



INTERIM CONSERVATION SCORECARD

Legislative Session 2006

Dear Missouri Conservationist

The mission of Missouri Votes Conservation is to make the protection of our natural resources a priority for Missouri voters, candidates, and elected officials. We are an independent, non-partisan organization with a unique role in Missouri's conservation community. We are modeled after and affiliated with the national League of Conservation Voters.

MVC represents **all** conservation interests – environmentalists, hunters, fishermen, conservationists, etc. – by focusing on the electoral process to achieve sound conservation practices. We are only five years old, but we're already making a difference.

Every year, MVC holds an Environmental Summit, where conservation organizations gather and agree on legislative priorities for the upcoming year. We educate our lawmakers on conservation issues, and we lobby the General Assembly on the common priorities established at the Summit. We publish an annual Environmental Scorecard, which informs the community about our legislators' voting records and holds them accountable for their work on the issues identified at the Summit. Lastly, we endorse and work to elect candidates of either party who are committed to the protection of Missouri's natural resources.

What can you do?

A good place to start is the MVC website:

www.movotesconservation.org We have links to local, state and national pro-conservation organizations that will help you investigate virtually any environmental issue. We also have links to the Republican and Democratic State web pages, as well as to other political organizations, designed to help you in your research of the political positions of various office-holders and candidates for office.

You can also write letters and make phone calls to your local state legislators. State Representatives and Senators often comment how important it is to them to hear from local constituents, and this remains the most effective way of influencing their votes. The MVC website has links to help you look up your legislators and their addresses.

Sincerely,

Ben Senturia, Chair, Board of Directors
Mark Fogal, Executive Director



WHAT'S NEW IN THIS SCORECARD

This scorecard may be different than others you've seen before. First, we are only including "clean votes" where the bill is largely about a conservation issue, and not an omnibus bill with multiple provisions, only one or two of which have anything to do with protecting natural resources.

Second, we realize that roll call votes don't always tell the entire story, so with this edition of the Conservation Scorecard, we have attempted to share information that cannot be gleaned from roll calls. Sponsoring bills, forging compromise, derailing damaging proposals, convincing other legislators to vote correctly – all of these are important activities that votes cannot measure. Our *Noteworthy* section goes beyond the roll calls to get a more complete picture of legislator's actions.

This scorecard provides tallies of the votes cast on key conservation issues in both the 2005 and 2006 sessions. Our interim scorecard in 2005 provided a discussion of those key 2005 votes, but we reproduce the vote chart from last year here, along with this year's votes.

RENEWABLE ENERGY STANDARDS

Voters in the City of Columbia passed legislation in 2005 requiring that, by the year 2020, 15% of the City's power shall come from renewable sources. The requirements are being phased in starting in 2008, and there are provisions to ensure that the cost of the renewable energy is not substantially higher than costs of 100% non-renewable energy.

In the 2006 legislative session, there were three key renewable energy bills introduced. Two of these bills were introduced together; one (HB 1384) in the House of Representatives by Representative Jenee Lowe (D-Kansas City), and the other (SB 843) in the Senate by Senator Chuck Graham (D-Columbia). For ease of reference, we will refer to these two bills as the Lowe/Graham Renewable Energy Bill. The third bill, SB915, was introduced by Republican Senator Chris Koster (R-Harrisonville).

The bills all set goals for power companies and utilities to sell energy created using alternative technologies, with progressively increasing percentages of a utility's power coming from alternative sources over the coming decades.

Senator Koster's bill (SB 915) had three key differences with the Lowe/Graham Renewable Energy Bill. First, the goals set by Koster's bill were voluntary, while the goals set by Lowe's and Graham's bill were mandated. Second, there was some concern about SB 915's definition of "biomass." This definition included "agricultural livestock waste treatment systems." Such waste treatment systems are more feasible in large-scale livestock operations – i.e. CAFOs. The environmental community has been working against the massive water and air pollution created by these industrial agriculture facilities.

In the absence of mandates, Senator Koster's SB915 was not as strong as the pro-conservation community might have preferred. On the one hand, in the absence of mandates, the bill was relatively toothless. On the other hand, Koster's bill was a step in the right direction, and in light of political realities, it was the strongest bill that was likely to pass.

