



## CONSERVATION VOTERS LEGISLATIVE SCORECARD

North Carolina League of Conservation Voters 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.

### 2010 LEGISLATIVE SHORT SESSION OVERVIEW

Welcome to North Carolina League of Conservation Voters's Legislative Scorecard for the 2010 Short Session of the North Carolina General Assembly. This scorecard is designed to help you hold state leaders accountable for their environmental decisions. By reading this Scorecard, you can see how your State Representative and Senator voted on key environmental issues, use this information to evaluate your elected representatives, and follow up with the lawmakers who represent you.

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. Among these votes are items from the



**2010 NC Common Agenda: Priorities for the Environment:** water allocation, protecting our beaches from hardened structures, solar energy, and steep slopes protections. These priorities are the collective priorities identified by the broader environmental community each year, and determine the priorities for Conservation Voters's own legislative agenda. Be sure to be on the lookout for the 2011 Common Agenda.

The 2010 Short Session featured an unusually determined effort by legislators to finish the budget and work on little else. In a time of severe economic hardship, legislators were very focused on passing the budget and initiatives to create jobs. Despite the business-like agenda, which saw the budget pass on schedule for the first time since 2003, a number of environmental matters were still addressed. From the *Common Agenda*, legislation was introduced on every issue: laws that will promote solar energy and help manage our precious water resources more wisely were passed, threats to our public beaches were stopped, and legislation to

protect our steep slopes from detrimental development was thoroughly discussed (though not passed). In addition, as a result of the horrible BP oil spill in the Gulf, we saw needed protections pass on the matter of offshore drilling.

However, this Session also presented one of the worst pieces of environmental legislation that we've seen in a long time pass: Senate Bill 778 exempts businesses that receive economic incentives from key State Environmental Policy Act requirements. (See H5, S3, S5 inside for more details.)

While this Legislative Session was a mixture of positive and negative environmental bills, congratulations are in order for the thirty legislators who had perfect voting records. These individuals each scored a flawless one hundred percent in the Short Session, and deserve credit for prioritizing the environment in a difficult economic year.

However, 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.

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.

## HOUSE VOTE DESCRIPTIONS

**[H1] SB 836 Oil Spill Liability, Response, and Preparedness**, 2nd Reading. This bill clarifies language in existing law to ensure that, in the event of a spill affecting the state, liable parties would be fully responsible for damages to public resources and the cost of cleanup. It also instructs the Coastal Resources Commission to review and update existing rules regarding offshore facilities, and directed responsible State agencies to update NC's Oil Spill Contingency Plan to include the possibility of oil from the BP spill impacting our coast. Finally, it revises the Coastal Area Management Act (CAMA) to review all offshore oil and gas facilities and insure that NC's laws and interests are properly addressed in federal decisions regarding these facilities. With the disaster of the Gulf fresh in everyone's mind, the bill was approved unanimously, with YES being the pro-conservation vote.

**[H2] HB 1829 Renewable Energy Incentives**, R3 for Adoption. This Common Agenda priority promotes solar power and renewable energy through various incentives, including: credit for constructing renewable energy facilities, greater tax incentives for investment in renewable energy property, reinstating and expanding tax credits for renewable energy facilities to include major component subassemblies for solar arrays and wind turbines, clarifying local government authority to offer financing for renewables and efficiency, as well as other incentives. This bill is a positive step toward creating job growth in an industry with an extraordinarily bright future. After undergoing two minor amendments in the Senate, the bill passed 84-19 where YES was the pro-conservation vote.

**[H3] HB 1804 Energy Policy Council Green Energy Study**, 2nd Reading. This bill simply directed the Energy Policy Council to research and recommend policies to the General Assembly that would promote energy efficiency and conservation, lower CO2 emissions, and increase the development of renewable energy sources. The bill passed 83-32 in the House, but did not pass out of committee in the Senate. YES was the pro-conservation vote.

