

Michigan League of Conservation Voters

Environmental Scorecard 2008

A Reflection on Michigan's Environmental Leadership




Table of Contents

Letter From the Director and Board President.....	Page 2
Michigan LCV Protects.....	Pages 3-4
Michigan LCV Board of Directors and Staff.....	Page 4
2007-2008 In Review.....	Page 5
Priority Issues.....	Page 6
The Best of 2007-2008.....	Page 8
The Worst of 2007-2008.....	Pages 9-10
Michigan Supreme Court.....	Pages 11-12
Senate Bill Descriptions.....	Pages 13-14
Senate Votes.....	Page 15
House Bill Descriptions.....	Pages 17-18
House Votes.....	Pages 19-21
Keep Score and Take Action.....	Page 22

Michigan LCV Mission

The Michigan League of Conservation Voters works to turn environmental values into community and legislative priorities. We do this by electing and holding accountable public officials who will champion a healthy and vital Michigan by preserving and protecting our air, land and water; working to pass strong environmental laws to protect our state's natural resources; and mobilizing citizens as a political force for the environment.

Acknowledgements

Special thanks to Dave Dempsey, without whom this Scorecard would not be possible. Additional thanks go to Brian Beauchamp, Amelia Menton and Lydia Mitchell.

Photo credits: Cover: L to R: Adam Romanowicz under license from Istockphoto.com, Bill Grove under license from Istockphoto.com, Ashok Rodrigues under license from Istockphoto.com, Greg Cooksey under license from Istockphoto.com, Brian Miller*, Cornelia Schaible under license from Istockphoto.com, GLNPO: Michigan Travel Bureau; Page 1: Douglas Allen under license from Istockphoto.com; Top to Bottom: Page 2: Snehitdesign*, Actinicblue*, Brian Miller*, Sparkia*; Page 3: Apschorr*, Dragan Veselinov*, Snehitdesign*, Don Breneman GLNPO; Page 4: Snehitdesign*, Jim Parkin*, Cameron Wendt*, Apschorr*; Page 5: Jennifer Shelton*, Apschorr*, Jennifer Stone*, Snehitdesign*; Page 7: Snehitdesign*; Page 8: Snehitdesign*, GLNPO: Michigan Travel Bureau, Kenneth Ilio*, Apschorr*; Page 9: Maksym Gorpenyuk*; Page 10: Phil Augustavo from Istockphoto.com, Evan Farinosi under a Creative Commons license, US EPA; Page 11: Michael Smith*, Snehitdesign*, Randall McCune (courtesy Michigan Travel Bureau), Michigan Travel Bureau; Page 12: Thomas A. Schneider (courtesy Michigan Travel Bureau), Snehitdesign*, Michael Smith*; Page 13: Snehitdesign*, Cornelia Schaible Istockphoto.com, Michigan Travel Bureau, Jeffrey Williams*; Page 14: GLNPO; Page 16: Brian Miller*; Page 22: Michael Thompson*, USDA Forest Service, Superior National Forest; Wolfrance*; Michigan Travel Bureau; Back cover: National Park Service, Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore. Photos with * are from Dreamstime.com. **Design:** The Principled Pen, (215) 990-7334.

Letter From the Director and Board President

A message from Executive Director Lisa Wozniak and Board President William Farr

Dear Friend:

Natural resources have always defined Michigan, and how we manage and treat them will define us far into the future. While each of us has a role to play in conservation, elected officials play an especially significant part—their decisions to invest in our parks and waters, to protect land, or to grow a clean, energy-efficient Michigan economy will affect the lives of all of us, and those who will come after us.

That's why we're pleased to offer you our 2008 Michigan LCV Environmental Scorecard. In one package, we believe we have provided you with the information you need to understand the actions of state Legislators, the Governor and the Supreme Court on key conservation issues in 2007 and 2008, and the tools to hold them accountable. We hope you will carefully review and act on this Scorecard to help build momentum for a Michigan quality of life second to none in the nation.


The 2007-2008 legislative session in Lansing began with a legislative stalemate over a looming budget crisis, which took most of 2007 to solve. In the process, our lawmakers shelved key conservation issues. Votes on energy, water and other issues were few until Spring 2008 when major water conservation and energy legislation finally reached the floor of the state House and Senate, but only after months and months of delay.

It is important, however, to note that, as this document went to print, only one bill voted on by both chambers reached the Governor's desk—the Great Lakes compact. Political in-fighting dominated the dialogue in Lansing, resulting in embarrassing energy proposals from the Senate and inconclusive action in both chambers.


Citizens have the power to change this situation, especially if they're armed with the necessary information. Moving conservation up the state agenda is critical. Michigan is at a crossroads. Years of shrinking budgets have weakened our state park system and undermined toxic cleanup. Meanwhile, as evidence of climate change mounts and the economic benefits of an economy charged by renewable energy and efficiency become more apparent, the state has a long way to go in creating jobs and cleaner air and water with a sensible energy policy.

Clean air, clean water, lakes and rivers to fish, swim and boat in, wildlife habitat, parks, trails and wild places—these are not a special interest. They are everyone's interest. We hope this Scorecard responds to your interest in knowing how the people you elect to serve you in Lansing are protecting the natural heritage and beauty of Michigan for today and future generations.


Sincerely, .



Lisa Wozniak,
Executive Director



William Farr,
Board President





Michigan LCV Protects

Michigan LCV takes action for Michigan's families and natural beauty

For 100 years, Michigan has helped define what it means to be a state that leads the way in conservation and a clean environment.

The people of Michigan were among the first in the U.S. to create state forests and state parks, attack water pollution, ban lethal chemicals like DDT, recycle bottles and cans through a deposit system, and conserve wetlands.

Governors and Legislators of both major parties responded positively to the public clamor for strong protections for, water and air with decisive action.

Unfortunately, that reputation is at risk. Michigan is no longer considered a conservation leader among the states. The bipartisan consensus that Michigan conservation is too important to be politicized has broken down.

As a result, other states are coming up with new and innovative ways to protect our natural resources, and provide the quality of life necessary to attract new employers and workers in the 21st Century.