Senator Koster's bill (SB 915 – without mandated targets) made it through the Senate Commerce, Energy and the Environment Committee and saw debate on the floor of the Senate. Senator Joan Bray offered several amendments, including one that would include mandates in the language of SB915. That proposed amendment was defeated.

In the House, the Special Committee on Energy and the Environment held a committee hearing, but never took action on Representative Lowe's Bill, HB1384. Once passed by the Senate, SB915 was taken up by the House Utilities Committee. While there, it was stripped of many of its key components. This House version of SB915 was not as progressive, and in fact contained language defining animal waste as a source for renewable energy in an effort to assist concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs). MVC worked to strip this language from the bill.

A conference committee was assembled to work out the differences in the Senate and House versions of SB915. A conference committee report was approved by the Senate but not the House; the bill stalled just short of passage.

Noteworthy:

- 1) SB915 passed unanimously in the Senate, and 150-2 in the House, but died in the conference committee.
- 2) **Special commendations** go to: **Representative Jenee' Lowe (D-H59)**, **Senator Chris Koster** and **Senator Chuck Graham** for introducing their respective bills, and to **Senator Joan Bray** for working to strengthen SB915. Senator Koster deserves special mention for his work with pro-conservation groups in restricting the definition of biomass in his bill.
- 3) **Bray's** amendment to phase in a mandate on energy companies failed by a vote of 10-22, straight party line vote.

ISSUE: AUDIT PRIVILEGE/ "DIRTY SECRETS"

Audit privilege is a policy initiative put together by business interests to bypass environmental protection laws. On the face of it, this bill sounds like a correction to a minor issue. Proponents of the legislation say they are addressing a small problem with the state's reaction to self-reported environmental infractions. Let's say a company has an environmental mishap – a bucket of turpentine is spilled. If the company reports the infraction to DNR, the agency issues a warning which goes on file, becomes part of the public record, and makes the company subject to increased risk of criminal and civil litigation.

Unfortunately, audit privilege bills typically go way beyond their supposed purpose. First, if a company reports an infraction, then the company is *immune* to prosecution for that infraction. Second, the records submitted by the company detailing the infraction are sealed and cannot be used by the government to build a case against the company. Third, by sealing these records, environmental watchdog groups are denied access, thus cutting out one of the key mechanisms by which environmental laws are enforced in this country. Finally, and perhaps most incredibly, we know of no instance where a company has been penalized for working with the Missouri Department of Natural Resources on cleaning up a self-reported incident.



This year's annual "Dirty Secrets" hearings took place in the Special Committee for Energy and the Environment. HB1147, sponsored by the committee's chair, Representative Walt Bivens (R-H97, St. Louis), never made it out of Committee. Two key things took place. First, when the Committee voted on the HB1147, Representative Dennis Wood (R-H62, Kimberling City) voted with Democrats on the Committee but were one vote shy of defeat. The language of HB1147 was later added to a larger bill, SB 925, which contained a variety of issues including water district provisions and solid waste fee extensions. In committee, Rep. Jeanette Oxford (D-H59, St. Louis) divided the question on a vote and successfully stripped the "dirty secrets" section out of the bill.

As a coda to this fight, pro-conservation lobbyists kept a close watch late in the legislative session to ensure that Audit Privilege legislation was not attached to other bills working their way through in the hectic final days of the session. Representative Scott Muschany (R-H87) tried to introduce a weaker version of audit privilege on the floor of the House, but pulled his amendment before it was brought up for a vote.

Audit privilege was not considered by the Senate.

Noteworthy:

- 1) **Representative Walt Bivens** (R-97, St. Louis) gets a minus (-) for introducing the bill in the first place.
- 2) Special thanks go to **Jeannette Oxford** (D-H59, St. Louis) for her leadership in killing this bad legislation.
- 3) We could simply provide the committee votes on HB1147, which would show a party-line vote, with the exception of Dennis Wood. We prefer simply to acknowledge Representative **Dennis Wood (R-H62)** for his key vote and his behinds-the-scene work in defeating this legislation.

Issue: Tax Increment Financing

Tax Increment Financing (TIF) is a development tool originally designed to help redevelop “blighted” areas that require extra public investment to make the development site economically feasible. For instance, a good use of TIF would be to clean up the site of an old gas station (which involves significant environmental remediation) to help redevelop an older neighborhood.

Unfortunately, TIFs have become a standard way for a variety of municipalities to develop land, and it has become common (especially in the St. Louis metropolitan area) for municipalities to use TIF to develop floodplains, farmland, and other areas that have never before been developed.

