



ENERGY & ENVIRONMENTAL GIVING IN THE STATES

By
MEGAN MOORE

MAY 23, 2007

This publication was made possible by grants from:

Carnegie Corporation of New York, *Strengthening U.S. Democracy*
Ford Foundation, *Program on Governance and Civil Society*
The Pew Charitable Trusts, *State Policy Initiatives*
Rockefeller Brothers Fund, *Program on Democratic Practice*

OVERVIEW

Energy companies across the nation are subject to closer scrutiny as ever-increasing attention is focused on climate change. These companies contribute large sums of money to state-level politics, and the environmental groups that they often go head-to-head with on energy policy also give, albeit to a lesser degree.

Non-individual contributors from the oil and gas, electric utilities and coal mining industries contributed \$58.3 million to state-level candidates and party committees from 2003 through 2006.¹ On the other side, pro-environmental policy organizations gave \$2.1 million and alternative energy interests contributed almost \$564,000.

An Institute analysis of contributions from energy companies, pro-environmental policy groups and alternative energy interests found:

- Five states were top recipients of both energy-interest and pro-environmental policy money: California, Florida, Michigan, Texas and Virginia.
- Republican candidates and party committees collected 75 percent more than Democrats from energy interests while pro-environmental groups contributed almost five times more to Democrats than Republicans.
- Legislative candidates received 56 percent of energy-interest contributions and 73 percent of pro-environmental money.
- Oil and gas companies, coal-mining interests and electric utilities supported more winning candidates than did environmental groups: 86 percent versus 65 percent.
- Energy interests contributed 79 percent of money given to candidates to incumbents, who often win re-election. Pro-environmental policy organizations contributed most often to candidates running for open seats and were more likely than energy interests to take a chance on challengers: 26 percent of environmental group contributions to candidates went to challengers compared to just 4 percent of energy-interest money.
- Top recipients of energy-interest contributions tended to be state party committees and gubernatorial candidates while environmental groups contributed large sums to state legislative candidates. The Florida Republican Party was a top recipient of both energy and environmental funds.

¹ Energy interests and environmental groups also contributed to ballot measure committees in the 2004 and 2006 election cycles, but those contributions are not included in this analysis. Data collection for the 2006 cycle is on-going and figures for that election cycle do not represent final election-cycle totals.

ENERGY CONTRIBUTORS

Electric utilities contributed \$30.3 million in the 2004 and 2006 election cycles, dominating the giving by energy interests. Oil and gas interests followed, donating \$23.7 million, and coal-mining companies gave \$2.37 million.

By far, the top contributor was Chevron Corp.,² which gave \$3.28 million, almost twice as much as the number two contributor, Pacific Gas & Electric. Republicans received almost \$2.7 million of the Chevron contributions, compared to the little more than half million given to Democrats. California candidates and party committees received the largest share of Chevron funds: nearly \$2.7 million.

Other oil and gas industry top contributors include Texas-based Valero Energy, the largest oil refiner in North America;³ such commonly known oil producers as ConocoPhillips and ExxonMobil; and Koch Industries, a Kansas-based multifaceted company with a notable interest in energy.

Dominion, an electric utilities provider with large natural gas holdings, was the third-largest contributor, donating \$1.6 million.

Electric utilities comprised a majority of the list of top contributors of energy-related funds. Nine electric utilities, providing services across the country, contributed more than \$1 million each.

Coal interest contributions accounted for less than 5 percent of energy-industry contributions and none made the list of top contributors. Large coal contributors included: Alpha Natural Resources, \$297,270; Massey Energy, \$271,950; and the Virginia Coal Association, \$240,650.

