ISSUE REVIEW
October 2012

Meet the New Legislature, Same as the Old Legislature

A quantitative analysis of the Connecticut Citizens' Election Program

Jason Farrell, Sean Parnell & Brett Sullivan
Center for Competitive Politics
October 2012

Center for Competitive Politics
124 S. West Street, Suite 201
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
http://www.campaignfreedom.org

Introduction

The 2008 election cycle was the first in Connecticut in which candidates for state legislature could choose to accept taxpayer dollars to fund their campaigns, replacing the traditional system of private, voluntary contributions from citizens. Supporters of the new system believed that removing private money from campaigns would change politics in the state. But this report demonstrates that, at least when it comes to casting votes on legislation, Connecticut lawmakers remain committed to the same legislative priorities. There is no evidence that private campaign contributions were securing policy outcomes, or that removing private money changes or improves legislative behavior in any way.

There is no evidence that private campaign contributions were securing policy outcomes, or that removing private money changes or improves legislative behavior in any way

In late 2005 the Connecticut legislature passed the Citizens' Election Program (CEP), which was signed by newly-installed Governor Jodi Rell. This program was created in the wake of the resignation of former governor John Rowland, who was forced to resign from office in 2004 after it was revealed that he had accepted gifts from private contractors seeking state contracts. Rowland later pleaded guilty to related corruption charges, and served time in jail. Additionally, former state treasurer Paul Sylvester pleaded guilty to accepting bribes in 1999, Bridgeport mayor Joseph Ganim was convicted in 2003 on 16 counts related to corruption, and state senator Ernest Newton pleaded guilty in 2005 to accepting a bribe.

In response, the so-called campaign finance "reform" community began to push taxpayer financed political campaigns as the solution to Connecticut's corruption problem. Yet none of the scandals up to that point had anything to do with campaign contributions. Instead, it was almost all "under the table" bribery for the direct enrichment of the elected official.

The CEP would give taxpayer dollars directly to candidates for state office who qualified by raising enough small contributions from eligible residents. A candidate for state representative, for example, must raise at least $5,000 from at least 150 citizens of municipalities that are part of the district they seek to represent.[1]

The program was implemented for the first time in the 2008 election cycle. Nearly three-quarters of candidates who ran, and all of those elected, in 2008 participated in the program.[2]

The high participation rate is often cited as self-evident proof of the success of the program. For example, in a State Election Enforcement Commission's report on the CEP, the participation rate

1 "Citizens' Election Program Basic Requirements – 2010 Overview," p. 2, State Elections Enforcement Commission. http://www.ct.gov/seec/lib/seec/citizens_election_program_/2010_overview__final_030109.pdf

2 "Connecticut – Reclaiming Democracy: The Inaugural Run of the Citizens' Election Program for the 2008 Election Cycle," p. 4, State Election Enforcement Commission, October 2009.

of candidates is the very first item addressed as evidence of success.[3]

But is this an appropriate measure of success? After all, the proponents of CEP and similar programs in other states often tout their success in erasing "special interest" influence from politics, freeing elected officials to vote in their constituents' interests rather than the interests of the donors to whom they would otherwise be beholden.[4]

...proponents of CEP and similar programs in other states often tout their success in erasing "special interest" influence from politics, freeing elected officials to vote in their constituents' interests rather than the interests of the donors to whom they would otherwise be beholden.

A better measurement of success for the CEP is to examine how legislators' voting patterns have changed since they began to rely on taxpayer dollars for their campaigns rather than private, voluntary contributions. If the "reform" position is correct, we should see noticeable and even dramatic changes in voting patterns once private contributions are removed from the legislative decision making process.

This report measures changes in the voting patterns of legislators who served in the Connecticut General Assembly during the 2007–2008 and 2009—2010 sessions and accepted taxpayer dollars for their 2008 reelection campaign.[5] By identifying significant interest groups and comparing their legislative priorities to voting patterns both before and after the CEP went into effect, any noticeable change in voting since the beginning of CEP would potentially provide evidence that freeing legislators from private, voluntary contributions has indeed made legislators more responsive to citizens and less responsive to so-called "special interests."[6]

The five organized interest groups addressed in this report are the Connecticut Business & Industry

3 Ibid. See also: "Campaign Finance Reform: A New Era," p. 4, January 2009, Common Cause, available at: http://www.commoncause.org/atf/cf/%7Bfb3c17e2-cdd1-4df6-92bebd4429893665%7D/COMMONCAUSECAMPAIGNFINANCEREFORMAGENDA2009.PDF

4 See "Clean Elections Campaign Reform 1, 2, 3" at: http://www.publicampaign.org/clean123: "[qualifying candidates end] their reliance on special interest campaign cash. Being freed from the money chase means…they can consider legislation on the merits, without worrying about whether they are pleasing well heeled donors…"; see also "Money in Politics" at http://www.commoncause.org/site/pp.asp?c=dkLNK1MQIwG&b=4764307: "The problem [with] political campaigns…is who pays for them, what they get in return, and how that distorts public policy..." and "Clean Elections…greatly [reduce] the undue influence of special interest money in politics;" see also "Why we need reform" by Joan Mandle at: http://www.democracymatters.org/site/c.lgLUIXOwGnF/b.3779941/k.BD37/Why_We_Need_Reform.htm: "Politicians, who depend on huge sums of money to run their campaigns, respond more to the concerns of wealthy donors and special interests than they do to the concerns of voters."

5 According to the State of Connecticut at least 70% of legislative candidates used the voluntary CEP during the election in question. See http://www.ct.gov/seec/lib/seec/publications/2010_citizens_election_program_report_final.pdf

6 Since comprehensive information on campaign donations prior to the CEP was not available, we used lobbying rankings as a proxy to indicate the resource and activity levels of individual interest groups. According to the State of Connecticut: "The [CEP] system that legislators devised prevented the bulk of special interest money from coming into the system in the form of contributions from lobbyists and state contractors…" See Footnote 5 for source.

Association (CBIA), the Connecticut Conference of Municipalities (CCM), Connecticut Hospital Association (CHA), the Connecticut Association of Health Plans (CAHP) and AFL-CIO. The first four organizations appeared in the top 10 list for client lobbying expenditures provided by the Connecticut Office of State Ethics in 2007, 2008, or 2009 .[7] [8] AFL-CIO did not appear on the list, but remains a well-funded and influential interest group.

The study analyzed the voting records on issues of interest to these four groups for the 94 House members and 27 Senators who accepted taxpayer dollars in their 2008 re-election campaigns. A total of 400 bills and thousands of individual votes were analyzed in an effort to determine if legislators participating in CEP had noticeably changed the frequency with which they voted with these interest groups.[9]

This study amended and updated our March 2, 2010 report[10] to include data from the 2010 legislative year, giving us a more complete picture of exactly how significant changes in voting patterns were between the 2007-08 and 2009-10 legislative sessions.

