

Issue: AZ Legislation

Arizona Legislation Report

In addition to the lightning-rod legislation that makes headlines each year, the Arizona state legislature passes—and kills—hundreds of bills per session that go unnoticed by the public. Many of these under-the-radar laws are good indicators of how well representatives vote their conscience or represent the will of their constituents. Historically, the Arizona legislature has been dominated by Republicans who are heavily financed by party-affiliated PACs and corporations.

The summary below includes legislation that has become the GOP mainstay in recent years. Voting in lockstep on issues, the Republican bloc in the Arizona House and Senate has imposed an agenda on Arizona increasingly at odds with the views of the general population. This in-depth analysis of recent legislation reveals a lack of connection between GOP politicians and issues of deep concern to their constituents in districts across the state. The GOP has become the “anti” party (anti-environment, anti-workers’ rights, anti-public education, anti-affordable health care, anti-reproductive rights, anti-immigration, and more).

With both legislative chambers in Arizona held by Republicans, progressive bills sponsored by Democrats are killed in committee repeatedly. Conversely, Republican-sponsored bills routinely make their way to the governor's desk. This report looks at the bills pushed by members of the two parties in recent years (2020 to follow) and what happened to them—whether they passed, failed, or, in rare cases, were vetoed by the governor or forced to be withdrawn by the courts.

The disparity in partisan treatment of legislation in Arizona is astoundingly apparent. In 2019, of the total number of bills heard in the Senate, 92% were sponsored by Republicans and just 7.9% were sponsored by Democrats. If the GOP were a supermajority, this disparity might be more understandable, but they hold only a slim two-seat majority. Because the vast majority of Democratic bills never get a floor hearing, the Democrats do not even get a chance to discuss their legislation. It is difficult for researchers to even *find* the Democrats’ bills since they are killed in committee or die in chamber. This extreme partisanship is a travesty.

The tables below contain representative samples of legislation illustrating the competing priorities of the Republican and Democratic parties within Arizona. Bills that had significant bipartisan support typically were not included. As mentioned, with both chambers held by Republicans, legislation sponsored by Democrats is killed in committee more often than not, while the majority of Republican-sponsored legislation is heard and allowed a vote. It is time that the public becomes aware of their representatives' legislative priorities, so they can truly vote as an educated electorate.

It is time for Democratic voters to take back the reins and elect representatives who will implement the changes the majority of the state is demanding. Citizens can ask no more, and no less, of their elected representatives than to *represent them*.

FORMAT NOTE:

The Arizona Legislative report is available in digital format on the Local Majority website at <https://www.localmajority.org/research-reports/> or by simply scanning this QR code.



Research Reports



Table of Contents

| | |
|----------------------------|----|
| Education | 3 |
| Environment..... | 10 |
| Health Care..... | 18 |
| Immigration | 23 |
| Voting Rights..... | 27 |
| Wages/Workers' Rights..... | 34 |

Education

For more than a decade following the 2008 recession, Arizona lawmakers have failed to provide adequate funding for the state’s schools. Following the 2018 #RedForEd teacher movement, Republican Governor Ducey and the Republican-controlled legislature committed to investing in education. However, during the 2019 legislative session, with a large budget surplus, lawmakers enacted nearly \$400 million in new tax cuts for the wealthy (HB 2757) instead of investing some of that surplus in Arizona’s public schools. This policy decision has contributed to education funding in most areas remaining below 2008 levels—despite 12 years of population growth in the state.

The 2019 budget (HB 2047/SB 1548) marks the second year of Governor Ducey's plan to raise teacher salaries 20% by 2020. Even with these increases, teacher salaries will remain below 2008 levels. This lack of progress is also true for per-pupil spending (which is near the bottom in the nation at \$5500 for 2020, compared with \$5800 for 2008) and for funding increases for school repairs, new construction, textbooks and classroom materials. This lack of funding has contributed to Arizona, once again, being ranked in the bottom ten states for education across the country. In addition:

- The legislature tried and failed to pass bills (HB 2562/SB 1344) that would have reduced Arizona’s student-to-counselor ratio from 905:1 to 550:1 and would have created a grant program of \$100 million by 2023 to fund school counselors.
- In retaliation for the #RedForEd walkout, Republican legislators introduced bills that would have made teacher walkouts illegal (HB 2001/HB 2017). Although neither bill passed, they indicate a trend among Republican legislators.
- In an attempt to increase charter school transparency and oversight, Democratic legislators introduced 24 reform bills (see list in chart below). All of the bills died in committee.

Legislation that Differentiates Republicans from Democrats

| Education | | | | | |
|-----------|---------------------------------------|------------------------|---|------------------|---|
| Year | Topic Subtopic | Bill | Synopsis | Party of Sponsor | Vote (if any) and Status |
| 2019 | Funding General appropriations | SB 1548 HB 2747 | <i>General appropriations act; 2019-2020</i> Provides the following funding for K-12 education: \$165M pre-appropriated in Fiscal Year 2019 for an additional 5% teacher pay raise; \$20M to the School Safety Program, including expanded grant eligibility for school counselors and social workers; \$136M in FY20 to restore cuts to District Additional Assistance; \$30M to increase Results-Based Funding; \$1M for Gifted Education; funding for new school construction based on enrollment projections. Dems voted against the bill because most of the funding was below 2008 levels. https://azednews.com/house-suspends-rules-to-hear-budget-bills-then-adjourns-til-tomorrow-morning/ https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/HB2747/2019 | Repub | Signed by Governor Passed Senate: 16 Yes (16 R, 0 D) 13 No (1 R, 12 D) Passed House: 31 Yes (31 R, 0 D) 28 No (0 R, 28 D) |

| | | | | | |
|------|--|------------------------|---|-------|---|
| 2019 | Funding Results-based funding | SB 1551 HB 2749 | <i>K-12 education; budget reconciliation; 2019-2020</i> Establishes the Credentials Incentive program, which provides schools with a \$1000 award for each high school graduate who obtains a certification, credential, or license accepted by a vocation or industry through a career technical education course or program (Sec. 6). Also specifies the ways schools receiving results-based funding can spend the money. This bill is controversial because it favors wealthy schools. https://votesmart.org/bill/26674/67703/appropriates-funds-for-k-12-education-for-fiscal-year-2020-2021#.XkCsiBd7nOR https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/HB2749/2019 | Repub | Signed by Governor Passed Senate: 17 Yes (17 R, 0 D) 12 No (0 R, 12 D) Passed House: 31 Yes (31 R, 0 D) 28 No (0 R, 28 D) |
| 2019 | Funding Increase in Prop 301 monies | SB 1472 | <i>TPT(Transaction Privilege Tax); distribution; education; use tax</i> Would have increased the fixed amount of Proposition 301 monies distributed to the Classroom Site Fund to \$1.1B annually, a \$400M increase. Dems voted against the bill because the sales tax is regressive and disproportionately affects low-income people. https://nau.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/155/2019/06/2019-Legislative-Summary_FINAL.pdf https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/SB1472/2019 | Repub | Passed Senate: 18 Yes (17 R, 1 D) 12 No (0 R, 12 D) Died in House committee |
| 2019 | Funding Changes to tax code | SB 1143 HB 2522 | <i>Conformity; internal revenue code; rates</i> Arizona stood to gain between \$130M and \$230M in General Fund revenues if it had conformed the Arizona tax code to the federal tax changes enacted in 2017. But the additional revenues would have gone toward a tax cut for the wealthiest Arizonans, rather than toward increased funding for schools. http://www.arizona.gov/assets/document/AZ/LegWrap-up2019.pdf https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/HB2522/2019 | Repub | Vetoed by Governor Passed Senate: 16 Yes (16 R, 0 D) 14 No (1 R, 13 D) Passed House: 31 Yes (31 R, 0 D) 29 No (0 R, 29 D) |
| 2019 | Funding Changes to tax law | SB 1546 HB 2757 | <i>Tax provisions; omnibus</i> Reduces the number of tax brackets from 5 to 4, increases the standard deductions and the charitable contribution tax deductions, and includes changes to the taxation of digital goods. Combined provisions of this permanent Tax Conformity law expected to result in a loss of \$386M in revenue for the General Fund. Dems voted against the bill because it provides a \$386M tax cut when schools remain underfunded. http://www.arizona.gov/assets/document/AZ/AEA_FY20BudgetSummary.pdf https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/HB2757/2019 | Repub | Signed by Governor Passed Senate: 16 Yes (16 R, 0 D) 13 No (1 R, 12 D) Passed House: 31 Yes (31 R, 0 D) 29 No (0 R, 29 D) |

| | | | | | |
|------|--|------------------------|--|-------|--|
| 2019 | Funding Teacher compensation loss Teachers academy | SB 1552 HB 2750 | <p><i>Higher education; budget reconciliation; 2019-2020</i></p> <p>Bans community college governing boards from compensating employees for employee organization representation work. Expands the Arizona Teachers Academy to include community colleges offering post-baccalaureate teacher certification programs. Gives \$5,000 per year to Teachers Academy university students and \$3,000 per year to community college students. Dems voted against this bill because it aims to prevent teacher walkouts and takes away the 2017 tuition waiver.</p> <p>http://www.arizonaaea.org/assets/document/AZ/AEA_FY20BudgetSummary.pdf https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/HB2750/2019</p> | Repub | <p>Signed by Governor</p> <p>Passed Senate: 17 Yes (17 R, 0 D) 12 No (0 R, 12 D)</p> <p>Passed House: 31 Yes (31 R, 0 D) 28 No (0 R, 28 D)</p> |
| 2019 | Funding Counseling | SB 1344 HB 2562 | <p><i>School counselors; grants</i></p> <p>Would have allocated nearly \$100M by 2023 for a school counselor grant program. Would have mandated a 550:1 student-to-counselor ratio in all public and charter schools. The AZ School Counselors Association worked with House and Senate Dems on a bill that never got a hearing in the Republican-led legislature.</p> <p>https://www.azcentral.com/story/news/local/arizona-education/2019/05/08/arizona-worst-ratio-students-counselors-in-nation-school-safety/1131862001/ https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/HB2562/2019</p> | Repub | <p>Died in Senate chamber</p> <p>Died in House committee</p> |
| 2018 | Funding K-12 restored to 2008 levels | SB 1521 HB 2663 | <p><i>K-12 education; budget reconciliation; 2018-2019</i></p> <p>When #RedForEd began building momentum during the legislative session in March and April, the governor and the legislature finally agreed on a budget aimed at ultimately restoring funding to pre-recession levels. Dems voted against the bill because most of the funding was below 2008 levels.</p> <p>http://www.ciclt.net/sn/leg/1_detail2.aspx?ClientCode=azba&L_ID=1673915&L_State=az&L_Session=2018&L_Prior=2019 https://ballotpedia.org/Statewide_public_education_strikes_2018#Arizona http://www.arizonaaea.org/assets/document/AZ/AEALEGISLATIVEWRAP2018.pdf https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/HB2663/2018</p> | Repub | <p>Signed by Governor</p> <p>Passed Senate: 20 Yes (16 R, 4 D) 9 No (0 R, 9 D)</p> <p>Passed House: 33 Yes (33 R, 0 D) 26 No (1 R, 25 D)</p> |
| 2018 | Funding Extension of K-12 tax | SB 1390 HB 2158 | <p><i>TPT; additional rate; education</i></p> <p>Extends until June 30, 2041, the 0.6% Transaction Privilege Tax, which was passed in 2000 and was set to expire on June 30, 2021. Distributes the tax revenue among the K-12 Classroom Site Fund, the School Facilities Board, funding for 5 additional school days per year, state universities and</p> | Repub | <p>Signed by Governor</p> <p>Passed Senate: 26 Yes (13 R, 13 D) 4 No (4 R, 0 D)</p> |

