



CONSERVATION TENNESSEE

> Nashville, Tennessee 37212 Suite 431 2021 21st Avenue S.

E tcved@bellsouth.net T 615-269-9090

www.tnconservationvoters.org

Member organizations:

arpeth River Watershed Association lowart Ours/Trust for the Future ague of Women Voters of Tennessee he Clean Air Action Team berland Harpeth Chapter of the Audubon Society ds of South Cumberland State Recreation Area ssippi River Corridor Alliance for Clean Energy Energy Efficiency Alliance Jean Water Network for Wilderness Planning Council ustice (formerly TTLA)

arks and Greenways Foundation reservation Trust ban Forestry Council pter of the Audubon Society livers Association Plant Society on and Parks Association

To receive updates on state environmental legislation, e-mail: info@tnconservationvoters.org



Printed on recycled paper using soy inks and aqueous coating.



Tennessee Conservation Voters (TCV) is a statewide non-partisan, non-profit organization dedicated to protecting legislative and protection a top accomplish this state legislators were particularly important to Tennessee's environment in the 2010 legislative session. Tennessee's environment and preserving our natural resources through effective nd administrative advocacy. TCV focuses its resources on making environmental priority for Tennessee's elected officials, political candidates and voters. One way we purpose is publishing this yearly legislative scorecard. The scorecard summarizes performance on environmental issues, i.e., how they voted on bills/resolutions that

practice of tak their dedicated purpose of land conservation funding. In a year of record financial deficits, ICV's top legislative priority for 2010 was restoration of the Real Estate Transfer Fees for there was well-placed concern about whether we could alter the General Assembly's recent respite the fact that the Funds became something of a political football in the Budget ing the dedicated land acquisition and preservation funds for general fund use.

obtaining this recurring bas discussions, wildlife and to communicate with legislators about the importance of these funds made the difference Tennessee develops, these Funds protect our living environment. Citizens who took the time he legislature restored all of the conservation funds in the final Budget on a nonsignificant victory. clean water, and to aid agricultural best practices. Legislators understand that as These fees are clearly dedicated by law to help save parks, wetlands, woods,

strong case against the practice, including irrefutable scientific evidence of its destructive out of the House Environment Subcommittee, Rep. Mike McDonald presented a very Another top priority for TCV was stopping the destruction caused by mountain top removal coal mining. This session, SB 1398/HB 455 was heard but failed to advance greater restrictions. as public opinion grows to end the practice, we believe they'll be forced to move toward consequences and a summary of the groundswell of opposition that is growing every unsuccessful. Legislators weren't willing to buck the powerful coal lobby this year, but in Tennessee. There was also an effort to hear the bill on the Senate Floor that was

property. These lawsuits are a major way that citizens and local governments protect would have made landowners immune from lawsuits if they allow a nuisance on their themselves against water quality violations, among other things. were introduced. One significant victory this session was the defeat of a bill that There were far fewer bills related to water quality filed in 2010, although troubling

新年的



expanded their use to public roads. The bills were overly broad and did not provide clear protections for land, water or public safety.

There were other battles. Over 100 bills touched on environmental matters and we reported on them weekly. An issue of concern TCV advocated for and against bills dealing with the processing and storage of nuclear waste in Tennessee. While the good bills failed to pass, we will continue to push for tighter restrictions and oversight. We also closely monitored ATV bills that would have

this session was the failure of the Senate Environment Committee to hear bills of consequence. This Committee stopped meeting several months before the session ended and failed to even hear testimony on important issues that impact the environment.

with a shrinking budget and will continue our efforts and air quality will be compromised if this continues. years. The approved 2010-11 budget props up quite funding, the net reduction results in lowered funding Another area that we will be closely monitoring is the TDEC budget, which has been reduced significantly over the past several to secure resources for TDEC, We applaud the leadership of the Department for their efforts to maintain standards a few vital programs with one-time stimulus funding, and even with the one-time for state parks and less staff to enforce environmental regulations. Our water, land

year when that action made a significant difference. We are especially grateful to all of the environmental advocates who responded to our calls to action and believe that this was a

sponsorship on important and appropriate environmental bills by giving positive or negative credit for 1) floor votes, 2) committee votes and/or 3) bill egislature however, bills may be filed but with no subsequent action or vote taken. Therefore, this scorecard evaluates legislators' work scoring system: Most scorecards are based on Floor votes (entire House or Senate consideration) on selected bills. In the Tennessee

