



Arizona League of Conservation  Voters

Arizona Legislative

SCORE CARD 2009

49th State Legislature

www.azlcv.org

Arizona Conservation Voter

Volume 18, Number 1 Winter 2009

Arizona Is Worth It



Dear Friends and Members,

First of all, I want to thank AZLCV members for supporting the AZLCV in the past, present, and future. AZLCV is almost entirely supported by our nearly 6,000 members statewide and we thank you for your support! I also want to thank others who are reading this publication for your interest in our work creating an Arizona whose government is actively working to create a sustainable Arizona that will offer her gifts to future generations.

I came to Arizona in 2002 for a two week visit that is fast becoming a decade. Though I had visited Arizona and the Grand Canyon as a child, coming to Arizona as an adult opened my eyes to the stunning beauty and unparalleled quality of life that we enjoy in Arizona. From the majestic Grand Canyon to the beautiful and diverse Sonoran Desert, Arizona is home to some of the greatest pieces of our nation's natural heritage. These places have inspired me to make my life's work the preservation of these treasures, the advancing the ideals of clean air and water for all Arizonans and to the protection of the many unique species that live in Arizona. AZLCV knows that Arizonans value our natural heritage and are willing to fight for its' future. For native Arizonans our natural heritage is what keeps them here and to relative newcomers like me it is one the reasons that we came to Arizona and settled.

In 2005 I joined the staff of AZLCV to improve our membership outreach and to expand the universe of concerned Arizonans that AZLCV can reach with our pro-conservation message and we have accomplished that goal, our membership has swelled from 3,200 in 2006 to almost 6,000 today. I strongly feel that the political process is the fastest and most effective way to protect our environment and preserve Arizona's unique character for generations to come. We have so many dedicated conservationists doing such great work in our state who too often run into the brick wall of our sometimes stubborn state government, it is the work of AZLCV to raise the voice of Arizona conservationists to a thunder pitch that elected officials cannot ignore.

Throughout my four and a half years at AZLCV I have been fortunate to interact with thousands of AZLCV members and other concerned Arizonans and every one of them understands the important role in our state that AZLCV has to play. This summer I was chosen to become the Executive Director of the League and to lead the League into the future. I am filled with pride, humility and excitement by the votes of confidence and support that I have received from AZLCV's board of directors, from our membership and from the larger Arizona community.

I hope you enjoy reading this scorecard which is not the most upbeat scorecard that we have created. In fact, more than any of our previous 18 scorecards, this edition highlights the amount of work that we have left to do to bring Arizona's elected representation in line with public sentiment.

Thank you for your support of the League,

Steven C Arnquist
Executive Director

Arizona League of Conservation Voters

Staff

Steve Arnquist	<i>Executive Director</i>
Mitch Doty	<i>Membership Coordinator</i>
Melissa Ramsey	<i>Office Manager and Membership Outreach</i>
Frederick Schulze	<i>Field Canvass Coordinator</i>
Mandana Nakhai	<i>Summer Intern</i>

Scorecard design by Julie St. John

Board of Directors

Roselyn O'Connell,
<i>Vice President, Scottsdale</i>
Roberta Voss
<i>Secretary, Phoenix</i>
Tina Beattie, Gilbert
Paul Burkhardt, Prescott
Michael Dunne, Tucson
Grant Loper, Tempe
Bill Roe, Tucson
Paul Walker, Phoenix

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 receive the *Scorecard* and, if they choose, our regular email updates.

Contact us:

info@azlcv.org www.azlcv.org

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

www.azlcv.org



Our Mission

The Arizona League of Conservation Voters (AZLCV or “the League”) is Arizona’s largest statewide membership-supported conservation group, with almost 6,000 members.

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

Our Membership

In 2009, we also expanded our membership by more than 1,000 members statewide. Since 2006 our membership has grown from 3,200 to almost 6,000 members today!

Our Accomplishments

- ★ In 2009, the League supported successful initiatives to expand tax incentives for renewable energy businesses and to incentivize energy efficiency for Arizona’s schools.
- ★ In 2008, the League endorsed and supported 42 general election candidates, 34 of them won (81%) and currently serve the state of Arizona.
- ★ In 2007, the League advocated for four clean energy laws and one important clean air law — all of which were signed into law.

Our Goals

- ★ Elect a bi-partisan green Legislature in 2010 that will better protect Arizona’s air, water, land and quality of life for generations to come.
- ★ Put more pro-conservation policies on the books in Arizona and continue to hold the Arizona Legislature and other elected officials accountable for their environmental performance.
- ★ Foster more cooperation and collaboration between conservation organizations throughout Arizona to increase our collective effectiveness.
- ★ Provide other conservation organizations with even more resources that enable them to effectively lobby Arizona’s elected officials on behalf of our environment.

The Future of Clean Elections by Steve Arnquist

Will Arizona say goodbye to Clean Elections? Has the experiment failed?

This is a difficult article to write, both because the AZLCV has supported Clean Elections from the beginning, and because I personally am a supporter of the concept of Clean Elections. But after a decade of Clean Elections and a 2008 Arizona Supreme Court decision ruling that matching funds are unconstitutional, it just might be time to re-evaluate the system.

In September of 2008, Arizona Supreme Court Justice Roslyn Silver ruled that awarding Clean Elections candidates additional funds to match the fundraising of traditionally funded candidates is unconstitutional and an infringement on the traditional candidates freedom of speech. Since this decision, many Arizonans have been asking the tough question: Are Clean Elections good for Arizona?

