



# *Meet the New Legislature, Same as the Old Legislature*

*Early findings of an examination of legislator voting patterns  
in the first year of the Citizens' Elections Program*

## **Preliminary Report**

March 2, 2010

by

Sean Parnell

President, Center for Competitive Politics  
Alexandria, Virginia

Center for Competitive Politics  
<http://www.campaignfreedom.org>  
124 S. West Street, #201, Alexandria, VA 22310  
(703) 894-6800 phone

## **Introduction**

The 2008 election cycle was the first in Connecticut where candidates for state legislature could choose to accept taxpayer dollars to fund their campaigns, replacing the traditional system of private, voluntary contributions from citizens.

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 plead guilty to related corruption charges, and served time in jail.

Rowland was not the only elected official in Connecticut to become embroiled in a corruption scandal. Among other scandals, 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 plead guilty in 2005 to accepting a bribe.

As a result of these and other scandals, Connecticut began to be referred to as “Corrupticut.” In response, the so-called campaign finance “reform” community began to push taxpayer financed political campaigns as the solution to Connecticut’s corruption problem. This was curious in that 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, something no campaign finance law is capable of effectively addressing.

Nevertheless, in late 2005 the Connecticut legislature passed the Citizens’ Election Program (CEP), which was signed by newly-installed Governor Jodi Rell. The program 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.<sup>1</sup>

The program was implemented for the first time in the 2008 election cycle. Nearly three-quarters of candidates who ran and also of those elected in 2008 participated in the program.<sup>2</sup>

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 of candidates is the very first item addressed as evidence of success.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> “Citizens’ Elections 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](http://www.ct.gov/seec/lib/seec/citizens_election_program_/2010_overview__final_030109.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> “Connecticut – Reclaiming Democracy: The Inaugural Run of the Citizens’ Election Program for the 2008 Election Cycle,” p. 4, State Election Enforcement Commission, October 2009.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. See also: “Campaign Finance Reform: A New Era,” p. 4, January 2009, Common Cause, available at: <http://www.commoncause.org/atf/cf/%7Bfb3c17e2-cdd1-4df6-92be-bd4429893665%7D/COMMONCAUSECAMPAIGNFINANCEREFORMAGENDA2009.PDF>

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 ridding “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.<sup>4</sup>

Rather than merely counting the number of politicians willing to take taxpayer dollars to finance their campaigns, 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 – 08 session and accepted taxpayer dollars for their 2008 re-election campaign. By identifying significant interest groups and comparing their legislative priorities to voting patterns, 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.”

The four organized interest groups addressed in this preliminary report are the Connecticut Business & Industry Association (CBIA), the Connecticut Conference of Municipalities (CCM), Connecticut Hospital Association (CHA), and the Connecticut Association of Health Plans.

Each of these organizations appeared in the top 10 list for lobbying expenditures provided by the Connecticut Office of State Ethics in 2007, 2008, or 2009.<sup>5</sup>

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 295 bills and thousands of individual votes were analyzed in an effort to determine if

---

<sup>4</sup> See “Clean Elections Campaign Reform 1, 2, 3” at: <http://www.publiccampaign.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](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.”

<sup>5</sup> “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>

legislators participating in CEP had noticeably changed the frequency with which they voted with these interest groups.<sup>7</sup>

The remainder of this report summarizes the initial findings at the end of the 2009 legislative session. Several additional groups are being studied, but data is not yet available for analytical purposes. In most cases, this is due to an insufficient number of floor votes cast in the 2009 session on a group's issues, by the end of the 2010 session we expect more votes to be cast on each groups' agenda, allowing for their inclusion in the final report.

Although this is a preliminary report, there is little reason to believe that legislator voting patterns in 2010 will dramatically change the findings here. The fact that the Citizens' Election Program has been struck down in court and may not survive may leave 2009 as the only legislative session available for study, meaning that the preliminary analysis here may be refined in the future but not substantially added to.

The analysis of the four groups studied in this preliminary report is followed by conclusions and recommendations for Connecticut's state legislature, which are also applicable to other states considering adopting similar programs providing taxpayer dollars to candidates for public office.

### **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 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..."<sup>8</sup>

The CBIA was the top spender for lobbying expenditures in 2007, 2008, and 2009.<sup>9</sup> With 124 floor votes in either the House or Senate to examine, it also provides the largest number of votes of any group to analyze.