- Other states are providing strong incentives for energy efficiency and clean, renewable and job-producing wind power.
- Other states are coming to terms with global warming by developing greenhouse gas reduction plans that will also make their economies more efficient and healthy.
- Other states are promoting water conservation and the development of water treatment technology.
- Other states are pursuing new approaches to funding conservation to be sure the future is protected.

There is good news for Michigan, however. For one thing, the protective web of strong state conservation and environmental laws woven for most of the 20th Century is mostly intact.

For another, Michigan voters remain strongly committed to protection of our water and other resources. Michigan's conservation leadership is a sleeping giant that can be stirred again.

That is why the Michigan League of Conservation Voters produces an annual Scorecard on the performance of the state Legislature. This year

we've added an analysis of gubernatorial and Supreme Court actions as well. Michigan LCV holds state officials accountable through the Scorecard. We do this for a simple reason: it is our mission to help translate the values of Michigan families—their desire for healthy air and water, unparalleled natural beauty, and abundant recreational opportunities—into priorities of state government.

Together with Michigan's people, Michigan LCV has succeeded in winning key conservation battles. We will continue to work to transform the people's desire for a great Michigan into reality for this generation and our children and grandchildren.

Michigan LCV Board of Directors and Staff

Michigan LCV Board

William Farr, President*
Mike Newman, Vice President*
Bob Martel, Treasurer
Douglas Glancy, Secretary
Irene McDonnell Cahill*
Kerry Duggan
Elizabeth Goodenough
David LaGrand
Dr. Daniel Luria*
Christine Manninen
Robert Matthews
Lana Pollack
Joe Schwarz
Ned Staebler
Bruce Wallace
Terry Ziemba

**Members of the Issues
and Accountability Committee*

Honorary Co-Chairs

Former Governor Milliken
and Mrs. Helen Milliken

Advisory Board


John Austin
John Carver
Marcia Gershenson

Directors Emeritus

Michael D. Moore
Mark Richardson
Joan Wolfe

Staff

Pam Bierzynski, Office and Special
Projects Manager
Jim Carey, Financial Systems Analyst
Bill Kirk, West Michigan Field
Director
Abby Rubley, Communications
Director
Lisa Wozniak, Executive Director





2007-2008 In Review

Michigan Legislature largely silent on the environment

The 2007-2008 legislative session in Lansing got off to a prolonged poor start for conservation. Facing a mammoth budget deficit and the loss of an additional \$1.2 billion in revenues as of Oct. 1, 2007, Legislators gave short shrift to issues like parks, pollution and water protection. Instead, they quarreled over budget solutions among themselves and with Governor Jennifer Granholm and reached stalemate for most of 2007. Few bills associated with conservation needs reached the floor of the House or Senate.

To compound the disappointment for conservationists, the Legislature and Governor closed part of the budget deficit by snatching \$70 million from a fund designed to protect public drinking water and reduce fire and other safety hazards resulting from leaking petroleum tanks.

As a result, 2007 ended with:

- A further reduction in the portion of state general fund dollars going to conservation and environmental protection. Only about a penny of every general state tax dollar goes to habitat and clean air and water—while most Michigan citizens assume the share is closer to 10 percent.
- An estimated unmet need of over \$80 million per year, or more than \$1 billion over the next 20 years, to protect the public from toxic wastes and clean it up.
- Sinking public approval of Lansing officials.

Early in 2008, the pace quickened for conservation:

Governor Granholm stepped up advocacy for renewable energy as part of the solution to Michigan's economic distress, and Legislators fashioned strong water conservation proposals.

By July 2008:

Key decisions regarding energy policy, including the adoption of a strong standard for renewable sources (especially wind or solar), were made in the House. Unfortunately, the Senate passed an unacceptable and incredibly weak package of energy bills late on a Friday night hoping that Michigan citizens would not take notice. As this Scorecard goes to print, negotiations between the chambers are underway.

By the second week of July, the Governor signed into law the compact to defend Great Lakes water from diversion to other regions and private interests. While both the House and Senate passed the Great Lakes Compact, they were split sharply over how to manage in-state water withdraws. After many days of negotiations, a deal was struck in which Michigan took a giant step forward in protecting our water, but missed the boat completely when it came to ensuring the public's right over use of our water.

Priority Issues

Water conservation, smart energy policy and conservation funding

Water

Water defines Michigan on a map, shaping the unforgettable image of the two mittens. Water also defines the heritage, quality of life and future opportunity of Michigan. The Great Lakes, which contain nearly 20 percent of the world's surface fresh water, are a natural wonder and key to our economy, recreation, and overall quality of life. They are ours to enjoy and protect.

But water is scarce in many fast-growing areas of the U.S. Water shortages in the West and a water supply crisis in Atlanta, Georgia in 2007 called national attention to the problem. There is a risk that other regions and some commercial interests will seek Great Lakes water to make up for bad planning and to make private profit off a public resource. Now is the time for Michigan to take bold action to secure our water legacy.

Our water resources are too important to be sacrificed for partisan, short-term political gain. Unfortunately, special interests have fought legislation that would go beyond the minimal standards set by the interstate Great Lakes Compact. Michigan needs to set a high standard of conservation for its water, but opponents sided with out-of-state interests to leave significant gaps in the state's water defenses. Michigan LCV and allies worked to close those gaps and assure Michigan's future.

Energy

What would you say if someone told you that Michigan is spending \$20 billion a year on dirty coal and oil from out of state that pollute our air and water? It's not the smart energy and economic policy most of us would design. But it's what we're faced with.

Michigan can change all that. We can act now to create a smarter energy future for Michigan by investing in homegrown renewable energy options, such as wind power and energy efficiency. We could save \$4 billion a year in energy costs, just for starters. Renewable

energy will keep money in Michigan's economy, create thousands of jobs manufacturing wind turbines and other technology, and give us a reliable source of energy that will never run out. But some special interests, while claiming to support renewable energy, opposed meaningful steps to encourage wind, solar and other projects. Michigan LCV supports a strong renewable energy standard that will convince clean energy developers to make the investments needed to create a robust source of clean power for the state's current and future needs.

