



2009 LEGISLATIVE SCORECARD

The Conservation Council of North Carolina is a statewide advocacy organization working for 40 years on behalf of people who want to breathe clean air and drink clean water. Working through our affiliated political action committee, Conservation PAC, we help elect state legislators who make public health and conservation a priority, and we advocate for sound environmental priorities.

2009 LEGISLATIVE SHORT SESSION OVERVIEW

Welcome to the Conservation Council of North Carolina's Legislative Scorecard for the 2009 Long Session of the North Carolina General Assembly. The purpose of this scorecard is to analyze votes made by legislators on issues that are important to the environment. You can see how your elected officials are representing you and how they are prioritizing environmental protections in their votes. Reading this is one step to protecting our environment, acting on the information is the next.

This scorecard is a reflection on how members voted on certain bills during this session. The Scorecard does not score all environmental votes, but represents an array of issues that the environmental community worked on during the session. Items that were on the Common Agenda, a set of priorities identified by many groups before session started, are included. The vote chosen may not be the final vote, but one that more accurately reflects legislators' intentions. We congratulate the twenty-four members that have a perfect score of 100 this year. We are always happy to work with members to help increase their scores.

The *Common Agenda: Priorities for the Environment* once again received critical attention during the session.



While some items passed, some stalled, and others will certainly be dealt with in the future, the Common Agenda continues to be a great tool for environmental groups to rally around in the legislative session. The Common Agenda represents a strategy that groups can use to send a message to legislators about issues of importance in a given session. Be on the lookout for the 2010 short session Common Agenda.

In the following pages, you will see a listing of

legislators, their votes and score for the 2009 Long Session, and scores from past Sessions. There is also a brief description of the specific bills used to calculate the scores and why they are important to the environmental community. More information on specific bills is available at www.ncleg.net.

Scorecards are a great tool to gauge a legislator's stance on important issues affecting the environment. It is a snapshot of the complexities of the legislative landscape of the session. However, it is also important to consider the full range of options a legislator has to champion a bill. From bill sponsorship, "working it" behind closed doors, to floor speeches, a member has many opportunities to show support for a particular issue.

As a constituent, you should ask your elected officials tough questions on the issues that are important to you, and put pressure on them if they are not making the right decisions on environmentally friendly legislation. This is critically important as we go to the polls this year. In order to ensure sound environmental policies, we need to elect candidates that include environmental protection as part of their agenda. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have a question about the scorecard or the rationale behind our thinking.

2010 NC COMMON AGENDA: *PRIORITIES FOR THE ENVIRONMENT*

The 2010 Priorities for the Environment are:

- Water Resource Management
- Healthy Beaches & Inlets
- Growing Solar in North Carolina
- Steep Slope Protections

SCORED BILLS NC HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

[H1] H709 Address Erosion Control Issues. , M11 to concur. This is the first bill that dealt with a common agenda item. For years, the environmental community has battled terminal groins. There is a mountain of research that shows hardened structures destroy the coast and habitat. Robbing the sand from one area for the nourishment of another is not a viable solution. There is more than enough information already out there to shut down this argument once and for all; a study is not needed on this topic. NO was the vote to protect our beaches from the potential harm of terminal groins, but the bill passed 92-21.

[H2] S1018 Ban Certain Single-Use Bags 2nd reading. This bill started out as a statewide ban on plastic bags and got altered in committee to a great pilot program for Dare, Currituck, and Hyde counties. One day, we will get away from the over-use of this petroleum-based product, and this is a great start to solving the problem. There were many constraints in place so that this would only affect a few places in the three counties aforementioned. Voting YES was the pro-conservation vote on this bill when it passed 78-41.

[H3] H148 Congestion Relief/Intermodal Transportation Fund. 2nd reading. This legislation gives voters the option of a self-tax to pay for public transportation. We cannot continue to move forward with status quo on our transportation needs. This bill lets local governments directly address the particular transportation issue they are faced with by allowing them to set a local tax. For some, it may be a light rail system, for others it could be buses for the first time. Moreover, there is a recall provision on the tax if it is deemed not to be working as intended. Funding for infrastructure needs are critical as North Carolina's population continues to grow. A YES vote was a pro-conservation vote to support public transportation funding. The bill passed 77-40.