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.

---

<sup>7</sup> 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.

<sup>8</sup> From the web site of CBIA, "About CBIA," on December 14, 2009, <http://www.cbia.com/3about/default.htm>

<sup>9</sup> See *ibid* at note 5

<b>Legislative Votes in Favor of CBIA Positions, 2007 – 2009</b>			
<i>Group</i>	<i>2007/2008 Session</i>	<i>2009 Session</i>	<i>Increase/Decrease</i>
House Republicans	44.2%	67.6%	+ 23.4%
House Democrats	36.2%	39.3%	+ 3.1%
All House	38.1%	45.9%	+ 7.8%
Senate Republicans	44.0%	52.3%	+ 8.3%
Senate Democrats	37.7%	39.8%	+ 2.1%
All Senate	39.1%	42.6%	+ 3.5%

The data above show that, whether considered by chamber or party, state legislators elected with funds from the CEP generally increased the frequency with which they voted in favor of the legislative agenda of the CBIA between the 2007/2008 and the 2009 sessions.

Reviewing data for individual elected officials shows that most did not change their voting patterns dramatically, with the exception of several Republican members in the House.<sup>10</sup> Out of 22 Republicans serving in the House, 17 of them increased the frequency with which they voted for the CBIA's legislative priorities by more than 20 percentage points. No House Republican decreased the rate at which they voted for CBIA priorities.

Among House Democrats, none increased their CBIA vote frequency by 20 percentage points or more, and only 11 out of 72 increased by 10 percentage points or more. Only 12 House Democrats decreased the CBIA vote frequency, none by more than 10 percentage points.

Senators showed far less change than their House counterparts, with only two of six Senate Republicans and no Democrats increasing their CBIA vote frequency by more than ten percentage points. Five out of 21 Senate Democrats and one Republican decreased their CBIA vote frequency, none by more than five percentage points.

Overall, it is clear that in 2009 the CBIA agenda fared better with members of the Connecticut General Assembly than it had in the previous session, although the improvement is modest.

### **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."<sup>11</sup>

<sup>10</sup> See Appendix 1 of this report for individual legislator scores

<sup>11</sup> From the website of CCM, "About CCM," on February 26, 2010, <http://www.ccm-ct.org/about/>

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.<sup>12</sup> 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, with CCM taking positions on bills that received 70 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.

<b>Legislative Votes in Favor of CCM Positions, 2007 – 2009</b>			
<i>Group</i>	<i>2007/2008 Session</i>	<i>2009 Session</i>	<i>Increase/Decrease</i>
House Republicans	68.3%	65.8%	- 2.5%
House Democrats	68.1%	62.7%	- 5.4%
All House	68.2%	63.4%	- 4.8%
Senate Republicans	75.5%	70.5%	- 5.0%
Senate Democrats	62.1%	66.3%	+ 4.2%
All Senate	62.8%	64.8%	+ 2.0%

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.

Individual voting records also recorded negligible changes.<sup>13</sup> Out of the 121 legislators studied, only one changed their CCM voting frequency by more than 20 percentage points. Only 11 of 121 reduced their CCM voting frequency by 10 percentage points or more, and one increased their CCM vote frequency by more than 10 percentage points. The overwhelming majority of state legislators saw little change in their CCM voting frequency.

### **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.”<sup>14</sup>

CHA ranked third in total lobbying expenditures in 2007 and fourth in both 2008 and 2009.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>12</sup> See *ibid* at note 5

<sup>13</sup> See Appendix 2 of this report for individual legislator scores

<sup>14</sup> From the website of CHA, , “About CHA,” on February 26, 2010 , <http://www.chime.org>

<sup>15</sup> See *ibid* at note 5

The Connecticut House and Senate considered a total of 25 bills that CHA took clearly identifiable positions on in 2007 and 2008. In 2009 the Senate took floor votes on ten bills that CHA took a position on, while the House only voted on five bills. Because of the small number of House votes, we are unable to provide meaningful analysis based only on 2009 House votes. For that reason, our analysis here relies only on Senate votes.