Conservation Funding

When it comes to making a state budget, too often Legislators put conservation into the equation last, and remove it first. This trend has grown significantly worse in Michigan since 2000. In September 2007, the Michigan LCV Education Fund issued a report depicting the problem in alarming terms:

- Between 2001 and 2006, general state funding for the parks, fish, wildlife and air and water pollution control programs of the Departments of Natural Resources (DNR) and Environmental Quality (DEQ) fell 62 percent. Overall general state funding fell only 6 percent during the same time.
- No other state agencies lost as large a proportion of their funding from 2001 to 2006 as the Michigan DNR and DEQ.

Michigan voters aren't the problem. In 1968, 1988, 1998, and 2002 elections, voters approved clean water, parks and toxic cleanup bonds totaling more than \$2.7 billion. Each ballot measure won by a margin of at least 60 percent to 40 percent. When voters get the chance, they invest in programs delivering tangible benefits to their resources and quality of life.

Michigan LCV knows that Michigan voters value smart budgets that support conservation, and we're committed to helping the state realize these priorities through funding solutions.



The Best of 2007-2008

Advancing renewable energy, climate action and environmental justice

Despite a difficult economic outlook and a challenging state budget, 2007 opened with promise for Michigan conservation.


Supported in her 2006 re-election bid by many conservationists, second-term Governor Jennifer Granholm promised to continue her open-door policy to conservation and environmental leaders, and proposed a strong agenda for her final four years as the state's chief executive.

A change of party leadership in the Michigan House of Representatives offered hope of a more productive relationship between the executive and legislative branches.

The return of a veteran conservation leader to the chair of the state Senate's environmental affairs committee suggested a busy legislative session for the state's pressing fish, wildlife, parks, land protection and clean air and water needs.

Although gridlock on the state's budget crisis frustrated hopes for a productive 2007 in Lansing, conservation did make some advances.

- The Governor created a new position and appointed a renewable energy advisor to help her advance renewable energy and energy efficiency policies, and made a statewide tour to tout the job-producing and environmental benefits of renewable energy industries.
- A new Climate Action Council, also appointed by the Governor, is charged with producing a comprehensive climate change action plan for the state by the end of 2008.
- The state initiated a strong environmental justice policy when the Governor issued an Executive Directive in November 2007 calling for the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) to identify and address discriminatory public health or environmental effects of state laws, regulations, policies and activities on Michigan residents.
- Michigan became the eighth and final state to sign into law the Great Lakes Compact. This groundbreaking legislation will, for the first time, regulate water withdraws to interests outside of the Great Lakes Basin. With agreements from all of the Great Lakes states, including two Provinces in Canada, the Compact is now headed to Congress for final ratification. The Governor also signed into law a package of bills that will start Michigan down the path toward regulating water use and withdraws inside our state boundaries.





The Worst of 2007-2008

Turning back the clock on Michigan's legacy of environmental protection

In many ways, 2007-2008 has disappointed Michigan conservationists. Legislators, the Governor and the Michigan Supreme Court have failed to build on Michigan's conservation record—and, in fact, the Supreme Court tried to turn back the clock by gutting one of Michigan's landmark environmental laws with a ruling rejected by many legal scholars.

The last two years have underscored how important public demand for strong conservation policies is, and how important all elective posts—including judicial positions—are to the future of the state's natural resources. Here's a rundown of some of the greatest disappointments of the last two years.

Moving money away from environmental cleanup

Since the late 1980s, Michigan motorists have paid a 7/8 cent fee per gallon of gasoline, in order to address a 100-year legacy of petroleum contamination—primarily the result of leaking underground storage tanks at service stations.

The money has been earmarked for a special cleanup fund, which has contributed to safe drinking water supplies and groundwater, as well as river and stream cleanups at 12,000 locations across the state.

Despite these actions, an estimated 4,500 leaking tank contaminated sites remain. It will take another \$1.5 billion to protect the public and our environment from these threats.

Regrettably, in a quick fix for the state's budget deficit, the Legislature and Governor approved a raid of \$70 million from the tank cleanup fund. This action not only delays cleanup at many critical sites, but also breaks faith with motorists who have paid the fee with the understanding it would go to petroleum-related purposes.

Rolling back the Michigan Environmental Protection Act

One of the most important things Michigan has ever done for conservation is to empower citizens to defend our air, water and other natural resources.

The 1970 Michigan Environmental Protection Act, known as MEPA, permitted any citizen of the state to go to court to prevent or stop harm to the environment.

Fiercely opposed by polluters at the time it was passed, the law has remained a target for those who believe the public has no business playing a direct role in halting environmental threats.

In a July 2007 decision, the state Supreme Court, on a narrow 4 to 3 vote, removed the heart of MEPA. It struck down the provision of MEPA that gave citizens automatic standing to sue to protect their natural resources.

“I thought this was a nation of and by and for the people,” said Joan Wolfe, the founder of the West Michigan Environmental Council and Michigan LCV Director Emeritus. “The Supreme Court has overstepped its bounds.”


Acid mines threatening the Upper Peninsula

One of the most polluting forms of hard rock mining ever practiced in the U.S. neared a foothold in the western Upper Peninsula when the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) issued permits to a corporation to extract nickel and copper. The proposed acid mine drainage system has never failed to pollute waters elsewhere. Threatening critical habitat for rare fish and other sensitive species as well as the headwaters of a precious Lake Superior tributary, sulfide mining has so far been delayed only by citizen lawsuits.

Inaction, stalemate, and retreat

Sometimes it's what doesn't happen that matters the most:

- A 2002 pledge by Governor Granholm to control Michigan's toxic mercury emissions from coal-fired power plants remains unfulfilled. A work group continues to struggle to draft a rule that would curb mercury pollution. If and when the rule takes effect, it will take years to reduce mercury emissions.
- Michigan lagged behind many other Great Lakes states in considering the Great Lakes Compact, which would help build a regional defense against water raids on the Lakes. Finally, in late spring 2008, both chambers of the Michigan Legislature passed the Compact. The House passed strong implementing legislation, while the Senate passed incredibly weak legislation that would not result in strong protections of our water. The final negotiated package was a step in the right direction, but missed completely on ensuring that the waters of Michigan be held in the public's trust.
- Despite year-long attention to the state's budget crisis, the Legislature made no progress in identifying solutions to declining conservation funding. With funds from a 1998 voter-approved environmental bond running out and shrinking general tax revenues devoted to conservation, the state continued to underinvest in natural resources.





