



NEW YORK STATE LEGISLATIVE CANDIDATE  
SURVEY REPORT  
2006

Prepared by  
Dennis R. Hawkins, Executive Director  
Denise Kronstadt, Director of Advocacy  
Trisha Trigilio, Advocacy Intern

**The Committee for Modern Courts  
Legislative Survey Report – October 31, 2006**

On September 15, 2006 the Committee for Modern Courts sent its New York State Legislative Candidate Survey to all 380 candidates for the New York State Senate and Assembly. The survey contained eight questions and focused on the issue of judicial selection. Modern Courts received 95 responses from those candidates; 25% of the total. <sup>1</sup>

This report summarizes the responses, both answers and comments, of those who answered. The breakdown of the responses shows the individual question asked, and the responses to that question based upon candidacy for the Senate or the Assembly, party, incumbency and challenger<sup>2</sup>. There are Yes (Y), No (N), Qualified Yes (QY) Qualified No (QN), Maybe, Unsure and Undecided responses. Some respondents did not answer all the questions. Many gave comments.

**Senate:**

There are 111 candidates for the 62 seats in the Senate; 38 are contested races. Modern Courts received 33 responses from Senatorial candidates. Republican incumbents provided 7 responses by letter which stated their policy against answering surveys; 4 Republican incumbents answered the survey, and 1 of those responses came from the sole Republican incumbent member of the Senate Judiciary Committee. 10 Democratic incumbents answered the survey questions – 7 are members of the Senate Judiciary Committee. 2 Republican challengers answered the survey question; 1 submitted a letter of his policy not to respond. 9 Democratic challengers answered the survey and 1 Independence party candidate answered the survey. <sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Late responses were not counted in the totals but are available on the website [www.moderncourts.org](http://www.moderncourts.org)

<sup>2</sup> Open seats were placed into the challenger category.

<sup>3</sup> See note 1

## **Assembly:**

There are 269 candidates for the 150 seats in the Assembly; 101 are contested races. Modern Courts received 62 responses from Assembly candidates. 35 of the responses came from incumbents; 28 from Democratic members and 7 from Republican members, 1 by letter. 13 Democratic challengers responded and 13 Republican candidates responded. 7 of the Democratic members of the Assembly Judiciary Committee responded, and the Chair responded by letter; no Republican member of the Judiciary Committee responded.<sup>3</sup>

## **Summary of Findings:**

**Question 1:** As you read in the cover letter to this survey, Legislative action is required to change the way we select Supreme Court justices, would you support a legislative effort to make such changes?

**Summary of Findings:** All who responded support a legislative effort to make changes in the way we select Supreme Court justices. The qualified response (QY) would support a legislative effort depending upon the details of that effort.

**Question 2:** Do you support holding public hearings to determine how to best amend our laws governing the selection of Supreme Court judicial candidates?

**Summary of Findings:** All but one respondent supported public hearings to determine how best to amend the law governing the selection of Supreme Court justices. Many commented that hearing from experts, the public, judicial candidates and academicians would be welcome and provide the information needed to make the best decision for how to select Supreme Court justices.

**Question 3:** The method of selecting judges in New York State has a direct and significant impact on the fair and efficient administration of justice. The Committee for Modern Courts believes that an appointive system represents the best method of limiting external pressures on judicial selection and diminishes the role of money and politics on the process. Would you favor replacing the present elective system for New York State Supreme Court justices with an appointive system in which a nonpartisan judicial qualification commission in each judicial district recommends well-qualified candidates?

**Summary of Findings:** By a more than two to one margin those who responded favor a commission based appointive system for selecting Supreme Court justices. Democratic incumbents and challengers were much more likely to support this approach, although a significant number of Republicans also support a commission based appointive system. Those who support a commission based appointive system believe it will diminish the role of money and politics in the selection process and provide the best qualified justices. Those against a

commission appointive system question the ability of the commission to be free from political influence and believe voters should chose the candidates. Many had conflicting thoughts on the issue and sought hearings as a means to resolve their questions.

**Question 4:** Until the Legislature enacts new laws, Supreme Court judicial candidates will be selected at open primaries. The undue influence of campaign contributions on judicial candidates would be enhanced in an open primary system. Would you support legislation that provides for public financing of judicial campaigns?

**Summary of Findings:** Assuming that there may be open primaries in September 2007, the vast majority of those who responded support public financing of judicial campaigns. Once again Democrats are much more likely to support this approach, but of those Republicans who did support public financing there was recognition that it “opened the doors” to more candidates. Those who opposed it did not want taxpayer dollars to be spent on campaigns for candidates whose views the taxpayer may not support; others wish to ensure that others programs are adequately funded before committing money to political campaigns. Comments also include the need for campaign finance reforms of some form -- even if not public financing -- were we to have primary elections.

