



## Guide to AFP-Arizona's Annual Legislative Scorecards

Since 2008, AFP-Arizona has given legislators advance notice of which bills would be scored as key bills during the session -- using multiple modes of communication, including email, hand-delivered flyers, social media and one-on-one in-person lobbying. Grassroots taxpayer activists can help us greatly in promoting our free market agenda by reminding legislators that we will hold them accountable for accomplishing free market victories.

Each year, AFP-Arizona's state legislative policy plan is closely tied to the scoring rubric for that year's Legislative Scorecard. AFP-Arizona's state legislative policy plan is developed prior to each legislative session with input from several allied organizations and from allied legislators.

The scorecard assigns weights to bills according to their projected dollar impact to Arizona taxpayers, consumers and producers, with \$1 million equaling one point on the raw scale. The raw point values are usually adjusted for a probability factor (e.g., values for referenda are typically halved) and sometimes doubled for a long-term policy value factor. AFP-Arizona has traditionally assigned a triple annual weight to tax bills, or used the JLBC's three-year fiscal note score, when available. On the raw scale, points are assigned to bills as follows: positive points for voting with AFP-Arizona on a bill, negative points for voting against AFP-Arizona on a bill, and zero for missing the vote. Failure to bring AFP-Arizona's key bills to floor votes in a chamber count as negative points for every member of that chamber. Sponsors of bills that fail to get to the floor and committee members who pass good bills out of their committee (except the Rules committee) will receive zero points instead of negative points.

Passing good legislation is a problem of collective action, and every legislator must do his or her part to keep leadership or special interests from killing good bills. (The Legislative Scorecard allows for substitute bills that have a substantially similar policy impact to the AFP key bills identified at the beginning of the legislative session.) Conversely, AFP-Arizona also rewards members of a chamber for holding/stopping certain key bad bills that passed the other chamber -- as long as members did not sponsor the bill or vote for in committee before it was held. In circumstances where the bill returns back to a chamber for a final passage vote and the legislation has not been substantively changed, the raw point values for each of the votes will be halved. For reconsideration votes, the final vote determines the raw point value. The governor will be scored only on bills that pass both chambers of the Legislature unless there is reason to believe the governor worked to block a good bill or pass a bad bill. Once bills have been scored, the maximum possible raw score is added to every legislator's score to create a positive-scale score.

AFP-Arizona typically grades budget-related bills proportionally. For example, in 2016, for every million dollars in general fund appropriations above a three percent budget increase (last year's budget plus a factor for the growth in population plus inflation), AFP-Arizona assigned a value of -1 (minus one) on the raw scale. The governor and the legislative majority voted to spend \$468 million more than the target. That gave a -468 (minus 468) raw score to anyone who voted for the general appropriations ("feeder") budget bill. AFP-Arizona assumed that the minority would have voted for as much or more spending as was contained in the budget bill.

The 2016 scorecard was the 33rd annual scorecard put out by AFP-Arizona and the Arizona Federation of Taxpayers. To obtain full scoring spreadsheets for recent years, contact [tjenney@afphq.org](mailto:tjenney@afphq.org).