Since the publishing of our preliminary report, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit upheld the portion of a 2009 ruling that declared the "trigger provision" that granted money to a participating candidate when a non-participating opponent exceeds the amount raised by the participating candidate violates the First Amendment.[11] The Connecticut Assembly responded to the ruling in August 2010, overriding a veto by Governor Rell to double the amount of the initial grant for gubernatorial Clean Elections candidates to $6 million, updating the old system that enabled them to receive the additional $3 million only if their opponent spent above a certain arbitrary amount.[12] The program still functions and continues to dole out taxpayer money to candidates, adjusted for inflation every two years, even though triggered supplemental grants are now prohibited.[13]

Connecticut Business & Industry Association

Connecticut Business & Industry Association's (CBIA) description of itself includes the following: "…CBIA is the broadest-based business membership organization in the state, as well

---

7 "Client Financial Expenditures for Calendar Year 2008 Top 10 Summary," "Client Financial Expenditures for Calendar Year 2007 Top 10 Summary," and "2009 Connecticut State of Lobbying Report," Connecticut Office of State Ethics. Available at: http://www.ct.gov/ethics/site/default.asp

8 The other top ten groups were not evaluated because either we couldn't identify how the groups wanted legislators to vote on or support certain bills through public records, or there weren't enough votes to do a meaningful analysis.

9 Some bills and votes may be double-counted if they were identified by more than one interest group as a legislative priority. See methodology section for additional details.

10 http://www.campaignfreedom.org/research/detail/meet-the-new-legislature-same-as-the-old-legislature

11 Green Party of Connecticut v. Garfield. US Circuit Court of Appeals, second circuit. August Term 2009; Argued Jan. 13, 2010, decided July 13, 2010. http://lawprofessors.typepad.com/files/green-party-1.pdf

12 http://www.progressivestates.org/node/25400

13 The grant amounts given to state legislative candidates have not changed since before the July 2010 ruling, except adjusting for inflation, which they do every two years. Grant amounts are based on the number of nominating petition signatures a candidate obtains. The CEP gives qualifying candidates up to $26,850 for the general election for a state representative, up to $91,290 for a state senator.

as the largest. CBIA's membership includes businesses of all types and sizes throughout the state. CBIA is the leading voice of business and industry at the State Capitol…"[14]

The CBIA was the top spender for lobbying expenditures in the state in 2007, 2008, and 2009 , spending over $1.4 million to lobby assemblymen and $718,739 on media spending in 2009 alone, considerably more than any other interest group in the state.[15] [16] With 164 floor votes in either the House or Senate to examine, it also provides the largest number of votes of any group to analyze.

...an examination of the largest single business lobby in Connecticut seems an ideal place to try to find changes in elected officials' voting patterns.

Because of this, and due to the fact that a great deal of the ire of the "reform" community is drawn by firms they believe use campaign contributions and lobbyists to persuade legislators to favor their interests over the public interest, an examination of the largest single business lobby in Connecticut seems an ideal place to try to find changes in elected officials' voting patterns.
The table below summarizes the main findings of our analysis.

Legislative votes in favor of CBIA positions, 2007-08 to 2009-10			
Group	*2007/2008 Session*	*2009/2010 Session*	*Increase/Decrease*
House Republicans	44.2%	75.6%	+31.4%
House Democrats	36.2%	61.4%	+25.2%
All House	38.1%	64.7%	+26.6%
Senate Republicans	44.0%	66.2%	+22.2%
Senate Democrats	37.7%	57.0%	+19.3%
All Senate	39.1%	59.1%	+20.0%

There is a substantial increase in support for the CBIA's agenda among both parties after the passage of the Clean Elections law; not just a minor increase, but well into double-digits, roughly equal across the aisles, although slightly more significant among Republicans. If the purpose of the CEP was to limit the influence of business interests on the Connecticut legislature, this increase alone indicates that policy was a colossal failure, since the corporate and business interests the CBIA represents seem to have improved their success rate substantially among CEP participants.

The dramatic increase in support for business interests may bear some relationship to the 2008-2009 economic crash, when it would have been logical for the assembly to institute business-friendly policies in order to keep companies from folding up, firing workers, or leaving the state entirely. This

14 From the web site of CBIA, "About CBIA," on December 14, 2009, http://www.cbia.com/3about/default.htm

15 See ibid at note 7

16 2009 Connecticut State of Lobbying Report. 2010 data is unavailable because the state did not create a report for that or subsequent years. http://www.ct.gov/ethics/lib/ethics/publications/ct_state_of_lobbying_reportamended.pdf

would appear to indicate that whether lobbying/campaign activity or current events are determining the direction of the legislative agenda, the CEP's impact on the end result appears negligible in either case.

Interestingly, the increase from the 2007-2008 to 2009 session (the period that saw the most dramatic economic contraction) was modest; more significant increases in support came with the 2010 legislative year.[17]

Connecticut Conference of Municipalities

The web site of the Connecticut Conference of Municipalities (CCM) states that it "…is Connecticut's statewide association of towns and cities. Its 144 member municipalities contain over 90 percent of the state's population. CCM represents municipalities at the General Assembly, before the State executive branch and regulatory agencies, and in the courts."[18]

CCM ranked eighth overall in lobbying expenditures in 2008 and fifth in 2009, but did not appear among the top ten in 2007, according to the Connecticut Office of State Ethics .[19] In 2007 and 2008 CCM weighed in on a total of 49 floor votes of bills that they supported or opposed. That jumped significantly in 2009-2010, with CCM taking positions on bills that received 104 floor votes. This was the second largest number of floor votes analyzed, behind only CBIA**.**

The table below breaks out the voting patterns by chamber and by party for the period studied.

Legislative Votes in Favor of CCM Positions, 2007-08 & 2009-10			
Group	*2007/2008 Session*	*2009/2010 Session*	*Increase/Decrease*
House Republicans	68.3%	64.6%	-3.7%
House Democrats	68.1%	63.0%	-5.1%
All House	68.2%	63.3%	-4.9%
Senate Republicans	64.8%	61.3%	-3.4%
Senate Democrats	62.1%	65.3%	+3.2%
All Senate	62.8%	64.3%	+1.5%

The data above indicate a very modest decline in support for CCM's agenda in the Connecticut House of Representatives, along with an even smaller increase in support for CCM's agenda in the Senate. The 2010 data included here shows only a slight difference from our preliminary report.

17 See 2010 report at http://www.campaignfreedom.org/research/detail/meet-the-new-legislature-same-as-the-old-legislature

18 From the website of CCM, "About CCM," on February 26, 2010, http://www.ccm-ct.org/about/

19 See ibid at note 7

Connecticut Hospital Association

The Connecticut Hospital Association (CHA) represents over 140 hospitals and related organizations in Connecticut and states that their mission is "to advance the health of individuals and communities by leading, representing, and serving hospitals and their related healthcare organizations that are accountable to the community and committed to health improvement."[20]

CHA ranked third in total lobbying expenditures in 2007 and fourth in both 2008 and 2009 .[21]

The Connecticut House and Senate considered a total of 25 bills that CHA took clearly identifiable positions on in 2007-2008 and 20 bills in 2009-2010.

The table below breaks out the voting patterns for the period studied.

Legislative votes in favor of CHA positions, 2007-08 & 2009-10			
Group	*2007/2008 Session*	*2009/2010 Session*	*Increase/Decrease*
House Republicans	61.6%	73.4%	+11.8%
House Democrats	72.0%	75.6%	+3.6%
All House	69.7%	75.1%	+5.4%
Senate Republicans	66.6%	67.2%	+0.6%
Senate Democrats	69.5%	60.6%	-8.9%
All Senate	68.9%	62.1%	-6.8%

The CHA saw a moderate increase in support for its agenda in 2009/2010 compared to the 2007/2008 in the House and among Senate Republicans, and a slight decrease among Senate Democrats, leading to an overall decrease in that body.