Michigan Supreme Court

Interpreting conservation laws

When citizens succeed in persuading or pressuring politicians to pass conservation and environmental laws, the battle isn't over—it's just begun. Successful conservation requires funding and enforcement of the laws. Judges can uphold, strike down or cut the heart out of laws enacted by elected representatives. That's where the Michigan Supreme Court comes in.

For instance, Chief Justice Clifford Taylor has recently played an important role in two cases that significantly weakened the Michigan Environmental Protection Act (MEPA).

The first, *National Wildlife Federation v. Cleveland Cliffs, Inc.*, decided in 2004, signaled the Supreme Court's willingness to override the Legislature's intent regarding protection of the environment.

The suit was filed on behalf of citizens in the Upper Peninsula to stop Cleveland Cliffs from destroying wetlands and filling streams with mining wastes from its Empire Mine in Marquette County.

The second, *Michigan Citizens for Water Conservation v. Nestle Waters North America, Inc.*, decided in 2007, had the effect of negating the central provision of MEPA, limiting the public's ability to protect natural resources.

This suit was brought on behalf of Michigan Citizens for Water Conservation to stop the draining of streams and springs by Nestle to export bottled water outside of Michigan.

Enacted in 1970 and supported by the state's longest-serving governor, William G. Milliken, MEPA was regarded as a national landmark. The law gives any citizen of the state the right to go to court to protect Michigan's incomparable natural resources.

But Taylor and the Supreme Court's decision held that "any person" could not bring a suit: only a person who demonstrates that he or she is directly affected can, despite the fact that MEPA was based on the principle that all citizens are directly affected by environmental degradation.

In response to the Supreme Court decision, Governor Milliken said: "It was clearly the intent of the Legislature and clearly my intent when I signed that bill that any citizen would have the right to sue. I think the ultimate recourse is to get a new court."

While these have been the two most recognized environmental decisions made by the Michigan Supreme Court, there have unfortunately been more:

- *Miller v. Ford Motor Co.*, 479 Mich 498 (2007): A company which puts a worker into an asbestos-exposure job owes no “duty” to a family member who contracts mesothelioma from routinely washing the workers’ clothes.
- *Henry v. Dow Chemical*, 473 Mich 63; 701 NW2d 684 (2005): Persons exposed to dioxins negligently released into the environment cannot bring claims for medical monitoring even though it is known that it may take years for cancer to manifest.
- *Preserve the Dunes, Inc v. Michigan DEQ*, 471 Mich 508; 684 NW2d 847 (2004): Michigan Environmental Protection Act provides no private cause of action for plaintiffs to challenge DEQ’s determination of eligibility for mining permits.

People don’t experience public policies, just the results of them.

They experience foul beaches, declining stocks of contaminated fish, tainted drinking water, skies yellowed by smog, wetlands smothered in concrete, plummeting Great Lakes water levels.

Or, if the policies are shaped in a different way, they enjoy honey gold beaches, abundant fish that are safe to eat, clean drinking water, skies blue as Lake Superior, wetlands that please the eye with vegetation and waterfowl, and Great Lakes that cycle in a predictable and mostly natural pattern.

—*Dave Dempsey, 2005. Author, On the Brink, The Great Lakes in the 21st Century*





Senate Bill Descriptions

Delayed action gave way to progress

The final score for each lawmaker in our Scorecard is always a snapshot of key votes taken on critical conservation issues. This session, it is important to note that the overwhelming lack of leadership in Lansing must be taken into consideration when measuring lawmaker's performance. A 100 percent score, for example, may be an adequate representation of a few of our elected official's leadership on conservation. For the most part, however, Michigan's air, water and land remained second tier issues for the House and Senate. We urge you to take this into consideration as you read this document and as you encourage your lawmaker to do a better job in Lansing.



1. Factory Farm Deregulation Bill (SB 504)

Status: Passed Senate, 21 to 17.

In late June 2007, the Senate passed a package of bills to deregulate the polluting animal factory (formally known as Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations, or CAFOs) industry. The bills eliminate the requirement for CAFOs to obtain pollution discharge permits and punished citizens who reported sewage discharges by making victims pay the DEQ's inspection costs. In addition, the bills redefine "agricultural stormwater" to include any quantity of animal sewage, making pollution discharges from animal factories legal. A NO vote was a vote for the environment.



2. Great Lakes Compact (SB 212)

Status: Passed Senate, 38 to 0.

In May 2008, the Michigan Senate passed SB 212, which protects Michigan's water resources by ratifying the eight-state Great Lakes Compact and writing good conservation standards and practices into statute. Senate members introduced a package of bills to make this broad approach the law of Michigan. The first bill in the package, SB 212, puts Michigan's stamp of approval on the Compact. A YES vote was a vote for the environment.



3. Great Lakes Water Withdrawal (SB 860)

Status: Passed Senate, 24 to 14.

In May 2008, the Michigan Senate passed SB 860, which leaves some of Michigan's treasured cold-water fishing streams vulnerable to up to 25 percent withdrawals, risks significant habitat loss for fish populations, and minimizes the state's ability to regulate large water users from adversely harming our water resources. Furthermore, this bill takes away the public's ability to be a part of the input process in decision making around large water withdrawals. A NO vote was a vote for the environment.

3A. Great Lakes Water Withdrawal (SB 860- Amendment 318)

Status: Failed Senate, 19 to 19.

In May 2008, the Michigan Senate failed to pass this amendment to water conservation legislation (SB 860), which would have increased protection of Michigan's world-renowned cold water trout streams and other waters by reducing the allowable negative impact on thriving fish populations from a new water withdrawal. A YES vote was a vote for the environment.

3B. Great Lakes Water Withdrawal (SB 860- Amendment 319)

Status: Failed Senate, 17 to 21.

In May 2008, the Michigan Senate failed to pass this amendment to water conservation legislation (SB 860), which would have strengthened protection for waters affected by new withdrawals. It would have required the state to take into account the amount of water already withdrawn from a lake, stream or groundwater by major users and make more protective decisions to safeguard existing users and/or avoid damage to the waters themselves. A YES vote was a vote for the environment.

3C. Great Lakes Water Withdrawal (SB 860- Amendment 320)

Status: Failed Senate, 18 to 19.