MVC took a relatively narrow perspective on legislation designed to reform TIF this past session: we were supportive of bills that effectively ended the use of this subsidy to develop floodplains, wetlands and other ecologically sensitive areas. Two such bills made it significantly through the legislative process: HB1070, introduced by **Representative Bob Johnson** (R-H47 Lee’s Summit) and SB832, introduced by **Senator John Greisheimer** (R-S26 Washington).

The two bills took very different approaches to restricting the use of TIF. HB1070 redefined the word “blight,” while SB832 simply noted areas that were not eligible for TIF subsidies. Both bills would have resulted in disallowing the use of TIF to develop floodplains and wetlands, and so MVC supported both bills.

Both bills made it through their respective chambers (and in fact, HB1070 passed unanimously in the House.) However, the very different approaches used in the two pieces of legislation could not be reconciled in conference, and in the end, neither bill passed into law.

Noteworthy:

1) **Senator Greisheimer** and **Representative Johnson** both deserve credit (a +) for sponsoring TIF reform legislation, and for working with pro-conservation groups to make sure that both pieces of legislation reflected our priorities.

2) It is not all that useful to scorecard the unanimous passage of HB1070 in the House. Moreover, the votes in the Senate, either for or against SB832, were cast for a variety of reasons, not all of them environmental. As well, there were no amendments offered in either chamber that were specific to our priorities.



MARK TWAIN FOREST

President Bush floated a proposal last spring to sell off swaths of National Forests across the country, and to use the proceeds to support rural education. Although we believe that rural education should be a national priority, most of the conservation community was strongly opposed to this initiative.

Senator Chuck Graham (D-S19 Columbia) introduced concurrent resolution SCR29 to express the sense of the Missouri General Assembly in opposition to this presidential proposal. This resolution was adopted unanimously by the Senate but never debated by the full House. In the last week of the session, Representative Dennis Wood (R-H62 Kimberling City) introduced an identically worded House resolution, HR2439, which was adopted by the House.

Noteworthy:

1) **Senator Chuck Graham** (D-S19, Columbia) and **Representative Dennis Wood** (R-H62, Kimberling City) both deserve a “+” for introducing these resolutions.

SAND AND GRAVEL MINING

Mining gravel out of streams causes harm to the streams. Excavations can alter the stream channel, banks, or bed, and can increase bed and bank erosion, channel instability, and gravel movement. These can result in filling of fishing and swimming holes, wider and shallower streams, destruction of habitat, loss of land and structures, and flooding.

The regulations currently in place are not onerous. Private property owners can extract as much gravel as they need for personal use on their property. They can hire commercial contractors to excavate gravel so long as the contractor gets a site-specific permit. And contractors are asked to use techniques that help mitigate the damage they do to streams. Moreover, these regulations have been in place for only one summer and are the result of a two-year public input process.

Even so, **Representative Tom Loehner** (R-H112 Koelztown) introduced HB1761 that would weaken even further these already weak regulations. The Committee on Conservation and Natural Resources voted the bill out but numerous questions during floor debate kept the legislation from coming to a vote on the House floor. For the last few weeks of the session, pro-conservation lobbyists were tracking other legislation to ensure that the language from HB1761 was not amended onto another piece of legislation.

Noteworthy:

Give **Representative Tom Loehner** (R-H112, Koelztown) a “minus” for introducing this legislation.

MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION (MDC) SALES TAX

MDC is supported by a 1/8 cent state-wide sales tax, which is written into the State Constitution. As a result, Missouri has one of the nation’s best conservation departments. But in times of tight budgets, the MDC sales tax becomes a target. This year, Senator Cauthorn (R-18) submitted SJR21, a non-binding resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the Department of Conservation sales tax ought to be put up for renewal every ten years. (The resolution is non-binding because it would require a constitutional ballot initiative to get rid of the dedicated MDC sales tax.)

Noteworthy:

Senator Cauthorn (R-S18, Mexico) deserves a “minus” for introducing this resolution, even though the resolution did not even get a hearing in the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Conservation, Parks and Natural Resources.