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

<b>Legislative Votes in Favor of CHA Positions, 2007 – 2009</b>			
<i>Group</i>	<i>2007/2008 Session</i>	<i>2009 Session</i>	<i>Increase/Decrease</i>
Senate Republicans	66.7%	59.3%	- 7.4%
Senate Democrats	69.5%	50.7%	- 18.8%
All Senate	68.9%	52.6%	- 16.3%

The CHA saw decreased support for its agenda in 2009 compared to the 2007/2008 session in the Connecticut Senate. Nearly every Senate Democrat saw the frequency they voted with CHA decline by nearly 20 percentage point, with only one seeing a decline of less than 10 percent. No Democratic Senator increased the frequency with which they voted in favor of CHA.

Republicans showed a similar, although less dramatic, decline in support for the CHA agenda, all between a 5 percent and 10 percent drop.

Because of the limited number of votes considered available for analysis, caution should be used in trying to draw significant conclusions from this data. Only ten bills that were CHA priorities received floor votes in 2009, the minimum number possible for inclusion in our analysis.

### **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 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.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> See *ibid* at note 5

In 2007 and 2008 combined, the Connecticut House only had floor votes on seven bills on which CAHP had taken a position, not enough for analysis. The Senate, however, voted on 12 bills during 2007 – 2008 and 15 in 2009, a sufficient number for analysis.

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

<b>Legislative Votes in Favor of CAHP Positions, 2007 – 2009</b>			
<i>Group</i>	<i>2007/2008 Session</i>	<i>2009 Session</i>	<i>Increase/Decrease</i>
Senate Republicans	15.3%	28.4%	+ 13.1%
Senate Democrats	8.4%	14.8%	+ 6.4%
All Senate	10%	17.8%	+ 7.8%

The data shows a relatively modest increase in support for CAHP's agenda in 2009 compared to the previous legislature, with a larger increase by Senate Republicans compared to Senate Democrats. Most Senate Republicans increased the frequency with which they voted for CAHP's agenda by between 10 and 20 percentage points, while only 4 out of 21 Senate Democrats showed increases of similar magnitude. Only one Senator, a Democrat, decreased the percentage by which they voted for the CAHP agenda.

As with the CHA information, the limited nature of the data available suggests that caution should be used in attempting to draw conclusions from these findings.

## **Conclusion**

There is no evidence to support the contention that providing taxpayer dollars to legislative candidates reduces the likelihood that a legislator will vote with an interest group. Although these findings are tentative and further study based on voting patterns in 2010 are necessary, there is little reason to believe these findings will noticeably change.<sup>17</sup>

<b>Change in frequency of voting with interest groups</b>		
Interest Group	House	Senate
CBIA	+9.5%	+3.4%
CCM	-4.7%	+2.1%
CHA	n/a	- 16.3%
CAHP	n/a	+ 7.9%

<sup>17</sup> If the program is not continued and the Citizens Election Program turns out to be a one-year experience, it will not be possible to determine if there was any impact beyond the 2009 session.



In four of the six vote sets observed, the number of times that legislators voted in favor of the interest groups studied actually rose. Only one group, the CHA, saw a noticeable decline, with the number of Senate votes cast in their favor falling by 16.3 percent.

Based on this evidence, it appears that the Citizens' Election Program has not changed the frequency with which state legislators vote in favor of organized interest groups. 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.<sup>19</sup>

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 to achieve one of its main purposes combined with the fact that Connecticut's system of taxpayer financed political campaigns has been struck down by a federal court, amidst an extreme budget crisis, all strongly suggest that this program should not be continued.

---

<sup>19</sup> Robert Franciosi, "Is Cleanliness Political Godliness?" p. 2, November 2001, The Goldwater Institute, available at: <http://www.goldwaterinstitute.org/article/899>

