

100th General Assembly

2017-2018 Legislative Ratings

STRONGER BUSINESS STRONGER ILLINOIS

About the Illinois Chamber of Commerce Legislative Ratings

The ratings are based on legislators' votes on the key business legislation of the 100th General Assembly as determined by staff and the Chamber's Government Affairs Committee. The votes in the Senate and House are selected based on their impact on the business community.

None of the bills used in the report are weighted, as there were an adequate number of legislation voted on during this General Assembly.

Legislators were given a positive mark (+) on their scorecard for bills in which they voted in favor with the Illinois Chamber and were given a negative mark (-) on their scorecard for bills in which they voted against the Illinois Chamber.

Legislators who voted present (P), were absent (A) or took a 'no vote' (NV) on a bill in which the Illinois Chamber supported were also given a negative mark (-) on their scorecard. Contrary, legislators who voted present, were absent or took a 'no vote' on a bill in which the Illinois Chamber opposed, were not counted for or against their final rating.

Legislators who were either not a member at the time of the vote (NA) or were excused from their absence (E) during the vote were not counted for or against their final score. Members who did not meet the required number of votes were not given a rating (NE).

In cases where more than one roll call was taken on a bill, the vote that best demonstrates support for employers' vital interests was chosen. If employers are to change the culture in Springfield, they must educate themselves on the record of their representatives and hold them accountable for it.

To view the breakdown of members of the House of Representatives, click <u>here</u>. To view the breakdown of members of the Senate, click <u>here</u>.

The 2017-2018 Champions of Free Enterprise

The Illinois Chamber of Commerce is proud to recognize legislators that have made special contributions in the defense of free enterprise, and the furtherance of economic opportunities for Illinoisans. Legislators with Illinois Chamber ratings averaging 85% or better over the previous two General Assemblies have demonstrated their commitment to legislation that frees the entrepreneurial spirit and qualify for the award. The Chamber would also like to thank several freshmen legislators who provided outstanding voting records in their first two years in office. However, the Chamber would like to recognize only one legislator from each chamber serving their first two years in office with the Outstanding Freshman Legislator award. Freshmen scoring above 85% will be eligible for the awards given in the 100th General Assembly. The Champions of Free Enterprise Awards are given biennially.

Senate Award Winners
Senator Pamela Althoff
Senator Jason Barickman
Senator Tim Bivins
Senator Michael Connelly
Senator Kyle McCarter
Senator Dan McConchie
Senator Karen McConnaughay
Senator Chris Nybo
Senator Christine Radogno
Senator Dale Righter
Senator Chapin Rose
Senator Chuck Weaver
Outstanding Freshman Senator

Senator Tom Rooney

House Awa	ard Winners
Representative Mark Batinick	Representative Patricia Bellock
Representative Thomas Bennett	Representative Avery Bourne
Representative Dan Brady	Representative Peter Breen
Representative Tim Butler	Representative John Cavalleto
Representative C.D. Davidsmeyer	Representative Tom Demmer
Leader Jim Durkin	Representative Mike Fortner
Representative Randy Frese	Representative Norine Hammond
Representative Chad Hays	Representative Jeanne Ives
Representative Sheri Jesiel	Representative Sara Wojcicki Jimenez
Representative Margo McDermed	Representative David McSweeney
Representative Charlie Meier	Representative Thomas Morrison
Representative Reginald Philips	Representative Robert Pritchard
Representative David Reis	Representative Keith Sommer
Representative Joe Sosnowski	Representative Brian Stewart
Representative Michael Unes	Representative Grant Wehrli
Representative Barbara Wheeler	Representative Keith Wheeler
Representative Christine Winger	
	Outstanding Freshman Representative

Representative Tony McCombie

Legislation Used for the 100th G.A Legislative Ratings

SB 2814 (Rose/Rita) – "Future Energy Jobs Act" *99th G.A.

The Illinois Chamber opposed this legislation out of concern for the adverse impact the bill would have on the business community. The Illinois Chamber recognizes that there were valid arguments in favor of approving this bill, including the regional impact to Clinton and the Quad Cities and the potential impact to the grid. With that in mind, we believe that the disruption to an already successful marketplace outweighed the arguments in favor of passing this legislation. SB 2814 is an anticompetitive bill that increases electricity prices for the business community and ultimately slows economic growth. This legislation will increase costs on all ratepayers and, while there was some success in easing those costs during the amendment process, the increases will still be extremely costly to the state's employers and further exacerbate Illinois' anti-business climate. With already skyrocketing workers' compensation costs and hostile tax policies, Illinois simply cannot afford another challenge to retaining businesses. Given the impact of this bill and the fact it was signed into law during the veto session of the 99th General Assembly, when lawmakers are often held with little to no accountability, we are using this vote towards members' 2017-2018 ratings.

Chamber Position: OPPOSE House 3rd Reading: <u>63-38-0</u> Senate Concurrence: <u>32-18-0</u>

Outcome: Public Act 99-0906

HB 162 (Zalewski/Bush) – EDGE Tax Credit Extension

HB 162 which would reinstate the state's main job creation incentive program, EDGE, for five years. The legislation also makes changes concerning the capital investment and employment requirements for credits under the Act. These changes may provide for a greater level of participation by small and mid-sized businesses - something the previous version of EDGE did not have.

Chamber Position: SUPPORT House 3rd Reading: 102-5-0 Senate 3rd Reading: 56-0-1

Outcome: Public Act 100-0511

HB 302 (Martwick/Collins) – Life Insurance Unclaimed Benefits

HB 302 would require life insurance companies to cross-match lapsed or expired policies against the Social Security Administration's Death Master File to find potential beneficiaries of unclaimed life insurance benefits. The bill as passed both chambers, requires all insurers to search policies in force as of Jan. 1, 2012, and to Jan. 1, 2000 if a company has electronically-searchable records.

Chamber Position: OPPOSE

House Motion to Override Veto: <u>71-40-0</u> Senate Motion to Override Veto: <u>38-16-0</u>

HB 791 (Demmer/McConnaughay) – Autonomous Vehicle Preemption

HB 791 Prohibits a unit of local government, including a home rule unit, from enacting an ordinance prohibiting the use of autonomous vehicles on its roadways. This bill sends a welcoming sign to both automobile manufacturers and technology companies that Illinois is open for business.