BIRD, FISH, WILDLIFE, AND FORESTRY RESOURCES – HJR43 (2/3 MAJORITY VOTE)

Representative Mike Dethrow, (R 153-Alton), proposed a constitutional amendment that would require a two-thirds majority for voter approval of initiative proposals relating to harvesting bird, fish, wildlife, or forestry resources. Measures to repeal initiative proposals previously approved by voters would require only a simple majority.

The House voted to approve the legislation was 94 – 61. The Senate Agriculture, Conservation, Parks and Natural Resources conducted a hearing, but Chairman Dan Clemens (R S20 -Marshfield) never forwarded the bill to the floor of the Senate for further action.

About MVC

The mission of Missouri Votes Conservation is to make the protection of our natural resources a priority for Missouri voters, candidates and elected officials. We are an independent, non-partisan organization with a unique role in Missouri’s conservation community. We are modeled after and affiliated with the national League of Conservation Voters.

MVC represents *all* conservation interests – environmentalists, hunters, fishermen, conservationists, etc. – by focusing on the electoral process to achieve sound conservation practices. We’re only four years old, but we’re already making a difference.

Every year MVC holds an Environmental Summit, where conservation organizations gather and agree on legislative priorities for the upcoming year. We educate our lawmakers on conservation issues and we publish an annual Environmental Scorecard, which informs the community about our legislators’ voting records and holds them accountable for their positions on conservation matters. Every two years, we endorse and work to elect candidates of either party who are committed to the protection of Missouri’s natural resources.

Make Your Voice Heard!

Let your legislators know how you feel about their work: To mail a letter, simply address it to:

Representative or Senator _____
State Capitol
201 West Capitol Avenue
Jefferson City, MO 65101

If you don’t know who your legislators are, you can look them up at the Missouri General Assembly home page: www.moga.state.mo.us. There is a link to the Missouri General Assembly at the MVC website – www.movotesconservation.org. The Missouri General Assembly page also lets you look up your legislators’ direct phone number and FAX number at the capitol, their email address, and their home phone and home address.

LEGISLATIVE SCORECARD VOTING SUMMARY

N means "No" / Y means "Yes" / = means absent

LEGISLATION FROM 2005

CAFO-HB187 / DEFEATED

CAFOs, or Confined Animal Feeding Operations, are large-scale agricultural factories. This bill would have allowed all but the very largest CAFOs to come to a county without notifying the department, county governing body, or owners of adjoining or nearby property owners. **The defeat of this bill was a positive outcome for conservationists.**

PARKS AND SOIL TAX-SJR1 / PASSED

The parks and soils tax is a one-tenth-of-one-percent sales tax that serves as the primary funding source for Missouri's State Parks and the prevention of soil erosion. Passage of this bill in 2005 authorized placing the tax on the ballot every ten years. Note that, in August 2006, this tax passed with an incredible 70%+ of the vote. **The passage of this bill was a positive outcome for conservationists.**

WASTE TIRE FEE-SB225 / PASSED

The Waste Tire Fee was a recycling program that expired in 2002, and the conservation community has been pushing for its reinstatement since that time. **The passage of this bill was a positive outcome for conservationists.**

LEGISLATION FROM 2006

RENEWABLE ENERGY STANDARDS – SB915

In the first column, we record the total votes on the final passage of the bill. In the second column, we record the votes received by an important amendment offered by Senator Bray that would have made the standards mandatory rather than non-enforceable goals. Senator Bray's amendment to mandate renewable energy standards failed. **Final Resolution:** This bill passed the Senate but stalled in the House.

2/3 MAJORITY VOTE – HJR43

This bill required that any public referenda that deals with wildlife and forestry management would require a 2/3 supermajority of the voters to pass. MVC's concerns were that this might get rid of a method by which important pro-conservation laws might be passed. **Final Resolution:** This bill passed in the House but stalled in the Senate.

A green 'plus' or a black "minus" by a name indicates either strong or weak pro-conservation advocacy as explained in the Noteworthy sections throughout the text.

Since it can be confusing whether a yes or no vote on particular bill is pro-conservation, the pro-conservation vote is indicted by a green square.