**Question 5:** The Feerick Commission recommended a series of reforms to the current elective system that might address the constitutional issues found by the Appeals Court in Lopez Torres (see cover letter). Included in the Feerick Commission recommendations are reforms of the judicial nominating conventions. The reforms are designed to increase the participation and knowledge of delegates to the convention. They include: providing for the election of judicial delegates long before the conventions, decreasing the number of delegates, extending the term a delegate maintains his/her position, decreasing the petition signatures required for a delegate, and allowing judicial candidates to address the delegates at the convention. Would you support legislation that would include some or all of these recommendations?

**Summary of Findings:** Almost all who responded support some or all of the reforms suggested by the Feerick Commission for the judicial nominating convention system – on the condition that the reforms resolve the constitutional violations found in Lopez Torres v. New York Board of Elections. The comments include: an interest that smaller counties within a judicial district have a voice in the selection process, that the reforms would eliminate the control of party leaders and that the reforms will make for a “better slate” of candidates.

**Question 6:** Would you support another recommendation of the Feerick Commission: legislation establishing independent judicial qualifying commissions composed of appointees of local bar/civic, not for profit organizations, and law schools or local colleges or universities that would review judicial candidates and report its findings of “most qualified” directly to the delegates and the voters?

**Summary of Findings:** Of those who answered this question, 95% support establishing independent judicial qualifying commissions (IJQC) as proposed by the Feerick Commission and supported by Modern Courts. The comments include: that qualification panels would result in highly qualified candidates, eliminating political influence would have to be addressed by proper membership and structure of the commission, IJQCs would promote public confidence in the judiciary, and the findings of the commission must be reported to the public. Support for IJQC was often mentioned in response to the other questions.

**Question 7:** Other elected judges in New York State include County Court, Surrogate Court, Family Court (outside of New York City), New York City Civil Court, District Court and City Court judges. Would you support the creation of independent judicial qualification commissions to review the qualifications of those judicial candidates?

**Summary of Findings:** Almost all who responded would also support the creation of IJQC for other judges and stated similar comments to those mentioned in response to question 6.

**Question 8:** Please circle and comment on which of the following components of our court system are important to the members of your community: Jury Duty, Court Facilities, Judges, City Court, Family Court, Supreme Court, or Village or Town Courts

**Summary of Findings:** All answered that the court system and the courts in their district are important to the community they wish to serve.

The cover letter to the survey sent to the candidates, a breakdown of their responses, Modern Courts' conclusions and a list of candidates for the Senate and the Assembly are on the pages that follow. Late responses were not included in the totals but all the survey responses are available at [www.moderncourts.org](http://www.moderncourts.org).



September 20, 2006

As a member of the Legislature your ability to enact laws affecting the judicial branch of government is significant. **This survey asks your position on issues and legislation affecting your constituents and the court system.** The Committee for Modern Courts does not endorse candidates, but will publish your responses for voters' review.

**This survey focuses on one issue of particular relevance for the upcoming legislative session – judicial selection.**

The majority of New York State trial judges are elected. Some run in primaries and are elected in general elections. Supreme Court Justice candidates were nominated at a political party nominating convention and then ran in a general election – now all that must change.

On August 30, 2006, in Lopez Torres v. New York State Board of Elections, the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit unanimously upheld the District Court's ruling that New York's judicial nominating convention system of selecting Supreme Court justices is unconstitutional because it **"violated the rights of voters and the rights of candidates who lack the backing of local party leaders."** The Second Circuit also affirmed the lower courts ruling that ordered Supreme Court nominations shall be made by primary election until the New York legislature enacts another method of selecting Supreme Court justices.

In a report issued by the Commission to Promote Public Confidence in Judicial Elections ("Feerick Commission"), a survey of New York State voters conducted by the Marist Institute for Public Opinion, found that **"registered voters feel that the most important responsibilities of New York judges are making impartial decisions, protecting individuals' rights, and providing equal justice for rich and poor."** Public opinion on the influence of campaign contributions in judicial elections was found to be a source of great concern for voters, with forty seven (47%) percent of registered voters believing campaign contributions had some influence, and eighty seven (87%) percent thinking that judges should not be allowed to hear cases when their campaigns contributors are involved."

New York may no longer use judicial nominating conventions for Supreme Court Justice candidates. Echoing the District Court's finding that **"[t]he choice of a permanent remedy for this constitutional violation does not fall to me, but rather to the legislature of New York State,"** the Second Circuit reiterated that it is the Legislature which has authority to enact a new nominating scheme. The unanimous appeals Court further stated, **"...the Legislature has pledged to 'move as expeditiously as necessary to devise a working solution.' We take it at its word."**

Please answer the attached questions and comment as necessary. We thank you for taking the time to answer the questions. **The deadline for your response is October 12, 2006. Please return by facsimile or mail.**

Dennis R. Hawkins  
Executive Director

Denise Kronstadt  
Director of Advocacy

# **2006 Legislative Survey**

## **Questions and Responses**

1. As you read in the cover letter to this survey, Legislative action is required to change the way we select Supreme Court justices, would you support a legislative effort to make such changes?