Chamber Position: SUPPORT House Concurrence: <u>98-0-0</u> Senate Third Reading: <u>53-0-0</u>

HB 2525 (Hoffman/Raoul) - Fake Workers' Compensation Reform

Amends the Employer's Liability Rates Article of the Illinois Insurance Code to regulate workers' compensation insurance rates. Includes employer safety and return to work programs, returns injuries to the shoulder part of the arm and hip part of the leg, provisions concerning repetitive and cumulative injuries, annual reports done by IWCC on self-insurance, a Workers' Compensation Premium Rates Task Force, an evidence-based drug formulary, and other changes.

Chamber Position: OPPOSE House Concurrence: <u>64-51-0</u> Senate 3rd Reading: <u>35-19-1</u>

Outcome: Governor Vetoed; Total Veto Stands

HB 2622 (Fine/Biss) - More Fake Workers' Compensation

HB 2622 uses employer and insurer tax dollars to capitalize the creation of a state established, mutual insurance company to compete with the over 300 insurers that already provide workers' compensation coverage. The \$10 million of startup money are tax dollars that currently go to run the operations of the Workers' Compensation Commission. The legislation provides that the funds are a "loan" to be paid back with interest. Given the track record regarding finances of Illinois state government, it is difficult to believe the loan would be paid in a timely fashion. Furthermore, removing resources meant to support the operations of the Commission jeopardizes the entire adjudication of workers' compensation for injured workers as well as employers.

Chamber Position: OPPOSE

House Motion to Override: 65-50-1

Senate 3rd Reading: 32-20-1

Outcome: Governor Vetoed; Total Veto Stands

HB 2771 (C. Mitchell/Hutchinson) – "Health Workplace Act"

HB 2771 as amended, would require employers to provide 5 sick days to employees. An employee may earn sick days 180 days after beginning employment at the accrual rate of one hour of sick leave for every 40 hours worked. School districts, park districts, and certain City of Chicago sister agencies are exempt. The Department of Labor will administer the program. Individuals may file civil actions with respect to violations of the new Act.

Chamber Position: OPPOSE
House Concurrence: 59-50-0
Senate 3rd Reading: 31-17-0
Outcome: Failed in the House

HB 3419 (Andrade/Martinez) - Corporate Expatriation: Blame the Tax Code, Not Companies

HB 3419 would unjustly punish companies who engage in perfectly legal federal tax planning retroactively. Under the bill, the state would prohibit so-called "expatriated entities" who have engaged in legal federal tax planning from bidding on state contracts and prohibits the state's pension systems from investing in the stock of such companies. It is also worth mentioning that since the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act was signed into law, many companies are repatriating foreign income back to the United States.

Chamber Position: OPPOSE

House Motion to Override Veto: <u>75-36-0</u> Senate Motion to Override Veto: <u>39-12-0</u>

HB 3449 (Williams/T. Cullerton) – Geolocation Bill

HB 3449, otherwise known as the 'geolocation bill.' This bill would have had immense impact on our state's thriving technology sector. A bill that all along was being pushed by trial lawyers would have prohibited private entities from receiving location information from a device until users are put through a consent process that would be long and cumbersome to both app developers, businesses and the consumers. Not to mention, it would have disrupted many businesses models and services with its passage.

Chamber Position: OPPOSE
House Concurrence: 63-38-2
Senate 3rd Reading: 33-22-0

Outcome: Governor Vetoed; Total Veto Stands

HB 4081 (Halpin/Bennett) - Call Center Bill

HB 4081 would create the Call Center Worker an Consumer Protection Act. The proposal would require employers with 50 or more employees that relocates a call center (or substantial operations) from Illinois to another country OR state to notify the Illinois Treasurer's Office at least 120 days prior to relocation. Any employer that does not notify the Treasurer is subject to a civil penalty of \$10,000 for each day they are found in violation. In addition, any employer that appears on the blacklist would be ineligible for any direct or indirect state grants or loan for 5 years. The bill would require any state agency to ensure that all state-business-related call center and customer service work be performed by state contractors entirely within the state.

Chamber Position: OPPOSE House 3rd Reading: 61-49-0

Outcome: Failed in the Senate Telecommunications and IT Committee

HB 4163 (Moeller/Castro) – Wage History: Equal Pay Act

HB 4163 would prohibit an employer from: (i) screening job applicants based on their wage or salary history, (ii) requiring that an applicant's prior wages satisfy minimum or maximum criteria, and (iii) requesting or requiring as a condition of being interviewed or as a condition of continuing to be considered for an offer of employment that an applicant disclose prior wages or salary. It also would prohibit an employer from seeking the salary, including benefits or other compensation or salary

history, of a job applicant from any current or former employer. It also undermines employer defenses along with expansion of civil penalties.

Chamber Position: OPPOSE
House 3rd Reading: <u>87-24-0</u>
Senate 3rd Reading: <u>31-16-1</u>
Outcome: Passed Both Houses

HB 4324 (Welch/Lightford) - Wage Lien Act

Creates the Wage Lien Act to allow for the creation of a lien on an employer's property for the amount of unpaid wages owed to an employee. The Chamber originally opposed to the bill in the House but worked with the sponsor to remove our opposition in anticipation of a House 3rd reading vote. Upon arrival in the Senate, the bill was amended to reinsert the original Chamber-opposed language. After passage in the Senate, the House sponsor agreed not to run the Senate's version. Therefore, only the Senate roll call will be used.

Chamber Position: OPPOSE Senate 3rd Reading: 31-18-1

Outcome: House Non-Concurs with Senate Amendment

HB 4572 (Guzzardi/Castro) – Human Rights Employer Definition

HB 4572 amends the Illinois Human Rights Act to redefine "employer" to include any person employing one (currently fifteen) or more employees within Illinois during twenty or more calendar weeks within the calendar year of or preceding the alleged violation. The Chamber opposed this measure. This bill passed both Houses.

Chamber Position: OPPOSE House 3rd Reading: <u>64-37-0</u> Senate 3rd Reading: <u>33-13-0</u> Outcome: Sent to Governor

SB 8 (Harmon/Riley) – Procurement Reform

SB 8 will save taxpayers money and will make it easier for the private sector to do business with the State. SB 8 ensures the state's procurement opportunities are handled through a sensible, fair, and transparent process. The Chamber supported the measure and was an advocate for instituting both the best value procurement program and the cooperative purchasing agreements.

