



CONSERVATION VOTERS LEGISLATIVE SCORECARD

The North Carolina League of Conservation Voters (NCLCV) is a statewide advocacy organization working for over 40 years on behalf of people who want to breathe clean air and drink clean water. We advocate for sound environmental policies at the state legislature, and work to hold our decision-makers accountable for their environmental decisions. Working through our affiliated political action committee, Conservation PAC, we help elect state legislators who make public health and conservation a priority and understand that a healthy environment is critical to North Carolina's communities, economy, and quality of life. *We believe that who you elect matters.*

2011 LEGISLATIVE LONG SESSION OVERVIEW

Welcome to the NCLCV Legislative Scorecard for the 2011 Long Session of the North Carolina General Assembly. This Scorecard is designed to help you hold state leaders accountable for their environmental decisions by tracking how your State Representative and Senator voted on key environmental issues. We urge you to use this information to evaluate your elected representatives, and follow up with the lawmakers who represent you to find out where they stand on the environmental issues you care about.

This Scorecard records members' votes on selected bills from throughout the Session. While the Scorecard is not a comprehensive listing of all votes, the votes recorded here have been selected as the most significant votes cast on the bills with the greatest environmental impact of the session.



NC Common Agenda
Priorities for the Environment

our beaches from hardened structures, reducing wasted water and securing our future growth, and protecting the wise investments we have made from damaging rollbacks. These priorities are the collective priorities identified by the broader environmental community each year, and determine the priorities for NCLCV's own legislative agenda. Be sure to be on the lookout for the 2012 Common Agenda. (For more information, please visit www.nccommonagenda.org.)

For the first time in over 100 years, the General Assembly was led by Republicans who held a majority in both houses, with leadership who is fundamentally committed to an anti-regulatory agenda. This change was accompanied by an influx of many freshman lawmakers. These shifts, in combination with a struggling economic recovery and budget shortfalls, produced more environmentally damaging legislation than we have seen in a long time, much of which was designed to roll back progress our state has made for the environment over the past decade. Using the economy as cover, and repeating unfounded claims that "regulations kill jobs," this General Assembly has put environmental safeguards in their crosshairs.

Decision-makers seemed to act as if North Carolina was the only state recovering from an economic downturn, and blamed North Carolina's environmental protections. However, there is strong evidence that North Carolinians want a healthy environment, and that a healthy environment is vital for a strong and sustainable economy. In fact, North Carolina is ranked by national business publications as one of the top places to do business; these rankings include criteria such as quality of life (and access to natural areas) and fairness of the regulatory environment.

While we anticipated that improving environmental protections would not likely be a priority for this Legislature in this economy, we were not prepared for the onslaught of aggressive environmental rollbacks that started in the early days of session with SJR 17 and SB 22 (see House vote descriptions), and will likely continue till the end, which is currently scheduled to continue through April 2012. We have scored many of the most anti-environmental decisions made by the General Assembly this year, and included two pro-environmental bills. This year's scores are the lowest we have reported since NCLCV has been producing a Scorecard (1999). The average score in the House was 43% compared to 67% for the 2009-2010 average; the Senate average was a mere 27%, compared to 69% in 2009-2010.

Under the premise of improving our economy by "reforming" or eliminating undue burdens posed by regulations, legislators wielded chainsaws against regulations, where a scalpel may have been more appropriate. Reforms may be needed, but the legislature needs to be mindful of the long term repercussions of the scale of reform they are undertaking. Costs AND benefits associated with environmental protections must be accounted for, and a better understanding that our economy has been strong in the past because of our sound environmental policies and regulations is needed. Ironically, legislators have quickly tried to claim responsibility for North Carolina climbing in the business rankings in one national publication, though they had previously dismissed this publication, and in spite of the fact that higher scores do not reflect any of the regulatory rollbacks passed this session.

