



1993 Environmental Voting Chart

An Environmental Guide to the Members of the California State Legislature



California League of Conservation Voters

CLCV

The California League of Conservation Voters (CLCV) is the non-partisan political action arm of the environmental community in California. The League works to protect the environmental quality of our state by electing candidates to office and holding them accountable. With 52 Congressional districts and 120 state legislative seats, California clearly presents a formidable challenge to any grassroots organization. To meet this challenge, CLCV conducts early research on candidates for office and concentrates on the environmental races where our campaign resources can be expected to make a difference in the outcome of a race.

We back our political endorsements with campaign expertise, assisting candidates with the media, fundraising and grassroots organizing strategies they need to win their races. Each year we assign experienced campaign organizers (known as the Grizzly Corps) to the closest environmental contests in the state. On Election Day, we comb the precincts, getting environmental voters to the polls for our candidates. In 1992 CLCV fielded 35 organizers in 29 campaigns and spent over \$200,000 on behalf of candidates.

Each year we publish our Environmental Voting Chart to help voters distinguish between the rhetoric and the reality of a legislator's environmental record. The Chart records the most important environmental votes of the 1993 legislative session. These are the votes that determined whether the state's environmental laws were strengthened or weakened. In recent years as more and more candidates have sought to appeal to California's environmental vote this information has become increasingly important.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

CLCV would like to thank the following organizations and individuals for their critical contributions to this publication: the Audubon Society, CalPIRG, Californians Against Waste, the Mountain Lion Preservation Foundation, the Planning and Conservation League, Sierra Club California, Joe Caves and V. John White and Associates.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

For more information about CLCV please contact us at one of our two statewide offices:

965 Mission Street
Suite 625
San Francisco, CA 94103
415-896-5550 phone * 415-896-5580 fax

10951 West Pico Blvd
Suite 201
Los Angeles, CA 90064
310-441-4162 phone * 310-441-1685 fax

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY	1
1993 LEGISLATION	3
ASSEMBLY FLOOR	6
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEES	9
SENATE FLOOR	12
SENATE COMMITTEES	14

CLCV BOARD OFFICERS & MEMBERS

Charles Grace.....Chairman
Winston Hickox..... President
Paul Growald.....No. Cal. Vice President
Carolyn Green.....So. Cal Vice President
Fred Woocher.....Treasurer
Jane Wingfield.....Secretary

Ed Begley, Jr.	Dan Emmett
Susan Bell	Dian Grueneich
Robert Berger	Ruth Hunter
Melinda Bittan	Kirk Marckwald
Lucy Blake	Ann Nothoff
Frank Boren	Will Parish
Kimo Campbell	Lance Penny
Sarah Catz	Jon Rainwater
Nicholas Clinch	David Roe
Gigi Coe	Jeanne Sedgwick
Jim Compton	Tom Soto
Martha Davis	Lynn Wasser
Mike Eaton	V. John White

LEGISLATURE AT A CROSSROADS

This Environmental Voting Chart for the first year of the 1993-94 legislative session reflects a dramatic decline in the quality of environmental representation in Sacramento. Influenced by a number of factors including term limits, the ailing California economy, and a Governor who has backed away from his own environmental commitments, the California legislature appears to be in a state of crisis. This representative body, once known for its environmental innovation and vision seems to have handed over many of its environmental policy making responsibilities to a handful of industrial and business interests.

For the first time in the twenty year history of CLCV's Environmental Voting Chart the number of anti-conservation bills far exceeds that of pro-conservation bills. In the words of one environmental lobbyist, "It is impossible to describe the enormity of the assault on environmental legislation this year." Confronted by heavy lobbying campaigns from industry groups and scrambling to find a quick fix solution to California's economic problems, legislators from both parties betrayed their better instincts and voted to weaken environmental laws in 1993. Environmentalists, working overtime to defeat or derail bad legislation before it reached the floor of the Assembly and Senate, found themselves defending the public's right to clean air, water and food. Governor Wilson made the situation worse by taking an anti-conservation position on 4 of the 6 priority bills that reached his desk. Fortunately for the California environment, some of the state's strongest environmental leaders are still in office. In the Assembly, the Natural Resources Committee and in particular its chair Byron Sher played an integral role in amending and/or defeating anti-conservation bills before they reached the floor. And there were a handful of solid environmental proposals offered by leaders like Assembly Members Terry Friedman, Burt Margolin, and Senators Nick Petris and Tom Hayden who continue to work to improve the quality of California's environment.

THE ECONOMY AND THE ENVIRONMENT

In the midst of California's longest continuous recession policy makers in Sacramento face a crucial choice. They can either move the state toward long term sustainable economic development or continue to accelerate the pace of natural resource "spending". In 1993 the California legislature gave serious consideration to the latter. In the words of Governor Pete Wilson, the state's economic recession can be blamed on "environmentalists who don't give a damn about jobs, who are utterly insensitive, who are remarkably hostile at a time when Californians are desperately in need of employment." Ironically, economists across the county are pointing in the opposite direction. A report released last year by Bank of America illustrated the dramatic connection between strong environmental laws and strong state economies. Their findings are summed up by the words of business and management consultant Tom Peters who says, "Regulation drives innovation." But in the halls of the capitol legislators were on a different track. In 1993 the legislature and the governor worked hard to prop up polluting industries by voting to roll back clean air laws (SB 1853 -Leslie), weaken pesticide regulations (AB 771 -Areias) and reduce protections for public resources (SB 779 -Leslie).