With a relatively insignificant decrease in the Senate and a modest increase in support in the House, it's difficult to see how the CEP had an effect on CHA's legislative agenda.

Connecticut Association of Health Plans

The Connecticut Association of Health Plans (CAHP) is the trade association for HMO insurance plans. According to their web site, their mission is focused on "bringing high quality, affordable health coverage to Connecticut consumers… by focusing on keeping people well through regular access to preventive care and by offering diverse networks of highly-trained health professionals to serve the health care needs of Connecticut consumers." They also note that the association "strives to facilitate a productive, on-going dialogue among Connecticut's

20 From the website of CHA, , "About CHA," on February 26, 2010 , http://www.chime.org

21 See ibid at note 7

HMOs, policy makers and consumers to ensure that Connecticut's health care system is the best that it can be."

According to the Connecticut Office of State Ethics, CAHP ranked ninth in lobbying expenditures in 2007, did not make the top 10 in 2008, and was ninth in 2009 again.[22] We analyzed a total of 40 bills that CAHP declared a position on, 12 in 2007-2008 and 28 in 2009-2010.

The table below breaks out the voting pattern for the period studied.

Legislative votes in favor of CAHP positions, 2007-08 & 2009-10			
Group	*2007/2008 Session*	*2009/2010 Session*	*Increase/Decrease*
House Republicans	20.0%	30.1%	+10.1%
House Democrats	23.8%	28.6%	+4.8%
All House	19.3%	25.3%	+6.0%
Senate Republicans	15.2%	26.0%	+10.8%
Senate Democrats	8.5%	13.7%	+5.2%
All Senate	10.0%	16.4%	+6.4%

The data shows a relatively modest across-the-board increase in support for CAHP's agenda in 2009-2010 compared to the previous legislature, with a larger increase by Republicans compared to Democrats.

If reformers believed that the influence of the HMO lobby on politics was a serious political problem that the CEP would remedy, they appear to have been mistaken.

AFL-CIO

The AFL-CIO describes itself as a voluntary federation of 57 national and international labor unions, created in 1955 by the merger of the AFL and CIO. It represents 12.2 million members with a stated mission to "improve the lives of working families—to bring economic justice to the workplace and social justice to our nation."[23]

Though the Connecticut AFL-CIO is not a top-ten lobbyist according to the Connecticut Office of State Ethics rankings, it remains an influential force in politics in Connecticut and the rest of the U.S., representing a number of union interests across the state. The Connecticut AFL-CIO has on their website approval ratings demonstrating their opinions on the voting records of Connecticut legislators from 2007-2008 and 2009-2010 that we used to determine increases or decreases in

22 See ibid at note 7. There was no 2010 report available by the time we went to print.

23 AFL-CIO website. http://www.aflcio.org/aboutus/thisistheaflcio/mission/

favorability to the group's positions between the two legislative sessions.

Legislative votes in favor of AFL-CIO positions, 2007-08 & 2009-10			
Group	*2007/2008 Session*	*2009/2010 Session*	*Increase/Decrease*
House Republicans	31.9%	9.2%	-22.7%
House Democrats	94.6%	93.4%	-1.2%
All House	80.6%	75.5%	-5.1%
Senate Republicans	47.7%	31.2%	-16.5%
Senate Democrats	82.1%	99.4%	+17.3%
All Senate	74.4%	84.3%	+9.9%

The results indicate a steep decline in support by House and Senate Republicans and a minimal decline among House Democrats with a substantial increase among Senate Democrats. The decline follows party lines, especially in the Senate. AFL-CIO reduced the scores of some House Republicans by as much as 57%, and one House Democrat's score dropped 43%.

Conclusion

Despite repeated ovations by supporters and the very high utilization rate among legislative candidates, it is not evident that the Citizens' Election Program has had any impact on the voting habits of its participants, and by extension, on state legislation; Connecticut taxpayers have paid over eighty million dollars[24] into the Citizens' Election Fund during the years in question for the illusion that their government has found a way to substantially decrease or eliminate "special interest" influence from the legislative process. This finding is consistent with an earlier study that analyzed the votes of state legislators in Arizona the first year after that state offered taxpayer financed political campaigns, and which also found no impact on legislative voting patterns.[25]

Change in frequency of voting with interest groups		
Interest Group	House	Senate
CBIA	+26.6%	+20.0%
CCM	-4.9%	+1.5%
CHA	+5.4%	-6.8%
CAHP	+6.0%	+6.4%
AFL-CIO	-5.1%	+9.9%

24 Estimate based on data from FY 2009 and FY 2010 found at http://www.cga.ct.gov/2010/ofarpt/2010OFA-0097.htm

25 Robert Franciosi, "Is Cleanliness Political Godliness?" p. 2, November 2001, The Goldwater Institute, available at: http://www.goldwaterinstitute.org/article/899

Of the five interest groups we studied, all saw at least some increase in legislative support, with the largest lobbying organization's increase gaining by double-digits. This clearly indicates that if the biggest lobbying groups have too much influence in the Connecticut Assembly, the CEP did not diminish it.

Connecticut's legislature should view with great skepticism any claims that eliminating candidate's reliance on private contributions, including those connected with organized interest groups, will change the way in which elected officials vote. The failure of the CEP to achieve its primary objective indicates that increasing reliance on taxpayer funds does not, in fact, reduce the likelihood that legislators will continue to vote in favor of interest groups.

Appendix 1 – CBIA

CBIA's legislative priorities were identified from their publication, "CBIA's Legislative Status Report," available on their web site at in the CBIA Government Affairs Report section at:

http://www.cbia.com/gov/GAR/egar/egarIndex.htm

These reports, updated regularly during the legislative regular session, provide the bill numbers and brief summaries of every single bill that CBIA tracks. The report also identifies whether CBIA supports or opposes the bill, or in rare circumstances is neutral or only favors or opposes part of the bill. All told CBIA tracked and took positions on nearly 300 bills over the four-year period covered by this study, although a smaller percentage of those bills received floor votes in at least one chamber. The bills identified in CBIA's Legislative Status Reports that received floor votes are:

CBIA Legislative Priorities and Positions, 2007 - 2010

Senate 07		*Senate 08*		*Senate 09*		*Senate 10*		*House 07*		*House 08*		*House 09*		*House 10*	
Bill #	S/O[1]	Bill #	S/O	Bill #	S/O	Bill #	S/O	Bill #	S/O	Bill #	S/O	Bill #	S/O	Bill #	S/O
6897	O	658	O	47	O	50	O	6879	O	5936	S	47	O	50	O
6989	O	702	S	80	S	65	S	6989	O	671	O	80	S	65	S
7055	O	5936	S	154	S	92	O	7032	O	5658	O	301	O	107	S
7281	S	440	S	290	O	95	S	7055	O	5600	O	379	O	133	S
7369	S	671	O	301	O	107	S	7281	S	5874	O	710	S	175	S
7400	S	5658	O	379	O	109	S	7369	S	57	O	894	O	275	S
1036	O	399	S	710	S	133	S	7400	S	5105	O	964	S	438	S
1112	S	401	S	716	O	173	S	1036	O	5480	O	997	O	493	O
1358	S	652	O	894	O	175	S	1112	S			1068	S	5028	S