Chamber Position: SUPPORT House 3rd Reading: <u>114-0-0</u> Senate Concurrence: <u>54-0-0</u>

Outcome: Public Act 100-0043

SB 9 (Hutchinson/Davis) – 32% Tax Increase; Revenue Omnibus Bill

This is the revenue omnibus bill. Below are some pertinent highlights of what is law and what was left out in the revenue portion of the package laid out under <u>SB 9</u>:

 Service taxes, soda taxes, satellite or streaming taxes as proposed in earlier versions were removed;

- Income taxes are permanently increased for individuals to 4.95% (from 3.75) and 7% for corporations (from 5.25) beginning July 1, 2017;
- A complete rewrite of the state's unclaimed property law, which we oppose;
- Graphic arts machinery and equipment exemption is restored;
- The expansion of the manufacturing machinery and equipment exemption to include production-related tangible personal property formerly covered by the expired manufacturers' purchase credit was removed from the final version of SB 9;
- The R&D credit is restored retroactively;
- Illinois Income Tax Act is decoupled from the federal Domestic Production Activities Deduction;
- Unitary business non-combination rule is repealed;
- The definition of the United States is amended to include areas of U.S jurisdiction for the purposes of natural resource exploration;
- Earned income tax credit and education expense credits are increased;
- Gasohol will subject to sales tax at 100% of selling price currently taxed at 80% of selling price; and.
- Creates the Uniform State Tax Lien Registration Act.

Chamber Position: OPPOSE

House Motion to Override Veto: 71-42-0 Senate Motion to Override: 36-19-0

Outcome: Governor Vetoed; Vetoed Overridden; Public Act 100-0022

SB 20 (Steans/Currie) – Human Rights Commission Changes

This bill makes extensive procedural changes to the Illinois Human Rights Act and significant structural changes to the Illinois Human Rights Commission to provide for full-time, professional commissioners. A temporary panel of commissioners also will be responsible for eliminating the backlog of requests for review at the Commission.

The one provision of concern were proposals that allowed for a complainant to go to circuit court during the investigation process. While not ideal, we did agree to a 60-day option that will allow a charge to be moved to circuit court. Notice to respondents will be required and any charge that goes to circuit court will be closed by the Department and no similar charge will be allowed to be filed at the Department at a later time. The Chamber has been at the forefront of negotiations to advance reform of the Human Rights Act, especially addressing the backlog at the Human Rights Commission.

Chamber Position: SUPPORT House 3rd Reading: <u>114-0-0</u> Senate 3rd Reading: <u>47-0-0</u>

Outcome: Public Act 100-1066

SB 81 (Lightford/Guzzardi) – \$15 per hour Minimum Wage

SB 81 would increase the state's minimum wage to \$15 per hour by 2022 for those over the age of 18 and \$12 by 2022 for those under the age of 18.

Chamber Position: OPPOSE House 3rd Reading: <u>61-53-2</u> Senate Concurrence: <u>30-23-2</u>

Outcome: Governor Vetoed; Total Veto Stands

SB 193 (Raoul/Hoffman) – Attorney General Worker Protection Unit

Creates the Worker Protection Unit within the Office of the Illinois Attorney General to intervene in, initiate, enforce, and defend all criminal or civil legal proceedings on matters and violations relating to the Prevailing Wage Act, the Employee Classification Act, the Minimum Wage Law, the Day and Temporary Labor Services Act, and the Wage Payment and Collection Act. Creates the Worker Protection Task Force to submit a report to the Governor and the General Assembly regarding its progress no later than December 1, 2018. Repeals the Task Force December 1, 2019.

Chamber Position: OPPOSE

House Motion to Override Veto: 67-49-0
Senate Motion to Override Veto: 39-15-0
Outcome: Governor Vetoed; Total Veto Stands

SB 904 (Hastings/Hoffman) – Increasing Workers' Compensation Costs

SB 904 will allow medical providers to pursue the 1% per month interest penalty on unpaid medical bills in circuit court. These changes will increase litigation for employers.

Chamber Position: OPPOSE House 3rd Reading: <u>105-11-0</u> Senate 3rd Reading: <u>38-7-4</u>

Outcome: Governor Amendatory Veto

SB 1451 (Link/K. Burke) - Small Cell Wireless Bill

This bill is designed to help attract small cell technology to enable the next generation of 5G wireless connectivity. Small cells are flexible network solutions that can be readily deployed to specific locations, including those where customers are prone to experience connectivity issues or in areas that can't effectively be served by a traditional cell tower. This is a great pro-business initiative that will spur economic growth and will meet consumer demands.

Chamber Position: SUPPORT House 3rd Reading: 62-41-5 Senate 3rd Reading: 41-7-2

Outcome: Public Act 100-0585

SB 1502 (Hastings/Turner) – "Right to Know"

SB 1502, otherwise known as the "Right to Know" bill would have had a chilling impact on Illinois businesses large and small. The proposed legislation would require any website that collects and discloses personal identifiable information to respond to requests from users of the site on what information is being collected and to whom is it being disclosed to. The legislation would have also required businesses across our state to create massive databases of personal information about their online customers/users that would not otherwise have to create or collect. By forcing business to create new and untested databases, the proposed legislation would inadvertently create more ways for customers' identities to be stolen.

Chamber Position: OPPOSE

House Vote: Consideration Postponed

Senate 3rd Reading: 31-21-1

Outcome: House Rules Committee

SB 1719 (Biss/Welch) – 20% Gross Receipts Tax on Investment Management

In today's interconnected world, billions of dollars travel across the globe in less than seconds. SB 1719 would both put Illinois' vital financial service sector and the tens of thousands of jobs it employs at risk by imposing a new 20% gross receipts tax on partnerships and S corps engaged in the business of conducting investment management services. Illinois has benefited from being a top ten globally-recognized financial hub. SB 1719 would hurt our state's global reputation and would force investors to look to less hostile cities such as Boston, Dallas, and Charlotte.

Chamber Position: OPPOSE House 3rd Reading: NA Senate 3rd Reading: 32-24-1

Outcome: House Rules Committee

SB 2213 (Biss/Stratton) – EPA Public Interest Actions

SB 2213 would require that Illinois environmental laws and regulations, as well as workplace safety laws, remain as strict or more stringent than federal laws in place before January 19, 2017. The amendment sunsets the bill after three years from the enactment date and removes the citizen suit and private right of action. While the amendment makes the bill better, it is still bad policy for Illinois and could make our state less competitive among our neighbors if certain environmental regulations were modified and Illinois could not comply.

Chamber Position: OPPOSE Senate 3rd Reading: <u>32-21-1</u>

Outcome: House Rules Committee

To download the House ratings, click <u>here</u>.

