

**Sierra Club Environmental Voting Record
Texas House of Representatives
80th Regular Legislative Session (2007)**

Introductory Note

Many important votes on bills, amendments to bills, or critical procedural questions that determine the fate of bills dealing with environmental and related issues considered on the House floor are taken by either a voice vote or a division vote (which is not recorded). Other major pieces of legislation pass by such a wide margin that a record vote on those bills is not a very good measure of the environmental record of a state representative. Nevertheless, in the regular session of the 80th Texas Legislature in the spring of 2007 there were at least 15 record votes that give some measure of the insight into the positions of House members on energy, environmental, and natural resource issues. These votes included support for clean energy amendments, tighter emissions standards for power plants, and support for water conservation over reservoir development. As in any record vote, care must be taken in interpreting the record votes. The descriptions of the votes below provide the context in which the vote was taken.

Description of Selected Recorded Votes

1. SB 483 (Motion to Adopt Amendment #18 by Dunnam/Coleman)

AIR POLLUTION FROM POWER PLANTS - Requirement to offset emissions increases of new power plants by 115% within non-attainment areas and zone of influence

SB 483 was a major reform of the electric utility industry and was specifically designed to reform market power and market power abuse. During the debate on the House floor, Representative Jim Dunnam and Coleman offered an amendment which was acceptable to the author that would require any company seeking a permit for a new power plant to offset the emissions by 115% within the area in Texas that contributes to air pollution in the non-attainment areas. (Non-attainment areas are those areas that do not meet one or more federal air quality standards for the protection of human health). The amendment passed by an overwhelmingly 86-11 vote although a large number of representatives were absent. Ultimately, the amendment did not become law when the conferees of the Senate and House on SB 483 failed to agree to a final version of the legislation. *A vote in favor of the amendment was a vote for the Sierra Club position.*

2. HB 3780 (Motion to Table Amendment #2 by Burnam)

ENFORCEMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL LAWS - Amendment to require that proposed limitations on state enforcement action based on citizen evidence had to conform to federal law

When Rep. Dennis Bonnen brought HB 3780 – which requires the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality to limit the enforcement it can take against certain facilities based on evidence provided by citizens – Rep. Lon Burnam offered an amendment that stated that if it was found that the new statutes counteracted federal court or U.S. Environmental Protection Agency – then the statute would not be implemented. Rep. Bonnen did not accept the amendment and instead made a motion to table the amendment. The motion to table won 77 to 63. *A vote against the motion to table was a vote for the Sierra Club position.*

3. **HB 3960 (Motion to Table Amendment #3 by Burnam)**

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE HISTORY - Amendment to expand from five to ten years the amount of time that enforcement and compliance data could be used by the TCEQ to determine compliance history

Rep. Wayne Smith brought a bill – HB 3960 -- to the House floor that would have severely curtailed the use of compliance history in permitting, enforcement and other programs at the Texas Commission for Environmental Compliance. Sierra Club opposed the legislation, in part because under the bill only up to five years of compliance history of a permit holder could be used when assessing issuance of a new or renewed permit, even though many permits are granted with 10-year time frames. An amendment by Rep. Lon Burnam was offered that would have extended the consideration of compliance history from five to 10 years. Unfortunately, Rep. Smith did not accept the amendment and moved instead to table the proposed amendment. The amendment was tabled 76 to 58. *A vote against the motion to table was a vote for the Sierra Club position.*

4. **HB 3960 (Motion to Table Amendment #5 by Dutton)**

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS OF AIR POLLUTION - Amendment to require TCEQ to consider the cumulative impacts of air pollution within three miles of a proposed facility before issuing an air pollution control permit

Rep. Harold Dutton offered an amendment on the compliance history bill to spell out that TCEQ must consider the cumulative impacts of toxic and other air pollutants within three miles of a proposed facility, not just the emissions from that one facility, before deciding whether to issue an air pollution control permit to that facility. Nonetheless, the bill's author moved to table the amendment, and the motion to table prevailed 77-53. *A vote against the motion to table was a vote for the Sierra Club position.*

5. **HB 3960 (Motion to Table Amendment #7 by Olivo)**

LANDFILL REGULATION – Amendment to review the permits of municipal landfill with compliance problems