To really look at Clean Elections we need to ask ourselves a few questions: Has Clean Elections reduced the undue influence of corporations and special interests? How much abuse is happening within the system? And most importantly has Clean Elections improved the quality of our representation?

There is no doubt that Clean Elections has reduced the financial influence of special interests on candidates, PACs and individuals are, in most cases, limited to \$410 dollar contributions to state

Legislative candidates (this number increases to \$840 for statewide candidates). Clean Elections clearly reduces the size of direct contributions to candidates. However, campaign contributions to candidates are not the only way for a political action committee to influence elections. PACs and other committees (including AZLCV's Committee for the Environment) in Arizona may execute "independent expenditures" or parallel campaigns to advocate for the election of a particular candidate or a slate of candidates. These independent expenditure campaigns can raise (contributions capped at \$5850 per individual per calendar year to all Arizona state candidates) and spend large sums of money on their independent expenditures.

In the last 10 years the Arizona State Legislature has become increasingly partisan, polarized and in some cases just plain batty. Because fringe candidates are awarded the same funding as more mainstream candidates, and because party primaries tend to elect less centrist candidates, we have found ourselves

with a legislature that is strong on idealism and weak on bipartisanship. This unwillingness to work with the other party was demonstrated in this year's budget negotiations in which the majority party refused to negotiate with the minority party and would not budge on a "no new taxes" pledge. The result was an entire legislative session characterized by gridlock and partisan name-calling.

A particular victim of the increased partisan rancor at the capitol has been the moderate wing of the Republican party. Since the advent of Clean Elections in Arizona there have been 8 moderate Republicans who supported Arizona's environment (scored an 80% on AZLCV scorecard) who have been defeated in primary elections following their high environmental scores. The majority of these legislators have been defeated by Clean Elections candidates. This seems a sad by-product of publicly funded elections, while party primaries have always been the

domain of the extremes of each political party, the broader appeal of moderate candidates from both sides of the aisle traditionally gives a financial advantage that evens the playing field.

In regards to abuses of the system it must first be said that the vast majority of candidates who have opted for clean elections funding have been legitimate and responsible candidates. But there HAVE been abuses, most of them small: spending public money at bicycles shops and restaurants, purchasing computer equipment and car upgrades. There were

even the three Libertarian candidates in Tempe who managed to spend almost \$100,000 of public money at nightclubs and bars — they claimed they were running a "nontraditional" campaign and aiming for the youth vote — they all got less than 5% of the vote.

There have also been more clever and more devious abuses mostly related to the "matching funds" provisions in clean elections law. Because third party candidates receive public funds as well, it is not difficult to convince your friend or neighbor to run as a third party candidate and direct them to beat up on your opponent or at least siphon a few hundred votes away from your opponent. Or you can run as a team with one traditional candidate and one or more "clean candidates" who are, technically speaking, opponents (and receiving matching funds) thus doubling or tripling the investment of the traditionally funded candidate's donors.

There are dozens of examples of overpriced staff dinners in the last days of the campaign to use up the last bits of government

continued next page

Clean Elections is an alternative funding system for political candidates in Arizona. Instead of relying on traditional funding sources, Arizona candidates can opt to collect scores of \$5 contributions and be awarded with significant public funds to run their campaigns. Advocates for Clean Elections argue that the system levels the playing field and allows greater participation in politics, especially by those who would otherwise be unable to afford to run for office. Opponents say that Clean Elections infringes on the freedom of fundraising (and thus freedom of speech) of traditionally funded candidates.

The Budget *by Steve Arnquist*

We could have filled all of the pages of this Scorecard and more with discussion about this year's budget. This saga, complete with bickering, grand statements and press releases, factionalism, idealism, and even a cameo by anti-tax celebrity Grover Norquist, has unfolded in the last year over the Arizona state budget and is worthy of a docudrama, or at least a few episodes of a daytime soap opera. With all of this in mind I will do my best to stay focused and keep this article as concise as possible.

The first thing to remember is that states in our great nation are required to present and execute balanced budgets every year. Unlike the federal government, states are not allowed to run budget deficits and consequently, when the money is needed the most it is often in the shortest supply. Another thing to remember is that while Arizona's economy was booming through most of the past decade, the size of the state budget did not increase at the same pace. Twenty years of anti-tax advocates in the legislature have pushed through tax cuts in good economic times, leaving the state treasurer holding an empty bag in times that are less good.

So as the global economy fell on hard times Arizona's revenue collections did not match the income projections our state had hoped for. All of the sudden Arizona was facing billions in budget deficits. Our new governor, Jan Brewer wanted a 1% sales tax increase. Legislative Republicans (for the most part) favored cuts to state agencies and services and, in some cases, further tax cuts in the face of the huge deficit. Legislative Democrats for the most part wanted fewer cuts and wanted revenue enhancements in the form of a restructuring of the



sales tax to include more services and purchases: food, healthcare and medication would have still been exempt but little else. The three sides to the negotiations (if we can call them negotiations), for the most part were unable to make compromises in the interest of Arizona. Legislative Republicans stuck to their "no new tax" pledges, Democrats stuck to fewer cuts to services and increasing revenues (and were largely left out of the discussion anyway), and the Governor stuck with her 1% sales tax plan and her threat to veto any legislation that did not include the sales tax increase. Senate Republicans never could find the 16 votes to pass the question of the sales tax on to the voters.