1378	S	5600	O	963	S	255	O	1358	S			1099	O	5163	S
1435	S	39	S	964	S	259	O	1378	S			5018	S	5164	S
389	O	5874	O	997	O	260	O	1435	S			5021	O	5201	S
601	O	57	O	1026	O	275	S	389	O			5023	O	5204	S
66	O	217	O	1050	O	393	O	66	S			5172	S	5208	S
73	O	335	O	1068	S	399	O	845	O			5177	O	5255	S
741	O	5105	O	1099	O	417	O					5433	O	5316	S
845	O			5018	O	433	S					5521	O	5336	S
846	O			5021	O	438	S					5930	S	5349	S
847	O			5023	O	455	S					6041	S	5374	S
				5177	O	493	O					6185	O	5393	S
				5433	O	5028	S					6187	O	5413	S
				5930	S	5163	S					6298	S	5421	S
				6041	S	5164	S					6463	S	5435	S
				6185	O	5201	S					6467	S	5436	S
				6463	S	5204	S					6476	S	5494	S
				6467	S	5208	S					6502	O	5497	O
				6476	S	5255	S					6510	O	5535	S
				6502	O	5336	S					6512	O		
				6540	O	5393	S					6540	O		
				6582	O	5413	S					6582	O		
				6600	O	5435	S					6589	S		
						5436	S					6600	O		
						5494	S					6636	O		
						5497	O					6683	O		
						5535	S								

The following table provides the percentage of votes each CEP-participating member of the House and Senate cast that favored CBIA's legislative agenda.

CBIA Vote Frequency				
Connecticut State House				
First Name	**Last Name**	**Party**	**2007/08 Frequency**	**2009/10 Frequency**
Catherine	Abercrombie	D	34.8%	62.7%
David	Aldarondo	D	31.8%	64.8%
Emil	Altobello	D	33.3%	63.9%
Andres	Ayala	D	39.1%	59.3%
Terry	Backer	D	38.1%	63.4%
Ryan	Barry	D	34.8%	59.2%
Jason	Bartlett	D	36.4%	58.6%
Jeffrey	Berger	D	39.1%	71.2%
Elizabeth	Boukus	D	40.0%	62.7%
Larry	Butler	D	35.0%	58.5%
Beth	Bye	D	38.1%	69.8%
Christopher	Caruso	D	39.1%	56.8%
Charles	Clemons	D	40.0%	56.0%
Paul	Davis	D	34.8%	62.7%
Patricia	Dillon	D	39.1%	59.3%
Christopher	Donovan	D	36.4%	59.0%
Thomas	Drew	D	33.3%	59.3%
Kim	Fawcett	D	40.9%	58.9%
Andrew	Fleischmann	D	34.8%	63.0%
Stephen	Fontana	D	30.4%	60.7%
Mary	Fritz	D	30.0%	58.0%
Henry	Genga	D	31.8%	60.7%
Linda	Gentile	D	34.8%	57.1%
John	Geragosian	D	45.0%	60.3%
Demetrios	Giannaros	D	36.4%	65.5%
Robert	Godfrey	D	34.8%	58.9%
Ted	Graziani	D	34.8%	60.7%
Antonio	Guerrera	D	31.8%	59.6%
Gail	Hamm	D	34.8%	59.3%
Deborah	Heinrich	D	47.8%	65.5%
John	Hennessy	D	34.8%	62.3%
Bryan	Hurlburt	D	40.0%	61.7%
Claire	Janowski	D	30.4%	64.7%
Karen	Jarmoc	D	34.8%	60.3%
Edwin	Jutila	D	39.1%	66.7%
Thomas	Kehoe	D	36.4%	60.4%
Marie	Kirkley-Bey	D	38.1%	60.7%
Mike	Lawlor	D	36.4%	59.3%
Joan	Lewis	D	34.8%	60.7%
John	Mazurek	D	36.4%	68.4%
David	McCluskey	D	31.8%	60.7%

Douglas	McCrory	D	40.0%	59.1%
Denise	Merrill	D	40.9%	59.3%
Joe	Mioli	D	40.9%	63.8%
Russell	Morin	D	34.8%	59.3%
Bruce	Morris	D	35.0%	58.2%
Mary	Mushinsky	D	31.8%	59.3%
Sandra	Nafis	D	39.1%	60.0%
Vickie	Nardello	D	30.4%	61.0%
Frank	Nicastro	D	34.8%	66.1%
Tim	O'Brien	D	34.8%	59.0%
Melissa	Olson	D	31.8%	61.7%
Linda	Orange	D	39.1%	59.3%
James	O'Rourke	D	34.8%	57.6%
Chris	Perone	D	34.8%	59.3%
Kelvin	Roldan	D	47.6%	61.4%
Richard	Roy	D	34.8%	63.8%
Peggy	Sayers	D	36.4%	65.0%
Linda	Schofield	D	34.8%	67.3%
Joseph	Serra	D	47.4%	65.5%
Brendan	Sharkey	D	34.8%	63.3%
James	Spallone	D	39.1%	60.0%
Joseph	Taborsak	D	34.8%	60.0%
Kathleen	Tallarita	D	31.8%	58.9%
Peter	Tercyak	D	34.8%	59.6%
John	Thompson	D	34.8%	60.7%
Diana	Urban	D	30.4%	61.1%
Peter	Villano	D	39.1%	64.3%
Toni	Walker	D	36.4%	60.0%
Patricia	Widlitz	D	31.8%	61.4%
Roberta	Willis	D	31.8%	61.4%
Elissa	Wright	D	39.1%	61.0%
Bruce	Zalaski	D	34.8%	63.3%
Mike	Alberts	R	59.1%	74.6%
William	Aman	R	43.5%	80.3%
Penny	Bacchiochi	R	34.8%	80.0%
Mary	Carson	R	39.1%	74.5%
Anthony	D'Amelio	R	47.8%	75.5%
John	Frey	R	45.5%	75.4%
Janice	Giegler	R	47.8%	77.0%
Marilyn	Giuliano	R	34.8%	76.3%
William	Hamzy	R	40.9%	78.7%
John	Harkins	R	39.1%	69.7%
John	Hetherington	R	52.2%	77.0%
DebraLee	Hovey	R	43.5%	75.4%
Themis	Klarides	R	35.0%	75.4%
Lawrence	Miller	R	47.8%	75.4%
Craig	Miner	R	52.2%	80.3%
Selim	Noujaim	R	57.9%	74.5%
John	Piscopo	R	47.8%	79.7%
T.R.	Rowe	R	47.8%	74.1%

Pamela	Sawyer	R	43.5%	80.0%
David	Scribner	R	34.8%	75.4%
John	Stripp	R	47.8%	72.7%
Connecticut State Senate				
First Name	**Last Name**	**Party**	**2007/08 Frequency**	**2009/10 Frequency**
Thomas	Colapietro	D	37.1%	58.5%
Eric	Coleman	D	40.0%	56.9%
Eileen	Daily	D	46.9%	60.0%
Donald	Defronzo	D	37.1%	57.6%
Paul	Doyle	D	35.3%	59.1%
Bob	Duff	D	34.3%	60.6%
John	Fonfara	D	35.3%	57.6%
Thomas	Gaffey	D	35.3%	56.5%
Edwin	Gomes	D	38.2%	57.6%
Mary	Handley	D	35.3%	56.9%
Toni	Harp	D	40.0%	57.6%
Jonathan	Harris	D	37.1%	58.5%
Joan	Hartley	D	38.2%	61.5%
Gary	Lebeau	D	37.1%	57.6%
Martin	Looney	D	35.3%	57.6%
Andrew	Maynard	D	42.9%	56.9%
Andrew	McDonald	D	34.3%	58.1%
Edward	Meyer	D	37.1%	58.5%
Gayle	Slossberg	D	40.0%	38.7%
Andrea	Stillman	D	38.2%	54.8%
Donald	Williams	D	37.1%	57.6%
Sam	Caligiuri	R	40.0%	68.3%
Dan	Debicella	R	51.4%	70.8%
Leonard	Fasano	R	45.7%	63.1%
John	Kissel	R	37.1%	63.1%
John	McKinney	R	47.1%	67.2%
Andrew	Roraback	R	42.9%	65.2%

Appendix 2 – CCM

CCM's legislative priorities were identified from three sources.