ATTACKS ON CEQA





The legislature also spent a lot of time and money debating the merits of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the cornerstone of the state's regulatory framework. CEQA requires developers and others who are using state money for projects to conduct an environmental review of a project's impacts and to involve the public in this review. Environmentalists, who rely on CEQA to hold the state and its contractors accountable to environmental standards, found themselves wading through more than 50 bills aimed at weakening the Act. While some of the "streamlining" proposals had merit most were aimed at actually undermining the standards set by CEQA. The CEQA assault was led by Senator Ralph Dills a Democrat from Los Angeles and Senator Bill Leonard a Republican from Riverside County. With Dills and Leonard at the helm, the campaign to weaken CEQA gained tremendous momentum in the Senate, pulling in Democrats and Republicans alike. Fortunately, Assembly Member Byron Sher (D-Palo Alto) used his power as head of the Assembly Natural Resources Committee to keep the debate in check. In the end, the legislature produced a CEQA reform package that environmentalists could live with but the debate rages on in the legislature in 1994 with many of the 1993 proposals carried over as two year bills.

WHAT LIES AHEAD

1994 is shaping up to be round two of the fight to protect the heart and soul of California environmental laws. Already proposals are on the table to continue the attack on the California Environmental Quality Act, rollback the state's landmark Zero Emission Vehicle regulations, and abolish environmental agencies such as the Energy Commission and the Integrated Solid Waste Management Board without adequate replacement. We hope that the results of the 1993 Environmental Voting Chart will serve as a wake up call rather than a precursor for future environmental policy making in California.

THE 1994 ELECTIONS

Now is the time for voters to take their basic concerns about environmental quality and public health to the polls. The entire Assembly and half of the state Senate are up for re-election this year. Due to term limits many of our most experienced environmental leaders are leaving or running for higher office. Greater turnover in office means elections play a more important role than ever in determining public policy in California. Prior to term limits the power of incumbency and the high re-election of incumbents lent some stability to the process. By contrast, this year, CLCV expects almost one third of the Assembly races (24 seats) to be open (where no incumbent is running) and one quarter of the Senate races (5 seats) to be open. If environmentalists fail to be effective in elections, we will surely lose our most dependable votes without adequate replacement. A worst case, but not so far fetched scenario for 1994 shows that both the Assembly and Senate are threatened with a majority anti-conservation voting block (see charts below). Representative democracy is only as good as those it represents. We encourage everyone who cares about the future of California to hold their representatives accountable to the environment and cast a vote for the earth in 1994.



1993 ENVIRONMENTAL LEGISLATION

AIR POLLUTION

1. BAY AREA

SB 1113 (Morgan) would delay the implementation of nitrogen oxide controls in the Bay Area and San Joaquin Valley until 1997. Nitrogen oxide is a major component of smog. **OPPOSED BY CONSERVATIONISTS. TWO YEAR BILL.**

2. TRUCK INSPECTIONS

AB 584 (Cortese) would weaken air pollution inspection standards for new trucks. Before being amended, the bill would have forced the Air Resources Board to implement federal standards which are weaker than those established by the state. **INITIALLY OPPOSED BY CONSERVATIONISTS. AMENDED IN SENATE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE. OPPOSITION WITHDRAWN. SIGNED INTO LAW.**

3. AIR DISTRICTS

AB 1853 (Polanco) would weaken the power of regional air pollution control districts by transferring funding and budget making authority from the districts to the state legislature. **OPPOSED BY CONSERVATIONISTS. DROPPED BY AUTHOR AFTER AMENDED IN SENATE APPROPRIATIONS.**

4. TRIP REDUCTION PLANS

SB 883 (Leslie) undermines efforts to reduce air pollution from cars and trucks. The bill exempts businesses who employ fewer than 100 people from developing trip reduction or carpooling plans for their employees. These plans are some of the most valuable tools used by air districts to meet the requirements of state and federal air quality laws. **OPPOSED BY CONSERVATIONISTS. SIGNED INTO LAW.**

CAL EPA

5. CAL EPA

SB 1082 (Calderon) would have weakened the power of CalEPA by giving oil, chemical and other industries which are regulated by the agency new

authority to control regulatory decision making. While the intent of the bill was to streamline the environmental permit process, the legislation would have resulted in the weakening of environmental standards. **INITIALLY OPPOSED BY CONSERVATIONISTS. AMENDED IN THE ASSEMBLY. OPPOSITION WITHDRAWN. SIGNED INTO LAW.**

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

6. CEQA EXEMPTIONS

SB 919 (Dills) would have exempted many industrial projects from complying with CEQA standards. The bill was also designed to list the public's ability to use CEQA as a tool for holding local industries and projects accountable to environmental standards. **INITIALLY OPPOSED BY CONSERVATIONISTS. AMENDED IN THE ASSEMBLY. OPPOSITION WITHDRAWN. SIGNED INTO LAW.**

7. CEQA EXEMPTIONS

SB 912 (Leonard) would undermine the environmental impact of CEQA by exempting industry actions which could be characterized as necessary to comply with other environmental regulations. These exemptions would hold even if the activity in question causes environmental damage. The bill would also limit the court's ability to penalize industries which violate CEQA laws. **OPPOSED BY ENVIRONMENTALISTS. TWO YEAR BILL.**

COASTAL PROTECTION

8. OIL TANKERS

AB 591 (Friedman) would require the oil industry to build a pipeline from Santa Barbara to Los Angeles, thus codifying the terms of a permit issued by the Coastal Commission allowing them to use oil tankers until 1996. Conservationists supported this bill because it requires oil companies to find a safe alternative to oil tankers which pose a serious danger to the coast. **SUPPORTED BY CONSERVATIONISTS. TWO YEAR BILL.**



