

LOBBY WATCH



TEXANS FOR PUBLIC JUSTICE 609 W. 18TH ST., SUITE E, AUSTIN, TX 78701 PH: (512)472-9770 FAX: (512)472-9830

Wisdom of Solomons:

June 1, 2011

Bob the Builder's DNA Soils House Floor Where HOA Reform Was DOA

Opponents of Homeowners Association Reform Got 5X More Money From Bob Perry and Two Related PACs Than Did Reformers

Last Tuesday House members put their mouths where their money is—killing reform of anti-consumer Homeowners Associations (HOAs). As Carrollton Rep. Burt Solomons tried to pass his reforms (CSSB 142), Weatherford Rep. Phil King proposed the wholesale gutting of Solomons reforms to replace them with a spineless Senate alternative. With 14 members not voting, 73 representatives backed King's motion to eviscerate, overruling the 63 who backed Solomons' reforms. Once again, the legislature pronounced HOA reform DOA.

Angered about another HOA-reform failure, Solomons said, "This is about Bob Perry," referring to the homebuilder who spent \$8.3 million on Texas' last elections.¹ "Last session and this session, he and certain management companies just said, 'Unless it's the way we want it, we're not going to let anything pass.'" Solomons also blamed Bob Perry's lobby firm, HillCo Partners, Texans for Lawsuit Reform (TLR) chief Dick Weekley (whose brother owns David Weekley Homes) and the Texas Conservative Coalition.²

Was Solomons just whining sour grapes? Running

the numbers, *Lobby Watch* found a persuasive correlation between the amount of money that members took from these lobby powerhouses and how they voted on HOA reform.

Bob Perry is Texas' No. 1 or No. 2 donor (depending on if you combine the \$9.7 million collectively supplied by Steve Mostyn and his plaintiff firm).³ Perry supplied 9 percent of the money raised by Texas' No. 1 political committee: Texans for Lawsuit Reform. And with Perry providing 50 cents of every dollar that it raised, HillCo's lobby PAC ranked No. 23 among Texas PACs. By contrast, the relatively small Texas Conservative Coalition PAC did not give to candidates.

Alleged Killers of HOA Reform

Contributor	Total In 2010 Cycle	Share from Bob Perry	2010 PAC Rank
Bob Perry	\$8,296,140	100%	NA
TLR PAC	\$6,887,155	9%	No. 1
HillCo PAC	\$894,629	50%	No. 23
Conserv. Coaliton	\$86,347	0%	No. 138

Table shows total raised for PACs and total spent for Bob Perry.

On Average Opponents of HOA Reform Got Five Times More Money From Bob Perry, Texans for Lawsuit Reform and HillCo Than Did Reformers

House HOA-Reform Vote (Count)	Bob Perry Amount	Perry % of Total	TLR PAC Amount	TLR % of Total	HillCo PAC Amount	HillCo % of Total	Three-Donor Total	Three-Donor %	House Total Raised 2010 Cycle
Pro-Reform (63)	\$433,000	3%	\$425,602	3%	\$147,388	1%	\$1,005,990	6%	\$16,986,583
Anti-Reform (73)	\$1,522,000	6%	\$4,320,099	16%	\$169,907	1%	\$6,012,006	22%	\$27,661,971
Not Voting (4)	\$205,000	3%	\$37,482	<1%	\$33,771	<1%	\$276,253	3%	\$7,967,753
Absent (10)	\$44,500	2%	\$10,000	<1%	\$32,194	1%	\$86,694	3%	\$2,925,119
All House (150)	\$2,204,500	4%	\$4,793,183	9%	\$383,260	1%	\$7,380,943	13%	\$55,541,426

Bob Perry, Texans for Lawsuit Reform PAC and HillCo PAC spent a stunning total of \$14,821,337 on Texas' 2010 election cycle.⁴ They gave half of that money (\$7,380,943) directly to the 150 current members of the Texas House. In fact, this trio supplied *13 percent* of the \$55.5 million that current House members raised for their 2010 campaigns.

