



MICHIGAN

ENVIRONMENTAL SCORECARD



2010



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Letter from the Director and Board President....	1
Michigan LCV Protects.....	2
Priority Issues.....	4
2009-2010 In Review.....	6
The Best of 2009-2010.....	8
The Worst of 2009-2010.....	9
Room for Improvement.....	9
At A Glance: 2009-2010 Highlights.....	10
House of Representatives Bill Descriptions.....	11
House Votes.....	14
Senate Bill Descriptions.....	17
Senate Votes.....	20

OUR 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

Michigan LCV would like to acknowledge and thank the following members of the conservation and environmental community for their input and participation as members of the Michigan Environmental Scorecard Advisory Council. As Advisory Council members, these individuals provide critical input to ensure that the *Scorecard* represents the interests and concerns of the statewide conservation and environmental community. Without their policy expertise and effort, this publication would not be possible.

Brian Beauchamp, Michigan Land Use Institute*
Don Brown, Kalamazoo Environmental Council*
James Clift, Michigan Environmental Council*
Rachel Hood, West Michigan Environmental Action Council*
Terry Miller, Lone Tree Council*
Mike Shriberg, Ecology Center*
Grenetta Thomassey, Tip of the Mitt Watershed Council*
**Organizational affiliation listed for identification purposes only.*

Special thanks to Dave Dempsey, without whom this *Scorecard* would not be possible.

Design Linette Lao, Invisible Engines

Photo Credits Pam Bierzynski (p. 8, back cover), Amanda Edmonds (p. 3), Harold Eyster (p. 5), Ken Fish (p. 4), Brad Garmon (p. 6), Jay Natoli (p. 19), Sarah Shelton (p. 4), Erin Wilkinson (p. 2).

Quotations from Lana Pollack and Bill Parfet were originally published in *Michigan: Our Land, Our Water, Our Heritage*, edited by John Knott.



Dear Friend,

What are Michigan values? For many of us, Michigan values include the appreciation and care for our great outdoors, and the natural resources that provide a high quality of life on our peninsulas.

These resources are intricately woven into the web of our lives: a summer picnic and play day at the shore of a Great Lake; a fall deer hunting outing in our forests; a family marshmallow roast over a campfire. All of these are experiences we treasure and want to protect now and for our children and grandchildren.

Michigan values include the thoughtful, consistent conservation of our air, water and land, our fish, game and wildlife. We understand these resources are the unfaltering backbone of our economy during hard times. We understand these are not just one-time gifts, but the equivalent of family heirlooms that we must guard. Michigan has a long history of doing just that through high rates of recycling, earth-friendly consumer choices, sustained financial support for habitat protection and public access for hunters and anglers, and much more.

We expect these Michigan values to be reflected in our public policies, too. When we can take policy into our own hands—by voting “yes” or “no” on a ballot question—Michigan citizens continuously put our natural resources first. Since 1968, Michigan voters have approved nine conservation ballot measures, including our nationally-recognized bottle bill and more than \$1 billion in bonding for clean water, parks and trails, and toxic cleanup.

Unfortunately, our state elected officials are not consistently embracing these Michigan values when crafting public policy in Lansing. In recent years, some legislative leaders have actually undermined these values by blocking common-sense measures that protect children from toxic chemicals and preventing Great Lakes water from being managed for the public benefit. At a time when we are spending millions of taxpayer dollars to promote tourism and recreation with the nationwide “Pure Michigan” advertising campaign, this is inexcusable. If the legislature cannot enact simple protections for our water, our forests and our outstanding park systems, there won’t be much of a “Pure Michigan” to market.

A primary task of the Michigan League of Conservation Voters (LCV) is to shine the spotlight on public officials who support our Michigan values—and those who don’t. We hope the *2009-2010 Environmental Scorecard* helps you identify who is championing our natural resources and who is letting them, and us, down. With this *Scorecard* in hand, you will be equipped with the necessary information to judge the conservation and environmental values of your elected officials, and you will be ready to join citizens across the state in holding them accountable.

Sincerely,

Handwritten signature of Lisa Wozniak in black ink.

Lisa Wozniak
Executive Director

Handwritten signature of Robert Martel in black ink.

Robert Martel
Board President



MICHIGAN LCV PROTECTS

“It is very human to be moved by place, by something larger than yourself. It is part of how we relate to each other in Michigan—our common attraction to nature. These places need champions.”

—Lana Pollack, Michigan LCV Director Emeritus and former Michigan Environmental Council President

Michigan is at a turning point. We are trying to build a new and prosperous economy, safe from the dramatic reverses of the last quarter-century. We are trying to do it while shielding and nurturing the natural qualities that make Michigan great. The Michigan League of Conservation Voters (LCV) is committed to this future.

Politicians often talk about “win-win” opportunities. Such opportunities are abundant in Michigan today. In the clean energy sector, we have a chance to harness non-polluting sources of energy while putting our manufacturing base back to work building advanced batteries, solar panels, and wind turbines. In tourism and recreation, when we protect and maintain our Great Lakes, streams, and forests, we boost an already booming business. In agriculture, new demand for fresh and local food encourages sustainable farming practices that help farmers and our environment.

However, Michigan politicians are too often pitting natural resource protection against economic renaissance. They argue—and vote recklessly—for choices producing a few short-term jobs at the expense of our quality of life and long-term economic health. We cannot flourish in the long run if we sell off or degrade our natural resources today. This may create temporary jobs now, but will bankrupt future generations in Michigan.

Consider these choices in recent sessions of the Michigan Legislature:

- The construction of more dirty coal-fired power plants vs. incentives for wind, solar and energy efficiency.
- Poorly-regulated factory farms that dump mammoth quantities of manure into our lakes and rivers vs. strong water protections coupled with the promotion of locally grown foods and family farms.
- Exporting and selling Great Lakes water far away from Michigan vs. making it available for in-state industries with incentives to use it responsibly and respectfully.

These are just a few of the stark choices Michigan’s elected officials have faced in the last several years—and too often, they have picked short-sighted policies that put our natural resources in danger.

Thankfully, there are also elected officials who have a different vision of Michigan and have demonstrated it through their actions. These leaders are generally not in the highest positions of state government. In fact, many of them are in only their first or second terms and they

are a hopeful new light in Lansing. They see a future of renewable energy, children's health protection, and robust tourism and recreation.

We know it can be done. There are other states across the country who have enacted strong clean energy policies, assured long-term adequate funding for habitat protection and clean water, promoted public transit, and put water conservation and technology near the top of their economic development strategies. These states are attracting new businesses and stimulating their economy, while at the same time protecting their resources for the future.