... continued on back cover

HOUSE VOTE DESCRIPTIONS

[H1] **SJR 17 – Senate Joint Resolution Establish Joint Regulatory Reform Committee (3rd reading).** This Joint Resolution establishes a joint regulatory reform committee tasked with creating a strong environment for private sector job creation by lifting the undue burden imposed by outdated, unnecessary, and vague rules. A major concern is that the Committee is not required to follow standard bill introduction deadlines, which potentially reduces transparency and public oversight of the process. Another concern is that it puts legislators in charge of complex rule-making, rather than agency experts. The Committee called a series of public meetings seeking input on burdensome regulations; while the committee discounted many of the public comments for various reasons, it was clear that North Carolinians prefer common sense environmental regulations over the excessive environmental rollbacks pre-supposed by this Committee. NO was the pro-environment vote, but it passed 117-2.

[H2] **SB 22 – APA Rules: Limit Additional Costs (2nd reading).** This bill prohibits agencies like the Department of Environment and Natural Resources from establishing any new rule which results in “additional costs of \$500,000 on the aggregate of persons subject to the rule” unless “required to respond” to some new legislation, federal rule, court order, or “serious and unforeseen threat.” While every rule will have some costs associated with it, this legislation does not consider the potential benefits, economic or otherwise, of some environmental rules (such as reductions in health care costs when pollution is reduced). Creating regulations that protect the environment does not kill business. In fact, Forbes magazine ranks NC 1st in regulatory environment (even before any regulatory “reforms” from this Session have come into play). This is a short-sighted approach that will potentially have long-term impacts on our quality of life, economy, and environment. NO was the pro-environment vote, but it passed 80-39. (SB 22 was later voided by language in SB 781. See vote description H10.)

 [H3] **SB 110 – Permit Terminal Groins (2nd reading).** This bill authorized the permitting and construction of 4 terminal groins on our inlets under a pilot program. Terminal groins and hardened structures are damaging to our valuable beaches and our economy, protecting some properties at the expense of often public beaches downdrift. They will also increase the cost of managing our beaches, and taxpayers will be forced to cover the escalating costs of moving sand for the long term. Our beaches have historically been protected from terminal groins and we have worked for years to maintain this sound policy as part of the Common Agenda. NO was the pro-environment vote, but it passed 71-46.

[H4] **HB 119 – Amend Environmental Laws 2011 (M11 to Concur).** This bill started out an innocuous bill that was amended to include 23 sections of industry handouts. Some of

SENATE VOTE DESCRIPTIONS

[S1] **SJR 17 – Senate Joint Resolution Establish Regulatory Reform Committee (2nd reading).** See H1 for a full vote description, but this bill takes a chainsaw to a problem where a scalpel was needed. NO was the pro-environment but it passed the Senate unanimously 49-0.

[S2] **SB 22 – APA Rules: Increasing Costs Prohibition (2nd reading).** See H2 for a full vote description. NO was the pro-environment vote, but it passed 49-1.

 [S3] **SB 110 – Permit Terminal Groins (2nd reading).** See H3 for full vote description. NO was the pro-environment vote, but it passed 35-13.

[S4] **SB 183 – Selective Vegetation Removal/State Highways (2nd reading).** See H5 for vote description. NO was pro-environmental vote, but the bill passed 36-13.

[S5] **HB 200 – Appropriations Act of 2011 (3rd reading).** See H6 for detail. NO was the pro-environment vote, but it passed 31-19.

[S6] **HB 200 – Appropriations Act of 2011 (Veto Override).** See H7 for description. NO was the pro-environment vote, but it passed 31-19.

[S7] **H242 – Natural Gas Bond Fee and Landowners Protection Study (Amendment 2).** While H242 was a well thought out first approach to consider hydraulic fracturing in North Carolina (see H8 for more detail), Amendment 2 supplemented language that requires a study that is considerably less thorough than the original study described in H242. NO was the pro-environment vote, but the amendment passed 34-16, significantly weakening the fracking study.

 [S8] **SB 708 – Building Code Rules/Effective Dates (2nd reading).** This bill improves energy conservation in new residential and commercial buildings, and is one of the more positive things to come out this Session. It requires the energy efficiency standards that were passed in 2010 to become effective January 1, 2012. Energy efficiency standards will go up by 15% for residential construction and 30% for commercial construction. YES was the pro-environment vote, and it passed 48-0.