Rep. Dora Olivo attempted to amend the compliance history elimination bill by Rep. Wayne Smith by adding some protections to citizens that live around municipal solid waste landfills,

by allowing – if requested and if the request met certain conditions– a review by the TCEQ of the permit and compliance history once every five years. However, Rep. Smith requested that the amendment be tabled, a position that prevailed 74 to 56. *A vote against the motion to table the amendment was a vote for the Sierra Club Position.*

6. HB 3960 (Motion to Table Amendment #8 by Coleman)

PUBLIC ACCESS TO COMPLIANCE HISTORY – Amendment to require that compliance history information be available on the TCEQ website

Rep. Garnet Coleman – in viewing the attempt by Rep. Smith in HB 3960 to effectively eliminate use of compliance history in agency permitting and other decisions – sought to assure that information on the compliance history of permittees was available on the TCEQ website. Rep. Smith did not accept the amendment, and a motion to table the amendment won 73 votes to 56. *A vote against the motion to table was a vote for the Sierra Club position.*

7. HB 1188 (Motion to Table Amendment #2 by Burnam)

PROMOTION OF RENEWABLE ENERGY – Amendment to require that 15 percent of funds awarded from the Texas Emerging Technology Fund be provided to renewable energy projects

The proposed amendment by Rep. Lon Burnam would have earmarked 15 percent of awards of the Texas Emerging Technology Fund to renewable energy technology. The Texas Emerging Technology Fund was created in 2005 to provide incentives to companies developing new technologies in a number of industries, including energy, but has yet to be used to a great extent to jumpstart renewables or energy efficiency technologies. Rep. Geanie Morrison did not accept the Burnam amendment and move to table it. The motion to table the amendment prevailed 84 to 55. *A vote against the motion to table the amendment was a vote for the Sierra Club position.*

8. SB 12 (Motion to Table Amendment #2 by Naishtat)

GLOBAL WARMING – Amendment to require TCEQ to look at cost-effective strategies to reduce global warming gases

Rep. Elliott Naishtat offered an amendment to SB 12 by Sen. Kip Averitt (sponsored in the House by Rep. Dennis Bonnen) that would have created a global warming task force to assess different strategies to reduce emissions of carbon dioxide and report the results of the study back to legislative leaders. While the Sierra Club strongly supported SB 12 by Averitt and Bonnen – which dealt with energy efficiency programs and programs to reduce nitrogen oxides from mobile sources – the Club also supported efforts to begin to look at strategies to reduce global warming gases produced by mobile and other sources. In the discussion that ensued, Rep. Bonnen recommended tabling the amendment and argued that another bill – supported by the Sierra Club – HB 2713, which would have created an interim energy planning committee would already be looking at global warming emissions. Nonetheless,

while HB 2713 would have led to a look at global warming emissions from power plants, it would not have led to an overall assessment of strategies on all sources (Governor Perry later vetoed HB 2713 anyway). Still, the discussion may have caused confusion about the need for this amendment. In the end, Rep. Bonnen's motion to table prevailed 88-52. *A vote against the motion to table the amendment was a vote for the Sierra Club position.*

9. **HB 3732 (Motion to Table Amendment #2 by Vaught)**

AIR POLLUTION REDUCTIONS – Amendment to reduce the nitrogen oxide (NOx) emissions limit to 0.02 pounds per MTBU for “Advanced Clean Energy Projects” receiving proposed tax breaks

HB 3732 – related to tax and regulatory incentives for so-called “advanced or ultraclean” energy projects – was opposed by major environmental organizations in part because the definition of an advanced energy projects was too loose, allowing essentially an emissions profile to be put in place statutorily for 20 years. The amendment by Rep. Allen Vaught would have changed the emissions profile by lowering the nitrogen oxide emissions from a maximum of 0.05 pounds per MTBU to 0.02 pounds per MTBU. The legislation's author, Rep. Rick Hardcastle, did not accept the amendment and the amendment was tabled by 80 votes to 60 votes. *A vote against the motion to table was a vote for the Sierra Club position.*

10. **HB 3732 (Final vote on HB 3732 conference committee report by Hardcastle)**

TAX BREAKS FOR POLLUTERS - Tax incentive bill for “Advanced Clean Energy Projects” that are not all that advanced or clean