= PRO-CONSERVATION ACTION BY GOVERNOR



= ANTI-CONSERVATION ACTION BY GOVERNOR

LAND USE

9. WATER

SB 1250 (Boatwright) would force any water agency within Contra Costa County to expand its service area regardless of the agency's existing water supply or infrastructure. The legislation would force the East Bay Municipal Utilities District to expand beyond its capacity resulting in less water for existing residential, business, agricultural and environmental needs. **OPPOSED BY CONSERVATIONISTS. TWO YEAR BILL.**

10. FARMLAND PROTECTION

AB 724 (Sher) would have strengthened the Williamson Act, the state's agricultural land protection law, by prohibiting tax breaks for land uses which jeopardize farming, like golf courses and gravel mining. **SUPPORTED BY CONSERVATIONISTS. VETOED BY THE GOVERNOR.**

11. BUSHY LAKE

SB 982 (Greene) would have permitted construction of a 40-acre parking lot for the California Exposition in the American River Parkway in Sacramento, a protected wildlife and riparian habitat area. **OPPOSED BY CONSERVATIONISTS. TWO YEAR BILL.**

12. INFRASTRUCTURE REFINANCING

AB 1495 (Peace) would have used funding dedicated for public transportation by proposition 116 to fund infrastructure projects. The bill had no provisions for accountability or growth management. **OPPOSED BY CONSERVATIONISTS AFTER IT WAS AMENDED IN THE SENATE. TWO YEAR BILL.**

13. URBAN FORESTRY

AB 205 (Friedman, T.) would authorize cities and counties to adopt a tree planting ordinance for public construction projects. The bill would also protect trees considered to be historically, environmentally or culturally significant. The bill was amended in the Assembly Ways and Means Committee to make the tree planting ordinance optional. **SUPPORTED BY CONSERVATIONISTS. TWO YEAR BILL.**

PESTICIDES

14. PUBLIC HEALTH DATA

AB 771 (Areias) permits the Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) to waive public health data requirements for pesticides which could be harmful to the public. Contrary to DPR assertions, the waiver is not limited to pesticides which are used in a benign manner. **OPPOSED BY CONSERVATIONISTS. SIGNED INTO LAW.**

15. PESTICIDE REDUCTION

SB 475 (Petris), the Pesticide Reduction Act, would require CalEPA to develop and implement a pesticide reduction program by the year 2000. **SUPPORTED BY CONSERVATIONISTS. TWO YEAR BILL.**

RECYCLING

16. STATE PURCHASING

AB 11 (Eastin) strengthens recycling in California by increasing the state's goals for purchasing recycled products. The bill also expands price preferences to include plastic, glass, compost and paint. Price preferences stimulate the market for recycled products by directing state offices to purchase recycled paper, glass and other products if they fall within a designated price range. **SUPPORTED BY CONSERVATIONISTS. SIGNED INTO LAW.**

17. BOTTLE RECYCLING

AB 401 (Margolin) would expand the state's bottle recycling law to include wine and liquor bottles. The bottle recycling law has been extremely successful in increasing the percentage of waste recycled in California. **SUPPORTED BY CONSERVATIONISTS. TWO YEAR BILL.**

18. PLASTIC RECYCLING

SB 466 (Boatwright) exempts plastic food and cosmetic containers from plastic recycling requirements from January 1995 to January 1997. Earlier versions of the bill called for a total exemption from current law. **INITIALLY OPPOSED BY CONSERVATIONISTS. AMENDED IN THE ASSEMBLY. OPPOSITION WITHDRAWN. SIGNED INTO LAW.**



= PRO-CONSERVATION ACTION BY GOVERNOR



= ANTI-CONSERVATION ACTION BY GOVERNOR

19. RECYCLING CONTRACTS

SB 450 (Dills) would limit recycling opportunities by restricting independent recyclers' ability to collect materials in jurisdictions with exclusive solid waste hauling franchises. The bill is supported by garbage haulers and local governments. **OPPOSED BY CONSERVATIONISTS. TWO YEAR BILL.**

20. HAZARDOUS WASTE FACILITIES

SB 1006 (Leonard) would limit citizens' "right-to-know" about environmental impacts when storage and treatment operations at hazardous waste facilities expand. The bill benefits Laidlaw Environmental Services, a waste management company that wants to expand its landfill in Buttonwillow, CA. **OPPOSED BY CONSERVATIONISTS. TWO YEAR BILL**

TRANSPORTATION

21. VEHICLE REGISTRATION

AB 2247 (Collins) authorizes the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) to increase the price of motor vehicle registration to fund air quality programs including mass transit improvements, low emission vehicle programs and incentives to get polluting cars off the road. **SUPPORTED BY CONSERVATIONISTS. TWO YEAR BILL.**

22. BICYCLE TRANSPORTATION

SB 833 (Hayden) Would require all new companies and industries to develop plans to provide for bicycle parking. **SUPPORTED BY CONSERVATIONISTS. TWO YEAR BILL**

23. RAIL TRANSIT

SB 602 (Kopp) would eliminate the state's only ongoing funding source for passenger rail transportation capital improvement projects. **OPPOSED BY CONSERVATIONISTS. TWO YEAR BILL.**

WATER

24. AUBURN DAM

AB 184 (Collins, Knowles) would place a billion dollar bond issue on the ballot to allocate funds for

Auburn Dam. Conservationists argue that building the dam would not produce worthwhile amounts of water, power or recreation and would irreparably harm the American River. **OPPOSED BY CONSERVATIONISTS. TWO YEAR BILL.**

25. BAY PROTECTION

SB 1084 (Calderon) would re-authorize the Bay Protection and Toxic Cleanup Fund and continue the program indefinitely. The bill would also require the State Water Resource Control Board (SWRCB) to contract with the University of California, Los Angeles to study the health risks of runoff to swimmers at urban beaches.

