



Texas League of Conservation Voters 2007 Legislative Scorecard

The Texas League of Conservation Voters

Who we are... and what we do

The Texas League of Conservation Voters works to preserve and enhance the quality of life of Texans by making conservation a top priority with Texas elected officials, political candidates and voters.

We elect champions. With money and other resources, we help elect candidates to the Texas Legislature who will fight for clean air, clean water, and access to public lands, water, fish and wildlife. TLCV conducts rigorous candidate research and we concentrate on the races we can impact. We educate candidates on how to use pro-conservation positions to win votes. We put money into hard-hitting, independent media campaigns contrasting the candidates' position on the issues – making sure that an effective message reaches voters. ■ **In the 2006 election, the TLCV Political Action Committee (PAC) helped elect three challengers who defeated bad incumbents, defend two good incumbents, and win two open seats for the conservation community.**

We fight at the Legislature. We aggressively lobby the Texas Legislature on the most important conservation bills and work to make sure your voice is heard. Through our endorsements and campaign work, TLCV creates deep, long-term relationships on behalf of the conservation community. Relationships like these are key to getting our issues addressed, and legislation passed.

We hold politicians accountable. At the end of each legislative session we publish and distribute our Legislative Scorecard. We rate the performance of each individual legislator on key environmental legislation and describe the key conservation issues. We then distribute our Scorecard to TLCV supporters, friends, partner organizations, and the media.

About the Scorecard

Our scorecard provides objective, factual information about conservation voting records and helps hold the Texas Legislature accountable.

This year's TLCV scorecard covers a range of votes and issues including: water and air quality, funding for state parks, energy, global warming, and waste disposal. Each vote scored presented a clear choice for our elected officials to uphold the conservation values shared by Texans.

Scores reflect only part of each legislator's conservation record.

Leadership in committee, caucuses and during floor debate, as well as vision and determination, also play a crucial role in establishing a legislator's record.

The Senate continues to operate too much like a private club and less open than we would like. There were not enough record votes in the Senate for a meaningful scorecard. We have instead provided a Senate narrative discussing key votes, legislation filed, and other helpful insights.

This year's House scorecard includes votes on some important conservation legislation which passed with unanimous or near-unanimous consent because of its "apple pie" type qualities. This caused all legislators to start with a much higher "base" score than in

previous scorecards. This was also due in part to a positive House procedural change requiring all final votes on bills to be recorded. In the past, these highly negotiated "consensus" bills were passed by a voice vote making them impossible to score. In the interest of accuracy and fairness, and to avoid the appearance of "picking and choosing" votes, they are now included.

The pro-conservation votes are marked as positive and incorrect votes are marked as negative. Absences are marked with an "A" and are not counted as negative votes in the score.

The 2007 Session in Review

Will the 2007 Legislative Session will be seen as a turning point for conservation in Texas?

It's not so much that great legislation was passed—though there were a few successes—but more that, in the 2007 legislature, we were no longer moving backward. Unlike the 2003 and 2005 sessions, conservation advocates didn't have to spend vast amounts of time and effort fighting bad bills. That said, there were numerous missed opportunities to fix dirty power plant permitting, address climate change, and secure a cleaner more sustainable energy future for Texas.

The scorecard also reflects the sad truth that many key conservation votes fell

along partisan lines with Republicans significantly underperforming Democrats. Numerous polls show that this partisan divide is close to non-existent among the voting public concerning core conservation issues.

As noted, the 2007 Legislature did manage to take a few small steps forward. Thanks to the work of a large and diverse group of advocates, our state parks finally received a much needed boost in funding. A modest energy efficiency bill was passed. Bills to protect our rivers and bays and promote water conservation were successful. And the money to fund

our state program for clean air initiatives in large urban areas was re-appropriated back into the program.

Much of this progress can be attributed to direct political pressure from Texas voters. The political winds for both political parties are shifting in Texas, with conservation issues like clean air and global warming becoming top issues for concerned voters. TLCV is confident that this political trend will only increase as we head into the 2008 political season. The 2007 TLCV legislative scorecard will be a useful tool for voters to assess their incumbents—and vote accordingly.

Leadership: Trouble at the top

Gov. Rick Perry

Gov. Perry—who took \$400,000 in campaign contributions from TXU—decided to fast-track 11 TXU proposed coal-fired power plants. This disastrous and misguided executive order galvanized opposition from urban mayors, citizens, the business community, and even the normally pro-TXU legislature. In the end, Gov. Perry was spared any major embarrassment at the hands of the legislature. TXU, its stock price driven down in part from environmental liability concerns, was bought by a private equity firm. The new buyers decided to negotiate with environmentalists and scrap a large portion of TXU's coal plant expansion plans.