State Representatives	District	Party	CAFO-HB187	Parks and Soil Tax-SJR1	Waste Tire-SB225	2/3 Majority Vote-HJR43
Aull, Joe	26	d	y	y	y	n
Avery, Jim	95	r	n	n	y	n
Baker, Brian	123	r	n	y	y	y
Baker, Judy	25	d	n	y	y	n
Bean, Otto	163	r	y	=	y	=
Bearden, Carl	16	r	y	y	y	y
Behnen, Bob	2	r	y	y	y	y
Bivens, Walt	97	r	y	n	y	y
Black, Lanie	161	r	y	y	y	y
Bland, Craig	43	d	n	y	y	=
Bowman, John	70	d	n	y	y	y
Boykins, Holly	60	d	=	y	=	y
Bringer, Rachel	6	d	y	y	y	y
Brooks, Sharon Sanders	37	d	n	n	y	n
Brown, Jason	30	r	n	y	y	=
Brown, Michael R.	50	d	n	y	y	n
Bruns, Mark	113	r	y	y	y	y
Burnett, John	40	d	n	n	y	n
Byrd, Richard	94	r	n	y	y	y
Casey, Ron	103	d	n	y	y	y
Chappelle-Nadal, Maria	72	d	n	y	y	n
Chinn, Kathy	8	r	y	y	y	y
Cooper, Nathan	158	r	y	y	y	y
Cooper, Robert Wayne	155	r	y	y	=	y
Cooper, Shannon	120	r	y	y	y	y
Corcoran, Michael George	77	d	n	y	y	y
Cunningham, Jane	86	r	n	n	y	n
Cunningham, Mike	145	r	n	y	y	y
Curts, Melba	41	d	n	y	y	n
Darrough, Bruce	75	d	n	y	y	n
Daus, Michael	67	d	n	y	y	n
Davis, Cynthia	19	r	y	n	y	y
Day, David	148	r	y	y	y	y
Deeken, Bill	114	r	y	y	y	y
Dempsey, Tom	18	r	y	y	y	y
Denison, Charles	135	r	y	y	y	y
Dethrow, Mike	153	r	y	y	y	y
Dixon, Bob	140	r	y	y	y	y
Donnelly, Margaret	73	d	n	y	y	n
Dougherty, Curt	53	d	y	n	y	y
Dusenberg, Gary	54	r	y	n	y	y
El-Amin, Yaphett S.	57	d	y	=	y	n
Emery, Edgar G.H.	126	r	y	y	y	y
Ervin, Doug	35	r	y	y	y	y
Faith, Sally	15	r	n	y	y	y
Fares, Kathlyn	91	r	n	=	y	n
Fisher, Barney Joe	125	r	y	y	y	y
Flook, Timothy	34	r	y	n	y	n
Franz, Ward	151	r	y	y	y	y
Fraser, Barbara	83	d	n	y	y	y
George, Thomas E.	74	d	n	y	y	n
Goodman, Jack	132	r	n	y	y	y
Guest, Jim	5	r	y	y	y	y
Harris, Belinda	110	d	n	y	y	n
Harris, Jeff	23	d	n	y	y	n
Haywood, Esther	71	d	n	y	=	n
Henke, Wayne J.	11	d	n	y	y	y