In the end we got pieces of a budget that passed through the Legislature in early September (into the third month of our fiscal year). Governor Brewer used her line item veto and signed some portions of that budget document and promised to call another special session to address the budget shortfall. To date, a fifth session has been called to address the budget shortfall projections have increased our deficit back to \$1.5 billion, but as of this printing have not solved the problem.

The Future of Clean Elections *continued*

money (at least these are related to the campaign). Others have purchased personal items in the final days of the campaign: Segway ramps for a candidate's home, video equipment, new bicycles. One candidate bought a \$405 GPS unit for his car (with a two-year service plan) on the last day of the campaign. Other candidates funnel public funds to their own consulting firms. Clean Elections does not require money to be spent strategically (or ethically).

It is clear that Clean Elections has changed Arizona politics significantly, in some positive ways and some negative ways. It is up to all Arizonans to continuously improve our electoral system in order to improve the quality of our representation and our democracy. It has been 10 years and we need to tighten up our Clean Elections system to curtail abuses and further the mission of Clean Elections, to limit the influence of special interest money on Arizona politics.

What does this mean to our environment?

It means that we are closing state parks (Jerome, Oracle, San Rafael and McFarland) and closing campgrounds. 14 of our 30 state parks have cut hours or reduced the number of days they will be open, closed campgrounds or closed their gates entirely. All are deferring maintenance on crumbling park infrastructure. It means the Department of Environmental Quality is operating at basically half capacity and there are fewer inspectors holding industry accountable for their emissions, and less money to clean up environmental disasters that, if left untreated, will impact the health of thousands of Arizonans.

It means we are losing the things that we love about Arizona, and it has to stop. As a state, we need to fully fund investments in our future. AZLCV will be working hard to fully fund the departments and agencies tasked with running our state parks, regulating pollution, and protecting Arizona's natural heritage for generations to come.

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 weighted 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 100 percent.

SCR 1009 Voter-protection; temporary budgetary suspension

(R. Pearce, Harper, Burges, et al) This was a dangerous resolution. While we understand the frustration of the legislature with having to balance a budget without cutting any voter approved funds, this bill went too far. This bill would have allowed the legislature to "sweep" voter approved funds in situations where there was a 1% budget deficit for 2 quarters in a row. That is too low of a threshold for crisis to even consider passing a law that allows the legislature to reverse the will of the voters of Arizona. This concurrent resolution would have referred the issue to the voters, allowing us the opportunity to essentially render powerless the citizen initiative process.

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

Passed Senate 17-12-1:
June 22, 2009

Held in House

SB 1118 NOW: definition; begin actual construction

(S. Allen) This bill effectively allows construction activities, known to emit air pollutants, to begin before an air quality permit can be issued. The federal Clean Air Act mandates that new major stationary sources of pollution, as well as major modifications to existing sources, must have air quality permits before construction begins. SB 1118 specifically defines and modifies what "before construction begins" means, listing various construction activities that can be undertaken before permit issuance.

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

Passed Senate 17-12-1:
June 25, 2009

Held in House



Actions used for scoring *continued*

SB 1147 Greenhouse emissions; regulations; fuel economy

(S. Allen, Gould, R. Pearce, et al) This bill attempted to require any state agency including the Department of Environmental Quality to acquire legislative permission before implementing or enforcing any state or regional program that regulates greenhouse gases or fuel economy standards for vehicles. The ADEQ would have to provide a written report to the Governor, President of the Senate, Speaker of the House of Representatives, Secretary of the State (SOS), Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records (ASLAPR) and the Arizona Corporation Commission regarding any proposed greenhouse gas regulating or fuel economy program. In June of 2009, the US Environmental Protection Agency began allowing states to implement Clean Car Standards, this bill would have effectively prevented the implementation of those standards.

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

Passed Senate 19-10-1:
June 22, 2009

Held in House

SB 1157 Department of environmental quality; continuation

(Nelson, C. Allen, Huppenthal, et al) This bill continued the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality for five more years. While it may seem like common sense to have a Department of Environmental Quality, stunningly, 6 Senators and 2 Representatives believe otherwise.

A "YES" vote is a green vote. Weight: 5

Passed Senate 23-6-1:
June 22, 2009

Passed House 50-2-8:
July 1, 2009

Signed into law by
Governor:
July 9, 2009

SB 1225 NOW: Dust control; best management practices

(S. Pierce) This bill requires dust control regulations to be adopted by the Agricultural Best Management Practices Committee by June 30, 2010, as relating to animal agriculture in regulated areas of Maricopa County. This Committee, which will expand to fourteen members from various parts of the agricultural sector (including animal), are appointed by the Governor and are responsible for adopting and regulating Best Management Practices (BMPs) intended to reduce PM-10 emissions (dust particulates less than ten micrometers).

This act is largely a response to the fact that Phoenix has not met federal Clean Air Act standards for PM-10 emissions since the Act's revision in 1990. Currently, only specific farmers – those farming more than ten contiguous acres in the Maricopa County PM-10 non-attainment area, and the part of Maricopa County in Area A – are required to implement PM-10 regulations. Additionally, agricultural BMPs only apply to commercial farming in specific areas of Maricopa County. This strike-everything amendment would force the Committee to adopt BMPs for animal agriculture by June 30, 2010, and for dairy, beef cattle, poultry and swine farming, if located in an area regulated as a PM-10 nonattainment area.

