



## 2020 LEGISLATIVE REPORT AND SCORECARD



Desert Nesting Bald Eagle photo by Robin Silver



## ARIZONA 2020 LEGISLATIVE REPORT

By Karen Michael

The 2020 session of the Arizona Legislature was unlike any other we have experienced, largely due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The Legislature recessed in March and returned briefly in May. After much debate between the House and Senate, the Legislature finally adjourned on May 26<sup>th</sup> without voting on many bills. As a result, all of those measures died.

The only bill in this report passed into law was HB2749, a measure requiring information on endangered species collected by a government agency on private property be kept confidential, and subjects violators to a \$25,000 fine per occurrence. The bill prohibits disclosing information to the public, university researchers, and even state and federal agencies in charge of protecting endangered species. HB2749 passed the Legislature on a party line vote and was signed into law by Governor Ducey.



Several bills to protect animals were introduced this session but died when the Legislature adjourned. Representative John Kavanaugh sponsored a bill that would have closed the loop on Arizona's animal fighting law by banning equipment and implements used in illegal animal fighting, such as gaffs and drugs used for cockfighting and breaking sticks and chains used for dogfighting. This legislation would provide needed tools for law enforcement to charge abusers in animal fighting cases.

He also sponsored a bill to charge operators of illegal horse races with a felony penalty and would place illegal races under the racketeering act. According to the Attorney General, unauthorized horse races connected to organized crime are held illegally in Arizona, which involve inhumane treatment and illegal drugging of horses.

Representative Amish Shah sponsored legislation to prohibit declawing of cats - a painful, unnecessary procedure where each toe of the cat is amputated at the first joint. Published veterinary studies show that declawing cats increases the risk of unwanted behaviors, permanent or intermittent lameness, back pain, and other medical issues.



He also sponsored a bill that would have repealed the 2016 "pet store" law that overturned Phoenix and Tempe city ordinances banning sales of puppy mill dogs in pet stores. Unfortunately, neither of these animal protection measures were even heard in committees.

In the bad bills department, Senator David Gowan sponsored a bill to legalize aerial fireworks in Maricopa and Pima Counties. The devices, which shoot around 100 feet high and explode, would have increased the already damaging and frightening effects of fireworks on veterans with PTSD, wildlife, and companion animals. The bill also could have created fire hazards, especially with our drought conditions. Cities in Maricopa and Pima Counties would not have authority to ban aerial fireworks since the Legislature passed a law in 2014 that prohibits cities and towns in those counties from regulating fireworks.

*Photo: Robin Silver*

Legislators continued their attempt to derail Arizona's citizen initiative process -- the single most important tool for protecting animals. All legislation introduced in the 2020 session would have made it nearly impossible for grassroots campaigns to place a measure on the ballot. Fortunately, these failed, largely due to the abbreviated session.

Representative David Cook, a cattle rancher from Globe, again sponsored the 'fake meat' bill which would have banned the use of meat or poultry on product labels and advertisements unless the product is derived from slaughtered animals. This measure died without being heard in committee.

## The Good Bills

[HB2531](#) pet dealers; state preemption; repeal (Shah: Longdon), supported by the Humane Society of the United States – Arizona (HSUS-AZ), would have repealed the provision of current law that strips localities of their right to prohibit sales of puppy mill puppies in pet stores. In 2016, the Arizona Legislature passed the 'pet store law' which preempted Phoenix and Tempe city ordinances banning sales of puppy mill dogs in pet stores. Legislators ran that bill on behalf of a local pet store owner who lost a lawsuit to overturn the Phoenix city ordinance. Through a stakeholder meeting, the bill was amended to restrict pet stores from selling animals from breeders that violate federal laws including the Animal Welfare Act. However, that law's consumer protection provisions were rendered useless after the USDA removed its public animal welfare inspection database and weakened enforcement of animal welfare law as reported in this Washington Post [article](#).

HVA supported this measure.

HB2531 was not assigned to any committees, so the bill died.

[HB2537](#) cat declawing; prohibition; exceptions (Shah: Campbell, Fillmore, et al.), supported by the Paw Project, HSUS-AZ, Animal Defense League of Arizona, and other animal protection groups would have prohibited non-therapeutic declawing of cats. According to Paw Project, declawing is one of the most painful, routinely performed procedures in veterinary medicine, where each toe of the cat is amputated at the first joint. Declawing a cat is equivalent in humans to amputating the entire first knuckle of every finger.