| | | | | | |
|------|---------------------------------|----------|--|--------------------|---|
| | | | community colleges, and an income tax credit. http://www.ciclt.net/sn/leg/1_detail2.aspx?ClientCode=azba&L_ID=1582281&L_State=AZ&L_Session=2018&L_Prior=2017 https://www.azcentral.com/story/opinion/oped/abekwok/2018/03/22/proposition-301-extension-arizona-teacher-pay-education-funding-win/451591002/ https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/HB2158/2018 | | Passed House: 53 Yes (29 R, 24 D) 6 No (6 R, 0 D) |
| 2018 | Funding Teacher salaries | Prop 207 | The <i>Invest in Education Act</i> , opposed by Governor Ducey, would have increased taxes on Arizonans making more than \$250,000 a year and generated an estimated \$690M annually in additional funding for teacher salaries and school operations. Supporters of the measure turned in nearly twice the 150,000 signatures needed to have it certified for the general election ballot. However, a lawsuit brought by opponents resulted in the proposition being removed from the ballot after the Arizona Supreme Court determined that a description of the ballot proposal shared with voters when they signed petitions was misleading. https://www.azcentral.com/story/news/politics/elections/2018/08/29/invest-education-tax-measure-kicked-off-november-ballot-redford/1140338002/ https://ballotpedia.org/Arizona_2018_ballot_measures https://www.azmirror.com/blog/invest-in-education-kicks-off-campaign-to-tax-the-wealthy-for-k-12-spending/ https://kjzz.org/content/667029/arizona-invest-education-turns-hundreds-thousands-signatures | Citizen initiative | Removed from ballot by order of Arizona Supreme Court |
| 2019 | Teacher shortage | HB 2525 | <i>Experienced teacher retention pilot program</i> Would have offered certified public school teachers with at least 3 years of classroom experience the chance to get an advanced degree and receive a 75% tuition reduction at the state's three public universities. https://kjzz.org/content/760149/proposal-would-give-experienced-arizona-teachers-college-tuition-discount https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/HB2525/2019 | Dem | Died in Senate chamber Passed House: 42 Yes (13 R, 29 D) 18 No (18 R, 0 D) |
| 2018 | Teacher evaluation | SB 1497 | <i>Teachers; principals; evaluation instrument</i> Would have removed the statewide requirement to have a teacher evaluation framework and would have shifted the responsibility to local school district governing boards. Would have given school districts the flexibility to choose which assessment to use in teacher evaluations, and the weight of quantitative data would be limited to 20% to 40%. SB 1497 had overwhelming bipartisan support. http://www.arizona.gov/assets/document/AZ/AEALEGI_SLATIVEWRAP2018.pdf | Repub | Passed Senate: 30 Yes (17 R, 13 D) 0 No Died in House chamber |

| | | | | | |
|------|---|---------|---|-------|---|
| | | | https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/SB1497/2018 | | |
| 2019 | RedforEd reaction | HB 2002 | <p><i>Educators; ethics; professional responsibility</i> Would have mandated a code of ethics for teachers in “taxpayer-supported schools” and required them to get three hours of training every year. Requirements would not have applied to non-certified charter school teachers. https://www.azcentral.com/story/opinion/op-ed/laurieroberts/2018/12/19/payback-time-redforded/2365587002/ https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/HB2002/2019</p> | Repub | Died in House committee |
| 2019 | RedforEd retaliation | HB 2017 | <p><i>Public schools; closure</i> Would have imposed a fine of up to \$5,000 on anyone who causes a school to close during operating hours. Proposed in reaction to the 2018 “RedforEd” teacher walkout. https://www.abcl5.com/news/state/proposed-arizona-bill-h-b-2017-looks-to-limit-school-walkouts-like-the-red-for-ed-movement https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/HB2017/2019</p> | Repub | Died in House committee |
| 2018 | English language learners | HB 2435 | <p><i>English language learners; instruction; budgeting</i> Would have removed the four-hour Structured English Immersion block requirement for English language learners. Would have provided school districts with the flexibility to create research-based alternative English instruction models for English language learners. HB 2435 had bipartisan support. http://www.arizonaaea.org/assets/document/AZ/AEALLEGISLATIVEWRAP2018.pdf https://apps.azleg.gov/BillStatus/BillOverview/70708?SessionId=119 https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/HB2435/2018</p> | Repub | Died in Senate chamber Passed House: 56 Yes (34 R, 22 D) 1 No (0 R, 1 D) |
| 2018 | Higher education Free speech model legislation | HB 2563 | <p><i>Post-secondary institutions; free expression policies</i> Related to the hate speech controversy triggered mainly by the Milo Yiannopoulos speech at the University of California, Berkeley. Authored by the Goldwater Institute as “cookie cutter” model legislation for introduction in all states. Requires public colleges and universities to establish 15-member committees to monitor and report infringements on free speech. Allows individuals to sue colleges and universities for violating their free speech rights. Imposes minimum damages of \$1000 if protesting students shut down speakers to whom they object (known as the “heckler’s veto”). https://freespeechproject.georgetown.edu/tracker-entries/arizona-governor-signs-law-imposing-consequences-on-students-who-impede-speech/ http://www.ciclt.net/sn/leg/1_detail2.aspx?ClientCode=azs</p> | Repub | Signed by Governor Passed Senate: 17 Yes (17 R, 0 D) 13 No (0 R, 13 D) Passed House: 34 Yes (34 R, 0 D) 22 No (0 R, 22 D) |

| | | | | | |
|------|---|--|---|-------|--|
| | | | ba&L_ID=1616966&L_State=az&L_Session=2018&L_Prior=2019 https://www.azcentral.com/story/news/politics/legislature/2018/04/27/campus-free-speech-crisis-focus-new-law-hb-2563-despite-lack-arizona-incidents/543283002/ https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/HB2563/2018 | | |
| 2019 | Charter school reform | SB 1394 | <i>Charter schools; training; information; procurement</i> Would have limited the number of family members who can serve on a charter school board, would have required the disclosure of contracts with companies owned by board members, and would have given the attorney general more authority to investigate questionable purchasing decisions. Dems voted against the bill because it did not increase transparency and oversight of charter schools enough. https://apnews.com/b901e6b1756c4961ac0cc581f5944c2b | Repub | Passed Senate: 17 Yes (17 R, 0 D) 13 No (0 R, 13 D) Died in House committee |
| 2019 | Charter school reform | HB 2220 HB 2221 HB 2222 HB 2323 HB 2325 HB 2326 HB 2388 HB 2389 HB 2398 HB 2641 HB 2642 HB 2651 HB 2690 SB 1118 SB 1404 SB 1405 SB 1406 SB 1407 SB 1408 SB 1409 SB 1410 SB 1411 SB 1412 SB 1413 | These 24 attempts to improve oversight of charter schools all died in committee. The bills represent an “effort to crack down on charter schools that misuse public funds.” They would have provided greater transparency and better monitoring of Arizona's charter schools. https://apps.azleg.gov/BillStatus/BillOverview https://www.azcentral.com/story/news/local/arizona-education/2020/02/14/discovery-creemos-academy-principal-harold-cadiz-pleads-guilty-fraud/4761062002/?utm_source=azcentral-Daily%20Briefing&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=daily_briefing&utm_term=list_article_thumb | Dem | Died in chamber/committee |
| 2018 | Charter schools Advantage in purchasing property from school districts | HB 2460 | <i>Charter schools; vacant buildings; equipment</i> One of many charter-school-related bills pushed through by the Republican majority and strongly opposed by the Democratic minority. Prohibits a school district that is selling or leasing a vacant or unused building from accepting an offer from a potential buyer or lessee that is less than an offer | Repub | Signed by Governor Passed Senate: 17 Yes (17 R, 0 D) 12 No (0 R, 12 D) |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | <p>from a charter or private school. Also prohibits a school district from withdrawing the property from sale solely because a charter or private school is the highest bidder.</p> <p>http://www.ciclt.net/sn/leg/1_detail2.aspx?ClientCode=azsba&L_ID=1596237&L_State=az&L_Session=2018&L_Prior=2019</p> <p>https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/HB2460/2018</p> | | <p>Passed House: 34 Yes (34 R, 0 D) 23 No (1 R, 22 D)</p> |
| | | <p>Additional sources:</p> <p>https://www.usnews.com/news/best-states/rankings/education</p> <p>https://azcapitoltimes.com/news/2019/09/19/inadequate-school-conditions-persist-students-deserve-better/</p> <p>https://www.azcentral.com/story/news/local/arizona-education/2020/01/30/how-much-arizona-spending-education-and-where-going/4532563002/?utm_source=azcentral-Daily%20Briefing&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=daily_briefing&utm_term=list_article_thumb</p> <p>https://www.azcentral.com/story/news/local/arizona-education/2019/05/08/arizona-worst-ratio-students-counselors-in-nation-school-safety/1131862001/</p> | | |

Environment

Not only do Republican state legislators fail to protect the environment, they actively pursue anti-environment policies. This stance is evident in legislation affecting the state’s water supply. Arizona has been experiencing a drought for more than two decades; most of the state’s rivers have dried up in the last century; and the remaining rivers are at significant risk. Yet Republican legislators promote unsustainable development and harmful groundwater pumping, even in areas where the land is sinking and fissures are forming due to over-extraction. Democratic proposals for more ecological water solutions do not even get a hearing.

Republicans also thwart renewable energy progress with legislation that impedes the installation of rooftop solar systems, prohibits local governments from advancing energy efficiency, gives coal companies a tax break, and helps utilities avoid requirements to produce a higher percentage of their energy output from renewable sources. Republican bills also seek to weaken clean water programs and air quality regulations, and they reduce protections and funding for public lands, national monuments, wildlife, and habitats for endangered species. Most conspicuous is the absence of any legislation to address the impacts of climate change.

