

1996 Environmental Voting Record

89th Illinois General Assembly

Prepared by the

Illinois Environmental Council
Springfield, Illinois

October, 1996

The Bills Used in the 1996 *Environmental Voting Record*

The IEC has selected bills from both the 1995 and 1996 sessions of the 89th General Assembly for the Environmental Voting Record. The bills represent a wide range of concerns including pollution prevention, waste reduction, environmental program funding, maintenance of biodiversity, and a healthful environment for Illinois communities.

A brief description of the bills used appears on pages 2 and 3. Roll calls for the Illinois Senate appear on pages 4 and 5; for the House of Representatives, on pages 6 through 9. For each legislator, a percentage of pro-environmental votes has been computed, along with percentages published in the 1993, 1992, and 1991 IEC Environmental Voting Record.

The overall profile for the 89th General Assembly shows a clustering in the upper-middle range of percentages. This effect is due in part to the presence of several bills on which nearly all members voted in favor of the pro-environmental position. IEC included these bills because they were high priorities for the environmental community. Legislators' percentage scores should be evaluated in terms of the overall average for each chamber. In the Senate, the average of all scores was 65%; in the House, the average of all scores was 70%.

SENATE BILLS

Brownfields Redevelopment

Sponsors: Sen. Mahar/Rep. Persico Pro-environmental vote: No

SB 46, along with HB 544, was an industry-drafted bill that amended the Environmental Protection Act to allow tax credits for voluntary remediation of contaminated sites.

The IEC supports the idea of redeveloping brownfields, but it opposed SB 46 as a "polluter bailout" bill that shifted responsibility away from the corporate polluter by removing "joint and several" liability and laid a financial burden on the state, i.e. the taxpayer.

The IEC is using the third-reading roll call from April 25, 1995 in the Senate and May 19, 1995 in the House. SB 46 passed both houses and was sent to Governor Edgar. Since there was no revenue source provided, Governor Edgar amendatorily vetoed both SB 46 and HB 544.

See also the synopsis of action on HB 544 and HB 901, which also dealt with the brownfields issue.

SB 300: Conservation 2000

Sponsors: Sens. Woodyard-Maitland

Reps. Ryder-Poe-Persico-Ackerman-Rutherford Pro-environmental vote: Yes

This six-year, \$100-million funding package was proposed by the Edgar Administration to support programs in several agencies. It amends the State Finance Act to create the Conservation 2000 Fund and the Conservation 2000 Projects Fund, to be used for natural resource protection, recreation, tourism, sustainable agriculture, and lake management.

IEC, along with a broad coalition of groups, actively supported SB 300. The bill was signed into law.

SB 694: Leaf-Burning Ban

Sponsors: Sens. Rauschenberger-Peterson

Pro-environmental vote: Yes

The IEC backed the efforts of air quality activists on behalf of this bill. SB 694 would have authorized the Illinois Pollution Control Board to develop a statewide rule to ban the burning of leaves and other yard waste in metropolitan areas. The bill passed the Senate in April, 1995 but was held in House Rules Committee and not voted on in the House.

SB 1390: Leaking Underground Tanks

Sponsor: Sen. Rauschenberger Pro-environmental vote: Yes

This bill was amended with a proposed tax on wholesale gasoline shipments, in order to fund cleanups of leaking underground petroleum storage tanks. The General Assembly's approval restores a measure adopted in 1994 but struck down in a judicial opinion for having been passed improperly. The tax revenue allows a waiting list of people who have paid for cleanup to be reimbursed by the state.

SB 1777: Livestock Management Facilities Act Sponsors: Sen. Donahue/Rep. Myers Pro-environmental vote: No

This bill was generated by the Governor's Livestock Industry Task Force with strong backing from livestock producers. Environmental and family farm groups opposed SB 1777 because it fell far short of the state's need to address air and water pollution risks from the rapidly increasing number of large-scale livestock facilities coming into Illinois.

After passing the Senate, SB 1777 was held in House Rules Committee. The House and Senate later passed a similar bill, HB 3151, with some amendatory changes and agreement to hold summer field hearings on the issue.

HOUSE BILLS

House Res. 101: Cass County Hog Facility

Sponsor: Rep. Myers Pro-environmental vote: Yes

This resolution called upon the Illinois Attorney General to provide injuctive relief from construction of hog confinement facilities by Land O'Lakes in Cass County. The House passed HR 101 on April 26, 1996.

The resolution was a response to the report that the excavators had struck shallow groundwater in digging a manure lagoon at the site.