It is critical that citizens and advocacy groups work together to hold elected officials accountable for their actions. This is why Michigan LCV produces the *Michigan Environmental Scorecard*. We want you to have all of the facts and information.

Like you, we have high hopes for a new dawn of Michigan leadership, both economically and environmentally. Together, we can make our vision a reality. Michigan LCV will continue to work to support your desire for a healthy, prosperous Michigan to become a reality. ■



MICHIGAN LCV BOARD/STAFF

Board

Robert Martel, President
William Farr, Immediate Past President*
Bruce Wallace, Vice President
Paul Brown, Treasurer
Doug Glancy, Secretary
Francine Alexander
Irene Cahill*
George Heartwell
Andrew Hoffman*
Peter Kotila
Dr. Daniel Luria*
Christine Manninen
Claudia Rast
Dr. Joe Schwarz
Sanjiv Sinha
Mark Stranahan
Terry Ziemba

Honorary Co-Chairs

Governor William and Helen Milliken

Directors Emeritus

Michael D. Moore
Lana Pollack
Mark Richardson
Joan Wolfe

Advisory Board

John Austin
John Carver
Marcia Gershenson

Staff

Lisa Wozniak, Executive Director
Kerry Duggan, Deputy Director/Development Director
Pam Bierzynski, Director of Operations
Bill Kirk, Campaigns Director
Hannah Smith, Policy and Programs Associate
Mark Neisler, Global Climate Change Specialist
Jeff Kart, Online Communications Director

*Members of the Issues and Accountability Committee



PRIORITY ISSUES

Throughout the 2009-2010 legislative session, Michigan LCV concentrated our efforts on the following priority issues; clean energy, environmental health, and funding for environmental protection. All of these issues fundamentally affect our water resources, and the health of the Great Lakes is always a priority.

Energy

Energy policy is about much more than clean air, clean water, and mitigating climate change. It's about creating jobs, Michigan jobs. We send \$23 billion a year to other states to pay for fossil fuels like coal and oil, supporting out-of-state jobs. By retrofitting houses and buildings to be more energy efficient, we can put Michigan builders and contractors back to work. Even better, by fostering and welcoming clean wind and solar energy industries, we can revive some of our manufacturing base and create jobs in advanced technology.

Michigan LCV believes the single most important step Michigan can take to build an economically and environmentally friendly future is to take the lead in clean energy policy. This is consistent with Michigan's historic reputation as an innovator in environmental policy and conservation. This also is the best way to diversify our manufacturing sector and put our labor force of talented, trained individuals back to work.

Environmental Health

Since Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring* of 1962 galvanized American awareness of toxic chemicals, public health protection has been an underpinning of our environmental laws—and our environmental comeback.

Michigan was the first state to ban most uses of DDT, for example, and as other states and the federal Environmental Protection Agency followed our lead, America's bald eagle population came back from the brink of extinction. Today, eagles flourish in Michigan.

People have benefited even more. DDT and PCB prohibitions significantly reduced contamination of sport fish, reducing risks to Michigan women of reproductive age and young children. Pesticide restrictions have reduced both accidental poisonings and long-term health impacts. Strong controls on harmful lead in paint and gasoline have helped reduce brain and other neurological damage. The bodies and bloodstreams of Americans show declining levels of dozens of chemicals due to stronger environmental laws and regulations.



But, there is still work to be done. Even as some of the old threats persist, new ones emerge. National scientific studies are turning up previously undetected pharmaceutical wastes in our waters. These materials damage fish and wildlife and may affect human health.

We need to prevent and police contaminants in drinking water, reduce and eliminate pesticide residues in food, and continue to ratchet down on air pollution to protect those with asthma and other respiratory problems. Michigan LCV believes these, too, are Michigan values and Michigan priorities.

Funding for Environmental Protection

In many ways, protecting the outdoors is like owning a house. If you neglect investments in maintenance and upkeep, you risk disaster. For too long Michigan has been neglecting maintenance funding for clean air, water and land, and for fish and wildlife. The effects are starting to show:

- After almost three decades of toxic waste cleanup, Michigan has run out of cleanup funds. In some cases these funds were diverted to fix unrelated budget problems. The result is contamination of drinking water sources by hundreds of leaking, toxic storage tanks all over the state.
- Funding for a Great Lakes water withdrawal assessment tool needed to guard our trout streams and other sensitive waters has been slashed.
- Parks and trails are showing wear and tear.

The dwindling of state dollars for the environment and conservation has expanded reliance on fees paid by those who apply to pollute or develop resources. This is bad for the business climate, but even worse for our natural resources: those who pay the fees often pay lobbyists to work to weaken regulations.

Michigan LCV believes an answer to Michigan's conservation funding crisis is essential to our future. Setting aside and protecting existing funding sources and identifying new ones is an important mission for all Michiganders. ■



“Michigan is the greatest state in the union. Four terrific seasons, rivers, streams, wildlife, beautiful lakes, great vistas, and nice friendly people.

It deserves every penny we spend to preserve it for generations to come.”

– Bill Parfet, Chairman and CEO of MPI Research



2009-2010 IN REVIEW

The 2009-2010 legislative session got off to a good start, but was quickly mired in partisan politics, which prevented numerous pieces of strong environmental and conservation legislation from becoming law.

Legislative Leadership and Partisan Politics

While the House of Representatives moved promptly in 2009 on a series of environmental health protections, which were designed to protect our most vulnerable citizens—children—they all stalled in the Michigan Senate. Upon arrival in the Senate, Majority Leader Mike Bishop (R-Rochester) and Health Policy Committee Chairman Senator Tom George (R-Kalamazoo) smothered the bills without calling for committee hearings or floor votes. The fate of these important bills is exactly what has characterized a significant portion of the 2009-2010 Session.

This intrusion of raw partisan politics into what should be sound decision-making is unacceptable. The three bills passed by the House tightening restrictions on toxic toys, a toxic fire retardant, and a toxic medication, for example, are preventative measures based on common sense and science. The fact that the measures would primarily and ultimately benefit Michigan children and their health appears less important to the Senate leadership than blatant and purposeful one up-man-ship.

Not only did the Senate bury important pro-environment legislation sent to them by the House; they went a step further and actively proposed measures to handcuff

state environmental agencies whose job it is to enforce pollution control and resource protection rules. Instead of working to protect Michigan's majestic places, the Senate went out of their way to concoct new ways to prevent sound environmental protections.