Legislation that Differentiates Republicans from Democrats

| Year | Topic Subtopic | Bill | Synopsis | Party of Sponsor | Vote (if any) and Status |
|--------------------|--------------------------------|---------|--|------------------|--|
| Environment | | | | | |
| 2019 | Water Drought plan | SB 1227 | <i>Colorado River Drought Contingency Amendments</i> Enacted plans in the event of Colorado River shortages—plans that promote unsustainable development and harmful groundwater extraction. Appropriates \$9M from the General Fund (in addition to the \$20M in the 2019 main state budget) for wells and infrastructure to increase pumping in the Pinal Active Management Area (AMA) and the Harquahala Irrigation Non-Expansion Area. (Note: AMAs are recognized by law as areas where serious overdraft of groundwater is occurring.) Democratic bills proposing more ecological water solutions (SB 1370 and HB 2630) were not heard. https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/SB1227/2019 https://www.sierraclub.org/sites/www.sierraclub.org/files/sce/grand-canyon-chapter/legislative_updates/2019/2019%20Environmental%20Report%20Card_Final.pdf (page 9) | Repub | Signed by Governor Passed Senate: 27 Yes (17 R, 10 D) 3 No (0 R, 3 D) Passed House: 59 Yes (31 R, 28 D) 0 No |
| 2019 | Water Adequate water supply | HB 2397 | <i>Water adequacy requirements; statewide applicability</i> Would have banned any subdivision development outside of Active Management Areas unless AZ Director of Water Resources approves its water supply plan. https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/HB2397/2019 | Dem | Died in House chamber |

| | | | | | |
|------|---|---------|--|-------|---|
| 2018 | Water Anti-adequate water supply regulations | SB 1515 | <i>Adequate water supply; county review</i> Would have weakened a county's ability to require proof of an adequate water supply before approving a subdivision plat. Would have required county to re-approve regulations with unanimous vote after 5 years and every 10 years thereafter. https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/SB1515/2018 https://www.sierraclub.org/sites/www.sierraclub.org/files/sce/grand-canyon-chapter/legislative_updates/2018/2018%20Environmental%20Report%20Card_Final.pdf (page 9) | Repub | Passed Senate: 17 Yes (17 R, 0 D) 13 No (0 R, 13 D) Died in House chamber |
| 2016 | Water Anti-adequate water supply regulations | SB 1268 | <i>Adequate water supply requirements; municipalities</i> Would have allowed municipalities to opt out of county laws requiring developers to demonstrate proof of adequate water supply. Intended to benefit a specific development in Sierra Vista that would have harmed the San Pedro River. https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/SB1268/2016 https://www.sierraclub.org/sites/www.sierraclub.org/files/sce/grand-canyon-chapter/political_action/2016_Enviro_Report_Card_Final.pdf (page 12) | Repub | Vetoed by Governor Passed Senate: 17 Yes (17 R, 0 D) 12 No (1 R, 11 D) Passed House: 33 Yes (33 R, 0 D) 25 No (1 R, 24 D) |
| 2016 | Water Anti-adequate water supply regulations | SB 1400 | <i>County water supply provision; renewal</i> Would have undermined county laws requiring developers to demonstrate an adequate water supply before approving a subdivision plat. Would have required unanimous vote of county board every 5 years or laws would be overturned. https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/SB1400/2016 https://www.sierraclub.org/sites/www.sierraclub.org/files/sce/grand-canyon-chapter/political_action/2016_Enviro_Report_Card_Final.pdf (page 13) | Repub | Vetoed by Governor Passed Senate: 16 Yes (16 R, 0 D) 12 No (1 R, 11 D) Passed House: 31 Yes (31 R, 0 D) 25 No (3 R, 22 D) |
| 2019 | Water Well-water rights | HB 2475 | <i>Water use; criminal penalty; wells</i> Removes misdemeanor penalties for taking someone else's surface water via a well. Creates a double standard for groundwater pumping versus diversion of waterways. https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/HB2475/2019 https://tucson.com/news/local/arizona-senate-oks-bill-benefitting-well-owners/article_16df1061-69c0-5776-9506-e3a6836d7cd9.html | Repub | Signed by Governor Passed Senate: 17 Yes (17 R, 0 D) 13 No (0 R, 13 D) Passed House: 32 Yes (31 R, 1 D) 28 No (0 R, 28D) |
| 2019 | Water Usage measurement | SB 1368 | <i>Water; well metering; nonexempt wells</i> Would have expanded requirement for metering well-water extraction to include wells outside Active Management Areas. https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/SB1368/2019 | Dem | Died in Senate chamber |

| | | | | | |
|------|--------------------------------|----------|---|-------|--|
| 2019 | Water Usage measurement | HB 2396 | <i>Water; well metering; nonexempt wells</i> Would have required use of flow-measuring devices for wells where more than 10 acre-feet are drawn for certain intensive or non-local purposes. https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/HB2396/2019 | Dem | Died in House committee |
| 2019 | Water Efficient use | HB 2394 | <i>Water efficient plumbing</i> Would have required plumbing fixture manufacturers to certify that they meet applicable water-use standards. Would have made it an infraction to knowingly sell noncompliant fixtures. https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/HB2394/2019 | Dem | Died in House committee |
| 2018 | Water Weaker regulations | SB 1493 | <i>Environmental quality; dredge, fill permits</i> Authorizes AZ Dept. of Environmental Quality to administer Dredge and Fill Permits, which protect wetlands. Next step in giving ADEQ full control of Clean Water Act program without more funding or capacity for the additional responsibilities. No provisions for public input, endangered species protection, or evaluation of alternatives. https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/SB1493/2018 https://www.sierraclub.org/sites/www.sierraclub.org/files/sce/grand-canyon-chapter/legislative_updates/2018/2018%20Environmental%20Report%20Card_Final.pdf (page 9) | Repub | Signed by Governor Passed Senate: 17 Yes (17 R, 0 D) 11 No (0 R, 11 D) Passed House: 35 Yes (35 R, 0 D) 24 No (0 R, 24 D) |
| 2018 | Water Weaker regulations | SB 1494 | <i>Environment; underground injection control program</i> Requires AZ Dept. of Environmental Quality to permit underground injection wells. First step in giving ADEQ full control of Safe Drinking Water Act. Raises concerns about lack of public process and water contamination from brine injection. https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/SB1494/2018 https://www.sierraclub.org/sites/www.sierraclub.org/files/sce/grand-canyon-chapter/legislative_updates/2018/2018%20Environmental%20Report%20Card_Final.pdf (page 9) | Repub | Signed by Governor Passed Senate: 17 Yes (17 R, 0 D) 13 No (0 R, 13 D) Passed House: 34 Yes (32 R, 2 D) 23 No (1 R, 22 D) |
| 2017 | Water Weaker regulations | SB 1412 | <i>Surface water; adjudication sequence</i> Establishes an order for hearing cases about surface water rights. Places smaller claims at end of line. May push all the risk of potential losses on federal and tribal claims as they will be adjudicated earlier. https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/SB1412/2017 https://www.sierraclub.org/sites/www.sierraclub.org/files/sce/grand-canyon-chapter/political_action/2017%20Environmental%20Report%20Card_Final.pdf (page 10) | Repub | Signed by Governor Passed Senate: 21 Yes (17 R, 4 D) 9 No (0 R, 9 D) Passed House: Yes 35 (34 R, 1 D) No 23 (0 R, 23 D) |
| 2019 | Renewable energy | SCR 1024 | <i>Climate change; supporting management</i> Resolution that would have encouraged governor | Dem | Died in Senate chamber |

| | | | | | |
|------|---|----------|--|-------|---|
| | Climate change | | and legislature to work on climate change issues. See also HCR 2033 (died in House committee). https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/SCR1024/2019 | | |
| 2019 | Renewable energy Anti-renewable energy | HB 2498 | <i>Hydraulic fracturing; prohibition</i> Would have banned fracking. See also SB 1197 (died in Senate chamber). https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/HB2498/2019 | Dem | Died in House chamber |
| 2018 | Renewable energy Anti-renewable energy | HB 2003 | <i>Coal mining; TPT; repeal</i> Exempts coal sold in AZ from the transaction privilege tax. Essentially gives a tax break to Peabody Energy. Allows an outdated, polluting generating station to stay open at a projected cost to the state of \$12M per year. https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/HB2003/2018 https://www.sierraclub.org/sites/www.sierraclub.org/files/sce/grand-canyon-chapter/legislative_updates/2018/2018%20Environmental%20Report%20Card_Final.pdf (page 11) | Repub | Signed by Governor Passed Senate: 18 Yes (17 R, 1 D) 12 No (0 R, 12 D) Passed House: 33 Yes (33 R, 0 D) 22 No (0 R, 22 D) |
| 2018 | Renewable energy Anti-renewable energy | HB 2005 | <i>Public service corporations; penalties</i> Undermines Clean Energy for a Healthy Arizona ballot initiative requiring utilities to generate 50% of their energy from renewable sources by 2030. Written by AZ Public Service (largest utility in AZ). Limits penalty for non-compliance to a \$100 fine per individual and \$5,000 total. If the ballot initiative passes, utilities can just ignore the citizen mandate because non-compliance would cost less than compliance. (Note: The citizen initiative ultimately failed by 31% yes, 69% no, even though a poll showed that 75% of AZ voters wanted more solar energy and AZ is the sunniest state. NextGen Climate Action spent \$24M on the campaign, while utilities spent \$41M to defeat the measure—the most expensive initiative in AZ’s history.) https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/HB2005/2018 https://www.sierraclub.org/sites/www.sierraclub.org/files/sce/grand-canyon-chapter/legislative_updates/2018/2018%20Environmental%20Report%20Card_Final.pdf (page 11) | Repub | Signed by Governor Passed Senate: 16 Yes (16 R, 0 D) 12 No (0 R, 12 D) Passed House: 34 Yes (34 R, 0 D) 24 No (0 R, 24 D) |
| 2018 | Renewable energy Anti-renewable energy | HCR 2017 | <i>Renewable energy standards; corporation commission</i> Proposed ballot measure intended to confuse voters by naming it Clean and Affordable Energy for a Healthy Arizona, which is almost the same name as the citizen ballot initiative Clean Energy for a Healthy Arizona. Would have allowed the AZ Corporation Commission to do nothing to advance clean energy. (See HB 2005 above.) | Repub | Passed Senate: 16 Yes (16 R, 0 D) 11 No (0 R, 11 D) Died in House chamber |

| | | | | | |
|------|--|----------|--|-------|--|
| | | | https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/HCR2017/2018 https://www.sierraclub.org/sites/www.sierraclub.org/files/sce/grand-canyon-chapter/legislative_updates/2018/2018%20Environmental%20Report%20Card_Final.pdf (page 13) | | |
| 2016 | Renewable energy Anti-renewable energy | SB 1417 | <i>Distributed energy generation systems</i> Establishes new regulatory obstacles and costs on the solar energy industry, both large companies and small installers, making it more difficult to install rooftop solar systems. Pushed by utilities. https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/SB1417/2016 https://www.sierraclub.org/sites/www.sierraclub.org/files/sce/grand-canyon-chapter/political_action/2016_Enviro_Report_Card_Final.pdf (page 14) | Repub | Signed by Governor Passed Senate: 29 Yes (17 R, 12 D) 0 No Passed House: 49 Yes (34 R, 15 D) 11 No (2 R, 9 D) |
| 2016 | Renewable energy Anti-renewable energy | SCM 1015 | <i>EPA; exceeding authority; urging Congress</i> Official message asking Congress to prevent the Environmental Protection Agency from enacting rules to reduce carbon emissions. https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/SCM1015/2016 https://www.sierraclub.org/sites/www.sierraclub.org/files/sce/grand-canyon-chapter/political_action/2016_Enviro_Report_Card_Final.pdf (page 15) | Repub | Transmitted to Secretary of State Passed Senate: 19 Yes (18 R, 1 D) 10 No (0 R, 10 D) Passed House: 33 Yes (33 R, 0 D) 24 No (0 R, 24 D) |
| 2016 | Renewable energy Anti-energy conservation | HB 2130 | <i>Municipalities; counties; energy use; reporting</i> Prohibits cities, towns, and counties from requiring businesses, commercial buildings, and housing projects to measure or report energy consumption. https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/HB2130/2016 https://www.sierraclub.org/sites/www.sierraclub.org/files/sce/grand-canyon-chapter/political_action/2016_Enviro_Report_Card_Final.pdf (page 9) | Repub | Signed by governor Passed Senate: 18 Yes (18 R, 0 D) 11 No (0 R, 11 D) Passed House: 35 Yes (35 R, 0 D) 23 No (0 R, 23 D) |
| 2019 | Public lands Lack of funding | SB 1241 | <i>State parks board; heritage fund</i> Re-establishes parts of the State Parks Heritage Fund without allocating any money in the state budget to fund the provisions of this bill. (Note: In 1990 voters passed an initiative by a 2-to-1 margin to provide money from the state lottery for wildlife research, habitat protection, parks, trails, and environmental education. The law allocated \$10M for the State Parks Dept. and \$10M for the state Game and Fish Dept. In 2010 the Republican governor and Republican-led legislature eliminated the State Parks Heritage Fund.) https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/SB1241/2019 | Repub | Signed by Governor Passed Senate: 30 Yes (17 R, 13D) 0 No Passed House: 54 Yes (25 R, 29 D) 6 No (6 R, 0 D) |