[H4] S835 Extend Climate Change Commission. 2nd reading. For four years, the state climate change commission has been meeting and listening to experts from around the country report on what is happening in our environment and identify potential solutions to the problems we are facing. This bill extends the commission so they can wrap up their work and make recommendations to the General Assembly. The Committee is expected to have recommendations for the body before the 2010 Short Session begins. YES was the pro-conservation vote, passing 67-50.

[H5] H2 Prohibit Smoking in Certain Public Places. M11 to concur. This was an historic piece of legislation for North Carolina that we considered from indoor air quality point of view. Too many times we forget about the mini-smokestacks emitting over 40 known carcinogens into the immediate air around us. This was quite a positive turn for the environment and public health in North Carolina. ... continued page 7

SCORED BILLS NC SENATE

[S1] H1335 Moratorium on EMC Rule Making. Amendment 1. The original bill was bad enough because it eliminated protections from air toxics standards that are currently in place. However, through legislative magic, this bill became something totally different—limiting the authority of the EMC to do its job as legislated. This amendment was an attempt to make something that was bad for the environment and health of our citizens a slight bit better by narrowing the scope of limitations placed on the EMC. YES was the pro-environment vote, passing 33 to 14.

[S2] H709 Address Erosion Control Issues, 2nd reading. This was an act to put a moratorium on the Coastal Resource Commission from removing sandbags on the coast and also to study the issue of terminal groins on our beaches. Though North Carolina had the foresight to ban these environmentally damaging structures from our beaches years ago, and leading scientists from across the nation still support this ban, private property owners continue to push for these structures to protect their private property. NO was the vote to protect our coasts and keep them public as they were intended. The bill passed the Senate 40-1.

[S3] S1018 Reduce Plastic Bag Use. . M8 to concur. See House notes for more about the bill. This bill establishes a pilot program to ban plastic bags on the coast. A small step in the right direction from what started out as an outright ban on the bags. YES was the pro-conservation vote, passing 44-2.

[S4] H148 Congestion Relief/Intermodal Transportation Fund. 2nd reading. This is a way to create a funding source for our dilapidated transportation system. Read more from the House description above. A YES vote was for creating more options for public transportation, passing 37-9.

[S5] S835 Extend Climate Change Commission. 3rd reading. This legislation extends the legislative Climate Change Commission so they can conclude their work and bring forth recommendations for the 2010 Legislative Session. The Committee is wrapping up and expected to have recommendations for the body before the 2010 short session begins. YES was the pro-conservation vote, passing 33-15.

[S6] H2 Prohibit Smoking in Certain Public Places. 3rd reading. A YES vote was to protect the indoor air quality for citizens of North Carolina. Read more in the House vote descriptions. The bill passed 30-18.

[S7] H239 Restore Water Quality in Jordan Reservoir. 3rd reading. A good compromise as stated above. YES was a vote to start the process of cleaning up this lake, passing 47-0.

.... continued page 7

SCORECARD

HOW TO READ THE SCORECARD

The following bills were ones scored in the 2009 Long Session of the NC General Assembly. It is important to note which version of the bill was scored. Second readings are often more reflective than the third and final reading because members may vote their preference on second reading, but vote with the majority on third, when it is clear what the outcome will be. At the top of the Scorecard tables, you will see a number that correlates with

a bill description; legislators are listed alphabetically, with their votes during the 2009 session, score, and previous average scores.

A "+" is a pro-conservation vote, a "-" is an anti-conservation vote, a "0" indicates a missed vote, which is counted as an anti-conservation vote, while excused absences (E) and excused votes (EV) are not scored. (INC - members did not cast enough votes to score. N/A - no previous voting record.)