Although the big-three contributors backed House members who supported and opposed HOA reform, the two camps are noticeably different. The more than \$6 million that the big three gave to the 73 members who voted to gut HOA reform accounted for a remarkable *22 percent of all the money that those anti-reformers raised* in the 2010 cycle.

By contrast, the more than \$1 million that the big three gave to the 63 members who backed Solomons on HOA reform accounted for *6 percent of the total money raised by reformers*. The average reform opponent collected \$82,356 from the big three—five times more than the reformer average of \$15,968.

The influence of the big three stands out at the extremes of the bell curve. The 18 most-dependent members tapped the big three for anywhere from 20 percent to 74 percent of their total 2010 warchests. Just one of these dependent members voted for HOA reform: Houston Democrat Sylvester Turner. The only other Democrat on the most-dependent list, El Paso's Naomi Gonzalez, had the highest dependency quotient. Before voting to kill HOA reform, Gonzalez got 74 cents of every dollar she raised from the big three.

So omnipotent are the big three that just three House members did not take a dime from any of them during the 2010 cycle. These untouchables—Amarillo Republican John Smittee and Houston Democrats Alma Allen and Borris Miles—all backed the Solomons reforms.

Thirty-five members took 1 percent or less of their campaign money from the big three (including the untouchables). Two-thirds of these least-dependent members voted for HOA reform. Seven least-dependent members voted to gut reform (20%) and five missed the vote (14%).

House Members Most Dependent On the Big 3 Stiffed HOA Reform

House Member	Dist.	Party	Total Raised For 2010	Share From Big 3 Donors	HOA-Reform Vote
Gonzalez	76	D	\$452,102	74%	N
Beck	57	R	\$931,920	71%	N
Carter	102	R	\$1,377,540	53%	N
Landtroop	85	R	\$830,726	52%	N
Gonzales, L	52	R	\$1,197,410	51%	N
Zedler	96	R	\$753,993	47%	N
Lavender	1	R	\$539,283	38%	N
Burkett	101	R	\$857,444	34%	N
Nash	93	R	\$349,905	34%	N
Aliseda	35	R	\$379,551	32%	N
Turner	139	D	\$345,285	31%	Y
Scott	34	R	\$745,683	29%	N
Cain	3	R	\$851,293	28%	N
Schwertner	20	R	\$339,580	27%	P
Torres	33	R	\$359,121	26%	N
Sheets	107	R	\$529,307	25%	N
Margo	78	R	\$908,695	23%	N
Garza	117	R	\$170,522	20%	N

Reform Votes: N = No; Y = Yes; P = Present, Not Voting.

With 59 Anti-Reform Votes, the Big-Three-Dependent GOP Needed Some Democrats To Kill HOA Reform

	No. of Members	Total Raised For 2010	Share From Big 3 Donors	Members Backing HOA Reform	Members Opposing HOA Reform	Members Not Voting
Dem.	49 (33%)	\$11,305,198	6%	30 (61%)	14 (29%)	5 (10%)
Rep.	101 (67%)	\$44,236,228	15%	33 (33%)	59 (58%)	9 (9%)

The big three account for 15 percent of all the money raised by the House's 101 Republicans. This dependency quotient is more than twice that of the House's 49 Democrats, who got six percent of their money from Bob Perry, HillCo and Texans for Lawsuit Reform. When HOA reform was on the line, 58 percent of House Republicans voted to kill the reforms, joined by 29 percent of Democrats. The 59 anti-reform Republicans would not have prevailed without Democratic aid. They enlisted 14 Democrats to kill the reforms.