[S9] **SB 709 – Energy Jobs Act (2nd reading).** See H9 for description. NO was the pro-environment vote, but it passed 38-12.

[S10] **SB 709 – Energy Jobs Act (Veto Override).** This bill was Vetoed by the Governor on 6.30.2011, and overridden by the Senate on 7.13.2011. For the bill to become law, the House needs to override the veto, as well. We will continue to work against this bad legislation throughout the remaining Session (which currently continues through April 2012). Again, this

NC SENATE continued on page 7

NC HOUSE continued on page 7

SCORECARD

HOW TO READ THE SCORECARD

Twelve votes were scored in both the House and the Senate; we included both floor votes and override votes on particularly important bills. 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 below. Legislators are listed alphabetically, with their votes during the 2011 session, their 2011 score, previous average, and "lifetime" scores listed. "Lifetime Scores" start in 1999, when our first Legislative Scorecard was published. A "+" is a pro-conservation vote, a "-" is an anti-conservation vote, NV indicates a missed vote, which is counted as an anti-conservation vote. Excused absences and votes (E) are not scored. INC indicates members did not cast enough votes to score. N/A means no previous voting record.

House	Party	District	County	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11	H12	2011 Long Session	2009-2010 Average	Lifetime Score
Pro Environmental Vote:				No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes									
Adams	D	58	Guilford	-	+	+	E	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	82	79	79
Alexander, M.	D	106	Mecklenburg	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	92	92	97
Alexander, K.	D	107	Mecklenburg	-	-	E	+	NV	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	73	100	89
Avila	R	40	Wake	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	17	31	38
Barnhart	R	82	Cabarrus	-	-	-	E	-	-	-	+	-	-	E	+	20	70	50
Bell	D	21	Sampson	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	75	84	72
Blackwell	R	86	Burke	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	17	36	30
Blust	R	62	Guilford	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	17	44	48
Boles, Jr.	R	52	Moore	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	17	44	35
Bordsen	D	63	Alamance	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	92	100	92
Bradley, Jr.	R	49	Franklin	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	17	N/A	17
Brandon, Jr.	D	60	Guilford	-	+	+	NV	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	67	N/A	67
Brawley, Jr.	R	103	Mecklenburg	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	17	N/A	17
Brisson	D	22	Bladen	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	25	77	58
Brown, L.	R	73	Forsyth	-	-	-	-	E	-	-	+	E	-	-	+	20	53	53
Brown, R.	R	81	Davidson	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	27	N/A	27
Brubaker	R	78	Randolph	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	25	58	52
Bryant	D	7	Nash	-	+	+	E	E	+	E	+	E	E	+	+	86	89	88
Burr	R	67	Stanly	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	17	47	37
Carney	D	102	Mecklenburg	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	83	90	84
Cleveland	R	14	Onslow	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	25	44	44
Collins	R	25	Nash	-	-	NV	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	27	N/A	27
Cook	R	6	Beaufort	-	-	-	NV	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	27	N/A	27
Cotham	D	100	Mecklenburg	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	E	+	+	+	+	91	95	89
Crawford, Jr.	D	32	Granville	-	-	-	E	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	18	50	63
Current, Sr.	R	109	Gaston	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	25	55	57
Daughtry	R	26	Johnston	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	17	69	51
Dixon	R	4	Duplin	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	17	N/A	17
Dockham	R	80	Davidson	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	17	54	55
Dollar	R	36	Wake	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	17	64	57
Earle	D	101	Mecklenburg	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	75	64	77
Faircloth, Jr.	R	61	Guilford	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	17	N/A	17
Faison	D	50	Orange	-	-	+	E	-	+	+	+	+	-	E	+	60	74	70
Farmer-Butterfield	D	24	Wilson	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	92	84	87
Fisher	D	114	Buncombe	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	83	100	94
Floyd	D	43	Cumberland	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	83	89	87