TOP ENERGY-INDUSTRY CONTRIBUTORS, 2003-2006

| CONTRIBUTOR | INDUSTRY | TOTAL |
|----------------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| Chevron Corp. | Oil & Gas | \$3,281,017 |
| Pacific Gas & Electric | Electric Utilities | \$1,781,500 |
| Dominion | Misc. Energy | \$1,647,138 |
| Florida Power & Light | Electric Utilities | \$1,466,034 |
| Teco Energy | Electric Utilities | \$1,458,892 |
| Valero Energy | Oil & Gas | \$1,371,034 |
| Progress Energy | Electric Utilities | \$1,367,688 |
| Sempra Energy | Electric Utilities | \$1,288,783 |
| American Electric Power | Electric Utilities | \$1,275,391 |
| Duke Energy | Electric Utilities | \$1,256,716 |
| Texas Utilities/TXU | Electric Utilities | \$1,190,355 |
| Exelon | Electric Utilities | \$1,133,520 |
| ConocoPhillips | Oil & Gas | \$984,146 |
| Southern California Edison | Electric Utilities | \$971,627 |
| FirstEnergy Corp. | Electric Utilities | \$926,068 |
| ExxonMobil | Oil & Gas | \$834,568 |

² In 2005, ChevronTexaco changed its name to Chevron Corp. In this analysis, the current name, Chevron Corp., will be used for contributions from both entities.

³ "About Valero," *Valero Energy Corp.* [on-line]; available from <http://www.valero.com/About+Valero/>; Internet; accessed April 11, 2007.

| CONTRIBUTOR | INDUSTRY | TOTAL |
|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| Entergy | Electric Utilities | \$802,309 |
| DTE Energy | Electric Utilities | \$721,410 |
| Koch Industries | Oil & Gas | \$652,539 |
| CenterPoint Energy | Electric Utilities | \$606,049 |
| TOTAL | | \$25,016,784 |

Where Energy Money Went

Oil and gas interests, electric utilities and coal mining operations contributed almost \$36.9 million to Republican candidates and party committees, 75 percent more than the \$21 million contributed to Democratic counterparts.

Legislative candidates received the bulk of energy-interest money: \$32.4 million. Another \$15 million went to party committees and \$6.5 million to gubernatorial and lieutenant gubernatorial hopefuls.

Energy interests supported winners with 86 percent of their contributions to candidates up for election. Incumbents received 79 percent of energy money compared with open seat candidates, who collected 17 percent, and challengers, who got 4 percent.

Sixty-nine percent of the contributions from energy interests were given in 10 states. Most of the money went to California and Texas, where candidate and party committees received \$10.2 million and \$7.5 million, respectively. See Appendix A for a complete rundown of energy contributions in all 50 states.

TOP RECIPIENT STATES OF ENERGY-INTEREST FUNDS, 2003-2006

| STATE | CONTRIBUTIONS |
|--------------|----------------------|
| California | \$10,259,846 |
| Texas | \$7,561,418 |
| Florida | \$4,427,637 |
| Illinois | \$3,761,506 |
| Virginia | \$3,359,409 |
| Pennsylvania | \$2,533,146 |
| Ohio | \$2,404,026 |
| Oklahoma | \$2,193,096 |
| Louisiana | \$1,796,278 |
| Michigan | \$1,671,443 |
| TOTAL | \$39,968,555 |

The top 10 recipients received \$11.35 million from energy interests, or 19 percent of contributions from oil and gas companies, electric utilities, and coal-mining interests. Here is a closer look at those recipients:

- The top four recipients were the Democratic and Republican state party committees in California and Florida. Chevron contributed just under half of the energy money that went to the California Republican Party

but just 14 percent of that received by the state Democrats. In Florida, the same three contributors — Teco Energy, Florida Power & Light and Progress Energy — were major funders for both the Democratic and Republican state parties, contributing 97 and 88 percent of energy money received by those committees, respectively.