While the Texas Conservative Coalition did not dole out campaign funds, Phil King and the other 12 House members who sit on the coalition's board wield influence with the nine senators and 69 House members who signed the coalition's "Pledge with Texans." Except for Pampa Rep. Warren Chisum, who backed Solomons, every other member of the Texas Conservative Coalition's board voted to gut HOA reform. Two-thirds of the 69 House members who signed the coalition's pledge voted to gut HOA reform, compared to the 26 percent of those signatories who backed Solomons.⁵

One Senate signatory of the coalition pledge was Dallas Republican John Carona, whose [Associa Co.](#) manages controversial homeowners associations. Since 2008, Carona and his wife have given \$25,000 to the campaign of Dallas Democratic Senator Royce West—author of the Senate's spineless HOA bill.

HOA reform did not die of natural causes. It was murder.

House Members Least Dependent On Big 3 Embraced HOA Reform

Member	Dist.	Party	Total Raised For 2010	Share From Big 3 Donors	HOA-Reform Vote
Allen	131	D	\$53,910	0%	Y
Miles	146	D	\$28,075	0%	Y
Smithee	86	R	\$76,975	0%	Y
Coleman	147	D	\$547,881	0%	N
Hernandez	143	D	\$109,007	0%	Y
Hochberg	137	D	\$182,170	0%	Y
Howard	48	D	\$353,383	0%	Y
Vo	149	D	\$249,614	0%	Y
Alonzo	104	D	\$91,805	1%	N
Anchia	103	D	\$293,368	1%	Y
Castro	125	D	\$119,475	1%	Y
Deshotel	22	D	\$125,210	1%	Y
Dukes	46	D	\$110,784	1%	A
Dutton	142	D	\$80,205	1%	Y
Eiland	23	D	\$639,383	1%	A
Eissler	15	R	\$384,667	1%	A
Farrar	148	D	\$174,201	1%	Y
Gallego	74	D	\$632,036	1%	N
Giddings	109	D	\$122,878	1%	Y
Gutierrez	119	D	\$162,091	1%	Y
Hamilton	19	R	\$147,362	1%	N
King, T	80	D	\$154,093	1%	N
Kolkhorst	13	R	\$409,608	1%	A
Lozano	43	D	\$391,801	1%	N
McClendon	120	D	\$161,124	1%	Y
Menendez	124	D	\$246,300	1%	Y
Munoz	36	D	\$226,874	1%	N
Naishtat	49	D	\$136,221	1%	Y
Oliveira	37	D	\$336,491	1%	A
Pickett	79	D	\$202,631	1%	Y
Quintanilla	75	D	\$91,436	1%	Y
Raymond	42	D	\$485,455	1%	Y
Solomons	65	R	\$504,923	1%	Y
Veasey	95	D	\$198,964	1%	Y
Villarreal	123	D	\$327,357	1%	Y

Reform Votes: N = No; Y = Yes; A = Absent.

*"Divide the living child in two, and give half to the one, and half to the other."
--King Solomon, 1 Kings 3:25*

House Member Votes on HOA Reform and Contributions From Bob Perry, Texans for Lawsuit Reform and HillCo PAC