| | | | | | |
|------|-----------------------------------|----------|--|-------|---|
| | | | https://www.sierraclub.org/sites/www.sierraclub.org/files/sce/grand-canyon-chapter/legislative_updates/2019/2019%20Environmental%20Report%20Card_Final.pdf (page 10) | | |
| 2019 | Public lands Anti-conservation | HB 2557 | <i>Public land department; establishment; study</i> Part of Republican effort to gain control of public land management from the federal government for mining and oil and gas extraction purposes. https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/HB2557/2019 https://www.sierraclub.org/sites/www.sierraclub.org/files/sce/grand-canyon-chapter/legislative_updates/2019/2019%20Environmental%20Report%20Card_Final.pdf (page 12) | Repub | Failed Senate: 12 Yes (12 R, 0 D) 14 No (4 R, 10 D) Passed House: 31 Yes (31 R, 0 D) 29 No (0 R, 29 D) |
| 2019 | Public lands Anti-conservation | HB 2596 | <i>Public land management; sovereign immunity</i> Would have provided absolute immunity to the state against actions relating to the management or administration of federal public lands. https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/HB2596/2019 https://www.sierraclub.org/sites/www.sierraclub.org/files/sce/grand-canyon-chapter/legislative_updates/2019/2019%20Environmental%20Report%20Card_Final.pdf (page 13) | Repub | Vetoed by Governor Passed Senate: 16 Yes (16 R, 0D) 14 No (1 R, 13 D) Passed House: 31 Yes (31 R, 0 D) 29 No (0 R, 29 D) |
| 2019 | Public lands Conservation | SCM 1003 | <i>Grand Canyon; uranium mining; opposing</i> Resolution urging federal government to ban uranium mining in the Grand Canyon area. https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/SCM1003/2019 | Dem | Died in Senate chamber |
| 2018 | Public lands Anti-conservation | HB 2498 | <i>Historic preservation; rangeland improvements; requirements</i> Would have weakened the protection of Native American cultural sites from rangeland improvement projects, such as roads and fences. https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/HB2498/2018 https://www.sierraclub.org/sites/www.sierraclub.org/files/sce/grand-canyon-chapter/legislative_updates/2018/2018%20Environmental%20Report%20Card_Final.pdf (page 12) | Repub | Vetoed by Governor Passed Senate: 16 Yes (16 R, 0 D) 12 No (1 R, 11 D) Passed House: 31 Yes (31 R, 0 D) 28 No (4 R, 24D) |
| 2017 | Public lands Anti-conservation | SCM 1011 | <i>Antiquities act; monuments; urging Congress</i> Official message to Congress asking for the repeal or amendment of the Antiquities Act, which gives authority to Congress or the President to designate land as a national monument. https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/SCM1011/2017 https://www.sierraclub.org/sites/www.sierraclub.org/files/sce/grand-canyon-chapter/political_action/2017%20Environmental%20Report%20Card_Final.pdf (page 11) | Repub | Transmitted to Secretary of State Passed Senate: 17 Yes (17 R, 0 D) 13 No (0 R, 13 D) Passed House: 32 Yes (32 R, 0D) 24 No (0 R, 24 D) |

| | | | | | |
|------|--|---------|--|-------|---|
| 2016 | Public lands Anti-conservation | HB 2585 | <i>National monuments; justification; litigation</i> Empowers State Land Dept. to evaluate national monument designations and refer them to the Attorney General to file a lawsuit challenging the monument. https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/HB2585/2016 https://www.sierraclub.org/sites/www.sierraclub.org/files/sce/grand-canyon-chapter/political_action/2016_Enviro_Report_Card_Final.pdf (page 11) | Repub | Signed by Governor Passed Senate: 20 Yes (18 R, 2 D) 8 No (0 R, 8 D) Passed House: 35 Yes (35 R, 0 D) 18 No (0 R, 18 D) |
| 2016 | Public lands Anti-conservation | SB 1361 | <i>G&F; heritage fund; expenditures</i> Diverts 50% of the Game and Fish Heritage Fund intended for acquisition and protection of habitats of endangered species and allocates that money for agency operations and maintenance. Contrary to the purposes in the Heritage Fund ballot initiative approved by voters in 1990. https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/SB1361/2016 https://www.sierraclub.org/sites/www.sierraclub.org/files/sce/grand-canyon-chapter/political_action/2016_Enviro_Report_Card_Final.pdf (page 13) | Repub | Signed by Governor Passed Senate: 21 Yes (17 R, 4 D) 8 No (0 R, 8 D) Passed House: 36 Yes (33 R, 3 D) 17 No (1 R, 16 D) |
| 2017 | Natural resources Anti-conservation | HB 2096 | <i>Natural resources projects; court actions</i> Penalizes individuals and organizations that obtain injunctions to stop “natural resources” projects (old growth logging, harmful actions in riparian areas, etc.) by requiring them to pay for erosion, fire suppression, flooding or other expenses associated with the activities stopped by the injunction. https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/HB2096/2017 https://www.sierraclub.org/sites/www.sierraclub.org/files/sce/grand-canyon-chapter/political_action/2017%20Environmental%20Report%20Card_Final.pdf (page 7) | Repub | Signed by Governor Passed Senate: 16 Yes (16 R, 0 D) 11 No (0 R, 11 D) Passed House: 35 Yes (35 R, 0 D) 25 No (0 R, 25 D) |
| 2017 | Natural resources Anti-conservation | HB 2406 | <i>Counties; municipal land acquisition; limitation</i> Targets Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan by limiting Pima County’s ability to protect land in the city of Marana, including land in the Tortolita Fan. https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/HB2406/2017 https://www.sierraclub.org/sites/www.sierraclub.org/files/sce/grand-canyon-chapter/political_action/2017%20Environmental%20Report%20Card_Final.pdf (page 9) | Repub | Signed by Governor Passed Senate: 16 Yes (9 R, 7 D) 14 No (8 R, 6 D) Passed House: 31 Yes (31 R, 0 D) 28 No (4 R, 24 D) |
| 2019 | Regulations Plastic bags | HB 2497 | <i>Single use plastics; recyclables; fee</i> Would have banned single-use plastic bags in retail locations unless a fee is charged per bag. See also SB 1447 (died in Senate chamber). | Repub | Died in House chamber |

| | | | | | |
|------|--|----------|---|-------|--|
| | | | https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/HB2497/2019 | | |
| 2019 | Regulations Dangerous chemicals | SB 1281 | <i>Predator control devices; prohibited chemicals</i> Would have banned government agencies from using certain pesticides and chemicals, including sodium cyanide, from use in animal control. https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/SB1281/2019 | Dem | Died in Senate chamber |
| 2017 | Regulations Air quality | SCM 1008 | <i>Ozone concentration standard; reinstatement</i> Official message asking Congress to weaken the ozone standard. See also SCM 1007 (2016). https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/SCM1008/2017 https://www.sierraclub.org/sites/www.sierraclub.org/files/sce/grand-canyon-chapter/political_action/2017%20Environmental%20Report%20Card_Final.pdf (page 10) | Repub | Transmitted to Secretary of State Passed Senate: 17 Yes (17 R, 0 D) 13 No (0 R, 13 D) Passed House: 31 Yes (31 R, 0 D) 23 No (1 R, 22 D) |
| 2019 | Main state budget | HB 2747 | <i>General appropriations act; 2019-2020</i> Allocates \$20M to infrastructure for unsustainable groundwater pumping in Pinal County and diverts money intended for clean air and recycling programs to cleanup of contaminated sites. https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/HB2747/2019 https://www.sierraclub.org/sites/www.sierraclub.org/files/sce/grand-canyon-chapter/legislative_updates/2019/2019%20Environmental%20Report%20Card_Final.pdf (page 14) | Repub | Signed by Governor Passed Senate: 16 Yes (16 R, 0 D) 13 No (1 R, 12 D) Passed House: 31 Yes (31 R, 0 D) 28 No (0 R, 28 D) |
| 2019 | Environment budget | HB 2753 | <i>Environment; appropriation; 2019-2020</i> Shifted money from air quality and recycling funds to WQARF—a program to clean up contaminated soil and water sites. WQARF is supposed to be funded by corporate income tax but has not received that tax revenue for 10 years. As a result, companies profit from their anti-environment practices, and the public pays to clean up their pollution. https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/HB2753/2019 https://www.sierraclub.org/sites/www.sierraclub.org/files/sce/grand-canyon-chapter/legislative_updates/2019/2019%20Environmental%20Report%20Card_Final.pdf (page 14) | Repub | Signed by Governor Passed Senate: 16 Yes (16 R, 0 D) 13 No (1 R, 12 D) Passed House: 31 Yes (31 R, 0 D) 29 No (0 R, 29 D) |

Health Care

Arizona expanded Medicaid under former Arizona Governor Brewer in 2013, but Governor Ducey has tried to limit the program severely since he was elected, despite the growth in Arizona’s population. His 2015 proposal, SB 1092, imposes a work requirement and limits coverage to five years. In 2019, the Trump administration did not approve limiting coverage to five years but did approve the work requirement. Implementation of the policy is on indefinite hold due to pending litigation in other states with the same requirement.

Two bills in 2018 and 2019 chipped away at access to good health insurance. A U.S. Department of Labor rule adopted in 2018 provided the impetus for SB 1109, which allows previously available, inexpensive, 6-month plans to be offered for up to 3 years. These plans, sometimes termed “junk plans”, do not conform to the mandatory requirements of the Affordable Care Act. Republicans also passed SB 1247, a preemption bill that prevents a city or county from requiring an employer to provide health insurance.

Abortion continues to be a controversial issue in Arizona. In 2017 and 2018, the Republican majority approved two bills designed to deter abortions (SB 1367 and SB 1394). In 2015, they approved SB 1318, which prohibits insurance policies offered through the health care exchange from providing abortion coverage, except to save the life of the woman or to prevent a major bodily function from irreversible damage, or if the pregnancy is the result of rape or incest.

The Children’s Health Insurance Program (KidsCare) secured a victory with funding in the FY2020 state budget. With a legislated drop in match funding from the Federal Medicaid Assistance Percentage (FMAP) set to begin in October 2020, the state needed to increase funding to fill the gap. Advocates were concerned that conservative lawmakers might pull support for the program. However, KidsCare has largely bipartisan support, and the increase in state funding covers enrollment through FY2022. In tandem, the law was amended to remove the requirement to freeze enrollment when FMAP falls below 100 percent. Since Arizona restored KidsCare in 2016, after a 6-year gap, more than 35,000 children have been enrolled.