Published veterinary [research](#) indicates that declawing cats increases the risk of unwanted behaviors and may increase risk for developing back pain. As a result of declawing, many cats suffer permanent or intermittent lameness and other surgical complications.

There is no scientific evidence that shows declawing cats protects them from relinquishment, abandonment, or euthanasia. Declawed cats are often found in shelters and rescues, or even outdoor colonies. Also, declawing cats does not protect human health. Scientific studies have found declawed cats bite more often and harder than their intact counterparts. Major health authorities including the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), National Institutes of Health (NIH), the US Public Health Services, the Canadian Medical Association, and the Infectious Diseases Society of America all agree that declawing cats to protect humans is “not advised.”

HVA supported this measure.

HB2537 was assigned to the House Commerce and Land & Agriculture Committees but was not heard, so the bill died.

[HB2062](#) animal fighting paraphernalia; offense (Kavanagh), supported by HSUS-AZ, would have prohibited a person from knowingly owning, possessing, purchasing, selling, transferring or manufacturing animal fighting paraphernalia for the purpose of engaging in, promoting or facilitating animal fighting or cockfighting.

According to the Animal Legal Defense Fund, evidence in animal fighting cases is often circumstantial, consisting primarily of animal fighting paraphernalia and the presence of animals with wounds consistent with common fighting injuries. Additionally, some individuals manufacture and/or sell animal fighting paraphernalia for profit. HB2062 would give law enforcement the tools needed to charge abusers in animal fighting cases.

HVA supported this measure.

HB2062 passed the House 51-8-1 but was held in the Senate when the Legislature adjourned, so the bill died.

[HB2652](#) unauthorized racing meetings; penalties; racketeering (Kavanagh) would have classified as a Class 6 felony, knowingly holding an unauthorized racing meeting. The bill also would have expanded the definition of racketeering to include an act involving holding an unauthorized racing meeting. Rep Kavanagh, who sponsored HB2652 at the request of Attorney General Mark Brnovich, testified that illegal horse races are being held in Arizona involving organized crime and the drugging and inhumane treatment of horses. Currently, anyone holding a race in violation of horse racing regulations can only be charged with a Class 2 misdemeanor. The bill would give prosecutors stronger tools to charge race organizers under the RICO Act.



Photo: HSUS



HVA supported this measure.

HB2652 passed the House 58-1-1 but was held in the Senate when the Legislature adjourned, so the bill died.

[SB1263](#) G&F; appointment recommendation board; repeal (Mendez: Dalessandro, Gonzales, et al.) would have repealed the special-interests-controlled board that recommends candidates to the Arizona Game and Fish Commission (AZGFC), charged with managing and protecting wildlife. In 2010, the Legislature passed a measure creating this recommendation board which appoints candidates to the AZGFC. The governor is limited from selecting only “board-endorsed” candidates. The board has not recommended wildlife biologists, or women, to the AZGFC, which lacks diversity and scientific expertise. The Commission appears to view predators as competition rather than crucial components of healthy ecosystems, which has led to some detrimental rulemaking and policies. Senator Mendez and others have introduced this legislation several times, but it has never been granted a committee hearing. This session was no exception.



HVA supported this measure.

SB1263 did not receive a committee hearing, so the bill died.

[SB1262](#) predator control devices; prohibited chemicals (Mendez: Dalessandro, Gonzales, et al.) would have banned deadly Compound 1080 livestock collars and M-44 cyanide bombs used by USDA Wildlife Services to kill predators, primarily on behalf of the agriculture industry. Non-target victims include dogs, protected wildlife, and humans. These poisons cause agonizing deaths for animals and endanger lives of children and pets, including a teenage boy who was injured, and his dog Canyon who was killed by an M-44 near his house in Idaho. That [incident](#) spurred a nationwide outcry, and in May 2019 Oregon banned M-44s, joining California and Washington. A federal bill (Canyon’s Law) has been introduced to prohibit Compound 1080 and M-44s.

HVA supported this measure.

SB1262 was not granted a committee hearing, so the bill died.