House Member	Dist.	Party	HOA Reform Vote	B. Perry Amount	Perry % of Total	HillCo Amount	HillCo % of Total	TLR PAC Amount	TLR % of Total	Total From All 3 Donors	3-Donor % of Total	Total Raised For 2010
Aliseda*	35	R	N	\$27,500	7%	\$3,000	1%	\$89,252	24%	\$119,752	32%	\$379,551
Allen	131	D	Y	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$53,910
Alonzo	104	D	N	\$0	0%	\$1,000	1%	\$0	0%	\$1,000	1%	\$91,805
Alvarado	145	D	Y	\$7,500	6%	\$1,500	1%	\$45	0%	\$9,045	8%	\$118,993
Anchia	103	D	Y	\$0	0%	\$2,500	1%	\$0	0%	\$2,500	1%	\$293,368
Anderson, C*	56	R	Y	\$45,000	6%	\$1,000	<1%	\$76,175	11%	\$122,175	17%	\$706,901
Anderson, R	106	R	N	\$5,000	2%	\$2,500	1%	\$29,377	14%	\$36,877	18%	\$209,863
Aycock*	54	R	N	\$0	0%	\$1,500	2%	\$2,000	2%	\$3,500	4%	\$84,581
Beck*	57	R	N	\$22,500	2%	\$2,500	<1%	\$639,477	69%	\$664,477	71%	\$931,920
Berman♥	6	R	N	\$0	0%	\$500	1%	\$1,000	2%	\$1,500	2%	\$64,884
Bohac*	138	R	N	\$42,500	6%	\$3,500	<1%	\$15,577	2%	\$61,577	8%	\$758,682
Bonnen	25	R	A	\$2,500	1%	\$2,000	1%	\$2,000	1%	\$6,500	3%	\$220,526
Branch	108	R	N	\$50,000	4%	\$8,000	1%	\$12,008	1%	\$70,008	5%	\$1,352,593
Brown*	14	R	Y	\$12,500	8%	\$1,000	1%	\$1,000	1%	\$14,500	10%	\$150,922
Burkett*	101	R	N	\$67,500	8%	\$2,500	<1%	\$217,673	25%	\$287,673	34%	\$857,444
Burnam	90	D	P	\$0	0%	\$3,271	2%	\$0	0%	\$3,271	2%	\$160,653
Button*	112	R	N	\$7,500	3%	\$500	<1%	\$2,000	1%	\$10,000	4%	\$242,877
Cain*	3	R	N	\$55,000	6%	\$1,500	<1%	\$182,073	21%	\$238,573	28%	\$851,293
Callegari*	132	R	N	\$0	0%	\$500	<1%	\$2,000	1%	\$2,500	2%	\$162,760
Carter*	102	R	N	\$205,000	15%	\$5,000	<1%	\$516,706	38%	\$726,706	53%	\$1,377,540
Castro	125	D	Y	\$0	0%	\$1,000	1%	\$0	0%	\$1,000	1%	\$119,475
Chisum♥	88	R	Y	\$0	0%	\$1,000	1%	\$2,000	1%	\$3,000	2%	\$152,225
Christian♥	9	R	N	\$5,000	3%	\$3,000	2%	\$2,500	2%	\$10,500	7%	\$143,412
