation votes over the course of the session. Measures are weighed according to their importance, and no credit is given for missing votes. However, members are not penalized for excused absences (as recorded on the official attendance sheet for each chamber on the day of the vote). In all cases, the scores are based on the final vote each measure receives in either chamber.

The League gives "extra credit" to legislators who sponsor positive legislation (prime-prime sponsors only). For each good measure introduced, the legislator receives an extra percentage point added to his or her final score. For measures that actually become law, two percentage points are added. On the other hand, those who sponsor anti-conservation or anti-public-participation legislation have one percentage point deducted from their final score for each measure introduced and two points deducted if the measure becomes law. Final scores are capped at 0 and 100 percent.

## HB 2114 NOW: Fish eradication; moratorium; study committee

(Stevens) This bill would have put a one year moratorium on non-native fish eradication in Sonoita Creek and would have set up a study committee to examine fish eradication methods using piscicides. This was an attempt by legislators to hinder native fish recovery using methods that have been shown to be successful. Although these methods use piscicides such as Rotenone and Antimycin A to eradicate non-native fish species, these chemicals break down easily. There are much larger risks to our water such as pollution and misuse from mines, pollution from water treatment plants, pesticide pollution and overuse. Fortunately common sense prevailed in the House of Representatives and this billed ultimately failed.

**A "NO" vote is a green vote. Weight: 4**

**Passed Senate 19-9-2:**  
April 12, 2011

**Defeated in House 10-50:** April 19, 2011

## HB 2264 Home sales; water supply disclosure

(Ableser) This bill was one of the few pieces of pro-conservation legislation introduced in 2011 that made it through committee to reach the floor. HB 2264 mandates the disclosure of water supply status by a subdivider and requires a statement of water supply status to be recorded with the county if the subdivision is outside of an active management area. This bill is good for consumer protection and water conservation efforts in Arizona, and it passed the House of Representatives but unfortunately did not get a hearing in the Senate.

**A "YES" vote is a green vote. Weight: 3**

**Passed House 41-18-1:**  
March 17, 2011

**Held in Senate**

## HB 2397 NOW: Taxes; sale of trust lands

(Jones) This bill takes aim at the state lands that are slated to be included in the Petrified Forest National Park under the Petrified Forest National Park Expansion Act of 2004. The state land parcels in the expansion were closed to mineral development by the State Land Commissioner when the expansion act passed. This bill allows the current Commissioner to offer mineral exploration permits at public auction on state lands that had been closed to mineral development by the previous Commissioner's order or on state land which a permit or mineral lease has been cancelled, terminated or not renewed by a lessee. Mining should not be happening inside of the expanded boundaries of one of the 58 national parks in the nation.

**A "NO" vote is a green vote. Weight: 6**

**Passed House 39-19-2:**  
April 20, 2011

**Passed Senate 19-11:**  
April 20, 2011

**Signed into law by Governor:** April 27, 2011

## HB 2707 General fund revenue limit

(Lesko, Court, Fann, et al.) This bill could spell disaster not only for conservation but for Arizona. Essentially, it requires the state of Arizona to keep general fund revenues at current low levels forever and could only increase because of changes in population and inflation. We know that current Arizona revenues are already too low right now (they are amongst the lowest in the nation per capita), our environmental watchdog agencies continue to suffer from lack of money, our state parks are on the verge of collapse and our public schools and universities are underfunded. This bill would ensure that these anemic revenue levels continue for the foreseeable future. Lawmakers in Arizona have complained for years that their hands were tied by voter spending mandates and inflexible budgets, and this bill would have completely tied the hands of the legislature to make future changes in the state's budget size. If this bill would have based revenue levels from a normal year it might have been less objectionable but basing them on next year's tattered budget is ludicrous.

**A "NO" vote is a green vote. Weight: 7**

**Passed Senate 19-11:**  
April 19, 2011

**Passed House 38-22:**  
April 19, 2011

**Vetoed by Governor:**  
April 28, 2011

## HCM 2002 Remove gray wolf; endangered species

(Weiers, Pierce, Fann, et al.) HCM 2002 asks Congress to remove the Gray Wolf from the endangered species list. Wolf listing, delisting and management should be in the hands of biologists and ecologists who have the background to recommend such actions. Our wildlife management should not be politicized, and this memorial is as short sighted as many of our legislators were this year.