Photo Credits: Penny Brooks

simply find the bills that are represented by the numbers in the columns. The bills that a legislator sponsored are noted by parentheses (). Legislators' net scores are the number of positive actions minus the number of negative actions. For every 2 net positive actions, legislators symbolize the bills in the Index of Actions. numbers in the columns "Positive Environmental Actions" and "Negative Environmental Actions" refer to the numbers we have used to toting: Legislators who sponsored or voted for a pro-environment bill or voted against an anti-environment bill or amendment received oted up or down without environmental concerns being the paramount consideration. "+1." Legislators who voted for or sponsored an actions, they received a stump. We have omitted some otherwise appropriate bills which were Therefore, anti-environment bill or voted against a pro-environment bill received a "-1." The in order to note which bills your legislators had the chance to vote on, you must

be directly compared unless they had an opportunity to vote on the same bills. bills. While the scorecard gives a good general sense of how legislators supported the environment, legislators' scores should not he opportunities for getting positive or negative points varied because not all legislators were on committees that considered environmental

To find the Legislators that represent your distri ct, please visit the Legislative Contacts page at www.tnconservationvoters.org

Index of Actions

- Mountain top removal mining. SB 1398/ HB 0455 would have prohibited mountain top surface mining that alters a ridgeline above 2,000 feet. The bill was heard, but House Environment Subcommittee adjourned in order not to vote on it. Positive points for sponsorships. Positive or negative points for Senate vote to bring the bill to the Floor and House Environment Subcommittee vote to adjourn the Committee.
- Mercury disposal. SB 2403/ HB 3218 will reduce the amount of toxic mercury that is discarded into TN landfills through education on the proper disposal and recycling of mercury-added consumer products. Enacted as Public Chapter 0840. Positive points for sponsorships
- 3. Responsible mining. SB 2592/ HB 3669 one of a series of bills filed by the sponsors on environmentally friendly mining practices. This bill would have created a reasonable method for documenting one's ability to comply with coal mining permit requirements. Bill filed, but no action taken. Positive points for
- 4. Rock harvesting. SB 2717/ HB 2837 would have restricted harmful rock harvesting practices on private land. Bill was taken off notice in House Budget Subcommittee. Positive points for sponsorships
- Nuclear waste processing. SB 2735/HB 2826 would have prohibited the process of blending more hazardous Class B & C nuclear waste with Class A waste for disposal in Class A landfills. Bill failed in House State Government Subcommittee. Positive points for sponsorships and positive or negative points for vote in Senate Environment and House State Government Subcommittee.
- Disposal of nuclear waste. SB 2801/ HB2911 would have prohibited the current practice of allowing low-grade nuclear waste in specified Tennessee landfills. Positive points for sponsorship. Positive or negative points for House State Government Subcommittee vote.
- 7. Land Conservation funding. SB 2861/ HB 3110 would have prohibited the diversion of land conservation funds to the state general fund. This funding, to help save parks, wetlands, woods, wildlife and clean water, was restored in the final Budget. Positive points for sponsorship. Positive or negative points for budget amendment vote in Senate Finance.