1. Bills CCM testified on at legislative hearings, as identified on their web site at: http://www.ccmlac.org/site/testimony.php
2. Bills CCM identified on their web site as being "Important Bills," here: http://www.ccmlac.org/site/important.php
3. Bills on which CCM's position was noted in Joint Favorable Reports by legislative committees, here: http://www.cga.ct.gov/

Only bills that received a floor vote in either chamber were included for this analysis.

CCM Legislative Priorities and Positions, 2007 - 2010

Senate 07		*Senate 08*		*Senate 09*		*Senate 10*		*House 07*		*House 08*		*House 09*		*House 10*	
Bill #	S/O	Bill #	S/O	Bill #	S/O	Bill #	S/O	Bill #	S/O	Bill #	S/O	Bill #	S/O	Bill #	S/O
167	O	39	O	251	S	141	O	167	O	39	O	251	S	141	O
784	O	217	O	375	S	168	O	848	S	217	O	379	S	312	O
848	S	5031	S	379	S	212	O	1054	O	5031	S	735	O	320	S
1054	O	5324	S	384	S	216	S	1091	S	5324	S	761	S	400	S
1084	O	5599	S	497	S	226	S	1182	S	5326	S	785	O	414	S
1091	S	5629	0	569	O	312	O	1447	O	5599	S	885	S	5004	S
1182	S	5633	S	735	O	318	O	5069	S	5629	0	966	S	5059	O
1289	S	5734	S	761	S	319	S	5119	S	5734	S	997	S	5120	S
1312	S	5873	S	762	O	320	S	5186	S	5873	S	1021	S	5208	S
1339	S			784	O	321	S	5234	O			1089	O	5282	S
1447	O			785	O	400	S	6776	O			5254	O	5295	S
5069	S			885	S	414	S	7025	S			5519	O	5315	O
5119	S			966	S	5004	S	7115	S			5536	S	5371	S
5186	S			997	S	5059	O	7125	S			5821	S	5372	S
5234	O			1012	S	5120	S					5861	S	5374	S
6776	O			1021	S	5208	S					5894	S	5383	S
7025	S			1089	O	5282	S					6007	S	5424	S
7115	S			5254	O	5295	S					6041	O	5425	O
				5519	O	5315	O					6097	O	5483	S
				5536	S	5371	S					6187	O	5497	O

				5821	S	5372	S					6285	O	5522	S
				5861	S	5383	S					6324	S		
				5894	S	5424	S					6385	S		
				6041	O	5425	O					6426	S		
				6097	O	5497	O					6463	S		
				6324	S							6467	S		
				6385	S							6496	O		
				6426	S							6582	S		
				6463	S							6585	S		
				6467	S							6588	S		
				6496	O							6589	S		
				6582	S							6625	S		
				6585	S							6656	O		
												6683	O		

The following table provides the percentage of votes each CEP-participating member of the House and Senate cast that favored CCM's legislative agenda.

CCM Vote Frequency

Connecticut State House

First Name	Last Name	Party	2007/08 Frequency	2009/10 Frequency
Catherine	Abercrombie	D	68.20%	65.00%
David	Aldarondo	D	66.70%	63.20%
Emil	Altobello	D	68.20%	66.70%
Andres	Ayala	D	68.20%	64.40%
Terry	Backer	D	65.00%	62.20%
Ryan	Barry	D	66.70%	65.30%
Jason	Bartlett	D	66.70%	57.60%
Jeffrey	Berger	D	78.90%	64.40%
Elizabeth	Boukus	D	65.00%	65.50%
Larry	Butler	D	68.20%	67.30%
Beth	Bye	D	68.20%	71.20%
Christopher	Caruso	D	68.20%	65.30%
Charles	Clemons	D	68.20%	62.50%

Paul	Davis	D	71.40%	65.50%
Patricia	Dillon	D	68.20%	60.00%
Christopher	Donovan	D	68.20%	62.70%
Thomas	Drew	D	68.20%	63.80%
Kim	Fawcett	D	66.70%	57.40%
Andrew	Fleischmann	D	66.70%	62.50%
Stephen	Fontana	D	68.20%	62.70%
Mary	Fritz	D	65.00%	65.40%
Henry	Genga	D	68.20%	63.30%
Linda	Gentile	D	66.70%	64.90%
John	Geragosian	D	66.70%	60.70%
Demetrios	Giannaros	D	68.20%	62.50%
Robert	Godfrey	D	63.60%	62.50%
Ted	Graziani	D	68.20%	63.30%
Antonio	Guerrera	D	68.20%	65.50%
Gail	Hamm	D	66.70%	58.90%
Deborah	Heinrich	D	66.70%	64.90%
John	Hennessy	D	66.70%	61.70%
Bryan	Hurlburt	D	68.20%	64.40%
Claire	Janowski	D	68.20%	64.60%
Karen	Jarmoc	D	68.20%	60.70%
Edwin	Jutila	D	68.20%	61.70%
Thomas	Kehoe	D	68.20%	67.90%
Marie	Kirkley-Bey	D	72.20%	64.20%
Mike	Lawlor	D	63.20%	60.00%
Joan	Lewis	D	68.20%	63.30%
John	Mazurek	D	68.20%	65.50%
David	McCluskey	D	68.20%	64.40%
Douglas	McCrory	D	72.20%	63.00%
Denise	Merrill	D	70.00%	63.80%
Joe	Mioli	D	66.70%	60.80%
Russell	Morin	D	71.40%	62.10%
Bruce	Morris	D	70.00%	61.80%
Mary	Mushinsky	D	68.20%	60.00%
Sandra	Nafis	D	65.00%	61.70%
Vickie	Nardello	D	66.70%	62.70%
Frank	Nicastro	D	68.20%	62.70%
Tim	O'Brien	D	68.20%	61.70%
Melissa	Olson	D	68.20%	63.30%
Linda	Orange	D	68.20%	61.10%
James	O'Rourke	D	68.20%	57.90%
Chris	Perone	D	63.60%	63.20%