HB 544: Brownfields

Sponsor: Rep. Persico/Sen. Mahar

Pro-environmental vote: Yes, accept amendatory veto

Like SB 46, HB 544 was an industry-backed bill to provide new clean-up procedures for contaminated industrial sites. Although the IEC supports the concept of brownfield redevelopment, it opposed these bills because they shifted liability and the burden of proof from polluters to state government.

HB 544 passed the General Assembly but was amendatorily vetoed by Governor Edgar on August 18, 1995. The veto message cited problems with the altered liability framework and inadequate funding to cover cleanup costs.

Business leaders made it a top priority to override the Governor's action in the November veto session of the legislature. But lawmakers voted instead to accept HB 544 with the amendatory changes. Industry then put its own brownfields language onto a different bill (HB 901) and passed it.

For HB 544, IEC is using the House roll call of November 3, 1995 and the Senate roll call of November 16, 1995—both votes to sustain the veto.

HB 901: Brownfields after Amendatory Veto

Sponsor: Rep. Persico Pro-environmental vote: No

HB 901 began as a good bill to authorize a fee on wholesale shipments of gasoline to replenish the state's Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) Fund. In the 1995 veto session, the "polluter bailout" version of brownfields redevelopment was included in a conference committee report to HB 901 and passed, with the addition of language that taps the state's recycling funds to pay for cleanup at hazardous waste sites for which the polluter formerly was responsible. In another switch, meanwhile, HB 544 became the vehicle for the LUST fee; it was passed. IEC is using the November 15, 1995 House roll call and the November 16, 1995 Senate

roll call on the HB 901 conference committee report. In both cases, the pro-environmental vote was no.

HB 1523: Incinerator Subsidy Repeal

Sponsors: Sen. O'Malley/Rep. Murphy Pro-environmental vote: Yes

Repeal of the Retail Rate Law was a top priority for environmentalists and community activists for three years. A conference committee report to HB 1523 repealed costly tax breaks initiated in 1987 when it was thought the state needed to attract more energy development. The incentives guaranteed profitability to trash-burning, polluting incineerators at the expense of the state and the taxpayers. Both the House and Senate voted in favor of repeal on January 11, 1996.

HB 1610: Incinerator Subsidies

Sponsor: Rep. Balthis

Pro-environmental vote: No

HB 1610 was a proposal to let the Retail Rate Law subsidies to incinerator developers continue for two more years. It lost on 3rd reading, April 27, 1995.

HB 3447: Soil and Water Conservation

Sponsor: Rep. Poe/Sen. Bomke Pro-environment vote: Yes

By amending the Property Tax Code, this bill provides a tax break for land planted as a vegetated filter strip. Such strips have been shown to reduce significantly the amount of silt and polluting chemicals in streams.

Supported by resource conservation, environmental and agricultural groups, HB 3447 passed with little controversy.

Explanation of ratings

- +1.0 "yes" on a pro-environmental bill, "no" on an antienvironmental bill
- +0.5 "present" on an anti-environmental bill (a supportive vote; it does not help pass an unfavorable bill)
- 0 absent or not voting
- -0.5 "present" on a pro-environmental bill (a vote withheld from the pro-environmental position)
- -1.0 "no" on a pro-environmental bill, "yes" on an antienvironmental bill

Points were added together for each legislator. This raw score was converted to a positive-number scale, then divided by the maximum points possible to obtain a percentage of environmentally supportive votes.