- 8. Solid waste reduction. SB 3112/ HB 3364 would have required TDEC and the Solid Waste Board to comply with waste reduction and recycling standards. Bill passed in the House but was stalled in Senate Environment. Positive points
- Green jobs. SB 3120/ HB 3654 would have created a state plan for development of green jobs in urban and rural communities experiencing chronic unemployment. If amended, it would have used federal funds. Bill was deferred in House Commerce. Positive points for sponsorship. Positive or negative points for vote to defer the bill in House Commerce.
- 10. Climate regulation. SB 3159/ HB 3287 would have preempted federal cap and trade or other greenhouse gas reducing programs. Bill failed to move on the House Floor. Negative points for sponsorship
- 11. Energy efficiency. SB 3192/ HB 3215 & SB 3293/ HB 3440 both bills would have upgraded the energy codes for new construction to the 2007 standard. Bills were filed, but no action was taken. *Positive points for*
- 12. Water quality appeals. SB 3451/ HB 3483 would have mandated automatic approval of water quality appeals, if the decision of the Water Quality Control Board is not rendered within 120 days. Bill filed, no committee action taken. Negative points for sponsorship.
- Container deposit. SB 3469/ HB 3429 would have created the TN Beverage Container Recycling Act (bottle bill) to reduce litter and increase recycling. Bill was taken off notice in House State Government Sub after a hearing. Positive points for sponsorship
- 14. Nuisance protection. SB 3479/ HB 3630 would have held landowners immune from the doctrine of nuisance for any land use that has been ongoing for seven years - including unpermitted quarries and similar threats to the water supply. Bill was taken off notice in House Civil Practice Subcommittee. Negative points for sponsorship.
- 15. Civil proceedings. SB 3565/HB 3564 would have made it prohibitively expensive to file an environmental enforcement action in court. Bill filed, but no action taken. Negative points for sponsorship.
- 16. Environmental Protection Fund. SB 3620/ HB 3482 would have reduced the TN Environmental Protection Fund by transferring fees from civil penalties and damages to the state general fund. Bill filed, no committee action taken. Negative points for sponsorship.
- 17. Foreign nuclear waste. SB 3623/ HB 3853 amendment 1 would have prevented the processing of foreign nuclear waste through blending, mixing or any other method. Amendment #1 was tabled. Positive point for Amendment sponsorship. Positive or negative points for House Floor vote on tabling motion.
- 18. Urban sprawl. SB 3634/ HB 3695 would have prohibited counties designated by EPA as having unhealthy air quality from some development on agricultural land. Bill failed in House State & Local Govt. Committee. *Positive* points for sponsorship.
- 19. Scenic landscapes. SB 3720/ HB 3150 would have lessened, through attrition, the number of billboards in Memphis, Nashville, Knoxville and Chattanooga. Bill failed to pass out of the Transportation Committees. Positive
- 20. Sustainable agriculture. SB 3890/ HB 3738 would have prohibited the sale of seeds that have been genetically modified to render the plant's seed sterile. The bill passed the House Agriculture Committee but was taken off notice in House Budget Subcommittee. Positive points for sponsorship.
- 21. Coal Ash. SJR 0784 requires a report on dry coal ash storage from TDEC, relative to TVA Emergency Preparedness and transition to dry coal ash storage. The resolution passed and was signed by the Governor. Positive points for sponsorship.
 - *For more information on individual bills go to www.legislature.state.tn.us