Kelvin	Roldan	D	71.40%	61.00%
Richard	Roy	D	68.20%	64.40%
Peggy	Sayers	D	71.40%	61.40%
Linda	Schofield	D	72.70%	60.70%
Joseph	Serra	D	68.20%	63.00%
Brendan	Sharkey	D	68.20%	63.20%
James	Spallone	D	68.20%	58.30%
Joseph	Taborsak	D	68.20%	72.90%
Kathleen	Tallarita	D	68.20%	59.30%
Peter	Tercyak	D	66.70%	58.50%
John	Thompson	D	66.70%	63.80%
Diana	Urban	D	66.70%	61.10%
Peter	Villano	D	68.20%	58.50%
Toni	Walker	D	68.20%	63.80%
Patricia	Widlitz	D	71.40%	65.50%
Roberta	Willis	D	68.20%	62.50%
Elissa	Wright	D	68.20%	62.70%
Bruce	Zalaski	D	68.20%	63.30%
Mike	Alberts	R	61.90%	62.70%
William	Aman	R	68.20%	66.10%
Penny	Bacchiochi	R	66.70%	65.00%
Mary	Carson	R	72.70%	74.00%
Anthony	D'Amelio	R	72.70%	66.70%
John	Frey	R	66.70%	59.30%
Janice	Giegler	R	68.20%	61.70%
Marilyn	Giuliano	R	68.20%	63.20%
William	Hamzy	R	72.70%	68.30%
John	Harkins	R	68.20%	64.90%
John	Hetherington	R	66.70%	66.70%
DebraLee	Hovey	R	70.00%	67.80%
Themis	Klarides	R	66.70%	65.00%
Lawrence	Miller	R	63.60%	57.60%
Craig	Miner	R	72.70%	62.10%
Selim	Noujaim	R	70.00%	66.10%
John	Piscopo	R	72.70%	60.00%
T.R.	Rowe	R	63.60%	68.40%
Pamela	Sawyer	R	68.20%	63.80%
David	Scribner	R	63.60%	61.70%
John	Stripp	R	72.70%	62.50%

Connecticut Senate				
First Name	**Last Name**	**Party**	**2007/08**	**2009/10**

Thomas	Colapietro	D	59.30%	64.90%
Eric	Coleman	D	63.00%	65.50%
Eileen	Daily	D	63.00%	63.80%
Donald	Defronzo	D	63.00%	65.50%
Paul	Doyle	D	65.40%	63.80%
Bob	Duff	D	59.30%	65.50%
John	Fonfara	D	65.40%	65.50%
Thomas	Gaffey	D	53.80%	64.90%
Edwin	Gomes	D	63.00%	66.70%
Mary	Handley	D	61.50%	65.50%
Toni	Harp	D	59.30%	65.50%
Jonathan	Harris	D	66.70%	64.90%
Joan	Hartley	D	59.30%	64.90%
Gary	Lebeau	D	63.00%	65.50%
Martin	Looney	D	59.30%	65.50%
Andrew	Maynard	D	66.70%	64.90%
Andrew	McDonald	D	59.30%	64.30%
Edward	Meyer	D	65.40%	66.10%
Gayle	Slossberg	D	66.70%	66.70%
Andrea	Stillman	D	59.30%	64.90%
Donald	Williams	D	63.00%	65.50%
Sam	Caligiuri	R	59.30%	60.70%
Dan	Debicella	R	61.50%	59.60%
Leonard	Fasano	R	63.00%	62.10%
Robert	Kane	R	63.00%	63.60%
John	Kissel	R	59.30%	62.10%
John	McKinney	R	76.90%	57.40%
Andrew	Roraback	R	70.40%	63.80%

Appendix 3 – Connecticut Hospital Association

CHA's legislative priorities were identified from three sources.

1. Bills CHA testified on at legislative hearings, as identified on their web site at: http://www.chime.org/
2. Bills CHA indicated a position on in their *Update* publication, also available at: http://www.chime.org/
3. Bills on which CHA's position was noted in Joint Favorable Reports by legislative committees, here: http://www.cga.ct.gov/

Only bills that received a floor vote in the Senate were included for this analysis. A total of 33 floor votes were taken on these bills (not including amendments).

CHA Legislative Priorities

Senate 07		*Senate 08*		*Senate 09*		*Senate 10*		*House 07*		*House 08*		*House 09*		*House 10*	
Bill #	O/S	Bill #	O/S	Bill #	O/S	Bill #	O/S	Bill #	O/S	Bill #	O/S	Bill #	O/S	Bill #	O/S
1013	S	57	O	365	O	246	S	1145	S	57	O	6264	S	246	S
1144	S	172	S	827	S	248	S	1484	S	471	S	6336	S	248	S
1145	S	420	S	980	S	265	O	6722	S	622	S	6391	S	402	S
1226	S	458	S	1026	O	402	S	7089	S	659	S	6642	O	5024	S
1342	O	471	S	1091	O	428	O	7155	S	5772	O	6678	O	5300	O
1484	S	483	O	6264	S	5024	S	7163	O	5902	S			5339	S
7089	S	579	S	6336	S	5339	S	7203	O					5349	S
7155	S	622	S	6391	S	5398	S	7210	O						
7163	O	654	O	6642	O										
7210	O	659	S	6678	O										
		5701	S												
		5772	O												
		5902	S												

The following table provides the percentage of votes each CEP-participating member of the Senate cast that favored CHA's legislative agenda.

CHA Vote Frequency

Connecticut House

First Name	Last Name	2007/08	2009/10
Catherine	Abercrombie	71.4%	75.0%

David	Aldarondo	75.0%	72.7%
Emil	Altobello	71.4%	75.0%
Andres	Ayala	71.4%	75.0%
Terry	Backer	75.0%	80.0%
Ryan	Barry	66.7%	83.3%
Jason	Bartlett	64.3%	75.0%
Jeffrey	Berger	72.7%	75.0%
Elizabeth	Boukus	80.0%	75.0%
Larry	Butler	76.9%	80.0%
Beth	Bye	75.0%	75.0%
Christopher	Caruso	71.4%	75.0%
Charles	Clemons	72.7%	77.8%
Paul	Davis	76.9%	75.0%
Patricia	Dillon	76.9%	72.7%
Christopher	Donovan	71.4%	75.0%
Thomas	Drew	64.3%	75.0%
Kim	Fawcett	71.4%	77.8%
Andrew	Fleischmann	78.6%	75.0%
Stephen	Fontana	71.4%	70.0%
Mary	Fritz	63.6%	81.8%
Henry	Genga	72.7%	75.0%
Linda	Gentile	71.4%	75.0%
John	Geragosian	72.7%	81.8%
Demetrios	Giannaros	71.4%	72.7%
Robert	Godfrey	64.3%	80.0%
Ted	Graziani	71.4%	75.0%
Antonio	Guerrera	71.4%	81.8%
Gail	Hamm	71.4%	81.8%
Deborah	Heinrich	69.2%	75.0%
John	Hennessy	71.4%	75.0%
Bryan	Hurlburt	71.4%	75.0%
Claire	Janowski	63.6%	80.0%
Karen	Jarmoc	71.4%	75.0%
Edwin	Jutila	71.4%	75.0%
Thomas	Kehoe	71.4%	70.0%
Marie	Kirkley-Bey	69.2%	70.0%
Mike	Lawlor	75.0%	75.0%
Joan	Lewis	71.4%	75.0%
John	Mazurek	75.0%	75.0%
David	McCluskey	78.6%	75.0%
Douglas	McCrory	69.2%	77.8%

