



**LEGISLATOR SCORECARD**  
FOR THE  
**2009 SESSION**  
OF THE  
**MONTANA LEGISLATURE**

Compiled by  
**MONTANANS FOR MULTIPLE USE**

# Montanans for Multiple Use Mission Statement

Our goal is to enhance access to public lands for everyone. Our purpose is to educate the public on the need for balanced environmental laws and public land use issues.

MFMU believes that through the intelligent use of natural resources we can meet the needs of people as well as the needs of the rest of our natural world.

With this in mind MFMU supports the "New Environmentalism" based on hope instead of fear, solutions instead of conflict, education instead of litigation, science instead of emotion, and employing rather than destroying human resources.

MFMU supports access to public lands; access to natural resources; access for recreation; access for all citizens.

Montanans For Multiple Use is a non-profit organization, comprised of a diverse group of people from various walks of life. We are gathering together to face the issues challenging our rights as tax paying citizens to live, work, and recreate in Montana.

Montanans For Multiple Use supports sound forest management practices that promote forest health and protect wildlife and its habitat. We believe it is wiser to reduce fuel buildup, enhance habitat and provide healthy forests for the future than it is to lose the forests to disease, insects, and fire through inaction.

Montanans For Multiple Use is alarmed that the lifestyles of mining, logging, farming, ranching, and motorized recreation are under attack by a very vocal minority of obstructionists. These preservationist groups already have a strong hold on our future. MFMU is determined to fight for our right to enjoy the quality of life we are accustomed to and continue to raise our families accordingly. We believe this goal can be accomplished but we must all combine forces to do it. We must have a unified voice and inform our Senators and Congressmen where we stand on ALL issues. Finally, we must support other user groups that have goals similar to ours.

This scorecard was compiled with all of the above in mind. We selected bills that in some way involve one or more of our core issues. All of the chosen bills were defeated or passed by close votes. When the stakes are high and the vote is close a legislator is more likely to pay attention and follow their core beliefs. The bandwagon effect that is common with a one-sided vote often hides more than it reveals. We used blue text and shading to indicate bills we supported and red to indicate our opposition.

MFMU does not endorse or support parties or individual candidates. This scorecard is provided to help voters make an informed choice at the polling booth.

THE FUTURE OF YOUR ACCESS TO PUBLIC LANDS IS MOSTLY DETERMINED ON  
ELECTION DAY. [PLEASE VOTE](#)

## THE BILLS WE SCORED

### HOUSE BILLS

#### HB 150

This bill provides that a person who engages in a sport or recreational opportunity on private land assumes the inherent risks in that sport or opportunity and is responsible for injuries and damages resulting from those inherent risks. Passage of the bill should encourage more outdoor sports events.

MFMU joins the motorized recreation community in supporting this bill.

#### HB 375

Requires Dept of Environmental Quality to determine what Montana should do to participate in "global warming" mitigation. Would allow DEQ to determine if the department could regulate or if new legislation is needed. Bill assumes that global warming exists and that it is man caused. This bill would cause increased energy costs that will ripple throughout our economy. MFMU OPPOSES HB 375.

#### HJ 4

In the NACO plan a governor can declare a crisis when the severity of fire danger from fuels on identified federal lands within that state poses a significant threat to public health and safety or there would be a probable loss of homes and property if wildfires occur. After the crisis declaration federal agencies would be required to expedite a fuel reduction plan that is exempted from NEPA red tape and appeals. Anyone filing a lawsuit against the plan would be required to post a sizable damage bond. MFMU thinks this is an excellent plan.

This bill urges Congress to pass this plan into law. MFMU **strongly** supports this bill.

#### HR3

This bill asserts Montana's States Rights as granted by the 10<sup>th</sup> Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Voting against this bill is tantamount to voting against the constitution. If this is not in fact a treasonable act and violation of oath of office it certainly comes close. If this act were passed and enforced and our rights thereby exercised, the Endangered Species Act would only apply to federal land and not to the management of resident Montana wildlife at all. MFMU supports this bill.

### SENATE BILLS

#### SB 34

The Montana Community Decay ordinances confer considerable power on local government to enter private property without the permission of the owner and take actions to alleviate conditions on that property that the local bureaucrat considers a threat to the community. The problem is the conditions that may constitute a threat are vague and leave lots of room for discretionary and arbitrary action on the part of a government official.

SB 34 adds the following to conditions to the Community Decay ordinances that may be acted upon. *'(b) the natural accumulation of fuel, INCLUDING NOXIOUS WEEDS, for fire that poses a threat to public health or*

*safety'*. Who decides what constitutes a threat and what actions are necessary to remove that threat? Accumulation of fuel may include trees, bushes, and weeds.