A "NO" vote is a green vote. Weight: 3

Passed Senate 22-7-1:
June 22, 2009

Passed House 36-19-5:
June 24, 2009

Signed into law by
Governor:
July 13, 2009



Actions used for scoring *continued*

SB 1259 Aggregate mine reclamation; initiation; extension

(S. Allen) This bill allows the State Mine Inspector to grant an extension to aggregate mining and exploration reclamation requirements if the owner or operator can demonstrate that mining will resume due to changes in market conditions. Provisions also state that the Mine Inspector can consider demand for sand and gravel operations when deciding whether or not to grant an extension. It also defines the terms “aggregate mining” and “aggregate mining unit.”

A “NO” vote is a green vote. Weight: 4

Passed Senate 17-11-2:
June 22, 2009

Passed House 36-14-10:
June 26, 2009

Signed into law by
Governor:
July 10, 2009

SB 1260 Aggregate mine reclamation law; exemption

(S. Allen) This bill exempts certain intermittently used aggregate mining operations from regulatory and reclamation measures, under certain conditions. These conditions state that the mining unit must be used for particular governmental projects, outside of a city or town’s boundaries, subject to the requirements of the Clean Water Act, as well as certain spatial regulations. This is an emergency clause and requires that the mining area be reclaimed when the project is complete.

A “NO” vote is a green vote. Weight: 4

Passed Senate 17-11-2:
June 22, 2009

Passed House 34-15-11:
June 26, 2009

Signed into law by
Governor:
July 10, 2009

SB 1403 Renewable; high-wage industries incentives

(Mason, Reagan, Leff) This bill provides income and property tax incentives for renewable energy businesses in Arizona. This incentive applies specifically to “expanding or locating qualified renewable energy operations (REO),” and provides the necessary protocol for applying and receiving such an incentive, including new capital investment in a manufacturing facility or headquarters.

A “YES” vote is a green vote. Weight: 8

Passed Senate 16-12-2:
June 15, 2009

Passed House 39-12-9:
June 26, 2009

Signed into law by
Governor:
July 10, 2009



HCM 2006 State land; natural resources

(Jones, Konopnicki, Barto, et al) This House Concurrent Memorial asked the US Congress to “refrain from passing any new legislation to withdraw any lands in Arizona from mining, and refrain from enacting any wilderness designations in Arizona without the unanimous support of Arizona’s congressional delegation.” Arizona’s congressional delegation rarely agrees upon anything, and certainly does not agree on any environmental issues; this memorial would have stalled much environmental progress in our state, and if it carried the force of law, would have made achieving new wilderness designations even more difficult than it is currently. Luckily, concurrent memorials are non-binding letters to the US congress, and have no teeth.

A “NO” vote is a green vote. Weight: 3

Passed House 36-17-7:
June 17, 2009

Passed Senate 19-7-4:
July 1, 2009

Transmitted to Arizona Secretary of State to be distributed to the US Senate President, the Speaker of the US House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Interior, the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, the Chief of the US Forest Service and the Arizona congressional delegation.

HCR 2030 NOW: Arizona’s water protection

(Stevens, Gowan, Antenori, et al) This bill sought to oppose “expansion of the federal Point Source Discharge Program,” and “any legislation that would result in the expansion of federal jurisdiction and emasculation of the states’ jurisdiction.” Arizona legislators state that they oppose any changes to the Clean Water Act that would reduce their authority over certain “ephemeral and intermittent watercourses” because of a recent federal act expanding the precedence of the Clean Water Act over all “waters of the United States” instead of just “navigable waters.” Essentially, state lawmakers are opposing the Clean Water Act, which has offered protection to United States’ rivers, streams and groundwater for 35 years and any other federal water protection legislation.

A “NO” vote is a green vote. Weight: 4

Passed House 37-22-1:
June 9, 2009

Passed Senate 20-8-2:
July 1, 2009

Transmitted to the Secretary of State

HB 2088 Public conservation monies; transfer; parks

(Nichols) This bill was just moving money around to attempt to bridge the budget gap. This bill would have diverted 20 million dollars from the Public Conservation Account in the Land Conservation Fund (established by voters in 1998) to the state parks, who in turn gave up their money for fire suppression. This bill would have violated the Voter Protection Act as the Land Conservation Fund was established by the voters. AZLCV supports all forms of citizen access to government, including the citizen initiative process, if the Legislature can “sweep” voter-mandated funds then all citizen initiatives are at risk and the process weakened.

A “NO” vote is a green vote. Weight: 4

Defeated in House:
36-22-2 (needed super majority to pass)
May 12, 2009



Actions used for scoring *continued*

HB 2278 NOW: tires; abandoned mines

(Jones) This is not the first time we have seen this bill. It proposes filling abandoned mines with used tires. To some, this bill might seem like a natural fit (we have holes in the ground and car tires in piles somewhere) and while it requires consultation from the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality as well as the state Fire Marshal, this is not smart thinking. Not only are tires extremely flammable, tires buried in mines could leach hazardous materials into the soil and pollute our water. This bill would also negatively impact species, especially bat populations who often roost in abandoned mines. This bill was a bad idea.