In May 2008, the Michigan Senate failed to pass this amendment to water conservation legislation (SB 860), which would have benefited the state's waters by requiring that state permission for any new withdrawal requiring a permit would also include restorative measures conserving the flow of a stream or groundwater. A YES vote was a vote for the environment.

3D. Great Lakes Water Withdrawal (SB 860- Amendment 321)

Status: Failed Senate, 17 to 21.

In May 2008, the Michigan Senate failed to pass this amendment to water conservation legislation (SB 860), which would have toughened protection of rivers and streams where a user proposes to take an amount of water close to the level that scientific modeling shows will cause damage. A YES vote was a vote for the environment.

3E. Great Lakes Water Withdrawal (SB 860- Amendment 322)

Status: Failed Senate, *19 to 18 (*20 Yeas needed for passage.)

In May 2008, the Michigan Senate failed to pass this amendment to water conservation legislation (SB 860), which would have dramatically increased protection of the state's water by requiring public oversight and state approval of any new water withdrawal of more than 200,000 gallons per day. A YES vote was a vote for the environment.

4. Renewable Energy Portfolio Standard (SB 213)

Status: Passed Senate, 20 to 15.

In June 2008, the Senate passed SB 213, which creates a renewable portfolio standard of 7 percent by 2015. This is an incredibly weak standard, given that Michigan already uses 3 to 4 percent renewable energy. The bill minimizes the prospect of more renewable usage by creating loopholes and "good faith" clauses for utility companies to sidestep the already low 7 percent mandate. It also opens the door for the construction of new coal-fired power plants in Michigan under the guise of "clean coal." This bill lines the pockets of the utilities instead of creating jobs and providing a clean energy future for our state. A NO vote was a vote for the environment.



Senate Votes

Senator	Party	District	Hometown	Term	2007-08 Score	2005-06 Score	2003 Score	1	2	3	3A	3B	3C	3D	3E	4
Allen, J.	R	37	Traverse City	2	11%	11%	57%	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Anderson, G.	D	6	Westland	1	100%			+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Barcia, J.	D	31	Bay City	5*	67%	33%	71%	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	-
Basham, R.	D	8	Taylor	2	89%	100%	86%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	A
Birkholz, P.	R	24	Saugatuck	2	11%	22%	57%	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bishop, M.	R	12	Rochester	2	11%	11%	57%	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brater, L.	D	18	Ann Arbor	2	100%	100%	71%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Brown, C.	R	16	Sturgis	2	22%	11%	57%	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+
Cassis, N.	R	15	Novi	2	11%	11%	57%	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cherry, D.	D	26	Burton	2	100%	89%	86%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Clark-Coleman, I.	D	3	Detroit	2	100%	78%	71%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Clarke, H.	D	1	Detroit	2	100%	100%	71%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Cropsey, A.	R	33	DeWitt	3*	11%	11%	43%	-	+	-	-	-	A	-	A	-
Garcia, V.	R	22	Howell	3**	11%	11%	57%	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
George, T.	R	20	Kalamazoo	2	11%	22%	57%	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gilbert II, J.	R	25	Algonac	2	11%	11%	57%	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gleason, J.	D	27	Flushing	1	89%			+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+
Hardiman, B.	R	29	Kentwood	2	11%	11%	57%	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hunter, T.	D	5	Detroit	1	100%			+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Jacobs, G.	D	14	Huntington Woods	2	100%	100%	71%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Jansen, M.	R	28	Grand Rapids	1	11%			-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jelinek, R.	R	21	Three Oaks	2	11%	33%	57%	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kahn, R. MD	R	32	Saginaw	1	33%			-	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-
Kuipers, W.	R	30	Holland	2	22%	11%	43%	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+
McManus, M.	R	35	Leelanau	2	11%	11%	57%	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Olshove, D.	D	9	Warren	2	100%	78%	86%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Pappageorge, J.	R	13	Troy	1	22%			-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
Patterson, B.	R	7	Canton	2	22%	67%	57%	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Prusi, M.	D	38	Ishpeming	2	100%	100%	86%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Richardville, R.	R	17	Monroe	1	33%			-	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-
Sanborn, A.	R	11	Richmond Twp.	3**	11%	11%	43%	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Schauer, M.	D	19	Battle Creek	2	100%	100%	71%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Scott, M.	D	2	Highland Park	3**	100%	56%	86%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Stamas, T.	R	36	Midland	2	11%	11%	43%	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Switalski, M.	D	10	Roseville	2	89%	56%	86%	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+
Thomas III, S. Buzz	D	4	Detroit	2	89%	78%	86%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	A
VanWoerkom, G.	R	34	Norton Shores	2	11%	22%	57%	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Whitmer, G.	D	23	East Lansing	2**	89%			+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	A

+ Pro-environmental action
 - Anti-environmental action
 A Absence: Counts as negative

*Additional terms not subject to term limits due to time served in office prior to term limit adaptation
 **Elected to the Senate in the first term by special election

1. Factory Farm Deregulation Bill
 2. Great Lakes Compact
 3. Great Lakes Water Withdrawal
 3A. Great Lakes Water Withdrawal Amendment
 3B. Great Lakes Water Withdrawal Amendment
 3C. Great Lakes Water Withdrawal Amendment
 3D. Great Lakes Water Withdrawal Amendment
 3E. Great Lakes Water Withdrawal Amendment
 4. Renewable Energy Portfolio Standard

Please see pages 13 and 14 for complete bill descriptions.





House Bill Descriptions

Interpreting conservation laws

The final score for each lawmaker in our Scorecard is always a snapshot of key votes taken on critical conservation issues. This session, it is important to note that the overwhelming lack of leadership in Lansing must be taken into consideration when measuring lawmaker's performance. A 100 percent score, for example, may be an adequate representation of a few of our elected official's leadership on conservation. For the most part, however, Michigan's air, water and land remained second tier issues for the House and Senate. We urge you to take this into consideration as you read this document and as you encourage your lawmaker to do a better job in Lansing.

1. Stopping Out of State Trash (HB 4221)

Status: Passed House, 56 to 53.