Coleman	147	D	N	\$1,000	<1%	\$1,500	<1%	\$0	0%	\$2,500	<1%	\$547,881
Cook*	8	R	Y	\$10,000	3%	\$1,000	<1%	\$2,032	1%	\$13,032	4%	\$302,638
Craddick*	82	R	N	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$2,000	4%	\$2,000	4%	\$50,450
Creighton♥	16	R	N	\$2,500	1%	\$500	<1%	\$2,000	1%	\$5,000	2%	\$223,893
Crownover*	64	R	N	\$0	0%	\$1,000	1%	\$2,021	1%	\$3,021	2%	\$160,451
Darby	72	R	Y	\$0	0%	\$2,500	1%	\$2,000	1%	\$4,500	2%	\$282,214
Davis, J	129	R	Y	\$40,000	16%	\$2,500	1%	\$2,500	1%	\$45,000	18%	\$254,876
Davis, S	134	R	N	\$17,500	5%	\$2,000	1%	\$25,000	7%	\$44,500	12%	\$357,038
Davis, Y	111	D	N	\$0	0%	\$4,500	3%	\$0	0%	\$4,500	3%	\$165,784
Deshotel	22	D	Y	\$0	0%	\$1,000	1%	\$0	0%	\$1,000	1%	\$125,210
Driver,*	113	R	N	\$20,000	3%	\$1,000	<1%	\$5,000	1%	\$26,000	4%	\$667,589
Dukes	46	D	A	\$0	0%	\$1,500	1%	\$0	0%	\$1,500	1%	\$110,784
Dutton	142	D	Y	\$0	0%	\$1,000	1%	\$0	0%	\$1,000	1%	\$80,205
Eiland	23	D	A	\$0	0%	\$5,090	1%	\$0	0%	\$5,090	1%	\$639,383
Eissler*	15	R	A	\$0	0%	\$2,500	1%	\$2,000	1%	\$4,500	1%	\$384,667
Elkins*	135	R	Y	\$0	0%	\$1,500	1%	\$2,000	1%	\$3,500	2%	\$164,863
Farias	118	D	Y	\$0	0%	\$2,100	2%	\$0	0%	\$2,100	2%	\$103,417
Farrar	148	D	Y	\$0	0%	\$2,500	1%	\$0	0%	\$2,500	1%	\$174,201
Fletcher*	130	R	N	\$0	0%	\$1,500	1%	\$10,000	6%	\$11,500	7%	\$154,629
Flynn♥	2	R	N	\$30,000	10%	\$2,760	1%	\$5,000	2%	\$37,760	13%	\$293,863
Fruzzo	84	R	N	\$25,000	9%	\$3,500	1%	\$10,000	4%	\$38,500	14%	\$270,236
Gallego	74	D	N	\$0	0%	\$6,415	1%	\$0	0%	\$6,415	1%	\$632,036
Garza*	117	R	N	\$7,500	4%	\$1,000	1%	\$25,019	15%	\$33,519	20%	\$170,522
Geren	99	R	Y	\$5,000	1%	\$7,500	1%	\$4,500	1%	\$17,000	2%	\$766,312
Giddings	109	D	Y	\$1,000	1%	\$741	1%	\$0	0%	\$1,741	1%	\$122,878
Gonzales, L	52	R	N	\$305,000	25%	\$2,500	<1%	\$308,353	26%	\$615,853	51%	\$1,197,410
Gonzales, V	41	D	Y	\$1,000	<1%	\$5,479	1%	\$0	0%	\$6,479	2%	\$410,466