House	Party	District	County	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11	H12	2011 Long Session	2009-2010 Average	Lifetime Score
Folwell	R	74	Forsyth	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	17	42	48
Frye	R	84	Mitchell	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	17	53	44
Gill	D	33	Wake	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	83	INC	92
Gillespie	R	85	McDowell	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	17	53	41
Glazier	D	45	Cumberland	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	92	100	95
Goodman	D	66	Richmond	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	67	N/A	67
Graham	D	47	Robeson	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	92	N/A	92
Guice	R	113	Transylvania	-	-	-	E	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	18	44	36
Hackney	D	54	Orange	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	92	INC	98
Hager	R	112	Rutherford	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	17	N/A	17
Haire	D	119	Jackson	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	92	95	91
Hall	D	29	Durham	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	92	100	97
Hamilton	D	18	New Hanover	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	NV	83	N/A	83
Harrison	D	57	Guilford	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	E	+	+	+	+	100	100	100
Hastings	R	110	Gaston	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	17	N/A	17
Hill	D	20	Columbus	-	+	-	E	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	27	64	68
Hilton	R	96	Catawba	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	17	39	38
Hollo	R	88	Alexander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	17	N/A	50
Holloway	R	91	Stokes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	17	36	39
Horn	R	68	Union	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	17	N/A	17
Howard	R	79	Davie	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	17	50	55
Hurley	R	70	Randolph	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	17	61	53
Iler	R	17	Brunswick	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	17	53	41
Ingle	R	64	Alamance	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	25	52	43
Insko	D	56	Orange	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	92	100	97
Jackson	D	39	Wake	+	+	+	E	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	91	86	87
Jeffus	D	59	Guilford	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	83	81	84
Johnson	R	83	Cabarrus	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	17	64	58
Jones, Jr.	U	65	Rockingham	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	17	59	17
Jordan	R	93	Ashe	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	17	N/A	17
Justice	R	16	Pender	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	17	84	75
Keever	D	115	Buncombe	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	92	N/A	92
Killian	R	105	Mecklenburg	-	-	-	-	-	E	-	+	-	-	-	+	18	36	37
Langdon, Jr.	R	28	Johnston	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	25	44	44
LaRoque	R	10	Lenoir	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	17	N/A	49
Lewis	R	53	Harnett	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	17	44	51
Lucas	D	42	Cumberland	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	83	77	74
Luebke	D	30	Durham	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	92	100	99
Martin	D	34	Wake	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	92	100	95
McComas	R	19	New Hanover	-	-	-	E	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	18	70	72
McCormick	R	92	Yadkin	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	17	29	25
McElraft	R	13	Carteret	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	17	53	42
McGee	R	75	Forsyth	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	17	36	54
McGrady	R	117	Henderson	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	58	N/A	58
McGuirt	D	69	Union	N/A	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	73	N/A	73
McLawhorn	D	9	Pitt	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	75	85	88
Michaux, Jr.	D	31	Durham	-	+	-	NV	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	75	72	78
Mills	R	95	Iredell	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	17	44	35

House	Party	District	County	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11	H12	2011 Long Session	2009-2010 Average	Lifetime Score
Mobley	D	5	Hertford	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	83	81	79
Moffitt	R	116	Buncombe	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	17	N/A	17
Moore, R.	D	99	Mecklenburg	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	83	N/A	83
Moore, T.	R	111	Cleveland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	17	36	44
Murry	R	41	Wake	-	-	-	E	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	18	N/A	18
Owens, Jr.	D	1	Pasquotank	-	E	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	18	75	62
Parfitt	D	44	Cumberland	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	92	N/A	96
Parmon	D	72	Forsyth	NV	+	+	E	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	82	61	73
Pierce	D	48	Scotland	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	83	79	75
Pridgen	R	46	Robeson	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	17	N/A	17
Randleman	R	94	Wilkes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	17	50	39
Rapp	D	118	Madison	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	92	86	91
Rhyne, Jr.	R	97	Lincoln	-	-	+	NV	NV	-	-	+	-	-	-	NV	17	57	43
Ross	D	38	Wake	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	92	88	94
Sager	R	11	Wayne	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	17	44	35
Samuelson	R	104	Mecklenburg	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	17	75	58
Sanderson	R	3	Pamlico	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	17	N/A	17
Setzer	R	89	Catawba	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	25	36	44
Shepard	R	15	Onslow	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	17	N/A	17
Spear	D	2	Washington	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	25	64	59
Stam	R	37	Wake	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	17	42	55
Starnes	R	87	Caldwell	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	25	51	43
Steen, II	R	76	Rowan	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	17	47	46
Stevens	R	90	Surry	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	17	44	35
Stone	R	51	Lee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	17	N/A	17
Tillis	R	98	Mecklenburg	-	-	NV	NV	NV	-	-	NV	NV	NV	-	NV	INC	52	40
Tolson	D	23	Edgecombe	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	67	75	78
Torbett	R	108	Gaston	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	17	N/A	17
Wainwright	D	12	Craven	-	+	-	E	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	73	81	79
Warren, E.	D	8	Pitt	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	67	75	77
Warren, H.	R	77	Rowan	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	17	N/A	17
Weiss	D	35	Wake	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	92	100	99
West	R	120	Cherokee	-	-	-	E	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	9	44	37
Wilkins, Jr.	D	55	Person	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	E	+	-	+	E	50	70	67
Womble	D	71	Forsyth	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	83	81	84
Wray	D	27	Northampton	0	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	58	81	73