On the House side, Speaker Andy Dillon (D-Redford) allowed passage of several strong pro-environment bills and cast his personal vote for these protections. Yet, he also took a contradictory position and tone on a proposed coal-fired power plant in Bay City. In a public appearance, Dillon blasted state officials for “dragging their feet” by evaluating cleaner alternatives and taking deliberate steps to make sure electric power demand exists to justify very large costs to consumers.

And, if that weren't enough, in the late hours of the night just before Christmas 2009, Speaker Dillon and Senate Majority Leader Bishop worked together to add amendments to a routine pollution prevention bill to actively weaken natural resource protection. Michigan citizens expect more and deserve much better when it comes to conservation and environmental policy from their leaders.

The Governor

One of the most hopeful developments of 2009-2010 was the new direction taken by the Granholm Administration on clean energy. Almost 70% of Michigan's electricity comes from coal-fired power, which

harms respiratory health, releases mercury that contaminates fish, and generates huge amounts of global warming gases. In addition, this dirty source of energy, and other fossil fuel sources like oil, drain \$23 billion from the state every year.

The Governor took the energy problem head-on in her 2009 State-of-the-State address, calling for a hard look at the necessity of new coal-fired power plant proposals in light of alternatives like clean, renewable energy and energy efficiency. Governor Granholm's statements built upon, and called for strengthening, the state's 2008 10% renewable energy law. The Public Service Commission and the Department of Energy, Labor and Economic Growth have partnered on this commitment, taking additional strides to develop policies for both offshore and onshore wind farms that give local governments and citizens extensive input in the process.

Despite these commitments to clean energy, the Governor remained silent when the Department of Environmental Quality issued a pollution permit for a proposed coal plant in Bay City in January of 2010. This action fundamentally undermines the administration's clean energy efforts.

The Governor also shocked the conservation and environmental community in January 2009 with a "budget saving" proposal to send wetland protection back to federal bureaucrats and repeal the state's landmark 1979 wetland conservation law. Had it passed, the Governor's proposal would not have resulted in significant budget savings and would have actually slowed the issuance of permits for new developments. It also would have left gaping holes in wetland protection under the weaker federal law. Wise members of the House and Senate—led by Representative Rebekah Warren (D-Ann Arbor) and Senator Patty Birkholz (R-Saugatuck)—ultimately preserved the state protections, although with amendments that could result in weakened enforcement in the future.

The Great Lakes

When it comes to the Great Lakes, the last two years have been both hopeful and discouraging. At the federal

level, the Obama Administration and Congress approved \$475 million in new federal funding to help Michigan and the other seven Great Lakes states restore the Lakes by cleaning up toxic harbors, fighting invasive species, and addressing other priorities. This built on the progress begun by the 2008 ratification of the Great Lakes Compact, which guards against large scale water diversions. However, Michigan's efforts to thwart the much-feared Asian carp invasion of Lake Michigan have been met with much resistance by the Obama administration and Illinois' congressional delegation.

At the state level, because of term limits and partisan politics, there are woefully too few Great Lakes champions in Lansing. State lawmakers cut funding for a critical program monitoring water withdrawals in Michigan and ultimately impacting the Great Lakes.

In addition, the State has now licensed a copper-sulfide mine in the Upper Peninsula without addressing serious sulfuric acid pollution control questions for an adjacent pure trout stream and, ultimately, Lake Superior. The state has also failed to resolve concerns raised by Native American tribes about the impact to ancestral lands and by many conservation organizations about whether taxpayers will be stuck with the bill if there is a mining accident or disaster. If new mines are to be a part of Michigan's future, our state government must do more to ensure the ultimate protection of our Great Lakes and interconnected waterways.

Michigan's long-running budget crisis has caused even more damage by dramatically weakening conservation and environmental protection, much of which has dramatic impacts on Great Lakes protections. The share and amount of the state's checkbook that pays for these programs continued to shrink in the last two years, down 72% from 2002 funding levels. The "Pure Michigan" campaign advertises the beauty and majesty of our natural resources and Great Lakes, yet state funding is shrinking for everything from parks and trails to water pollution prevention. If we cannot maintain the vitality and integrity of our natural resources, we won't have a "Pure Michigan" or the Great Lakes to advertise. ■

In the midst of the partisan bickering, there were still elements of work over the past two years that were worthy of praise. Promising new legislators and promising policy changes came even as funding for conservation and the environment tumbled and other legislators resorted to tired, false rhetoric attacking clean energy, water protections and health safeguards. Here's a rundown of the best, the worst, and a few developments that lie in between.

THE BEST OF 2009-2010



This session, **first-term lawmakers showed commitment, leadership, and effectiveness on critical issues.** Rep. Dan Scripps (D-Northport) authored legislation to protect children's health and to prevent Great Lakes water raids. Rep. Deb Kennedy (D-Brownstown) crafted a proposed law to ban deca-BDE, a toxic chemical that is contaminating Great Lakes fish and poses risks to women and children. Rep. Sarah Roberts (D-St. Clair Shores) sponsored legislation that would capture increased fees from landfills to boost recycling programs and fund natural resource protection, all while helping to cut down on Canadian trash in Michigan.

Staff of the Public Service Commission, a central element in Michigan energy policy, **performed a "needs assessment"** documenting that state utility companies will not need coal-fired power for over a decade and that energy efficiency and wind and solar power can contribute significantly to providing electricity. This report not only buys the state time to develop renewable technologies, but also protects ratepayers from financing unnecessary, multi-billion dollar coal plants.

After years of unfulfilled promises from Washington, D.C., **the President and Congress delivered on funding to clean up and protect the Great Lakes.** In 2010 and 2011, the region will receive approximately \$675 million to deal with invasive species, stop sewage overflows, protect habitat, and clean up toxic bays and harbors. Michigan is likely to benefit with tens of millions of new Great Lakes protection dollars.

Governor Jennifer Granholm **set a new course for Michigan energy in her 2009 State of the State message**, pledging to reduce the state's reliance on coal and other polluting, nonrenewable power sources. ■





THE WORST OF 2009-2010

Despite the Governor's pledge to move away from polluting fossil fuels, the state Department of Environmental Quality **approved pollution permits for a Consumers Energy coal plant expansion in Bay City that will belch over 8 million tons of carbon dioxide into the air each year.** The multi-billion dollar cost of this plant will be passed directly onto consumers on their utility bills if the project moves forward.

Brushing aside important pollution and safety issues, the Department of Environmental Quality **approved a copper-sulfide mine project in the Upper Peninsula that has the potential to contaminate a world class trout stream and Lake Superior,** threatening an endangered species—the Coaster Brook Trout—and a sacred Ojibwa tribal site. The agency dismissed concerns that must be addressed under the state's mining laws, resulting in a lawsuit from a number of citizens groups.