**A "NO" vote is a green vote. Weight: 5**

**Passed House 39-20-1:**  
March 9, 2011

**Passed Senate 21-9:**  
April 20, 2011

**Transmitted to the Secretary of State**

## SB 1171 Cities; acquisition of wastewater utility

(Antenori, Griffin, Melvin, et al.) This bill is an attempt by legislators to allow Marana control and rights to their wastewater. Although this bill may seem benign on the surface, it causes problems for Pima County's regional planning efforts. Marana has an unrealistic projection of their regional growth for the next five years, even though it is evident that there is currently not much growth happening in Arizona. To sustain and allow this growth, Marana needs to show that it has a 100-year water supply, but they cannot show that unless they control their sewage and effluent. This is a misguided attempt to create mismanaged growth and bad public policy.

**A "NO" vote is a green vote. Weight: 5**

**Passed Senate 23-6-1:**  
February 8, 2011

**Passed House 36-23-1:**  
April 11, 2011

**Signed into law by Governor:** April 18, 2011

## SB 1334 Hunting within city limits

(Antenori, Nelson, Gowan, et al.) This bill encapsulates the old wild west theme of our state legislature this year. SB 1334 prohibits political subdivisions from enacting any ordinance or regulation that would prohibit hunting in populated areas. This bill allows hunting in incorporated areas up to ¼ mile from homes and other occupied structures.

**A "NO" vote is a green vote. Weight: 5**

**Passed House 41-17-2:**  
April 18, 2011

**Passed Senate 21-9:**  
April 19, 2011

**Signed into law by Governor:** April 29, 2011

# Actions Used for Scoring continued

## **SB 1339 Administrative rules; repeal; legislative action**

**A "NO" vote is a green vote. Weight: 5**

**Defeated in Senate 11-17-2:** March 14, 2011

(Antenori, Gowan, Montenegro, et al.) Privatization advocates would benefit from this legislation. This bill would repeal any agency's administrative ruling that impacts the private sector. Agencies would be prohibited from adopting rules that impact the private sector according to this bill. In addition to the obvious far reaching implications of this bill, it would have also had disturbing effects on our state parks, especially as many legislators are supporting privatization of our parks. Fortunately this bill was defeated in the Senate this year.

## **SB 1392 Mexican gray wolf; interstate compact**

**A "NO" vote is a green vote. Weight: 7**

**Passed Senate 21-8-1:** March 1, 2011

**Held in House**

(Allen, Griffin) This bill would have attempted to put the protection and management of the Mexican gray wolf under the authority of the Arizona Game and Fish Commission and allow the Governor to enter an interstate compact for its management. The Mexican gray wolf is protected under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) and should remain so. Species protection should not be done by the states both because threatened and endangered species need consistent policy across state lines and because Arizona does not have the expertise and simply cannot afford to manage the wolf. This is one of several attempts by the legislature to remove the strong protection of the ESA for this ecologically important species and could open the door for the removal of future species protections.

## **SB 1393 Greenhouse emissions; legislative authority**

**A "NO" vote is a green vote. Weight: 7**

**Passed Senate 21-8-1:** March 1, 2011

**Held in House**

(Allen) In this bill and in SB 1394, the state legislature attempts to assert the power to control our air quality standards. Had this bill passed, the legislature would be in control of anthropogenic emissions of CO<sub>2</sub>, other greenhouse gases, and particulates including PM-10 and PM-2.5. This bill and SB 1394 are direct attempts from the legislature to remove the strong protections of the Clean Air Act. Scientists should be making these decisions, not politicians.

## **SB 1394 Greenhouse substances; freedom to breathe**

**A "NO" vote is a green vote. Weight: 8**

**Passed Senate 21-8-1:** March 1, 2011

**Held in House**

(Allen) This legislation, coupled with SB 1393, is the legislature's attempt to eliminate pollution standards set by the Clean Air Act. Some members of the state legislature seem to believe that they are more qualified to regulate greenhouse gases (GHGs) than scientists and other experts and feel that they should be the final authority over what types of pollution are emitted. SB 1394 defines "*freedom to breathe laws*" which protect and guarantee the freedom or right to engage in air pollution and preserve for the legislature the exclusive power to regulate the intrastate emission of anthropogenic carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) or other greenhouse substances produced by biological, mechanical or chemical processes, including refuse and agricultural operations.

## **SB 1433 Federal legislation; state nullification**

(Klein, Burges, Harper, et al.) This bill would have established a joint legislative committee on nullification of federal laws consisting of the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and six additional members of each chamber. Had this “*a la carte* federal government” bill passed, the committee could recommend, propose and call for a vote to nullify any federal law that the committee opposed or found inconvenient. Along with all of the attacks on the Endangered Species Act, the Clean Air Act, and the Clean Water Act, this bill was just bad policy to an extreme.