- Four gubernatorial candidates were top recipients of energy-related funds. Of these, three were Republicans and one a Democrat. Jerry W. Kilgore, the 2005 Virginia gubernatorial candidate, was the only top recipient of energy-interest money who did not win his election.
- Texas Lieutenant Governor David Dewhurst collected \$525,789. Top contributors to Dewhurst, a Republican who was re-elected to his second term in 2006, were TXU, Valero Energy and the Texas Oil & Gas Association.
- Rep. Tom Craddick, the Speaker of the Texas House of Representatives, was the only legislator among the top recipients. Craddick received \$365,000

TOP RECIPIENTS OF ENERGY INDUSTRY CONTRIBUTIONS, 2003-2006

| STATE | RECIPIENT | PARTY | OFFICE* | STATUS | TOTAL |
|--------------|-----------------------------|------------|--------------|--------|---------------------|
| CA | California Republican Party | Republican | Party | N/A | \$4,000,357 |
| FL | Florida Republican Party | Republican | Party | N/A | \$2,408,072 |
| CA | California Democratic Party | Democrat | Party | N/A | \$1,133,180 |
| FL | Florida Democratic Party | Democrat | Party | N/A | \$953,352 |
| VA | Kilgore, Jerry W. | Republican | Governor | Lost | \$544,455 |
| TX | Dewhurst, David | Republican | Lt. Governor | Won | \$525,789 |
| TX | Perry, Rick | Republican | Governor | Won | \$525,750 |
| IL | Blagojevich, Rod R. | Democrat | Governor | Won | \$459,622 |
| CA | Schwarzenegger, Arnold | Republican | Governor | Won | \$435,391 |
| TX | Craddick, Tom | Republican | House | Won | \$365,000 |
| TOTAL | | | | | \$11,350,968 |

*Office listed represents most recent election.

PRO-ENVIRONMENTAL AND ALTERNATIVE ENERGY CONTRIBUTORS

Often working at loggerheads to energy companies are pro-environmental policy groups, which contributed \$2.1 million during the 2004 and 2006 election cycles.

Ten groups contributed 58 percent, or \$1.2 million, of the total given by environmental advocates. Among the top contributors were state chapters of the League of Conservation Voters located in California, Georgia, Oregon, Texas, Virginia and Washington. Overall, the League of Conservation Voters and its state and local affiliates gave more than \$1 million over the four-year period.

Two other top contributors were the Environmental Campaign Fund and the Arbor Committee, political action committees (PACs) based in Alabama. Both PACs list the same chair, Joe Cottle,

who is the Director of Government Relations for the Alabama Education Association.⁴ Though the professed purposes of the committees are pro-environmental,⁵ most of the funding came from the Alabama Education Association's PAC, law firms and dog-racing interests.⁶

Another well-known environmental advocacy group, the Sierra Club, was active in the 2004 and 2006 election cycles. Contributions from the Sierra Club and local chapters totaled \$182,149.

TOP PRO-ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY CONTRIBUTORS, 2003-2006

| CONTRIBUTOR | TOTAL |
|--|--------------------|
| California League of Conservation Voters | \$244,850 |
| Oregon League of Conservation Voters | \$243,238 |
| Virginia League of Conservation Voters | \$128,123 |
| Environmental Campaign Fund | \$119,059 |
| Arbor Committee | \$109,900 |
| Committee of Citizens to Protect Environmentally Sensitive Areas | \$88,000 |
| Texas League of Conservation Voters | \$80,674 |
| Conservation Council of North Carolina | \$72,347 |
| Washington Conservation Voters | \$68,488 |
| Georgia Conservation Voters/GVC Action Fund | \$67,871 |
| TOTAL | \$1,222,550 |

Alternative energy interests contributed \$563,907 in the 2004 and 2006 elections cycles. More than two-thirds of alternative energy contributions were given in California, where Californians for Clean Alternative Energy contributed \$345,000 to the California Democratic Party. The committee formed around a failed ballot measure, Proposition 87, which would have taxed energy companies and used the money to further alternative energy research.

Other top alternative energy contributors were: Vulcan Power, an Oregon-based geothermal energy provider that gave a total of \$24,500 in Nevada and Oregon; the California Wind Energy Association, which gave \$23,750 in California; and JW Prairie Wind Power, a Kansas-based company that contributed \$23,500 in that state.