In March 2007, the Michigan House passed HB 4221 that adds a surcharge to waste, which would be used to set up a Recycling and Waste Division Fund. The charge would also make trash importation less attractive. Canadian trash is imported into Michigan at an alarming rate due to our cheap and plentiful landfill space. A YES vote was a vote for the environment.

2. Investing in Renewable Energy (HB 5548)

Status: Passed House, 86 to 21.

In April 2008, the Michigan House passed HB 5548, which defines renewable energy sources in Michigan and sets a goal for energy providers in Michigan to reach 10 percent renewable energy generation by 2015. Investing in renewable sources of energy, such as wind and solar, is not only good for the environment, it also creates new jobs. A YES vote was a vote for the environment.

3. Saving Energy = Saving Money (HB 5525)

Status: Passed House, 81 to 18.

In May 2008, the Michigan House passed HB 5525, which puts Michigan on track to save money, burn less fossil fuels, and be part of our nation's clean energy solution. The cheapest, easiest and fastest way to save money on energy costs and help solve the problems associated with global warming is to increase the efficiency in our homes and in the workplace. A YES vote was a vote for the environment.

4. Restricted Use of Harmful Chemical, Lindane (HB 4569)

Status: Passed House, 72 to 35.

In May 2008, the Michigan House passed HB 4569, which significantly restricts the use of Lindane, a toxic bioaccumulative chemical that is used in shampoos and lotions for the treatment of head lice. Lindane has been banned in 53 countries and the state of California, is not allowed in agricultural or veterinary use, and is also banned in the US Military. A YES vote was a vote for the environment.

5. Great Lakes Compact (HB 4343)

Status: Passed House, 108 to 0.

In May 2008, the Michigan House passed HB 4343, which protects Mich-

igan's water resources by ratifying the eight-state Great Lakes Compact and writing good conservation standards and practices into statute. House members introduced a package of bills to make this broad approach the law of Michigan. The first bill in the package, HB 4343, puts Michigan's stamp of approval on the Compact, subject to approval of the entire set of bills. A YES vote was a vote for the environment.

6. Protecting Great Lakes Water from Exportation (HB 5065)

Status: Passed House, 57 to 50.

In May 2008, the Michigan House passed HB 5065, which closes a major loophole in the Great Lakes Compact and state law by requiring tough protections against Great Lakes water exports by commercial water bottlers. A YES vote was a vote for the environment.

7. Broadening Water Conservation Enforcement (HB 5066)

Status: Passed House, 58 to 49.

In May 2008, the Michigan House passed HB 5066, which enables the state to require water conservation measures by major water users. A YES vote was a vote for the environment.

8. Protecting Water as a Public Trust & Citizens' Rights (HB 5067)

Status: Passed House, 101 to 7.

In May 2008, the Michigan House passed HB 5067, which charges the state with protecting the public trust in water resources and gives citizens the ability to fight harmful water uses in the courts. A YES vote was a vote for the environment.

9. Expanding Conservation Requirements of Industrial Water Users (HB 5068)

Status: Passed House, 56 to 52.

In June 2008, the Michigan House passed HB 5068, which expands water conservation requirements to include more large industrial water users than covered by current law, which covers a relative handful of water takers. It also provides strong protections for public trust values of Michigan's waters. A YES vote was a vote for the environment.

10. Water Assessment Tool Utilization & Implementation (HB 5069)

Status: Passed House, 56 to 52.

In June 2008, the Michigan House passed HB 5069, which provides for a science-based water withdrawal environmental impact assessment tool and allows the state to designate sensitive water resources where strong water protections are in effect. A YES vote was a vote for the environment.

11. Citizen & Local Government Empowerment (HB 5070)

Status: Passed House, 62 to 45.

In May 2008, the Michigan House passed HB 5070, which empowers local governments to enact water conservation ordinances and enhances the ability of citizens to seek action to stop water withdrawals causing adverse impacts. A YES vote was a vote for the environment.

12. Expanding Conservation Requirements of Drinking Water Suppliers (HB 5071)

Status: Passed House, 57 to 51.

In June 2008, the Michigan House passed HB 5071, which expands water conservation requirements to include more large drinking water suppliers than covered by current law. A YES vote was a vote for the environment.

13. Expanding Conservation Requirements of Bottled Water Suppliers (HB 5072)

Status: Passed House, 99 to 9.

In May 2008, the Michigan House passed HB 5072, which expands water conservation requirements to include most bottled water suppliers. A YES vote was a vote for the environment.

14. Empowering the DEQ to Protect Public Water Resources (HB 5073)

Status: Passed House, 58 to 49.

In May 2008, the Michigan House passed HB 5073, which gives the Department of Environmental Quality the ability to write rules to strengthen protection of public water resources from major water users. A YES vote was a vote for the environment.

House Votes

Representative	Party	District	Hometown	Term	2007-08 Score	2005-06 Score	2003 Score	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Accavitti Jr., F.	D	42	Eastpointe	3	93%	50%	88%	+	+	+	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Acciavatti, D.	R	32	New Baltimore	3	21%	25%	50%	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-
Agema, D.	R	74	Grandville	1	7%			-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Amos, F.	R	43	Waterford	3	21%	25%	38%	-	-	A	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-
Angerer, K.	D	55	Dundee	2	100%	100%		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Ball, R.	R	85	Laingsburg	2	43%	25%		-	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-
Bauer, J.	D	68	Lansing	1	100%			+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Bennett, D.	D	92	Muskegon	2	86%	100%		+	A	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Bieda, S.	D	25	Warren	3	100%	88%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Booher, D.	R	102	Evart	2	36%	25%		-	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-
Brandenburg, J.	R	24	Harrison Twp.	3	71%	25%	50%	-	-	A	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Brown, T.	D	84	Pigeon	1	57%			+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	+	-
Brynes, P.	D	52	Chelsea	2	100%	100%		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Byrum, B.	D	67	Onondaga	1	86%			+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
Calley, B.	R	87	Portland	1	43%			-	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-
Casperson, T.	R	108	Escanaba	3	21%	25%	38%	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-
Caswell, B.	R	58	Hillsdale	3	36%	25%	25%	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-
Caul, B.	R	99	Mt. Pleasant	2	36%	25%		-	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-
Cheeks, M.	D	6	Detroit	3	100%	38%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Clack, B.	D	34	Flint	3	100%	88%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Clemente, E.	D	14	Lincoln Park	2	93%	63%		-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Condino, P.	D	35	Southfield	3	100%	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Constan, B.	D	16	Dearborn Hts.	1	100%			+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Corriveau, M.	D	20	Northville	1	100%			+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Coulouris, A.	D	95	Saginaw	1	100%			+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Cushingberry Jr., G.	D	8	Detroit	2**	100%	88%		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Dean, R.	D	75	Grand Rapids	1	100%			+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
DeRoche, C.	R	38	Novi	3	21%	25%	25%	-	-	-	-	+	A	A	+	-	-	A	-	+	A
Dillon, A.	D	17	Redford Twp.	2**	100%	50%		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Donigan, M.	D	26	Royal Oak	2	100%	100%		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Ebli, K.	D	56	Monroe	1*	100%			+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Elsenheimer, K.	R	105	Kewadin	2	21%	25%		-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-
Emmons, J.	R	70	Sheridan	3	0%	25%	38%	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	A	-
Espinoza, J.	D	83	Croswell	2	86%	50%		+	A	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Farrah, B.	D	13	Southgate	3	93%	63%	100%	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Gaffney, E.	R	1	Grosse Pointe Farms	3	79%	38%	50%	-	+	A	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Garfield, J.	R	45	Rochester Hills	3	7%	13%	25%	A	-	A	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