SUPPORTED BY CONSERVATIONISTS. SIGNED INTO LAW.

WILDLIFE

26. DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

SB 779 (Leslie) prohibits Fish and Game biologists from entering private land without the consent of the owner, a search warrant or an inspection warrant, making it impossible for them to monitor public trust resources like streams, rivers and wildlife. Conservationists worked with the author on the bill in the hopes that he would amend it. When he failed to do so, conservationists opposed the bill when it reached the Assembly. **OPPOSED BY CONSERVATIONISTS. SIGNED INTO LAW.**

27. ENDANGERED SPECIES

SB 658 (Deddeh) would result in the delay and possible cancellation of any endangered species listing under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) by requiring that a costly and time consuming recovery plan be completed before the listing even occurs. **OPPOSED BY CONSERVATIONISTS. KILLED IN SENATE APPROPRIATIONS.**



= PRO-CONSERVATION ACTION BY GOVERNOR



= ANTI-CONSERVATION ACTION BY GOVERNOR

ASSEMBLY FLOOR	AIR			CST	LAND USE			PEST	RCYC	TRNS	WATER		WLD	1993 FLOOR SCORE	1993 COMM SCORE	1992 FLOOR SCORE
	2	3	4		8	10	13				14	16				
Bill Numbers	2	3	4	8	10	13	14	16	21	24	25	26				
Pro-Conservation Votes	15	24	9	27	42	43	21	51	51	32	46	32				
Anti-Conservation Votes	58	49	67	43	25	28	51	23	23	41	28	44				
Aguiar (R-61)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0	-	*	
Alby (R-5)	*	*	O	*	O	*	*	*	O	O	O	O	0	-	*	
Allen (R-67)	O	O	O	O	O	A	O	O	O	O	O	O	0	13	0	
Alpert (D-78)	O	X	O	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	83	75	100	
Andal (R-17)	X	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	8	0	13	
Archie-Hudson (D-48)	A	O	O	A	A	X	A	X	X	O	X	A	57	-	94	
Areias (D-28)	O	O	O	O	A	X	O	X	X	O	X	A	40	-	92	
Baca (D-62)	O	O	O	O	X	X	O	X	X	O	X	X	50	-	*	
Bates (D-14)	X	X	X	X	A	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	100	89	100	
Boland (R-38)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	X	O	O	O	8	-	0	
Bornstein (D-80)	A	O	O	X	X	X	O	X	X	O	X	O	54	-	*	
Bowen (D-53)	X	X	O	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	92	63	*	
Bowler (R-10)	O	O	O	O	X	A	O	O	O	O	O	O	9	-	*	
Bronshvag (D-6)	X	X	O	X	X	X	A	X	X	X	X	X	91	-	*	
Brown, V (D-7)	O	X	O	X	X	X	O	X	X	X	X	X	75	-	*	
Brown, W (D-13)	O	A	O	O	X	X	A	X	X	X	X	X	70	-	94	
Brulte (R-63)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	A	O	O	O	0	-	6	
Burton (D-12)	O	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	92	100	93	
Bustamante (D-31)	O	O	O	O	X	X	O	X	X	X	X	O	50	-	*	
Caldera (D-46)	A	X	A	A	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	100	-	*	
Campbell (D-11)	X	X	O	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	92	100	100	
Cannella (D-26)	O	A	O	O	X	X	O	X	X	O	X	O	45	-	94	
Connolly (D-77)	O	X	O	A	X	X	X	X	X	O	X	O	64	-	*	
Conroy (R-71)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	X	O	O	O	8	-	0	
Cortese (D-23)	O	O	O	O	A	X	O	X	X	X	X	X	54	-	94	
Costa (D-30)	O	O	O	O	X	O	A	X	X	O	X	O	36	36	81	
Eastin (D-20)	O	X	O	X	A	X	X	X	X	X	A	X	80	-	100	
Epple (D-56)	O	O	O	O	X	X	O	X	X	A	X	O	45	62	92	

X = PRO-CONSERVATION VOTE O = ANTI-CONSERVATION VOTE A = ABSENT / NOT VOTING * = NOT IN OFFICE

ASSEMBLY FLOOR	AIR			CST	LAND USE			PEST	RCYC	TRNS	WATER		WLD	1993 FLOOR SCORE	1993 COMM SCORE	1992 FLOOR SCORE
	2	3	4	8	10	13	14	16	21	24	25	26				
Bill Numbers	2	3	4	8	10	13	14	16	21	24	25	26				
Pro-Conservation Votes	15	24	9	27	42	43	21	51	51	32	46	32				
Anti-Conservation Votes	58	49	67	43	25	28	51	23	23	41	28	44				
Escutia (D-50)	O	O	X	A	X	X	O	X	X	X	X	X	73	-	*	
Farr (D-27)	O	X	*	X	X	X	O	X	X	*	*	*	75	80	100	
Ferguson (R-70)	O	O	O	A	A	A	O	O	O	O	X	O	11	-	0	
Frazer (R-74)	O	O	O	A	O	A	O	O	O	O	O	O	0	0	6	
Friedman, B (D-40)	X	X	A	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	100	-	100	
Friedman, T (D-41)	X	X	X	X	A	X	X	X	X	X	A	X	100	100	100	
Goldsmith	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	X	O	O	O	O	8	40	*	
Gotch (D-76)	X	X	O	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	92	100	88	
Hannigan (D-8)	O	A	O	O	X	X	O	X	X	X	X	X	64	100	88	
Harvey (R-32)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0	-	13	
Hauser (D-1)	X	O	O	X	X	X	O	X	X	X	X	X	75	75	88	
Haynes (R-66)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	A	O	O	O	O	0	-	*	
Hoge (R-44)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0	0	*	
Honeycutt (R-34)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	A	O	O	O	O	0	0	*	
Horcher (R-60)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	X	O	O	O	O	8	13	19	
Isenberg (D-9)	O	X	X	X	X	X	O	X	X	X	X	X	83	-	100	
Johnson (R-72)	A	A	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	A	O	O	0	0	A	
Jones (R-29)	O	O	O	O	X	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	8	11	14	
Karnette (D-54)	O	X	O	X	X	X	O	X	X	X	X	X	75	80	*	
Katz (D-39)	X	X	O	X	X	A	X	X	A	X	X	X	90	-	100	
Klehs (D-18)	O	X	O	X	X	X	O	X	X	X	X	X	75	-	100	
Knight (R-36)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0	25	*	
Knowles (R-4)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0	0	0	
Lee (D-16)	X	X	X	A	A	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	100	78	100	
Margolin (D-42)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	100	100	100	
Martinez (D-49)	O	O	O	X	X	X	X	X	X	O	X	O	58	-	*	
McDonald (D-55)	A	A	O	A	A	X	A	X	X	O	X	X	71	50	*	
Moore (D-47)	O	O	O	A	A	X	O	X	X	X	X	X	60	-	94	