Gonzalez	76	D	N	\$0	0%	\$2,500	1%	\$330,705	73%	\$333,205	74%	\$452,102
Gooden*	4	R	Y	\$15,000	5%	\$2,665	1%	\$25,095	9%	\$42,761	15%	\$276,526
Guillen	31	D	N	\$5,000	5%	\$1,500	1%	\$5,000	5%	\$11,500	11%	\$102,650
Gutierrez	119	D	Y	\$0	0%	\$1,300	1%	\$0	0%	\$1,300	1%	\$162,091
Hamilton	19	R	N	\$0	0%	\$1,500	1%	\$0	0%	\$1,500	1%	\$147,362
Hancock*	91	R	N	\$30,000	10%	\$2,000	1%	\$2,000	1%	\$34,000	12%	\$287,753
Hardcastle*	68	R	Y	\$5,000	4%	\$1,000	1%	\$2,000	2%	\$8,000	7%	\$116,300
Harless	126	R	A	\$15,000	7%	\$2,580	1%	\$2,000	1%	\$19,580	9%	\$209,819
Harper-Br.♥	105	R	N	\$45,000	5%	\$3,000	<1%	\$108,930	13%	\$156,930	18%	\$866,798
Hartnett	114	R	N	\$5,000	3%	\$3,500	2%	\$0	0%	\$8,500	4%	\$196,098
Hernandez	143	D	Y	\$0	0%	\$500	<1%	\$0	0%	\$500	<1%	\$109,007
Hilderban*	53	R	Y	\$0	0%	\$2,000	1%	\$2,000	1%	\$4,000	2%	\$221,135
Hochberg	137	D	Y	\$0	0%	\$500	<1%	\$0	0%	\$500	<1%	\$182,170
Hopson	11	R	Y	\$35,000	6%	\$4,000	1%	\$23,397	4%	\$62,397	10%	\$628,018
Howard, C*	26	R	A	\$0	0%	\$1,000	1%	\$2,000	1%	\$3,000	2%	\$142,814
Howard, D	48	D	Y	\$0	0%	\$1,624	<1%	\$0	0%	\$1,624	<1%	\$353,383
Huberty*	127	R	N	\$52,500	12%	\$1,000	<1%	\$10,000	2%	\$63,500	15%	\$424,184
Hughes♥	5	R	N	\$0	0%	\$3,367	3%	\$0	0%	\$3,367	3%	\$128,488
Hunter*	32	R	Y	\$30,000	3%	\$15,477	2%	\$51,861	6%	\$97,338	11%	\$918,287
Isaac*	45	R	N	\$10,000	2%	\$2,500	<1%	\$25,000	4%	\$37,500	7%	\$563,230
Jackson*	115	R	Y	\$0	0%	\$500	1%	\$3,500	4%	\$4,000	4%	\$93,583
Johnson	100	D	N	\$10,000	3%	\$3,000	1%	\$2,000	1%	\$15,000	4%	\$380,907
Keffer	60	R	Y	\$0	0%	\$3,500	1%	\$2,000	1%	\$5,500	2%	\$308,236
King, P♥	61	R	N	\$30,000	13%	\$4,000	2%	\$3,500	1%	\$37,500	16%	\$236,393
King, S	71	R	Y	\$0	0%	\$1,500	1%	\$2,000	1%	\$3,500	2%	\$199,288
King, T	80	D	N	\$0	0%	\$1,000	1%	\$0	0%	\$1,000	1%	\$154,093
Kleinschmidt*	17	R	Y	\$30,000	5%	\$1,500	<1%	\$15,563	3%	\$47,063	9%	\$552,582
Kolkhorst*	13	R	A	\$0	0%	\$1,023	<1%	\$2,000	0%	\$3,023	1%	\$409,608