4	-				11 5 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	45	.0						
Senate Recor	d .	19: 5: 11/18: 19: 10: 10: 10: 10: 10: 10: 10: 10: 10: 10			the state of the s	SOUTH	100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100	- 12°	10 (48) 17 (48) 18 (48	lo li			
+ Pro-environmental vote		2 Con S. (2) (1) (1) (2) (1) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2	2 & &		N. S.	48 S	10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1	16 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 1	E B			
- Non-environmental vote		g &	10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1		\$ 15		7. % \$6. \$	(a)	S	8.			•
P Present	10/1	S. Sail		E. TOP	\$ 5 E					.		•	
NV Not Voting or Absent EXC Excused	Spoll OF T	6	18 18 E	9. K	100	40 1/2	40 10 E	10 10					
NR No Record	S 46	S 300	S 694	S1390	S1777	H544	H901	H1523	H3447	1996	1993	1992	1991
BARKHAUSEN (R-30)		+	+ `	NV	NV	+		+.	+	67%	63%	63%	36%
BERMAN (D-9)	+	· +	NV	+	-	. +	+	NV	+	78%	66%	38%	95%
BOMKE (R-50)	NR	NR	NR		•	+	•	+	+	67% ◊	, *	#	*
BOWLES (D-56)	+	+	, <u>-</u>	+		+	<i>-</i>	-	+	56%	* ~·	*	*
BURZYNSKI (R-35)	_	+	_	+		+	-	+	· +	56%	56%	29%	30%
BUTLER (R-28)	-	. +	. +	+	- ,	+	· -	+	4	67%	38%	75%	27%
CARROLL (D-8)	+	NV	NV	+	NV	+ '	_	-	+	61%	66%	25%	86%
CLAYBORNE (D-57)	+ 5	NR	٠.	+	-	+	-	٠ _	+	50% ◊	*	#	#
COLLINS (D-4)	+	+	+	· .	· ·	+	_	NV	+	72%	69%	44%	77%
CRONIN (R-39)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+ **	100%	81%	. 43%	45%
CULLERTON (D-6)	NV	+	+	• +	-	. +	+	·NV	+	78% .	91%	25%	98%
DEANGELIS (R-40)		+	+	+		+	. .	NV	· +	61%	69%	75%	27%
DELEO (D-10)	NV	+	+	+	<u>.</u>	· +	_	NV	NV	61%	66%	36%	38%
DELVALLE(D-2)	4	+	+	+	-	+ .	· +	NV	+	83%	81%	44%	82%
DEMUZIO (D-49)	P	NV	: <u> </u>	+	· <u>-</u>	+		-	. +	47%	69%	25%	64%
DILLARD (R-41)	1	+	+	+		+	_	+	· +	67%	# .	. * .	*
DONAHUE (R-48)	_	+	+	+	_	+	-	_	+	56%	25%	75%	43%
DUDYCZ(R-7)		+	+	+	-	. +		. +	+	67%	63%	69%	45%
DUNN, R. (R-58)	_	+		NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	33% ◊	28%	75%	45%
DUNN, T. (D-43)	+	+	•	+	-	+	NV	NV	+	67%	75%	75%	82%
FARLEY (D-17)		· +	+	+	_	+	_	NV	, +	61%	69%	32%	58%
FAWELL (R-20)	_	+	· +	+	•			+	+	67%	75%	63%	27%
FTIZGERALD (R-27)	+	+	. 1	+		. +	NV.	· +	+	83%	88%	#	. ≠
GARCIA (D-1)	+		+	+	'	+	+	· NV	+	83%	75%		*
GEO-KARIS (R-31)		+	+	+	_	· +	_	+	NV	61%	69%	75%	64%
HASARA (R-50)		+	· .	NR	NR		NR	NR	NR	33% ◊	56%	14%	38%
HAWKINSON (R-47)	+	+	_	+	_	+	_	+	+	67%	63%	75%	36%
HENDON (D-5)	_	+	+	+		+	· _	+	+	67%	63%	*	. #
JACOBS (D-36)	-		_		٠ _	+	_	NV	•	61%	38%	38%	68%
JONES (D-14)	"	;+ +	NV			+	· _		+	61%	81%		73%
KARPIEL (R-25)	-				-		+	NV	+	61%	75%	100%	30%
	-	+	+	EXC +	EXC	EXC			· ·	80%	75%	57%	48%
# KLEMM (R-32)	-	+	+		EAC		LAC		NV	61%	78%	*	*
LAUZEN (R-21)	-	+	+	+		. +	-	÷		67% ◊	1	 	*
LUECHTEFELD(R-58)	NR	NR	NR	. +	-	+		+	.+	i i	· 1	750%	41%
MADIGAN (R-45)	-	+	. +	+	-	+	-	, +	NV	61%	53%	75%	43%
MAHAR (R-19)	-	+	+	+	•	. +		+	+	67%	75%	75%	50%
MAITLAND (R-44)	/-	+	+	+	NV	; +	· · -	+	÷	72%	38%	75%	50%
MOLARO (D-12)	NV	. NV	. +	+	-	+	-	+	+	67%	75%	*	ľ
O'DANIEL (D-54)		+	+	. +	-	+			+	56%	63%	0%	56%