<b>SENATE</b>	
Republican Incumbents (4 survey + 7 letter, 11 responses)	Y 3, QY 1, N 0
Democratic Incumbents (10 surveys)	Y 10, N 0
Republican Challengers (2 surveys + 1 letter, 3 responses)	Y 2, N 0
Democratic Challengers (9 surveys)	Y 9, N 0
<b>Total : 33 responses (25 surveys + 8 letters)</b>	<b>Y 24, QY 1, N 0</b>
<b>ASSEMBLY</b>	
Republican Incumbents (7 surveys + 1 letter, 8 responses)	Y 7, N 0
Democratic Incumbents (26 survey + 1 letter, 27 responses)	Y 26, N 0
Republican Challengers (12 survey + 1 letter, 13 responses)	Y 13, N 0
Democratic Challengers (13 surveys)	Y 13, N 0
<b>Totals 61 ( 59 surveys + 2 letters)</b>	<b>Y 59, N 0</b>
<b>TOTAL OF SENATE AND ASSEMBLY</b>	<b>Y 83, N 0</b>

All who responded support a legislative effort to make changes in the way we select Supreme Court justices. The qualified response (QY) would support a legislative effort depending upon the details of that effort.

2. Do you support holding public hearings to determine how to best amend our laws governing the selection of Supreme Court judicial candidates?

<b>SENATE</b>	
Republican Incumbents (4 survey + 7 letter, 11 responses)	Y 4, N 0
Democratic Incumbents (10 surveys)	Y 10, N 0
Republican Challengers (2 surveys + 1 letter, 3 responses)	Y 1, N 1
Democratic Challengers (9 surveys)	Y 9, N 0
<b>Total : 33 responses (25 surveys + 8 letters)</b>	<b>Y 24, N 1</b>
<b>ASSEMBLY</b>	
Republican Incumbents (7 surveys + 1 letter, 8 responses)	Y 7, N 0
Democratic Incumbents (26 survey + 1 letter, 27 responses)	Y 26, N 0
Republican Challengers (12 survey + 1 letter, 13 responses)	Y 13, N 0
Democratic Challengers (13 surveys)	Y 13, N 0
<b>Totals 61 ( 59 surveys + 2 letters)</b>	<b>Y 59, N 0</b>
<b>TOTAL OF SENATE AND ASSEMBLY</b>	<b>Y 83, N 1</b>

All but one respondent supported public hearings to determine how best to amend the law governing the selection of Supreme Court justices. Many commented that hearing from experts, the public, judicial candidates and academicians would be welcome and provide the information needed to make the best decision for how to select Supreme Court justices.

3. The method of selecting judges in New York State has a direct and significant impact on the fair and efficient administration of justice. The Committee for Modern Courts believes that an appointive system represents the best method of limiting external pressures on judicial selection and diminishes the role of money and politics on the process. Would you favor replacing the present elective system for New York State Supreme Court justices with an appointive system in which a nonpartisan judicial qualification commission in each judicial district recommends well-qualified candidates?

<b>SENATE</b>	
Republican Incumbents (4 survey + 7 letter, 11 responses)	Y 1, Maybe 1, N 2
Democratic Incumbents (10 surveys)	Y 4, Maybe 2, Combo 1, Und 1, N 2
Republican Challengers (2 surveys + 1 letter, 3 responses)	Y 2, N 0
Democratic Challengers (9 surveys)	Y 6, Maybe 1, N 2
<b>Total : 33 responses (25 surveys + 8 letters)</b>	<b>Y 13, N 6 (misc. above)</b>
<b>ASSEMBLY</b>	
Republican Incumbents (7 surveys + 1 letter, 8 responses)	Y 4, N 3
Democratic Incumbents (26 survey + 1 letter, 27 responses)	Y 18, N 5, QY 2 (1 no response)
Republican Challengers (12 survey + 1 letter, 13 responses)	Y 9, N 3, Maybe 1
Democratic Challengers (13 surveys)	Y 9, N 4
<b>Totals 61 ( 59 surveys + 2 letters)</b>	<b>Y 40, N 15 (misc. above)</b>
<b>TOTAL OF SENATE AND ASSEMBLY</b>	<b>Y 53, N 21</b>

By a more than two to one margin those who responded favor a commission based appointive system for selecting Supreme Court justices. Democratic incumbents and challengers were much more likely to support this approach, although a significant number of Republicans also support a commission based appointive system. Those who support a commission based appointive system believe it will diminish the role of money and politics in the selection process and provide the best qualified justices. Those against a commission appointive system question the ability of the commission to be free from political influence and believe voters should chose the candidates. Many had conflicting thoughts on the issue and sought hearings as a means to resolve their questions.

4. Until the Legislature enacts new laws, Supreme Court judicial candidates will be selected at open primaries. The undue influence of campaign contributions on judicial candidates would be enhanced in an open primary system. Would you support legislation that provides for public financing of judicial campaigns?