HB 3732 was significantly improved in the Senate, with a review and rule making every three years of the emissions profile for so-called “Advanced Energy Clean Projects,” and with requirements that TCEQ look at cumulative impacts of power plants within 200 kilometers when permitting new power plants and make certain that attainment areas would not lead to the creation of non-attainment areas. These improvements were supported by Sierra Club. However, the good Senate amendments and language were *stripped* out of the final version of the legislation, the conference committee report. Despite making the Sierra Club position clear – and work by other environmental organizations against passage of the tax incentives for new, albeit, cleaner coal plants, the legislation passed 112 to 30. Part of the reason that some legislators who normally vote for the environment voted for the legislation was because Rep. Mark Strama had added an amendment to give tax breaks for the recovery of oil from capturing carbon dioxide emissions and injecting them underground. Still, a vote for the legislation was a vote for a bill that provides tax incentives for power plants that are not really advanced or clean projects. *A vote for the conference committee report version of HB 3732 was a vote against the Sierra Club position.*

11. **SB 3 (Motion to Adopt Amendment #27 by Frost)**

WATER CONSERVATION – Amendment to prohibit new reservoir development if cities do not reduce per-capita usage rate

SB 3 was the major legislation related to water development, management and conservation during the 80th legislative session. While Sierra Club supported most aspects of the legislation, the designation of reservoir sites as part of the legislation was opposed by the organization. Rep. Frost, an opponent of the designation, offered an amendment that said that the designation of a reservoir site could not be made if the construction of the reservoir was not recommended in the regional water plan unless the region that recommended the construction of the reservoir had a water usage rate that is less than 200 gallons per capita per day. In other words, no new reservoir site designation unless there was at least a reasonable effort at conservation. The amendment passed 92-34. *A vote for the amendment was a vote for the Sierra Club position.*

12. SB 3 (Motion to Table Amendment #42 by Callegari)

REQUIREMENTS ON INTERBASIN TRANSFERS – Amendment to weaken requirements for consideration of inter-basin transfers

Rep. Bill Callegari offered an amendment that would have weakened the requirements on the analysis and public notice that must occur before an interbasin transfer could be approved by TCEQ. The Lone Star Chapter of the Sierra Club takes the position that proposed interbasin transfers must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Full notice and thorough analysis according to statutory criteria are important to that evaluation, and such requirements should not be weakened. The amendment was tabled 102-30. *A vote for the motion to table was a vote for the Sierra Club position.*

13. SB 3 (Motion to Table Amendment #92 by Rose)

SPRINGFLOW PROTECTIONS – Amendment to increase protections for springflows in light of an increased in the cap on pumping of groundwater from the Edwards Aquifer

Rep. Patrick Rose attempted to amend SB 3 to make the provisions that would raise the cap on pumping of groundwater from the Edwards Aquifer less problematic for the protection of springflows from San Marcos Springs, one of the major discharge points for the Aquifer. Unfortunately, the motion to table won 113-30. *A vote against the motion to table was a vote for the Sierra Club position.*

14. SB 1604 (Motion to Table Amendment #1 by Escobar)

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN URANIUM MINING CASES – Amendment to allow for contested case Hearings on expansions of uranium mining operations

SB 1604 was a bill by Senator Robert Duncan to consolidate the regulation of the management and disposal of radioactive waste under one single state agency, the Texas Commission of Environmental Quality. Unfortunately, the original bill also included one

provision that would have stripped the rights of citizens and local governments to contest an authorization to expand a uranium mining production area. Sierra Club worked with Rep. Juan Escobar, who has a large mining operation in his district in Kleberg County, to offer an amendment to allow for contested case hearings in certain cases of uranium mine expansions. Rep. Dennis Bonnen, House sponsor of the bill, moved to table the amendment, but the motion to table failed 48-91. Rep. Bonnen then accepted the amendment. *A vote against the motion to table the amendment was a vote in favor of the Sierra Club position.* The final version of the legislation included a weaker version of the Escobar amendment, still a victory for local citizens concerned about the expansion of uranium mining.

15. HB 1 (Motion to Table Amendment #98 by Burnam)

CLEAN SCHOOL BUSES – Amendment to dedicate \$33 million out of the Texas Emissions Reduction Plan for the Clean School Bus Program

The State Parent Teacher Association, as well as environmental groups, had called for significant funding for the Texas Clean School Bus program to retrofit school buses with cleaner-burning engines. Advocates had called for spending \$100 million over six years, including \$33 million in the upcoming Fiscal Years 2008-2009 biennium. Because HB 1, the state appropriations bill, only earmarked a paltry \$1 million for Clean School Buses, Rep. Lon Burnam offered an amendment to HB 1 on the House floor to dedicate \$16.5 million per fiscal year out of an existing clean air account for school bus diesel retrofits. Nonetheless, Rep. Warren Chisum, House Appropriations Committee Chairman, and Rep. Bonnen argued that funding school buses at this level would take away funds from the other clean air programs – the Texas Emissions Reduction Plan – that would be funded by the same pot of money. What they did not tell House members, however, was that more than \$100 million was sitting unspent that had accumulated over time in the account that could be used for school buses. The motion to table the Burnam amendment prevailed 88-57. *A vote against the motion to table the amendment was a vote for the Sierra Club position.*