## The Bad Bills

[HB2749](#) endangered species conservation; confidential information (Griffin) was the only bill in this report that passed the Legislature and was signed into law. (HB2749 replaced the identical Senate version SB1666, sponsored by Senator Gowan.) HB2749 requires information on endangered species collected by a government agency from private property owners to remain secret, and subjects anyone who violates that confidentiality to a \$25,000 civil penalty for each violation. This provision prohibits disclosing information to the public, university researchers, and even state and federal agencies in charge of protecting endangered species.



*Photo: Barry Lopez*

Bill sponsors claimed the measure was needed to protect private property owners and was modeled after Texas laws. However, Texas has a [record](#) of fighting protection for endangered species. In fact, this damaging law weakens protection for endangered species and decreases chances of enforcement actions in Arizona.

Preventing crucial information from being released to the public and government agencies jeopardizes protection of wildlife threatened by extinction. Moreover, the law’s overreaching provision to charge anyone who shares information with a \$25,000 fine per violation is extreme and an unnecessary suppression of government transparency. As Sandy Bahr, Director of Sierra Club Grand Canyon Chapter, [stated](#), “If this kind of information is kept confidential and is not available, how would we know if a conservation plan that’s in place is working or not? Sunshine provides the best public policy, and this goes the opposite direction.”

HVA opposed this measure.

HB2749 passed the House 31-29 and passed the Senate 17-13. The bill was signed into law by Governor Ducey.

[SB1667 fireworks; aerial devices](#) (Gowan) would have permitted currently illegal aerial fireworks to be sold at retail stands in Maricopa and Pima Counties. The devices contain up to 15 tubes that individually shoot about 100 feet into the air and explode. This legislation would increase the costs to already overburdened fire and police departments responding to fires and wildfires these devices cause, especially in drought conditions and would increase the already damaging and frightening effects of fireworks on veterans with PTSD, wildlife, and companion animals. SB1667 would also multiply the number of dogs affected by fireworks that end up in municipal and private shelters or killed, costing taxpayers and donors more funds while endangering public safety.

It is important to note that cities in Arizona's two largest counties would be powerless to ban aerial fireworks. The Legislature passed a law in 2014 that prohibits cities and towns in Maricopa and Pima Counties from regulating the sale or use of fireworks for periods around July 4th and New Year's Day.

The bill's sponsor, Sen. David Gowan owns a business that sells fireworks. In 2019, he sponsored legislation to expand days for fireworks sales, which was passed and signed into law.



SB1667 failed to pass the Senate 14-15-1. Senator Kate Brophy McGee was the only member of her party to vote "no" on the bill. Senator Paul Boyer also crossed party lines by refraining to vote on the bill. Senator Tyler Pace changed his vote in order to allow a revote on the bill, but reconsideration did not take place.

HVA opposed this measure.

SB1667 failed to pass the Senate 14-15-1, so the bill died.

### **Attack on Citizen Initiative Rights**

Arizona's citizen ballot measure process is the single most important tool for protecting Arizona's animals.

Arizona's initiative process is a constitutional right enacted at statehood in 1912. Thanks to grassroots citizen ballot measures, voters banned leghold traps, snares, and poisons on public lands in 1994. Cockfighting was outlawed in 1998. In 2006, voters prohibited the cruel confinement of pregnant pigs and calves raised for veal in industrial agriculture operations. All these measures failed in the Legislature, yet were passed by Arizona voters, most by large margins.



*Photo: Farm Sanctuary*

In 1998, voters passed the [Voter Protection Act](#) (Proposition 105) to prevent the Legislature from undermining citizen initiatives and to protect measures passed by voters. The Legislature has placed several referenda on the ballot that could destroy the public initiative process, but voters overwhelmingly defeated the referenda, indicating the strong determination of citizens to defend voting rights.

In 2017, the Arizona Legislature passed two bills severely damaging our public initiative process. These laws have increased the cost of hiring petition circulators and changed the State's standard for initiatives to 'strict compliance', which result in valid signatures being tossed out for even the slightest technical mistake. The Legislature's passage of these two measures has made it difficult, time consuming, and expensive for Arizonans to place a measure on the ballot. The challenge proved insurmountable for the citizen initiative campaign to protect Arizona's wild cats from

trophy hunting and trapping. That grassroots campaign which relied largely on volunteers, was suspended in 2018.