<b>SENATE</b>	
Republican Incumbents (4 survey + 7 letter, 11 responses)	Y 2, N 0, QY 1, Maybe 2
Democratic Incumbents (10 surveys)	Y 9, N 1
Republican Challengers (2 surveys + 1 letter, 3 responses)	Y 2, N 0
Democratic Challengers (9 surveys)	Y 9, N 0
<b>Total : 33 responses (25 surveys + 8 letters)</b>	<b>Y 22, N 1 (misc. above)</b>
<b>ASSEMBLY</b>	
Republican Incumbents (7 surveys + 1 letter, 8 responses)	Y 1, N 5, QY 1
Democratic Incumbents (26 survey + 1 letter, 27 responses)	Y 22, N 3, QY 1
Republican Challengers (12 survey + 1 letter, 13 responses)	Y 9, N 4, (sunset 1, maybe no 4)
Democratic Challengers (13 surveys)	Y 12, N 0, QY 1
<b>Totals 61 ( 59 surveys + 2 letters)</b>	<b>Y 44, N 12 (misc. above)</b>
<b>TOTAL OF SENATE AND ASSEMBLY</b>	<b>Y 66, N 13</b>

Assuming that there may be open primaries in September 2007, the vast majority of those who responded support public financing of judicial campaigns. Once again Democrats are much more likely to support this approach, but of those Republicans who did support public financing there was recognition that it “opened the doors” to more candidates. Those who opposed it did not want taxpayer dollars to be spent on campaigns for candidates whose views the taxpayer may not support; others wish to ensure that others programs are adequately funded before committing money to political campaigns. Comments also include the need for campaign finance reforms of some form -- even if not public financing -- were we to have primary elections.

5. The Feerick Commission recommended a series of reforms to the current elective system that might address the constitutional issues found by the Appeals Court in *Lopez Torres* (see cover letter). Included in the Feerick Commission recommendations are reforms of the judicial nominating conventions. The reforms are designed to increase the participation and knowledge of delegates to the convention. They include:

- providing for the election of judicial delegates long before the conventions,
- decreasing the number of delegates,
- extending the term a delegate maintains his/her position,
- decreasing the petition signatures required for a delegate, and
- allowing judicial candidates to address the delegates at the convention.

Would you support legislation that would include some or all of these recommendations?

<b>SENATE</b>	
Republican Incumbents (4 survey + 7 letter, 11 responses)	Y 2, N 1, QY 1
Democratic Incumbents (10 surveys)	Y 7, N 0, Maybe 1, Unsure 1, MN 1
Republican Challengers (2 surveys + 1 letter, 3 responses)	Y 2, N 0
Democratic Challengers (9 surveys)	Y 8, N 1
<b>Total : 33 responses (25 surveys + 8 letters)</b>	<b>Y 19, N 2 (misc. above)</b>
<b>ASSEMBLY</b>	
Republican Incumbents (7 surveys + 1 letter, 8 responses)	Y 5, N 1, QY 1
Democratic Incumbents (26 survey + 1 letter, 27 responses)	Y 24, N 1, QY 1
Republican Challengers (12 survey + 1 letter, 13 responses)	Y 11, N 1
Democratic Challengers (13 surveys)	Y 12, N 1
<b>Totals 61 ( 59 surveys + 2 letters)</b>	<b>Y 52, N 4 (misc. above)</b>
<b>TOTAL OF SENATE AND ASSEMBLY</b>	<b>Y 71, N 6</b>

Almost all who responded support some or all of the reforms suggested by the Feerick Commission for the judicial nominating convention system – on the condition that the reforms resolve the constitutional violations found in *Lopez Torres v. New York Board of Elections*. The comments include: an interest that smaller counties within a judicial district have a voice in the selection process, that the reforms would eliminate the control of party leaders and that the reforms will make for a “better slate” of candidates.

6. Would you support another recommendation of the Feerick Commission: legislation establishing independent judicial qualifying commissions composed of appointees of local bar/civic, not for profit organizations, and law schools or local colleges or universities that would review judicial candidates and report its findings of “most qualified” directly to the delegates and the voters?

<b>SENATE</b>	
Republican Incumbents (4 survey + 7 letter, 11 responses)	Y 3, N 0, QY 1
Democratic Incumbents (10 surveys)	Y 8, N 0, Maybe 1, Uns 1
Republican Challengers (2 surveys + 1 letter, 3 responses)	Y 2, N 0
Democratic Challengers (9 surveys)	Y 9, N 0
<b>Total : 33 responses (25 surveys + 8 letters)</b>	<b>Y 22, No 0 (misc. above)</b>
<b>ASSEMBLY</b>	
Republican Incumbents (7 surveys + 1 letter, 8 responses)	Y 5, N 1, QY 1
Democratic Incumbents (26 survey + 1 letter, 27 responses)	Y 23, N 1, QY 1, QN 1
Republican Challengers (12 survey + 1 letter, 13 responses)	Y 9, N 2, QY 1
Democratic Challengers (13 surveys)	Y 12, N 0, QY 1
<b>Totals 61 ( 59 surveys + 2 letters)</b>	<b>Y 49, N 4 (misc. above)</b>
<b>TOTAL OF SENATE AND ASSEMBLY</b>	<b>Y 71, N 4</b>

Of those who answered this question, 95% support establishing independent judicial qualifying commissions (IJQC) as proposed by the Feerick Commission and supported by Modern Courts. The comments include: that screening panels would result in highly qualified candidates, eliminating political influence would have to be addressed by proper membership and structure of the commission, IJQCs would promote public confidence in the judiciary, and the findings of the commission must be reported to the public. Support for IJQC was often mentioned in response to the other questions.