Pro-environmental vote Non-environmental vote Present NV Not Voting or Absent	Sounder,	1. 15 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19	1587 July 200 1 1887 1	1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1	110 00 1 10 00 0 1 1 10 00 0 1 1 1 1 1	100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100	191 (281) 191 (191)	10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1	18 (86) 16 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18	1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	-
EXC Excused	••			10° 70°	31	A. I.	E II	The state of	6 1	•			-
NR No Record	S 46	S300	S 694	S1390	S1777	H544	H901	H1523	H3447	1996	1993	1992	1991
O'MALLEY (R-18)	+	+	+	+	· -	+	NV	· .	+	83%	75%	#	*
PALMER (D-13).	│ + .	+	+	. +	NV	ŅV	NV	NV	+	78%	78%	100%	100%
PARKER (R-29)	-	+ ',	+ .	+	-	+	<u>,-</u>	+	÷	.67%	_* `	*	, #
PETERSON (R-26)	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	. +	67%	75%	43%	0%
PETKA (R-42)	-	+	-	+	-	+		+	+	56%	63%	57%	45%
PHILIP (R-23)	· -	+ ·	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	67%	69%	75%	27%
RAICA (R-24)	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	78%	63%	75%	55%
RAUSCHENBERGER (R-33)	+	÷,	+	+	- .	+	-	+	+.	78%	63%	*	#
REA (D-59)	-	+	-	+	٠_	+	_	-	+	44%	47%	50%	64%
# SEVERNS (D-51)	+	+	+	NV	NV	+	<u>.</u> .	NV	NV	80%	88%	94%	73%
SHADID (D-46)	NV	+	NV	+	-	+	_		+	56%	· *	#	/3/0 #
SHAW (D-15)	+ .	+	+	NV	NV	+	÷	NV	+	78%	50%	79%	65%
SIEBEN (R-37)	<u>-</u>	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	56%	63%	29%	20%
SMITH (D-3)	+	+	NV	+	_	· +	_	NV	+	67%	63%	25%	82%
SYVERSON (R-34)	-	. +	٠ .	+	_	+	_	+	+	. 56%	47%	*	*
TROTTER (D-16)	. +	. +	NV	+		+	• +		+	72%	78%	86%	83%
VIVERITO (D-11)	-	+	+	+		+	. •	+.	÷.	67%	#	*	35 % ±
WALSH (R-22)	-	. +	+	+	_	; +	_	. +	+	67%	. #	#	*
WATSON (R-55)	-	+	-	. +	_	+	_		·' +	56%	38%	75%	45%
WEAVER (R-52)	-	+	+.	+	<u>.</u> .	+		+	+	67%	50%	75% 88%	30%
WELCH (D-38)	+	+		+		+		NV	+	72%	88%	63%	68%
WOODYARD (R-53)	· - ,	+	P	+	-	+	-	+	- -	58%	50%	75%	.52%

♦ 50th District: The rating for Sen. Karen Hasara is figured on three votes

She was replaced by Larry Bomke, whose score is figured on six votes.

57th District: The rating for Sen. Ralph Dunn is figured on three votes.

He was replaced by David Lucchtefeld, whose score is figured on six votes.

58th District: The rating for James Clayborne, who replaced Sen. Kenneth Hall, is figured on eight votes.

Sen. Hall is recorded as "not voting" on the ninth bill, SB 300.

Sen. Severns and Sen. Klemm each had four excused absences for illness. Scores for each are computed on five votes.

ENVIRONMENTAL VOTING HONOR ROLL: ILLINOIS SENATE based on highest percentage of pro-environmental votes (average Senate score: 65%)

Sen: Dan Cromm 100%
Sen: Miguel del Valle 83%
Sen: Peter Fitzgerald 83%
Sen: Jesus Garcia 83%

Sen. Patrick O'Malley 83%

Leadership Award—for sponsorship of Retail Rate Law repeal legislation in the Senate: Sen. Patrick O'Malley.

- + Pro-environmental vote
 - Non-environmental vote
- P Present
- NV Not Voting or Absent
- EXC Excused
- NR No Record

•	<i>\$</i> 0			\$
•	A ^Z			, the state of the
, <u>jo</u>	**************************************	F. F. F.		20 86 JE 86 1
			35 5 6 6	
AL A.	" 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	, 20, 21. 2		
200		A E LE	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	
1 2 6 6 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1