## 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 three-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:

<b>CBIA Legislative Priorities and Positions, 2007 - 2009</b>											
<i>Senate 2007</i>		<i>Senate 2008</i>		<i>Senate 2009</i>		<i>House 2007</i>		<i>House 2008</i>		<i>House 2009</i>	
<b>Bill #</b>	<b>Support/ Oppose</b>	<b>Bill #</b>	<b>Support/ Oppose</b>	<b>Bill #</b>	<b>Support/ Oppose</b>	<b>Bill #</b>	<b>Support/ Oppose</b>	<b>Bill #</b>	<b>Support/ Oppose</b>	<b>Bill #</b>	<b>Support/ Oppose</b>
6897	O	658	O	47	O	6897	O	5936	S	47	O
6989	O	702	S	80	S	6989	O	671	O	80	S
7055	O	5936	S	154	S	7032	O	5658	O	301	O
7281	S	440	S	290	O	7055	O	5600	O	379	O
7369	S	671	O	301	O	7281	S	5874	O	710	S
7400	S	5658	O	379	O	7369	S	57	O	894	O
1036	O	399	S	710	S	7400	S	5105	O	964	S
1112	S	401	S	716	O	1036	O	5480	O	997	O
1358	S	652	O	894	O	1112	S			1068	S
1378	S	5600	O	963	S	1358	S			1099	O
1435	S	39	S	964	S	1378	S			5018	S
389	O	5874	O	997	O	1435	S			5021	O
601	O	57	O	1026	O	389	O			5023	O
66	O	217	O	1050	O	66	S			5172	S
73	O	335	O	1068	S	845	O			5177	O
741	O	5105	O	1099	O					5433	O
845	O			5018	O					5521	O
846	O			5021	O					5930	S
847	O			5023	O					6041	S
				5177	O					6185	O
				5433	O					6187	O
				5930	S					6298	S
				6041	S					6463	S
				6185	O					6467	S

				6463	S					6476	S
				6467	S					6502	O
				6476	S					6510	O
				6502	O					6512	O
				6540	O					6540	O
				6582	O					6582	O
				6600	O					6589	S
										6600	O
										6636	O
										6683	O

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

<b>CBIA Vote Frequency</b>				
<b>Connecticut State House</b>				
<b>First Name</b>	<b>Last Name</b>	<b>Party</b>	<b>2007/08 Frequency</b>	<b>2009 Frequency</b>
Catherine	Abercrombie	D	33.3%	41.2%
David	Aldarondo	D	30.4%	39.3%
Emil	Altobello	D	31.8%	44.1%
Andres	Ayala	D	37.5%	34.4%
Terry	Backer	D	36.4%	53.1%
Ryan	Barry	D	33.3%	37.9%
Jason	Bartlett	D	34.8%	36.4%
Jeffrey	Berger	D	37.5%	48.1%
Elizabeth	Boukus	D	38.1%	43.3%
Larry	Butler	D	33.3%	33.3%
Beth	Bye	D	33.3%	50.0%
Christopher	Caruso	D	33.3%	41.4%
Charles	Clemons	D	38.1%	32.1%
Paul	Davis	D	33.3%	40.6%
Patricia	Dillon	D	37.5%	32.1%
Christopher	Donovan	D	34.8%	38.2%
Thomas	Drew	D	31.8%	36.4%
Kim	Fawcett	D	39.1%	35.5%
Andrew	Fleischmann	D	33.3%	37.9%
Stephen	Fontana	D	29.2%	38.2%
Mary	Fritz	D	28.6%	37.9%
Henry	Genga	D	30.4%	38.2%
Linda	Gentile	D	33.3%	33.3%
John	Geragosian	D	42.9%	37.5%
Demetrios	Giannaros	D	34.8%	43.3%
Robert	Godfrey	D	33.3%	36.4%
Ted	Graziani	D	33.3%	38.2%
Antonio	Guerrera	D	30.4%	38.2%