7. Other elected judges in New York State include County Court, Surrogate Court, Family Court (outside of New York City), New York City Civil Court, District Court and City Court judges. Would you support the creation of independent judicial qualification commissions to review the qualifications of those judicial candidates?

<b>SENATE</b>	
Republican Incumbents (4 survey + 7 letter, 11 responses)	Y 3, N 0, QY 1
Democratic Incumbents (10 surveys)	Y 9, N 0, Maybe 1
Republican Challengers (2 surveys + 1 letter, 3 responses)	Y 2, N 0
Democratic Challengers (9 surveys)	Y 8, N 1
<b>Total : 33 responses (25 surveys + 8 letters)</b>	<b>Y 22, N 1 (Misc. above)</b>
<b>ASSEMBLY</b>	
Republican Incumbents (7 surveys + 1 letter, 8 responses)	Y 7, N 0
Democratic Incumbents (26 survey + 1 letter, 27 responses)	Y 24, N 1, Undecided 1
Republican Challengers (12 survey + 1 letter, 13 responses)	Y 10, N 1, QY 1
Democratic Challengers (13 surveys)	Y 13, N 0
<b>Totals 61 ( 59 surveys + 2 letters)</b>	<b>Y 54, N 2 (misc. above)</b>
<b>TOTAL OF SENATE AND ASSEMBLY</b>	<b>Y 76, N 3</b>

Almost all who responded would also support the creation of IJQC for other judges and stated similar comments to those mentioned in response to question 6.

8. Please circle and comment on which of the following components of our court system are important to the members of your community.

Jury Duty  
Court Facilities  
City Court  
Judges  
Family Court  
Supreme Court  
Village or Town Courts

All answered that the court system and the courts in their district are important to the community they wish to serve.

*The responses to this survey by the candidates may be found at [www.moderncourts.org](http://www.moderncourts.org)*

**List of Candidates for the New York State  
Senate and Assembly**

**Names in Bold are those who responded to survey  
Names with an asterisk are incumbents**

Senate District	Republican	Democrat
1 Eastern LI	Kenneth P. Lavallo*	Michael Comando
2 Long Island (Suffolk)	John J. Flanagan*	Brooke Ellison
3 Long Island (Suffolk)	Caesar Trunzo*	Jimmy Dahroug
4 Long Island (Suffolk)	Owen H. Johnson*	James J. Mc Donald
5 Long Island (Suffolk/Nassau)	Carl L. Marcellino*	Leslie C. Bielanski
6 Long Island (Nassau)	<b>Kemp Hannon*</b>	Casilda E. Roper-Simpson
7 Long Island (Nassau)	Michael A. Balboni*	Joseph Hand
8 Long Island (Suffolk/Nassau)	Charles J. Fuschillo, Jr.*	Adam E. Small
9 Long Island (Nassau)	Dean G. Skelos*	<b>Odelia Goldberg</b>
10 Queens	Jereline Hunter	Shirley L. Huntley
11 Queens	<b>Frank Padavan*</b>	<b>Nora C. Marino</b>
12 Queens		George Onorato*
13 Queens		John D. Sabini*

Senate District	Republican	Democrat
14 Queens		<b>Malcolm A. Smith*</b>
15 Queens	<b>Serphin R. Maltese*</b>	Albert Baldeo
16 Queens		Toby Ann Stavisky*
17 Brooklyn	<b>Victor F. Guarino</b>	<b>Martin M. Dilan*</b>
18 Brooklyn	Viviana Vazquez- Hernandez	<b>Velmanette Montgomery*</b>
19 Brooklyn	Mary J. Vicino	John L. Sampson*
20 Brooklyn		Eric Adams
21 Brooklyn	Salvatore Grupico	Kevin S. Parker*
22 Brooklyn	<b>Martin J. Golden*</b>	
23 Brooklyn/Staten		<b>Diane J. Savino*</b>
24 Staten Island	Andrew J. Lanza	Matthew J. Titone
25 Brooklyn/Manh.		Martin Connor*
26 Manhattan	Philip Pidot	<b>Liz Krueger*</b>
27 Brooklyn		Carl Kruger*