If the landowner does not alleviate the conditions in question to the satisfaction of the government official, the local government *'officers and employees of the county may enter upon the property for the specific purpose of abating the violation of the ordinance and may assess the property owner for the actual costs for the abatement. Nonpayment of such an assessment becomes a lien upon the property and is enforceable in the same manner as the nonpayment of property taxes is enforced.'*

There is nothing in the Community Decay statute that provides for an appeal of a local government decision or action under this ordinance. MFMU opposes this bill

SB 98

This bill adds fuel reduction projects in Wildland urban Interface as a taxable purpose. There is no question that there is a great backlog of fuel reduction needed but can the fixed and low income folks who live there afford it? These projects can be very expensive in areas where there is no commercial timber for harvest.

Will these projects take place on federal land and be charged to private property owners? On state land? Will WUI owners who have cleaned up their property be required to pay for landowners, private and public, who have not?

The federal government has stated that they will work to pass fire fighting costs related to WUI to states. Montana is passing them to counties and private. There is a statute in the legislature which reinforces laws already on the books that makes a landowner liable for fire that starts on his land. Isn't that and the desire to protect your assets enough incentive for landowners to thin out their property?

This bill puts too much of the fire costs and prevention on private property owners. The real culprit is the federal managers who do not fight fire until it gets close to homes and then they pull out all the stops and run up the bill and blame it on private landowners and residents and then try to make us pay for their lack of management. MFMU opposes this bill

SJ 21

The Kootenai N.F. is currently studying the Galton Area which is all of that forest east of Eureka and HWY 93. Part of the area is locked up in Wilderness Study Area, part is in the Ten Lakes Scenic area, part is in a roadless area and part is in general forest.

The Montana Wilderness Assoc. wants to close down long time snowmobiling access and even to turn most of the area into designated wilderness. The area is very popular with local residents, Montanans from neighboring counties, and out of state tourists. It is one of the few remaining high altitude snowmobiling areas in NW Montana. This bill will put the legislature on record behind protecting current management for recreation and forest health. The bill requests consultation with the legislature before any access reductions occur. MFMU strongly supports this bill.