State Representatives	District	Party	CAFO-HB187	Parks and Soil Tax-SJR1	Waste Tire-SB225	2/3 Majority Vote-HJR43
Hobbs, Steve	21	r	y	y	y	y
Hoskins, Theodore	80	d	n	y	y	n
Hubbard, Rodney R.	58	d	n	y	y	y
Hughes, Leonard	42	d	n	y	y	=
Hunter, Steve	127	r	y	y	y	y
Icet, Allen	84	r	n	y	y	y
Jackson, Jack	89	r	y	y	n	y
Jetton, Rod	156	r	y	y	y	y
Johnson, Connie "LaJoyce"	61	d	n	y	y	n
Johnson, Rick	90	d	n	y	y	n
Johnson, Robert Thane	47	r	n	y	y	n
Jolly, Cathy	45	d	n	y	y	n
Jones, Kenneth	117	r	y	y	y	y
Jones, Robin Wright	63	d	n	y	y	n
Kelly, Van	144	r	y	y	y	y
Kingery, Gayle	154	r	y	y	y	y
Kratky, Fred	65	d	n	y	y	y
Kraus, Will	48	r	y	n	y	n
Kuessner, J.C.	152	d	n	y	y	y
Lager, Brad	4	r	y	y	y	y
Lampe, Sara	138	d	n	y	y	y
Lembke, Jim	85	r	y	n	y	y
LeVota, Paul	52	d	n	n	y	n
Liese, Albert Joseph	79	d	n	y	y	n
Lipke, Scott A.	157	r	y	y	y	y
Loehner, Tom	112	r	y	=	y	y
Low, Beth	39	d	n	y	y	n
Lowe, Jenee' M.	44	d	n	y	y	y
Marsh, B.J.	136	r	n	=	y	y
May, Bob	149	r	y	y	y	y
McGhee, Michael	122	r	y	y	y	y
Meadows, Tim	101	d	n	y	y	y
Meiners, Kate	46	d	n	y	y	y
Moore, Danielle	20	r	y	y	y	y
Munzlinger, Brian	1	r	y	y	y	y
Muschany, Scott	87	r	n	n	y	n
Myers, Peter	160	r	y	y	=	y
Nance, Bob	36	r	y	y	y	y
Nieves, Brian	98	r	y	y	y	y
Nolte, Jerry	33	r	y	y	y	y
Oxford, Jeanette Mott	59	d	n	y	y	n
Page, Sam	82	d	n	y	y	n
Parker, Sherman	12	r	n	y	y	y
Parson, Michael	133	r	y	y	y	y
Pearce, David	121	r	y	y	y	y
Phillips, Susan C.	32	r	y	y	y	y
Pollock, Darrell	146	r	y	y	y	y
Portwood, Charles R.	92	r	n	n	y	n
Pratt, Bryan	55	r	y	n	y	y
Quinn, John	7	r	y	y	y	y
Rector, Rex	124	r	y	y	y	y
Richard, Ron	129	r	n	y	y	y
Roark, Brad	139	r	y	y	y	y
Robb, Edward	24	r	y	y	y	y
Robinson, Brad	107	d	n	y	y	y
Roorda, Jeff	102	d	n	n	y	y
Rucker, Martin T.	29	d	n	n	y	n
Ruestman, Marilyn	131	r	n	y	y	y

State Representatives

	District	Party	CAFO-HB187	Parks and Soil Tax-SJR1	Waste Tire-SB225	2/3 Majority Vote-HJR43
Rupp, Scott T.	13	r	y	y	y	n
Salva, Ray	51	d	n	n	=	n
Sander, Therese	22	r	y	y	y	y
Sater, David	68	r	y	y	y	y
Schaaf, Robert	28	r	n	y	y	y
Schad, Rodney	115	r	y	y	y	y
Schlottach, Charles	111	r	y	y	y	y
Schneider, Vicki	17	r	y	y	y	n
Schoemehl, Sue	100	d	n	y	y	n
Selby, Harold R.	105	d	n	y	y	y
Self, Tom	116	r	n	y	y	y
Shoemyer, Wes	9	d	n	y	y	y
Silvey, Ryan	38	r	y	y	y	y
Skaggs, Trent	31	d	n	=	y	n
Smith, Joe	14	r	n	y	y	n
Smith, Todd	118	r	n	y	=	y
Spreng, Michael	76	d	n	y	y	y
St. Onge, Neal C.	88	r	y	y	y	n
Stefanick, Jodi A.	93	r	n	y	y	y
Stevenson, Bryan P.	128	r	y	y	y	y
Storch, Rachel	64	d	n	y	y	n
Sutherland, Mike	99	r	y	y	y	y
Swinger, Terry	162	d	y	y	y	y
Threlkeld, Kevin	109	r	y	y	y	p
Tilley, Steven	106	r	y	y	y	y
Viebrock, Jim	134	r	y	y	y	y
Villa, Tom	108	d	n	y	y	n
Vogt, Michael	66	d	n	y	=	n
Wagner, Wes	104	d	n	y	y	y
Wallace, Maynard	143	r	y	y	y	y
Walsh, Regina	69	d	n	y	y	y
Walton, Juanita Head	81	d	n	y	y	n
Wasson, Jay	141	r	n	y	y	y
Wells, Don	147	r	y	y	y	y
Weter, Ray	142	r	n	y	y	y
Whorton, James	3	d	n	y	n	p
Wildberger, Edward	27	d	n	n	y	n
Wilson, Kevin	130	r	n	y	y	y
Wilson, Larry	119	r	y	y	y	y
Witte, Terry L.	10	d	y	y	y	y
Wood, Dennis	62	r	n	y	y	y
Wright, Billy Pat	159	r	y	y	y	y
Wright, Mark	137	r	n	y	y	y
Yaeger, Patricia M.	96	d	n	y	y	n
Yates, Brian David	56	r	y	n	y	y
Young, Terry	49	d	n	n	y	n
Zweifel, Clint	78	d	n	y	y	n
Summary Statistics						
Total "yeas"			77	135	153	107
Total "nays"			84	21	2	48
Total "Absent"			1	6	7	7
Dems voting pro -conservation			57	53	59	36
Dems voting anti -conservation			6	9	1	25
Repubs voting pro-conservation			27	82	94	12
Repubs voting anti-conservation			71	12	1	82