Senate District	Republican	Democrat
28 Manhattan/Bronx		Jose Serrano*
29 Manhattan	Dan Russo	<b>Thomas K. Duane*</b>
30 Manhattan	<b>Alphonzo Mosley</b>	Bill Perkins
31 Manhattan/Bronx	Stylo A. Sapaskis	<b>Eric T. Schneiderman*</b>
32 Bronx	Arlene Anderson	Ruben Diaz*
33 Bronx		Efrain Gonzalez Jr.*
34 Bronx/Westches.	Joseph J. Savino	<b>Jeffrey D. Klein*</b>
35 Westchester	<b>Nick Spano*</b>	<b>Andrea Stewart-Cousins</b>
36 Bronx/Westches.	Curtis Brooks	Ruth H. Thompson*
37 Westchester		<b>Suzi Oppenheimer*</b>
38 Rockland/Orange Counties	Thomas P. Morahan*	Nancy Low-Hogan
39 Orange/Ulster Counties	<b>William J. Larkin, Jr.*</b>	<b>Christopher P. McBride</b>
40 Westchester, Putnam, Dutchess	<b>Vincent L. Leibell, III*</b>	<b>Michael B. Kaplowitz</b>
41 Dutchess, Columbia	<b>Stephen M. Saland*</b>	Brian Keeler

Senate District	Republican	Democrat
42 Del, Sull, Orange, Ulster	<b>John J. Bonacic*</b>	<b>Susan E. Zimet</b>
43 Rensselaer, Saratoga	Joseph L. Bruno*	
44 Schen, Mont, Fulton, Sara	<b>Hugh T. Farley*</b>	Gary R. McCarthy
45  (Many)	Elizabeth O’C. Little*	Timothy C. Merrick
46  (Albany)		<b>Neil D. Breslin*</b>
47  Lewis, Oneida, St. Lawrence	Joseph A. Griffo	<b>John L. Murad</b>
48  Jefferson, Oswego, St. Lawrence	James W. Wright*	
49  Madison, Cayuga, Oneida., Onondaga	<b>Jeff Brown</b>	David J. Valesky*
50  Onondaga	John A. DeFrancisco*	Carol E. Mulcahy
51  Otsego, Schoharie Herkimer	James L. Seward*	
52  Broome, Tioga, Chenango	Thomas W. Libous*	<b>Mark Trabucco</b>
53  Steuben, Yates, Schyler, Chemung, Tompkins	George H. Winner, Jr.*	
54  Seneca, Ontario, Wayne, Cayuga	Michael F. Nozzolio*	

Senate District	Republican	Democrat
55 Western NY (Monroe)	Jim Alesi*	Eugene F. Saltzberg
56 Western NY (Monroe)	Joseph E. Robach*	Willa Powell
57 Buff/Western NY (Alleg, Cattar, Chaut, Livingst.)	Catharine M. Young*	
58 Buffalo (Erie)	Joseph J. Mesler	<b>William T. Stachowski*</b>
59 Buff/Western NY (Wyo, Erie, Livings, Ontario)	Dale M. Volker*	<b>Thomas Casey</b>
60 Buff/Western NY (Erie, Niagara)		Antoine M. Thompson
61 Buff/Western NY (Genessee, Erie)	Mary Lou Rath*	Richard L. Woll
62 Western NY (Orleans, Monroe, Niagara)	George D. Maziarz*	Christopher M. Srock

Assembly District	Democrat	Republican
1 Eastern LI	Marc S. Alessi*	<b>Daniel J. Panico</b>
2 Eastern LI	M. Treewolf West	<b>Fred W. Thiele, Jr.*</b>
3 Long Island (Suffolk)	Patricia A. Eddington*	Scott J. Salimando
4 Long Island (Suffolk)	Steven Englebright*	<b>Bruce C. Bennett</b>
5 Long Island (Suffolk)	Ginny A. Fields*	William M. Faulk, Jr.
6 Long Island (Suffolk)	Philip R. Ramos*	Waldo P. Cabrera
7 Long Island (Suffolk)	Grace Kelly-McGovern	Michael J. Fitzpatrick*
8 Long Island (Suffolk)	Dennis M. Cohen	Philip M. Boyle*
9 Long Island (Suffolk)	Gerard J. McCreight	<b>Andrew P. Raia*</b>
10 Long Island (Nassau/Suffolk)	Barbara A. Lo Moriello	James D. Conte*
11 Long Island (Suffolk)	<b>Robert K. Sweeney*</b>	
12 Long Island (Nassau)	<b>Craig S. Heller</b>	Joseph S. Saladino*
13 Long Island (Nassau)	<b>Charles D. Lavine*</b>	Steve J. Gonzalez

Assembly District	Democrat	Republican
14 Long Island (Nassau)	Daniel A. Torres	Robert D. Barra*
15 Long Island (Nassau)	Robert Walker*	Matthew Pangburn
16 Long Island (Nassau)	<b>Thomas P. DiNapoli*</b>	Louis F. Chisari
17 Long Island (Nassau)	Dolores D. Sedacca	Thomas McKeivitt*
18 Long Island (Nassau)	Earlene Hooper*	J. Barrington Jackson
19 Long Island (Nassau)	Donald Birnbaum	David G. McDonough*
20 Long Island (Nassau)	Harvey Weisenberg*	<b>Francis X. McQuade</b>
21 Long Island (Nassau)	Alfred D. Cooper, Sr.	Thomas W. Alfano*
22 Queens	Ellen Young	Christopher M. Migliaccio
23 Queens	<b>Audrey I. Pheffer*</b>	<b>Stuart Mirsky</b>
24 Queens	Mark S. Weprin*	
25 Queens	Rory I. Lancman (Current Senator)	Morshed Alam
26 Queens	Ann Margaret E. Carrozza*	
27 Queens	Nettie Mayersohn*	