As the latest polls indicate, Arizona voters strongly support animal protection and our public initiative process. However, each session, Legislators continue to run bills trying to weaken or dismantle the citizen initiative process. These bills generally, with very few exceptions, are extremely partisan. The issue of citizen initiatives could be related to any number of issues unrelated to animal protection and it is possible that otherwise animal-friendly legislators are considering a bigger picture when supporting these bills. That is why one of HVA's priority goals is to continually educate legislators on the importance of citizen initiatives for protecting large numbers of Arizona's animals.

### **2020 Anti-Initiative Bills**

[HCR2032 initiatives; single subject; title](#) (Kern: Allen, Barto, et al.) would have referred to the ballot a measure to require citizen initiatives to conform to a single subject. This would ensure that only the narrowest of subjects could be placed on the ballot. The Arizona Supreme Court has already rejected that proposal. In 2017, the Justices unanimously ruled constitutional provisions that limit legislation to a single subject do not apply when the proposal comes from voters.

HVA opposed this measure.

HCR2032 passed the House 31-28-1 but was held in the Senate when the Legislature adjourned, so the bill died.

[HCR2039](#) initiative; referendum; signatures; legislative districts (Finchem: Carroll, Fillmore, et al.) would have referred to the ballot a measure that requires citizen initiative campaigns to submit 1/30th percent of signatures from each of Arizona's 30 legislative districts. Currently, initiative campaigns must submit signatures from 10% of all voters statewide, not in each of the 30 legislative districts. This would make it virtually impossible for grassroots citizen initiative campaigns to place a measure on the ballot.

As stated, the Legislature has already passed laws that have severely damaged our citizen initiative process. Wealthy, out-of-state groups have the capacity to hire petition gatherers to collect the exact number of signatures in every district.



However, this bill would have created an unnecessary and insurmountable hurdle for grassroots groups running campaigns with lots of volunteers and a shoe-string budget.

HVA opposed this bill.

HCR2039 passed the House 31-29 but was held in the Senate when the Legislature adjourned, so the bill died.

[HCR2046](#) initiatives; referendums; reauthorization (Bowers: Biasiucci, Bolick, et al.) would have referred to the ballot a measure requiring that all initiatives

and referenda already passed by voters be referred back to the ballot every 10 years. Since the bill was retroactive to 1989, it would have required a revote on all of our hard-won laws including bans on leghold traps, cockfighting, and the inhumane confinement of farm animals. Forcing initiative campaigns to continually defend these laws disproportionately hurts the largely volunteer campaigns that placed these measures on the ballot.

HVA opposed this measure.

HCR2046 passed the House Election committee but was held in Rules, so the bill died.

[SB1020](#) ballot measures; proposition 105; disclosure (Ugenti-Rita) would have required a warning be placed on all advertising, publicity pamphlets, and the ballot questions stating that "NOTICE: PURSUANT TO PROPOSITION 105 (1998), THESE MEASURES CANNOT BE CHANGED IN THE FUTURE IF APPROVED ON THE BALLOT EXCEPT BY A THREE-FOURTHS VOTE OF THE MEMBERS OF EACH HOUSE OF THE LEGISLATURE AND IF THE CHANGE FURTHERS THE PURPOSE OF THE ORIGINAL BALLOT MEASURE, OR BY REFERRING THE CHANGE TO THE BALLOT." This bill was meant to dissuade voters from supporting citizen initiatives. Senator Ugenti-Rita has sponsored versions of this legislation several times. In 2017, Representative Ken Clark spoke in opposition to her bill, arguing that the requirement for ads and fundraisers is ripe for a lawsuit. He stated, "Bills like this are forced political speech."

HVA opposed this measure.

SB1020 passed the Senate 17-13 but was held in the House when the Legislature adjourned, so the bill died.

### Other Bad Bills

[HB2044](#) meat; poultry; sale; misrepresentation (Cook: Pierce) would have banned the use of the term meat, or poultry, on product labels and advertisements unless the product is derived from slaughtered animals. Bill sponsor Rep. David Cook, a cattle rancher, ran a similar bill in the 2019 session, which died after failing to pass the House.