State Senators

	District	Party	CAFO-HB187	Parks and Soil Tax-SJR1	Waste Tire-SB225	Renewable Energy SB915	Renewable Energy Amend.
Alter, Bill	22	r	=	=	y	y	n
Barnitz, Frank	16	d	=	=	y	y	n
Bartle, Matt	8	r	y	y	y	y	n
Bray, Joan	24	d	n	n	y	y	y
Callahan, Victor	11	d	n	n	y	y	y
Cauthorn, John	18	r	y	y	y	y	n
Champion, Norma	30	r	n	y	y	y	n
Clemens, Dan	20	r	y	y	y	y	n
Coleman, Maida	5	d	n	n	y	y	y
Crowell, Jason	27	r	y	y	y	y	n
Days, Rita Heard	14	d	=	n	y	y	y
Dolan, Jon	2	r	y	y	y	y	n
Dougherty, Pat	4	d	n	n	y	=	n
Engler, Kevin	3	r	y	y	y	y	n
Gibbons, Michael	15	r	y	y	y	y	n
Graham, Chuck	19	d	n	y	y	y	y
Green, Tim	13	d	=	n	=	y	y
Greisheimer, John	26	r	y	y	y	y	n
Gross, Chuck	23	r	y	y	y	y	n
Kennedy, Harry	1	d	n	n	y	y	y
Klindt, David	12	r	y	y	y	=	n
Koster, Chris	31	r	y	y	y	y	n
Loudon, John	7	r	y	y	y	y	n
Mayer, Rob	25	r	y	y	y	y	n
Nodler, Gary	32	r	n	y	y	y	n
Purgason, Chuck	33	r	y	y	y	y	n
Ridgeway, Luann	17	r	y	y	y	y	n
Scott, Delbert	28	r	y	y	y	y	n
Shields, Charlie	34	r	n	y	y	y	n
Stouffer, Bill	21	r	y	y	y	y	n
Taylor, Larry Gene	29	r	n	y	y	y	n
Vogel, Carl	6	r	y	y	y	y	n
Wheeler, Charles	10	d	y	n	y	=	y
Wilson, Yvonne	9	d	y	n	y	y	y
Summary Statistics							
Total "yeas"			12	23	33	23	9
Total "nays"			18	9	0	0	25
Total "Absent"			4	2	1	2	0
Dems voting pro-conservation			8	1	10	10	9
Dems voting anti-conservation			0	9	0	0	0
Repubs voting pro-conservation			4	22	23	23	0
Repubs voting anti-conservation			18	0	0	0	25

Support Missouri Votes Conservation

___ YES! I want to help protect Missouri's natural resources and elect conservation-minded candidates to the Missouri General Assembly.

Enclosed is my contribution of ___\$35___\$50___\$100
___\$250 ___\$500 ___other

Contributions to Missouri Votes Conservation support political action to protect Missouri's resources and are not tax deductible.

Name: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____

ZIP: _____ Telephone: _____

email: _____

___ I want to volunteer! Let me know how I can work to elect conservation-minded candidates.

Mail to:

Missouri Votes Conservation
6267 Delmar Blvd. Suite 2W
St. Louis, MO 63130

Board of Directors:

- Ben Senturia, *Chair*
- Pedro McMillan, *Vice-Chair*
- Tal Sant, *Treasurer*
- Charles Abele, *Secretary*
- Dave Bedan, *Chair, Program and Policy Committee*
- Jeanne Kirkton, *Chair, Development Committee*
- Roy Gerdel
- Gary Giessow
- Wayne Goode
- John Hickey
- Sheila Lumpe
- Terry Spence

Executive Director:

Mark Fogal

Phone: 314-725-9494

www.movotesconservation.org

Please recycle this MVC Scorecard by passing it along to a friend



6267 Delmar Blvd. Suite 2W
St. Louis, MO 63130