Legislation that Differentiates Republicans from Democrats

| Year | Topic Subtopic | Bill | Synopsis | Party of Sponsor | Vote (if any) and Status |
|-------------------|-------------------------------|---------|---|------------------|--|
| Healthcare | | | | | |
| 2019 | “Junk” health insurance plans | SB 1109 | <p><i>Short-term limited duration insurance; notice</i></p> <p>Allows for inexpensive insurance plans that do not conform to ACA requirements but are authorized under a rule from Dept. of Labor in Aug. 2018. Plans used to be allowed for 185 days but can now be for one year and can be renewed for another 2 years. Plans may exclude maternity coverage, pre-existing conditions, and mental health care.</p> <p>https://www.azcentral.com/story/news/politics/legislature/2019/03/12/new-arizona-law-expand-so-called-junk-health-insurance-plans-gov-doug-ducey/3131533002/</p> | Repub | <p>Signed by Governor</p> <p>Passed Senate: 18 Yes (17 R, 1 D) 12 No (0 R, 12 D)</p> <p>Passed House: 31 Yes (31 R, 0 D) 28 No (0 R, 28 D)</p> |

| | | | | | |
|------|------------------------------|--------------------|---|------------------------------------|--|
| 2019 | Health insurance | SB 1502 | <i>AHCCCS; lifetime limit; repeal</i> Would have repealed the lifetime limit on low-income health care. https://www.azleg.gov/legtext/54leg/1R/bills/SB1502P.pdf | Dem | Died in Senate chamber |
| 2018 | Health insurance | SB 1247 HB 2075 | <i>Health insurance; mandated provision prohibited</i> Prohibits a city or county from mandating an employer to provide health insurance to its employees. Under current statewide law, an applicable large employer with at least 50 FTEs that does not offer health insurance and meet certain minimum requirements to its employees and their dependents may be subject to specific penalties. https://trackbill.com/bill/arizona-senate-bill-1247-health-insurance-mandated-provision-prohibited/1524339/ | Repub | Signed by Governor Passed Senate: 17 Yes (17 R, 0 D) 13 No (0 R, 13 D) Passed House: 32 Yes (32 R, 0 D) 24 No (0 R, 24D) |
| 2015 | Medicaid | SB 1092 | <i>AHCCCS, annual waiver submittals</i> Requires able-bodied adults to work or be actively looking for work. Requires enrollees to pay higher premiums and share costs. Imposes a lifetime limit of 5 years of benefits. However, under both the Obama and Trump administrations, the Dept. of Health and Human Services denied the 5-year limit on benefits. The work requirement was approved by the Trump administration but is indefinitely postponed because of legal challenges to the work requirement in other states. https://trackbill.com/bill/arizona-senate-bill-1092-ahcccs-annual-waiver-submittals/764127/ https://tucson.com/news/local/arizona-pulls-back-from-imposing-time-limits-on-ahcccs-enrollment/article_7812f83c-3160-5fef-bd1d-aa3ff70a711c.html | Repub (Gov. Ducey proposal) | Signed by Governor Passed Senate: 17 Yes (17 R, 0 D) 12 No (1 R, 11 D) Passed House: 34 Yes (34 R, 0 D) 23 No (0 R, 23 D) |
| 2019 | Family services and abortion | HB 2759 | <i>Appropriations; direct services; referral</i> Would have allocated \$2.5M for a one-year family-health pilot program administered by a statewide nonprofit organization to provide various health and social services for parents of unborn children and children under 2 years. A stated purpose of the program is to promote childbirth as an alternative to abortion. Prohibits money being used for abortion referral services or distributed to organizations that promote or perform abortions. Backed by the anti-abortion lobbying group Center for Arizona Policy. https://www.azleg.gov/legtext/54leg/1R/bills/SB1547P.pdf https://azcapitoltimes.com/news/2019/05/22/legislature-to-debate-bill-to-give-7-5m-to-nonprofit-for-pro-life-counseling/ | Repub | Failed Senate: 15 Yes (15 R, 0 D) 14 No (1 R, 13 D) (A bill requires a majority of 16 votes to pass.) Passed House: 31 Yes (31 R, 0 D) 29 No (0 R, 29 D) |
| 2018 | Abortion | SB 1394 | <i>Reporting; abortions</i> Effective January 1, 2019, requires a hospital or facility where abortions are performed to submit a report to the Department of Health Services for each abortion, indicating at least one reason why | Repub | Signed by Governor Passed Senate: |

| | | | | | |
|------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|--|-------|---|
| | | | the woman is seeking an abortion (unless the woman declined to provide a reason), any known medical complications that resulted from the abortion, the medical specialty of the physician, and the type of facility performing the procedure. https://trackbill.com/bill/arizona-senate-bill-1394-dhs-reporting-abortion/1537218/ | | 17 Yes (16 R, 1 D) 13 No (1 R, 12 D) Passed House: 35 Yes (35 R, 0 D) 22 No (0 R, 22 D) |
| 2017 | Abortion | SB 1367 | <i>Abortion; live delivery; report; definition</i> Requires a physician performing an abortion to attempt to revive the fetus if it shows any signs of life. Requires a person trained in neonatal resuscitation to be in the room when an abortion takes place and to contact Emergency Services to take the fetus to a hospital if the fetus shows signs of life. Requires informing the patient that normal medical care must be given to the fetus if it shows signs of life. https://trackbill.com/bill/arizona-senate-bill-1367-abortion-live-delivery-report-definition/1362267/ | Repub | Signed by Governor Passed Senate: 18 Yes (17 R, 1 D) 11 No (0 R, 11 D) Passed House: 34 Yes (34 R, 0 D) 22 No (0 R, 22 D) |
| 2015 | Abortion | SB 1318 | <i>Abortion; health care exchange; licensure</i> Prohibits a health insurance policy offered through the health-care exchange from providing coverage for abortions, except to save the life of the woman or to save a major bodily function from irreversible damage, or if the pregnancy is the result of rape or incest. Requires abortion clinics to submit verification that the physician has admitting privileges at the clinic. https://trackbill.com/bill/arizona-senate-bill-1318-abortion-health-care-exchange-licensure/782874/ | Repub | Signed by Governor Passed Senate: 17 Yes (16 R, 1 D) 2 No (1 R, 1 D) Passed House: 33 Yes (33 R, 0 D) 24 No (1 R, 23 D) |
| 2019 | Budget provision on mental health | HB 2754 SB 1553 | <i>Health, budget reconciliation</i> Budget reconciliation provisions for changes relating to health. Needed for implementing the FY2020 budget. Section 7 authorizes a court to approve a patient's placement in a secure behavioral-health residential facility if s/he has been deemed to be seriously mentally ill and the court finds that s/he is chronically resistant to treatment. Authorizes the court to determine that a person is chronically resistant to treatment under certain situations. https://votesmart.org/bill/26675/67707/28101/appropriate-s-funds-for-health-related-costs-and-areas-for-fiscal-year-2020-2021#67707 | Repub | Signed by Governor Passed Senate: 27 Yes (16 R, 11 D) 2 No (0 R, 2 D) Passed House: 31 Yes (31 R, 0 D) 29 No (0 R, 29 D) |
| 2019 | AHCCCS / KidsCare | HB 2754 SB 1553 | <i>Health, budget reconciliation, 2019-2020</i> Removes the requirement for an immediate stop to KidsCare enrollment if federal match funding (FMAP) drops below 100% (see SB 1527 below). Replaces that requirement with new language | Repub | Signed by Governor Passed Senate: |

| | | | | | |
|------|--|--------------------|---|-------|--|
| | <p><i>Abbreviations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>AHCCCS:</i> Arizona Health Care Cost Containment System • <i>CHIP:</i> Children's Health Insurance Program • <i>FMAP:</i> Federal Medicaid Assistance Percentage | | <p>giving the AHCCCS Director “permissive authority” to stop processing applications if federal and state appropriations are insufficient. The FY2020 budget includes General Fund spending of \$7.5M to cover the state share of KidsCare (FMAP match of \$98.9M). Democratic <i>No</i> votes reflect displeasure with other parts of the budget, not with KidsCare.</p> <p>Note re decreasing FMAP: In 2018, Congress extended FMAP for CHIP for 10 years, through FY2027. However, the match rate is falling back to original levels in two steps: FY2019 (as of Oct. 1, 2019): FMAP is 100% FY2020 (as of Oct. 1, 2020): FMAP will be 90.5% FY2021 (as of Oct. 1, 2021): FMAP will be 79.01%</p> <p>https://www.azleg.gov/legtext/54leg/1R/summary/S.2754-1553APPROP_ASENACTED.pdf https://www.aap.org/en-us/advocacy-and-policy/state-advocacy/Documents/CHIPFundingJanuary2019.pdf https://www.kff.org/other/state-indicator/enhanced-federal-matching-rate-chip/?currentTimeframe=2&sortModel=%7B%22colId%22:%20%22Location%22,%20%22sort%22:%20%22asc%22%7D</p> | | <p>16 Yes (16 R, 0 D) 13 No (1 R, 12 D)</p> <p>Passed House: 31 Yes (31 R, 0 D) 29 No (0 R, 29 D)</p> |
| 2018 | AHCCCS / KidsCare | HB 2127 | <p><i>Children's health insurance program</i> By law, on Oct. 1, 2019, federal matching funds (FMAP) were due to fall to 90%, meaning that the “trigger” provision of the prior 2016 bill (see SB 1527 below) was looming. Therefore, this bill was introduced to eliminate the freeze on KidsCare enrollment. No funding was requested. https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/HB2127/2018</p> | Repub | <p>Died in Senate chamber by design. Intention was discussion only, never to vote.</p> <p>Passed House: 46 Yes (22 R, 24 D) 12 No (12 R, 0 D)</p> |
| 2017 | AHCCCS / KidsCare | SB 1527 HB 2542 | <p><i>Health; budget reconciliation; 2017-2018</i> Inserts so-called “trigger” language to immediately freeze enrollment in KidsCare if the federal matching contribution (FMAP) drops below 100%. This language is more restrictive than the original freeze, which would occur only if FMAP was eliminated completely (see SB 1457 below). https://www.azleg.gov/alispdfs/53leg/1R/senate/SummaryComplete.pdf</p> | Repub | <p>Signed by Governor</p> <p>Passed Senate: 17 Yes (17 R, 0 D) 13 No (0 R, 13 D)</p> <p>Passed House: 34 Yes (34 R, 0 D) 25 No (1 R, 24 D)</p> |
| 2016 | AHCCCS/ KidsCare | SB 1457 | <p><i>Eligibility, empowerment scholarships, health insurance</i> After the preceding 6-year freeze for KidsCare enrollment, the House voted to reinstate it, but Senate President Biggs refused to assign the bill to committee. Bipartisan supporters strategized a path</p> | Repub | <p>Signed by Governor</p> <p>Passed Senate:</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>to attach the provisions to this Senate education bill meant for extending scholarships to disabled children, which had unanimous support in the Senate and was awaiting House action. With assurances that the 5 needed Senate Republican votes were committed and that Gov. Ducey would sign the bill, sponsor David Bradley (R) agreed to add language to re-open KidsCare enrollment.</p> <p>Specifically, eliminates the enrollment cap for CHIP, requires AHCCCS to submit a state amendment to resume enrollment in the program and to project the enrollment rate for FY2016-2017, and requires AHCCCS to stop processing applications and provide notice that the program will terminate if the federal government ever eliminates match funding (FMAP).</p> <p>https://www.azleg.gov/alispdfs/52leg/2R/senate/SummaryComplete.pdf https://www.azcentral.com/story/news/politics/legislature/2016/05/09/kidscare-serpentine-path-revival/84059358/</p> | <p>16 Yes (5 R, 11 D) 12 No (12 R, 0 D)</p> <p>Passed House: 47 Yes (23 R, 24 D) 12 No (12 R, 0 D)</p> |
|--|--|--|--|

Immigration

Because the state shares hundreds of miles of border with Mexico, immigration is a complex and sensitive issue in Arizona, and—for better or worse—the state has been at the national forefront in passing immigration legislation. The 2010 landmark “show me your papers” Senate Bill 1070 passed largely along party lines and was signed into law. The bill has been a focal point of controversy since its inception, and portions of the law have been overturned. The controversy over SB 1070 continues to play out today.