Senate	Party	District	County	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	S11	S12	2011 Long Session	2009-2010 Average	Lifetime Score
Pro Environmental Vote:				No	Yes	No	No	No	No									
Allran	R	42	Catawba	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	8	68	69
Apodaca	R	48	Henderson	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	8	66	54
Atwater	D	18	Chatham	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	58	88	82
Berger, D.	D	7	Franklin	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	58	84	83
Berger, P.	R	26	Rockingham	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	8	45	49

+ pro-conservation vote - anti-conservation vote NV missed vote counted as anti-conservation vote
 E excused absences/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	S11	S12	2011 Long Session	2009-2010 Average	Lifetime Score
Bingham	R	33	Davidson	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	25	81	70
Blake	R	22	Moore	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	8	38	47
Blue	D	14	Wake	E	-	-	E	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	60	81	83
Brock	R	34	Davie	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	8	40	46
Brown	R	6	Onslow	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	8	47	42
Brunstetter	R	31	Forsyth	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	E	-	E	10	70	54
Clary	R	46	Cleveland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	8	66	57
Clodfelter	D	37	Mecklenburg	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	NV	-	+	-	-	50	83	76
Daniel	R	44	Burke	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	8	N/A	8
Dannelly	D	38	Mecklenburg	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	50	76	78
Davis	R	50	Macon	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	8	N/A	8
East	R	30	Surry	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	8	56	48
Forrester	R	41	Gaston	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	8	55	61
Garrou	D	32	Forsyth	-	-	E	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	45	70	81
Goolsby	R	9	New Hanover	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	8	N/A	8
Graham	D	40	Mecklenburg	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	67	81	79
Gunn	R	24	Alamance	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	8	N/A	8
Harrington	R	43	Gaston	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	8	N/A	8
Hartsell	R	36	Cabarrus	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	8	76	74
Hise	R	47	Mitchell	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	8	N/A	8
Hunt	R	15	Wake	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	25	68	67
Jackson	R	10	Sampson	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	8	N/A	8
Jenkins	D	3	Edgecombe	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	E	-	E	-	E	22	79	72
Jones	D	4	Halifax	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	50	76	65
Kinnaird	D	23	Orange	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	75	94	97
Mansfield	D	21	Cumberland	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	50	N/A	50
McKissick	D	20	Durham	-	-	NV	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	50	64	72
Meredith	R	19	Cumberland	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	25	N/A	25
Nesbitt	D	49	Buncombe	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	50	76	76
Newton	R	11	Wilson	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	8	N/A	8
Pate	R	5	Wayne	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	8	N/A	50
Preston	R	2	Carteret	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	8	60	51
Purcell	D	25	Scotland	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	67	76	81
Rabon	R	8	Brunswick	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	8	N/A	8
Robinson	D	28	Guilford	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	50	N/A	50
Rouzer	R	12	Johnston	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	8	50	36
Rucho	R	39	Mecklenburg	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	17	44	48
Soucek	R	45	Watauga	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	8	N/A	8
Stein	D	16	Wake	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	58	95	83
Stevens	R	17	Wake	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	25	INC	66
Tillman	R	29	Randolph	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	E	-	9	55	53
Tucker	R	35	Union	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	8	N/A	8
Vaughan	D	27	Guilford	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	67	76	73
Walters	D	13	Robeson	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	25	INC	44
White	D	1	Dare	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	50	N/A	50