X = PRO-CONSERVATION VOTE O = ANTI-CONSERVATION VOTE A = ABSENT / NOT VOTING * = NOT IN OFFICE

ASSEMBLY FLOOR VOTES

ASSEMBLY FLOOR	AIR			CST	LAND USE			PEST	RCYC	TRNS	WATER		WLD	1993 FLOOR SCORE	1993 COMM SCORE	1992 FLOOR SCORE
	2	3	4	8	10	13	14	16	21	24	25	26				
Bill Numbers	15	24	9	27	42	43	21	51	51	32	46	32				
Pro-Conservation Votes	58	49	67	43	25	28	51	23	23	41	28	44				
Anti-Conservation Votes																
Morrow (R-73)	O	O	O	O	O	A	O	O	O	O	O	O	0	0	*	
Mountjoy (R-59)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	A	O	O	O	O	0	-	0	
Murray (D-52)	O	O	O	O	X	X	O	X	X	X	X	O	50	62	81	
Napolitano (D-58)	O	O	O	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	A	X	73	50	*	
Nolan (R-43)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	A	O	O	O	O	0	50	0	
O'Connell (D-35)	O	X	O	X	X	X	A	X	X	X	X	X	82	100	94	
Peace (D-79)	O	A	O	X	X	X	X	X	X	O	X	O	64	-	80	
Polanco (D-45)	O	O	O	O	X	X	O	X	X	A	X	O	45	71	93	
Pringle (R-68)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	A	A	O	O	0	-	*	
Quackenbush (R-24)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	X	O	8	25	0	
Rainey (R-15)	O	O	O	O	O	O	A	O	A	O	O	O	0	-	*	
Richter (R-3)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	X	O	O	O	8	0	*	
Seastrand (R-33)	O	O	O	O	X	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	8	10	0	
Sher (D-21)	X	X	X	X	X	A	X	X	X	X	A	X	100	100	100	
Snyder (D-25)	O	O	O	O	X	O	O	X	X	A	X	O	36	-	*	
Solis (D-57)	O	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	92	-	*	
Speier (D-19)	A	X	O	X	A	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	90	-	100	
Statham (R-2)	O	O	O	O	X	O	O	X	A	O	X	O	27	-	27	
Takasugi (R-37)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	X	O	O	O	8	-	*	
Tucker (D-51)	O	O	O	O	A	A	O	A	X	X	X	A	38	43	92	
Umberg (D-69)	X	O	O	X	X	X	X	X	X	A	X	X	82	-	67	
Vasconcellos (D-22)	O	O	O	A	X	X	O	X	X	O	X	O	45	83	100	
Weggeland (R-64)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	X	O	O	O	O	8	20	*	
Woodruff (R-65)	X	O	O	O	X	O	O	O	O	O	A	O	18	38	6	

X = PRO-CONSERVATION VOTE O = ANTI-CONSERVATION VOTE A = ABSENT / NOT VOTING * = NOT IN OFFICE

ASSEMBLY FLOOR VOTES

ASSEMBLY WAYS & MEANS	AIR		LAND USE		RECYC	TRAN	TOXIC	WILD
	2 AB 584	3 AB 1853	10 AB 724	13 AB 205	16 AB 11	21 AB 2247	25 SB 1084	26 SB m779
Pro-Conservation Votes	4	5	16	11	17	13	14	6
Anti-Conservation Votes	12	12	4	6	4	8	7	13
Allen (R-67)	O	O	O	X	X	O	O	O
Alpert (D-78)	O	A	X	X	X	X	O	X
Archie-Hudson (D-48)	*	*	*	*	*	X	*	O
Brown, V (D-7)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	O
Burton (D-12)	A	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Campbell (D-11)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Costa (D-30)	O	O	O	O	X	X	X	O
Epple (D-56)	O	O	X	X	X	X	X	O
Friedman, B (D-40)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	A
Gotch (D-76)	X	X	X	X	X	X	*	*
Hannigan (D-8)	A	A	X	X	X	X	X	X
Horcher (R-60)	O	O	O	O	X	O	O	O
Johnson (R-72)	O	O	O	A	O	O	O	O
Jones (R-29)	O	O	X	O	O	O	O	O
Lee (D-16)	A	O	X	X	X	*	X	O
Murray (D-52)	O	O	X	X	X	X	X	O
Nolan (R-43)	O	A	X	A	X	O	X	O
O'Connell (D-35)	A	X	X	A	X	X	X	X
Polanco (D-45)	O	O	X	A	X	X	X	X
Quackenbush (R-24)	O	O	X	O	O	O	X	O
Seastrand (R-33)	O	O	A	O	O	O	O	O
VASCONCELLOS (D-22)	A	A	X	X	X	X	X	O
Woodruff (R-65)	X	O	X	O	X	O	O	O