- In his 2020 State of the State address, Governor Doug Ducey called on lawmakers to place on the November ballot a constitutional amendment banning sanctuary city policies. Since SB 1070 already bans sanctuary cities, Democrats assert that the proposal is an election-year ploy to drive Republicans to the polls. Arizona businesses have reacted negatively as well.
- In 2019, Citizen Initiative Proposition 205, an implicit challenge to SB 1070, sought to make Tucson a sanctuary city. It was soundly defeated. While supported by progressive groups, the Tucson mayor and city council, all Democrats, were opposed to Prop 205 because of perceived risks to public safety and to funding.
- In 2019, the Democrat-sponsored SB 1056, which would have repealed additional aspects of SB 1070, died in the Senate.
- In 2016, SB 1378 sought to prohibit money transfers from the state General Fund to any sanctuary city. This bill was drafted in part over confusion about whether Tucson police were enforcing immigration policy. However, SB 1070 already contains enforcement mechanisms to address this issue, so SB 1378 failed.

In 2015, with passage of Republican-backed HB 2064, Arizona also led the nation when it became the first state to require that high school students pass the civics portion of the U.S. naturalization exam to graduate. Few Democratic legislators voted in favor. 2019 legislation (SB 1444) expanded on this policy with the funding of an American civics education pilot program. And in 2016, highly partisan legislation included two bills pertaining to the sentencing and serving of sentences of immigrants convicted of crimes.

Legislation that Differentiates Republicans from Democrats

| Year | Topic Subtopic | Bill | Synopsis | Party of Sponsor | Vote (if any) and Status |
|--------------------|----------------------|---------|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| Immigration | | | | | |
| 2019 | Education Tuition | SB 1217 | <i>Arizona high school graduates; tuition</i> Would have required community colleges and universities to set tuition below out-of-state levels for “Dreamers” and others who graduate from Arizona high schools but do not meet residency requirements. After the bill failed in the legislature, the AZ Board of Regents voted to reduce Dreamers’ tuition at AZ universities from \$30,000 to about \$16,000. (In-state tuition at the time was about \$11,000.) Note: Prop 300 (passed by voters in 2006) does not allow Dreamers to be charged the same tuition rate | Bipartisan (Repub primary sponsor) | Passed Senate: 18 Yes (5 R, 13 D) 12 No (12 R, 0 D) Died in House committee |

| | | | | | |
|------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|-------|---|
| | | | <p>as residents or receive any financial assistance from state funds.</p> <p>https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/SB1217/2019 https://www.azcentral.com/story/news/local/arizona-education/2019/08/22/arizona-undocumented-high-school-students-get-college-tuition-break/2074854001/ https://azcapitoltimes.com/news/2019/03/25/dreamers-tuition-proposal-likely-dead/</p> | | |
| 2018 | Education Civics | SB 1444 | <p><i>Schools; American civics education</i> Establishes an American civics education pilot program in Arizona schools with \$500,000 appropriated from the state General Fund. (Meanwhile, state education funding per pupil has yet to recover to pre-2008 “Great Recession” levels.) This bill builds on legislation from 2015 when, in a first for the nation, the governor signed HB 2064, requiring high school students to answer correctly at least 60% of the questions on the civics portion of the U.S. naturalization test in order to graduate.</p> <p>https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/SB1444/2018 https://www.azcentral.com/story/news/politics/legislature/2018/05/03/arizona-legislature-live-updates-through-session-end/577812002/ https://www.azcentral.com/story/news/local/arizona-education/2019/04/18/redford-battle-over-school-funding-is-still-raging-a-year-later-funding-options/348118002/ https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/HB2064/2015</p> | Repub | <p>Signed by Governor</p> <p>Passed Senate: 29 Yes (16 R, 13 D) 0 No</p> <p>Passed House: 52 Yes (35 R, 17 D) 7 No (0 R, 7 D)</p> |
| 2019 | Documents, criminal statutes | SB 1056 Also 2018 SB 1074 | <p><i>Immigration; law enforcement; repeal</i> Would have repealed many facets of SB 1070 (“show me your papers” law) which includes provisions to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • fund border security • allow police to stop anyone for any “reasonable suspicion” of civil traffic law violations and relate it to human smuggling • arrest without a warrant a person who has “committed any public offense that makes the person removable from the United States” (basically saying that local police can arrest anyone suspected of a federal crime, which should be the federal ICE responsibility) • make it nearly impossible for employers to prove entrapment in cases where authorities are charging them with hiring illegal aliens. <p>https://legiscan.com/AZ/text/SB1056/2019</p> | Dem | Died in Senate chamber |

| | | | | | |
|------|--------------------------|----------|--|--------------------|---|
| | | | https://www.legiscan.com/AZ/bill/SB1074/2018 https://www.azleg.gov/legtext/53leg/2r/bills/sb1074p.htm | | |
| 2019 | Sanctuary cities | Prop 205 | <p><i>Tucson Sanctuary City Initiative</i> Would have made Tucson, one of Arizona’s most liberal cities, a “sanctuary city” that would not enforce federal immigration law and would prohibit racial profiling by Tucson city police. Proposition 205 was supported by progressive Democratic groups in Arizona. However, according to CBS News, “The measure drew fierce opposition from [Tucson’s] mayor and city council, all of them Democrats, who said the initiative risked public safety and millions of dollars the city gets from the state and federal governments.”</p> <p>https://ballotpedia.org/Tucson,_Arizona,_Proposition_205,_Sanctuary_City_Initiative_(November_2019) https://www.cbsnews.com/news/tucson-sanctuary-city-vote-pro-immigrant-measure-rejected-by-voters-in-liberal-arizona-city/</p> | Citizen initiative | Voters defeated the initiative on Nov. 5, 2019: 30% Yes 70% No |
| 2016 | Sanctuary cities | SB 1378 | <p><i>Prohibited money transfers; immigration; violations</i> Would have prohibited the state treasurer from transferring money from the state General Fund or any other fund to a “sanctuary city.” This bill was drafted in part because of confusion over whether Tucson police were enforcing immigration policy. However, SB 1070 (“show me the papers” law) already includes enforcement mechanisms if cities don’t follow the law.</p> <p>https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/SB1378/2016 https://tucson.com/news/local/columnists/steller/steller-tucson-a-sanctuary-city-not-so-fast/article_e06cda4e-70f9-56a2-9e86-5b62de2a0933.html</p> | Repub | Failed Senate: 14 Yes (14 R, 0 D) 16 No (4 R, 12 D) |
| 2016 | Criminal sentencing | SB 1377 | <p><i>Sentence enhancements; unlawful presence; release</i> Would have established requirements for the sentencing of undocumented immigrants convicted of a felony or misdemeanor. Requires at least the “presumptive” sentence for a felony, and requires the maximum term of imprisonment for a misdemeanor. Prohibits eligibility for probation, suspension, commutation, or release until the sentence has been served.</p> <p>https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/SB1377/2016 https://votesmart.org/bill/21250/57027/129361/establishes-criminal-sentencing-requirements-for-undocumented-immigrants#57027</p> | Repub | Passed Senate: 19 Yes (18 R, 1 D) 11 No (0 R, 11 D) Failed House: 29 Yes (29 R, 0 D) 31 No (7 R, 24 D) |
| 2016 | Prison term, deportation | HB 2451 | <p><i>Release of prisoners; detainers; repeal</i> Requires that undocumented immigrants convicted of a crime complete at least 85% of their</p> | Repub | Signed by Governor |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>imposed sentence before being released to ICE for deportation. Previously, only 50% completion was required. Those in favor of the bill argued that it is fair because US citizens in AZ are also required to serve at least 85% of a criminal sentence. However, U.S. citizens are not turned over to ICE and deported upon their release from prison.</p> <p>https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/HB2451/2016 https://www.azcentral.com/story/news/politics/legislature/2016/03/31/arizona-gov-doug-ducey-signs-immigrant-inmate-bill/82491622/</p> | <p>Passed Senate: 17 Yes (17 R, 0 D) 12 No (0 R, 12 D)</p> <p>Passed House: 36 Yes (34 R, 2 D) 21 No (0 R, 21 D)</p> |
| | | <p>Additional sources: Oxford, A. (2020). "Ducey calls for banning 'sanctuary cities' in state constitution; Dems see election-year ploy." https://www.azcentral.com/story/news/politics/arizona/2020/01/14.</p> | |

Voting Rights—Attack on Democracy

The Republican attack on voting rights goes beyond partisan politics. It is not just anti-Democrat; it is anti-democracy. In 2013 the Republican majority passed HB 2035, a sweeping incursion on a whole panoply of voting rights, but citizen groups mounted a referendum to overturn the legislation. Rather than face defeat at the polls, Republican lawmakers repealed HB 2035 so that the referendum would not appear on the 2014 ballot. Instead, they adopted a new strategy—death by a thousand cuts. Since then Republicans have been chipping away at voter rights in a piecemeal fashion, “one bill, one right” at a time. The main target has been the citizen-sponsored ballot measure—the right afforded to citizens by the Arizona Constitution to sponsor ballot measures that either repeal laws enacted by the legislature that are contrary to the public interest or pass laws when the legislature fails to act. Republicans have made it more difficult and more expensive to get citizen initiatives on the ballot. Petitions for signatures can be disqualified for minor technicalities. Republicans have even attempted to amend the state constitution to make it easier for the legislature to weaken, defund, and repeal voter-approved ballot measures.

Voter suppression measures have also included an attempt to purge voters from the early voting list and an attempt to impose criminal charges for technical violations by people conducting voter registration drives. One successful voter suppression bill makes it a felony for anyone other than a family member or caregiver to deliver early ballots. Republicans also tried to interfere with the independent redistricting commission to achieve gerrymandering indirectly, and they passed several dark money measures that make campaign donations less transparent. Numerous Democrat-sponsored bills to increase voter participation and make political influence more transparent have been quashed by the Republican majority without even allowing them to come to the floor for a vote.

Legislation that Differentiates Republicans from Democrats

| Year | Topic Subtopic | Bill | Synopsis | Party of Sponsor | Vote (if any) and Status |
|----------------------|------------------------------|---------|--|------------------|---|
| Voting Rights | | | | | |
| 2019 | Anti-citizen ballot measures | SB 1451 | <i>Procedures; nomination petitions; registered circulators</i> Imposes more excuses based on technicalities for disqualifying citizen ballot measures. Erects additional barriers for gathering signatures, disqualifies signatures if a paid circulator's number is not on the petition, and notifies paid petition circulators of disqualification by subpoena without any guarantee that the subpoena was received. https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/SB1451/2019 https://www.sierraclub.org/sites/www.sierraclub.org/files/sce/grand-canyon-chapter/legislative_updates/2019/2019%20Environmental%20Report%20Card_Final.pdf | Repub | Signed by governor Passed Senate: 16 Yes (16 R, 0 D) 10 No (0 R, 10 D) Passed House: 31 Yes (31 R, 0 D) 29 No (0 R, 29 D) |
| 2017 | Anti-citizen ballot measures | HB 2244 | <i>Initiatives; standard of review; handbook</i> Requires that initiatives meet a strict compliance rather than a substantial compliance standard. The courts have used a standard of “legally sufficient” (substantial compliance) for initiatives, meaning | Repub | Legal challenge dismissed by Maricopa Superior Court; Appeals Court affirmed |