**A “NO” vote is a green vote. Weight: 8**

**Defeated in Senate  
12-18:** March 8, 2011

## **SB 1517 Transmission lines; siting**

(Melvin) This bill would have limited public involvement in transmission line siting in Arizona and would have allowed the Arizona Corporation Commission (ACC) to exclude its line-siting committee from review of proposed interstate power lines through Arizona. The line-siting committee makes recommendations to the ACC on major power lines. This bill ultimately died because it limited public involvement, infringed on property rights and local control, and was backed by lobbyists who advocated for a major interstate power line to run through crucial habitat in Arizona. SB 1517 was bottom line bad public policy and it deservedly died in the House.

**A “NO” vote is a green vote. Weight: 7**

**Defeated in House  
14-40-6:** April 18, 2011

## **SB 1525 City; town; development fees**

(Pearce, Allen, Driggs, et al.) This bill makes various changes to statutes relating to municipal development fees, and restricts developer impact fees to “necessary public services” which are defined as water and wastewater facilities, roads, flood control structure and police and fire services. This will increase the financial burden of municipalities, causing the tax-paying community to pay for other municipal improvements not listed as “necessary public services”. This legislation is one more burden on the taxpayer rather than the developer who profits from the home building. This is bad legislation that only serves very specific stakeholders.

**A “NO” vote is a green vote. Weight: 6**

**Passed House 41-18-1:**  
April 19, 2011

**Passed Senate 20-10:**  
April 19, 2011

**Signed into law by  
Governor:** April 26, 2011

## **SB 1546 Eminent domain on federal property**

(Melvin) There are reasons why Al Melvin (R-26) made the national LCV’s state representative dirty dozen list. He sponsors outrageous legislation such as this. This bill stipulates that property possessed by the U.S. government may be taken by the state through eminent domain unless the property was acquired by the federal government with the consent of the Legislature or the property is Indian land. It seems as if he is asking that we be in court with the federal government continuously. Our tax dollars should be going to more worthy causes and not to seizing federal land in Arizona.

**A “NO” vote is a green vote. Weight: 5**

**Passed House 39-20-1:**  
April 19, 2011

**Passed Senate 21-9:**  
April 19, 2011

**Signed into law by  
Governor:** April 29, 2011

# Actions Used for Scoring *continued*

## **SB 1548 Nuclear fuel recycling; school funding**

**A “NO” vote is a green vote. Weight: 7**

**Passed Senate 20-9-1:**  
March 22, 2011

**Held in House**

(Melvin) This bill attempts to fund our schools through fees collected from a newly established Nuclear Recycling Public School Fund. Although the legislature had many issues with the federal government this year, some members of the legislature thought it would be a good idea to work with the federal government to establish a nuclear waste processing plant. Under this legislation, the federal government must pay for the development of such a facility, and the operation must be a joint venture between the federal government, the state and a private entity. The state would then charge the federal government fees per unit of fuel sent to this facility, and these fees would go straight to the schools. Not only do Arizonans not want to be the nuclear waste capitol of the west but we should not tie our school funding to such a volatile revenue source. This bill was held in the House, so before you exhale a sigh of relief or keel over with laughter at the outrageousness of this bill — remember that we may see it again next year.

## **SB 1612 NOW: 2011-2012; general appropriations**

**A “NO” vote is a green vote. Weight: 6**

**Passed House 40-19-1:**  
April 1, 2011

**Passed Senate 21-8-1:**  
April 1, 2011

**Signed into law by Governor:** April 6, 2011

(Biggs, Klein, Pierce, et al.) This year, the Senate hastily passed a budget in 30 hours for fiscal year 2011-2012. In addition to the environmentally short-sighted and irresponsible bills that had already been introduced this year, the budget made no concessions for fiscal support for our environmental and land agencies and further damaged our state park system. The budget for FY 2011-12 permanently reduces the funding for the Water Quality Assurance Revolving Fund program from \$15 million per year to \$7 million per year, eliminates the state General Fund appropriation of up to \$5 million to the Arizona Water Protection Fund, and includes provisions to make the ADEQ and Dept. of Water Resources totally fee based. Worst of all, this budget sweeps the State Parks Enhancement Fund of over \$2 million. This \$2 million is fees that we all pay to use the parks, and these fees should be going back to the parks to maintain them and keep them open!

## **SB 1624 NOW: Budget reconciliation; environment; 2011-2012**

**A “NO” vote is a green vote. Weight: 6**

**Passed House 40-19-1:**  
April 1, 2011

**Passed Senate 21-8-1:**  
April 1, 2011

**Signed into law by Governor:** April 6, 2011

(Biggs, Pierce, Murphy, et al.) This is another budget bill that is damaging to State Parks. It requires the State Parks Board to issue a request for proposals for the private operation of some or all state parks. The Board shall “award” a contract to a private entity to manage at least one state park that operated at a net profit for FY 2010-2011 and at least one state park that had expenditures in excess of revenues for FY 2010-2011 or was closed for any part or all of FY 2010-2011. These proposals must be submitted by October 1, 2011 and the State Parks Board must award a contract by February 1, 2012.