## VOTING RECORD

### SENATE

Last	Party	Districts	HB 150	HB 375	HJ 4	HR 3	SB 34	SB 98	SJ 21	09 SCORE	07 SCORE	05 SCORE	
BALES	(R)	SD 20	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	3	60.00%	100	100
BALYEAT	(R)	SD 34	Y		Y		N	N	Y	5	100.00%	100	87.5
BARKUS	(R)	SD 4	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	3	60.00%	100	90.9
BARRETT	(R)	SD 36	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	3	60.00%	100	87.5
BLACK	(R)	SD 14	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	3	60.00%	83	90.9
BRANAE	(D)	SD 27	N		N		Y	Y	N	0	0.00%	0	0
BRENDEN	(R)	SD 18	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	3	60.00%		
<b>BROWN, Roy</b>	(R)	SD 25	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	3	60.00%	100	
BROWN, Taylor	(R)	SD 22	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	3	60.00%		
BRUEGGEMAN	(R)	SD 6	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	3	60.00%	67	90.9
COONEY	(D)	SD 40	N		N		Y	Y	N	0	0.00%	0	27.3
CURTISS	(R)	SD 1	Y		Y		N	Y	Y-S	4	80.00%	100	100
ERICKSON	(D)	SD 47	N		N		N	Y	N	1	20.00%	0	
ESP *H	(R)	SD 31	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	3	60.00%	100	81.6
<b>ESSMANN</b>	(R)	SD 28	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	3	60.00%	83	72.7
GALLUS	(D)	SD 37	N		N		Y	Y	Y	1	20.00%	0	40
GEBHARDT	(R)	SD 23	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	3	60.00%	100	90.9
GILLAN	(D)	SD 24	N		N		Y	Y	N	0	0.00%	0	30
HAMLETT	(D)	SD 10	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	3	60.00%		
HANSEN	(D)	SD 17	Y		Y		Y	Y	N	2	40.00%	17	27.3
HAWKS	(D)	SD 33	Y		N		Y	Y	N	1	20.00%	0	18.2
HINKLE	(R)	SD 7	Y		Y		N	Y	Y	4	80.00%		
<b>JACKSON</b>	(R)	SD 5	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	3	60.00%	100.00	100
<b>JENT</b>	(D)	SD 32	Y		N		N	Y	N	2	40.00%	0	14.3
JUNEAU	(D)	SD 8	N		N		Y	Y	N	0	0.00%	0	0
KAUFMANN	(D)	SD 41	N		N		N	Y	N	1	20.00%	0	0
KEANE	(D)	SD 38	N		Y		Y	Y-S	Y	2	40.00%	43	37.5
LAIBLE	(R)	SD 44	Y		Y		Y	E	Y		75.00%	67	81.8
LARSEN	(D)	SD 50	Y		N		Y	Y	N	1	20.00%	17	18.2
LASLOVICH	(D)	SD 43	N		Y		Y	Y	Y	2	40.00%	0	27.3
<b>LEWIS</b>	(R)	SD 42	Y		Y		Y-S	Y	Y	3	60.00%	0	9.1
MCGEE	(R)	SD 29	Y		Y		Y	N	Y	4	80.00%	83	100
MOSS	(D)	SD 26	N		N		N	Y	N	1	20.00%	0	0
<b>MURPHY</b>	(R)	SD 39	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	3	60.00%	83	
PERRY	(R)	SD 35	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	3	60.00%	83	72.7
<b>PETERSON, Jim</b>	(R)	SD 15	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	3	60.00%	83	
RIPLEY	(R)	SD 9	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	3	60.00%	100	87.5
SCHMIDT *H	(D)	SD 11	N		N		Y	Y	N	0	0.00%	0	
SHOCKLEY	(R)	SD 45	N		Y		Y	Y	Y	2	40.00%	67	72
SQUIRES *H	(D)	SD 48	N		Y		Y	E	N		25.00%	0	30
STEINBEISSER	(R)	SD 19	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	3	60.00%	100	100
STEWART-PEREGOY	(D)	SD 21	N		N		Y	Y	Y	1	20.00%		
STORY	(R)	SD 30	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	3	60.00%	100	81.8
TROPILA, Joe	(D)	SD 13	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	3	60.00%	33	36.4
<b>TROPILA, Mitch</b>	(D)	SD 12	Y		Y		Y	Y	N	2	40.00%	17	
TUTVEDT	(R)	SD 3	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	3	60.00%		
<b>WANZENRIED</b>	(D)	SD 49	N		N		Y	Y	N	0	0.00%	0	12.5
WILLIAMS	(D)	SD 46	N		N		Y	Y	N	0	0.00%	0	20
WINDY BOY	(D)	SD 16	Y		Y		Y	Y	N	2	40.00%	14	0
ZINKE	(R)	SD 2	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	3	60.00%		