| | | | | | |
|------|-----------------------------|----------|--|-------|---|
| | | | <p>that a petition signed by legal voters would be considered valid even with some minor omissions or errors. Under strict compliance, whole pages of signatures could be disqualified for purely minor technical reasons.</p> <p>https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/HB2244/2017 https://www.sierraclub.org/sites/www.sierraclub.org/files/sce/grand-canyon-chapter/political_action/2017%20Environmental%20Report%20Card_Final.pdf https://ballotpedia.org/Arizona_Strict_Compliance_Initiative_Process_Referendum_(2018) https://www.azmirror.com/blog/supreme-court-wont-hear-appeal-of-strict-compliance-law-for-initiatives/</p> | | <p>lower court decision; state Supreme Court declined to review; law went into effect.</p> <p>Signed by governor</p> <p>Passed Senate: 16 Yes (16 R, 0 D) 14 No (1 R, 13 D)</p> <p>Passed House: 34 Yes (34 R, 0 D) 23 No (0 R, 23 D)</p> |
| 2017 | Anti-citizen ballot measure | HB 2404 | <p><i>Initiatives; circulators; signature collection; contests</i> Prohibits paying people per signature when they gather signatures for petitions to get measures on the ballot. Punishes citizens who support the proposed ballot measure because they have no way of knowing that their signatures may be invalidated. Punishes the petition circulators based merely on how they are paid.</p> <p>https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/HB2404/2017 https://www.sierraclub.org/sites/www.sierraclub.org/files/sce/grand-canyon-chapter/political_action/2017%20Environmental%20Report%20Card_Final.pdf https://www.azcentral.com/story/news/politics/legislature/2017/03/23/arizona-bill-banning-pay-per-signature-citizen-initiative-petitions/99557348/</p> | Repub | <p>Signed by governor</p> <p>Passed Senate: 17 Yes (17 R, 0 D) 13 No (0 R, 13 D)</p> <p>Passed House: 34 Yes (34 R, 0 D) 22 No (0 R, 22D)</p> |
| 2017 | Anti-citizen ballot measure | HCR 2002 | <p><i>Repeal 1998 proposition 105</i> Would have referred to the ballot a measure to repeal provisions in the Arizona Constitution that limit the Arizona Legislature’s ability to weaken, defund, and repeal voter-approved measures.</p> <p>https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/HCR2002/2017 https://www.sierraclub.org/sites/www.sierraclub.org/files/sce/grand-canyon-chapter/political_action/2017%20Environmental%20Report%20Card_Final.pdf</p> | Repub | <p>Died in Senate chamber</p> <p>Passed House: 35 Yes (35 R, 0 D) 25 No (0 R, 25 D)</p> |
| 2017 | Anti-citizen ballot measure | SB 1236 | <p><i>Statewide petition circulators; registration; committees</i> Would have erected more impediments to gathering the required number of petition signatures to place an initiative or referendum on the ballot. Required that any advertising for a ballot measure include a “warning” that it is difficult for</p> | Repub | <p>Died in Senate chamber</p> <p>Passed House: 35 Yes (35 R, 0 D) 23 No (0 R, 23 D)</p> |

| | | | | | |
|------|-----------------------------|----------|--|-------|---|
| | | | <p>the Legislature to amend a voter-approved measure. Would have made an organization liable for law violations by a petition circulator and imposed a fine of up to \$1,000 per violation. Would have allowed the Secretary of State to disqualify whole pages of signatures merely if the pages were not grouped by name of circulator.</p> <p>https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/SB1236/2017 https://www.sierraclub.org/sites/www.sierraclub.org/files/sce/grand-canyon-chapter/political_action/2017%20Environmental%20Report%20Card_Final.pdf</p> | | |
| 2016 | Anti-citizen ballot measure | HCR 2023 | <p><i>Proposition 105; legislative authority</i></p> <p>Would have referred to the ballot a measure to allow the Legislature to repeal or change voter-approved measures by a three-fifths vote. Would have removed the requirement that the Legislature’s action “further the purpose” of the ballot measure. Would have weakened the voter protection provisions in the Arizona Constitution.</p> <p>https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/HCR2023/2016 https://www.sierraclub.org/sites/www.sierraclub.org/files/sce/grand-canyon-chapter/political_action/2016_Enviro_Report_Card_Final.pdf</p> | Repub | <p>Died in Senate chamber</p> <p>Passed House: 32 Yes (32 R, 0 D) 25 No (2 R, 23 D)</p> |
| 2016 | Anti-citizen ballot measure | HCR 2043 | <p><i>Initiative, referendum; vote percentage requirements</i></p> <p>Would have referred to the ballot a measure to weaken the Voter Protection Act provisions in the Arizona Constitution by allowing the Legislature to amend an initiative or referendum passed in 2016 or later, if the Legislature approved the amendments by a greater percentage than the percentage of voters that approved the measure. Would have removed the requirement that the Legislature’s action “further the purpose” of the ballot measure unless the measure was passed by more than two-thirds vote (which seldom occurs).</p> <p>https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/HCR2043/2016 https://www.sierraclub.org/sites/www.sierraclub.org/files/sce/grand-canyon-chapter/political_action/2016_Enviro_Report_Card_Final.pdf</p> | Repub | <p>Died in Senate chamber</p> <p>Passed House: 32 Yes (32 R, 0 D) 25 No (3 R, 22 D)</p> |
| 2019 | Voter suppression | SB 1188 | <p><i>Permanent early voting list</i></p> <p>Would have purged voters from the Permanent Early Voting List (PEVL) if they failed to vote early in two consecutive elections. An estimated 200,000 voters would have been removed from the PELV. This attempted purging contradicts the “permanent” nature of the list.</p> | Repub | <p>Passed Senate: 16 Yes (16 R, 0 D) 14 No (1 R, 13 D)</p> <p>Died in House chamber</p> |

| | | | | | |
|------------------|------------------------------|--|--|-------|--|
| | | | https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/SB1188/2019 https://www.sierraclub.org/sites/www.sierraclub.org/files/sce/grand-canyon-chapter/legislative_updates/2019/2019%20Environmental%20Report%20Card_Final.pdf | | |
| 2019 | Voter suppression | HB 2616 | <p><i>Registration of voters; payment; prohibition</i></p> <p>Would have penalized people who help register voters by imposing class 2 misdemeanor charges for not returning voter registration forms within 10 days and a fine of \$25 per day per registration form. Would have had a chilling effect on voter registration drives, especially those in more remote areas where drives are conducted over longer periods of time and the completed forms are delivered just prior to voter registration deadlines.</p> <p>https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/HB2616/2019 https://www.sierraclub.org/sites/www.sierraclub.org/files/sce/grand-canyon-chapter/legislative_updates/2019/2019%20Environmental%20Report%20Card_Final.pdf</p> | Repub | <p>Failed Senate: 12 Yes (12 R, 0 D) 18 No (5 R, 13 D)</p> <p>Passed House: 31 Yes (31 R, 0 D) 27 No (0 R, 27 D)</p> |
| 2016 | Voter suppression | HB 2023 | <p><i>Delivery; early ballots; limitation</i></p> <p>Makes it a Class 6 felony to collect and deliver early ballots unless you are a family member or caregiver.</p> <p>https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/HB2023/2016 https://www.sierraclub.org/sites/www.sierraclub.org/files/sce/grand-canyon-chapter/political_action/2016_Enviro_Report_Card_Final.pdf</p> | Repub | <p>Signed by governor</p> <p>Passed Senate: 17 Yes (17 R, 0 D) 12 No (0 R, 12 D)</p> <p>Passed House: 34 Yes (34 R, 0 D) 23 No (1 R, 22 D)</p> |
| 2019 2018 | Voter registration | <p>HB 2215 SB 1521 SCR 1025 HB 2216 SB 1505</p> <p>SB 1334 HB 2052 SB 1335</p> | <p>Multiple bills would have facilitated more citizen participation in elections by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Making voter registration automatic when a person applies for or renews a driver's license or non-operating state ID license unless that person affirmatively opts out • Allowing other public agencies to adopt an automatic process for voter registration • Allowing people to register on election day and vote by provisional ballot • Referring to the ballot an initiative for the citizens to decide on automatic voter registration | Dem | Died in chamber/committee |
| 2019 | Restoration of voting rights | HB 2401 SB 1202 SB 1117 | Multiple bills would have facilitated more citizen participation in elections by: | Dem | Died in chamber/committee |

| | | | | | |
|------|-----------------------------|---|--|-------|--|
| 2018 | | SB 1377 SB 1343 HB 2470 HB 2146 HB 2610 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Automatically restoring the right to vote to felons upon discharge from probation or upon absolute discharge from prison Publishing information from the Secretary of State on websites about the voting rights of people with a criminal history and about automatic restoration of those rights | | |
| 2018 | Voter ID and student voting | SB 1125 SB 1127 SB 1128 SB 1129 SB 1337 | <p>Multiple bills would have facilitated more citizen participation in elections by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adding a student ID from a postsecondary institution in AZ as an acceptable voter ID Adding a Veterans Administration health card as an acceptable voter ID Deleting proof of citizenship and voter ID as requirements for being eligible to vote Allowing verification of the last 4 digits of one's Social Security Number as satisfactory proof of citizenship Requiring community colleges and universities to establish voting centers on campus | Dem | Died in chamber/committee |
| 2018 | Gerry-mandering | SCR 1034 | <p><i>Membership; independent redistricting commission</i> Included some negative and inaccurate commentary on the Independent Redistricting Commission. Would have required that the smallest and largest electoral districts have a two percent or less difference in population. The Navajo Nation and other tribal communities objected to the two percent requirement because it could result in a dilution of their vote and no representation at the Capitol. https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/SCR1034/2018 https://www.sierraclub.org/sites/www.sierraclub.org/files/sce/grand-canyon-chapter/legislative_updates/2018/2018%20Environmental%20Report%20Card_Final.pdf</p> | Repub | <p>Failed Senate: 13 Yes (13 R, 0 D) 15 No (3 R, 12 D)</p> <p>Passed House: 32 Yes (32 R, 0 D) 25 No (0 R, 25 D)</p> |
| 2018 | Dark money | HB 2153 | <p><i>Campaign finance; nonprofits; disclosure</i> Limits local government's ability to require certain non-profits to register as political action committees and disclose donors. The bill preempts communities such as Tempe (which voted overwhelmingly for a disclosure ordinance) from requiring disclosure of individuals and groups who are influencing elections. https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/HB2153/2018 https://www.sierraclub.org/sites/www.sierraclub.org/files/</p> | Repub | <p>Signed by governor</p> <p>Passed Senate: 17 Yes (17 R, 0 D) 13 No (0 R, 13 D)</p> <p>Passed House: 33 Yes (33 R, 0 D) 25 No (1 R, 24 D)</p> |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | | <p>use to influence elections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Setting limits on the aggregate amount that individuals can contribute to candidate committees and PACs • Setting limits on the aggregate amount that PACs and political parties can contribute to candidate committees • Setting limits on the aggregate amount that a candidate committee can accept from PACs and political parties • Setting limits on the aggregate amount that a corporation, limited liability company, or labor organization can contribute to a PAC or to another corporation, limited liability company, or labor organization in an attempt to influence an election | | |
| | | | <p>Additional sources:</p> <p>https://www.azcentral.com/story/news/politics/legislature/2017/04/16/arizona-citizen-initiatives-restrictions-came-after-years-long-effort/99719152/</p> <p>https://www.azcentral.com/story/news/arizona/politics/2015/03/26/arizona-legislature-revives-thwarted-elections-bills/70471722/</p> <p>https://ballotpedia.org/Arizona_Election_Law_Referendum_(2014)</p> | | |

Wages / Workers’ Rights

Arizona is known for fiercely protecting a free-market economy, as well as its ability to attract businesses in a relatively regulatory-free environment. When taken to extremes, however, Republican legislators have eroded fundamental worker protections, including protections against workplace discrimination, along with the ability to sustain economic growth on their workers’ behalf. The wage restrictions alone, with minimums that fall below a living wage, hurt not only workers and their families, but also the very businesses those workers’ wages support, as has been shown across the country.