Kuempel	44	R	Y	\$0	0%	\$2,500	<1%	\$25,000	5%	\$27,500	5%	\$511,737
Landtroop*	85	R	N	\$42,500	5%	\$2,500	<1%	\$390,952	47%	\$435,952	52%	\$830,726
Larson	122	R	N	\$0	0%	\$1,500	1%	\$10,018	4%	\$11,518	4%	\$272,411
Laubenberg♥	89	R	N	\$0	0%	\$1,500	1%	\$2,000	1%	\$3,500	2%	\$160,615
Lavender*	1	R	N	\$2,500	0%	\$1,500	<1%	\$199,786	37%	\$203,786	38%	\$539,283
Legler*	144	R	N	\$40,000	8%	\$1,000	<1%	\$27,221	5%	\$68,221	13%	\$530,788
Lewis*	81	R	Y	\$0	0%	\$1,500	1%	\$5,000	3%	\$6,500	4%	\$163,287
Lozano	43	D	N	\$1,000	<1%	\$1,500	<1%	\$2,000	1%	\$4,500	1%	\$391,801
Lucio	38	D	N	\$26,500	11%	\$2,000	1%	\$13,606	5%	\$42,106	17%	\$251,404
Lyne	69	R	Y	\$2,500	1%	\$1,500	1%	\$10,000	5%	\$14,000	7%	\$212,406
Madden*	67	R	N	\$0	0%	\$2,015	1%	\$24,515	14%	\$26,530	15%	\$171,447
Mallory C	110	D	N	\$0	0%	\$1,804	3%	\$0	0%	\$1,804	3%	\$53,036
Margo	78	R	N	\$22,500	2%	\$5,000	1%	\$177,854	20%	\$205,354	23%	\$908,695
Marquez	77	D	Y	\$0	0%	\$2,000	2%	\$15,250	12%	\$17,250	14%	\$123,528
Martinez, T	116	D	N	\$5,000	2%	\$5,000	2%	\$0	0%	\$10,000	4%	\$265,127
Martinez, A	39	D	A	\$6,000	3%	\$1,500	1%	\$0	0%	\$7,500	4%	\$200,899
McClendon	120	D	Y	\$0	0%	\$1,500	1%	\$0	0%	\$1,500	1%	\$161,124
Menendez	124	D	Y	\$0	0%	\$1,500	1%	\$0	0%	\$1,500	1%	\$246,300
Miles	146	D	Y	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$28,075
Miller, D*	73	R	N	\$0	0%	\$2,000	1%	\$5,000	3%	\$7,000	4%	\$157,135
Miller, S*	59	R	N	\$2,500	2%	\$1,000	1%	\$2,500	2%	\$6,000	5%	\$118,348
Morrison♥	30	R	N	\$0	0%	\$1,000	1%	\$2,000	1%	\$3,000	2%	\$149,332
Munoz	36	D	N	\$1,000	<1%	\$0	0%	\$2,023	1%	\$3,023	1%	\$226,874
Murphy*	133	R	N	\$72,500	10%	\$2,500	<1%	\$42,904	6%	\$117,904	17%	\$702,413
Naishtat	49	D	Y	\$0	0%	\$1,500	1%	\$0	0%	\$1,500	1%	\$136,221
Nash	93	R	N	\$32,500	9%	\$5,032	1%	\$81,152	23%	\$118,684	34%	\$349,905
Oliveira	37	D	A	\$1,000	<1%	\$1,500	<1%	\$0	0%	\$2,500	1%	\$336,491
Orr*	58	R	Y	\$10,000	4%	\$500	<1%	\$9,183	4%	\$19,683	8%	\$241,730