House	Party	District	County	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	2009 Long Session	2007-2008 Score	2005-2006 Score
Pro-Env Vote:				No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes		%	%
Adams	D	58	Guilford	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	78	88	88
Alexander, K.	D	107	Meck.	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	INC	N/A
Alexander, M.	D	106	Meck.	+	+	+	E	+	+	+	+	+	100	94	100
Allen	D	49	Franklin	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	67	69	77
Avila	R	40	Wake	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	11	56	N/A
Barnhart	R	82	Cabarrus	-	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	56	54	47
Bell	D	21	Sampson	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	67	63	67
Blackwell	R	86	Burke	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	22	N/A	N/A
Blackwood	R	68	Union	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	33	50	38
Blue	D	33	Wake	NA	NA	+	NA	+	-	NA	+	NA	INC	69	N/A
Blust	R	62	Guilford	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	22	56	55
Boles	R	52	Moore	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	22	N/A	N/A
Bordsen	D	63	Alamance	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	INC	78
Braxton	D	10	Lenoir	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	44	63	N/A
Brisson	D	22	Bladen	-	+	+	+	-	E	+	E	+	71	57	N/A
Brown	R	73	Forsyth	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	22	52	72
Brubaker	R	78	Randolph	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	33	53	INC
Bryant	D	7	Nash	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	78	88	N/A
Burr	R	67	Stanly	-	+	-	-	+	-	+	-	+	44	N/A	N/A
Burriss-Floyd	R	110	Gaston	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	44	N/A	N/A
Carney	D	102	Meck.	-	+	E	+	E	E	+	E	+	80	69	77
Cleveland	R	14	Onslow	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	22	44	54
Coates	D	77	Rowan	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	78	75	67
Cole	D	65	Rockingham	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	44	63	72
Cotham	D	100	Meck.	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	89	82	N/A
Crawford	D	32	Granville	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	0	33	67	65
Current	R	109	Gaston	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	44	64	67
Daughtry	R	26	Johnston	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	E	+	38	50	44
Dickson	D	44	Cumberland	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	78	74	77
Dockham	R	80	Davidson	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	E	25	50	64
Dollar	R	36	Wake	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	44	63	67
Earle	D	101	Meck.	-	+	+	+	-	0	+	-	0	44	56	INC
England	D	112	Rutherford	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	78	75	70
Faison	D	50	Orange	-	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	67	75	67
Farmer-Butterfield	D	24	Wilson	-	+	+	+	+	0	+	-	+	67	93	INC
Fisher	D	114	Buncombe	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	94	89
Floyd, E.	D	43	Cumberland	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	78	N/A	N/A

House	Party	District	County	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	2009 Long Session	2007-2008 Score	2005-2006 Score
Folwell	R	74	Forsyth	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	33	50	67
Frye	R	84	Mitchell	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	22	38	38
Gibson	D	69	Anson	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	67	75	70
Gill	D	33	Wake	-	+	NA	+	NA	NA	+	NA	E	INC	N/A	N/A
Gillespie	R	85	McDowell	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	22	38	44
Glazier	D	45	Cumberland	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	E	100	87	94
Goforth	D	115	Buncombe	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	89	62	72
Goodwin	D	66	Richmond	E	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	E	86	82	83
Grady	R	15	Onslow	-	+	-	+	-	-	+	-	E	38	79	72
Guice	R	113	Transylvania	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	22	N/A	N/A
Gulley	R	103	Meck.	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	22	63	49
Hackney	D	54	Orange	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	INC	INC	100
Haire	D	119	Jackson	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	89	79	86
Hall	D	29	Durham	+	+	+	+	+	+	E	+	+	100	94	INC
Harrell	D	41	Wake	+	+	+	E	+	-	+	+	+	88	81	N/A
Harrison	D	57	Guilford	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	100	100
Hill	D	20	Columbus	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	44	75	60
Hilton	R	96	Catawba	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	11	38	49
Holliman	D	81	Davidson	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	E	+	75	69	72
Holloway	R	91	Stokes	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	22	38	54
Howard	R	79	Davie	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	0	33	78	INC
Hughes	D	18	New Hanover	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	78	INC	N/A
Hurley	R	70	Randolph	-	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	56	63	N/A
Iler	R	17	Brunswick	-	-	NA	-	NA	NA	+	NA	+	40	N/A	N/A
Ingle	R	64	Alamance	-	-	NA	-	NA	NA	+	NA	-	20	N/A	N/A
Insko	D	56	Orange	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	88	INC
Jackson	D	39	Wake	E	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	88	N/A	N/A
Jeffus	D	59	Guilford	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	78	82	75
Johnson	R	83	Cabarrus	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	44	72	67
Jones	D	60	Guilford	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	67	88	83
Justice	R	16	Pender	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	67	94	83
Justus	R	117	Henderson	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	22	69	67
Killian	R	105	Meck.	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	22	47	N/A
Langdon	R	28	Johnston	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	22	38	60
Lewis	R	53	Harnett	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	22	69	52
Love	D	51	Lee	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	67	81	N/A
Lucas	D	42	Cumberland	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	78	66	77
Luebke	D	30	Durham	E	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	E	100	100	100
Mackey	D	99	Meck.	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	78	N/A	N/A
Martin	D	34	Wake	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	88	100
McComas	R	19	New Hanover	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	56	63	68
McCormick	R	92	Yadkin	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	33	N/A	N/A
McElraft	R	13	Carteret	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	56	43	N/A
McGee	R	75	Forsyth	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	0	22	56	73
McLawnhorn	D	9	Pitt	E	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	E	86	79	93
Michaux	D	31	Durham	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	78	80	65
Mills	R	95	Iredell	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	22	N/A	N/A
Mobley	D	5	Hertford	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	78	75	N/A