A "NO" vote is a green vote. Weight: 3

Passed House 35-21-4:
June 22, 2009

Held in Senate

HB 2332 Schools; energy contracts

(Boone) This bill provides provisions to a previous law which established protocols for school districts to secure guaranteed energy cost savings contracts from qualified providers. These new provisions state that school districts can keep the savings from guaranteed energy cost saving contracts, and that these savings may be used to pay for project implementation. Energy savings must be carefully documented and submitted to the DOC Energy Office, and in this bill, the definition of an "energy cost savings measure" has been expanded to include such progressive procedures as rainwater harvesting, water consumption reduction devices, and other alternative and renewable energy projects.

This bill also authorizes school districts to establish a water and energy savings account that will consist of specific capital investment funds for energy or water savings projects in school facilities. These funds can be deposited by utility companies as well as by energy savings rebates including those from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

A "YES" vote is a green vote. Weight: 7

Passed House 57-0-3:
June 10, 2009

Passed Senate 22-5-3:
July 1, 2009

Signed into law by
Governor:
July 10, 2009



HB 2336 NOW: county renewable energy incentive districts

(Mason) This bill allows a county, city or town to establish a renewable energy district, if the district is comprised of currently vacant or underused property and in an area large enough to be “compatible with the construction and operation of renewable energy equipment.” The county board of supervisors or governing body of a city or town of this area must also develop a renewable energy incentive plan which includes expedited zoning and processing, waivers of certain fees and development standards. The county board of supervisors must hold an informational hearing and notify property owners within a proposed district.

A “YES” vote is a green vote. Weight: 6

Passed House 49-10-1:
June 9, 2009

Passed Senate 19-8-3:
July 1, 2009

Signed into law by
Governor:
July 10, 2009

HB 2352 Aquifer protection permits; natural gas

(Mason) There is nothing in Arizona more important than preserving our future water supply and this bill would have allowed for the contamination of an important aquifer. In 1986, a landmark initiative called Arizona’s Aquifer Protection Permit program was implemented in Arizona. This program designated all Arizona aquifers as potential drinking water, and protected that water for future use. HB 2352 would have created an exemption for the activity proposed by one particular company, Multifuels, Inc., a Texas based natural gas company, and would have allowed them to dig an underground storage facility for natural gas in Pinal County. Sadly, the proposed storage site was right next to an aquifer, and would have polluted the water in the aquifer. Multifuels pushed for a legislative exemption which would have bypassed the permit process. If a company knows months or years ahead of time that their plan will pollute a valuable water supply for Arizona and that it will not meet even Arizona’s relatively lax environmental standards, they should be ashamed and so should the 36 representatives who voted for this bill.

A “NO” vote is a green vote. Weight: 4

Passed House 36-21-3:
June 10, 2009

Held in Senate

HB 2424 Illegal dumping; penalties

(McGuire, Barnes, M. Garcia, et al) This bill would have increased the penalty for illegally dumping trash to a Class 1 misdemeanor, and added a \$1,800 fine while retaining the responsible party’s liability for all disposal costs. This bill is just common sense, Arizonans have long known that the dumping of trash in our deserts is a bad idea, and this bill addresses that with stronger enforcements.

A “YES” vote is a green vote. Weight: 5

Passed House 36-13-11:
June 18 2009

Held in Senate

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, Infrastructure and Public Debt

Member	Party	District	Score
John Nelson (chair)	R	12	43%
Steve Pierce (vice chair)	R	1	19%
Amanda Aguirre	D	24	75%
Sylvia Allen	R	5	2%
Pamela Gorman	R	6	11%
Albert Hale	D	2	89%
Leah Landrum-Taylor	D	16	100%

Committee Average Score: 48%

Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Education and Natural Resources

Member	Party	District	Score
Russell Pearce (chair)	R	18	9%
Paula Aboud	D	28	100%
Pamela Gorman	R	6	11%
Steve Pierce	R	1	19%

Committee Average Score: 35%



Scorecard Key

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

Scorecard Bills

A Green Vote is:
Weight:

SENATOR

Aboud	100%	D
Aguirre	75%	D
Allen, Carolyn	40%	R
Allen, Sylvia	2%	R
Alvarez	75%	D
Burns	21%	R
Burton-Cahill	100%	D
Chevront	67%	D
Garcia	87%	D
Gorman	11%	R
Gould	0%	R
Gray, Chuck	8%	R
Gray, Linda	43%	R
Hale	89%	D
Harper	19%	R
Huppenthal	22%	R
Landrum-Taylor	100%	D
Leff	45%	R
Lopez	90%	D
McCune-Davis	100%	D
Melvin	34%	R
Miranda	100%	D
Nelson	43%	R
Paton	31%	R
Pearce	9%	R
Pierce	19%	R
Rios	100%	D
Tibshraeny	67%	R
Verschoor	43%	R
Waring	13%	R
Senate D AVERAGE	90%	
Senate R AVERAGE	26%	

SCR1009	SB1118	SB1147	SB1157	SB1225	SB1259	SB 1260	SB1403	HCM2006	HCR2030	HB2332	HB2336
7	5	5	5	3	4	4	8	3	4	7	6
✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	EA	✓	✓	✓	✓
✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓
✗	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓
✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓
✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗
✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	EA	EA	✗	EA	EA	EA	EA
✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓
✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗
✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓
✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓	—
✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓
✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	—	✓	✓	✓
EA	EA	EA	EA	EA	EA	EA	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓
✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	EA	EA	EA	EA
✗	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	EA	✗	✗	✓	✓
✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	EA	✗	✓	✓
✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗
✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓
✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓
✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓
✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗



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 two of four House committees that are especially important to conservation.