enate Lt. Gov. Ramsey, R-2	2010 (+) Positive Actions*	(-) Negative Actions®	Score -1	2010 Ratin
Barnes, D-22	(1),1,5,(11)		4	AA
Beavers, R-17 Berke, D-10	(1),1,(5),(6),(9)		5	44
Black, R-18 Bunch, R-9	(2),7	-	0	
Burchett, R-7 Burks, D-15	(18),(20),(21)	1,7	1	
Crowe, R-3 Faulk, R-4	(2)	1,5	-1	
Finney, D-2	(1),1,(5),(9)	-360	4 2	A A
O. Ford, D-29 Gresham, R-26	1,(5)	-1	-1	9
Harper, D-19 Haynes, D-20	1,7,(19)		3	did
Henry, D-21 Herron, D-24	(7),7 1,(5),7,(21)	1	1	all all
Jackson, D-25 Johnson, R-23	(1),1,(5),5,(13)	(14) 1,5,(10)	4	di di
Kelsey, R-31	751.775	1	-1	
Ketron, R- L3 Kyle, D-28	(2),(7) 1,7	(15)	2	A
Marrero, D-30 McNally, R-5	1,(3),(5),(6),(8),(13),(21)	1,7	7	A PARTY
Norris, R-32 Overbey, R-8	(2),7	1	1	
Southerland, R-1 E. Stewart, D-14	(2),5,(11) (1),1,(5),5		3 4	商商
Tate, D-33	i		1	The later is
Tracy, R-16 B. Watson, R-11	(2) (4),7		2	A
Woodson, R-6 Yager, R-12	(2),7,(21)	1,5	-2	
	327755	700000000000000000000000000000000000000		
House of Representatives		1772		
Speaker Williams, I-4 Armstrong, D-15	17	17	-1	
Barker, D-77 Bass, D-65	17 17		1	200
Bell, R-23 Bone, D-46	(13),17	1,17	-2	-
Borchert, D-75 H. Brooks, R-19	(1),1,(5),17	17	4	dh.dh
K. Brooks, R-24		17	-1	-
Brown, D-28 Camper, D-87	(9),17 (8),17		2 2	9
Campfield, R-18 Carr, R-48	(6),6	(10),17 5,9,17	-1	
Casada, D-62 lim Cobb, R-31	186660	17 17	-1	
Ty Cobb, R-31	(5),5,6,17	*/.	4	100.00
Coleman, D-49 Coley, R-97	(2),(13)	17	1	
Cooper, D-86 Curtiss, D-43	(8),(9),17 9,17		3 2	and an
Dean, R-30 J. Deberry, D-90	(9),(13),17	17	-1	dad
L. Deberry, D-91 Dennis, R-71	(9),17	17	2	dh
Dunn, R-16	(1),(7)	17	1	
Eldridge, R-73 Evans, R-66		17 17	-1 -1	
Faulkner, R-36 Favors, D-29		17	-1	
Ferguson, D-32 Fincher, D-42	(1),(4),(9),17	(12),(16),17	-2 3	da d
Fitzhugh, D-82 Floyd, R-27	9,17	(10),17	-1	A
D. Ford, R-6		17	-1	4
Fraley, D-39 Gilmore, D-54	1,17 (1),1,(6),(8),(9),17		6	- Chillian
Hackworth, D-33 Halford, R-79	9	17	0	5-045
Hardaway, D-92 Harmon, D-37	(2),(8),(9),17 9,17	27.55	4	dada dada
Harrison, R-9	(19)	17 9,17	-1	
Harwell, R-56 Hawk, R-5	(2),(18)	1,17	0	
Haynes, R-14 Hensley, R-70		5,6,17 17	-3 -1	-
Hill, R-7 C. Johnson, R-68	(11)	17 9,17	-2	4
P. Johnson, R-78 S. Jones, D-59	(13),17	9,17	-2 2	45
U. Jones, D-98	(8),(9),(17),17		4	-
Kernell, D-93 Litz, D-10	(8),(13),17 5,6,17		3	dh.d dh.d
Lollar, R-99 Lundberg, R-1		1,17 9,17	-2 -2	4
Lynn, R-57 Maddox, D-76	(2),17	9,(10),17	-3	-0-
Maggart, R-45	(±917	17	-1	
Marsh, R-62 Matheny, R-47		9,17 17	-1	
Matlock, R-21 McCord, R-8		17 1,9,17	-1 -3	-7-
McCormick, R-26 McDaniel, R-72	(4),6	5,9,17 17	-1	
McDonald, D-44 McManus, R-96	(1),1,(4),(9),(13),17	17	6	(III)
Miller, D-88	(9),17	1111-71	2	in the
Moore, D-50	17	9,17	-2	4
Mumpower, R-3 Naifeh, D-81	9,17	17	-1	A
Niceley, R-17 Odom, D-55	(13), (18),(20)	1,17	1 1	
Pitts, D-67	9,17		2	A.A.
Pruitt, D-58 Ramsey, R-20	5, 6, (9), (13), 17 (13)		1	A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A
Rich, R-94 Richardson, D-89	(13),17	17	-1 2	- An
Roach, R-35 Rowland, R-34		17 (15),17	- 1 -2	4
Sargent, R-61	17	17	-1	
Shaw, D-80 Shepard, D-69	(8),9,(13),17		4	(A)
Shipley, R-2 Sontany, D-53	(7),17	17.	-1 2	de
M. Stewart, D-52 Swafford, R-25	(1),(2),(7),(9),9,(13),17 (13)	9,17	7	990
Tidwell, D-74		1,17	-2	-1-
Tindell, D-13 Todd, R-95	17	9,17	-2	-
Towns, D-84 J. Turner, D-85	(2),(9),17	774.0	2	in in
M. Turner, D-51 E. Watson, R-22	(1),(5),(13),17	17	4	10.0
Weaver, R-40	437.47	17	-1	ф
West, D-60	(13),17	17	2	die
White, R-83 Windle, D-41**			N/A	N/A

* Refers to the index of Actions;

() denotes sponsorship;

**Absent due to service in Afghanistan