Vote Totals	N	Y Y	71.40-0 N	Y E		N	N	75-28-0 N	83-83-2 N	81-48-D N	87-24-0 N			N			8B 198 67-48-9 N - + + - - + NA + +	88 904 106-11-0 N			Total- 14 7 14 14 4 7 3 1	Total + 2 11 5 5 5 13 5 16 17 16	Total Bills 16 18 19 19 17 12 19 18 17		33% 100% 42% 17% 100% 50% 100% 100% 100% 100%	13% 13% 13% 28% 28% 78% 42% 34% 94% 33% 38%	23% 81% 81% 82% 88% 46% 92% 97% 97% 97%
Ammons (D)	E E E + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +	A	+ + + + + + + + + A - + + + + + + + + +	+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *		+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +	+		NA			Y	•	NA	N	• •		P (-)		14 7 14 14 4 7 3	2 11 5 5 13 5 16 17 16	16 18 19 19 17 12 19 18 17		33% 100% 42% 17% 100% 50% 100% 100% 100% 81%	13% 81% 28% 28% 78% 42% 84% 84% 84% 84%	81% 34% 22% 88% 46% 92% 97% 97% 87%
Ammons (D)	E E E + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +	A	+ + + + + + + + + A - + + + + + + + + +	+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *		+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +	+		NA			Y	•	NA	N	• •		Y P(-)		14 7 14 14 4 7 3	2 11 5 5 13 5 16 17 16	16 18 19 19 17 12 19 18 17		33% 100% 42% 17% 100% 50% 100% 100% 100% 81%	13% 81% 28% 28% 78% 42% 84% 84% 84% 84%	81% 34% 22% 88% 46% 92% 97% 97% 87%
Ammons (D)	E E E + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +	A	+ + + + + + + + + A - + + + + + + + + +	+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *		+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +	+		NA			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•	NA	*	• •		P (-)		14 7 14 14 4 7 3	2 11 5 5 13 5 16 17 16	16 18 19 19 17 12 19 18 17		100% 42% 17% 100% 50% 100% 100% 100% 81%	81% 28% 28% 78% 42% 84% 94% 94%	81% 34% 22% 88% 46% 92% 97% 97% 87%
Anderson (R)	+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +	A I	+ + + + + + + + + A - + + + + + + + + +	+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +		* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	NA + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +			:	•		•		NA	•	+ + NA + +		+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +		7 14 14 4 7 3	11 5 5 13 5 16 17 16	18 19 19 17 12 19 18 17		100% 42% 17% 100% 50% 100% 100% 100% 81%	81% 28% 28% 78% 42% 84% 94% 94%	81% 34% 22% 88% 46% 92% 97% 97% 87%
Andrade (D)	+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +	A I	+ + + + + + + + + A - + + + + + + + + +	+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +		* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	NA + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +			:	•	- - - - NA + + - E			NA	•	+ NA + +	NA	+ + - + - E		14 4 7 3	5 13 5 16 17 18	19 19 17 12 19 18 17		42% 17% 100% 50% 100% 100% 100%	28% 28% 78% 42% 84% 84% 84%	34% 22% 88% 46% 92% 97% 97% 87%
Batinion (R)	+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +	A I	+ + + + + + + + + A - + + + + + + + + +	+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +		* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	NA + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +			:	•	NA + + E	* • • • •		NA	•	+ NA + +	NA -	+ + - E		4 7 3 1	13 5 16 17 16	17 12 19 18 17		100% 50% 100% 100% 100%	78% 42% 34% 94% 94% 93%	88% 46% 92% 97% 97% 87%
Belicer (D)	+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +	A I	+ + + + + + + + + A - + + + + + + + + +	+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +		* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	NA + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +			:	•	NA + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +	: :		NA	•	NA +	NA	• • • • •		3	5 16 17 16	12 19 18 17		50% 100% 100% 100% 81%	42% 34% 94% 94% 33%	46% 92% 97% 97% 87%
Bellicok [R]	+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +		+ A - +	• • • •		+ + + + + + NA	+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +		+ + + + NA	:	•	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	•	•			• •		E .		3	16 17 16	19 18 17		100% 100% 100% 81%	34% 94% 94% 33%	92% 97% 97% 87%
Bennett (R)	+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +		+ A - +	• • • •		+ + + NA +	+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +		•	:	NV	E .		•	•	•	•		E .		1	17 16	18 17		100% 100% 81%	94% 94% 33%	97% 97% 87%
Bourne (R) +	+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +		+ A - +	• • • •			+ - + NV		•	:	NV +	E +	:	+	•		*		+		1				100%	94% 83%	97% 87%
Breen (R -	+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +		+ A - +	• • • •			+ - + NV		•	:	*>	•	•				100						10				
Britsow (C)	+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +		+ A - +	• • • •			+ NV	NA +	•		+	4	_		. ***	•	*	*	4 8		3	15	18		100%	89%	DESC.