## SCM 1007 State lands; mining; exploration

(Melvin) The legislature is asking the US Department of Interior to refrain from withdrawing Arizona lands from new mining claims and exploration in this concurrent memorial. They are also asking that the BLM and Forest Service not limit the public's access to public lands under their respective jurisdictions for mining, grazing, recreation or other uses. Finally, the legislature is asking that the Secretary of Interior not to take these lands from state jurisdiction, which would prevent the state from having control over these lands and resources. Basically, this is just a letter to the federal government asking that they not get involved in the legislature's plans to mine where they want to mine.

**A "NO" vote is a green vote. Weight: 4**

**Passed Senate 21-8-1:**  
March 1, 2011

**Passed House 41-17-2:**  
April 13, 2011

**Transmitted to the Secretary of State**

## SCR 1024 Intrastate water resources; state sovereignty

(Griffin) This is an all-out attack on the Clean Water Act. SCR1024 refers to the voters the question of whether to allow the legislature to "assert the continued sovereignty and jurisdiction of the states to regulate intrastate water resources and oppose any attempt by the federal government to diminish this jurisdiction unnecessarily." Basically this resolution seeks to eliminate the Clean Water Act from almost all of Arizona's rivers.

**A "NO" vote is a green vote. Weight: 8**

**Passed Senate 20-9-1:**  
February 28, 2011

**Passed House 40-18-2:**  
April 13, 2011

**Transmitted to the Secretary of State**

## SCR 1033 Best available control technology; generation

(Allen) This resolution would refer to the ballot the question of urging the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality to issue PSD permits for new coal fueled electricity plants, to act "expeditiously" to develop these facilities and to consider using clean coal technologies. PSD permits are "Prevention of Significant Deterioration" permits and are given to structures that emit pollutants in attainment areas. Clean coal is a very deceptive term. Mining and burning coal is dirty energy, and coal fired plants are the biggest emitters of CO<sub>2</sub>. This bill harms Arizona's air quality, and we should be passing legislation that moves us towards true clean energy.

**A "NO" vote is a green vote. Weight: 6**



**Passed House 39-20-1:**  
April 19, 2011



**Passed Senate 21-9:**  
April 19, 2011

**Transmitted to the Secretary of State**



# Map of District Scores





# House voting tally & COMMITTEE SCORES

The AZLCV scores are based on floor votes, and not votes taken in committee. However, it is important that we understand the makeup of the committees to which a majority of bills dealing with our natural environment are sent for consideration. Here are snapshots of three House committees that are especially important to conservation.

## House Environment


Member	Party	District	Score
Amanda Reeve (chair)	R	6	8%
Karen Fann (vice chair)	R	1	12%
Heather Carter	R	7	13%
Chester Crandell	R	5	13%
Frank Pratt	R	23	8%
Ed Ableser	D	17	86%
Lela Alston	D	15	93%

**Committee Average Score: 33%**

## House Energy & Natural Resources

Member	Party	District	Score
Frank Pratt (chair)	R	23	8%
Kate Brophy McGee (vice chair)	R	11	8%
Brenda Barton	R	5	4%
Karen Fann	R	1	12%
Peggy Judd	R	25	12%
Amanda Reeve	R	6	8%
Daniel Patterson	D	29	100%
Macario Saldate	D	27	100%
Bruce Wheeler	D	28	92%

**Committee Average Score: 38%**



Courtesy Averette wikipedia.org

## Scorecard Key

- ✓ = Pro-environment vote
- ✗ = Anti-environment vote
- NV = Not voting (counts against score)
- EA = Excused absence (does not count against score)

## Scorecard Bills


A Green Vote is:  
Weight:

REPRESENTATIVE	Score	Party
Ableser	86%	D
Adams	5%	R
Alston	93%	D
Arredondo	93%	D
Ash	12%	R
Barton	4%	R
Brophy McGee	8%	R
Burges	13%	R
Campbell	86%	D
Carter	13%	R
Chabin	100%	D
Court	4%	R
Crandell	13%	R
Dial	8%	R
Fann	12%	R
Farley	100%	D
Farnsworth	13%	R
Fillmore	23%	R
Forese	13%	R
Gallego	100%	D
Gonzales	100%	D
Goodale	17%	R
Gowan	8%	R
Gray	13%	R
Hale	85%	D
Harper	5%	R
Heinz	100%	D
Hobbs	100%	D
Jones	21%	R
Judd	12%	R