Gov. Perry's wielded his veto pen on two pieces of environmental legislation - perplexing advocates and neutral observers alike. One victim was HB 3457, which prohibited school buses from idling for long periods while parked on a school campus or at a school event. More than 4 million Texas schoolchildren breathe dirty air from buses, and the bill had the added benefit of saving school districts money.

The House Committee on Environmental Regulations Chairman, Rep. Dennis Bonnen, is notorious for killing or burying good conservation bills. So it was a bit odd that Gov. Perry chose to wield his veto pen on Rep. Bonnen's own HB 2713. This bill created an interim committee to study electricity generation and its impacts on the environment. This "study" bill was largely seen by the conservation community as a way for the legislature to avoid passing any significant legislation on air quality issues or global warming. Apparently, even thinking about the problem was too much for Perry.

Gov. Perry's hostility toward addressing global warming shouldn't take anyone by surprise. While Republican governors from California to Utah, Florida and Con-

necticut are leading on global warming, Perry was quoted in the press as saying, "I am not going to put the state of Texas in a competitive economic disadvantage on some science that may or may not be correct."

We ask Governor Perry to listen to his fellow Aggies. The tenured faculty of the Atmospheric Sciences Department, including the state's official Climatologist John Nielsen-Gammon, has unanimously endorsed a statement on climate change, saying in part: "It is virtually certain that the climate is warming, and . . . it is very likely that humans are responsible for most of the recent warming."

Lt. Gov. David Dewhurst

Lt. Gov. Dewhurst is perhaps the most frustrating of our state's three top legislative elected leaders. He often talks about doing the right thing, and his legislative office is always willing to meet and talk with the conservation community. The problem is, he rarely actually does anything truly positive. In fact, this session, the one time he acted on an important environmental issue, he actively rallied votes to make sure a really bad bill, SB 1317, had enough votes to pass. SB 1317 would have taken away the city of Houston's ability to clean up regional toxic air pollution and protect the people of Houston. It's been speculated that Dewhurst was motivated by the desire to harm Houston Mayor, Bill White, a future potential political rival. He also joins Gov. Perry in his skepticism over global warming science saying that there's "an absence of scientific consensus on the causes of climate change".

Speaker Tom Craddick

Speaker Craddick is the biggest obstacle to conservation legislation. As they often say in politics—follow the money. At

the start of the session, Craddick's campaign account registered a whopping \$4 million dollars. His contributor list is a who's who of industry polluters and big-time developers.

Let's take a look at how he stacks the House Environmental Regulation Committee to make sure his contributors get their money's worth. The committee is composed of seven House members. Of those seven, two are Democrats—neither of which represents districts with significant pollution problems. In fact, none of the committee members represents an inner city district where our worst pollution problems are found. The House at large is 54% Republican versus the committee which is 71%. Five of the seven committee members received "F's" on our scorecard. The committee's average score was 41%. Never was the phrase "the foxes are guarding the henhouse" more appropriate.

Craddick's appointment to chair the House Environmental Regulations Committee, Angleton Republican **DENNIS BONNEN**, effectively squashes any sensible environmental legislation that hasn't received pre-approval from the polluter lobby. Most bills suffer one of two fates: they're never brought up for public testimony or they're left in committee to die. In that sense, Chairman Bonnen is merely fulfilling his marching orders from Speaker Craddick. What sets Chairman Bonnen apart, and has earned him the nickname, "Dennis the Menace" from House colleagues, is his rude and bullying tactics towards conservation advocates and citizens who testify before his committee and dare to offer a different opinion than his. Whatever happened to good old-fashioned Texas civility?

The Senate

The Texas Senate has a long tradition of consensus and cooperation, with senators displaying a great deal of deference and respect to their fellow members.

Unlike in the Texas House, floor debate and confrontation is kept to a minimum. In fact, procedural rules and tradition within the chamber reinforce this concept. The “Two-thirds Rule” stipulates that bills cannot be brought up for a vote unless two-thirds of those present agrees to hear it. This system of consensus, strong personal relationships, procedural rules, and good old fashion political horse-trading has some advantages—it’s easier to block really bad legislation in the Senate.

However, this approach to legislating creates an atmosphere in which senators are reluctant to offer amendments if they are unacceptable to the bill’s author or the votes for passage aren’t already in place. This trend is only increasing and, like last session, compiling a meaningful scorecard was not possible. However, a great deal of action happened in the 2007 Senate. Here are the highlights, the heroes, and the despots.

Senate Best & Worst

The Best

Sen. Rodney Ellis: One of the first bills Sen. Ellis (Houston) filed was **SB 124**, which provided stricter vehicle emissions standards in Texas. The federal Clean Air Act allows states to choose between complying with federal vehicle emission standards or adopting the “Clean Cars Program”—implemented by the state of California and currently in place in 12 states including New York, Pennsylvania and most recently, Florida. Despite support from virtually all the state’s major urban mayors, business groups, and environmental and health advocates, the bill died in the Natural Resources Committee.