Where the Pro-Environmental Money Went

Democratic candidates and party committees received \$1.7 million, or 82 percent of pro-environmental policy money, compared to the Republicans' \$363,717.

Legislative candidates collected 73 percent of pro-environmental policy groups' contributions, or \$1.5 million of \$2.1 million. Gubernatorial and lieutenant gubernatorial candidates received \$195,769 and party committees collected \$134,040.

⁴ "About AEA," *Alabama Education Association* [on-line]; available from <http://www.myaea.org/AEAMembershipTypes.htm>; Internet; accessed April 12, 2007.

⁵ "Political Committee Inquiry System," *Alabama Secretary of State* [on-line]; available from http://www.sos.state.al.us/cf_vb/election/pacbrowse.aspx; Internet; accessed April 13, 2007.

⁶ From reports filed with the Secretary of State available at <http://arc-sos.state.al.us/cgi/BOSELC10.MBR/INPUT>.

Winners received 65 percent of environmental-interest contributions to candidates who were up for election. Open seat contenders received the largest share of pro-environmental group contributions: 40 percent. Incumbents followed with 34 percent. The 26 percent of environmental group funds received by challengers was significantly more than the 4 percent energy groups contributed to challengers.

Eighty-two percent of environmental policy groups' money was spent in just 10 states. Five of the top recipients of environmental group money were also top recipients of energy money: California, Florida, Michigan, Texas and Virginia. See Appendix A for a complete rundown of environmental contributions in all 50 states.

Somewhat surprisingly, Alabama candidates and party committees were the top recipients of pro-environmental policy funds. More than half of these contributions were from the above-mentioned PACs chaired by Joe Cottle, which gave a combined \$228,959. Four other PACs: 21st Century PAC, Enviro PAC, Green PAC and Vision PAC, gave a combined \$151,250. These PACs are chaired by John Crawford, a lobbyist listed as the chair of 12 Alabama PACs, with purported purposes ranging from environment to education to business.⁷ The funding sources for these PACs is often difficult to determine as they shuffle funds from one PAC to another.⁸ Funders of Crawford's PACs include the Builders Association of Alabama, developer and Democratic state Sen. Jeff Enfinger, a law firm and the Alabama Education Association.⁹

TOP RECIPIENT STATES OF PRO-ENVIRONMENTAL CONTRIBUTIONS, 2003-2006

| STATE | CONTRIBUTIONS |
|----------------|----------------------|
| Alabama | \$421,409 |
| California | \$302,839 |
| Oregon | \$260,278 |
| Virginia | \$145,623 |
| Texas | \$143,474 |
| Florida | \$108,575 |
| North Carolina | \$103,547 |
| Michigan | \$90,075 |
| Washington | \$82,870 |
| Georgia | \$68,871 |
| TOTAL | \$1,727,561 |

The Florida Republican Party, the number two recipient of energy contributions, received \$70,425 from environmental interests. The Committee of Citizens to Protect Environmentally Sensitive Areas, which lists its purpose as "environment" with the Florida Division of Elections,¹⁰ contributed \$70,000 of that amount. According to campaign finance reports, the committee's

⁷ "Political Committee Inquiry System," *Alabama Secretary of State* [on-line]; available from http://www.sos.state.al.us/cf_vb/election/pacbrowse.aspx; Internet; accessed April 13, 2007.

⁸ "PAC Glossary," *The Birmingham News*, June 4, 2006 [newspaper on-line]; available from <http://www.al.com/printer/printer.ssf?/base/news/1149413194210210.xml&coll=2>; Internet; accessed June 28, 2006.

⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰ *Division of Elections* [on-line]; available from <http://election.dos.state.fl.us/cgi-bin/ComHtml.exe?account=36488>; Internet; accessed April 13, 2007.

funding came from dues collected in 2004 and contributions from Citizens for Housing & Urban Growth received in 2006; that committee is funded mainly by construction and development interests.¹¹

Phil Angelides, the Democratic California treasurer who unsuccessfully challenged Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger in 2006, received \$48,300. The California League of Conservation Voters contributed \$27,300 to Angelides' gubernatorial campaign and Sierra Club California gave him \$1,000. The remaining \$20,000 was contributed to Angelides in 2004 when he served as the state treasurer and came from Conservation Resources, "a California-based company founded to acquire, develop, and manage property for their ecological resource values."¹²

In Alabama, state Sen. Roger Bedford and newly elected Supreme Court Chief Sue Bell Cobb, both Democrats, were top recipients of pro-environmental policy contributions. Another top recipient was state house-hopeful Jim Phillips. The aforementioned PACs chaired by Joe Cottle and John Crawford contributed \$45,500 to Bedford's 2006 re-election campaign, \$32,000 to Sue Bell Cobb and \$27,200 to Phillips. The Alabama League of Environmental Action Voters also gave Cobb \$1,000.

Virginia Gov. Tim Kaine, elected in 2006, received \$40,003 in contributions and in-kind donations from the Virginia League of Conservation Voters and \$1,000 from the Virginia chapter of the Sierra Club.

Four Democratic legislative candidates in Oregon were top recipients of environmental group funds, all of which were contributed by the Oregon League of Conservation Voters except for a \$1,000 contribution to Sen. Laurie Monnes Anderson by the Oregon Sierra Club and a \$250 contribution from Oregonians For Wildlife and Habitat Management.

TOP RECIPIENTS OF PRO-ENVIRONMENTAL CONTRIBUTIONS, 2003-2006

| STATE | RECIPIENT | PARTY | OFFICE* | STATUS | TOTAL |
|--------------|--------------------------|------------|---------------|--------------|------------------|
| FL | Florida Republican Party | Republican | Party | N/A | \$70,425 |
| CA | Angelides, Phil | Democrat | Governor | Lost | \$48,300 |
| AL | Bedford, Roger | Democrat | Senate | Won | \$45,500 |
| VA | Kaine, Timothy M. | Democrat | Governor | Won | \$41,003 |
| AL | Cobb, Sue Bell | Democrat | Supreme Court | Won | \$33,000 |
| OR | Bates, Alan C. | Democrat | Senate | Won | \$32,205 |
| OR | Anderson, Laurie Monnes | Democrat | Senate | Won | \$30,589 |
| OR | Brading, Rob | Democrat | House | Lost | \$28,179 |
| AL | Phillips, Jim | Republican | House | Lost Primary | \$27,200 |
| OR | Cowan, Jean | Democrat | House | Lost | \$26,006 |
| TOTAL | | | | | \$382,407 |

*Office listed represents most recent election.

¹¹ "View Contributions," *Citizens For Housing & Urban Growth* [on-line]; available from <http://www.housingandurbangrowth.com/ViewContributions.asp>; Internet; accessed April 13, 2007.

¹² "About Conservation Resources, LLC," *Conservation Resources, LLC* [on-line]; available from <http://www.conservation-resources.com/about.html>; Internet; accessed April 13, 2007.