ACKERMAN (R-89) BALTHIS (R-79) BIGGERT (R-81)	HR101 + +	H544 +	H901	H1523	H1610	H3447	S46	S300	S1390	1996	1993	1992	1991
BALTHIS (R-79) BIGGERT (R-81)	+	+	_									 	
BIGGERT (R-81)	+		-	+	-	.+	-	+ .	+	67%	38%	43%	40%
	•	+	-	-	_	+	-	· +	+	56%	69%	60%	33%
	+	+	<u>.</u> ,	. +	+	+	: <u>.</u> .	+	+	78%	63%	#	∗
BIGGINS (R-78)	+ ,	+	- ,	- '+	+	· +	_	+	+	78%	80%	#	. #
BLACK (R-105)	NV .	+	- .	+		+	-	+ /	+	61%	36%	18%	30%
BLAGOJEVICH (D-33)	NV	NV	+	+	. +	+	+	+	NV	83%	88%	#	#
BOLAND (D-71)	#	+	-	·	+	+	+	+	-	67%	*	· #	* ·
BOST (R-115)	+	+	- ,	+	+	+	- ,	+	+	78%	*	*	#
BRADY (R-88)	+	+	<u>.</u>	+	+	+	. -	. +	÷	78%	39%	# 1	#
BRUNSVOLD (D-72)	+	NV	•	+	• +	+	· <u>-</u>	+	. +	72%	36%	29%	73%
BUGIELSKI (D-19)	+	NV ·	-	+ -	+	+		+	NV	67% ·	69%	29%	60%
BURKE (D-23)	+	+	<u>-</u> ',	. +	+	NV	· 🚣 .	+	<u>.</u> :	61%	69%	29%	70%
CAPPARELLI (D-13)	+	+	-	+	, +	+	_	+	P	69%	69%	43%	60%
CHURCHILL (R-62)	+ -	+	-	+	· NV	+	-	. +	+	72%	44%	29%	10%
CIARLO (R-80)	+	+	-	4.	_	+	-	+	-	56%	*	*	*
CLAYTON (R-51)	+	··· +	. .	+	+	+	`	. +	+	78%	63%	#	±
COWLISHAW (R-41)	+	+		+	+	+	• :	+	+	78%	69%	43%	43%
CROSS (R-84)	+	+	-	+	+	+	_	+	+ '	78%	69%	#	
CURRIE (D-25)	+	+	+ ,	+	+	+	+	+	_	89%	89%	86%	90%
CURRY (D-101)	+	NV	_	+	+	+		+		61%	#	*	
DANIELS (R-46)	+	+		+		+	<u>.</u>	. +	+	67%	75%	43%	0
DART (D-28)	.+	NV	+	+	+	+	- .	NV	-	67%	1	*	#
DAVIS, M (D-27)	+	NV	NV	+	+	+	•	NV	-	61%	56%	71%	90%
DAVIS, S (D-111)	+	NV	-	·	+	+ .	<u>.</u> .	+	+	61%	#	*	. ≠
DEERING (D-116)	+	+		+	+	+	· <u>-</u>	+ .	, + ··-	78%	59%	29%	45%
DEUCHLER (R-42)	+	÷	-	+	+	+0.0	-	+	+	78%	69%	32%	43%
DOODY (R-37)	+	+	-	+	NR	+	NR	NR	ŊŸ	75% ◊	*	*	*
DURKIN (R-44)	+	. +	_	+	+•	+		+	+	78%	≠	*	
ERWIN (D-11)	+	NV	_	+	+	+		+	+	72%	86%	- _#	*
FANTIN (D-29)	+	NV		: -	+	+		+	*	50%	#	. #	*
FEIGENHOLTZ(D-12)	+	NV	-	+ :	+	+	+	+	+	83%	* '		*
FLOWERS (D-21)	NV	NV	NV		+	+ .	_	+	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	50%	63%	57%	83%
FRIAS, F. (D-1)	+	NV		+	+	+		+	NV	67%	69%	37%	#
GASH (D-60)	+	+	_	+	+, -	, +	_	+	NV	72%	83%		
GILES (D-8)	+,	+	_	· -	+	. +	P	+	NV	69%	64%		#.
GOSLIN (R-57)	+	NR.	NR	NR.	NR	· ·	NR	NR.	+	100% ♦	# .		