Gail	Hamm	D	33.3%	36.4%
Deborah	Heinrich	D	45.8%	45.2%
John	Hennessy	D	33.3%	41.2%
Bryan	Hurlburt	D	38.1%	41.2%
Claire	Janowski	D	29.2%	38.5%
Karen	Jarmoc	D	33.3%	34.4%
Edwin	Jutila	D	37.5%	48.5%
Thomas	Kehoe	D	34.8%	45.5%
Marie	Kirkley-Bey	D	36.4%	41.9%
Mike	Lawlor	D	34.8%	39.4%
Joan	Lewis	D	33.3%	38.2%
John	Mazurek	D	34.8%	50.0%
David	McCluskey	D	30.4%	38.2%
Douglas	McCrary	D	38.1%	30.0%
Denise	Merrill	D	39.1%	36.4%
Joe	Mioli	D	39.1%	43.8%
Russell	Morin	D	33.3%	34.4%
Bruce	Morris	D	33.3%	33.3%
Mary	Mushinsky	D	30.4%	34.5%
Sandra	Nafis	D	37.5%	38.2%
Vickie	Nardello	D	29.2%	39.4%
Frank	Nicastro	D	33.3%	46.9%
Tim	O'Brien	D	33.3%	35.3%
Melissa	Olson	D	30.4%	39.4%
Linda	Orange	D	37.5%	32.1%
James	O'Rourke	D	33.3%	33.3%
Chris	Perone	D	33.3%	38.2%
Kelvin	Roldan	D	45.5%	36.7%
Richard	Roy	D	33.3%	40.6%
Peggy	Sayers	D	34.8%	42.4%
Linda	Schofield	D	33.3%	50.0%
Joseph	Serra	D	45.0%	41.4%
Brendan	Sharkey	D	33.3%	42.4%
James	Spallone	D	37.5%	36.4%
Joseph	Taborsak	D	33.3%	36.4%
Kathleen	Tallarita	D	30.4%	36.4%
Peter	Tercyak	D	33.3%	35.5%
John	Thompson	D	33.3%	38.2%
Peter	Villano	D	37.5%	40.0%
Toni	Walker	D	34.8%	38.2%
Patricia	Widlitz	D	30.4%	41.2%
Roberta	Willis	D	30.4%	36.7%
Elissa	Wright	D	37.5%	40.6%
Bruce	Zalaski	D	33.3%	42.4%
Mike	Alberts	R	56.5%	66.7%
William	Aman	R	41.7%	73.5%
Penny	Bacchiochi	R	33.3%	73.5%
Mary	Carson	R	37.5%	67.7%
Anthony	D'Amelio	R	45.8%	66.7%
John	Frey	R	43.5%	68.8%

Janice	Giegler	R	45.8%	70.6%
Marilyn	Giuliano	R	33.3%	65.6%
William	Hamzy	R	39.1%	73.5%
John	Harkins	R	37.5%	69.7%
John	Hetherington	R	50.0%	70.6%
DebraLee	Hovey	R	41.7%	69.7%
Themis	Klarides	R	33.3%	67.6%
Lawrence	Miller	R	45.8%	67.6%
Craig	Miner	R	50.0%	73.5%
Selim	Noujaim	R	55.0%	67.7%
John	Piscopo	R	45.8%	75.8%
T.R.	Rowe	R	45.8%	63.3%
Pamela	Sawyer	R	41.7%	72.7%
David	Scribner	R	33.3%	67.6%
John	Stripp	R	45.8%	62.1%
Diana	Urban	R	29.2%	33.3%
Connecticut State Senate				
First Name	Last Name	Party	2007/08 Frequency	2009 Frequency
Thomas	Colapietro	D	37.1%	40.0%
Eric	Coleman	D	40.0%	38.7%
Eileen	Daily	D	46.9%	41.9%
Donald	Defronzo	D	37.1%	38.7%
Paul	Doyle	D	35.3%	41.9%
Bob	Duff	D	34.3%	41.9%
John	Fonfara	D	35.3%	38.7%
Thomas	Gaffey	D	35.3%	40.0%
Edwin	Gomes	D	38.2%	38.7%
Mary	Handley	D	35.3%	38.7%
Toni	Harp	D	40.0%	38.7%
Jonathan	Harris	D	37.1%	41.9%
Joan	Hartley	D	38.2%	43.3%
Gary	Lebeau	D	37.1%	38.7%
Martin	Looney	D	35.3%	38.7%
Andrew	Maynard	D	42.9%	38.7%
Andrew	McDonald	D	34.3%	40.0%
Edward	Meyer	D	37.1%	40.0%
Gayle	Slossberg	D	40.0%	38.7%
Andrea	Stillman	D	38.2%	38.7%
Donald	Williams	D	37.1%	38.7%
Sam	Caligiuri	R	40.0%	55.2%
Dan	Debicella	R	51.4%	61.3%
Leonard	Fasano	R	45.7%	45.2%
John	Kissel	R	37.1%	48.4%
John	McKinney	R	47.1%	55.2%
Andrew	Roraback	R	42.9%	48.4%

## 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. A total of 119 floor votes were taken on these bills (not including amendments).