In the last two years alone, GOP efforts to erode workers’ rights include multiple attempts to override minimum wage increases, which is contrary to the wishes of the majority of citizens who passed Proposition 206. In that same timeframe Republicans have also refused to hear scores of bills proposed by Democratic legislators to protect workers’ rights, including bills addressing salary discrimination; unequal pay for equal work; fair employee work scheduling; family leave; discrimination based on gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, or marital status; and “right to work” legislation that guts employee protections by organized labor. Republicans have also thwarted Democratic attempts to protect temporary service employees—an emerging sector of workers in the gig economy that is growing exponentially and absolutely merits equal protection under the law.

Legislation that Differentiates Republicans from Democrats

| Year | Topic Subtopic | Bill | Synopsis | Party of Sponsor | Vote (if any) and Status |
|------------------------------|--|---------|---|------------------|--|
| Wages/Workers’ Rights | | | | | |
| 2019 | Minimum wage Exemption for youths | HB 2523 | <p><i>Youth employment</i> Would have exempted businesses from paying the state minimum wage to students 22 years of age or younger, - working part-time. This GOP bill attempted to subvert citizen-approved Proposition 206, the Fair Wages and Healthy Families Act, which raised the minimum wage in Arizona from \$8.05 an hour to \$12 by 2020, to be adjusted based on inflation thereafter.</p> <p>The GOP was forced to withdraw this bill after the Attorney General found that it conflicted with the intent of the citizen-passed initiative. The state held that to be constitutional the bill would need a three-fourths vote in each chamber and would have to “further the purpose” of the voter-approved law, which it did not.</p> <p>https://votesmart.org/bill/26180/66578/authorizes-employers-to-pay-less-than-minimum-wage-to-full-time-students#.XitTXWhKjcc https://www.azcentral.com/story/opinion/op-ed/laurieroberts/2019/04/08/minimum-wage-bill-dies-and-arizona-voters-prevail/3406498002/ https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/HB2523/2019</p> | Repub | <p>Withdrawn by Senate</p> <p>Passed House: 31 Yes (31 R, 0 D) 29 No (0 R, 29 D)</p> |

| | | | | | |
|------|--|---------|--|-------|---|
| 2019 | <p>Minimum wage</p> <p>Penalty for higher local minimum wage</p> | HB 2756 | <p><i>Revenue; budget reconciliation; 2019-2020</i></p> <p>Amends minimum wage regulations to penalize cities that adopt a minimum wage that is higher than the state level. Requires the state to assess and collect from a county, city, or town an amount to reimburse the state for the costs associated with that locality's increased minimum wage.</p> <p>This bill is a classic example of preemption laws promulgated by ALEC and the Goldwater Institute to override the independence of local governments by preventing them from passing laws at the city or county level—even when it benefits its citizens. In this case the GOP is penalizing the city of Flagstaff for adopting a minimum wage that is higher than the state's minimum wage because the cost of living is higher for workers there. This bill requires the city to reimburse the state to make up for the impact of higher wages on the state. E.g., among others jobs affected, Flagstaff raised the rates of developmental disability workers whose wages, in turn, are paid by the state—even though denying that raise increase will hurt those low-pay workers.</p> <p>https://votesmart.org/bill/26852/68692/amends-minimum-wage-regulations#.XitKZmhKjcc https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/HB2756/2019</p> | Repub | <p>Signed by Governor</p> <p>Passed Senate: 16 Yes (16 R, 0 D) 13 No (1 R, 12 D)</p> <p>Passed House: 31 Yes (31 R, 0 D) 29 No (0 R, 29 D)</p> |
| 2016 | <p>Minimum wage</p> <p>Ban on local non-wage benefit setting</p> | HB 2579 | <p><i>Nonwage compensation; minimum wage</i></p> <p>Would have prevented local governments from setting non-wage benefits for local citizens. This GOP bill is another attempt at an end run around Prop 206, the Fair Wages and Healthy Families Act.</p> <p>https://votesmart.org/bill/21300/57150/prohibits-a-city-from-regulating-nonwage-compensation#.XjnJpGhKjcc https://www.natlawreview.com/article/arizona-court-appeals-strikes-down-law-restricting-local-governments-requiring https://arizonadailyindependent.com/2019/02/05/arizona-democrats-win-court-challenge-of-minimum-wage-law/ https://legiscan.com/AZ/votes/HB2579/2016</p> | Repub | <p>Ruled unconstitutional by AZ Court of Appeals on Feb. 5, 2019, for violating the will of voters in Prop 206 to set local minimum wages, including benefits</p> <p>Signed by Governor</p> <p>Passed Senate: 18 Yes (18 R, 0 D) 11 No (0 R, 11, D)</p> <p>Passed House: 35 Yes (35 R, 0 D) 24 No (0 R, 24 D)</p> |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------|--|--|---|-----|---------------------------|----------|-------------|--|------------|---------|------------|--------------|---------|---------|---------|--------------------|--|
| 2016 | <p>Minimum wage</p> <p>Statewide raise in minimum wage</p> | Prop 206 | <p><i>Fair Wages and Healthy Families Act</i> Raises the minimum wage in Arizona from \$8.05 an hour to \$12 by 2020, to be adjusted based on inflation thereafter.</p> <p>After years of the GOP legislature refusing to raise the minimum wage to a living-wage level, Arizona finally passed a citizen-led initiative to increase the minimum wage in small increments over four years. Defined wage increases end in 2020 at \$12/hour, after which increases are tied to inflation. While rate hikes help minimum-wage workers, these wages still fall below living-wage rates for Arizona:</p> <p>Living Wage Calculation for Arizona</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td></td> <td>1 ADULT</td> <td>2 ADULTS</td> <td>(1 working)</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>0 Children</td> <td>1 Child</td> <td>2 Children</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Wage per hr.</td> <td>\$11.68</td> <td>\$23.09</td> <td>\$25.79</td> </tr> </table> <p>Even with future inflation adjustments, wages will not meet the basic needs of life. Further exacerbating the fair wage issue is the income inequality gap, which according to the Census Bureau has grown wider in the last five years in places like Pima County where 20% of the households have 50% of the wealth.</p> <p>https://livingwage.mit.edu/states/04 https://www.azica.gov/sites/default/files/media/FREQUENTLY%20ASKED%20QUESTIONS_MasterwTOC%20FINAL%20020518.pdf https://tucson.com/news/local/income-gap-widens-of-households-have-of-pima-county-s/article_27aff8c3-2486-5908-9021-e71907a5f3b3.html https://www.epi.org/blog/january-1-state-minimum-wage-changes-will-bring-raises-to-nearly-7-million-workers/</p> | | 1 ADULT | 2 ADULTS | (1 working) | | 0 Children | 1 Child | 2 Children | Wage per hr. | \$11.68 | \$23.09 | \$25.79 | Citizen initiative | Voters passed the initiative on Nov. 8, 2016 |
| | 1 ADULT | 2 ADULTS | (1 working) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 0 Children | 1 Child | 2 Children | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Wage per hr. | \$11.68 | \$23.09 | \$25.79 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2019 2018 | Salary discrimination, unequal pay | <p>HB2204 SB1514 HB2205 HB2391 SB1435</p> <p>HB2224 SB1242 SB1342 HB2637</p> | <p>Multiple bills would have ended employee discrimination based on salary history by preventing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hiring based on salary history, rather than qualifications Firing employees who disclose their salary/wages to others Retaliating against employees who file complaints related to the above Perpetuating protection for unequal wage rates for substantially similar work <p>https://legiscan.com/AZ/ [2019] https://legiscan.com/AZ/ [2018]</p> | Dem | Died in chamber/committee | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|------|-------------------------------|--------|--|-----|---------------------------|
| 2019 | Employee discrimination | HB2156 | <p><i>Employment; training; termination; conditions; discrimination</i></p> <p>Would have expanded discrimination list to include: gender, gender identity or expression, sexual orientation, marital status (still exempting religious organizations). Would have required employee training on sexual harassment. Would have prohibited employers from requiring an employee to reenact an injury arising out of employment. Would have made it a misdemeanor to retaliate against, harass, or intimidate any person for seeking to join a labor organization.</p> <p>https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/HB2156/2019</p> | Dem | Died in chamber/committee |
| 2018 | Worker discrimination | HB2437 | <p><i>Employment omnibus</i></p> <p>Would have required employers to allow labor organizations to offer presentations to new employees. Attempted to expand list of protected classes for employment discrimination to include gender, gender identity or expression, sexual orientation, and marital status.</p> <p>https://legiscan.com/AZ/text/HB2437/id/1689959</p> | Dem | Died in chamber/committee |
| 2018 | Overtime pay | HB2436 | <p><i>Overtime pay</i></p> <p>Would have required the Industrial Commission to set a minimum salary amount at the 40th percentile of weekly earnings of full-time, non-hourly, overtime-exempt workers in the lowest-wage census region in the second quarter of the year immediately preceding the update published by the U.S. Department of Labor.</p> <p>https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/HB2436/2018</p> | Dem | Died in chamber/committee |
| 2019 | Fair employee work scheduling | HB2227 | <p><i>Employment; employee work scheduling</i></p> <p>Would have protected workers from arbitrary work schedule changes or last-minute shift cancellations. Would have required employers to provide new hires with a good-faith estimate of work schedules 14 days before starting, and would have allowed employees to request work locations and shifts in advance. Would have ensured that employers do not simply hire staff and promise work commitments, only to cancel or assign shifts that could conflict with the worker's other jobs--essentially hurting lower-wage workers who may need multiple jobs to support themselves and their families.</p> <p>https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/HB2227/2019</p> | Dem | Died in chamber/committee |

| | | | | | |
|--------------|------------------------------|------------------|--|-----|---------------------------|
| 2019 | Family Leave Act | SB1326 | <p><i>Family leave</i></p> <p>Would have enacted the Family Leave Act to entitle an employee to 12 workweeks of leave during any 12-month period for the birth of a child, for the placement of a child with the employee for adoption or foster care, to care for a family member with a serious health condition, or because of a serious health condition that makes the employee unable to perform the functions of the employee's position.</p> <p>https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/SB1326/2019</p> | Dem | Died in chamber/committee |
| 2019 2018 | Right to work, union busting | SB1324 SB1227 | <p><i>Repeal; right to work</i></p> <p>Would have repealed a long-standing right-to-work law that allows workers to reap the benefits of union representation without being a member or paying union dues. Were workers required to be a member of union shops, the funding base of labor unions would increase, thereby increasing union membership and bargaining power. As workers' rights advocates put it, right-to-work laws ensure "the right to work—for less."</p> <p>https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/made-by-history/wp/2018/04/24/the-right-to-work-really-means-the-right-to-work-for-less/</p> <p>https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/SB1227/2018</p> <p>https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/SB1324/2019</p> | Dem | Died in chamber/committee |
| 2019 | Temporary workers protection | SB1210 | <p><i>Temporary services employer; employees; rights</i></p> <p>Would have protected temporary employees by ensuring that they are paid at least minimum wage and are reimbursed for the use of their own vehicle for transportation to a work site. Would have limited temp workers to 20% of an employer's workforce. This bill would have protected the ever-growing temporary worker population in today's "gig economy."</p> <p>https://apps.azleg.gov/BillStatus/BillOverview/71788</p> | Dem | Died in chamber/committee |
| | | | <p>Additional sources:</p> <p>https://legiscan.com/AZ/</p> <p>https://apps.azleg.gov</p> <p>https://azbankers.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/07-AzBA-Legislative-Review-2018.pdf</p> <p>https://azbankers.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/AZBA-LR-2019.pdf</p> <p>https://justfacts.votesmart.org/</p> | | |