APPENDIX A: ENERGY, PRO-ENVIRONMENTAL & ALTERNATIVE ENERGY CONTRIBUTIONS, 2003-2006

| STATE | ENERGY | PRO-ENVIRO | ALT-ENERGY | TOTAL |
|----------------|---------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------|
| California | \$10,259,846 | \$302,839 | \$378,950 | \$10,941,635 |
| Texas | \$7,561,418 | \$143,474 | \$0 | \$7,704,892 |
| Florida | \$4,427,637 | \$108,575 | \$3,500 | \$4,539,712 |
| Illinois | \$3,761,506 | \$23,496 | \$0 | \$3,785,002 |
| Virginia | \$3,359,409 | \$145,623 | \$0 | \$3,505,032 |
| Pennsylvania | \$2,533,146 | \$19,825 | \$0 | \$2,552,971 |
| Ohio | \$2,404,926 | \$22,250 | \$0 | \$2,426,276 |
| Oklahoma | \$2,193,846 | \$9,600 | \$0 | \$2,203,446 |
| Louisiana | \$1,796,278 | \$1,750 | \$0 | \$1,798,028 |
| Michigan | \$1,671,443 | \$90,075 | \$0 | \$1,761,518 |
| New Mexico | \$1,532,688 | \$8,143 | \$16,450 | \$1,557,281 |
| New York | \$1,408,396 | \$34,737 | \$9,750 | \$1,452,883 |
| North Carolina | \$1,211,725 | \$103,547 | \$0 | \$1,315,272 |
| Oregon | \$993,038 | \$260,278 | \$14,500 | \$1,267,816 |
| Indiana | \$1,256,007 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,256,007 |
| Alabama | \$811,300 | \$421,409 | \$2,500 | \$1,235,209 |
| Missouri | \$1,035,202 | \$9,450 | \$0 | \$1,044,652 |
| South Carolina | \$1,002,998 | \$18,750 | \$0 | \$1,021,748 |
| Washington | \$752,705 | \$82,870 | \$9,075 | \$844,650 |
| Georgia | \$760,896 | \$68,871 | \$0 | \$829,767 |
| Nevada | \$707,947 | \$54,376 | \$29,750 | \$792,073 |
| Mississippi | \$749,800 | \$1,400 | \$0 | \$751,200 |
| Maryland | \$650,808 | \$28,286 | \$13,875 | \$692,969 |
| Kansas | \$645,448 | \$7,200 | \$38,507 | \$691,155 |
| New Jersey | \$526,058 | \$0 | \$0 | \$526,058 |
| Iowa | \$463,528 | \$13,900 | \$12,350 | \$489,778 |
| Arkansas | \$425,109 | \$2,250 | \$0 | \$427,359 |
| West Virginia | \$420,385 | \$2,350 | \$0 | \$422,735 |
| Colorado | \$306,243 | \$44,957 | \$0 | \$351,200 |
| North Dakota | \$304,856 | \$0 | \$0 | \$304,856 |
| Idaho | \$286,835 | \$10,224 | \$0 | \$297,059 |
| Kentucky | \$249,475 | \$0 | \$0 | \$249,475 |
| Arizona | \$194,408 | \$4,338 | \$0 | \$198,746 |
| Utah | \$191,375 | \$4,430 | \$0 | \$195,805 |
| Tennessee | \$181,675 | \$1,000 | \$0 | \$182,675 |
| Wisconsin | \$160,203 | \$75 | \$0 | \$160,278 |
| Alaska | \$142,695 | \$16,760 | \$0 | \$159,455 |
| Nebraska | \$124,159 | \$0 | \$20,700 | \$144,859 |
| Hawaii | \$133,172 | \$0 | \$8,650 | \$141,822 |
| Connecticut | \$128,884 | \$3,165 | \$0 | \$132,049 |
| Wyoming | \$131,850 | \$0 | \$0 | \$131,850 |
| Minnesota | \$93,285 | \$11,176 | \$0 | \$104,461 |
| Delaware | \$79,675 | \$0 | \$0 | \$79,675 |
| Montana | \$65,136 | \$11,178 | \$0 | \$76,314 |
| Maine | \$60,580 | \$6,550 | \$2,500 | \$69,630 |
| South Dakota | \$65,025 | \$0 | \$0 | \$65,025 |
| Vermont | \$24,222 | \$1,000 | \$2,850 | \$28,072 |

| STATE | ENERGY | PRO-ENVIRO | ALT-ENERGY | TOTAL |
|---------------|---------------------|--------------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| New Hampshire | \$15,675 | \$7,414 | \$0 | \$23,089 |
| Massachusetts | \$17,675 | \$275 | \$0 | \$17,950 |
| Rhode Island | \$10,650 | \$0 | \$0 | \$10,650 |
| TOTAL | \$58,290,348 | \$2,107,866 | \$563,907 | \$60,962,121 |