<b>CCM Legislative Priorities and Positions, 2007 - 2009</b>											
<i>Senate 2007</i>		<i>Senate 2008</i>		<i>Senate 2009</i>		<i>House 2007</i>		<i>House 2008</i>		<i>House 2009</i>	
<b>Bill #</b>	<b>Support/ Oppose</b>	<b>Bill #</b>	<b>Support/ Oppose</b>	<b>Bill #</b>	<b>Support/ Oppose</b>	<b>Bill #</b>	<b>Support/ Oppose</b>	<b>Bill #</b>	<b>Support/ Oppose</b>	<b>Bill #</b>	<b>Support/ Oppose</b>
167	O	39	O	251	S	167	O	5031	S	251	S
784	O	217	O	375	S	848	S	5324	S	379	S
848	S	5031	S	379	S	1054	O	5326	S	735	O
1054	O	5324	S	384	S	1091	S	5599	S	761	S
1084	O	5599	S	497	S	1182	S	5621	S	785	O
1091	S	5629	O	569	O	1447	O	5629	O	885	S
1182	S	5633	S	735	O	5069	S	5734	S	966	S
1289	S	5734	S	761	S	5119	S	5873	S	997	S
1312	S	5873	S	762	O	5186	S			1021	S
1339	S			784	O	5234	O			1089	O
1447	O			785	O	6776	O			5254	O
5069	S			885	S	7025	S			5474	O
5119	S			966	S	7115	S			5519	O
5186	S			997	S	7125	O			5536	S
5234	O			1012	S					5821	S
6776	O			1021	S					5861	S
7025	S			1089	O					5894	S
7115	S			5254	O					6007	S
				5519	O					6041	O
				5536	S					6097	O
				5821	S					6187	O
				5861	S					6285	O
				5894	S					6304	S
				6041	O					6324	S
				6097	O					6385	S

				6324	S					6426	S
				6385	S					6435	O
				6426	S					6463	S
				6463	S					6467	S
				6467	S					6496	O
				6496	O					6582	S
				6582	S					6585	S
				6585	S					6588	S
										6589	S
										6625	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.

<b>CCM Vote Frequency</b>				
<b>Connecticut State House</b>				
<b>First Name</b>	<b>Last Name</b>	<b>Party</b>	<b>2007/08 Frequency</b>	<b>2009 Frequency</b>
Catherine	Abercrombie	D	68.2%	64.9%
David	Aldarondo	D	66.7%	61.8%
Emil	Altobello	D	68.2%	67.6%
Andres	Ayala	D	68.2%	63.9%
Terry	Backer	D	65.0%	61.1%
Ryan	Barry	D	66.7%	64.5%
Jason	Bartlett	D	66.7%	54.1%
Jeffrey	Berger	D	78.9%	63.9%
Elizabeth	Boukus	D	65.0%	62.9%
Larry	Butler	D	68.2%	66.7%
Beth	Bye	D	68.2%	71.9%
Christopher	Caruso	D	68.2%	62.5%
Charles	Clemons	D	68.2%	62.5%
Paul	Davis	D	71.4%	62.9%
Patricia	Dillon	D	68.2%	61.8%
Christopher	Donovan	D	68.2%	61.1%
Thomas	Drew	D	68.2%	63.9%
Kim	Fawcett	D	66.7%	60.6%
Andrew	Fleischmann	D	66.7%	60.6%
Stephen	Fontana	D	68.2%	61.1%
Mary	Fritz	D	65.0%	67.7%
Henry	Genga	D	68.2%	62.2%
Linda	Gentile	D	66.7%	64.7%