ASSEMBLY ENVIRONMENTAL SAFETY	TOXIC
	25 SB 1084
Pro Conservation Votes	7
Anti Conservation Votes	1
Alpert (D-78)	X
Andal (R-17)	A
Bates (D-14)	X
Boland (R-38)	A
Bowen (D-53)	X
Jones (R-29)	X
Karnette (D-54)	X
Peace (D-79)	A
Rainey (R-15)	A
Richter (R-3)	O
Sher D-21)	A
Solis (D-57)	X
UMBERG (D-69)	X

X = PRO-CONSERVATION VOTE O = ANTI-CONSERVATION VOTE A = ABSENT/ NOT VOTING * = NOT IN OFFICE

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE VOTES

ASSEMBLY NATURAL RESOURCES	AIR			CST	LAND		RECYC	
	1 SB 1113	3 AB 1853	4 SB 883	8 AB 591	10 AB 724	13 AB 205	17 AB 401	18 SB 466
Pro-Conservation Votes	5	5	7	7	7	7	7	3
Anti-Conservation Votes	6	7	0	6	5	5	5	6
Allen (R-67)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Bates (D-14)	X	X	O	X	X	X	X	X
Bowen (D-53)	A	X	O	X	X	X	X	A
Farr (D-27)	*	O	*	X	X	X	X	*
Friedman, T (D-41)	A	A	A	X	X	X	A	A
Gotch (D-76)	X	X	A	X	X	X	X	X
Hoge (R-44)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Knowles (R-4)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Margolin (D-42)	X	X	A	X	A	X	X	A
Morrow (R-73)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Richter (R-3)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
SHER (D-21)	X	X	A	X	X	A	X	X
Solis (D-57)	X	*	A	*	*	*	*	A
Tucker (D-51)	O	O	A	O	X	X	X	O

ASSEMBLY CONSUMER PROTECTION	RECYC
	16 AB 11
Pro Conservation Votes	12
Anti Conservation Votes	0
Areias (D-28)	X
Bowen (D-53)	X
Bronshvag (D-6)	X
Caldera (D-46)	A
Eastin (D-20)	X
Goldsmith (R-75)	X
Honeycutt (R-34)	X
Knight (R-36)	X
Martinez (D-49)	X
Seastrand (R-33)	X
Sher (D-21)	X
SPEIER (D-19)	X
Weggeland (R-64)	X

X = PRO-CONSERVATION VOTE O = ANTI-CONSERVATION VOTE A = ABSENT/ NOT VOTING * = NOT IN OFFICE

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE VOTES

ASSEMBLY TRANSPORTATION	AIR		TRANS	
	2 AB 584	4 SB 883	21 AB 2247	22 SB 833
Pro-Conservation Votes	2	0	9	9
Anti-Conservation Votes	10	12	5	7
Andal (R-17)	O	O	O	O
Costa (D-30)	O	O	A	X
Eastin (D-20)	A	A	O	X
Escutia (D-50)	O	O	X	X
Frazee (R-74)	O	O	O	O
Goldsmith (R-75)	O	O	X	O
Hauser (D-1)	X	O	X	X
Honeycutt (R-34)	O	O	O	O
Karnette (D-54)	X	O	X	X
KATZ (D-39)	A	A	X	O
Knight (R-36)	O	O	A	O
Lee (D-16)	A	A	X	X
McDonald (D-55)	O	O	X	X
Napolitano (D-58)	O	O	X	X
Umberg (D-69)	A	A	X	X
Weggeland (R-64)	O	O	O	O

ASSEMBLY AGRICULTURE	LAND	PEST
	11 SB 982	14 AB 771
Pro-Conservation Votes	5	0
Anti-Conservation Votes	5	8
Aguiar (R-61)	X	O
ARELIAS (D-28)	A	O
Bornstein (D-80)	X	O
V. Brown (D-7)	X	O
Bustamante (D-31)	X	*
Cannella (D-26)	O	O
Harvey (R-32)	O	O
Haynes (R-66)	O	O
Jones (R-29)	O	A
Polanco (D-45)	A	A
Seastrand (R-33)	O	O
Snyder (D-25)	X	A
Vasconcellos (D-22)	A	A

ASSEMBLY WATER, PARKS AND WILDLIFE	WILD
	27 SB 779
Pro Conservation Votes	1
Anti Conservation Votes	7
Andal (R-17)	O
Bronshvag (D-6)	X
Bustamante (D-31)	O
Campbell (D-11)	A
Cannella (D-26)	A
CORTESE (D-23)	O
Costa (D-30)	O
Frazee (R-74)	O
Harvey (R-32)	O
Hauser (D-1)	A
Haynes (R-66)	O
Isenberg (D-9)	A
Knowles (R-4)	O