House	Party	District	County	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	2009 Long Session	2007-2008 Score	2005-2006 Score
Moore	R	111	Cleveland	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	22	50	62
Neumann	R	108	Gaston	E	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	63	56	N/A
Owens	D	1	Pasquotank	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	67	69	48
Parmon	D	72	Forsyth	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	+	56	66	86
Pierce	D	48	Scotland	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	78	69	72
Randleman	R	94	Wilkes	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	+	33	N/A	N/A
Rapp	D	118	Madison	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	89	81	94
Rhyne	R	97	Lincoln	+	-	0	-	-	0	+	-	+	33	N/A	N/A
Ross	D	38	Wake	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	E	75	88	100
Sager	R	11	Wayne	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	22	N/A	N/A
Samuelson	R	104	Meck.	+	-	-	+	-	-	E	+	+	50	INC	N/A
Setzer	R	89	Catawba	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	22	46	60
Spear	D	2	Washington	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	44	69	INC
Stam	R	37	Wake	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	33	69	67
Starnes	R	87	Caldwell	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	22	69	55
Steen	R	76	Rowan	-	+	-	-	+	-	+	-	+	44	44	55
Stevens	R	90	Surry	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	22	N/A	N/A
Stewart	D	25	Nash	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	67	N/A	N/A
Stiller	R	17	Brunswick	NA	NA	-	NA	+	E	NA	-	NA	INC	75	65
Sutton	D	47	Robeson	0	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	56	63	72
Tarleton	D	93	Watauga	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	89	74	N/A
Tillis	R	98	Meck.	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	E	38	47	N/A
Tolson	D	23	Edgecombe	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	67	74	77
Tucker	D	4	Duplin	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	E	63	63	73
Underhill	D	3	Craven	+	+	+	+	+	E	+	+	E	100	INC	83
Wainright	D	12	Craven	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	78	86	66
Warren, E.	D	8	Pitt	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	67	75	77
Warren, R.	D	88	Alexander	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	67	63	N/A
Weiss	D	35	Wake	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	100	100
West	R	120	Cherokee	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	22	33	44
Whilden	D	116	Buncombe	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	89	N/A	N/A
Wiley	R	61	Guilford	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	33	69	54
Wilkins	D	55	Person	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	+	56	63	78
Williams	D	6	Beaufort	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	44	75	67
Womble	D	71	Forsyth	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	78	66	75
Wray	D	27	Northampton	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	78	75	INC
Yongue	D	46	Scotland	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	67	68	70

Senate	Party	District	County	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	2009 Long Session	2007-2008 Score	2005-2006 Score
Pro-Env Vote:				Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes			
Albertson	D	10	Duplin	+	-	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	80	77	85
Allran	R	42	Catawba	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	60	65	83
Apodaca	R	48	Henderson	-	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	70	44	69
Atwater	D	18	Chatham	+	E	+	E	+	+	+	+	E	E	100	79	92

+ pro-conservation vote - anti-conservation vote 0 missed vote counted as anti-conservation vote E excused absence
 EV excused votes are not scored INC members did not cast enough votes to score N/A no previous voting record