The large-scale agriculture industry has introduced versions of this legislation across the United States. In addition to meat-alternative companies, animal protection and legal advocacy groups, these bills are opposed by other food industries. Missouri passed a meat labeling law in 2018 which led to a federal lawsuit filed by Animal Legal Defense Fund, the Good Food Institute, and other groups. Read NY Times article on meat labeling bills [here](#).



HVA opposed this measure.

HB2044 was not heard in committees, so the bill died.



## **Superstar Legislators**

HVA wishes to thank our “Superstar” Legislators, who expend efforts to protect animals and our public initiative process and were present for most, or all, key bill votes. Many of these legislators voted against all measures damaging to animals and citizen initiatives and sponsored and/or voted for animal protection bills. Many also spoke out against anti-initiative bills and defended animal protection measures in committees and on the floor.

Legislators that voted favorably on *all* key bills:

Representatives Richard Andrade, Isela Blanc, Kelli Butler, Andres Cano, Cesar Chavez, Domingo DeGrazia, Kirsten Engel, Mitzi Epstein, Diego Espinoza, Charlene Fernandez, Randall Friese, Rosanna Gabaldon, Pamela Powers Hannley, Alma Hernandez, Daniel Hernandez, Jr, Jennifer Jermaine, Aaron Lieberman, Jennifer Longdon, Robert Meza, Jennifer Pawlik, Geraldine Peten, Amish Shah, Lorenzo Sierra, Raquel Teran, Myron Tsosie, and Arlando Teller.

Senators Lela Alston, Sean Bowie, David Bradley, Lupe Contreras, Andrea Dalessandro, Sally Ann Gonzales, Juan Mendez, Lisa Otondo, Jamescita Peshlakai, Martin Quezada, Rebecca Rios, Victoria Steele, and Tony Navarrete.

The following legislators missed one key vote but voted consistently to protect animals and citizens’ voting rights:

Representatives Reginald Bolding, Diego Rodriguez

HVA offers congratulations to Representatives Kirsten Engel and John Kavanagh, recipients of HSUS – Arizona’s Humane Legislator of the Year Award for 2020.



*Rep. Amish Shah*

## **Legislators who helped on specific animal related measures**

HVA greatly appreciates the efforts of the following legislators who sponsored animal protection measures.



*Rep. John Kavanagh*

Representative John Kavanagh was the primary sponsor of several animal protection bills including HB2671, which would provide tools to enforce animal fighting laws, and HB2652, which would charge unauthorized horse racing organizers with a Class 6 felony and add the offense under the RICO statute. While aspects of Rep. Kavanagh’s voting record on wildlife and initiative bills could be improved, he is a powerful, effective longtime champion in fighting animal cruelty, and has been a consistently accessible resource for animal protection groups.

Representative Amish Shah was the primary sponsor of HB2531, which would repeal the law that preempted local ordinances banning sales of puppy mill dogs. He also sponsored HB2537, which would ban the practice of declawing cats. As an ER physician, Rep. Shah was able to address the bill from a medical perspective. In just two years as a lawmaker, Rep. Shah has proven to be a passionate, tireless advocate for animals and citizen initiative rights.

Senator Mendez again sponsored bills to protect wildlife including SB1262, which bans cyanide bombs used to kill predators, and SB1263, which would repeal the ineffective board that recommends candidates to the Arizona Game & Fish Commission.

Senator Kate Brophy McGee was the only member of her party to vote “no” on SB1667 to legalize aerial fireworks. Senator Paul Boyer also crossed party lines by refraining to vote on the bill, which failed the Senate by two votes.

## **Advocates**

HVA thanks the Humane Voters of Arizona board and team members: Stephanie Nichols-Young, Scott Bonsall-Cargill, Tom Krepitch, Michelle Lukasiewicz, Don Bentley, Martha German, and Heather Moos.

HVA thanks Stephanie Nichols-Young and Don Bentley with Animal Defense League of Arizona, the Paw Project, and Kellye Pinkleton, Arizona Director of The Humane Society of the US for her substantial efforts on legislation and for hosting the successful annual Humane Lobby Day.

Thanks to the Arizona Advocacy Network, Grand Canyon Sierra Club, Arizona League of Women Voters, and the many other organizations, legislators, and citizens for their efforts opposing anti-initiative bills.