John	Geragosian	D	66.7%	61.1%
Demetrios	Giannaros	D	68.2%	58.8%
Robert	Godfrey	D	63.6%	58.8%
Ted	Graziani	D	68.2%	62.2%
Antonio	Guerrera	D	68.2%	66.7%
Gail	Hamm	D	66.7%	61.1%
Deborah	Heinrich	D	66.7%	65.7%
John	Hennessy	D	66.7%	59.5%
Bryan	Hurlburt	D	68.2%	63.9%
Claire	Janowski	D	68.2%	64.0%
Karen	Jarmoc	D	68.2%	64.7%
Edwin	Jutila	D	68.2%	59.5%
Thomas	Kehoe	D	68.2%	66.7%
Marie	Kirkley-Bey	D	72.2%	64.5%
Mike	Lawlor	D	63.2%	63.9%
Joan	Lewis	D	68.2%	62.2%
John	Mazurek	D	68.2%	68.6%
David	McCluskey	D	68.2%	62.2%
Douglas	McCrary	D	72.2%	64.0%
Denise	Merrill	D	70.0%	62.2%
Joe	Mioli	D	66.7%	64.7%
Russell	Morin	D	71.4%	60.0%
Bruce	Morris	D	70.0%	58.8%
Mary	Mushinsky	D	68.2%	59.4%
Sandra	Nafis	D	65.0%	62.2%
Vickie	Nardello	D	66.7%	61.1%
Frank	Nicastro	D	68.2%	63.9%
Tim	O'Brien	D	68.2%	59.5%
Melissa	Olson	D	68.2%	62.2%
Linda	Orange	D	68.2%	60.6%
James	O'Rourke	D	68.2%	54.3%
Chris	Perone	D	63.6%	61.1%
Kelvin	Roldan	D	71.4%	61.1%
Richard	Roy	D	68.2%	63.9%
Peggy	Sayers	D	71.4%	61.8%
Linda	Schofield	D	72.7%	61.8%
Joseph	Serra	D	68.2%	61.3%
Brendan	Sharkey	D	68.2%	62.9%
James	Spallone	D	68.2%	54.1%
Joseph	Taborsak	D	68.2%	84.0%
Kathleen	Tallarita	D	68.2%	62.9%
Peter	Tercyak	D	66.7%	60.0%
John	Thompson	D	66.7%	63.9%
Peter	Villano	D	68.2%	54.8%



Toni	Walker	D	68.2%	63.9%
Patricia	Widlitz	D	71.4%	67.6%
Roberta	Willis	D	68.2%	63.6%
Elissa	Wright	D	68.2%	62.2%
Bruce	Zalaski	D	68.2%	62.2%
Mike	Alberts	R	61.9%	64.9%
William	Aman	R	68.2%	69.4%
Penny	Bacchiochi	R	66.7%	67.6%
Mary	Carson	R	72.7%	69.7%
Anthony	D'Amelio	R	72.7%	69.2%
John	Frey	R	66.7%	55.9%
Janice	Giegler	R	68.2%	62.2%
Marilyn	Giuliano	R	68.2%	61.8%
William	Hamzy	R	72.7%	70.3%
John	Harkins	R	68.2%	64.9%
John	Hetherington	R	66.7%	67.6%
DebraLee	Hovey	R	70.0%	70.3%
Themis	Klarides	R	66.7%	67.6%
Lawrence	Miller	R	63.6%	56.8%
Craig	Miner	R	72.7%	65.7%
Selim	Noujaim	R	70.0%	69.7%
John	Piscopo	R	72.7%	63.9%
T.R.	Rowe	R	63.6%	70.6%
Pamela	Sawyer	R	68.2%	70.3%
David	Scribner	R	63.6%	62.2%
John	Stripp	R	72.7%	68.0%
Diana	Urban	R	66.7%	59.4%
Connecticut State Senate				
First Name	Last Name	Party		
Thomas	Colapietro	D	59.3%	65.6%
Eric	Coleman	D	63.0%	66.7%
Eileen	Daily	D	63.0%	63.6%
Donald	Defronzo	D	63.0%	66.7%
Paul	Doyle	D	65.4%	66.7%
Bob	Duff	D	59.3%	66.7%
John	Fonfara	D	65.4%	66.7%
Thomas	Gaffey	D	53.8%	66.7%
Edwin	Gomes	D	63.0%	66.7%
Mary	Handley	D	61.5%	66.7%
Toni	Harp	D	59.3%	66.7%
Jonathan	Harris	D	66.7%	66.7%
Joan	Hartley	D	59.3%	65.6%
Gary	Lebeau	D	63.0%	66.7%
Martin	Looney	D	59.3%	66.7%

Andrew	Maynard	D	66.7%	65.6%
Andrew	McDonald	D	59.3%	65.6%
Edward	Meyer	D	65.4%	65.6%
Gayle	Slossberg	D	66.7%	66.7%
Andrea	Stillman	D	59.3%	66.7%
Donald	Williams	D	63.0%	66.7%
Sam	Caligiuri	R	59.3%	59.4%
Dan	Debicella	R	61.5%	60.6%
Leonard	Fasano	R	63.0%	60.6%
Robert	Kane	R	63.0%	63.6%
John	Kissel	R	59.3%	63.6%
John	McKinney	R	76.9%	51.7%
Andrew	Roraback	R	70.4%	63.6%

### 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).

<b>CHA Legislative Priorities and Positions, 2007 - 2009</b>					
<i>Senate 2007</i>		<i>Senate 2008</i>		<i>Senate 2009</i>	
<b>Bill #</b>	<b>Support/ Oppose</b>	<b>Bill #</b>	<b>Support/ Oppose</b>	<b>Bill #</b>	<b>Support/ Oppose</b>
1013	S	57	O	365	O
1144	S	172	S	827	S
1145	S	420	S	980	S
1226	S	458	S	1026	O
1342	O	471	S	1091	O
1484	S	483	O	6264	S
7089	S	579	S	6336	S
7155	S	622	S	6391	S
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.