+ Pro-environmental action
 - Anti-environmental action
 A Absence: Counts as negative

***Robertson and Palmer are in their
 3rd term under term limits
 **Cushingberry and Dillon are in their
 2nd term under term limits
 *Ebli and Meadows are in their
 1st term under term limits

Please see pages 17-18 for complete bill descriptions.

1. Stopping Out of State Trash
2. Investing in Renewable Energy
3. Saving Energy = Saving Money
4. Restricted Use of Harmful Chemical, Lindane
5. Great Lakes Compact
6. Protecting Great Lakes Water from Exportation
7. Broadening Water Conservation Enforcement
8. Protecting Water as a Public Trust & Citizens' Rights
9. Expanding Conservation Requirements of Industrial Water Users
10. Water Assessment Tool Utilization & Implementation
11. Citizen & Local Government Empowerment
12. Expanding Conservation Requirements of Drinking Water Suppliers
13. Expanding Conservation Requirements of Bottled Water Suppliers
14. Empowering the DEQ to Protect Public Water Resources

House Votes

Representative	Party	District	Hometown	Term	2007-08 Score	2005-06 Score	2003 Score	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Gillard, M.	D	106	Alpena	3	100%	88%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Gonzales, L.	D	49	Flint	2	100%	75%		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Green, K.	R	77	Wyoming	2	36%	25%		-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-
Griffin, M.	D	64	Jackson	1	64%			+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	+	+
Hammel, R.	D	48	Flushing	1	100%			+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Hammon, T.	D	50	Burton	1	100%			+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Hansen, G.	R	100	Hart	2	36%	25%		-	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-
Hildendbrand, D.	R	86	Lowell	2	36%	25%		-	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-
Hood III, M.	D	11	Detroit	3	100%	88%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Hoogendyk, J.	R	61	Kalamazoo	3	7%	13%	13%	-	-	A	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hopgood, H.	D	22	Taylor	3	100%	100%	88%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Horn, K.	R	94	Frankenmuth	1	43%			-	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-
Huizenga, B.	R	90	Zeeland	3	21%	25%	38%	-	-	-	-	+	A	A	+	A	A	A	A	+	A
Hune, J.	R	47	Hamburg	3	21%	25%	38%	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jackson, S.	D	9	Detroit	1	93%			+	+	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Johnson, B.	D	5	Highland Park	1	100%			+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Jones, Rick	R	71	Grand Ledge	2	43%	25%		-	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-
Jones, Robert	D	60	Kalamazoo	1	100%			+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Knollenberg, M.	R	41	Troy	1	36%			-	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-
Lahti, M.	D	110	Hancock	1	93%			+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+
LaJoy, P.	R	21	Canton	3	43%	25%	38%	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-
Law, D.	R	39	Commerce Twp.	2	43%	50%		-	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-
Law, K.	D	23	Gibraltar	3	100%	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
LeBlanc, R.	D	18	Westland	1	100%			+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
LeLand, G.	D	10	Detroit	2	100%	88%		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Lemmons Jr., L.	D	2	Detroit	2	100%	75%		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Lindberg, S.	D	109	Marquette	1	100%			+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Marleau, J.	R	46	Lake Orion	2	43%	25%		-	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-
Mayes, J.	D	96	Bay City	2	64%	75%		+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	-	+	-
McDowell, G.	D	107	Rudyard	2	100%	75%		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Meadows, M.	D	69	East Lansing	1*	100%			+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Meekhof, A.	R	89	West Olive	1	29%			-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-
Meisner, A.	D	27	Ferndale	3	100%	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Melton, T.	D	29	Pontiac	1	100%			+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Meltzer, K.	R	33	Clinton Twp.	1	36%			-	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-
Miller, F.	D	31	Mount Clemens	2	100%	100%		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Moolenaar, J.	R	98	Midland	3	21%	25%	38%	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-

+ Pro-environmental action
 - Anti-environmental action
 A Absence: Counts as negative

***Robertson and Palmer are in their 3rd term under term limits
 **Cushingberry and Dillon are in their 2nd term under term limits
 *Ebli and Meadows are in their 1st term under term limits

Please see pages 17-18 for complete bill descriptions.