Thanks to advocates Deb Thompson, Nancy Young Wright, Gary Vella, Robin Motzer, Carolyn Campbell, Lain Kahlstrom, Tina Meredith, and others for their efforts to defeat SB1667.

As always, HVA appreciates the tireless efforts of Sierra Club Arizona Director Sandy Bahr to protect our state's wildlife, habitat, and citizen initiative rights.

Finally, thanks to Stephanie Nichols-Young, Tom Krepitch, Martha German, Heather Moos, and Don Bentley for their valuable input on this report.

For more information on legislation visit the HVA [website](#), Thanks to Strategies 360 for their efforts on the site which was designed by Lavana Tirtaguna.

This 2020 Legislative Report and Scorecard is the 21st one written by Karen Michael. She has been a volunteer lobbyist for animal protection organizations in Arizona since 1997. She is a mural artist and retired RN. She received her BSN from the University of New Mexico. After graduation she moved to Arizona with her husband. They have lived in Arizona since 1976 and raised their family in Peoria. They are also pet parents to several rescued animals.

### **Legislative Scorecard**

Voting records are provided on key bills affecting animals, including citizen initiative measures. There are no actual points or grades assigned.

#### Animal Bills

A checkmark ✓ indicates a vote in favor of animal protection, while an "x" represents a vote that negatively impacts animals.

#### Voting/Initiative Bills

A checkmark ✓ indicates a vote supporting citizen initiative rights, while an "x" represents a vote negatively affecting the initiative process and, in turn, voters' ability to protect animals.

#### All Bills

An asterisk \* indicates that the legislator's vote was for the purpose of reconsideration. After a bill vote takes place, a legislator who voted with the prevailing side may move to reconsider it. This tactic is a final attempt to save a bill that failed the House or Senate but can also be used to kill a bill that passed. The asterisk follows symbols based on whether HVA supported or opposed the bill: ✓\* or x\*

NV indicates that the legislator did not vote on a bill. This could be because that legislator was absent, or that they refrained from voting to affect the bill's passage.

A blank column under a bill indicates that the legislator did not have an opportunity to vote on that measure. This applies to legislators replacing another one who left office during the session. In that case, the new legislator is included in the scorecard but has a blank column for bills voted on prior to the replacement.

Bill voting records represent one public aspect of the legislative process. However, many factors affecting measures are not subject to public scrutiny and are sometimes beyond the scope of this legislative report including efforts of lawmakers, lobbyists, and others to influence legislation largely take place within the "hidden" political process. That is why some additional actions by lawmakers are also taken into consideration, such as sponsoring bills or influencing the passage or defeat of animal-related measures.

Those actions are represented in the OTHER column by a positive icon 😊 or negative icon ☹️. In the COMMENTS column, PS means that the legislator was the primary sponsor of the bill. Cosponsors are not included in the scorecard.

Please click on the bill number in the main legislative report for all information including status, primary and co-sponsors, amendments, committee and floor votes, and videos. Bill positions registered by organizations and individuals are listed under RTS Bill Positions.

Although animal protection and initiative bills provide a gauge for reviewing lawmakers, other bills that impact animals are those that affect wildlife habitat in Arizona. For legislative information on conservation measures, including voting records and scorecards visit the Arizona Sierra Club's [legislative](#) page. For more information on this legislative report please email [humanevotersarizona@cox.net](mailto:humanevotersarizona@cox.net).