Denise	Merrill	75.0%	75.0%
Joe	Mioli	71.4%	72.7%
Russell	Morin	71.4%	72.7%
Bruce	Morris	76.9%	70.0%
Mary	Mushinsky	71.4%	87.5%
Sandra	Nafis	57.1%	75.0%
Vickie	Nardello	78.6%	72.7%
Frank	Nicastro	71.4%	75.0%
Tim	O'Brien	71.4%	75.0%
Melissa	Olson	76.9%	75.0%
Linda	Orange	71.4%	77.8%
James	O'Rourke	71.4%	77.8%
Chris	Perone	71.4%	72.7%
Kelvin	Roldan	75.0%	75.0%
Richard	Roy	71.4%	75.0%
Peggy	Sayers	71.4%	75.0%
Linda	Schofield	78.6%	75.0%
Joseph	Serra	71.4%	72.7%
Brendan	Sharkey	71.4%	75.0%
James	Spallone	71.4%	90.0%
Joseph	Taborsak	64.3%	72.7%
Kathleen	Tallarita	75.0%	75.0%
Peter	Tercyak	71.4%	72.7%
John	Thompson	71.4%	75.0%
Diana	Urban	71.4%	72.7%
Peter	Villano	69.2%	72.7%
Toni	Walker	83.3%	75.0%
Patricia	Widlitz	83.3%	72.7%
Roberta	Willis	63.6%	75.0%
Elissa	Wright	71.4%	72.7%
Bruce	Zalaski	71.4%	75.0%
Mike	Alberts	57.1%	72.7%
William	Aman	64.3%	75.0%
Penny	Bacchiochi	64.3%	75.0%
Mary	Carson	64.3%	70.0%
Anthony	D'Amelio	57.1%	70.0%
John	Frey	66.7%	75.0%
Janice	Giegler	64.3%	75.0%
Marilyn	Giuliano	61.5%	75.0%
William	Hamzy	57.1%	75.0%
John	Harkins	61.5%	60.0%

John	Hetherington	58.3%	75.0%
DebraLee	Hovey	64.3%	75.0%
Themis	Klarides	66.7%	75.0%
Lawrence	Miller	64.3%	75.0%
Craig	Miner	50.0%	72.7%
Selim	Noujaim	77.8%	75.0%
John	Piscopo	50.0%	75.0%
T.R.	Rowe	57.1%	72.7%
Pamela	Sawyer	57.1%	75.0%
David	Scribner	64.3%	75.0%
John	Stripp	64.3%	72.7%

CHA Vote Frequency

Connecticut State Senate

First Name	Last Name	2007/08 Frequency	2009/10 Frequency
Sam	Caligiuri	69.6%	62.5%
Thomas	Colapietro	73.9%	61.1%
Eric	Coleman	69.6%	61.1%
Eileen	Daily	65.2%	61.1%
Dan	Debicella	69.6%	70.6%
Donald	Defronzo	69.6%	61.1%
Paul	Doyle	69.6%	61.1%
Bob	Duff	69.6%	61.1%
Leonard	Fasano	65.2%	72.2%
John	Fonfara	68.2%	61.1%
Thomas	Gaffey	69.6%	58.8%
Edwin	Gomes	69.6%	61.1%
Mary	Handley	69.6%	61.1%
Toni	Harp	69.6%	61.1%
Jonathan	Harris	69.6%	58.8%
Joan	Hartley	73.9%	64.7%
John	Kissel	65.2%	66.7%
Gary	Lebeau	69.6%	61.1%
Martin	Looney	69.6%	61.1%
Andrew	Maynard	69.6%	61.1%
Andrew	McDonald	65.2%	58.8%
John	McKinney	65.2%	64.7%
Edward	Meyer	69.6%	66.7%
Andrew	Roraback	65.2%	66.7%
Gayle	Slossberg	69.6%	50.0%
Andrea	Stillman	69.6%	58.8%
Donald	Williams	69.6%	61.1%

Appendix 4 – Connecticut Association of Health Plans

CAHP's legislative priorities were identified from a single source, bills on which CAHP's position was noted in Joint Favorable Reports by legislative committees, here: http://www.cga.ct.gov/

Only bills that received a floor vote in the Senate were included for this analysis.

CAHP Legislative Priorities

Senate 07		*Senate 08*		*Senate 09*		*Senate 10*		*House 07*		*House 08*		*House 09*		*House 10*	
Bill #	O/S	Bill #	O/S	Bill #	O/S	Bill #	O/S	Bill #	O/S	Bill #	O/S	Bill #	O/S	Bill #	O/S
74	O	5696	O	46	O	12	S	74	O	5696	O	46	O	17	O
7055	O	273	O	47	O	17	O	7055	O	273	O	47	O	50	O
7262	S	280	O	74	O	50	O	7262	S	5902	O	301	O	92	O
66	O	478	O	301	O	92	O	66	O			457	S		
73	O	491	O	457	S	192	O					5018	S		
		5902	O	638	O	254	O					5019	O		
		30	O	962	O	255	O					5021	O		
				5018	S	258	O					5023	O		
				5019	O	259	O					5172	S		
				5021	O	260	O					5433	O		
				5023	O	393	S					5669	O		
				5172	S							6529	O		
				5433	O							6531	O		
				5669	O							6582	O		
				6529	O										
				6531	O										
				6582	O										

The following table provides the percentage of votes each CEP-participating member of the Senate cast that favored CHA's legislative agenda.

CAHP Vote Frequency

Connecticut House

First Name	Last Name	P	2007/08	2009/10
Catherine	Abercrombie	D	17.9%	25.0%
David	Aldarondo	D	20.8%	25.0%
Emil	Altobello	D	22.2%	25.0%

Andres	Ayala	D	17.9%	25.0%
Terry	Backer	D	17.9%	31.3%
Ryan	Barry	D	17.9%	18.8%
Jason	Bartlett	D	17.9%	25.0%
Jeffrey	Berger	D	17.9%	18.8%
Elizabeth	Boukus	D	19.0%	25.0%
Larry	Butler	D	22.2%	18.8%
Beth	Bye	D	20.8%	18.8%
Christopher	Caruso	D	17.9%	18.8%
Charles	Clemons	D	30.0%	18.8%
Paul	Davis	D	17.9%	25.0%
Patricia	Dillon	D	17.9%	25.0%
Christopher	Donovan	D	17.9%	25.0%
Thomas	Drew	D	22.2%	18.8%
Kim	Fawcett	D	17.9%	25.0%
Andrew	Fleischmann	D	17.9%	18.8%
Stephen	Fontana	D	17.9%	25.0%
Mary	Fritz	D	17.9%	18.8%
Henry	Genga	D	17.9%	25.0%
Linda	Gentile	D	17.9%	25.0%
John	Geragosian	D	26.7%	25.0%
Demetrios	Giannaros	D	17.9%	31.3%
Robert	Godfrey	D	17.9%	25.0%
Ted	Graziani	D	17.9%	25.0%
Antonio	Guerrera	D	22.2%	25.0%
Gail	Hamm	D	17.9%	18.8%
Deborah	Heinrich	D	35.7%	37.5%
John	Hennessy	D	17.9%	25.0%
Bryan	Hurlburt	D	22.2%	25.0%
Claire	Janowski	D	17.9%	25.0%
Karen	Jarmoc	D	20.8%	18.8%
Edwin	Jutila	D	17.9%	25.0%
Thomas	Kehoe	D	17.9%	25.0%
Marie	Kirkley-Bey	D	26.7%	25.0%
Mike	Lawlor	D	19.0%	25.0%
Joan	Lewis	D	17.9%	25.0%
John	Mazurek	D	20.8%	31.3%
David	McCluskey	D	17.9%	25.0%
Douglas	McCrory	D	30.0%	18.8%
Denise	Merrill	D	26.7%	25.0%
Joe	Mioli	D	17.9%	25.0%