Anti-environmental legislators continued to scapegoat state environmental protections and officials for the state's economic problems. Their proposed “reforms,” drafted with the support of polluters, would have the effect of degrading the state's air and water and increasing health risks. Many of these reforms would prevent the state from setting its own standards for resource protection, instead relying on outdated, bare-minimum federal standards. ■

ROOM FOR IMPROVEMENT

A misguided **proposal by the Governor to terminate Michigan's outstanding wetland protection** resulted in months of debate. Fortunately, legislators, led by Rep. Rebekah Warren (D-Ann Arbor) and Sen. Patty Birkholz (R-Saugatuck), compromised on legislation continuing the program while studying changes that could weaken the law. The efforts of legislators to maintain the program at the state level were positive, but it was a debate that never should have happened. Thankfully, these legislators, with bipartisan leadership from Rep. Warren and Sen. Birkholz, were able to block the Governor's attempt to abandon the program.

The state's new **“Pure Michigan” tourism and business promotion campaign showed off the state** and increased tourism and recreation revenue. **However, funding to protect the natural assets of “Pure Michigan”—including air, water and habitat—continued to decline.** This is a systemic problem in the budget process, and legislators have the opportunity to properly fund natural resource protection every year. Moving forward, a much larger share of the state's general fund must be dedicated to natural resource protection, and new, sustainable sources of funding must be created. ■

AT A GLANCE: 2009-2010 Highlights

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

AVERAGES

House	67%
Democrats	89%
Republicans	31%

Honorable Mention - Score of 100%

Angerer, K. (D-55)	Lindberg, S.W. (D-109)
Barnett, V. (D-37)*	Lipton, E.C. (D-27)*
Bauer, J. (D-68)	Liss, L. (D-28)*
Bledsoe, T. (D-1)*	McDowell, G. (D-107)
Brown, L. (D-39)*	Meadows, M.S. (D-69)
Brown, T. (D-84)	Melton, T. (D-29)
Byrum, B. (D-67)	Miller, F. (D-31)
Constan, B. (D-16)	Roberts, S. (D-24)*
Corriveau, M. R. (D-20)	Scripps, D. (D-101)*
Dean, Rev. R.(D-75)	Segal, K. (D-62)*
Geiss, D.A. (D-22)*	Slavens, D. (D-21)*
Gregory, V. (D-35)*	Slezak, J. (D-50)*
Haase, J. (D-32)*	Stanley, W. (D-34)*
Jones, Robert (D-60)	Switalski, J. (D-25)*
Kennedy, D. (D-23)*	Valentine, M. (D-91)
Leland, G. (D-10)	Warren, R. (D-53)

Dis-Honorable Mention – Score of 0%

Amash, J. (R-72)	McMillin, T. (R-45)
Genetski, B. (R-88)	

SENATE

AVERAGES

Senate	47%
Democrats	95%
Republicans	11%

Honorable Mention - Score of 100%

Anderson, G.S.(D-6)*	Jacobs, G.Z. (D-14)
Basham, R.E. (D-8)	Olshove, D. (D-9)
Brater, L. (D-18)	Scott, M.G. (D-2)
Clark-Coleman, I. (D-3)	Switalski, M. (D-10)
Clarke, H. (D-1)	Whitmer, G. (D-23)
Hunter, T.A. (D-5)*	

Dis-Honorable Mention – Score of 0%

Bishop, M.D. (R-12)	Kuipers, W. (R-30)
Brown, C.S. (R-16)	McManus, M. (R-35)
Garcia, V. (R-22)	Sanborn, A. (R-11)
Gilbert, J. (R-25)	Van Woerkom, G. (R-34)
Kahn, R (R-32)	

LEADERSHIP

House

Speaker of the House: Dillon, A. (D-17)	78%
Majority Floor Leader: Angerer, K. (D-55)	100%
Assistant Majority Leader: Meadows, M. (D-69)	100%

House Committee Chairs

Great Lakes & Environment: Warren, R. (D-53)	100%
Energy & Technology: Mayes, J. (D-96)	89%
Agriculture: Huckleberry, M. (D-70)	94%
Health Policy: Corriveau, M.R. (D-20)	100%

Senate

Majority Leader: Bishop, M. (R-12)	0%
Assistant Majority Leader: McManus, M. (R-35)	0%
Majority Floor Leader: Cropsey, A. (R-33)	20%

Senate Committee Chairs

Natural Resources & Environmental Affairs: Birkholz, P. (R-24)	30%
Energy Policy & Public Utilities: Patterson, B. (R-7)	20%
Agriculture & Bioeconomy: VanWoerkom, G. (R-34)	0%
Health Policy: George, T. (R-20)	20%

*Outstanding freshmen members of the legislature



HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES BILL DESCRIPTIONS

1 Restricting Toxic Lindane

House Bill 4402 | Yeas=88 Nays=20 | Passed the House, but stalled in the Senate.

In March 2009, the Michigan House passed HB 4402, which tightens restrictions on Lindane, a highly toxic pesticide chemical available in Michigan as a second-line treatment for lice or scabies, and requires it to be applied only under a physician's direct supervision. A YES vote was a vote for the environment.

2 Restricting Mercury Disposal

House Bill 4277 | Yeas=66 Nays=43 | Passed the House, but stalled in the Senate.

In April 2009, the Michigan House passed HB 4277, which prohibits products labeled as containing mercury or a mercury compound from being delivered to or disposed of in a landfill. A YES vote was a vote for the environment.

3 New Mercury Labeling Guidelines

House Bill 4278 | Yeas=79 Nays=30 | Passed the House, but stalled in the Senate.

In April 2009, the Michigan House passed HB 4278, which establishes strict guidelines for labeling mercury-containing products, and requires better disclosure of mercury in products to Michigan consumers. A YES vote was a vote for the environment.

4 Prohibit Sale of Mercury

House Bill 4279 | Yeas=85 Nays=24 | Passed the House, but stalled in the Senate.

In April 2009, the Michigan House passed HB 4279, which prohibits the sale of mercury-added batteries and novelties. A YES vote was a vote for the environment.

5 Documentation of Mercury Distribution

House Bill 4280 | Yeas=80 Nays=29 | Passed the House, but stalled in the Senate.

In April 2009, the Michigan House passed HB 4280, which requires careful documentation of the receipt and distribution of all elemental mercury, including the storage and disposal of the mercury. A YES vote was a vote for the environment.

6 Enforcement of New Mercury Laws

House Bill 4281 | Yeas=80 Nays=29 | Passed the House, but stalled in the Senate.