## ARIZONA STATE SENATE 2020 SCORECARD

NAME	LD	Party	Animal Bills		Initiative Bills		COMMENTS
			HB 2749	SB 1667	SB 1020	OTHER	
<a href="#">Karen Fann</a>	1	R	✘	✘	✘		
<a href="#">Andrea Dalessandro</a>	2	D	✓	✓	✓		
<a href="#">Sally Ann Gonzales</a>	3	D	✓	✓	✓		
<a href="#">Lisa Otondo</a>	4	D	✓	✓	✓		
<a href="#">Sonny Borrelli</a>	5	R	✘	✘	✘		
<a href="#">Sylvia Allen</a>	6	R	✘	✘	✘		
<a href="#">Jamescita Peshlakai</a>	7	D	✓	✓	✓		
<a href="#">Frank Pratt</a>	8	R	✘	✘	✘		
<a href="#">Victoria Steele</a>	9	D	✓	✓	✓		
<a href="#">David Bradley</a>	10	D	✓	✓	✓		
<a href="#">Vince Leach</a>	11	R	✘	✘	✘		
<a href="#">Eddie Farnsworth</a>	12	R	✘	✘	✘		
<a href="#">Sine Kerr</a>	13	R	✘	✘	✘		
<a href="#">David Gowan</a>	14	R	✘	✘	✘	☹☹	PS SB1667 (aerial fireworks), PS SB1666 (Senate version of HB2749)
<a href="#">Heather Carter</a>	15	R	✘	✘	✘		
<a href="#">David C. Farnsworth</a>	16	R	✘	✘	✘		
<a href="#">J.D. Mesnard</a>	17	R	✘	✘	✘		
<a href="#">Sean Bowie</a>	18	D	✓	✓	✓		
<a href="#">Lupe Contreras</a>	19	D	✓	✓	✓		
<a href="#">Paul Boyer</a>	20	R	✘	NV	✘	☺	Crossed party lines to refrain from voting on SB1667 (aerial fireworks)
<a href="#">Rick Gray</a>	21	R	✘	✘	✘		
<a href="#">David Livingston</a>	22	R	✘	✘	✘		
<a href="#">Michelle Ugenti-Rita</a>	23	R	✘	✘	✘	☹	PS SB1020 (Prop 105 disclosure on initiatives)
<a href="#">Lela Alston</a>	24	D	✓	✓	✓		
<a href="#">Tyler Pace</a>	25	R	✘	✓*	✘	☹	Changed vote on SB1667 (aerial fireworks) in order to obtain a revote on the failed bill
<a href="#">Juan Mendez</a>	26	D	✓	✓	✓	☺	PS SB1262 and SB1263 (wildlife protection bills)
<a href="#">Rebecca Rios</a>	27	D	✓	✓	✓		
<a href="#">Kate Brophy McGee</a>	28	R	✘	✓	✘	☺	Crossed party lines to vote 'no' on SB1667 (aerial fireworks)
<a href="#">Martin Quezada</a>	29	D	✓	✓	✓		
<a href="#">Tony Navarrete</a>	30	D	✓	✓	✓		

### Animal Bills

HB2749: endangered species conservation; confidential information  
 SB1667: fireworks; aerial devices

### Voting/Initiative Bills

SB1020: ballot measures; proposition 105; disclosure

### Vote Symbols

Vote supporting animal protection or initiative rights ✓  
 Vote opposing animal protection or initiative rights ✘  
 Vote changed for purpose of reconsideration of bill ✓\* or ✘\*

### Other

Action taken supporting animal protection or initiative rights ☹  
 Action taken opposing animal protection or initiative rights ☹

### Comments

PS: Primary sponsor of a bill (cosponsors are not included in this list)

**ARIZONA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES 2020 SCORECARD (Page 1 of 2)**

NAME	LD	Party	Animal Bills			Initiative Bills			OTHER	COMMENTS
			HB 2062	HB 2652	HB 2749	HCR 2032	HCR 2039			
<a href="#">Noel Campbell</a>	1	R	NV	✓	✗	✗	✗			
<a href="#">Steve Pierce</a>	1	R	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗			
<a href="#">Rosanna Gabaldón</a>	2	D	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			
<a href="#">Daniel Hernandez, Jr.</a>	2	D	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			
<a href="#">Andres Cano</a>	3	D	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			
<a href="#">Alma Hernandez</a>	3	D	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			
<a href="#">Charlene R. Fernandez</a>	4	D	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			
<a href="#">Geraldine Peten</a>	4	D	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			
<a href="#">Leo Biasiucci</a>	5	R	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗			
<a href="#">Regina E. Cobb</a>	5	R	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗			
<a href="#">Walter Blackman</a>	6	R	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗			
<a href="#">Bob Thorpe</a>	6	R	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗			
<a href="#">Arlando Teller</a>	7	D	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			
<a href="#">Myron Tsosie</a>	7	D	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			
<a href="#">David L. Cook</a>	8	R	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	☹	PS HB2044 (fake meat bill)	
<a href="#">Thomas "T.J." Shope, Jr.</a>	8	R	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗			
<a href="#">Randall Friese</a>	9	D	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			
<a href="#">Pamela Powers Hannley</a>	9	D	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			
<a href="#">Domingo DeGrazia</a>	10	D	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			
<a href="#">Kirsten Engel</a>	10	D	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			
<a href="#">Mark Finchem</a>	11	R	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	☹	PS HCR2039 (anti-initiative bill)	
<a href="#">Bret Roberts</a>	11	R	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗			
<a href="#">Travis W. Grantham</a>	12	R	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗			
<a href="#">Warren Petersen</a>	12	R	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗			
<a href="#">Timothy M. Dunn</a>	13	R	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	😊	Supported protection of farm animals	
<a href="#">Joanne Osborne</a>	13	R	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗			
<a href="#">Gail Griffin</a>	14	R	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	☹	PS HB2749 (endangered species secrecy bill)	
<a href="#">Becky A. Nutt</a>	14	R	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗			
<a href="#">John Allen</a>	15	R	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗			
<a href="#">Nancy Barto</a>	15	R	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗			
<a href="#">John Fillmore</a>	16	R	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗			
<a href="#">Kelly Townsend</a>	16	R	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗			
<a href="#">Jennifer Pawlik</a>	17	D	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			