CONTINUED NEXT PAGE

HB2114 NOW: Fish eradication; moratorium; study committee  
 HB2264 Home sales; water supply disclosure  
 HB2397 NOW: Taxes; sale of trust lands  
 HB2707 General fund revenue limit  
 HCM2002 Remove gray wolf; endangered species  
 SB1171 Cities; acquisition of wastewater utility  
 SB1334 Hunting within city limits  
 SB1517 Transmission lines; siting  
 SB1525 City; town; development fees  
 SB1546 Eminent domain on federal property  
 SB1612 NOW: 2011-2012; general appropriations  
 SB1624 NOW: 2011-2012; general appropriations  
 SCM1007 State lands; mining; exploration  
 SCR1024 Intrastate water resources; state sovereignty  
 SCR1033 Best available control technology; generation

	N 4	Y 3	N 6	N 7	N 5	N 5	N 5	N 7	N 6	N 5	N 6	N 6	N 4	N 8	N 6
✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	EA	NV	NV	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	NV	NV	✓
✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
✓	EA	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	NV	NV	✓	✓	✓	✓
✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗



Courtesy chensiyuan at wikipedia.org

# House voting tally

## & COMMITTEE SCORES continued

### House Agriculture & Water

Member	Party	District	Score
Russ Jones (chair)	R	24	21%
Chester Crandell (vice chair)	R	5	13%
Brenda Barton	R	5	4%
Kate Brophy McGee	R	11	8%
Peggy Judd	R	25	12%
Steve Urie	R	22	9%
Catherine Miranda	D	16	100%
Ruben Gallego	D	16	100%
Lynne Pancrazi	D	24	82%

**Committee Average Score: 39%**

### Scorecard Key

- ✓ = Pro-environment vote
- ✗ = Anti-environment vote
- NV = Not voting (counts against score)
- EA = Excused absence (does not count against score)

### Scorecard Bills

A Green Vote is:

Weight:

#### REPRESENTATIVE

Kavanagh	17%	R
Lesko	4%	R
McCune Davis	94%	D
McLain	30%	R
Mesnard	18%	R
Meyer	100%	D
Miranda, Catherine	100%	D
Miranda, Richard	84%	D
Montenegro	5%	R
Olson	5%	R
Pancrazi	82%	D
Patterson	100%	D
Pratt	8%	R
Proud	5%	R
Reeve	8%	R
Robson	31%	R
Saldade	100%	D
Seel	13%	R
Smith	13%	R
Stevens	7%	R
Tobin	4%	R
Tovar	100%	D
Ugenti	8%	R
Urie	9%	R
Vogt	8%	R
Weiers, Jerry	15%	R
Weiers, Jim	8%	R
Wheeler	92%	D
Williams	8%	R
Yee	17%	R

Courtesy Christian Mehlführer wikipedia.org





# Senate voting tally & COMMITTEE SCORES

The AZLCV scores are based on floor votes, and not votes taken in committee. However, it is important that we understand the makeup of the committees to which a majority of bills dealing with our natural environment are sent for consideration. Here are snapshots of two Senate committees that are especially important to conservation.

## Senate Natural Resources & Transportation

Member	Party	District	Score
John Nelson (chair)	R	12	15%
Steve Pierce (vice chair)	R	1	11%
Gail Griffin	R	25	2%
Don Shooter	R	24	0%
Olivia Cajero Bedford	D	27	95%
Jack Jackson, Jr.	D	2	95%

**Committee Average Score: 36%**

## Senate Commerce & Energy

Member	Party	District	Score
Al Melvin (chair)	R	26	0%
Gail Griffin (vice chair)	R	25	2%
Adam Driggs	R	11	11%
Michele Reagan	R	8	12%
Steve Yarbrough	R	21	11%
Olivia Cajero Bedford	D	27	95%
Robert Meza	D	14	90%

**Committee Average Score: 32%**



Courtesy Finetooth wikipedia.org

## Scorecard Key

- ✓ = Pro-environment vote
- ✗ = Anti-environment vote
- NV = Not voting (counts against score)
- EA = Excused absence (does not count against score)


## Scorecard Bills

A Green Vote is:  
Weight:

SENATOR	Weight	Party
Aboud	95%	D
Allen	0%	R
Antenori	0%	R
Barto	11%	R
Biggs	1%	R
Bundgaard	0%	R
Cajero Bedford	95%	D
Crandall	17%	R
Driggs	11%	R
Gallardo	96%	D
Gould	5%	R
Gray	23%	R
Griffin	2%	R
Jackson	95%	D
Klein	0%	R
Landrum-Taylor	77%	D
Lopez	100%	D
McComish	17%	R
Melvin	0%	R
Meza	90%	D
Murphy	5%	R
Nelson	15%	R
Pearce	3%	R
Pierce	11%	R
Reagan	12%	R
Schapira	100%	D
Shooter	0%	R
Sinema	100%	D
Smith	5%	R
Yarbrough	11%	R