House Environment

Member	Party	District	Score
Ray Barnes (chair)	R	7	47%
Frank Pratt (vice chair)	R	23	52%
Ed Ableser	D	17	87%
Martha Garcia	D	13	93%
Russell L. Jones	R	24	40%
Lucy Mason	R	1	30%
Barbara McGuire	D	23	41%
Doug Quelland	R	10	58%

Committee Average Score: 54%

House Natural Resources & Rural Affairs

Member	Party	District	Score
Bill Konopnicki (chair)	R	5	41%
Russell L. Jones (vice chair)	R	24	40%
Christopher Deschene	D	2	100%
Patricia V. Fleming	D	25	93%
Lynne Pancrazi	D	24	62%
Frank Pratt	R	23	52%
David W. Stevens	R	25	36%
Jerry Weiers	R	12	28%

Committee Average Score: 52%

Scorecard Key

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

Scorecard Bills

A Green Vote is:
Weight:

REPRESENTATIVE

Ableser	87%	D
Adams	38%	R
Antenori	36%	R
Ash	52%	R
Barnes	47%	R
Barto	40%	R
Biggs	20%	R
Boone	54%	R
Bradley	100%	D
Brown	58%	D
Burges	11%	R
Cajero-Bedford	100%	D
Campbell, Chad	100%	D
Campbell, Cloves	100%	D
Chabin	100%	D
Court	42%	R
Crandall	26%	R
Crump	30%	R
Deschene	100%	D
Driggs	52%	R
Farley	100%	D
Fleming	93%	D
Garcia	93%	D
Goodale	38%	R
Gowan	36%	R
Heinz	88%	D
Hendrix	33%	R
Jones	40%	R
Kavanagh	20%	R
Konopnicki	41%	R



House voting tally & COMMITTEE SCORES

continued

House Water & Energy

Member	Party	District	Score
Lucy Mason (chair)	R	1	30%
David W. Stevens (vice chair)	R	25	36%
Christopher Deschene	D	2	100%
Doris Goodale	R	3	38%
Daniel Patterson	D	29	92%
Doug Quelland	R	10	58%
Jerry Weiers	R	12	28%
Nancy Young-Wright	D	26	91%

Committee Average Score: 52%

House Transportation & Infrastructure

Member	Party	District	Score
Andy Biggs (chair)	R	22	20%
Frank Antenori (vice chair)	R	30	36%
Judy M. Burges	R	4	11%
Sam Crump	R	6	30%
Steve Farley	D	28	100%
Nancy McLain	R	3	28%
Eric Meyer	D	11	93%
Rae Waters	D	20	100%

Committee Average Score: 47%

Scorecard Key

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

Scorecard Bills

A Green Vote is:
Weight:

REPRESENTATIVE

Lesko	30%	R
Lopes	100%	D
Lujan	100%	D
Mason	30%	R
McComish	52%	R
McGuire	41%	D
McLain	28%	R
Meyer	93%	D
Meza	88%	D
Miranda	80%	D
Montenegro	43%	R
Murphy	12%	R
Nichols	42%	R
Pancrazi	62%	D
Patterson	92%	D
Pratt	52%	R
Quelland	58%	R
Reagan	54%	R
Schapira	100%	D
Seel	33%	R
Sinema	57%	D
Stevens	36%	R
Tobin	52%	R
Tovar	100%	D
Waters	100%	D
Weiers, Jerry	28%	R
Weiers, Jim	52%	R
Williams	52%	R
Yarborough	52%	R
Young-Wright	91%	D
House D AVERAGE	89%	
House R AVERAGE	39%	



There is Nothing More Conservative than Conservation *by Steve Arnquist*

In producing this scorecard, and talking with members of the League and of the larger Arizona community, I was asked one question more than any other, “Where are the green Republicans?” We know that most Arizonans, Republican, Democrat or independent, treasure our natural heritage, unfortunately conservationist Republicans are conspicuously absent in our state government. The Arizona League of Conservation Voters is a non-partisan organization, and we have been proud to honor, endorse and award high scores to Republican legislators every year for the last decade. We also have been proud to welcome Republicans as members and onto our board of directors. We currently have almost 1,000 Republican members, and 4 of our 8 board members are Republicans.

Sadly, this year we will not be able to honor any Republican Legislators. This is not because we have changed our system of grading to favor Democrats, or to punish Republicans. It is because too many Republican representatives have been slowly but surely moving away from moderation, dialogue and conservation values, and towards the politics of division, shortsighted financial management and environmental irresponsibility. This year, it is especially evident that the voices of environmental responsibility are being ignored by too many in our legislature.

In 2008, we had the pleasure of honoring Pete Hershberger (R-Tucson) and Tom O’Halloran (R-Sedona), as environmental champions. In every recent election year, the anti-environmental wing of the Republican party has targeted moderate, environmentally-responsible

Republicans, like Hershberger and O’Halloran, in primary elections. Unfortunately, both of these legislators were defeated in their September 2008 primary elections by anti-environmental legislators Al Melvin (R-Tucson), and Steve Pierce (R-Flagstaff), following nasty — and expensive — primaries. In 2006 Arizonans also lost the voices of moderates Toni Hellon (R-Tucson) and Steve Huffman (R-Tucson) in competitive primaries.