Assembly District	Democrat	Republican
28 Queens	Andrew D. Hevesi*	Dolores Maddis
29 Queens	William Scarborough*	
30 Queens	Margaret M. Markey*	
31 Queens	Michele R. Titus*	
32 Queens	Vivian E. Cook*	
33 Queens	Barbara M. Clark*	
34 Queens	<b>Ivan C. Lafayette*</b>	
35 Queens	Jeffrion L. Aubry*	
36 Queens	Michael N. Gianaris*	
37 Queens	Catherine T. Nolan*	
38 Queens		Anthony S. Seminerio*
39 Queens	Jose R. Peralta*	
40 Brooklyn	Diane Gordon*	Godfrey Jelks
41 Brooklyn	<b>Helene E. Weinstein*</b>	Jack Benton

Assembly District	Democrat	Republican
42 Brooklyn	Rhoda S. Jacobs*	Harriet Katz
43 Brooklyn	Karim Camara*	Kenneth E. Cook
44 Brooklyn	<b>James F. Brennan*</b>	Yvette Velazquez Bennett
45 Brooklyn		Steven Cymbrowitz*
46 Brooklyn	Alec Brook-Krasny	<b>Patricia B. Laudano</b>
47 Brooklyn	William Colton*	Phyllis Carbo
48 Brooklyn		Dov Hikind*
49 Brooklyn	Peter J. Abbate Jr.*	<b>Lucretia Regina-Potter</b>
50 Brooklyn	Joseph R. Lentol*	Richard Trainor
51 Brooklyn	Felix W. Ortiz*	Washington G. Artus
52 Brooklyn	Joan L. Millman*	<b>Rosemarie Markgraf</b>
53 Brooklyn	Vito J. Lopez*	Ameriar Feliciano
54 Brooklyn	Darryl C. Towns*	<b>Khorshed A. Chowdhury</b>
55 Brooklyn	William F. Boyland Jr.*	Rose Laney

Assembly District	Democrat	Republican
56 Brooklyn	Annette M. Robinson*	
57 Brooklyn	Hakeem Jeffries	Henry P. Weinstein
58 Brooklyn	N. Nick Perry*	
59 Brooklyn	Alan N. Maisel*	
60 Brooklyn/Staten	D. Janele Hyer-Spencer	Anthony C. Xanthakis
61 Staten Island	John W. Lavelle*	Rose Margarella
62 Staten Island		Vincent M. Ignizio*
63 Staten Island	Michael J. Cusick*	Victor A. Grossman
64 Manhattan	Sheldon Silver*	Michael A. Imperiale
65 Manhattan	<b>Alexander Pete Grannis*</b>	Michael Fandal
66 Manhattan		Deborah J. Glick*
67 Manhattan	Linda B. Rosenthal*	Theodore Howard
68 Manhattan	<b>Adam C. Powell*</b>	Dean L. Velasco
69 Manhattan	Daniel J. O'Donnell*	

Assembly District	Democrat	Republican
70 Manhattan	Keith LT Wright*	
71 Manhattan	Herman D. Farrell Jr.*	Glenda Allen
72 Manhattan	Adriano Espaillat*	Martin Chicon
73 Manhattan	<b>Jonathan L. Bing*</b>	Robert Heim
74 Manhattan	Brian P. Kavanagh	Frank J. Scala
75 Manhattan	<b>Richard N. Gottfried*</b>	
76 Bronx	Peter M. Rivera*	<b>Steven Stem</b>
77 Bronx	Aurelia Greene*	Kathleen B. Larkins
78 Bronx	Jose Rivera*	William J. Sullivan
79 Bronx	Michael A. Benjamin*	Sharon L. Grady
80 Bronx	Naomi Rivera*	Frank Olivo
81 Bronx	<b>Jeffrey Dinowitz*</b>	
82 Bronx	Michael R. Benedetto*	<b>Raymond Capone</b>
83 Bronx	Carl E. Heastie*	Willie Bowman

Assembly District	Democrat	Republican
84 Bronx	Carmen E. Arroyo*	David Rosado
85 Bronx	Ruben Diaz Jr.*	William J. McDonagh
86 Bronx	Luis M. Diaz*	Sham Ninah
87 Westchester	<b>J. Gary Pretlow*</b>	Barbara Snyder
88 Westchester	<b>Amy R. Paulin*</b>	Jim Coleman
89 Westchester	<b>Adam T. Bradley*</b>	
90 Putnam/Westch.	<b>Sandra R. Galef*</b>	
91 Westchester	George S. Latimer*	
92 Westchester	Richard L. Brodsky*	
93 Westchester	<b>Shelley B. Mayer</b>	Mike Spano
94 Rockland	<b>Kenneth P. Zebrowski*</b>	
95 Rockland	<b>Ellen C. Jaffee</b>	<b>Joseph P. Brennan</b>
96 Orange/Rockland	<b>Richard Randazzo</b>	<b>Nancy Calhoun*</b>
97 Orange/Rockland	Michael D. Paduch	<b>Ann G. Rabbitt*</b>