Sen. Ellis also filed a bill, **SB 860**, calling for a two-year moratorium on the permitting of any new coal-fired power plants in Texas. Unfortunately, this was not the coal power plant legislation that the Legislature decided to move forward. Instead, the Senate passed House Bill 3732. This bill created a taxpayer-funded incentive program to encourage power companies to build “state-of-the-art ultra-clean” coal plants in Texas. That’s a noble purpose, but unfortunately, the target levels in the bill

for NO_x and CO₂ were the same as the 11 discredited coal plants proposed by TXU. NO_x is one of the primary contributors to ozone and CO₂ is a primary global warming pollutant.

Two unsuccessful attempts were made on the House floor to improve the NO_x target levels (see the House scorecard), and the bill arrived in the hands of the Senate sponsor, the Natural Resources Committee Chair, Sen. Kip Averitt. Intense senate negotiations began and changes were made that improved the bill. **HB 3732** then went to conference committee, where the Senate and House are tasked with working out differences. Unfortunately, Sen. Averitt caved to demands from industry and House conferees, and all the good stuff—including amendments from fellow senators—was stripped from the legislation. The bill that arrived back in the Senate was a disappointment to the conservation community and many Senators alike. In the end, it narrowly passed.

► Here’s the Senate vote on **HB 3732**:

Senators voting **against taxpayer subsidies for dirty coal**: Brimer, Ellis, Fraser, Harris, Hinojosa, Lucio, Ogden, Shapleigh, Uresti, Van de Putte, Watson, Whitmire, Zaffirini.

Senators voting **for taxpayer subsidies for dirty coal**: Averitt, Carona, Deuell, Eltife, Estes, Hegar, Jackson, Janek, Nelson, Nichols, Patrick, Seliger, Shapiro, Wentworth, Williams.

Sen. Kirk Watson: Freshman Senator Kirk Watson had a flawless voting record and also authored two of the most important conservation bills of the session. The Senate overwhelmingly passed Sen. Watson’s **SB 529**, which authorized the use of surplus money within existing clean air programs to reduce dirty emissions from Texas school buses. Studies show that toxic pollution levels inside older diesel buses can be five times higher than outside levels, due to crankcase and tailpipe emissions that can be reduced cost-effectively.

► **Only three Senators voted against SB 529:** Harris, Jackson and Patrick.

Sen. Watson also introduced **SB 1687**, the “no regrets” global warming bill. This bill required the state environmental agency to identify strategies that would reduce greenhouse gas emissions and save consumers money or cost nothing. These are strategies that even the “flat-earthers,” who still claim global warming science is uncertain, should support because even if we did not have a global warming problem, they are good for the state’s bottom line. The majority voted

for this common-sense bill, but three senators couldn't even vote for a global warming bill that was limited to a "no regrets" strategy.

► **Senators voting against SB 1687:** Ogden, Patrick, Wentworth.

Sen. Eliot Shapleigh: El Paso Senator Eliot Shapleigh has a long history fighting for the health and safety of his constituents and protecting our state's natural resources. He has led the fight against the re-permitting of Asarco's 100-year-old copper smelter plant, which has one of the worst environmental records of any industrial facility in the U.S. This session, Sen. Shapleigh also filed bills to strengthen TCEQ air permitting rules, and passed legislation to study the effects of climate change on the Rio Grande.

Sen. Mario Gallegos: Recent scientific studies by the City of Houston and health, environmental and medical branches of Texas universities, confirm that levels of toxins in Texas' air threaten the public's health. This is specifically a problem in Houston, where industry emissions have created toxic "hot-spots." Two Senate bills, **SB 1924** and **SB 1855** by Sen. Gallegos, addressed toxic air emissions. SB 1855 required the state environmental agency, the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ), to designate "hotspots" where toxic pollution exceeds safe levels and to develop plans for cleaning up that pollution within three to seven years. The bill died in committee. SB 1924, simply required TCEQ to inform the public through their website about areas where toxic pollution was unsafe and to explain what the agency was doing to reduce pollution in those areas. It made it to the Senate floor for a vote and passed (27-4). It later died in the House.

► **Four senators voted against this simple public notice bill:** Brimer, Harris, Nelson, Shapiro.

Notables

Sen. John Whitmire: The environment has never registered as a top priority for Sen. Whitmire, but this year he took the lead in rallying votes against SB 1317. He was one vote away (see Dishonorable Mention below) from killing this bad bill.

Sen. Kim Brimer: Sen. Brimer's historical record on conservation issues is abysmal. That said, he deserves recognition for his work trying to rein in air pollution from cement kilns located in Ellis County. These cement kilns are a major source of air pollution for the Dallas/Fort Worth non-attainment area.