Bryant (R E Burke, K (D) - Burke, K (D) + Burke, K (D) + Burke, K (D) + Cascell (R] A Cascell (D] NA Cascell (R] NV Cavaletto (R] NV Connor (D) NA Control (D) + Connor (D) NA Costello (D) E Crespo (D) - Curris (D) -	+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +		+ A - +	• • • •			+ NV	NA +	•	*		_	•	*:	**	*			•	- 4	2	17	19	- 3		-	
Burke, D [D] -	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	A	A	E + + NA	•			A	-				NA.	NA	*	NA.		80	NA		5	15	7		83%	28%	29% 83%
Burke,K (D) + Buffer (R) - Cabello (R) A Carroll (D) NA Cascildy (D) + Cavaletto (R) NV Chape LaVis (D) + Connor (D) NA Conrol (D) NA Convert (D) NA Convert (D) NA Costello (D) E Convert-Ervin (D) E Convert (D) + Country (D) + Cutting (D) + Cutting (D) + Cutting (D) - Cutting (D) -	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	A	· ·	÷ • NA					27 34	NV					•20		. 1				10	5	15		42%	88%	38%
Cabello [R]	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	A	• •	+ NA	•	•							NV (-)	•3		NV	· .	400	+		12	3	15		42%	20%	31%
Caroli D	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	A		NA NA		400	+	•			NV	• (i)	•	•	•	•		9)	- 0		4	14	18		100%	78%	89%
Castoly (D)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	A		NA		T)	+			*		NV	•	•	*	+			+		3	14	17		75%	82%	79%
Cavasetto (R) NV	+		+		NA	8/ 51	•0\		NA				NA	NA	***	NA.	*/)	80	*		10	5	19	-	NA 33%	28%	9%
Chape LeVis [D]	+		The state of the s	*//u			+							+			+				2	16	18	-	100%	38%	30% 95%
Connor [D] NA	1		. 3	•		\$2. S				.0		. "		•2	•	V	\$ S	400	-		14	5	19		36%	28%	31%
Conyears-Ervin [D] NA	•			NA	NA .	P	20			200		. 3	NA		•	NA	2	20)		1.0	10	3	13		NA	23%	23%
Costello [D] E Crespo [D] +	+			*	, T	. 3				• 0			•		*		•0 5				14	5	19	9	42%	28%	34%
Crespo (D) + Currie (D) -	*			*		9/	- 1			*			•	• 2	*	×	F		*		13	5	18		NA	28%	28%
Currie [D]			-	¥			•					•		•	***	•					10	8 6	18 19		42% 60%	82%	43% 41%
				A (-)						-											15	4	19		42%	21%	32%
D'Amiso [D] -				•	\$ ()			2				. 8	+						NV (-)	- 15	15	4	19		42%	21%	32%
Davidsmeyer [R] +	N/	V (-)	+	*	•	*			•			•	•	+	*		*	ecc .	•		2	17	19	- 1	83%	89%	86%
Davis [D]	*			*		£	•				4	. 9	•		•	8 0		•	+	134	14	5	19		33%	28%	30%
DeLuca (D)			-	•	Υ		NV .		NV	•			•						*		11	6 16	17		60%	36%	43%
Demmer [R] - Drury [D] -							E			Δ			F	*			NV	-	A (-)		13	2	15	-	100%	13%	92% 39%
Durkin [R]	+					+	+		P	+	+		+						P (-)		3	15	18	- 1	100%	83%	92%
Evans [D] -	+		-	+	9					A	ķ.	. //	•		•	1			+		13	5	18		27%	28%	28%
Feigenhoitz [D] -			¥	*		8)			- 1		4	9	•			8 8			+	124	14	5	19		38%	28%	31%
Fine (D)	+			*										NA NA					•	-	14	- 5	19		45%	28%	36%
Finnie [D] NA	NA NA	Α		NA	NA				NA			•	NA	NA	-	NA		-	-	-	9	6	11	-	NA 42%	18%	18% 37%
Ford [D] +	+			*	2	£ 5	E .								•		. 9		Ù I		13	5	18		38%	28%	32%
Fortner [R]			+	•0		*	+		E	+	+	•		-	•	•	•		•	- 8	4	14	18	- 8	100%	78%	89%
Frece [R] +			*	*	•	*	+ -	+	•		+		•	*	•	•	*	*		- 8	1	18	19	3	100%	86%	98%
Gabel (D)				*		¥7		-		E		E	•	*	*		×2 0	*	+		12	5	17		42%	29%	36%
Gordon-Booth, J. [D]				•			-		NV		-		•	•	*		-	•	*	-	12	6	18 18	-	42% NA	33% 22%	38% 22%
Guzzardi [D]	+			•			20		E									20	+	- 1	13	- 5	18		42%	28%	35%
Halbrook (R) NA		- 3	+	****		*	+				+	÷ 6		+	*			*	• 6	- 8	0	18	18	- 8	NA	100%	100%
Halpin (D) NA				• 5	€ 0				9			9	•		•20	4 0			. 9	- 8	14	4	18		NA	22%	22%
Hammond (R) +			•	•		•	•	+	•		NV	*	•	*6	*	•	*	(2)	•		2	16	18		100%	88%	94%
Harris,D [R]	+	V (-)			1	-			NV NV	-		NV NV	•		•			200	•	5	14	5 9	19 15		83%	28% 80%	35% 72%
Harris, G (D)	H 1	* 197		+	Ž.					20					*						14	5	19		42%	28%	34%
Hays [R]			+	÷ 3	*		+					¥ 0						9)	• 0		5	14	19	3	100%	74%	87%
Hernandez (D) -				* ::	8 0		·		9 9		ŝ.	E	+ 3	-	◆ 20	Q ()	.)	-3	¥ 8		14	4	18	, i	60%	22%	36%
Hoffman (D)				•30		S 6							•		•		27 8		-		15	4	19		42%	21%	32%
Hurley (D) -	+			*							-		•						•		14	5 15	19		42%	28%	34%
tves [R] + Jeslei [R] +							+		NV		+	NV.			*			200			2	15	17	-	100%	88%	94% 92%
Jimenez [R] +	+	- 1							•			. 0						e))	2 0	- 8	5	14	19	3	100%	74%	87%
Jones [D] NV	+			E		-: :						. 3		-	★ 20	9					13	- 4	17		27%	24%	26%
Kifowit [D] -	+			•		¥7, 1	38 ·			:			• /	<i>-2</i>	*	Р	F 1	337	-		14	4	18		42%	22%	32%
Lang (D)	+			+									•		•	•			NV (-)	- 4	15	4	19		42%	21%	32% 26%
L Bly (D) E Long (R) NA	+			-								-			-			200	NV (-)		14	16	18	2	30% NA	22% 88%	26% 89%
Mah [D] NA				•	2 9	8				200					•		2	.00	+		13	5	18	7	NA NA	28%	
Manley (D) +				* ///						•0	2	. 6	•		◆ 111	2 8	. 8	- :	.)		14	5	19	3	40%	28%	33%
Martwick [D] NV				•								. 6	•						• 0		13	5	18		42%	28%	35%
Mayfield (D) E	+		•5.	*		87 2	•		•				+	• 2	•		P 3	4 0	•		12	6	18		42%	88%	38%
MoAuliffe (R)	+			*//	•	711			•	•		•	•			*	+		•		5	14	19		83%	74%	
MoComble [R] .	NA +			NA E							NA +	NA			NA +	A	NA.		NA.	-	0	17	17		42% NA	NE 100%	NE 100%
MoDermed [R] +			+	÷ //		+	+	+				+	+	+	*		+				3	16	19	- 3	100%	84%	
Mo Sweeney [R]	7 2			+	*	+	+				+		-				200		-		4	15	19		92%	78%	86%