TEXAS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES VOTING RECORD
80TH LEGISLATURE, 2007 SESSION

State Representative	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8	#9	#10	#11	#12	#13	#14	#15	Journal Entry
Speaker Craddick (R)	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	
Allen, Alma (D)	E	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	E	+	+	-	+	+	
Alonzo (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	
Anchia (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	A*	-	+	+	* Would have voted no
Anderson (R)	+	P	A	+	+	-	-	+	*	-	+	-	-	+	-	* Intended to vote yes
Aycock (R)	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	
Bailey (D)	+	+	E	E	E	E	+	+	+	+	A	A	A	+	A	
Berman (R)	E	-	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	
Bohac (R)	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	
Bolton (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	
Bonnen (R)	E	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	
Branch (R)	+	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Brown, Betty (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	
Brown, Fred (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	
Burnam (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Callegari (R)	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	
Castro (D)	A*	+	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	*Would have voted yes
Chavez (D)	+	+	+	A	+	+	+	E	+	E	+	A	-	+	+	
Chisum (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	A	-	+	-	
Christian(R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	A	-	+	-	
Cohen (D)	A	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	
Coleman (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Cook, Byron (R)	E	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	+	-	+	-	
Cook, Robby (D)	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	
Corte (R)	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	E	-	+	-	-	-	-	
Crabb (R)	+	-	-	-	-	A	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	
Creighton (R)	+	-	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	
Crownover (R)	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	P	-	-	-	

State Representative	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8	#9	#10	#11	#12	#13	#14	#15	Journal Entry
Darby (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	
Davis, John (R)	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	
Davis, Yvonne (D)	A*	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	* Would have voted yes
Delisi (R)	+	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	
Deshotel (D)	+	-	-	A	-	A	+	+	-	-	+	+	-	A	+	
Driver (R)	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	+	A	P	-	
Dukes (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	
Dunnam (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	- *	+	+	+	+	+	* Intended to vote yes
Dutton (D)	+	+	+	+	A	A	A	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	-	
Eiland (D)	E	+	+	+	A	A	E	+	-	-	A*	+	+	+	+	* Would have voted yes
Eissler (R)	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	
Elkins (R)	E	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	
England (R)	+	-	+	+	A	+	-	+	+	- *	-	***	+	+	+	* Intended to vote yes; ** Intended to vote no
Escobar (D)	+	+	+	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	
Farabee (D)	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	
Farias (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	
Farrar (D)	E	+	+	+	A	+	+	E	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	
Flores (D)	E	+	+	+	+	+	A	-	A	+	+	-	-	+	-	
Flynn (R)	+ *	-	E	E	E	E	A	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	* Intended to vote no
Frost (D)	E	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	
Gallego (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	A	+	+	+	+	
Garcia (D)	E	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	
Gattis (R)	+	E	E	E	E	E	-	E	-	P	+	+	-	+	-	
Geren (R)	A	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Giddings (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	A	-	-	-	A	-	
Gonzales (D)	E	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Gonzalez Toureilles (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	
Goolsby (R)	E	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Guillen (D)	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	

State Representative	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8	#9	#10	#11	#12	#13	#14	#15	Journal Entry
Haggerty (R)	A	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	
Hamilton (R)	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	
Hancock (R)	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Hardcastle (R)	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	
Harless (R)	A *	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	+	-	-	-	* Would have voted present
Harper-Brown (R)	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	
Hartnett (R)	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Heflin (D)	A	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	A	+	+	+	+	
Hernandez (D)	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	A	+	-	+	+	
Herrero (D)	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	
Hilderbran (R)	A *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	* Would have voted no
Hill (R)	+	-	A	A	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	+	A	A	-	
Hochberg (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	A	+	-	+	+	
Hodge (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	
Homer (D)	E	-	+	-	+	A	+	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	
Hopson (D)	E	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	
Howard, Charlie (R)	E	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	
Howard, Donna (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Hughes (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	+	+	-	-	-	
Isett (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	
Jackson, Jim (R)	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Jones, Delwin (R)	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	
Keffer (R)	A	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	A	-	+	-	
King, Phil (R)	+	-	E	E	E	E	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	
King, Susan (R)	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A *	+	-	A	-	* Would have voted yes
King, Tracy (D)	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	E	-	-	A	-	-	-	
Kolkhorst (R)	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	E	-	-	
Krusee (R)	E	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	+	A	+	P	
Kuempel (R)	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	
Latham (R)	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	A	-	-	-	