The Worst

Sen. Mike Jackson: Sen. Jackson has the ignoble distinction of championing the worst environmental bill of the session, **SB 1317**. Frustrated over the state's lack of action in addressing toxic "hotspots" in Houston, Mayor Bill White proposed that Houston should be able to regulate toxics using a city nuisance ordinance. The polluter lobby didn't hesitate to use the Legislature to maintain the *status quo* and produced SB 1317. The bill prohibited a municipality from regulating air pollution through ordinance. With the "two-thirds rule" needed to consider any bill for a vote, only 11 Senators were needed to block SB 1317 from being considered. The vote broke down directly along party lines, with one exception: Democratic **Sen. Eddie Lucio** pledged he would vote against the motion, then (for reasons only he can explain) changed his mind at the last minute.

► **The motion to consider passed 20-10**, and the bill went on to pass the Senate:

Senators voting **for cleaner air and against the motion to consider SB 1317:** Ellis, Gallegos, Hinojosa, Shapleigh, Uresti, Van de Putte, Watson. West, Whitmire, Zaffarini.

Senators voting **against cleaner air and for the motion to consider:** Averitt, Brimer, Carona, Deuell, Duncan, Eltife, Estes, Fraser, Harris, Hegar, Jackson, Janek, Nelson, Nichols, Ogden, Patrick, Seliger, Shapiro, Wentworth, Williams.

Sen. Dan Patrick: Sen. Patrick's 2007 record on conservation is easily summed up: If legislation before the Senate attempted to clean our air, address climate change, or protect children from harmful school bus emissions, he was against it.

Dishonorable Mention

Sen. Eddie Lucio: After naming Sen. Lucio one of the "worst" senators in *Texas Monthly's* 2007 "Best & Worst" article, senior editor, Paul Burka tells of a longstanding joke within the Senate body: "Want to get a laugh from your colleague? Tell him you have 11 votes to block a bill and then show him a list with Sen. Lucio's name on it."

Instead of joining 10 other senators to block the polluter-backed SB 1317 from being heard, Sen. Lucio, after saying he'd help, registered as "present, not voting". The bill was free to move forward and eventually passed the Senate. Sen. Lucio's overall voting record saved him from being on TLCV's "Worst" list, but when the conservation community needed him most, he took a walk.

The House of Representatives

The Votes

Air

1 Toxic school bus pollution. Studies show that toxic pollution levels inside old diesel school buses can be 5 times higher than background levels due to emissions from the crankcases and tailpipes that can be reduced cost effectively. While several other states have acted to reduce this threat to children's health, Texas has ignored the problem. Rep. Lon Burnam's amendment would have protected children from asthma as well as exposure to dangerous chemicals by providing funds to clean up diesel emissions from Texas school buses over the next several years. The House voted against the health of Texas kids, 88–57.

2 The Dirty Coal Bill. While TCLV supports state incentives for truly cleaner coal technologies, industry lobbyists this year high-jacked the concept in the Texas legislature and turned a good idea into subsidies for dirty coal. HB 3732 by Sen. Averitt and Rep. Hardcastle provided fast-tracking and big tax breaks for coal plants that were just as dirty as the proposed discredited TXU power plants on the two most important pollutants, NOx (the main contributor to smog) and CO₂ (the main global warming pollutant).

Rep. Allen Vaught's amendment would have limited the application of these incentives only to coal plants whose NOx emission were at the level of the least polluting plants being built elsewhere in America. This effort to provide incentives for clean, but not dirty coal projects was rejected by a vote of 80–61.

3 Dirty Coal Bill, Part II. After the House rejected Rep. Vaught's amendment, Rep. Burnam's introduced a compromise amendment that allowed HB 3732 incentives with more NOx emissions than the Vaught amendment, but less than the sponsors' bill. This attempt to improve the bill was also rejected by a vote of 84–53.

4 Reducing toxic air emissions. During debate over SB 12, the bill's House sponsor, Rep. Dennis Bonnen, accepted two amendments that would help reduce toxic air emissions. Rep. Thompson's "motion to instruct" (a common method to inform conference committee members of important provisions the House wants protected during negotiations with the Senate) to Rep. Bonnen and his committee members to not double cross the House and to trade away those good environmental amendments was voted down by 59–73.

A look at the scores

Average House score: 56% (C)
Avg. Republican score: 32% (F)
Avg. Democratic score: 84% (A)

Perfect 100s: 11
Overachievers (A+): 36
Failures (F): 56

House Republicans over 50%: 2
House Democrats below 50%: 3

Highest Republican score:
Kirk England (69%)
Lowest Democratic score:
Joe Pickett (37%)

5 Tracking pollution levels. Rep. Ana Hernandez's amendment required TCEQ to install more air quality monitors in Houston and Dallas, the areas in Texas with the most and worst violations of federal health standards. The House voted to remain ignorant 46–79.