Otto*	18	R	Y	\$0	0%	\$3,000	1%	\$2,000	1%	\$5,000	2%	\$239,923
Parker♥	63	R	N	\$0	0%	\$1,000	1%	\$2,000	1%	\$3,000	2%	\$191,611
Patrick*	94	R	N	\$0	0%	\$7,620	7%	\$2,000	2%	\$9,620	8%	\$116,115
Paxton♥	70	R	N	\$0	0%	\$3,367	1%	\$2,000	1%	\$5,367	2%	\$293,836
Pena	40	R	Y	\$11,000	10%	\$1,000	1%	\$3,500	3%	\$15,500	15%	\$106,000
Perry	83	R	N	\$20,000	9%	\$1,000	<1%	\$10,000	4%	\$31,000	14%	\$223,246
Phillips*	62	R	N	\$2,500	2%	\$3,027	3%	\$2,023	2%	\$7,550	7%	\$100,757
Pickett	79	D	Y	\$0	0%	\$2,053	1%	\$0	0%	\$2,053	1%	\$202,631
Pitts	10	R	Y	\$20,000	3%	\$4,000	1%	\$2,000	<1%	\$26,000	3%	\$758,487
Price*	87	R	N	\$0	0%	\$5,000	1%	\$10,044	2%	\$15,044	3%	\$525,349
Quintanilla	75	D	Y	\$0	0%	\$1,000	1%	\$0	0%	\$1,000	1%	\$91,436
Raymond	42	D	Y	\$0	0%	\$3,500	1%	\$0	0%	\$3,500	1%	\$485,455
Reynolds	27	D	N	\$0	0%	\$1,000	1%	\$2,000	2%	\$3,000	2%	\$126,685
Riddle*	150	R	N	\$10,000	5%	\$500	<1%	\$2,000	1%	\$12,500	6%	\$211,841
Ritter	21	R	Y	\$0	0%	\$3,000	2%	\$0	0%	\$3,000	2%	\$184,700
Rodriguez	51	D	Y	\$0	0%	\$3,031	2%	\$0	0%	\$3,031	2%	\$133,306
Schwertner	20	R	P	\$80,000	24%	\$1,000	<1%	\$10,000	3%	\$91,000	27%	\$339,580
Scott	34	R	N	\$42,500	6%	\$2,500	<1%	\$173,294	23%	\$218,294	29%	\$745,683
Sheets	107	R	N	\$25,000	5%	\$0	0%	\$108,120	20%	\$133,120	25%	\$529,307
Sheffield*	55	R	N	\$0	0%	\$1,500	1%	\$2,020	1%	\$3,520	3%	\$139,042
Shelton*	97	R	N	\$0	0%	\$2,500	2%	\$2,000	1%	\$4,500	3%	\$157,442
Simpson	7	R	Y	\$0	0%	\$1,000	1%	\$10,000	6%	\$11,000	6%	\$170,931
Smith, T	92	R	A	\$20,000	7%	\$13,500	5%	\$0	0%	\$33,500	12%	\$270,129
Smith, W*	128	R	Y	\$0	0%	\$3,000	2%	\$2,023	1%	\$5,023	3%	\$171,026
Smithee	86	R	Y	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$76,975
Solomons	65	R	Y	\$0	0%	\$5,000	1%	\$0	0%	\$5,000	1%	\$504,923
Strama	50	D	Y	\$5,000	1%	\$1,500	<1%	\$42,500	12%	\$49,000	13%	\$366,125
Straus	121	R	P	\$115,000	2%	\$25,000	<1%	\$25,482	<1%	\$165,482	2%	\$6,891,869
Taylor, L♥	24	R	N	\$12,500	4%	\$2,500	1%	\$28,645	9%	\$43,645	13%	\$331,261
Taylor, N	66	R	Y	\$0	0%	\$2,500	1%	\$10,000	4%	\$12,500	5%	\$266,745
Thompson	141	D	Y	\$20,000	5%	\$9,955	2%	\$2,000	<1%	\$31,955	7%	\$432,742
Torres*	33	R	N	\$17,500	5%	\$2,500	1%	\$75,000	21%	\$95,000	26%	\$359,121
Truitt*	98	R	P	\$10,000	2%	\$4,500	1%	\$2,000	<1%	\$16,500	3%	\$575,652
Turner	139	D	Y	\$105,000	30%	\$3,500	1%	\$0	0%	\$108,500	31%	\$345,285
Veasey	95	D	Y	\$0	0%	\$1,531	1%	\$0	0%	\$1,531	1%	\$198,964
Villarreal	123	D	Y	\$0	0%	\$3,500	1%	\$0	0%	\$3,500	1%	\$327,357
Vo	149	D	Y	\$0	0%	\$1,000	<1%	\$0	0%	\$1,000	<1%	\$249,614
Walle	140	D	Y	\$0	0%	\$1,517	2%	\$0	0%	\$1,517	2%	\$77,868
Weber*	29	R	N	\$5,000	3%	\$1,500	1%	\$2,500	2%	\$9,000	6%	\$155,063
White	12	R	N	\$22,500	8%	\$1,000	<1%	\$5,000	2%	\$28,500	10%	\$281,232
Woolley*	136	R	Y	\$0	0%	\$1,914	3%	\$2,500	4%	\$4,414	6%	\$68,814
Workman*	47	R	Y	\$17,500	2%	\$2,500	<1%	\$62,977	8%	\$82,977	11%	\$775,588
Zedler*	96	R	N	\$32,500	4%	\$4,000	1%	\$314,752	42%	\$351,252	47%	\$753,993
Zerwas*	28	R	Y	\$5,000	1%	\$4,000	1%	\$2,000	<1%	\$11,000	3%	\$423,605

Reform Votes: N = No; Y = Yes; A = Absent; P = Present, Not Voting.

♥ Texas Conservative Coalition board member.

* Signed Texas Conservative Coalition pledge.

¹ "HOA Bill Dies In House," *Dallas Morning News*, May 25, 2011.

² "Solomons Pulls Down HOA Bill After King Prevails With Floor Substitute," *Quorum Report*, May 24, 2011.

³ Mostyn's firm spent \$7,625,679; John and Amber Mostyn spent another \$2,088,639.

⁴ This number equals the total amount that the HillCo and TLR PACs *spent* in the 2010 cycle, *plus* what Bob Perry gave to political committees other than HillCo and TLR. This differs from what appears in the "Alleged Killers of HOA Reform" table. It shows the share of money that HillCo and TLR PACs *raised from* Bob Perry.

⁵ Among the signatories, 46 opposed reform, 18 supported it and five didn't vote on the measure (7 percent).