HB2114 NOW: Fish eradication; moratorium; study committee  
 HB2397 NOW: Taxes; sale of trust lands  
 HB2707 General fund revenue limit  
 HCM2002 Remove gray wolf; endangered species  
 SB1171 Cities; acquisition of wastewater utility  
 SB1334 Hunting within city limits  
 SB1339 Administrative rules; repeal; legislative action  
 SB1392 Mexican gray wolf; interstate compact  
 SB1393 Greenhouse emissions; legislative authority  
 SB1394 Greenhouse substances; freedom to breathe  
 SB1433 Federal legislation; state nullification  
 SB1525 City; town; development fees  
 SB1546 Eminent domain on federal property  
 SB1612 NOW: Nuclear fuel recycling; school funding  
 SB1624 NOW: 2011-2012; general appropriations  
 SCM1007 State lands; mining; exploration  
 SCR1024 Intrastate water resources; environment; 2011-2012  
 SCR1033 Best available control technology; generation

N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
4	6	7	5	5	5	5	7	7	8	8	6	5	7	6	6	4	8	6
✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	EA	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
NV	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
EA	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	EA	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗



Courtesy Pam Sponholtz USFWS

# Redistricting in Arizona by Steve Arnquist

**“He who controls redistricting can control Congress.” — Karl Rove**

Once every ten years, following the census, every state in the nation redraws congressional and legislative districts to reflect the ever changing demographics of our great nation and the changing demographics within a state. For years, the population of the United States has been slowly shifting from east to west. As a result the East Coast, Midwestern and Rust Belt states lost 12 seats in congress (and thus votes in the electoral college) while Western states and states with growing Latino populations gained 12 seats in Congress.

In most states, redistricting is a purely partisan exercise in which the state legislature draws and approves the new legislative and congressional districts. It is easy to see the problem with politicizing the redistricting process and, thankfully, forward thinking Arizonans revamped Arizona’s process over a decade ago. Arizona’s redistricting process is unlike most states in that we have an Independent Redistricting Commission. This five member team (2 Republicans, 2 Democrats and an Independent chairperson) creates the new maps without input from politicians.

This year much of the conversation about redistricting has been focused around the concept of “competitive districts” with many organizations and individuals pushing hard for competition while others dismiss it as impossible. Competition is among the 6 constitutionally mandated criteria for redrawing Arizona’s political maps along with Voting Rights Act Considerations (minority-majority districts), Equal Population, Compactness, and Respect for Geographic, City and Town Boundaries.

Competition was largely ignored in the 2001-2002 process, leaving Arizona with only 3 out of 30 competitive legislative districts and only two out of 9 competitive congressional districts. But what does the lack of competitive districts really mean for Arizona? It means that in many districts the November election is just a formality to rubber stamp that party’s nominee,

so the real election is in the primary, in which as few as 4,000 voters essentially choose the representative for 210,000 Arizonans. It also means that nearly 1,700,000 Arizona voters never really get to vote for a viable candidate who espouses their values (Democratic voters in Republican districts, Republican voters in Democratic districts and all of Independent voters). Non-competitive districts also tend to elect more extreme candidates as the party faithful often nominate an extremist who would be unlikely to win a competitive general election. Perhaps the worst thing about non-competitive elections is exactly that, the lack of competition. Americans believe that policy improves when it is debated vigorously and non-competitive districts stifle that debate and turn legislatures into deeply partisan hate chambers with few, if any, real debates on matters of substance. Non-competitive districts also create legislative chambers that do not resemble the people they were elected to serve. For example our state legislature wrote and put Proposition 301, which would have raided the voter approved Land Conservation Fund, on the ballot in November with the support of 60% of the legislature, many of whom actively campaigned for it. On election day, only 25% of Arizonans voted for it, this is clearly a legislature out of touch with the people of Arizona.

Many people say that you simply cannot redistrict and create more than 3 competitive legislative districts but that is simply untrue, and some experts say we could have as many as 12 competitive legislative districts and 4 competitive congressional districts in Arizona. In my first, very amateur, attempt at district drawing, I did not even look at party affiliation or competition (focusing instead at the other 5 criteria mentioned above) and ended up with 6 truly competitive legislative districts with another 4 that were reasonably competitive. Imagine that, doing the impossible without even trying!

*To learn more about redistricting visit the Arizona Competitive Districts Coalition at [azredistricting.com](http://azredistricting.com).*

# What's Next?

So now you know who was good and bad on the environment this year. What can you do next?

## Vote for environmentally responsible candidates!

Our environment needs to be a top priority for voters and our representatives: We need strong green representation at the state capitol to push legislation that will protect our air and water and preserve our land and the natural heritage that is the reason that so many of us choose to live in Arizona.