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

the more troublesome points included: delaying certain sewage treatment plant upgrades needed to help clean up Jordan Lake; reducing minimum setbacks for developers to keep burning debris from away from neighboring properties; removing pollution reduction requirements for biomass facilities; weakening the Neuse and Tar-Pam riparian buffer rules; weakening financial assurances for Hazardous Waste Facilities; expanding exemptions in the dam safety act; and more. NO was the pro-environment vote, but this wish list for polluters passed 64-38.

[H5] SB 183 – Selective Vegetation Removal/State Highways (2nd reading). This bill rolls back our existing policy on billboards that balances business and the environment, and prohibits excessive clear-cutting of trees along our highways. Look forward to a new landscape on your next road trip down Interstate 40. NO was pro-environmental vote, but the bill passed 90-25.

[H6] HB 200 – Appropriations Act of 2011 (2nd reading). This is the biannual budget bill for North Carolina, and it had environmental protections in its crosshairs. The budget makes significant cuts to conservation trust funds, DENR, and the State Energy Office, among many others. Probably even more damaging, the budget also included provisions barring the state from passing any rules more stringent than federal standards. The budget also transferred several agencies out of DENR to Department of Agriculture, which will likely manage our state's forests and soil resources more as commodities, rather than natural resources. DENR's regional offices were also put on notice for justification review in 2012, which means they will likely be targeted for closure by the General Assembly. NO was the pro-environment vote, but it passed 72-47.

[H7] HB 200 – Appropriations Act of 2011 (Veto Override). This budget was so aggressively anti-environmental, we are including the veto override vote, as well. As expected, it passed 73-46, where NO was the pro-environment vote.

[H8] HB 242 – Natural Gas Bond Fee and Landowners Protection Study (2nd reading). HB242 is a well thought out first approach to consider hydraulic fracturing in North Carolina. It mandates and funds the state environmental agency to study the potential impacts of shale gas development in North Carolina and report back to the legislature by May 1, 2012. Rep. Gillespie worked with environmental advocates to make sure many of our concerns were included in the final product. Although there are many concerns about fracking, this bill would have required a thorough study to explore whether or not hydraulic fracturing to extract natural gas could be done safely in North Carolina. YES was the pro-environment vote, and it passed 114-2.

[H9] SB 709 – Energy Jobs Act (3rd reading). Like many bills, bill title is deceiving, and once you start reading, this bill does not pass the smell test. Promoted as a “jobs bill,” it really is an excessive push for fossil fuel exploration and increased consumption, benefiting the oil and gas industry, most likely

at the expense of North Carolina's tourism industry and clean water resources. It steps on executive branch authority, shifts our balanced Energy Policy Council to a pro-industry minded committee, and fast tracks the state towards off shore drilling and fracking. Fracking is a controversial form of drilling for natural gas that has been connected to drinking water contamination in other states. NO was the pro-environment vote, but it passed 68-49

[H10] SB 781 – Regulatory Reform Act of 2011 (2nd reading). Arguably one of the most destructive bills introduced this session (or on record), this bill does not “balance jobs with the environment,” but rather effectively eliminates environmental protections. This bill will ultimately set our state back decades. Of note, NC is currently ranked as one of the top places to do business based on criteria that includes both quality of life/environment and a fair regulatory environment. In effect, this bill increases the bureaucratic process required to protect our environment; environmental agencies lose their ability to enforce regulations and adopt rules, instead placing that power with the General Assembly; and limits our state to federal standards. NO was the pro-environment vote, but it passed 73-45.

[H11] SB 781 – Regulatory Reform Act of 2011 (Veto Override). As one of the worst environmental bills in decades, we applauded Governor Bev Perdue for her veto. Unfortunately, it was quickly overridden, and 781 is now law. NO was the pro-environment vote, but it passed 76-42.