+ - P NV EXO	Pro-environmental voi Non-environmental vo Present Not Voting or Absent C Excused No Record			10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1	10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1	18 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		THE SECOND SECON		100 C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C	The Solution of the solution o				
		HR10			× H1523	H1610	H3447		S300	S1390	1	د اممه	. 1	1	
	ANBERG (D-109)	NV	NV	NV	+.			•		01050	1996	1993	199	2 1991	_
	NNIG (D-98)	+	NV	+	+	P		-	+	+	72%	44%	18%	63%	
	VRAHAN (R-57)	NR	, +		NV	•	NR	-	+		69%	58%	43%	40%	
-	RTKE (D-108)		NV	_	4	+		-	+	NR	42% ◊	.*	*	#	
HAS	SSERT (R-83)	+	+	٠ ـ	+	+	+.	-	+	· +	61%	41%	14%	60%	
HOE	FT (R-66)	+	+	~	NV	+	+	-	+	+	78%	44%	#	#	
HOF	FMAN (D-112)	+	NV	_	+	+	*	, -	+	+	72%	69%	*	. #	. •
HOL	BROOK (D-113)	+	+	<i>.</i>	+ .	+	+ ,		+	+,	72%	50%	29%	23%	
HOW	VARD (D-32)	+	NV	_	NV		,+	-	+	+	78%	#	*	. *	
HUG	HES (R-63)	ļ ₊	+		+	+	+	7	+	P	58%	#	#	*	
, loh	NSON, TIM (R-104)	-	+	_			+ .		. +	, +	67%	38%	*	*	
JOHN	VSON, TOM (R-50)	+	· .	+	+	. +	† .	+	+	. +	89%	41%	43%	40%	
JONE	ES, J (R-107)	+	+		. •	+ .	+	P	. +	+ +	86%	47%	#	#	
JONE	S, L (D-5)		NV	_	. *	+ · .	+	-	.+ *	+	78%	*	#	#	
JONE	S, S (D-6)	+	' NV	NV	NV	+	+	+	+	NV	64%	52%	64%	70%	
KASZ	ZAK (D-34)	+	+			NV	NV.	- ;	. +	NV	56%	47%	43%	60%	
	VER (D-24)	+	NV	+ '	.+	+	+	- , '	.+	+	89%	94%		#	
	GLER (R-100)	+		-	NV	+	+	-	+	NV	61%	*	#	. ↓	•
	ARZ(D-20)	NV	+ NV	-	+.	+	+	- .	+	+ .	78%	#	#	#	
	JSE (R-56)	+		NV	+ .	+	+	~	NV	NV	-61%	69%	*	#	
	K (R-43)		+		+	-	+	- '.	+	+	67%	75%	*		
	NER (R-59)	,	+	· -	+	+	. + ·	- .	, +	NV	72%	75%	29%	30%	
	(D-16)	•	+		+ .	•	+	· -	+	+	67%	# -	#	= .	
	INO (D-15)	+ ŃV	NV	NV	+ '	+ .	+.	-	+	-	67%	91%	47%	98%	
	ER (R-74)		· NV	-	+	+-	+		+	NV ·	61%	75%	29%	58%	
	H (R-93)	+	· · +	-	+	`, +	+		+	+	78%	69%	± ·	#	
	VER (R-65)	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	67%	38%	-36%	20%	
	Z(D-4)	+	+	-	. +	+ ,	+	-	+	+	78%	59%	<i>3010</i> ≠	20%	
	S (R-47)	-b · ,	+	-	+	+	+ '	• -	+	- 1	67%	64%	*		
	GAN (D-22)	÷	+	- ,	4	+	+	+	+	NV	83%	*	#		
	2000	+	NV	-	+ .	+	NV	_	+	NV	61%	70%	40%		
		EXC	EXC	EXC	EXC]	EXC .	EXC]	EXC :	EXC	EXC	EXC	69%		88%	
	INO (D-76)	+	NV	+	+	· +	+ .	+	+	+	94%	50%	36%	53%	
	LIFFE (R-14)	+	+ -		+	+	+	NV	+	+	83%	75%	43%	20%	
	RE (D-86)	-	+	-	+	+	+	_	+	NV	61%	63%	29%	20%	
	R (R-82)	+	+	- ,	+	+	+	<i>- ·</i>	+	+	78%	- 1	57%	85%	
MILL CH	ELL(R-73)	+	+		+	- ,	+.	-	+	+	67%	75%	*.	*	
											- 21.20°.	- 1	• 1	*	

House Record

Pro-environmental vote

Non-environmental vote

Present

NV Not Voting or Absent

EXC Excused

NR No Record

					٠.	
	700	<i>\$</i> 0 <i>\$</i> 0				*
		"4.85 "4.85"			8 8 S	
		Se Ser	9 V. 18 V.	100 m		,
100 8 1 7 100 8 1 7 100 8 1 7 100 8 1 7 100 8 100 8 10 100 8 100 8 10 100 8	1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1	20 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1.00 (88) (1.00) (1.	* 18 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19	
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	The Rail	原本 原		1. Q.1.	\$ 1. J.	