State Representative	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8	#9	#10	#11	#12	#13	#14	#15	Journal Entry
Laubenberg (R)	A *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	* Would have voted yes
Leibowitz (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	
Lucio (D)	E	E	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	
Macias (R)	+	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	
Madden (R)	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	+	-	-	-	
Mallory Caraway (D)	E	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	
Martinez (D)	E	-	A	+	+	+	A	+	+	+	A	-	+	+	+	
Martinez Fischer (D)	A *	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	* Said his "yes" vote did not register.
McCall (R)	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	+	-	+	-	
McClendon (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	
McReynolds (D)	-	+	+	-	A	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	
Menendez (D)	+	+	A	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	-	A	+	
Merritt (R)	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	
Miles (D)	A *	+	+	+	+	+	+	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	* Would have voted yes
Miller (R)	E	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	
Moreno, Paul (D)	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	+	-	-	+	+	
Morrison (R)	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	+	-	-	-	
Mowery (R)	E	A	A	A	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	A	-	+	-	
Murphy (R)	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	
Naishtat (D)	E	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Noriega (D)	A	+	+	A	A *	A	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	* Would have voted no
O'Day (R)	A *	-	-	-	** A	A	-	-	-	-	***	+	-	A	-	* Would have voted yes ** Would have voted no *** Intended to vote yes
Oliveira (D)	+	+	+	+	A	+	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Olivo (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	
Orr (R)	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	
Ortiz (D)	E	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	P *	+	+	+	-	+	+	* Intended to vote no
Otto (R)	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	

State Representative	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8	#9	#10	#11	#12	#13	#14	#15	Journal Entry
Parker (R)	E	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+ *	+	-	-	-	* Intended to vote no
Patrick (R)	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	
Paxton (R)	E	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	+	
Peña (D)	E	- *	-	+	+	A	+	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	* Intended to vote no
Phillips (R)	E	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	A	-	-	-	
Pickett (D)	E	+	-	-	-	-	-	P	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	
Pierson (D)	E	+	A	A	A	A	A	- *	+	-	+	+	A	+	+	* Intended to no
Pitts (R)	E	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	A	+	-	-	-	
Puente (D)	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	- *	-	-	+	-	* Intended to vote yes
Quintanilla (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	
Raymond (D)	+	+	+	A	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	
Riddle (R)	E	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	
Ritter (D)	E	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	A	+	+	+	+	-	
Rodriguez (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Rose (D)	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	
Smith, Todd (R)	+	-	-	A *	** A	-	-	-	-	-	*** +	-	-	+	-	* Would have voted yes ** Would have voted yes *** Intended to vote no
Smith, Wayne (R)	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	
Smithee (R)	A	-	-	-	-	A	A	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	A	
Solomons (R)	+	P	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	
Strama (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	A *	+	+	+	* Would have voted yes
Straus (R)	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	A	-	A	-	
Swinford (R)	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	
Talton (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	E	
Taylor (R)	+	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	A	-	-	-	
Thompson (D)	A	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	A	+	+	+	+	
Truitt (R)	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Turner (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	
Van Arsdale (R)	E	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	A	-	
Vaught (D)	A *	+	+	+	+	+	+	E	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	* Would have voted yes

State Representative	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8	#9	#10	#11	#12	#13	#14	#15	Journal Entry
Veasey (D)	A *	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	* Would have voted yes
Villarreal (D)	E	-	E	E	E	E	+	+	+	-	+	A	-	+	+	
Vo (D)	A *	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	* Said his “yes” vote did not register.
West, Buddy (R)	-	-	-	-	-	A *	-	-	-	-	A	+	-	-	-	* Would have voted yes
Woolley (R)	E	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	A	-	-	-	
Zedler (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A *	+	-	-	-	* Would have voted no
Zerwas (R)	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	+	-	

LEGEND

+ voted for Sierra Club position

- voted against Sierra Club position

A absent

E excused absence

P present, not voting