<b>CHA Vote Frequency</b>			
<b>Connecticut State Senate</b>			
<b>First Name</b>	<b>Last Name</b>	<b>2007/08 Frequency</b>	<b>2009 Frequency</b>
Sam	Caligiuri	69.6%	60.0%
Thomas	Colapietro	73.9%	50.0%
Eric	Coleman	69.6%	50.0%
Eileen	Daily	65.2%	50.0%
Dan	Debicella	69.6%	60.0%
Donald	Defronzo	69.6%	50.0%
Paul	Doyle	69.6%	50.0%
Bob	Duff	69.6%	50.0%
Leonard	Fasano	65.2%	60.0%
John	Fonfara	68.2%	50.0%
Thomas	Gaffey	69.6%	50.0%
Edwin	Gomes	69.6%	50.0%
Mary	Handley	69.6%	50.0%
Toni	Harp	69.6%	50.0%
Jonathan	Harris	69.6%	50.0%
Joan	Hartley	73.9%	55.6%
John	Kissel	65.2%	60.0%
Gary	Lebeau	69.6%	50.0%
Martin	Looney	69.6%	50.0%
Andrew	Maynard	69.6%	50.0%
Andrew	McDonald	65.2%	50.0%
John	McKinney	65.2%	55.6%
Edward	Meyer	69.6%	60.0%
Andrew	Roraback	65.2%	60.0%
Gayle	Slossberg	69.6%	50.0%
Andrea	Stillman	69.6%	50.0%
Donald	Williams	69.6%	50.0%

#### 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. A total of 29 floor votes were taken on these bills (not including amendments).

<b>CAHP Legislative Priorities and Positions, 2007 - 2009</b>					
<i>Senate 2007</i>		<i>Senate 2008</i>		<i>Senate 2009</i>	
<b>Bill #</b>	<b>Support/ Oppose</b>	<b>Bill #</b>	<b>Support/ Oppose</b>	<b>Bill #</b>	<b>Support/ Oppose</b>
74	O	5696	O	46	O
7055	O	273	O	47	O
7262	S	280	O	74	O
66	O	478	O	301	O
73	O	491	O	457	S
		5902	O	638	O
		30	O	962	O
				5018	S
				5019	O
				5021	O
				5023	O
				5172	S
				5433	O
				5669	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.

<b>CAHP Vote Frequency</b>			
<b>Connecticut State Senate</b>			
<b>First Name</b>	<b>Last Name</b>	<b>2007/08 Frequency</b>	<b>2009 Frequency</b>
Sam	Caligiuri	16.7%	28.6%
Thomas	Colapietro	8.3%	14.3%
Eric	Coleman	8.3%	13.3%

Eileen	Daily	9.1%	20.0%
Dan	Debicella	33.3%	33.3%
Donald	Defronzo	8.3%	13.3%
Paul	Doyle	8.3%	20.0%
Bob	Duff	8.3%	20.0%
Leonard	Fasano	8.3%	26.7%
John	Fonfara	8.3%	13.3%
Thomas	Gaffey	9.1%	14.3%
Edwin	Gomes	8.3%	13.3%
Mary	Handley	8.3%	13.3%
Toni	Harp	8.3%	13.3%
Jonathan	Harris	8.3%	20.0%
Joan	Hartley	8.3%	21.4%
John	Kissel	8.3%	26.7%
Gary	Lebeau	8.3%	13.3%
Martin	Looney	8.3%	13.3%
Andrew	Maynard	8.3%	13.3%
Andrew	McDonald	8.3%	13.3%
John	McKinney	16.7%	28.6%
Edward	Meyer	8.3%	13.3%
Andrew	Roraback	8.3%	26.7%
Gayle	Slossberg	8.3%	7.1%
Andrea	Stillman	8.3%	13.3%
Donald	Williams	9.1%	13.3%