·	× 11,	Ø.11.	Ø 1/	* *		2. W.	Ø. 1/	O *	A				
	HR101	H544	H901	H1523	H1610	H3447	S46	S300	S1390	1996	1993	1992	1991
MOFFIT (R-94)	+	+		+	· •	+	-	+	+	67%	56%	*	*
MOORE, A. (R-61)	+	+	` -	+ .	+	+	-	+	+	78%	81%	*	*
MOORE, E. (D-7)	+	+	_	~_	+	+ .	- '	+	NV	61%	66%	*	*
MORROW (D-26)	+	NV	_		-	+	P	+	NV	53%	52%	68%	83%
MULLIGAN (R-55)	+	+		+	-	+	, - ,	+	+	67%	75%	*	#
MURPHY, H. (D-30)	+	NV	·_	-	-	+ .	_	. +	+	50%	53%	*	*
MURPHY, M. (R-36)	+	+	NV	+	+ .	+	+	+ .	· +	94%	86%	*	*
MYERS (R-95)	+	+ .	, -		+	+ .	-	+	+	67%	**	*	*
NOLAND (R-102)	,+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	78%	47%	43%	28%
NOVAK (D-85)	+ .	NV	-	+	+	+	-	` +	. +	72%	58%	57%	70%
O'CONNOR (R-35)	+ .	+		+	٠ +	+	+.	+	+ ′	89%	*	* .	*
PANKAU (R-49)	+	+		+	+	+	· - ·	+	+ .	78%	72%	# "	*
PARKE (R-53)	+	+	· - '	+	+	- +	-	+ .	+	78%	58%	47%	33%
PEDERSEN (R-54)	+	+	:	+	+	+	P	+	7 + ·	86%	47%	47%	3%
PERSICO (R-39)	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+ `	+	78%	69%	29%	45%
PHELPS (D-118)	+ -	NV	+,	+	+	NV	-	+	+	67%	39%	29%	73%
POE (R-99)	÷	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	. +	78%	#	* .	#
PUGH (D-10)	+	NV	:NV	-	NV	+	P	+	NV	64%	58%	# :	#
RONEN (D-17)	+ ,	NV	-	+	+	+	+	+ '		72%	83%	29%	53%
ROSKAM (R-40)	. +	+	. - ,	+	-	+	·	+	NV	61%	63%	#	#
RUTHERFORD (R-87)	+	+.		+	, +	+ .	-	NV ·	+	72%	44%	#	#
RYDER (R-97)	+	· +	-	+	P	+ .	<u>-</u> :	+	+	75%	41%	29%	30%
SALTSMAN (D-92)	\ \ +	+	-	+	+	. +	-	+	NV	72%	56%	57%	60%
SALVI (R-52)	NV	+	+	+	-	NV	+		+	78%	64%	. +	*
SANTIAGO (D-3)	+	+	-	: 1	+	ŃV		+	P	64%	64%	29%	55%
SAVIANO (R-77)	+		-	+	+		-	+	+ '	78%	70%	*	*
SCHAKOWSKY (D-18)	+	. +	NV	+	+	1	+	+	, +	94%	89%	80%2	100%
SCHOENBERG (D-58)	+	NV		+	_	+	-	+	_	50%	100%	71%	98%
SCOTT (D-67)	+	+	-	+	+	+,		+	+ .	78%	*	*	±
SKINNER (R-64)	· +	+	, + ,	+	. +	+	+	+	4	100%	69%	*	· *
SMITH (D-91)	+	+	-	+	+	+	_	+	4	78%	#	#	±
SPANGLER (R-75)	+	+		+	+	+	-	+	+	78%	*	#	*
STEPHENS (R-110)	+	+	_	+	_	NV .		+	· ·	61%	56%	*	
STROGER (D-31)	+	NV	NV	ŊV	+	+	P	+		69%	75%	#	#
TENHOUSE (R-96)	+	+	_	. +	+	+	-	+	. +	78%	39%	29%	20%
TURNER, A (D-9)	+	NV	_	_	NV	NV '	<u>-</u> ·	+	NV	44%	48%	60%	60%
- 3-4 (144 12 (14-2)	-	144.	-	-	TAA	TAA	= '	. +	1/1/	1 44%	1 48%	1 00%	1 00%