[H12] HB 787 – NC Water Efficiency Act (2nd reading). This bill makes improvements in water efficiency goals for our quickly growing state. Most importantly, it mandates that local water supply plans include a water efficiency plan. The local water efficiency plan would include policies and practices that will result in residential water use at a level that does not exceed 100 gallons for each person per day by 2016, 75 gallons by 2025, and 45 gallons by 2035. This is the type of common sense approach needed to reduce water inefficiencies and meet our growing water needs. YES was the pro-environment vote, and it passed 116-0.

legislation is too important to let pass, so we scored the Senate's veto override. NO was the pro-environment vote, but it passed 31-17.

[S11] SB 781 – Regulatory Reform Act of 2011 (3rd reading). See H10 for detail. NO was the pro-environment vote, but it passed unanimously 49-0.

[S12] SB 781 – Regulatory Reform Act of 2011 (Veto Override). Two wrongs do not make a right so the override vote is included in our Scorecard. It passed the Senate 48-0, becoming one of the worst pieces of environmental legislation in decades.



The *Common Agenda* had mixed results this session, but we had some success on our energy and water priorities. On energy, we passed SB 708, which improves energy efficiency standards for new residential and commercial construction. We also passed HB 787, improving our water efficiency standards. Another success was stopping a bill that would have greatly expanded a financing mechanism for risky nuclear power plants called Construction Work in Progress; concerns over the safety of nuclear energy, spurred by the Fukushima meltdown helped dampen support for this bill.

Unfortunately, we lost our long-term battle against hardened structures on our coast. Our efforts weren't for naught though. The final version of the bill prevents public funding and restricts the number of allowable structures to four.

Our final Common Agenda priority, protecting the wise investments we have made, saw the majority of the most egregious assaults on our environment. These bills included HB 119 which was drafted specifically by some of the State's largest polluters. Another one of the most destructive bills, SB 781, sought to roll back as many environmental protections as possible.

This Legislative Session also saw an unprecedented number of Gubernatorial Vetoes, including one on the budget, and on two anti-environmental bills, SB 709 and SB 781. These bills aim to promote dirty energy and roll back environmental protections, and we appreciate the Governor's vetoes. We will continue to fight against an override of SB 709, the legislation which opens the door for

offshore drilling and hydraulic fracturing. While studies are being implemented to determine if this type of energy extraction can be done safely, we are skeptical that this Legislature will adopt the type of environmental regulations that would be necessary to ensure the soundness of these activities.

Despite the importance of legislators' votes, the Scorecard cannot represent the full complexity of what it takes to be an environmental champion. In everything from sponsoring legislation to actively promoting a pro-environment bill to fellow legislators, legislators have a wide and complicated range of options for supporting or undermining the environment that cannot be fully reflected in a simple score. However, this scorecard reflects historic lows for many members. Members who had perfect lifetime scores got caught in the tsunami of draconian bills being passed, and NCLCV could not let this go unnoticed. However, we would be remiss if we didn't applaud the few that only strayed briefly from pro-conservation votes, or who bucked leadership on environmental issues.

As a result, your work in becoming an educated voter and informed citizen is vital. You should not be afraid to contact your legislator to ask tough questions about the positions they have taken on issues important to you. In order to advance a better and cleaner future, we need environmentally conscious voters in the General Assembly, but that also requires environmentally conscious voters in every county in our state. Therefore, if you need additional information on the environmental issues considered this year by the General Assembly, or have any questions about the Scorecard, do not hesitate to contact us.

AVERAGE PARTY SCORES		2011 Long Session	Average 2009-2010	Average 2007-2008
House				
Republicans	18%	51%	57%	57%
Democrats	75%	81%	76%	76%
Total House	43%	67%	67%	67%
Senate				
Republicans	11%	58%	51%	51%
Democrats	53%	76%	74%	74%
Total Senate	27%	69%	66%	66%

919.839.0006 | www.nclcv.org

PO Box 12671 Raleigh, NC 27605
North Carolina League of Conservation Voters

2011 LEGISLATIVE SCORECARD

CONSERVATION VOTERS

North Carolina League of