X = PRO-CONSERVATION VOTE O = ANTI-CONSERVATION VOTE A = ABSENT/ NOT VOTING * = NOT IN OFFICE

SENATE FLOOR	AIR		EPA	CEQA		LAND USE				PEST		RECYCLING		TOX	TRANS		WAT	WLD	1993 FLOOR SCORE	1993 COMM SCORE	1992 FLOOR SCORE	
	1	4	5	6	7	9	10	11	12	14	15	16	18	19	20	22	23	25				26
Bill Numbers																						
Pro-Conservation Votes	7	10	9	11	13	9	21	12	13	9	21	22	8	15	12	21	7	28	11			
Anti-Conservation Votes	23	26	27	25	21	21	12	21	14	24	13	10	28	21	22	10	30	6	21			
Alquist (D-30)	A	O	O	O	A	O	A	X	A	O	A	A	O	O	O	A	O	X	A	18	10	65
Ayala (D-34)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	A	O	X	X	O	X	A	X	O	X	O	29	20	50
Bergeson (R-35)	O	O	O	O	O	O	X	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	A	O	O	X	O	11	38	45
Beverly (R-27)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	X	O	O	O	A	O	X	O	11	20	53
Boatwright (D-7)	O	O	O	O	O	O	X	O	X	O	X	X	O	O	O	X	O	X	O	32	-	67
Calderon (D-26)	A	X	O	X	X	A	X	A	O	O	X	X	O	X	O	X	O	X	X	62	33	A
Craven (R-38)	O	O	O	A	O	O	X	O	O	O	X	X	A	O	O	A	O	X	O	25	0	A
Deddeh (D-40)	O	O	O	O	O	*	*	X	*	*	X	*	O	O	A	X	O	A	*	27	-	68
Dills (D-30)	O	O	O	O	O	O	X	A	O	X	X	X	O	O	O	X	O	X	X	39	31	59
Greene (D-6)	O	O	O	O	O	O	X	O	X	O	X	X	O	O	O	A	O	X	O	28	33	63
Hart (D-18)	X	X	X	X	X	A	X	X	A	X	X	X	X	X	O	X	O	X	A	87	100	100
Hayden (D-23)	A	A	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	100	90	100
Hill (R-29)	O	O	A	O	O	O	O	X	A	O	O	X	O	O	O	O	O	X	O	18	0	50
Hughes (D-25)	O	O	O	O	O	O	X	O	O	A	X	X	X	O	O	X	O	X	O	33	0	*
Hurt (R-32)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	A	O	X	O	O	O	O	O	6	0	*
Johnston (D-5)	O	X	O	X	X	X	X	O	X	O	X	X	O	O	X	X	O	X	O	58	62	90
Kelley (R-37)	O	O	O	O	O	X	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	A	O	6	17	20
Killea (I-39)	O	X	O	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	89	70	67
Kopp (I-8)	X	X	X	O	O	O	X	O	X	O	X	O	O	X	O	X	O	X	X	53	50	62
Leonard (R-31)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	A	O	O	O	O	X	O	O	O	O	O	6	0	0
Leslie (R-1)	A	O	O	O	A	A	O	O	O	A	O	A	A	O	O	A	X	O	O	8	0	15
Lewis (R-33)	O	O	A	O	O	O	O	O	A	O	A	O	O	X	O	O	A	O	O	7	-	6
Lockyer (D-10)	A	O	X	O	X	X	X	X	A	A	X	X	O	O	X	X	O	X	O	63	59	90

X = PRO-CONSERVATION VOTE O = ANTI-CONSERVATION VOTE A = ABSENT/ NOT VOTING * = NOT IN OFFICE

SENATE FLOOR VOTES

SENATE FLOOR	AIR		EPA		CEQA		LAND USE				PEST		RECYCLING			FOX	TRANS		WAT	WLD	1993 FLOOR SCORE	1993 COMM SCORE	1992 FLOOR SCORE
	1	4	5	6	7	9	10	11	12	14	15	16	18	19	20	22	23	25	26				
Bill Numbers																							
Pro-Conservation Votes	7	10	9	11	13	9	21	12	13	9	21	22	8	15	12	21	7	28	11				
Anti-Conservation Votes	23	26	27	25	21	21	12	21	14	24	13	10	28	21	22	10	30	6	21				
Maddy (R-14)	A	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0	0	30
Marks (D-3)	O	X	X	X	X	O	X	X	X	X	X	A	O	X	X	X	O	X	A	76	100	95	
McCorquodale D1	A	X	O	X	A	X	A	A	A	O	O	X	O	A	X	A	A	A	X	60	60	100	
Mello (D-15)	A	O	O	O	O	A	X	O	O	O	A	X	O	O	A	X	O	X	X	33	31	89	
Morgan (R-11)	O	O	O	O	A	*	*	X	*	*	A	*	O	O	O	X	X	X	*	36	-	50	
Petris (D-9)	X	X	X	A	X	X	X	A	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	O	X	A	94	-	94	
Presley (D-36)	O	O	O	O	X	X	O	X	O	O	X	X	O	O	A	X	O	X	O	39	70	67	
Roberti (D-20)	X	A	O	A	A	O	X	O	A	A	X	X	O	X	X	X	O	A	A	58	-	95	
Rogers (R-17)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	X	O	O	O	O	O	O	A	O	O	O	6	0	5	
Rosenthal (D-22)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	100	-	100	
Russell (R-21)	O	O	A	O	O	O	X	A	O	O	O	O	A	X	O	O	X	A	O	20	50	15	
Thompson (D-2)	X	O	X	X	X	A	X	A	A	O	A	X	O	A	X	X	X	X	X	79	50	85	
Torres (D-24)	A	A	X	X	X	A	A	X	O	X	X	X	X	A	X	X	O	X	X	86	91	100	
Watson (D-28)	X	X	O	X	X	A	A	O	X	X	X	A	X	X	X	A	O	X	X	80	-	93	
Wright (R-19)	O	O	O	O	O	O	X	O	X	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	X	O	16	20	0	
Wyman (R-16)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	X	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	X	O	11	-	0	