Senate	Party	District	County	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	2009 Long Session	2007-2008 Score	2005-2006 Score
Basnight	D	1	Dare	+	-	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	80	79	61
Berger, D	D	7	Franklin	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	80	77	100
Berger, P	R	26	Rockingham	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	40	35	59
Bingham	R	33	Davidson	+	E	E	E	+	+	+	+	E	E	100	62	83
Blake	R	22	Moore	-	E	+	+	-	E	+	+	+	-	63	42	61
Blue	D	14	Wake	+	E	+	+	NA	NA	+	+	+	+	100	69(H)	N/A
Boseman	D	9	New Han.	E	E	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	79	77
Brock	R	34	Davie	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	30	52	54
Brown	R	6	Onslow	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	E	+	+	44	35	61
Brunstetter	R	31	Forsyth	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	E	+	+	78	45	INC
Clary	R	46	Cleveland	-	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	70	69(H)	NC(H)
Clodfelter	D	37	Meck.	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	90	79	75
Dannelly	D	38	Meck.	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	90	70	76
Davis	D	5	Greene	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	90	N/A	N/A
Dorsett	D	28	Guilford	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	90	79	85
East	R	30	Surry	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	50	35	54
Foriest	D	24	Alamance	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	90	71	N/A
Forrester	R	41	Gaston	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	60	65	61
Garrou	D	32	Forsyth	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	E	+	+	78	78	76
Goodall	R	35	Union	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	50	31	54
Goss	D	45	Watauga	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	90	65	N/A
Graham	D	40	Meck.	+	E	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	80	80
Hartsell	R	36	Cabarrus	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	90	66	77
Hoyle	D	43	Gaston	+	-	+	+	E	-	+	E	+	+	75	66	69
Hunt	R	15	Wake	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	60	73	83
Jacumin	R	44	Burke	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	50	50	55
Jenkins	D	3	Edgecombe	+	-	+	+	+	+	E	E	+	+	88	68	92
Jones	D	4	Halifax	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	90	65	N/A
Kinnaird	D	23	Orange	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	100	100
McKissick	D	20	Durham	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	90	92	N/A
Nesbitt	D	49	Buncombe	+	-	E	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	89	65	85
Preston	R	2	Carteret	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	70	42	72(H)
Purcell	D	25	Scotland	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	90	71	77
Queen	D	47	Haywood	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	90	73	N/A
Rand	D	19	Cumberland	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	90	79	76
Rouzer	R	12	Johnston	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	50	N/A	N/A
Rucho	R	39	Meck.	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	50	N/A	N/A
Shaw	D	21	Cumberland	+	0	E	+	+	+	+	E	+	+	88	68	70
Snow	D	50	Cherokee	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	90	65	84
Soles	D	8	Columbus	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	90	71	69
Stein	D	16	Wake	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	90	N/A	N/A
Stevens	R	17	Wake	E	E	E	+	+	+	E	E	E	E	INC	71	77
Swindell	D	11	Nash	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	80	68	77
Tillman	R	29	Randolph	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	60	59	61
Vaughan	D	27	Guilford	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	90	N/A	N/A
Weinstein	D	13	Robeson	E	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	89	68	69

+ pro-conservation vote - anti-conservation vote 0 missed vote counted as anti-conservation vote E excused absences are not scored
 EV excused votes are not scored INC members did not cast enough votes to score N/A no previous voting record

NC HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES Continued _____

A YES was the pro-conservation (and pro-health) vote when the bill passed 62-56.

[H6] H1429 Clarify the New NC Drought Response. 2nd reading. The drought legislation that passed two years ago was a tremendous accomplishment in protecting our water resources in times of drought. The original bill was designed to clarify and improve the State's preparedness and response to drought conditions. It is never a good idea to revisit a bill and tweak it unnecessarily before the bill has even been put to a test. H1429 was a bill designed to "fix" portions of the original drought legislation that have never even been tested by supporting no regulation of private wells. The original legislation was not intended to be used to regulate private wells, but this 2009 legislation was a reaction to the perceived impact on private wells; this was not necessary. Re-opening a bill can create an opportunity to weaken it, as was the case with several amendments that were considered for this bill. We have already witnessed two of the worst droughts in recorded history in the past decade, and that was addressed in the 2008 legislation. This legislation was an opposition-driven tactic to weaken a consensus based piece of legislation from 2008. NO was the pro-environment vote, but the bill passed 100 to 12.