## Join or renew your membership.

Basic membership is \$35 but consider an additional gift to support our work. Many of our members choose to contribute monthly, consider supporting the league every month with a contribution of \$10, \$25 or even \$50 per month.

Renew your membership or become a monthly donor instantly online at <http://azlcv.org> and click on **Donate Now**

Or mail a check to: AZLCV, P.O. Box 40154, Tucson, AZ 85717

## Follow us...

on Twitter at [www.twitter.com/azlcv](http://www.twitter.com/azlcv) and on Facebook at [www.facebook.com/azlcv](http://www.facebook.com/azlcv) for regular updates and news.

## Share...

what you know about environmental candidates, legislation and the AZLCV with your friends, family and neighbors. As we reach more concerned Arizonans our voice becomes stronger. Join our E-Action Alert list by emailing [mramsey@azlcv.org](mailto:mramsey@azlcv.org) and encourage your friends to do the same!

## Sign up 5 friends...

as new League members or host a house party to tell your friends about our work. Call Melissa Ramsey in Tucson (520) 622-2819 for more information.

## Volunteer...

to walk neighborhoods with the AZLCV or in support of environmentally responsible candidates.



## Here's a new member for the Arizona League of Conservation Voters!

Enclosed is my contribution\* of:  \$1,000  \$500  \$250  \$100  \$50  \$35

I would like to help even more by making a payment of \$\_\_\_\_\_ per month on my credit card.

Method of payment:  Check (please make payable to AZLCV)  Credit card


Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
City/State/Zip: \_\_\_\_\_  
Phone/Email: \_\_\_\_\_

Credit card no.: \_\_\_\_\_  
Type: \_\_\_\_\_ Exp. Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Please mail form & payment to:

**AZLCV, PO Box 40154, Tucson AZ 85717**

**\*Contributions to the Arizona League of Conservation Voters are NOT tax deductible due to our lobbying efforts.**



# 50<sup>th</sup> Legislature Members & Scores: 2011 & Lifetime

	2011	Life		2011	Life		2011	Life
<b>District 1</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>District 11</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>District 21</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>23%</b>
Sen. Steve Pierce <i>Prescott</i>	11%	16%	Sen. Adam Driggs <i>Phoenix</i>	11%	43%	Sen. Steven Yarbrough <i>Chandler</i>	11%	39%
Rep. Andrew Tobin <i>Paulden</i>	4%	46%	Rep. Kate Brophy McGee <i>Phoenix</i>	8%	8%	Rep. Tom Forese <i>Gilbert</i>	13%	13%
Rep. Karen Fann <i>Prescott</i>	12%	12%	Rep. Eric Meyer <i>Paradise Valley</i>	100%	95%	Rep. Javan "J.D." Mesnard <i>Chandler</i>	17%	17%
<b>District 2</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>District 12</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>District 22</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>14%</b>
Sen. Jack Jackson Jr. <i>Window Rock</i>	95%	92%	Sen. John Nelson <i>Litchfield Park</i>	15%	44%	Sen. Andy Biggs <i>Gilbert</i>	1%	18%
Rep. Albert Hale <i>Window Rock</i>	85%	82%	Rep. Jerry Weiers <i>Glendale</i>	15%	39%	Rep. Eddie Farnsworth <i>Gilbert</i>	13%	16%
Rep. Tom Chabin <i>Flagstaff</i>	100%	98%	Rep. Steve Montenegro <i>Avondale</i>	5%	23%	Rep. Steve Urie <i>Gilbert</i>	9%	9%
<b>District 3</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>District 13</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>District 23</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>20%</b>
Sen. Ron Gould <i>Lake Havasu City</i>	5%	9%	Sen. Steve Gallardo <i>Phoenix</i>	96%	99%	Sen. Steve Smith <i>Maricopa</i>	5%	5%
Rep. Doris Goodale <i>Kingman</i>	17%	28%	Rep. Anna Tovar <i>Tolleson</i>	100%	100%	Rep. John Fillmore <i>Apache Junction</i>	23%	23%
Rep. Nancy McLain <i>Bullhead City</i>	30%	40%	Rep. Richard Miranda <i>Tolleson</i>	84%	91%	Rep. Frank Pratt <i>Casa Grande</i>	8%	32%
<b>District 4</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>District 14</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>District 24</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>42%</b>
Sen. Scott Bundgaard <i>Peoria</i>	0%	12%	Sen. Robert Meza <i>Phoenix</i>	90%	92%	Sen. Don Shooter <i>Yuma</i>	0%	0%
Rep. Judy Burges <i>Skull Valley</i>	13%	20%	Rep. Chad Campbell <i>Phoenix</i>	86%	97%	Rep. Lynne Pancrazi <i>Yuma</i>	82%	80%
Rep. Jack Harper <i>Surprise</i>	5%	28%	Rep. Debbie McCune Davis <i>Phoenix</i>	94%	93%	Rep. Russell Jones <i>Yuma</i>	21%	46%
<b>District 5</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>District 15</b>	<b>98%</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>District 25</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>12%</b>
Sen. Sylvia Allen <i>Snowflake</i>	0%	4%	Sen. Kyrsten Sinema <i>Phoenix</i>	100%	90%	Sen. Gail Griffin <i>Hereford</i>	2%	0%
Rep. Chester Crandell <i>Heber</i>	13%	13%	Rep. Lela Alston <i>Phoenix</i>	93%	73%	Rep. David Stevens <i>Sierra Vista</i>	7%	26%
Rep. Brenda Barton <i>Safford</i>	4%	4%	Rep. Katie Hobbs <i>Phoenix</i>	100%	100%	Rep. Peggy Judd <i>Willcox</i>	12%	12%
<b>District 6</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>District 16</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>District 26</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>19%</b>
Sen. Lori Klein <i>Anthem</i>	0%	0%	Sen. Leah Landrum-Taylor <i>Phoenix</i>	77%	91%	Sen. Al Melvin <i>Tucson</i>	0%	20%
Rep. Carl Seel <i>Phoenix</i>	13%	19%	Rep. Ruben Gallego <i>Phoenix</i>	100%	100%	Rep. Terri Proud <i>Tucson</i>	5%	5%
Rep. Amanda Reeve <i>Phoenix</i>	8%	22%	Rep. Catherine Miranda <i>Phoenix</i>	100%	100%	Rep. Vic Williams <i>Tucson</i>	8%	32%
<b>District 7</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>District 17</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>District 27</b>	<b>98%</b>	<b>97%</b>
Sen. Nancy Barto <i>Phoenix</i>	11%	37%	Sen. David Schapira <i>Tempe</i>	100%	99%	Sen. Olivia Cajero Bedford <i>Tucson</i>	95%	96%
Rep. Heather Carter <i>Cave Creek</i>	13%	13%	Rep. Ben Arredondo <i>Tempe</i>	93%	93%	Rep. Sally Ann Gonzales <i>Tucson</i>	100%	95%
Rep. David Burnell Smith <i>Carefree</i>	13%	18%	Rep. Edward Ableser <i>Tempe</i>	86%	94%	Rep. Macario Saldate IV <i>Tucson</i>	100%	100%
<b>District 8</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>District 18</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>District 28</b>	<b>96%</b>	<b>96%</b>
Sen. Michele Reagan <i>Scottsdale</i>	12%	54%	Sen. Russell Pearce <i>Mesa</i>	3%	16%	Sen. Paula Aboud <i>Tucson</i>	95%	96%
Rep. John Kavanagh <i>Fountain Hills</i>	17%	27%	Rep. Cecil Ash <i>Mesa</i>	12%	38%	Rep. Bruce Wheeler <i>Tucson</i>	92%	92%
Rep. Michelle Ugenti <i>Scottsdale</i>	8%	8%	Rep. Steve Court <i>Mesa</i>	4%	19%	Rep. Steve Farley <i>Tucson</i>	100%	99%
<b>District 9</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>District 19</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>District 29</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>92%</b>
Sen. Rick Murphy <i>Peoria</i>	5%	19%	Sen. Rich Crandall <i>Mesa</i>	17%	33%	Sen. Linda Lopez <i>Tucson</i>	100%	93%
Rep. Debbie Lesko <i>Glendale</i>	4%	15%	Rep. Kirk Adams <i>Mesa</i>	5%	30%	Rep. Daniel Patterson <i>Tucson</i>	100%	96%
Rep. Rick Gray <i>Sun City</i>	13%	13%	Rep. Justin Olson <i>Mesa</i>	5%	5%	Rep. Matt Heinz <i>Tucson</i>	100%	86%
<b>District 10</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>District 20</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>District 30</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>21%</b>
Sen. Linda Gray <i>Glendale</i>	23%	29%	Sen. John McComish <i>Phoenix</i>	17%	42%	Sen. Frank Antenori <i>Tucson</i>	0%	19%
Rep. Kimberly Yee <i>Phoenix</i>	17%	17%	Rep. Jeff Dial <i>Chandler</i>	8%	8%	Rep. David Gowan <i>Sierra Vista</i>	8%	24%
Rep. Jim Weiers <i>Phoenix</i>	8%	25%	Rep. Bob Robson <i>Chandler</i>	31%	41%	Rep. Ted Vogt <i>Tucson</i>	8%	20%