WARRANCE CO.				_				_			-																
Meler [R]		+	+					+	+	•	NV	+	+	+			+		+		- 1	17	18		100%	94%	97%
Mitchell, Bill [R]		+		+		*	+	· 0	*	NV	4	+	+	£0	* 0	+	NV			3	7	10	17		81%	68%	71%
Mitchell, Christian (D)	¥				4		į.	ý.		483	ě.	v.	+					i i	+		14	- 5	19		33%	28%	30%
Moeller (D)		+			E			6 6		A)/			+			4)				- 3	13	- 5	18		60%	28%	39%
Morrison (R)	NV		+			+	+	*			•	E	+	+	NV (-)		+	+	+	13	7	15:	17		100%	88%	94%
Moylan [D]		4	20			20 0		į.		401	0	0					2		ĝ.		13	6	19		42%	82%	37%
Museman (D)		+						3 3				2 0							2 0	3	13	- 6	19		42%	82%	37%
Nekritz [D]			NA			NA	NA	NA		NA	NA.	NA		0	NA		NA.	NA.	NA	- 6	4	2	- 6		42%	NE	NE
Olcen [R]	-	-	NA	E	-	NA	NA	NA	NV	NA	NA.	NV.			NA	-	NA.	NA.	NA	-	V.A.	13	17		NA NA	78%	
		*	-	•	•	*	*	-	NV.	(4))	-	NV:	*	AV.					*		3	13					76%
Parkhurot (R)	NA	*	E	•	•	*	*	E	*	•		*	*	*		•	*			-		13	16		NA	81%	81%
Phelps [D]	E	+	NA	*			NA	NA	NV	NA	NA	NA	+		NA		NA	NA	NA		3	- 3	- 6		42%	NE	NE
Phillips (R)	*	+	+	*	*	*	E	NV	*		E	E	*	•	NV (-)	*	+	+	*		2	12	14		100%	88%	93%
Pritohard (R)	•	+	E			E	+	E	+		4	+	E	E	*	+	+		4	- 8	3	- 11	14		100%	79%	90%
AND	NA	+	+	* 1	+	*	+	• 0	*	+	+	+	+	+	* 3	+	+		+	1	11	17	18		NA	94%	94%
Reis (R)	E	+	+		+	+	E	+	* 3	*	2	E	+	+	*	*.	*	+	+		1	15	16		100%	84%	97%
Riley [D]		+		*				¥ 3				8 8	+		* 3	4).			÷	- 3	13	- 6	19		27%	82%	30%
Rita (O)	¥ 3	+										2 3	+						NV (-)	3	15	4	19		42%	21%	32%
Sauer [R]	NA	+	+			*	•	+	4			E	+	E		+	+		2		2	14	16		NA:	88%	88%
Soherer [D]		+					4			211	2	ž (*			P		4	2 0	- 3	13	- 5	18		36%	28%	32%
Sente (D)		+							NV	400		2	+			+				- 6	12	6	18		60%	88%	42%
Beverin (R)	NA	+	+				+	0				+					*	+	+		2	16	18		NA	88%	89%
8Ims [D]	and a			e	c	0.00	NA	Ú 10		NA	NA	NA			NA		NA.	NA			7	3	10		42%	80%	36%
8killioorn (R)	NA			-	-		110			e e	110	in.			THE STREET		in.	110		9	1	16	17		NA.	84%	94%
	NA NA				-	-		-			-	-	7	-		-	7				13	5	18		NA NA		28%
												100	NA		2 0							3	10			_	
Smith [D]	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		NA	NA			*	NA	NA	•	NA			NA	- 3	- 6	0.01	- P		NA	14%	14%
Sommer (R)	•	E	+	E			+	+	E	*		+	+	+	•		+	+		- 3	2	14	16		91%	88%	90%
Bosnowski [R]	•	E	E	E	•		+	+	*	*	*	E	+	•	*	*	+	NV	NV (-)		_ 1	13	14		100%	93%	97%
8oto (D)	•	A (-)	*	A (-)		4	E		A	A	4	A	+		*				+		12	3	15		38%	20%	28%
Spain (R)	NA	+	+	************		+	+	• 8	•		*/	E	+ .	+	* /		+	4	*	3	4	16	17		NA	94%	94%
Stewart [R]	2	E	+	+	+	+	+	+	£	E	*	NV	E	+	*	+	+	4	+		3	12	15		100%	80%	90%
Stratton (D)	NA	+				7	E	4					+		+				P (-)	- 3	13	4	17		NA	24%	24%
Stuart (D)	NA	+		+		4>	ÇA:		* .	Acc.		4	+	*	+		400		\$ 150 m	- 2	13	- 5	18		NA	28%	28%
Swancon (R)	NA	+	+			+	40	+		+		+	+				+		+	- 1	-1	17	18		NA	84%	94%
Tabares (D)		+									V.	2	+		E			E	+		13	- 4	17		42%	24%	33%
Thapedi [D]	NV	+	NV					NV		Acc.		2 2	+		*	400			+	- 3	11	- 6	16		33%	81%	32%
Turner [D]		+							2			2				J. 9			2 0		15	4	19		33%	21%	27%
Unes (R)				E							NV	1	20 3				20	į.			- 2	15	17		92%	88%	90%
Wallace [D]				-								į.							P (-)		14	. 5	19		42%	28%	34%
										-								_	NV (-)	-	15	4	19			21%	32%
Walsh [D] Wehrii [R]		*			-	10				***			7		•	2		•	NA I-I		4	14	18		42% 100%	78%	89%
	•	*	+	-	•	•	+	•		*	-	•	•	E	-	*	*:	-				14	18				
Welch [D]		+		E		•			4.11	400		*	+.		*					- 6	15	- 3	40		42%	17%	30%
Welter [R]		NV (-)		E	*	*	+	* 0	NV	•	X		+	+	• 0	+	*		*	- 5	В	9	17		NE	63%	53%
Wheeler, B (R)	*	E	+	E	*		+	+	E	•		4	+	*	+	*	+	2	+		- 3	13	16		100%	81%	91%
Wheeler, K [R]	•	+	+	+		+	+	+	+	•	*	+	+.	+	*		+		E		-9	17	18		100%	94%	97%
Williams (D)	6	+		E				4			4		+		*	4.0			+	1	14	.4	18		42%	22%	32%
Willie [D]	×	+		+	-	6	2	8		4	ý.	2	+ 8		+	-	6	4	2		15	4	19		42%	21%	32%
Winger [R]	•	+			+	+	+	¥ 8	P	*		NV	+	E		+	+		4	3	- 5	11	16		100%	89%	85%
Yingling [D]	+	+	E	* 6		E	ě.	E		-80	9	- 1	+	+	* 0					3	10	- 6	16		42%	38%	40%
Zalewski [D]	2	+		E	¥1		ý.	2			ě.	E	+			- E		á .	P (-)		14	3	17		42%	18%	30%
	NV	+					2	2 3	.) 7			2 3	+		NV (-)	4)			NV (-)	- 7	15	- 3	18		25%	17%	21%
parameter de la companya della companya della companya de la companya de la companya della compa	7.00	2.1		12 18				9 8				3 3	100		5 min 9				2 1000		11/00	S AR	S - 10 - 3	- 1	10,000		
Key			_	_																		-		AVG:	62%	50%	
Voted with Chamber				0 9				0 8	- 3		C.	3 0	- 2						0 0	- 3		S.	2 0	Arw.	***	00.10	
The state of the s														-	-												
Voted against Chamber												-	-		- 3								2			- 5	
Voted Precent on a Y Chamber BIII								0 2			6								0			6				-	
Voted Present on a N Chamber BIII	P							- 2	- 1				- 1					-		1		6					
Not Voting on a Y Chamber Bill	4:			15 3				3 6	3		15	2 3	- 5		3				3	- 5		3	2 3			- 3	- 3
Not Voting on a N Chamber Bill	NV																										
Not a member of the House at time of vote	NA			9				8 8	3		3	9	- 3		13 1				A 0	3		28	8			1 6	3
Exoused Absence	E			1 1		3		1	3	1		4	3	-	1		3			3		ii .	8	-		- 13	3
Abcent on a Y Chamber bill	2							<u> </u>				4			1 0				<u> </u>				0 -		-	1	
Absent on a N Chamber bill	A			7 8	3			領 数	1		8	10 B	3		(d)				(d) (d)	1 2		8	12 B			3 33	
	NE			1				S 8				8 8											8				9
	Annual Control																										