We know, however, that hundreds of thousands of Republicans in Arizona value environmental protection and want to see Arizona honor our natural heritage by protecting it for our children, and our children’s children. We know that there is a growing movement of Republicans in Arizona who are actively working to correct their representative’s course and bring environmental protection to the forefront of their party platform.

AZLCV will continue and ramp up our efforts to support environmentally-responsible Republican candidates throughout the state. We know that to truly make progress, and to pass environmentally responsible legislation, we need policy makers on both sides of the political aisle to participate, and to show a willingness to cross party lines in the interest of our state.

AZLCV plans to support environmentally responsible Republican candidates wherever and whenever possible. We will actively recruit common-sense, green Republicans to challenge the current anti-conservation ethics that are too prevalent in their party. AZLCV would like nothing more than to see both the Democratic and Republican parties working to become the party of the environment.

100% Arizonans

Sen. Paula Aboud (D-28) – 100%
Sen. Meg Burton-Cahill (D-17) – 100%
Rep. David Bradley (D-28) – 100%
Rep. Olivia Cajero-Bedford (D-27) – 100%
Rep. Chad Campbell (D-14) – 100%
Rep. Cloves Campbell (D-16) – 100%
Rep. Tom Chabin (D-2) – 100%
Rep. Christopher Deschene (D-2) – 100%
Rep. Steve Farley (D-28) – 100%
Sen. Leah Landrum-Taylor (D-16) – 100%
Rep. Phil Lopes (D-27) – 100%
Rep. David Lujan (D-15) – 100%
Sen. Debbie McCune-Davis (D-14) – 100%
Sen. Richard Miranda (D-13) – 100%
Sen. Rebecca Rios (D-23) – 100%
Rep. David Schapira (D-17) – 100%
Rep. Anna Tovar (D-13) – 100%
Rep. Rae Waters (D-20) – 100%

Top Scorers

Republicans:

Sen. Jay Tibshraeny (R-21) – 67%
Rep. Doug Quellan (R-10) – 58%
Rep. Michele Reagan (R-8) – 54%
Rep. Tom Boone (R-4) – 54%

Democrats:

Rep. Pat Fleming (D-25) – 93%
Rep. Martha Garcia (D-13) – 93%
Rep. Eric Meyer (D-11) – 93%
Rep. Daniel Patterson (D-29) – 92%

Bottom Scorers

Republicans:

Sen. Ron Gould (R-3) – 0%
Sen. Sylvia Allen (R-5) – 2%
Sen. Chuck Gray (R-19) – 8%
Sen. Russell Pearce (R-18) – 9%

Democrats:

Rep. Barbara McGuire (D-23) – 41%
Rep. Kyrsten Sinema (D-15) – 57%
Rep. Jack Brown (D-5) – 58%
Sen. Lynne Pancrazi (D-24) – 62%

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

Volunteer...

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

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. Encourage friends to join our E-Action Alert list or our Facebook page to keep up with our work.

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 or Mitch Doty in Phoenix (602) 288-8664 for more information.