## HOUSE

			HB 150	HB 375	HJ 4	HR 3	SB 34	SB 98	SJ 21	09 Scorecard	2007	2005	
<b>ANKNEY</b>	(R)	HD 43	Y	N	Y	Y		Y		4	80.00%	100	
<b>ARNTZEN</b>	(R)	HD 53	Y	N	Y	Y		Y		4	80.00%	100	87.5
<b>AUGARE</b>	(D)	HD 16	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y		3	60.00%	14	
<b>BARRETT</b>	(D)	HD 93	N	Y	N	N		Y		0	0.00%	100	87.5
BEAN	(R)	HD 17	Y	N	Y	Y		N		5	100.00%		
<b>BECK, Paul</b>	(D)	HD 59	N	Y	Y	N		N		2	40.00%	100	
<b>BECK, Bill</b>	(R)	HD 6	Y	N	Y	Y		N		5	100.00%		
BECKER	(D)	HD 52	N	Y	N	N		Y		0	0.00%	14	28.6
<b>BELCOURT</b>	(D)	HD 32	N	Y	Y	N		Y		1	20.00%		
<b>BENNETT</b>	(R)	HD 1	Y	N	Y	Y		N		5	100.00%		
<b>BERGREN</b>	(D)	HD 33	N	Y	N	N		Y		0	0.00%	29	50
<b>BERRY</b>	(R)	HD 45	Y	N	Y	Y		E			100.00%		
<b>BLASDEL</b>	(R)	HD 10	Y	N	Y	Y		N		5	100.00%	100	
BLEWETT *S	(D)	HD 21	N	Y	N	N		Y		0	0.00%		
<b>BOLAND</b>	(D)	HD 23	N	Y	N	N		Y		0	0.00%		
<b>BONIEK</b>	(R)	HD 61	Y	N	Y	Y		N		5	100.00%		
<b>BOSS RIBS</b>	(D)	HD 15	Y	Y	N	N		E			0.00%		
BROWN	(R)	HD 3	Y-S	N	Y	Y		E			100.00%		
BUTCHER	(R)	HD 29	Y	N	Y	Y		Y		4	80.00%	100	87.5
<b>CAFERRO</b>	(D)	HD 80	N	Y	N	N		Y		0	0.00%	0	0
CAMPBELL	(D)	HD 31	N	Y	Y	N		Y		1	20.00%	0	12.5
COHENOUR *S	(D)	HD 78	N	Y	N	N		Y		0	0.00%	0	25
DICKENSON	(D)	HD 25	N	Y	N	N		Y		0	0.00%	0	0
<b>DRISCOLL</b>	(D)	HD 51	N	Y	N	N		Y		0	0.00%	0	28.6
<b>EBINGER</b>	(D)	HD 62	Y	Y	N	N		Y		1	20.00%	14	
<b>FLEMING</b>	(D)	HD 12	N	Y	N	N		Y		0	0.00%		
<b>FRENCH</b>	(D)	HD 36	N	Y	N	N		Y		0	0.00%	14	
<b>FUREY</b>	(D)	HD 91	Y	Y	N	N		Y		1	20.00%	0	0
<b>GETZ</b>	(D)	HD 38	Y	Y	Y	N		Y		2	40.00%		
GLASER	(R)	HD 44	Y	N	Y	Y		Y		4	80.00%	86	75
<b>GRINDE</b>	(D)	HD 48	Y	Y	N	N		Y		1	20.00%	0	12.5
HAMILTON	(D)	HD 92	N	Y	N	N		Y		0	0.00%	0	0
<b>HANDS</b>	(D)	HD 99	N	Y	N	N		Y		0	0.00%	0	
HAWK	(R)	HD 90	Y	N	Y	Y		N		5	100.00%	100	100
<b>HENDRICK</b>	(R)	HD 14	Y	N	Y	Y		Y		4	80.00%	100	87.5
HENRY *S	(D)	HD 96	N	Y	N	N		Y		0	0.00%	0	0
HIMMELBERGER	(R)	HD 47	Y	N	Y	Y		N		5	100.00%	100	87.5
<b>HINER</b>	(D)	HD 85	Y	Y	N	N		Y		1	20.00%	43	37.5
<b>HOLLANDSWORTH</b>	(R)	HD 28	N	N	Y	Y		N		4	80.00%		
<b>HOLLENBAUGH</b>	(D)	HD 81	N	Y	N	N		Y		0	0.00%	0	
<b>HOVEN</b>	(R)	HD 24	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y		3	60.00%		
<b>HOWARD</b>	(R)	HD 60	Y	N	Y	Y		N		5	100.00%		
<b>HUNTER</b>	(D)	HD 79	N	Y	N	N		Y		0	0.00%		
<b>INGRAHAM</b>	(R)	HD 13	Y	N	Y	Y		N		5	100.00%	100	
JONES *S	(R)	HD 27	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y		3	60.00%	83	87.5
JOPEK	(D)	HD 4	Y	Y	N	N		Y		1	20.00%	0	12.5
KASTEN	(R)	HD 30	Y	N	Y	Y		Y		4	80.00%	100	
<b>KERNS</b>	(R)	HD 58	Y	N	Y	Y		N		5	100.00%	100	
<b>KLOCK</b>	(R)	HD 83	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y		3	60.00%	100	87.5
KOTTEL	(D)	HD 20	Y	Y	N	N		Y		1	20.00%	17	
LAKE *S	(R)	HD 88	Y	N	Y	Y		N		5	100.00%	100	100
<b>MACDONALD</b>	(D)	HD 54	N	Y	N	N		Y		0	0.00%		
<b>MACLAREN</b>	(R)	HD 89	Y	N	Y	Y		Y		4	80.00%	86	75
<b>MALEK</b>	(D)	HD 98	N	Y	N	N		Y		0	0.00%		
MCALPIN	(D)	HD 94	N	Y	N	N		Y		0	0.00%	0	14.3
<b>MCCHESNEY</b>	(D)	HD 40	Y	Y	Y	N		Y		2	40.00%	43	