NAME	LD	Party	Animal Bills			Initiative Bills			COMMENTS
			HB 2062	HB 2652	HB 2749	HB 2616	SB 1451	OTHER	
<a href="#">Jeff Weninger</a>	17	R	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗		
<a href="#">Mitzi Epstein</a>	18	D	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	☺	PS bill to protect wildlife by banning balloon releases
<a href="#">Jennifer Jermaine</a>	18	D	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
<a href="#">Diego Espinoza</a>	19	D	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
<a href="#">Lorenzo Sierra</a>	19	D	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
<a href="#">Shawna Bolick</a>	20	R	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗		
<a href="#">Anthony T. Kern</a>	20	R	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	☹	PS HCR2032 (anti-initiative bill)
<a href="#">Kevin Payne</a>	21	R	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗		
<a href="#">Tony Rivero</a>	21	R	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗		
<a href="#">Frank Carroll</a>	22	R	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗		
<a href="#">Ben Toma</a>	22	R	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗		
<a href="#">John Kavanagh</a>	23	R	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	☺☺	PS HB2062 (animal fighting), PS HB2652 (racing)
<a href="#">Jay Lawrence</a>	23	R	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗		
<a href="#">Jennifer Longdon</a>	24	D	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
<a href="#">Amish Shah</a>	24	D	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	☺☺	PS HB2537 (cat declaw), PS HB2531 (pet store)
<a href="#">Russell "Rusty" Bowers</a>	25	R	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	☹	PS HCR2046 (anti-initiative bill)
<a href="#">Michelle Udall</a>	25	R	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗		
<a href="#">Isela Blanc</a>	26	D	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
<a href="#">Athena Salman</a>	26	D	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓		
<a href="#">Reginald Bolding, Jr.</a>	27	D	✓	✓	NV	✓	✓		
<a href="#">Diego Rodriguez</a>	27	D	✓	NV	✓	✓	✓		
<a href="#">Kelli Butler</a>	28	D	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
<a href="#">Aaron Lieberman</a>	28	D	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
<a href="#">Richard C. Andrade</a>	29	D	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
<a href="#">César Chávez</a>	29	D	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
<a href="#">Robert Meza</a>	30	D	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
<a href="#">Raquel Terán</a>	30	D	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		

#### Animal Bills

HB2062: animal fighting paraphernalia; offense  
 HB2652: unauthorized racing meetings; penalties; racketeering  
 HB2749: endangered species conservation; confidential information

#### Voting/Initiative Bills

HCR2032: initiatives; single subject; title  
 HCR2039: initiative; referendum; signatures; legislative districts

#### Vote Symbols

Vote supporting animal protection or initiative rights ✓  
 Vote opposing animal protection or initiative rights ✗  
 Vote changed for purpose of reconsideration of bill ✓\* or ✗\*

#### Other

Action taken supporting animal protection or initiative rights ☺  
 Action taken opposing animal protection or initiative rights ☹

#### Comments

PS: Primary sponsor of a bill (cosponsors are not included in this list)