In April 2009, the Michigan House passed HB 4281, which expands the definition of mercury-added products, and gives the Department of Natural Resources and Environment disclosure and enforcement responsibilities. A YES vote was a vote for the environment.

7 **Consumer’s “Right To Know”**

House Bill 4763 | Yeas=63 Nays=44 | Passed the House, but stalled in the Senate.

In May 2009, the Michigan House passed HB 4763, which authorizes the Department of Community Health (DCH) to implement programs to give parents the right to know of harmful chemicals contained in children’s products. A YES vote was a vote for the environment.

8 **Define Harmful Chemicals**

House Bill 4764 | Yeas=63 Nays=44 | Passed the House, but stalled in the Senate.

In May 2009, the Michigan House passed HB 4764, which defines which chemicals are to be considered potentially harmful to children. A YES vote was a vote for the environment.

9 **Identify and Track Harmful Chemicals**

House Bill 4765 | Yeas=63 Nays=45 | Passed the House, but stalled in the Senate.

In May 2009, the Michigan House passed HB 4765, which requires the DCH to compile a list of “chemicals of highest concern” based on the definition established in HB 4764. A YES vote was a vote for the environment.

10 **Publicly Identify Products Containing Harmful Chemicals**

House Bill 4766 | Yeas=63 Nays=45 | Passed the House, but stalled in the Senate.

In May 2009, the Michigan House passed HB 4766, which requires manufacturers of children’s products to inform the DCH of the presence of any “chemicals of highest concern” in their products. It requires MDCH to make this information publicly available and easily accessible. A YES vote was a vote for the environment.

11 **Participate in Interstate Clearinghouse on Chemicals**

House Bill 4767 | Yeas=72 Nays=36 | Passed the House, but stalled in the Senate.

In May 2009, the Michigan House passed HB 4767, which allows the DCH and the DNRE to participate in an interstate clearinghouse on chemicals. A YES vote was a vote for the environment.

12 **Departmental Accountability**

House Bill 4768 | Yeas=64 Nays=44 | Passed the House, but stalled in the Senate.

In May 2009, the Michigan House passed HB 4768, which requires the DCH to report annually on its efforts under the Children’s Safe Products Act. A YES vote was a vote for the environment.

13 **Establishment of Fines**

House Bill 4769 | Yeas=64 Nays=44 | Passed the House, but stalled in the Senate.

In May 2009, the Michigan House passed HB 4769, which establishes fines to be charged for violations of the Children’s Safe Products Act. A YES vote was a vote for the environment.

14 **Designate New Revenue to State Parks**

House Bill 4677 | Yeas=82 Nays=25 | Passed the House & Senate. Signed by the Governor.

In December 2009, the Michigan House passed HB 4677, which designates revenue from the Recreation Passport fee to be used to support state parks and recreation areas. A YES vote was a vote for the environment.

Double Take: Why do so many of these bills look the same?

Even though it might seem like you're seeing double, you're not. Each of the bills listed below are individual actions that are simply grouped together because they address similar issues. It is common, when the legislature is taking action on complex issues, that they often group individual bills together in what's called a "package". In the House of Representatives this session, there were three "packages" addressing Mercury, Children's Health, and State Parks Funding:

Controlling Toxic Mercury: Made up of five bills, House Bills 4277-4281, control and limit our exposure to mercury, a highly toxic material that puts our health and the health of our children at risk.

Children's Safe Products Act: Made up of seven bills, House Bills 4763-4769, collectively give parents the right to know if products they buy for their children contain toxic chemicals.

Increasing State Parks Funding: Made up of two bills, House Bills 4677-4678, create additional funding to address existing infrastructure needs throughout Michigan's 98 state parks and recreation areas.

15 Create the Recreation Passport

House Bill 4678 | Yeas=83 Nays=24 | Passed the House & Senate. Signed by the Governor.

In December 2009, the Michigan House passed HB 4678, which creates a recreation passport fee of \$10 for cars and \$5 for motorcycles, collected during annual vehicle registration, unless the vehicle owner declines to pay the fee. The Recreation Passport would allow the vehicle to access any state park, recreation area, or boat launch. A YES vote was a vote for the environment.

16 Banning Smoking in Public Places

House Bill 4377 | Yeas=75 Nays=30 | Passed the House & Senate. Signed by the Governor.

In December 2009, the Michigan House passed HB 4377, which became law in 2010 and prohibits smoking in public places, in places of employment, and in food service establishments such as restaurants, cafeterias, food courts in shopping malls, and bars. Second-hand cigarette smoke is a major cause of respiratory diseases, including lung cancer. A YES vote was a vote for the environment.

17 Clean Energy Alternatives Repeal

House Bill 5220 | Yeas=43 Nays=54 | Defeated in the House.

In December 2009, the Michigan House successfully defeated HB 5220, which would have renewed Michigan's air quality fee program, but would have specifically prohibited the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ, now the DNRE) from assessing energy demand and renewable alternatives when considering permits for new power plants. Ultimately, it would have overturned the Governor's Executive Directive designed to prevent the unnecessary construction of power plants. A NO vote was a vote for the environment.

18 Banning Toxic Flame Retardant

House Bill 4699 | Yeas=94 Nays=6 | Passed the House, but stalled in the Senate.

In January 2010, the Michigan House passed HB 4699, which bans the use of Decabromodiphenyl Ether (Deca-BDE), a toxic flame retardant once used widely in the U.S in electronics (including televisions and computers), mattresses, upholstered furniture, automobiles, and airplanes. It is toxic, persistent, and bioaccumulative; it has been found on our dust, food, drinking water, rivers, lakes, and bodies. A YES vote was a vote for the environment. ■

House Votes

- + Pro environment action
- Anti-environment action
- A Absence, Counts as as negative

- Restricting Toxic Lindane
- Restricting Mercury Disposal
- New Mercury Labeling Guidelines
- Prohibit Sale of Mercury
- Documentation of Mercury Distribution
- Enforcement of New Mercury Laws
- Consumer's "Right to Know"
- Define Harmful Chemicals
- Identify and Track Harmful Chemicals
- Publicly Identify Products Containing Harmful Chemicals
- Participate in Interstate Clearinghouse on Chemicals
- Departmental Accountability
- Establishment of Fines
- Designate New Revenue to State Parks
- Create the Recreation Passport
- Banning Smoking in Public Places
- Clean Energy Alternatives Repeal
- Banning Toxic Flame Retardant