To download the Senate ratings, click <u>here</u>.

Name/Party	SB 2814 (99th GA)				HB 2525	HB 2622	HB 2771	HB 3419	HB 3449	HB 4163	HB 4324	HB 4572	\$B.8	\$B 9	\$B 20	SB 81	SB 193	3B 904	SB 1451	\$B 1502	\$B 1719	SB 2213								
Vote Totals	32-18-0	56-0-1	38-16-0	98-0-0	35-19-1	32-20-1	31-17-0	39-12-0	33-22-0	31-16-1	31-18-0	33-13-0	54-0-0	36-19-0	47-0-0	30-23-2	39-15-0	38-7-4	41-7-2	31-21-1	32-24-1	32-21-1				22				
							8										9									ă i		1	10/19	TOUS /
Chamber Position	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N.	Y	N.	N	N	To	tal -	Total +	Total Bills		2019	/ zon	Average
Althoff [R]	<i>4</i> -	+	+	+	•	+	NV	21		*		NV	+		NV (-)	+	+	-	+	•	+	•	100	4	16	20		93%	80%	87%
Anderson [R]	8	+	-	+		+	NV	8	+	NV	+	NV	+		NV (-)	•		-	+	*	٠			6	13	19		80%	68%	74%
Aquino [D]		+	5)	+	-	-	-	-			-	•	+	-	•	-	•		+	-	-			7	5	22		NA	23%	23%
Barickman [R]	5:	*	+	+	*	*	NV NV	*	•	*	+	*	*	*	+	*	*	*	*	*	*	•		5	21	22		80% 47%	95%	88% 38%
Bennett [D] Bertino-Tarrant [D]	NV					2	NV			D		NV				NV			NV (-)		2			4	6	18		40%	29%	31%
Biss [D]			. 7												1				NV (-)					8	4	22		40%	18%	29%
Bivine [R]		+	NV	NV (-)		+	+	NV	+		NV	+	+	+	NV (-)	•	+	+	+			¥1		_	17	19		100%	89%	95%
Brady [R]	-:	+		+		+	+			+	+	+:	+		NV (-)	*:		- "	+	+			1 83	3	19	22		80%	86%	83%
Bush [D]	+	+	(A)	+	-11	2		0	-	2	4	2		17	+		4 1		+	-	4	+		6	6	22		40%	27%	34%
CONTROL CONTROL	NA	+	-0	+	-	-6	-	F)	-	es .	NV	5)	NV (-)	e)	+			- 1	-	-	-	-	_	7	3	20		NA	15%	15%
Clayborne [D]		+	E /2	+		*	-	0			-	-	+	-	+			P	+	- 1	Р	Р		4	5	19		27%	26%	27%
Collins, J [D]	•	+	+3)	*		-	-	-	-	-	-	#S	+	-	+		-	- 1	+	-	-	-		6	6	22		40%	27%	34%
Connelly [R] Cullerton, T [D]	•	*	*	•	*	*	+	*	*	NV	*	** ***	*		*	*	*	NV	8	*	NV NV	•		4	19 6	21		93%	90% 30%	92% 35%
Cunningham [D]		+	- 1				-				0	-		-				-	+	- 0				7	5	22		40%	23%	32%
	NA	+		NA	NA	NA	NA	2	NA	2		NV	NA	NA		NA		P	2	NA	NA			4	5	9		NA	56%	56%
	NA	+	+	+		+	NV	-	+	*		NV			NV (-)	*	•	-8 %	+	•	•	+	_	3	16	19		NA	84%	84%
Haine [D]	•	+	NV	NV (-)	NV	NV	NV	NV	NV	•	-	•	NV (-)	10	+	NV			NV (-)	NV	NV	•	_	7	6	13		53%	46%	50%
Harmon [D]	NV	+	-	•	+	-	-		-		-	-0	•	+8	+			NV	+	-		+		5	5	20		40%	25%	33%
	NV	+	- 1	+	-	NV	NV	-	NV	NV	NV	NV	+	T.	+	NV		NV	+	NV	-	NV		_	5	11		40%	45%	43%
Hastings [D]	RI .	+	- 0	*		+	NV.	-		NV	-	#85	+	-	+	-	•	AD C	•	-				4	6	20		47%	30%	39%
Holmes [D]	5	*	20. 1	•		50 50	7	5.		0/ 2/			NV (-)	70	+	۲		NV		20 8				7	3	20		47%	15%	31%
Hunter [D] Hutchinson [D]						-						-				-				- 0				7	5	22		40%	23%	32% 32%
Jones, E [D]	NV		-			20	2		NV			20		10			2			NV				4	5	19		40%	26%	33%
Koehler [D]			5. 1				-	-			4	-0			+			-0.0						7	5	22		33%	23%	28%
Landek [D]	5	+	.57	+	4	+	NV	S		NV	Р	28	+	16	+		-		ğ ,	£7.		19	1.19	2	7	19		47%	37%	42%
Lightford [D]	-	+	-21	NV (-)	NV	NV	-	84	è	2		55	•	- (()	+	-8	- 1	-9	+	-0	-	-	81	6	4	20		40%	20%	30%
Link [D]	*	+	200	+	-11	-	ê l	3	-	28	2	2//	+	2//	+		•	e)	+	0	-	+		6	6	22		40%	27%	34%
Manar [D]	•	+	-55	•	-	-	-		-	NV	-	20	+	-	+	<u>.</u>	-	-	+	-	-	NV		4	6	20		40%	30%	35%
Martinez [D]	50	+	NV	NV (-)	NV	NV	-	NV	8	e.	NV		•		+	\$10 100		<u> </u>	NV (-)			-		4	3	17		47%	18%	33%
	NV	•	NV NV	+ NV (-)	-	-)	+	NV NV		• 3	+	*	+		+ NV (-)	•	NV	NV	NV (-)	-	•	• NV		9	11	20		87% 100%	55% 82%	71% 91%
McCarter [R] McConchie [R]	*		NY	N V (-)		•	NV.	+		NV.	NV NV	NV	•		NV (-)				+		*	NV	_	1	15	16		100%	94%	97%
McConnaughay [R]		NV (-)					+			+		NV			+		NV	-				NV	_	2	17	19		93%	89%	91%
McGuire [D]	2)	+	25		-		4	23		NV	-	20		2.				-	NV (-)	-	-	-		7	4	21		40%	19%	30%