X = PRO-CONSERVATION VOTE O = ANTI-CONSERVATION VOTE A = ABSENT/ NOT VOTING * = NOT IN OFFICE

SENATE FLOOR VOTES

SENATE GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION	AIR		CEQA		RECYCLE	
	1 SB 1113	4 SB 883	6 SB 919	7 SB 912	18 SB 466	19 SB 450
Pro-Conservation Votes	4	0	1	4	1	0
Anti-Conservation Votes	6	7	9	6	7	8
Alquist (D-13)	O	O	O	O	O	O
Beverly (R-27)	O	O	O	O	O	O
DILLS (D-30)	O	O	O	O	O	O
Greene (D-6)	O	A	A	O	O	O
Hill (R-29)	A	O	O	O	O	A
Hughes (D-25)	A	O	O	O	A	O
Lockyer (D-10)	A	O	O	X	O	O
Maddy (R-14)	O	O	O	O	O	O
Mello (D-15)	O	A	O	X	O	O
Rosenthal (D-22)	X	A	X	X	A	A
Torres (D-24)	A	A	A	X	X	A

SENATE LOCAL GOVERNMENT	LAND	
	9 SB 1250	10 AB 724
Pro-Conservation Votes	0	4
Anti-Conservation Votes	7	1
Ayala (D-34)	O	O
BERGESON (R-35)	O	X
Calderon (D-26)	O	A
Craven (R-38)	O	X
Hughes (D-25)	O	A
Kopp (I-8)	O	X
Russell (R-21)	O	X

SENATE TOXICS & PUBLIC SAFETY	EPA	PEST	PEST	TOX	WTR
	5 SB 1082	14 AB 771	15 SB 475	20 SB 1006	25 SB 1084
Pro-Conservation Votes	2	2	4	3	4
Anti-Conservation Votes	4	4	3	4	0
CALDERON (D-26)	O	O	X	O	X
Hayden (D-23)	X	X	X	X	X
Hurt (R-32)	O	O	O	O	A
Leonard (R-31)	O	O	O	O	A
Lockyer (D-10)	A	A	X	X	X
Torres (D-24)	X	X	X	X	A
Wright (R-19)	O	O	O	O	X

SENATE TRANSPORTATION	TRANS	
	23 SB 602	24 SB 833
Pro-Conservation Votes	2	7
Anti-Conservation Votes	9	3
Ayala (D-34)	O	X
Bergeson (R-35)	O	O
Boatwright (D-7)	O	X
Hayden (D-23)	O	X
Johnston (D-5)	O	A
Kelley (R-37)	O	O
Killea (I-39)	O	X
KOPP (I-8)	O	X
McCorquodale (D-12)	X	X
Russell (R-21)	X	O
Torres (D-24)	O	X

X = PRO-CONSERVATION VOTE O = ANTI-CONSERVATION VOTE A = ABSENT/ NOT VOTING * = NOT IN OFFICE

SENATE COMMITTEE VOTES

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS	EPA	CEQA	LAND	PEST	RCYC	TRANS		WTR	WILD
	5 SB 1082	6 SB 912	12 AB 1495	15 SB 475	16 AB 11	22 SB 833	23 SB 602	25 SB 1084	27 SB 658
Pro-Conservation Votes	0	7	0	7	10	8	1	12	4
Anti-Conservation Votes	10	4	12	3	2	1	10	0	5
Alquist (D-13)	A	O	O	A	A	A	O	X	A
Bergeson (R-35)	A	A	O	A	X	A	O	X	A
Beverly (R-27)	O	O	O	O	X	X	O	X	O
Dills (D-30)	O	O	O	X	X	X	O	X	O
Greene (D-6)	O	O	A	X	X	X	O	X	O
Johnston (D-5)	O	X	O	X	X	X	O	X	X
Kelley (R-37)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	X	O
Killea (I-39)	O	X	O	X	X	X	X	X	A
Leonard (R-31)	O	O	O	O	O	A	A	A	O
Lockyer (D-10)	O	X	O	X	X	X	O	X	X
Mello (D-15)	O	O	O	X	X	X	O	X	A
PRESLEY (D-36)	O	X	O	X	X	X	O	X	X
Torres (D-24)	A	A	O	A	X	A	A	X	X

SENATE NATURAL RESOURCES & WILDLIFE	LAND		WLD
	11 SB 982	13 AB 205	26 SB 658
Pro-Conservation Votes	5	6	4
Anti-Conservation Votes	6	2	7
Hart (D-18)	X	X	X
Hayden (D-23)	X	X	X
Johnston (D-5)	O	X	X
Leslie (R-1)	O	O	O
Lewis (R-33)	O	A	O
Marks (D-3)	X	X	X
McCorquodale (D-12)	O	A	O
Mello (D-15)	O	O	O
Rogers (R-17)	O	A	O
THOMPSON (D-4)	X	X	O
Torres (D-24)	X	X	O

SENATE AGRICULTURE AND WATER RESOURCES	LAND
	9 SB 1250
Pro-Conservation Votes	3
Anti-Conservation Votes	7
Ayala (D-34)	O
Calderon (D-26)	A
Craven (R-38)	O
Kelley (R-37)	X
Kopp (I-8)	O
Lewis (R-33)	O
McCORQUODALE (D-12)	X
Presley (D-36)	X
Rogers (R-17)	O
Thompson (D-4)	O
Wyman (R- 16)	O

X = PRO-CONSERVATION VOTE O = ANTI-CONSERVATION VOTE A = ABSENT/ NOT VOTING * = NOT IN OFFICE