6 Dirty Coal Bill, Part III. The final version of HB 3732 emerged from conference committee with unacceptable target levels for NOx; weak provisions for future carbon capture; and without protective language passed in the Senate. The House voted for a bill that had only the worst and none of the good provisions from the House and Senate versions, by 32–110.

7 Considering cumulative toxic impacts on the health of Texans. Rep. Dutton's amendment to HB 3960 required TCEQ to consider the cumulative impacts of toxins and other air pollutants within three miles of a proposed facility before issuing an air quality permit. The House rejected Dutton's amendment 53–78,

8 Funding for industry to retrofit diesel trucks and equipment. SB 12, TERP funding bill. The House voted to increase the money available for industry and governments to retrofit existing diesel equipment to lower emissions and to improve the Texas Emission Reduction Program, by 145–0.

Energy

9 Clean energy. Rep. Burnam's amendment to the state budget would have directed \$60 million dollars from the Emerging Technology Fund to be invested in new renewable energy, energy efficient, and other low polluting technologies to jump start those industries in Texas. The House voted against renewable energy support by 51–87.

10 Clean Energy, Part II. Rep. Burnam's amendment to HB 1188 required at least 15% of the Emerging Technology Fund to be used for cutting edge renewable energy technologies rather than being used to subsidize other more mature industries. The House voted against renewable energy 55–84.

11 Making renewable energy count. Rep. Strama's amendment fixed an existing loophole in the law that limited the growth the growth of wind energy in the state. By striking "Section M", the amendment eliminated the double counting of voluntary customer funded "green power" programs and clarified the state law requiring generators to provide a small percentage of its electricity from renewable energy. The House helped support renewable energy by a vote of 123–17.

12 Energy Efficiency. HB 3693— Rep. Strauss’s energy efficiency bill was a pale version of what was originally filed. Even though industry opposition caused the sponsors to take out some of its best provisions, the bill improved electric utility conservation programs, building codes and energy saving efforts by local governments. Almost all members voted for these improvements, 141–0.

13 Corporate Welfare. HB 2994, by Rep. Dennis Bonnen, provided property tax breaks to build nuclear power generators. Rep. Burnam’s amendment would have eliminated this subsidy for the nuclear power industry. The Texas House supported corporate welfare, 39–99.

Parks Funding

14 Funding our parks. Rep. Pete Gallego’s amendment to the state budget would have provided an additional \$75 million that the Texas Parks Advisory Committee said was desperately needed to prevent further deterioration of our state parks. The House voted against improving our parks, 46–87.

15 Lift the Cap! / Parks, Part II HB 12: Parks funding cap and historic site transfer. In a 141-0 vote, the House lifted the cap imposed on funding for State parks. Unfortunately, the legislature did not implement a permanent funding solution, and funding for the next biennium is not assured.

Global Warming

16 Analyzing global warming’s impacts on Texas. Rep. Elliott Naishtat’s amendment created a task force to develop a balanced and authoritative assessment of the likely global warming impacts on Texas, and opportunities for strategies and technologies that could reduce global warming in Texas and save money or otherwise benefit the state’s economy. Failed 52-88

Enforcement

17 Giving citizens a voice. Rep. Escobar’s amendment allowed citizens and local governments to contest permits for expanded drilling within an existing uranium mining operation if it might expose them to radiation. The House sided with Texans and against the mining companies by a vote of 91–48.

18 Ignoring evidence of wrongdoing. HB 3780, by Rep. Dennis Bonnen, limited TCEQ’s ability to use information of pollution violations gathered by private citizens, even if that information was true and the only source of information about the illegal act. The bill would conflict with requirements in existing federal environmental law. Rep. Burnam’s amendment tried to limit the damage by instructing TCEQ to ignore any portion of HB 3780 TCEQ determined to be inconsistent with federal law. The House voted 64–76 against the amendment.

19 See less evil, hear less evil. Rep. Lon Burnam’s amendment to HB 3960 required TCEQ to consider 10 years of a company’s legal compliance history in any permit hearing, rather than limiting consideration to 5 years as Rep. Wayne Smith wanted. The House voted by 58–76 to have regulators ignore years of illegal action by permit applicants.

20 See less evil, hear less evil, Part II. Rep. Burnam’s amendment to HB 3960 required TCEQ to consider important evidence of illegal acts by polluters, including “notices of violation” and “notices of enforcement” when using compliance history during permit reviews that Rep. Wayne Smith wanted to keep from being considered. The House voted with the polluters, 51–84.

21 Trusting the people. Rep. Garnet Coleman’s amendment to HB 3960 required TCEQ to publish compliance history on the internet making it available to the public. The House voted to keep the public in dark by 56–74.