Russell	Morin	D	17.9%	18.8%
Bruce	Morris	D	0.0%	18.8%
Mary	Mushinsky	D	17.9%	18.8%
Sandra	Nafis	D	22.2%	25.0%
Vickie	Nardello	D	17.9%	25.0%
Frank	Nicastro	D	17.9%	31.3%
Tim	O'Brien	D	17.9%	25.0%
Melissa	Olson	D	17.9%	25.0%
Linda	Orange	D	22.2%	18.8%
James	O'Rourke	D	17.9%	25.0%
Chris	Perone	D	17.9%	25.0%
Kelvin	Roldan	D	20.8%	12.5%
Richard	Roy	D	17.9%	18.8%
Peggy	Sayers	D	17.9%	25.0%
Linda	Schofield	D	17.9%	25.0%
Joseph	Serra	D	22.2%	25.0%
Brendan	Sharkey	D	17.9%	25.0%
James	Spallone	D	17.9%	25.0%
Joseph	Taborsak	D	17.9%	18.8%
Kathleen	Tallarita	D	17.9%	25.0%
Peter	Tercyak	D	17.9%	25.0%
John	Thompson	D	17.9%	25.0%
Diana	Urban	D	17.9%	18.8%
Peter	Villano	D	22.2%	25.0%
Toni	Walker	D	17.9%	25.0%
Patricia	Widlitz	D	0.0%	25.0%
Roberta	Willis	D	17.9%	18.8%
Elissa	Wright	D	17.9%	25.0%
Bruce	Zalaski	D	17.9%	31.3%
Mike	Alberts	R	35.7%	37.5%
William	Aman	R	17.9%	31.3%
Penny	Bacchiochi	R	17.9%	31.3%
Mary	Carson	R	17.9%	31.3%
Anthony	D'Amelio	R	17.9%	25.0%
John	Frey	R	17.9%	31.3%
Janice	Giegler	R	17.9%	31.3%
Marilyn	Giuliano	R	17.9%	25.0%
William	Hamzy	R	17.9%	31.3%
John	Harkins	R	17.9%	25.0%
John	Hetherington	R	22.2%	31.3%
DebraLee	Hovey	R	17.9%	31.3%

Themis	Klarides	R	20.8%	31.3%
Lawrence	Miller	R	17.9%	31.3%
Craig	Miner	R	35.7%	31.3%
Selim	Noujaim	R	22.2%	31.3%
John	Piscopo	R	17.9%	37.5%
T.R.	Rowe	R	17.9%	31.3%
Pamela	Sawyer	R	17.9%	31.3%
David	Scribner	R	17.9%	31.3%
John	Stripp	R	17.9%	25.0%

CAHP Vote Frequency

Connecticut State Senate

First Name	Last Name	2007/08 Frequency	2009/10 Frequency
Thomas	Colapietro	8.3%	12.5%
Eric	Coleman	8.3%	12.5%
Eileen	Daily	9.1%	18.8%
Donald	Defronzo	8.3%	12.5%
Paul	Doyle	8.3%	18.8%
Bob	Duff	8.3%	18.8%
John	Fonfara	8.3%	12.5%
Thomas	Gaffey	9.1%	12.5%
Edwin	Gomes	8.3%	12.5%
Mary	Handley	8.3%	12.5%
Toni	Harp	8.3%	12.5%
Jonathan	Harris	8.3%	18.8%
Joan	Hartley	8.3%	18.8%
Gary	Lebeau	8.3%	12.5%
Martin	Looney	8.3%	12.5%
Andrew	Maynard	8.3%	12.5%
Andrew	McDonald	8.3%	12.5%
Edward	Meyer	8.3%	12.5%
Gayle	Slossberg	8.3%	6.3%
Andrea	Stillman	8.3%	12.5%
Donald	Williams	9.1%	12.5%
Sam	Caligiuri	16.7%	25.0%
Dan	Debicella	33.3%	31.3%
Leonard	Fasano	8.3%	25.0%
John	Kissel	8.3%	25.0%
John	McKinney	16.7%	25.0%
Andrew	Roraback	8.3%	25.0%

Appendix 5—AFL-CIO

These opinions came directly from the Connecticut AFL-CIO's legislative scorecards available at http://www.ctaflcio.org/index.cfm?action=article&articleID=4977ab4e-0605-4b85-ae37-4f3965aafa7e

The legislative scores given to each legislator were calculated by the AFL-CIO and can be seen at the above link.

Appendix 6—Methodology Notes

Standard of Inclusion for Bills

In order to be included in our research, a bill must meet the following criteria:

1. It must be a bill that one of our interest groups expressed an opinion on, and must have made it to a floor vote (where individual legislators had their yea/nay recorded).

2. If the bill was amended, the amendment did not create any apparent contradiction with the expressed desires of the interest group, per Joint Favorable Reports (JFR) or other available reports by the interest groups. If the amended language appears to have made substantial changes to the language of the bill and may have altered its intent, the bill was left out.

3. If the interest group expressed, in a JFR or elsewhere, that a bill needed to be amended in a specific way (i.e. a specific language change), that change was made.

4. If the amended version of a bill did not have any objection professed by the interest group to the best of our knowledge. Many groups do not publish their opinions on specific legislation (or it is no longer available for previous years) and their opinions can only be surmised by JFR reports.

5. This sort of standard will involve judgment calls when comparing JFR and other opinions from interest groups with amendment language; different researchers might make different calls on some legislation when there is sufficient ambiguity. CCP's research team has made every attempt to ensure the accuracy of our information, and believe it to be an accurate representation of the opinions of the interest groups we are studying.

Omitted Bills

CBIA: SB 176 (2010)
CCM: SB 376, 5033, 5255, 5534 (2010)

CHA: none
CAHP: none
AFL-CIO: none

(Footnotes)

1 S= Supported O= Opposed

GUARANTEE *of* QUALITY SCHOLARSHIP

The Center for Competitive Politics is committed to delivering the highest quality and most reliable research on issues related to campaign finance, political speech, First Amendment rights, and related topics.

The Center guarantees that all original factual data are true and correct and that information attributed to other sources is accurately represented.

The Center encourages rigorous critique of its research. If the accuracy of any material fact or reference to an independent source is questioned and brought to the Center's attention with supporting evidence, the Center will respond in writing. If an error exists, it will be corrected in subsequent printings and distributions. This will constitute the complete and final remedy under this guarantee.

Published by the Center for Competitive Politics. All information is from sources considered reliable, but may be subject to inaccuracies, omissions, and modifications.

The Center for Competitive Politics (CCP) is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization based in Washington, DC. CCP's mission, through legal briefs, studies, historical and constitutional analyses, and media communication is to promote and defend citizens' first amendment political rights of speech, assembly, and petition, and to educate the public on the actual effects of money in politics and the benefits of a more free and competitive election and political process. Contributions to CCP are tax deductible to the extent allowed by law.

124 S. West Street Suite 201
Alexandria, Va 22314
(703) 894-6800
http://www.CampaignFreedom.org