<b>MCCLAFFERTY</b>	(D)	HD 75	N	Y	N	N	Y	0	0.00%		
<b>MCGILLVRAY</b>	(R)	HD 50	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>	5	100.00%	100	85.7
<b>MCNUTT</b>	(R)	HD 37	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>	5	100.00%	86	87.5
<b>MEHLHOFF</b>	(D)	HD 26	N	Y	Y	N	Y	1	20.00%		
<b>MENAHAN</b>	(D)	HD 82	N	Y	N	N	Y	0	0.00%		
MENDENHALL	(R)	HD 77	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>	5	100.00%	100	87.5
<b>MILBURN</b>	(R)	HD 19	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>	5	100.00%	100	87.5
<b>MILLER</b>	(R)	HD 84	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>	5	100.00%		
<b>MORE</b>	(R)	HD 70	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y-S</b>	<b>N</b>	5	100.00%		
MORGAN *S	(R)	HD 57	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>	5	100.00%	100	87.5
<b>NOONAN, Pat</b>	(D)	HD 73	N	Y	N	N	Y	0	0.00%	14	12.5
NOONAN, Art	(D)	HD 74	N	Y	N	N	Y	0	0.00%		
NOONEY	(R)	HD 100	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	E		80.00%	100	
<b>O'HARA</b>	(R)	HD 18	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	Y	4	80.00%	100	
<b>PEASE-LOPEZ</b>	(D)	HD 42	N	Y	N	N	Y	0	0.00%		
<b>PETERSON</b>	(R)	HD 46	N	<b>N</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>	4	80.00%	100	87.5
<b>PHILLIPS</b>	(D)	HD 66	N	Y-S	N	N	Y	0	0.00%	0	
<b>POMNICHOWSKI</b>	(D)	HD 63	<b>Y</b>	Y	N	N	<b>N</b>	2	40.00%	0	
<b>RANDALL</b>	(R)	HD 39	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>	5	100.00%		
<b>REGIER</b>	(R)	HD 5	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	Y	5	100.00%		
<b>REICHNER</b>	(R)	HD 9	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>	5	100.00%		
<b>REINHART</b>	(D)	HD 97	N	Y	Y	N	Y	1	20.00%	0	
<b>ROBERTS</b>	(R)	HD 56	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	Y	4	80.00%		
<b>ROUNDSTONE</b>	(D)	HD 41	<b>Y</b>	Y	N	N	Y	1	20.00%		
SALES	(R)	HD 68	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>	5	100.00%	100	87.5
<b>SANDS</b>	(D)	HD 95	N	Y	N	N	Y	0	0.00%	14	
<b>SESSO</b>	(D)	HD 76	N	Y	N	Y	Y	1	20.00%	14	37.5
<b>SMITH</b>	(R)	HD 55	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	N	5	100.00%		
SONJU *S	(R)	HD 7	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	Y	4	80.00%	100	100
<b>STAHL</b>	(R)	HD 35	E	<b>N</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	Y		75.00%	100	87.5
STEENSON	(D)	HD 8	<b>Y</b>	Y	Y	N	Y	2	40.00%		
STOKER	(R)	HD 87	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>	5	100.00%	100	87.5
<b>TAYLOR</b>	(R)	HD 11	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	Y	4	80.00%	100	87.5
VAN DYK *S	(D)	HD 49	N	Y	N	N	Y	0	0.00%		0
<b>VANCE</b>	(R)	HD 67	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>	5	100.00%		
VILLA	(D)	HD 86	N	Y	N	N	Y	0	0.00%	14	37.5
VINCENT *S	(R)	HD 2	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Y-S</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>	5	100.00%	100	
<b>WAGNER</b>	(R)	HD 71	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>	5	100.00%		
<b>WARBURTON</b>	(R)	HD 34	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>	5	100.00%		
<b>WASHBURN</b>	(R)	HD 69	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>	5	100.00%		
<b>WELBORN</b>	(R)	HD 72	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	Y	4	80.00%		
<b>WILMER</b>	(D)	HD 64	N	Y	N	N	Y	0	0.00%	0	
WILSON	(D)	HD 22	N	Y	N	N	Y	0	0.00%	0	25
WISEMAN	(D)	HD 65	N	Y	N	N	Y	0	0.00%	0	12.5

Votes in Bold Italic indicate support for Montanans For Multiple Use Position. Y-S indicates a yes vote by the sponsor of the bill. Blue bill number indicates MFMU support for that bill; a red bill number indicates MFMU opposition to that bill. A = Absent or Abstain E = Excused We did not count this as a vote either way

	2007 Score	2005 Score
Scott Boggio	100%	
Bill Jones	86%	85%
Tom Facey		0%
Dave Gallik		0%
Ed Hilbert	100%	
Carol Lambert	100%	75%
Mark Noennig		75%
Jerry O'Neil	100%	90.9%
Joey Jayne	0%	

34 incumbent Republicans running in House
1 Senate Republican running for House
34 incumbent Democrats running in House
2 Senate Democrats running for House
All 100 seats in the House are open
6 incumbent Republicans running in Senate
5 House Republicans running for Senate
3 incumbent Democrats running in Senate
4 House Democrats running for Senate
25 out of 50 seats in Senate are open