[H7] H239 Restore Water Quality in Jordan Reservoir. M11 to concur. This bill has been in the works over the last decade and was a culmination of a lot of hard work. This bill begins the slow and tedious process of cleaning up this impaired water supply. It is also important because it will be the first lake to go through this process and may set the precedent for future watershed cleanup. Stakeholders on both sides of the issue worked diligently to craft this piece of consensus legislation. While it is not perfect, it is a step in the right direction. YES was the pro-environment vote, passing 108-9.

[H8] H1079 Energy-Efficient State Motor Fleet. . 2nd reading. This is a simple bill requiring the Department of Administration to give preference to energy efficient motor

vehicles being considered for the state fleet. One would think it is innocuous enough, but a lot went in to this bill. Cars in the top 15% of efficiency are to be considered. The State needs to lead by example, and this bill will do that while lowering emissions from inefficient cars. YES was the pro conservation vote, passing 60 to 55.

[H9] S968 Mountain Resources Planning. 2nd reading. This Common Agenda priority would help create a planning commission for the most Western counties in our state which have unique development issues. While no funding was provided, the legislation requires collaboration across western North Carolina. The Commission will help champion growth and development for the region while protecting the natural heritage that makes it such a unique place. A YES vote would help protect our mountains for years to come, and the bill passed 101 to 3.

NC SENATE Continued _____

[S8] H1079 Energy-Efficient State Motor Fleet. 2nd reading. See above for more information. A YES vote was to change the way the state purchases cars for the motor fleet and to make them more energy efficient. The bill passed 43-0.

[S9] S968 Mountain Resources Planning. 2nd reading. Thanks for all who voted to help protect our valuable Mountain Resources. The Commission is starting to form and begins meeting soon. YES was the pro-conservation vote, passing 47-0.

[S10] H1099 Amend Environmental Laws of 2009. 2nd Reading. An annual bill to make any needed changes to laws from the session. The bill addresses several things and usually passes by a large margin. This one had a couple of issues that made it a little different from ones in the past. It would have created the Yadkin River Trust to help North Carolina acquire and prepare to operate the hydro facility on the Yadkin River in the event of the FERC giving the state the power. YES was the pro conservation vote, passing 45-2.

THE FILTHY FIFTY??????????

In the 2007 Long Session, we began pointing out some members with less than stellar voting records for the session. In that particular session, there were 17 members who obtained the label of Dirty Dozen or Filthy Five.

When looking over this year's Scorecard, we noticed that there were a lot more people with a very low score. In the Senate, 8 members had a 50% or lower score, and for some of them, that was an improvement. In the House, over 35 members scored 35% or less, with 26 at or below 25%.

There are a lot of factors that could explain this significant downturn. With the economy being in a recession, members are more focused on an economic recovery rather than

protecting our natural resources. Or this could have been reflective on the nature of the bills that were scored and voted on this session.

Whatever the case may be, when moving forward, the health of our economy cannot come at the cost of a healthy environment; the health of our communities and quality of life are part of the reason businesses choose to come to North Carolina, and tourism is a significant portion of our economy.

When the economy recovers, and it will, we do not want to look back on history and be embarrassed at the condition we have left our state in.

NOW THAT YOU KNOW THE SCORE...

Join Conservation Council Today

to help hold our legislators accountable!

\$50 Individual Member Other \$ _____

Name: _____

Address: _____

City: _____

State: _____ Zip: _____

Phone: _____

Email: _____

Please make your check payable to CCNC, or use

MC Visa: Expiration Date: _____

Card#: _____

Signature: _____

Your membership supports CCNC's advocacy programs, and is not tax-deductible. Please return payment to:
CCNC PO Box 12671 Raleigh, NC 27605

AVERAGE PARTY SCORES

House

Republicans	32%	57%	57%
Democrats	76%	76%	78%

Total House

57% 67% 69%

Senate

Republicans	60%	51%	66%
Democrats	89%	74%	80%

Total Senate

78% 66% 75%

919.839.0066 | www.conservationcouncilnc.org

Conservation Council of North Carolina
PO Box 12671 Raleigh, NC 27605



2009 LEGISLATIVE SCORECARD