Representative	Party	District	Hometown	Term	2009-2010 Score	Lifetime Average	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Agema, D.	R	74	Grandville	2	11%	9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+
Amash, J.	R	72	Kentwood	1	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Angerer, K.	D	55	Dundee	3	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Ball, R.	R	85	Laingsburg	3	89%	52%	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+
Barnett, V.	D	37	Farmington Hls.	1	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Bauer, J.	D	68	Lansing	2	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Bennett, D.	D	92	Muskegon	3	44%	77%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	A	A	A	A	+
Bledsoe, T.	D	1	Grosse Pointe	1	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Bolger, J.	R	63	Marshall	1	39%	39%	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-
Booher, D. L.	R	102	Ewart	3	6%	22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+
Brown, L.	D	39	W. Bloomfield	1	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Brown, T.	D	84	Pigeon	2	100%	79%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Byrnes, P.	D	52	Chelsea	3	89%	96%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+
Byrum, B.	D	67	Onordaga	2	100%	93%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Calley, B. N.	R	87	Portland	2	17%	30%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+
Caul, B.	R	99	Mt. Pleasant	3	11%	24%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+
Clemente, E.	D	14	Lincoln Park	3	83%	80%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	A	+	+
Constan, B.	D	16	Dearborn Hts.	2	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Corriveau, M. R.	D	20	Northville	2	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Coulouris, A.	D	95	Saginaw	2	94%	97%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	A
Crawford, H. D.	R	38	Novi	1	17%	17%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+
Cushingberry Jr., G.	D	8	Detroit	*6	72%	87%	+	+	+	+	+	+	A	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	A	A	A
Daley, K.	R	82	Lum	1	17%	17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+
Dean, Rev. R.	D	75	Grand Rapids	2	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Denby, C.	R	47	Fowlerville	1	22%	22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	+
DeShazor, L.	R	61	Portage	1	94%	94%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+
Dillon, A.	D	17	Redford Twp.	3	78%	76%	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	A	A	+	A	+
Donigan, M.	D	26	Royal Oak	3	50%	83%	+	+	+	+	+	+	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	-	-	+	+	+
Durhal Jr., F.	D	6	Detroit	1	94%	94%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	A	+
Ebli, K.	D	56	Monroe	2	94%	97%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	A	+
Elsenheimer, K.A.	R	105	Kewadin	3	22%	23%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+
Espinoza, J.	D	83	Croswell	3	94%	77%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+
Geiss, D.A.	D	22	Taylor	1	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Genetski, B.	R	88	Saugatuck	1	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gonzales, L.	D	49	Flint	3	78%	84%	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	A
Green, K.J.	R	77	Wyoming	3	28%	30%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+
Gregory, V.	D	35	Southfield	1	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Griffin, M.J.	D	64	Jackson	2	50%	57%	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+
Haase, J.	D	32	Richmond	1	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Haines, G.	R	43	Waterford	1	89%	89%	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+
Hammel, R.E.	D	48	Flushing	2	67%	84%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+
Hansen, G.	R	100	Hart	3	67%	43%	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+
Haugh, H.L.	D	42	Roseville	1	94%	94%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+
Haveman, J.	R	90	Holland	1	17%	17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+
Hildenbrand, D.	R	86	Lowell	3	39%	33%	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+

*Rep. Cushingberry is in his third term under term limits.

House Votes

- + Pro environment action
- Anti-environment action
- A Absence, Counts as as negative

- Restricting Toxic Lindane*
- Restricting Mercury Disposal*
- New Mercury Labeling Guidelines*
- Prohibit Sale of Mercury*
- Documentation of Mercury Distribution*
- Enforcement of New Mercury Laws*
- Consumer's "Right to Know"*
- Define Harmful Chemicals*
- Identify and Track Harmful Chemicals*
- Publicly Identify Products Containing Harmful Chemicals*
- Participate in Interstate Clearinghouse on Chemicals*
- Departmental Accountability*
- Establishment of Fines*
- Designate New Revenue to State Parks*
- Create the Recreation Passport*
- Banning Smoking in Public Places*
- Clean Energy Alternatives Repeal*
- Banning Toxic Flame Retardant*

Representative	Party	District	Hometown	Term	2009-2010 Score	Lifetime Average	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Horn, K.B.	R	94	Frankenmuth	2	17%	30%	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+
Huckleberry, M.	D	70	Greenville	1	94%	94%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	A	+	+
Jackson, S.	D	9	Detroit	2	50%	72%	+	+	+	+	+	+	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	+	+	+	A	A
Johnson, B.	D	5	Highland Park	2	89%	95%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	A	A
Jones, Rick	R	71	Grand Ledge	3	44%	37%	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+
Jones, Robert	D	60	Kalamazoo	2	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Kandrevas, A.	D	13	Southgate	1	89%	89%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+
Kennedy, D.	D	23	Brownstown	1	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Knollenberg, M.	R	41	Troy	2	22%	29%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	+
Kowall, E.	R	44	White Lake	1	33%	33%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	-	+
Kurtz, K.	R	58	Coldwater	1	6%	6%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lahti, M.A.	D	110	Hancock	2	94%	94%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+
LeBlanc, R.	D	18	Westland	2	56%	78%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	+
Leland, G.	D	10	Detroit	3	100%	96%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Lemmons Jr, L.	D	2	Detroit	3	94%	90%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	A
Lindberg, S.W.	D	109	Marquette	2	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Lipton, E.C.	D	27	Huntington Wds.	1	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Liss, L.	D	28	Warren	1	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Lori, M.	R	59	Constantine	1	17%	17%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+
Lund, P.	R	36	Shelby Twp.	1	6%	6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+
Marleau, J.	R	46	Lake Orion	3	39%	36%	+	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	+
Mayes, J.	D	96	Bay City	3	89%	76%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+
McDowell, G.	D	107	Rudyard	3	100%	92%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
McMillin, T.	R	45	Rochester Hills	1	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Meadows, M.S.	D	69	East Lansing	2	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Meekhof, A.B.	R	89	West Olive	2	22%	26%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+
Melton, T.	D	29	Pontiac	2	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Meltzer, K.	R	33	Clinton Twp.	2	22%	29%	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+
Miller, F.	D	31	Mount Clemens	3	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Moore, T.	R	97	Farwell	3	17%	26%	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+
Moss, C.	R	40	Birmingham	2	28%	36%	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+
Nathan, D.E.	D	11	Detroit	1	94%	94%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	A	+
Nerat, J.	D	108	Wallace	1	89%	89%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+
Neumann, A.	D	106	Alpena	1	83%	83%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+
Opsommer, P.E.	R	93	DeWitt	2	33%	38%	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	+
Pavlov, P.	R	81	St. Clair Twp.	3	17%	21%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+
Pearce, T.	R	73	Rockford	2	6%	22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Polidori, G.H.	D	15	Dearborn	3	94%	90%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	A
Proos, J.M.	R	79	St. Joseph	3	39%	33%	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	+
Roberts, S.	D	24	St. Clair Shores	1	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Rocca, T.	R	30	Sterling Hts.	3	89%	69%	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+
Rogers, B.	R	66	Brighton	1	33%	33%	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	+
Schmidt, R.	D	76	Grand Rapids	1	94%	94%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+
Schmidt, W.A.	R	104	Traverse City	1	33%	33%	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+
Schuitmaker, T.	R	80	Lawton	3	50%	37%	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	+