 Pro-environmental vote Non-environmental vote Present NV Not Voting or Absent EXC Excused NR No Record 		100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100	10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1	100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100	100 (10 (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (1	881 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16	1000 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 10	* Consolidation of the Consoli	Co. 1641 1840 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	Mr 1867 91	·		
	HR101	H544	H901	H1523	H1610	H3447	S46	S300	S1390	1996	1993	1992	1991
TURNER, J (R-90)	+	+	_	+	•		_				 -	 	
WAIT (R-68)	+	+	_	+	+		· -	+	+	67%	† .	*	*
WEAVER (R-106)	+	+		-	•	+	+ .	+	+	78%	#	*	*
WENNLUND (R-38)	+		-	+	, + .	+	-	+	+	78%	63%	14%	43%
WINKEL (R-103)		+	_	+	- .	+	• .	+	+	67%	63%	57%	20%
WINTERS (R-69)	+	+ .	+	+	+	+	+	+ .	+	100%	#	#	*
`I	+	+	+	+	+	- +		+	+	78%	#	* ·	#
WIRSING (R-70)	+ .	+	· -	+ +	+	+	-	+	+.	78%	44%	*	+
WOJCIK (R-45)	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+.	' +	78%	47%	42.07	
WOOLARD (D-117)	+	+		+	+	+		+				43%	25%
YOUNGE (D-114)	· +	NV	-	_					+	78%	41%	29%	68%
ZABROCKI (R-37)	NR	NR	NR	NR	•	NR.		+	NV	61%	53%	64%	80%
ZICKUS (R-48)	+				- ·.	TNEC	-	. +	NR	33% ◊	. *	#	#
		• •			+	+	•	+	+	78%	81%	.*	* ,,

37th District: The rating for Rep. Edward Zabrocki is figured on three votes.

He was replaced by Rep. John Doody, whose score is figured on six votes.

57th District: The rating for Rep. Kevin Hanrahan is figured on six votes.

He was replaced by Rep. Gregg Goslin, whose score is figured on three votes.

Rep. Martinez was excused for illness.

ENVIRONMENTAL VOTING HONOR ROLL: ILLINOIS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES hased on highest percentage of pro-environmental votes (average House score: 70%)

100% Reps. Gregg Goslin (three roll calls), Cal Skinner, Rick Winkel

94% Reps. Richard Mantino, Maureen Murphy, Jan Schakowsky

89% Reps. Barbara Currie, Tim Johnson, Nancy Kaszak, Jack O'Connor

86% Reps Tom Johnson, Bernard Pederson

83% Reps. Rod Blagojevich, Sara Feigenholtz, Edeen Lyons, Roger McAuliffe (deceased 1996)

Leadership Award—for sponsorship of Retail Rate Law repeal legislation in the House Rep. Maureen Murphy

Non-profit org. First Class U.S. Postage PAID Permit No. 1 Springfield, IL 62705



Illinois Environmental Council 319 West Cook St. Springfield, IL 62704

phone: 217-544-5954 fax: 217-544-5958 e-mail: iec@eosinc.com

President: William Borden Vice-President: Ron Burke Secretary: Renée Robinson Treasurer: Tom Smith

Executive Director Virginia Scott

Printed on Recycled Paper

About the *Environmental Voting Record* and the IEC

The Environmental Voting Record is published by the Illinois Environmental Council (IEC) for purposes of public education and information. It provides a record and analysis of votes in the Illinois General Assembly on a range of environmental and conservation bills to help create better-informed citizens in the state of Illinois.

No endorsement of any party, legislator, or political candidate is implied in this or in other publications and activities of the Illinois Environmental Council. The IEC does not make financial contributions to, or receive them from, any political party.

The Illinois Environmental Council is a not-for-profit coalition of individuals and organizations committed to a healthful environment and stewardship of natural resources. Founded in 1975, the IEC currently includes more than seventy affiliated organizations. Governed by a statewide board of directors, the IEC works toward the goals of pollution prevention, waste reduction, maintenance of biodiversity, adequate funding for state environmental programs, and citizen participation in public policy decisions. The IEC serves its membership through its advocacy on state issues, informative publications, issue research, and networking assistance.

The public is welcome to attend the annual conference of the Illinois Environmental Council, scheduled each year on the third weekend in October. This event brings together grassroots leaders, environmental professionals, students, state government officials, and other interested individuals to hear notable speakers, participate in workshops, and enhance their network of contacts.

Regular publications of the IEC include the bimonthly Affiliate Notes featuring issue background and current news items, the IEC Bulletin with legislative news, Action Alerts, and occasional fact sheets and special reports.

If you would like additional copies of the 1996 Environmental Voting Record or wish to receive membership information, please contact the office.

Illinois Environmental Council 319 West Cook Street Springfield, Illinois 62704

Phone: 217-544-5954 • Fax: 217-544-5958 e-mail: iec@eosinc.com

Internet: http://www.prairienet.org/~isen/