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.**



49th Legislature Members & Scores: 2009 & Lifetime

	2009	Life		2009	Life		2009	Life
District 1	34%	46%	District 11	63%	68%	District 21	54%	46%
Sen. Steve Pierce <i>Prescott</i>	19%	19%	Sen. Barbara Leff <i>Paradise Valley</i>	45%	54%	Sen. Jay Tibshraeny <i>Chandler</i>	67%	58%
Rep. Andrew Tobin <i>Paulden</i>	52%	65%	Rep. Adam Driggs <i>Phoenix</i>	52%	57%	Rep. Steven Yarbrough <i>Chandler</i>	52%	45%
Rep. Lucy Mason <i>Prescott</i>	30%	54%	Rep. Eric Meyer <i>Paradise Valley</i>	93%	93%	Rep. Warde Nichols <i>Chandler</i>	42%	36%
District 2	96%	94%	District 12	38%	47%	District 22	32%	29%
Sen. Albert Hale <i>Window Rock</i>	89%	82%	Sen. John Nelson <i>Glendale</i>	43%	52%	Sen. Thayer Vershoor <i>Gilbert</i>	43%	33%
Rep. Christopher Deschene <i>St. Michaels</i>	100%	100%	Rep. Jerry Weiers <i>Glendale</i>	28%	46%	Rep. Andy Biggs <i>Gilbert</i>	20%	22%
Rep. Tom Chabin <i>Flagstaff</i>	100%	99%	Rep. Steve Montenegro <i>Glendale</i>	43%	43%	Rep. Laurin Hendrix <i>Gilbert</i>	33%	33%
District 3	22%	32%	District 13	98%	95%	District 23	64%	67%
Sen. Ron Gould <i>Lake Havasu City</i>	0%	9%	Sen. Richard Miranda <i>Tolleson</i>	100%	91%	Sen. Rebecca Rios <i>Apache Junction</i>	100%	94%
Rep. Doris Goodale <i>Lake Havasu City</i>	38%	38%	Rep. Anna Tovar <i>Phoenix</i>	100%	100%	Rep. Barbara McGuire <i>Kearny</i>	41%	56%
Rep. Nancy McLain <i>Bullhead City</i>	28%	48%	Rep. Martha Garcia <i>Phoenix</i>	93%	94%	Rep. Frank Pratt <i>Casa Grande</i>	52%	52%
District 4	28%	37%	District 14	96%	95%	District 24	59%	72%
Sen. Jack Harper <i>Surprise</i>	19%	32%	Sen. Debbie McCune-Davis <i>Phoenix</i>	100%	94%	Sen. Amanda Aguirre <i>Yuma</i>	75%	80%
Rep. Judy Burges <i>Skull Valley</i>	11%	24%	Rep. Chad Campbell <i>Phoenix</i>	100%	100%	Rep. Lynne Pancrazi <i>Yuma</i>	62%	81%
Rep. Tom Boone <i>Peoria</i>	54%	55%	Rep. Robert Meza <i>Phoenix</i>	88%	92%	Rep. Russell Jones <i>Yuma</i>	40%	56%
District 5	34%	37%	District 15	75%	88%	District 25	68%	70%
Sen. Sylvia Allen <i>Snowflake</i>	2%	2%	Sen. Ken Chevront <i>Phoenix</i>	67%	84%	Sen. Manuel Alvarez <i>Elfrida</i>	75%	80%
Rep. Bill Konopnicki <i>Safford</i>	41%	51%	Rep. David Lujan <i>Phoenix</i>	100%	95%	Rep. David Stevens <i>Sierra Vista</i>	36%	36%
Rep. Jack Brown <i>St. Johns</i>	58%	68%	Rep. Kyrsten Sinema <i>Phoenix</i>	57%	86%	Rep. Patricia Fleming <i>Sierra Vista</i>	93%	93%
District 6	25%	32%	District 16	93%	93%	District 26	59%	61%
Sen. Pamela Gorman <i>Anthem</i>	11%	21%	Sen. Leah Landrum-Taylor <i>Phoenix</i>	100%	93%	Sen. Al Melvin <i>Tucson</i>	34%	34%
Rep. Carl Seel <i>Anthem</i>	33%	33%	Rep. Ben Miranda <i>Phoenix</i>	80%	90%	Rep. Nancy Young-Wright <i>Tucson</i>	91%	96%
Rep. Sam Crump <i>Anthem</i>	30%	42%	Rep. Cloves Campbell Jr. <i>Phoenix</i>	100%	95%	Rep. Vic Williams <i>Tucson</i>	52%	52%
District 7	33%	48%	District 17	96%	98%	District 27	96%	95%
Sen. Jim Waring <i>Phoenix</i>	13%	53%	Sen. Meg Burton-Cahill <i>Tempe</i>	100%	98%	Sen. Jorge Luis Garcia <i>Tucson</i>	87%	92%
Rep. Nancy Barto <i>Phoenix</i>	40%	46%	Rep. David Schapira <i>Tempe</i>	100%	100%	Rep. Olivia Cajero-Bedford <i>Tucson</i>	100%	97%
Rep. Ray Barnes <i>Phoenix</i>	47%	45%	Rep. Edward Ableser <i>Tempe</i>	87%	97%	Rep. Phil Lopes <i>Tucson</i>	100%	96%
District 8	38%	55%	District 18	34%	38%	District 28	100%	98%
Sen. Carolyn Allen <i>Scottsdale</i>	40%	65%	Sen. Russell Pearce <i>Mesa</i>	9%	21%	Sen. Paula Aboud <i>Tucson</i>	100%	97%
Rep. John Kavanagh <i>Fountain Hills</i>	20%	36%	Rep. Cecil Ash <i>Mesa</i>	52%	52%	Rep. David Bradley <i>Tucson</i>	100%	96%
Rep. Michele Reagan <i>Scottsdale</i>	54%	63%	Rep. Steve Court <i>Mesa</i>	42%	42%	Rep. Steve Farley <i>Tucson</i>	100%	99%
District 9	21%	31%	District 19	24%	37%	District 29	90%	91%
Sen. Robert Burns <i>Peoria</i>	21%	40%	Sen. Chuck Gray <i>Mesa</i>	8%	35%	Sen. Linda Lopez <i>Tucson</i>	90%	94%
Rep. Debbie Lesko <i>Glendale</i>	30%	30%	Rep. Kirk Adams <i>Mesa</i>	38%	38%	Rep. Daniel Patterson <i>Tucson</i>	92%	92%
Rep. Rick Murphy <i>Glendale</i>	12%	24%	Rep. Rich Crandall <i>Mesa</i>	26%	39%	Rep. Matt Heinz <i>Tucson</i>	88%	88%
District 10	51%	48%	District 20	58%	64%	District 30	34%	42%
Sen. Linda Gray <i>Glendale</i>	43%	49%	Sen. John Huppenthal <i>Chandler</i>	22%	41%	Sen. Jonathan Paton <i>Tucson</i>	31%	53%
Rep. Doug Quelland <i>Phoenix</i>	58%	44%	Rep. John McComish <i>Phoenix</i>	52%	51%	Rep. David Gowan <i>Tucson</i>	36%	36%
Rep. Jim Weiers <i>Phoenix</i>	52%	51%	Rep. Rae Waters <i>Ahwatukee</i>	100%	100%	Rep. Frank Antenori <i>Vail</i>	36%	36%