House Votes

- + Pro environment action
- Anti-environment action
- A Absence, Counts as as negative

Representative	Party	District	Hometown	Term	2009-2010 Score	Lifetime Average	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; font-size: 8px; font-weight: normal; margin-bottom: 5px;"> Restricting Toxic Lindane Restricting Mercury Disposal New Mercury Labeling Guidelines Prohibit Sale of Mercury Documentation of Mercury Distribution Enforcement of New Mercury Laws Consumer's "Right to Know" Define Harmful Chemicals Identify and Track Harmful Chemicals Publicly Identify Products Containing Harmful Chemicals Participate in Interstate Clearinghouse on Chemicals Departmental Accountability Establishment of Fines Designate New Revenue to State Parks Create the Recreation Passport Banning Smoking in Public Places Clean Energy Alternatives Repeal Banning Toxic Flame Retardant </div>																						
							1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18					
Scott, B.C.	D	3	Detroit	2	83%	85%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	A	A
Scott, P.	R	51	Grand Blanc	1	72%	72%	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	+
Scripps, D.	D	101	Northport	1	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Segal, K.	D	62	Battle Creek	1	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Sheltrown, J.A.	D	103	West Branch	3	78%	74%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Simpson, M.	D	65	Jackson	**2																									
Slavens, D.	D	21	Canton Twp.	1	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Slezak, J.	D	50	Davison	1	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Smith, A.W.	D	54	South Lyon	3	94%	98%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	A	+
Spade, D.	D	57	Tipton	3	61%	64%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Stamas, J.	R	98	Midland	1	17%	17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+
Stanley, W.	D	34	Flint	1	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Switalski, J.	D	25	Warren	1	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Tlaib, R.	D	12	Detroit	1	94%	94%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	A	+
Tyler, S.	R	78	Niles	1	50%	50%	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	+
Valentine, M.	D	91	Muskegon	2	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Walsh, J.J.	R	19	Livonia	1	28%	28%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	+
Warren, R.	D	53	Ann Arbor	2	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Womack, J.	D	7	Detroit	1	94%	94%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	A	+
Young II, C.	D	4	Detroit	2	94%	97%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	A

** Rep. Simpson passed away on December 18, 2009. He was in his second term representing the residents of Jackson County.



SENATE BILL DESCRIPTIONS

1 Roadblocking Environmental Protection

Senate Bill 13 | Yeas=20 Nays=16 | Passed the Senate, and stalled in the House.

In June 2009, the Michigan Senate passed SB 13, which imposes onerous new requirements on state agencies proposing rules and standards. Strong public health and environmental standards put in place by Michigan have limited or prevented serious contaminant problems from DDT, PCBs, mercury and other critical pollutants. The bill is a thinly-disguised effort to limit the ability of state agencies, especially those that regulate pollution and protect public health, to perform their duties and prevent Michigan from acting on serious pollutant problems in the future. A NO vote was a vote for the environment.

2 Falling Back to Federal Minimum Protections

Senate Bill 431 | Yeas=20 Nays=16 | Passed the Senate, and stalled in the House.

In June 2009, the Michigan Senate passed SB 431, which like SB 13, limits the state's regulatory protection power, forcing the state to fall back and remain at minimum levels established by the federal government. Such an approach ignores the fact that Michigan has unique resources, such as the Great Lakes, that are not considered in many federal programs. This bill continues to erode the leadership that Michigan once displayed in the areas of conservation and environmental policy. A NO vote was a vote for the environment.

3 Limiting State Protections

Senate Bill 434 | Yeas=20 Nays=16 | Passed the Senate, and stalled in the House.

In June 2009, the Michigan Senate passed SB 434, which prohibits state agencies from enacting any regulatory measure that exceeds federal standards. The measure prevents state environmental protectors from issuing rules tailored to Michigan's unique public health and natural resource needs. In addition, protections needed to respond to unexpected environmental needs would be required to go through a lengthy approval process. This is unacceptable for a state that must protect 20% of the world's fresh surface water and some of the most valuable natural resources on the planet. A NO vote was a vote for the environment.

4 Rule-Killing Review

Senate Bill 435 | Yeas=20 Nays=16 | Passed the Senate, and stalled in the House.

In June 2009, the Michigan Senate passed SB 435, which requires a cumbersome process to review all existing environmental health protections on a five-year basis, in effect tying protectors' hands and limiting their ability to fashion new rules. It requires the House and Senate to use limited resources to review rules and regulations that were put into effect to protect public health. The review is designed to analyze the impact of rules and

regulations on businesses, but does not include any measures to analyze the impact of rules on public health. This is another attempt to weaken public health and environmental protections by decreasing regulations on polluters. A NO vote was a vote for the environment.

5 Limiting Pollution Inspections

Senate Bill 438 | Yeas=21 Nays=15 | Passed the Senate, and stalled in the House.

In June 2009, the Michigan Senate passed SB 438, which limits the state's ability to conduct random inspections except under limited conditions, potentially giving a free pass to those with a record of taking risky short cuts that could cost taxpayers in cleanup dollars and public health. Routine, unannounced state inspections of polluting facilities, especially of those with a history of chronic violations, are a deterrent to future violations. A NO vote was a vote for the environment.

6 Paralysis by Analysis

Senate Bill 439 | Yeas=21 Nays=15 | Passed the Senate, and stalled in the House.

In June 2009, the Michigan Senate passed SB 439, which requires the Department of Natural Resources and Environment (DNRE) who manages scores of programs charged with safeguarding air, water, land and human health, to hire outside reviewers of each program. In addition to wasting scarce public money in a time of fiscal crisis, the bill gives private consultants with conflicting interests or personal agendas the opportunity to weaken state protections. A NO vote was a vote for the environment.

7 Giving Away Protection to Consultants

Senate Bill 436 | Yeas=19 Nays=17 | Passed the Senate, and stalled in the House.