Water

22 Protecting Texas springs and rivers. SB 3, the omnibus water bill, while containing good provisions, raised the pumping limits on the Edwards Aquifer to dangerous high levels that could threaten wildlife and even spring flow. Rep. Rose’s amendment would have limited the amount of pumping levels to protect the San Marcos River. The House voted against this amendment to protect Texas springs and rivers, by 30–113.

23 Slowing harmful and expensive new reservoirs. Rep. Stephen Frost’s amendment to SB 3 stipulated that no new water reservoirs could be designated if they were not vetted in existing regional water planning process and only if a region had first implemented reasonable and less costly water conservation programs. 94–37

24 Protecting our rivers, bays and estuaries. HB 3, in-stream flows, adoption of conference committee report. The House adopted legislation that put in statute for the first time, legally protected status for environmental uses of water in Texas, 143-2.

25 Conserving the water we’ve got. HB 4, water conservation, adoption of conference committee report. Almost all of the House voted to improve water conservation measures in Texas (145-1).

Waste

26 Municipal landfills. Rep. Dora Olivo’s amendment to HB 3960 provided permitting incentives for municipal operated landfills—if they met certain operation requirements. It was voted down 58–75.

27 Fewer computers in landfills. HB 14, E-waste bill. With support from industry leaders, like Dell Computer, and the environmental community, the House voted for a bill that required a computer take back and recycling program by 137–0.

Go to next page to see how members voted!

Texas House of Representatives

+ = Good conservation vote
- = Bad conservation vote

Vote descriptions on p.6	Score	Grade	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Allen, Alma (D)	93%	A+	+	+	+	+	+	AE	+	+	+	+
Alonzo, Roberto (D)	88%	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	A	+
Anchia, Rafael (D)	93%	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Anderson, Charles "Doc" (R)	48%	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-
Aycock, Jimmie Don (R)	33%	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
Bailey, Kevin (D)	83%	A	A	+	+	+	A	+	AE	+	-	+
Berman, Leo (R)	31%	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
Bohac, Dwayne (R)	38%	D	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-
Bolton, Valinda (D)	96%	A+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
Bonnen, Dennis (R)	28%	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
Branch, Dan (R)	22%	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
Brown, Betty (R)	33%	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
Brown, Fred (R)	26%	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
Burnam, Lon (D)	100%	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Callegari, William "Bill" (R)	31%	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	A	-
Castro, Joaquin (D)	92%	A+	+	+	+	+	A	-	+	+	+	+
Chavez, Norma (D)	91%	A+	+	+	+	+	-	AE	A	+	+	+
Chisum, Warren (R)	28%	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	AE	-	-
Christian, Wayne (R)	27%	F	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	+	-	-
Cohen, Ellen (D)	88%	A	+	+	A	+	+	-	+	+	+	-
Coleman, Garnet F. (D)	100%	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Cook, Byron (R)	31%	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
Cook, Robert "Robby" (D)	48%	D	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+
Corte Jr., Frank J. (R)	36%	D	-	AE	AE	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
Crabb, Joe (R)	35%	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
Craddick, Tom (R) (Speaker)	n/a	n/a	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C
Creighton, C. Brandon (R)	32%	F	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	+	-	-
Crownover, Myra (R)	23%	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
Darby, Drew (R)	35%	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	A	-
Davis, John E. (R)	41%	D	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-
Davis, Yvonne (D)	96%	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Delisi, Dianne White (R)	32%	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	+	-	-
Deshotel, Joe D. (D)	52%	C	+	-	-	+	-	-	A	+	-	+
Driver, Joe (R)	29%	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
Dukes, Dawanna (D)	85%	A	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+
Dunnam, Jim (D)	100%	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Dutton Jr., Harold V. (D)	77%	B	-	+	+	+	A	-	+	+	+	A
Eiland, Craig (D)	78%	B	+	-	-	A	+	-	+	+	+	AE
Eissler, Rob (R)	30%	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
Elkins, Gary (R)	26%	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
England, Kirk (R)	69%	B	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-	-
Escobar, Juan Manuel (D)	96%	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	A	+	+	+
Farabee, David (D)	52%	C	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+
Farias, Joe (D)	96%	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Farrar, Jessica (D)	87%	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Flores, Ismael "Kino" (D)	82%	A	-	A	+	A	-	+	+	+	A	A
Flynn, Dan (R)	35%	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	AE	+	-	A
Frost, Stephen (D)	72%	B	+	+	+	A	+	-	-	+	A	+