Morrison (D)	*:	+	-01	+	-	-8	ž.	6	9	-	-	88 1	+	+	+	+	Ş ,	-8	+	es "	+	-		3	9	22		47%	41%	44%
Muiroe [D]	5	+	-	+	-	Žį.	-	0		27	-	2//		27	+	-	-		+	-			- 1	7	5	22		53%	23%	38%
Munoz [D]	49	+	-37	+	-	8	2	45	,	2)	2	-3	+	48	+	4	4 8		+	P	9 3	-7		6	5	21		40%	24%	32%
Murphy [D]	-	+	-0	•	-	-	-	-		**	8	-	+	7.0	٠	-		- 1	+		•	-		7	5	22		56%	23%	40%
Nybo [R]	-	+	+	+	*	+	+	NV	•	NV	+	NV	+	+	+	Р	*		NV (-)	+	•	•	- 8	_	15	18		100%	83%	92%
Oberweis [R] Radogno [R]	NV		NV NA	NV (-)	NV	NV		NV NA	•	NA NA	NA NA	NA NA		****	+ NA	•	NA NA		NV (-) NA		•	NA NA		3	13	16		93%	81% 90%	71% 92%
Raoul [D]		+	RA .					na .		. INA	NV	na -			NV (-)		NA .		+			na .		7	4	21		40%	19%	30%
Rezin [R]		+			р	P	NV			+		NV	+		NV (-)			Р	+					_	13	15		80%	87%	84%
Righter [R]	+	+	+			+	+	*		*	NV	+		*	+	*)	+			+				_	20	21		93%	95%	94%
Rooney [R]	+	+	•	+	•	+	+	+	•	NV		NV	+	+	NV (-)	+	+	NV	+	•	•	+		1	18	19		NE	95%	95%
Rose [R]	4	+	+	•	*	+	+	•	•	+	+ :	+	•	+	+	•	+		+	•	•	•		2	20	22		80%	91%	86%
\$andoval [D]	D.	+	-	+	-	-,	4	NV	•	NV	8	7/	+	Til	+			NV	P (-)	NV	-	-		3	5	18		53%	28%	41%
The state of the s	NA	*	+	*	•	+	+	-:	•	+	1000	NV	+	+	+	100000	NV	- Ame	+	+	•	+		2	17	19		NA	89%	89%
Silverstein [D] Sims	* NA	NA NA	NA NA	* NA	NA NA	NA	NA NA	NA NA	NA.		NV		NV (-)	- NA		NV NA		NV	+ NA	NV NA	- NA	NV		8	5	17		40% NA	29%	35%
Stadelman [D]	nd.	HA.	IVA.	*	itte.	IN M	NV.	NV NV	NV	-0	2 6	NV	in in	- NOM		- A			P (-)	1404			_	14	4	18		40%	22%	14% 31%
	NV		-51		-	-	-	2	-		-			20		28			+	-	0			6	5	21		47%	24%	36%
	NV	+	+:	*	*	NV	•	*	•	•	*	•	+		NV (-)	•1	NV	•		*:		•		1	18	19		67%	95%	81%
Tracy [R]		NV (-)	+	+		+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	•	+			1	20	21		NA	95%	95%
Trotter [D]		+	-0	*	+	8		£.	4	NA	NA	NA	+	+8	NA	• >		NA	+	+		NA		1	4	15		40%	27%	34%
	1-	+	7	+	-	-	-	0.	-	-	6	1	NV (-)	7	+	£12		NV	NV (-)	NV	-		_	7	3	20		47%	15%	31%
Van Peit [D]	10		4 92.	+	•	+	+	+	*	+	+	*	+		NV (-)	+	+	Р	+	*	+	•		2	19	21		100%	90%	95%
Van Peit [D] Weaver [R]	•	+				1-		1	-		7	7.	*	-	+	72	1	-0 9	+	-		•		7	5	22		40%	23%	32%
Van Peit [D]	-			•	-																								-	
Van Peit [D] Weaver [R]	-	+		•					1 3						8 0											5 3	AVG:	58%	48%	
Van Peit [D] Weaver [R] President Culierton [D]	-	•		•																							AVG:	58%	48%	
Van Peit [D] Weaver [R] President Cullerton [D] Key	•	•		•																							AVG:	58%	48%	
Van Peit [D] Weaver [R] President Cullerton [D] Key		*		•																							AVG:	58%	48%	
Van Peit [D] Weaver [R] President Culierton [D] Key Voted with Chamber	•	*		•																							AVG:	58%	48%	
Van Peit [D] Weaver [R] President Culierton [D] Key Voted with Chamber Voted against Chamber Voted Present on a Y Chamber Bill Voted Present on a N Chamber Bill	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	+		•																							AVG:	58%	48%	
Van Peit [D] Weaver [R] President Culierton [D] Key Voted with Chamber Voted againet Chamber Voted Present on a Y Chamber Bill Not Voting on a Y Chamber Bill	p	+		•																							AVG:	58%	48%	
Van Pelf [D] Weaver [R] President Cullerton [D] Key Voted with Chamber Voted against Chamber Voted Present on a Y Chamber Bill Voted Present on a N Chamber Bill Not Voting on a Y Chamber Bill Not Voting on a N Chamber Bill	- - P - NV	+																									AVG:	58%	48%	
Van Pelt [D] Weaver [R] President Culierton [D] Key Voted with Chamber Voted Present on a Y Chamber Bill Not Voting on a Y Chamber Bill Not Voting on a N Chamber Bill Not a member of the Senate at time of vote	p	+																									AVG:	58%	48%	