In June 2009, the Michigan Senate passed SB 436, which hands state environmental protectors' authority over to certain licensed private engineers, paid by those seeking permits or approval cleanup



Double Take: Why do so many of these bills look the same?

Even though it might seem like you're seeing double, you're not. Each of the bills listed below are individual actions that are simply grouped together because they address similar issues. It is common, when the legislature is taking action on complex issues, that they often group individual bills together in what's called a "package". In the Senate this session, there was one "package" addressing State Parks Funding:

Increasing State Parks Funding: Made up of two bills, Senate Bills 388-389, create additional funding to address existing infrastructure needs throughout Michigan's 98 state parks and recreation areas.

plans. It would also limit state oversight of the engineers' recommendations and tie up the protectors' time in reviews of private permit approvals. A NO vote was a vote for the environment.

8 Weakening Wetland Protection

Senate Bill 785 | Yeas=21 Nays=16 | Passed the Senate & House. Signed by the Governor.

In September 2009, the Michigan Senate passed SB 785, which guts much of the wetland protection law first enacted in 1979 to halt wetland destruction, but keeps wetland regulation authority in Michigan. The bill was a weak attempt by legislators to rectify a shortsighted proposal by Governor Granholm to terminate Michigan's outstanding wetland protection in an effort to save \$2 million per year out of a billion-dollar state deficit. A NO vote was a vote for the environment.

9 Designate New Revenue to State Parks

Senate Bill 388 | Yeas=25 Nays=12 | Passed the Senate & House. Signed by the Governor.

In November 2009, the Michigan Senate passed SB 388, which designates revenue raised by the Recreation Passport fee to be distributed to state parks and recreation areas. A YES vote was a vote for the environment.

10 Create the Recreation Passport Fee

Senate Bill 389 | Yeas=25 Nays=12 | Passed the Senate & House. Signed by the Governor.

In November 2009, the Michigan Senate passed SB 389, which creates a voluntary recreation passport fee of \$10 for cars and \$5 for motorcycles, collected during annual vehicle registration. Unlike the original version of SB 389, however, the fee is strictly voluntary, significantly limiting the funding raised by the measure. The fee replaces state forest, state park, and boating access fees for Michigan residents. A YES vote was a vote for the environment. ■



Senate Votes

- + Pro environment action
- Anti-environment action
- A Absence, Counts as as negative

Roadblocking Environmental Protection
 Falling Back to Federal Minimum Protections
 Limiting State Protections
 Rule-Killing Review
 Limiting Pollution Inspections
 Paralysis by Analysis
 Giving Away Protection to Consultants
 Weakening Wetland Protection
 Designate New Revenue to State Parks
 Create the Recreation Passport Fee

Senator	Party	District	Hometown	Term	2009-2010 Score	Lifetime Average	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Allen, J.	R	37	Traverse City	2	20%	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+
Anderson, G.S.	D	6	Westland	1	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Barcia, J.	D	31	Bay City	***5	80%	63%	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
Basham, R.E.	D	8	Taylor	2	100%	94%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Birkholz, P.	R	24	Saugatuck	2	30%	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+
Bishop, M.D.	R	12	Rochester	2	0%	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brater, L.	D	18	Ann Arbor	2	100%	93%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Brown, C.S.	R	16	Sturgis	2	0%	23%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cassis, N.	R	15	Novi	2	20%	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+
Cherry, D.	D	26	Burton	2	80%	89%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-
Clark-Coleman, I.	D	3	Detroit	2	100%	87%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Clarke, H.	D	1	Detroit	2	100%	93%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Cropsey, A.I.	R	33	DeWitt	***3	20%	21%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+
Garcia, V.	R	22	Howell	**3	0%	26%	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	-	-	-
George, T.	R	20	Kalamazoo	2	20%	28%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+
Gilbert, J.	R	25	Algonac	2	0%	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gleason, J.J.	D	27	Flushing	1	80%	85%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	A	A
Hardiman, B.	R	29	Kentwood	2	20%	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+
Hunter, T.A.	D	5	Detroit	1	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Jacobs, G.Z.	D	14	Huntington Woods	2	100%	93%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Jansen, M.C.	R	28	Grand Rapids	1	20%	16%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+
Jelinek, R.	R	21	Three Oaks	2	20%	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+
Kahn, R.	R	32	Saginaw	1	0%	17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kuipers, W.	R	30	Holland	2	0%	19%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
McManus, M.A.	R	35	Lake Leelanau	2	0%	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nofs, M.	R	19	Battle Creek	*1	0%	0%									-	-
Olshove, D.	D	9	Warren	2	100%	91%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Pappageorge, J.	R	13	Troy	1	20%	21%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+
Patterson, B.	R	7	Canton	2	20%	42%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+
Prusi, M.	D	38	Ishpeming	2	80%	92%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-
Richardville, R.	R	17	Monroe	1	20%	27%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+
Sanborn, A.	R	11	Richmond Twp.	**3	0%	28%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Scott, M.G.	D	2	Highland Park	**3	100%	84%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Stamas, T.	R	36	Midland	2	20%	21%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+
Switalski, M.	D	10	Roseville	2	100%	83%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Thomas, B.	D	4	Detroit	2	100%	88%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Van Woerkom, G.	R	34	Norton Shores	2	0%	23%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Whitmer, G.	D	23	East Lansing	**2	100%	95%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

*Elected to the Senate by special election in November 2009

**Elected to the Senate in first term by special election

*** Additional terms not subject to term limits due to time served in office prior to term limit adoption.

Keep Score and Take Action

Join Michigan LCV

Join us 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: www.senate.michigan.gov/

House: www.house.mi.gov/find_a_rep.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

Mailing addresses for the 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: www.senate.michigan.gov/

House: www.house.mi.gov/find_a_rep.asp

To contact the Governor:

P.O. Box 30013

Lansing, MI 48909

Phone: (517) 373-3400

Phone: (517) 335-7858, Constituent Services

Fax: (517) 335-6863

To contact the Michigan Department of Natural Resources and Environment (DNRE):

Department of Natural Resources and Environment

P.O. Box 30473

Lansing, MI 48909

Phone: (517) 373-7917

www.michigan.gov/dnre

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



Ann Arbor Office

213 W. Liberty St., Suite 300, Ann Arbor, MI 48104
Tel: 734.222.9650 | Fax: 734.222.9651

Grand Rapids Office

40 Monroe Center NW, Suite 200, Grand Rapids, MI 49503
Tel: 616.459.6459 | Fax: 616.459.6469

www.michiganlcv.org