A = Absent AE = Excused absence

PNV = Present, not voting

C = In the chair, not voting

Key 2007 conservation votes

11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27
+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
+	+	-	-	+	-	+	PNV	A	A	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
+	+	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	+
+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	AE	AE	AE	A	A	+	+	AE	+
+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	+
+	C	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+
+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
-	+	-	A	+	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	+
+	+	-	A	AE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+		A	AE
+	+	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	+
-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	+
+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
-	+	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+		+
+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	A	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
+	+	+	A	+	AE	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
+	+	-	-	AE	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	+
+	+	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+
+	+	A	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
+	+	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	A	+	+	-	+
+	+	-	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	+
+	+	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	+
+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	A	-	-	+	+	-	+
C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C
+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	+
+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	AE
+	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	+
+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	+	+	+	-	+
+	+	-	-	+	+	A	-	-	A	A	-	+	+	+	-	+
+	+	-	-	+	-	C	-	-	-	-	A	A	+	+	-	1
+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
A	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	A	-	+	+	+	A	+
+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	A	+	+	+	+	A	+
+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	+
-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	+
+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	A	+
+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	A	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
+	+	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
AE	+	AE	+	+	AE	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	A	+
+	+	+	A	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	AE	AE	AE	-	+	+	+	AE	+
+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+

⊕ = Good conservation vote ⊖ = Bad conservation vote

Vote descriptions on p.6	Score	Grade	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Gallego, Pete (D)	100%	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Garcia III, Juan (D)	88%	A	+	+	A	-	+	-	+	+	+	+
Gattis, Dan (R)	43%	D	-	-	+	-	A	C	AE	+	-	-
Geren, Charlie (R)	31%	F	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	+	-	-
Giddings, Helen (D)	79%	B	-	+	A	+	-	A	+	+	+	+
Gonzales, Veronica (D)	100%	A+	+	+	+	AE	+	+	+	+	+	+
Gonzalez Toureilles, Yvonne (D)	89%	A	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
Goolsby, Tony (R)	30%	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
Guillen, Ryan (D)	56%	C	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	+
Haggerty, Pat (R)	37%	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
Hamilton, Mike "Tuffy" (R)	35%	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
Hancock, Kelly G.	28%	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
Hardcastle, Rick (R)	22%	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
Harless, Patricia (R)	25%	F	-	A	A	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
Harper-Brown, Linda (R)	30%	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
Hartnett, Will (R)	21%	F	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	C	-	-
Heflin, Joe (D)	80%	A	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+
Hernandez, Ana (D)	92%	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Herrero, Abel (D)	96%	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Hilderbran, Harvey (R)	30%	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
Hill, Fred (R)	44%	D	-	A	A	A	A	-	A	+	-	-
Hochberg, Scott (D)	96%	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Hodge, Terri (D)	96%	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Homer, Mark (D)	58%	C	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+
Hopson, Chuck (D)	59%	C	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+
Howard, Charlie F. (R)	28%	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
Howard, Donna (D)	100%	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Hughes, Bryan (R)	36%	D	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	+	-	-
Isett, Carl H. (R)	27%	F	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-
Jackson, Jim (R)	30%	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
Jones, Delwin (R)	52%	C	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	-
Keffer, Jim (R)	35%	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	+	-	-
King, Phil (R)	32%	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	AE	+	-	-
King, Susan (R)	33%	F	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	+	-	-
King, Tracy O. (D)	55%	C	-	AE	AE	+	A	-	-	+	-	+
Kolkhorst, Lois W. (R)	23%	F	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	+	-	-
Krusee, Mike (R)	35%	D	C	-	-	-	A	-	-	+	-	-
Kuempel, Edmund (R)	30%	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
Latham, Thomas (R)	29%	F	-	A	A	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
Laubenberg, Jodie Anne (R)	35%	D	+	-	-	A	-	-	-	+	-	-
Leibowitz, David McQuade (D)	96%	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Lucio III, Eddie (D)	92%	A+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
Macias, Nathan (R)	38%	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
Madden, Jerry (R)	27%	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
Mallory Caraway, Barbara (D)	88%	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Martinez Fischer, Trey (D)	92%	A+	+	+	+	+	A	-	+	+	+	+
Martinez, Armando (D)	96%	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	A
McCall, Brian (R)	31%	F	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-
McClendon, Ruth (D)	80%	A	-	+	+	A	-	+	+	+	A	+
McReynolds, Jim (D)	69%	B	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	-
Menendez, Jose (D)	77%	B	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	A	+