Assembly District	Democrat	Republican
98 Orange/Sullivan	Aileen M. Gunther*	
99 Dutch, Putnam, Westchester.	<b>Kenneth P. Harper</b>	Greg Ball
100 Dutchess, Orange, Ulster	<b>Eleanor Thompson</b>	Thomas J. Kirwan*
101 Dutchess, Ulster	Kevin A. Cahill*	
102 Dutchess	Joel C. Tyner	Joel M. Miller*
103 Columbia/Dutchess	<b>Virginia S. Martin</b>	Marcus Molinaro
104 Albany	<b>John J. McEneny*</b>	
105 Montgomery/ Schenectady	<b>Paul D. Tonko*</b>	John R. Mertz
106 Albany, Rensselaer, Saratoga	<b>Ronald J. Canestrari*</b>	Kandi S. Terry
107 Broome, Delaware, Ulster	Kelly Keck	Clifford W. Crouch*
108 Rensselaer, Columbia +	Timothy P. Gordon	<b>Marin T. Reid</b>
109 Albany/Saratoga	Robert P. Reilly*	Paulette M. Barlette
110 Saratoga/ Schnectady	<b>Michael C. Eidens</b>	James N. Tedisco*
111 Madison, Oneida, Otsego	Bill Magee*	

Assembly District	Democrat	Republican
112 Rensselaer, Saratoga Washington	David J. Carter	Roy J. McDonald*
113 Warren, Hamilton, Essex		Teresa R. Sayward*
114 Clinton, Essex, Franklin	Andrew D. Brockway	Janet L. Duprey
115 Oneida, Oswego	<b>David J. Gordon</b>	<b>David R. Townsend, Jr.*</b>
116 Oneida	Ro Ann M. Destitio*	
117 Fulton, Herkimer Otsego		Marc W. Butler*
118 Jefferson, St Lawrence	Darrel J. Aubertine*	
119 Onondaga	<b>Joan K. Christensen*</b>	Jacques Zenner
120 Onondaga	William B. Magnarelli*	
121 Onondaga,	Albert A. Stripe, Jr.	William H. Meyer, Jr.
122 Lewis, Jefferson St. Lawrence	Karl R. Williams	Dierdre K. Scozzafava*
123 Cortland, Tioga, Chenago, Broome	<b>Barbara Abbott King</b>	Gary D. Finch*
124 Onondaga, Oswego	J. Edward Putnam	William A. Barclay*
125 Cortland, Tompkins	Barbara S. Lifton*	<b>Jim R. Rohan</b>

Assembly District	Democrat	Republican
126 Broome	<b>Donna A. Lupardo*</b>	Jay J. Dinga
127 Schoharie, Greene Columbia	W. Scott Trees	Peter D. Lopez
128 Wayne +		<b>Robert C. Oaks*</b>
129 Ontario, Seneca, Cayuga		<b>Brian M. Kolb*</b>
130 Ontario, Livingston Monroe	<b>Daniel C. West</b>	Joe Errigo*
131 Western NY (Monroe)	<b>Susan V. John*</b>	John J. Ferlicca
132 Western NY (Monroe)	<b>Joseph D. Morelle*</b>	Samuel R. Trapani
133 Western NY (Monroe)	David F. Gantt*	Carlos Q. Coker
134 Western NY (Monroe)	<b>Philip A. Fedele</b>	Bill Reilich*
135 Western NY (Monroe)	<b>David R. Koon*</b>	Mark C. Johns
136 Western NY (Steuben, Yates)		James G. Bacalles*
137 Chemung, Schuyler, Tioga		Tom O'Mara*
138 Niagara	Francine DelMonte*	Daniel J. Bazzani
139 Orleans, Genesee Monroe	<b>Gary F. Kent</b>	Stephen M. Hawley*

Assembly District	Democrat	Republican
140 Buffalo (Erie, Niagara)	Robin Schimminger*	Catherine G. Schwandt
141 Buffalo (Erie)	Crystal D. Peoples*	
142 Buffalo (Erie, Niagara)	Laura Monte	<b>Michael W. Cole*</b>
143 Buffalo (Erie)	Dennis H. Gabryszak	Jeffrey N. Sell
144 Buffalo (Erie)	<b>Sam Hoyt*</b>	Rus Thompson
145 Buffalo (Erie)	Mark J. Schroeder*	Richard E. Zajac
146 Buffalo (Erie)	<b>Maximillian G. Tresmond</b>	Jack Quinn*
147 Western NY (Many)	Judith A. Hunter	Daniel J. Burling*
148 Buffalo (Erie, Niagara)	Susan J. Grelick	James P. Hayes*
149 Western NY (All, Catt, Chaut)	Linda L. Witte	Joseph M. Giglio*
150 Western NY (Chautauqua)	William L. Parment*	