1. Stopping Out of State Trash
2. Investing in Renewable Energy
3. Saving Energy = Saving Money
4. Restricted Use of Harmful Chemical, Lindane
5. Great Lakes Compact
6. Protecting Great Lakes Water from Exportation
7. Broadening Water Conservation Enforcement
8. Protecting Water as a Public Trust & Citizens' Rights
9. Expanding Conservation Requirements of Industrial Water Users
10. Water Assessment Tool Utilization & Implementation
11. Citizen & Local Government Empowerment
12. Expanding Conservation Requirements of Drinking Water Suppliers
13. Expanding Conservation Requirements of Bottled Water Suppliers
14. Empowering the DEQ to Protect Public Water Resources

House Votes

Representative	Party	District	Hometown	Term	2007-08 Score	2005-06 Score	2003 Score	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Moore, T.	R	97	Farwell	2	36%	25%		-	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	
Moss, C.	R	40	Birmingham	1	43%			-	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	
Nitz, N.	R	78	Baroda	3	21%	25%	25%	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	
Nofs, M.	R	62	Battle Creek	3	36%	25%	50%	-	+	+	A	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	
Opsommer, P.	R	93	Dewitt	1	43%			-	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	
Palmer, B.	R	36	Romeo	3***	7%	13%	38%	-	-	A	-	+	-	-	-	A	A	-	A	-	
Palsrok, D.	R	101	Manistee	3	36%	38%	38%	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	
Pastor, J.	R	19	Livonia	3	21%	25%	50%	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Pavlov, P.	R	81	St. Clair Twp.	2	21%	25%		-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	
Pearce, T.	R	73	Rockford	2	36%	25%		-	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	
Polidori, G.	D	15	Dearborn	2	100%	75%		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Proos, J.	R	79	St. Joseph	2	36%	25%		-	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	
Robertson, D.	R	51	Grand Blanc	3***	21%	13%	25%	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	
Rocca, T.	R	30	Sterling Hts.	2	93%	25%		-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Sak, M.	D	76	Grand Rapids	3	100%	75%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Schuitmaker, T.	R	80	Lawton	2	36%	25%		-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	
Scott, B. Cook	D	3	Detroit	1	86%			+	A	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Shaffer, R.	R	59	Three Rivers	3	36%	25%	38%	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	
Sheen, F.	R	88	Plainwell	3	7%	13%	38%	-	-	A	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Sheltrown, J.	D	103	West Branch	2	93%	50%		+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Simpson, M.	D	65	Jackson	1	50%			+	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	
Smith, A.	D	54	Ypsilanti	2	100%	100%		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Smith, V.	D	7	Detroit	3	100%	75%	75%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Spade, D.	D	57	Tipton	2	57%	75%		+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	
Stahl, J.	R	82	North Branch	3	21%	25%	38%	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	
Stakoe, J.	R	44	Highland	3	29%	25%	25%	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	
Steil Jr., G.	R	72	Grand Rapids	3	29%	25%	38%	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	
Tobocman, S.	D	12	Detroit	3	100%	100%	88%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Vagnozzi, A.	D	37	Farmington Hills	3	100%	88%	88%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Valentine, M.	D	91	Muskegon	1	100%			+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Walker, H.	R	104	Traverse City	3	36%	38%	38%	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	
Ward, C.	R	66	Brighton	3	71%	25%	38%	-	+	+	+	A	+	+	A	+	+	+	A	+	
Warren, R.	D	53	Ann Arbor	1	100%			+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Wenke, L.	R	63	Kalamazoo	3	29%	25%	38%	-	+	-	-	+	A	A	+	-	-	A	-	A	
Wojno, L.	D	28	Warren	3	100%	63%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Young II, C.	D	4	Detroit	1	100%			+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	

+ Pro-environmental action
 - Anti-environmental action
 A Absence: Counts as negative

***Robertson and Palmer are in their
 3rd term under term limits
 **Cushingberry and Dillon are in their
 2nd term under term limits
 *Ebli and Meadows are in their
 1st term under term limits

Please see pages 17-18 for complete bill descriptions.

1. Stopping Out of State Trash
2. Investing in Renewable Energy
3. Saving Energy = Saving Money
4. Restricted Use of Harmful Chemical, Lindane
5. Great Lakes Compact
6. Protecting Great Lakes Water from Exportation
7. Broadening Water Conservation Enforcement
8. Protecting Water as a Public Trust & Citizens' Rights
9. Expanding Conservation Requirements of Industrial Water Users
10. Water Assessment Tool Utilization & Implementation
11. Citizen & Local Government Empowerment
12. Expanding Conservation Requirements of Drinking Water Suppliers
13. Expanding Conservation Requirements of Bottled Water Suppliers
14. Empowering the DEQ to Protect Public Water Resources

Keep Score and Take Action

Take action to let Legislators know you're keeping score

Join Michigan LCV

Join the Michigan League of Conservation Voters and be a part of the positive change by turning environmental values into community priorities.

Find your elected officials

If you're not sure who represents you in Lansing visit:

- Senate: <http://www.senate.michigan.gov/>
- House: <http://house.michigan.gov/representatives.asp>

Write to your elected officials

Let your Legislators know you're watching! If your Legislators voted with the polluting interests that work to weaken Michigan's environmental safeguards, send a short, polite note expressing your disapproval of their performance in Lansing. If your Legislator voted to protect Michigan's water, air and quality of life, please write to thank them. Those who resisted the strong pressure of corporate polluters and special interests deserve our thanks.

Contact information for:

Mailing addresses for state House and Senate:

- State Senate: The Honorable (Senator's name)
P.O. Box 30036, Lansing, MI 48909
- State House: The Honorable (Representative's name)
P.O. Box 30014, Lansing, MI 48909

To find your state Representative's and Senator's e-mail address, visit:

- Senate: <http://www.senate.michigan.gov/SenatorInfo/senfull2003.htm>
- House: http://house.michigan.gov/find_a_rep.asp

To contact Governor Jennifer M. Granholm:

The Honorable Jennifer Granholm

P.O. Box 30013

Lansing, Michigan 48909

Phone: (517) 373-3400

Phone: (517) 335-7858, Constituent Services

Fax: (517) 335-6863

To contact the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ):

Division Name, Employee Name (where applicable)

Constitution Hall, Floor Number


525 West Allegan Street

P.O. Box 30473

Lansing, MI 48909-7973

Phone: (517) 373-7917

For information on how to contact a member of Congress regarding an environmental concern or to check the scores of your member of Congress, visit the national League of Conservation Voters website at www.lcv.org.





Ann Arbor Office

213 W. Liberty Street, Suite 300
Ann Arbor, MI 48104
Phone (734) 222-9650
Fax (734) 222-9651

Grand Rapids Office

40 Monroe Center NW
Suite 200
Grand Rapids, MI 49503

NON PROFIT ORG.
U.S. POSTAGE PAID
ANN ARBOR, MI
PERMIT NO. 423

www.MichiganLCV.org