⊕ = Good conservation vote ⊖ = Bad conservation vote

Vote descriptions on p.6	Score	Grade	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Merritt, Tommy (R)	38%	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-
Miles, Borris (D)	100%	A+	+	+	+	A	+	+	+	+	+	+
Miller, Sid (R)	31%	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
Moreno, Paul (D)	88%	A	+	AE	AE	A	+	A	AE	AE	+	AE
Morrison, Geanie (R)	27%	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
Mowery, Anna (R)	37%	D	-	A	A	+	-	-	A	+	-	-
Murphy, Jim (R)	35%	D	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	+	-	-
Naishtat, Elliott (D)	100%	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Noriega, Richard "Rick" (D)	96%	A+	+	+	+	A	+	-	A	+	+	+
O'Day, Mike (R)	36%	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
Oliveira, Rene O. (D)	100%	A+	+	+	+	+	A	+	+	+	+	A
Olivo, Dora (D)	96%	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Orr, Rob (R)	26%	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
Ortiz Jr., Solomon (D)	93%	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Otto, John (R)	31%	F	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	+	-	-
Parker, Tan (R)	26%	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
Patrick, Diane (R)	30%	F	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
Paxton, Ken (R)	31%	F	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
Pena, Aaron (D)	58%	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+
Phillips, Larry (R)	44%	D	-	-	-	A	-	-	+	+	-	-
Pickett, Joe (D)	38%	D	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	A	-
Pierson, Paula (D)	95%	A+	+	+	+	+	+	-	A	+	+	A
Pitts, Jim (R)	22%	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
Puente, Robert (D)	68%	B	-	1	-	AE	-	+	-	+	-	-
Quintanilla, Chente (D)	80%	A	+	+	+	A	A	-	+	+	+	+
Raymond, Richard (D)	92%	A+	+	+	+	+	+	-	A	+	+	+
Riddle, Debbie (R)	29%	F	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	+	-	-
Ritter, Allan (D)	44%	D	-	1	-	-	-	A	-	+	A	-
Rodriguez, Eddie (D)	100%	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Rose, Patrick M. (D)	67%	B	-	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-
Smith, Todd (R)	26%	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
Smith, Wayne (R)	23%	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-
Smithee, John T. (R)	33%	F	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	+	AE	A
Solomons, Burt R. (R)	29%	F	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	+	-	-
Strama, Mark (D)	93%	A+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
Straus III, Joe (R)	30%	F	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	+	A	-
Swinford, David (R)	31%	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
Talton, Robert E. (R)	25%	F	AE	-	-	-	AE	-	-	+	AE	-
Taylor, Larry (R)	25%	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	A
Thompson, Senfronia (D)	100%	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Truitt, Vicki (R)	23%	F	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	+	-	-
Turner, Sylvester (D)	59%	C	-	+	-	+	A	-	+	+	-	-
Van Arsdale, Corbin (R)	32%	F	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	+	-	-
Vaught, Allen (D)	96%	A+	+	+	+	+	A	+	+	+	+	+
Veasey, Marc (D)	96%	A+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
Villarreal, Michael (D)	86%	A	+	+	+	+	+	-	AE	+	+	+
Vo, Hubert (D)	96%	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
West, G. E. "Buddy" (R)	28%	F	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	+	-	-
Woolley, Beverly (R)	28%	F	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	+	-	-
Zedler, Bill (R)	27%	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
Zerwas, John (R)	38%	D	-	+	-	A	-	-	-	+	-	-

A = Absent AE = Excused absence C = In the chair, not voting

11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27
-	+	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	A
+	+	+	+	+	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
+	+	-	-	+	A	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+
AE	AE	AE	AE	AE	AE	+	AE	AE	AE	AE	-	+	+	+	AE	A
+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	+	+	-	+
AE	A	-	-	+	-	1	A	A	-	-	-	A	+	+	-	+
+	+	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	+
+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
+	+	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	A	+	+	+	+	+	+
+	+	-	-	+	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	+	+	+	+	+
+	+	+	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	A	A
+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+
+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	+
+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+
+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+
+	+	-	-	+	-	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+
+	+	+	A	+	-	+	+	-	-	A	-	+	+	+	+	+
A	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+
A	+	-	-	+	C	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	+
+	+	+	+	A	+	+	+	A	A	A	A	+	+	+	A	+
+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	+	A	-	+
+	+	-	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
-	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
+	+	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	+	-	+
+	+	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+
+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
+	+	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	+
-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+
+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	+	+	-	C
+	+	A	+	+	+	+	A	+	+	+	+	A	A	+	+	+
-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+
A	AE	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	C	+	+	AE
A	+	-	-	+	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	+	+	+	A	+
+	+	+	+	+	AE	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	A
+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
+	+	A	+	+	+	+	-	AE	AE	AE	-	+	+	+	AE	+
+	+	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	+	A	-	+
-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	+
+	+	C	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	+
+	+	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	+

**For more information about this
Scorecard or any of our other
activities, visit our Web site at
www.tlcv.org**

•

**To help support our efforts, look for
the contribution envelope inside.**

Texas League of Conservation Voters

44 East Ave., Suite 202
Austin TX 78701
(512) 477-4424

Colin Leyden
Executive Director
colin@tlcv.org

The Texas League of Conservation Voters is a 501(c)(4) organization.
Contributions to the Texas League of Conservation Voters are not tax-deductible.