**[H4] HB 1743 Improve River Basin Modeling**, M11 to Concur. Better management of our water resources was a priority on the Common Agenda, and this bill generates important information by charging scientists from the Division of Water Resources to develop models for each of North Carolina's seventeen major river basins. These models will then be used to predict the impact of water withdrawal proposals on river health and human and essential uses. Currently, North Carolina lacks monitoring methods to determine whether a proposed withdrawal will damage river health or downstream users. Information from these models will allow businesses and municipalities to make responsible and productive decisions on

... continued on Page 7

## SENATE VOTE DESCRIPTIONS

**[S1] SB 836 Oil Spill Liability, Response, and Preparedness**, Motion 8/To Concur. This bill is more fully described in the House section (H1). Although action on this bill came down to the last few days in the Senate, the bill came out of committee and passed in the Senate 46-2 where YES was the vote to help protect our coasts.

**[S2] HB 1829 Renewable Energy Incentives**, 2nd Reading. As noted in the House, this was a Common Agenda priority, serving to promote solar power. For a more extensive account of the bill, please see the H2 vote description above. The bill passed unanimously, with YES being the vote for a better future.

**[S3] HB 1973 Various Economic Incentives**, Amendment 4. The biggest setback for the environment started simply as an amendment to a much larger bill in the Senate. What eventually would become a crucial part of SB 778, Application of the SEPA to Incentives, began as this House Bill amendment. The amendment reversed a key environmental victory recently won in the courts where the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) was judged to apply to private projects that benefit from public "economic incentives" payments. SEPA requires a comprehensive environmental review process be completed when a private project requires a state action (e.g., issuing a permit), has the potential to cause environmental harm, and the project receives public money or uses public lands. A recent court decision had ruled that economic incentive payments were sufficient to meet the public money criteria and trigger the need for an environmental review. This amendment completely reversed that decision, and unfortunately passed easily 45-3. NO was the pro-conservation vote. The amendment would eventually become part of SB 778 and pass through both chambers (see the H5 and S5 vote descriptions).

**[S4] HB 1743 Improve River Basin Modeling**, 2nd Reading. See H4 vote description above for a fuller description of this bill. A good piece of legislation and on the Common Agenda, the Senate passed this bill 42-6 where YES was the vote for better management of our water resources.

**[S5] SB 778 Application of the State Environmental Policy Act to Incentives**, Motion 8\To Concur. This was the final act in the drama over the reversal on SEPA. Because this was the most detrimental and far-reaching piece of environmental legislation this Session, we are scoring it twice (amendment and final vote). Starting in the Senate as an amendment to HB 1973 (see S3), and passed through the House as a separate bill (see H5), the bill came up for a final vote in the Senate. The bill easily passed in the Senate 43-2 where NO was the vote to protect our environment.

... continued on Page 7

# SCORECARD

## HOW TO READ THE SCORECARD

The following bills were ones scored in the 2010 Short 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 below; legislators are listed alphabetically, with their votes during the 2010 session, their 2010 score, and their previous average scores listed. 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	2010 Short Session	2009 Long Session	2009-2010 Average	2007-2008 Average	2005-2006 Average
<b>Pro Env. Vote:</b>				<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes</b>					
Adams	D	58	Guilford	+	+	+	+	-	E	80	78	79	88	88
Alexander, K.	D	107	Mecklenburg	+	+	+	+	-	+	83	100	92	INC	N/A
Alexander, M.	D	106	Mecklenburg	+	E	+	E	E	E	100	100	100	94	100
Avila	R	40	Wake	+	-	-	+	-	+	50	11	31	56	N/A
Barnhart	R	82	Cabarrus	+	+	+	+	-	+	83	56	70	54	47
Bell	D	21	Sampson	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	67	84	63	67
Blackwell	R	86	Burke	+	-	-	+	+	-	50	22	36	N/A	N/A
Blackwood	R	68	Union	+	-	-	+	-	+	50	33	42	50	38
Blust	R	62	Guilford	+	-	-	+	+	+	67	22	44	56	55
Boles	R	52	Moore	+	+	-	+	-	+	67	22	44	N/A	N/A
Bordsen	D	63	Alamance	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	100	100	INC	78
Braxton	D	10	Lenoir	+	+	+	+	-	+	83	44	64	63	N/A
Brisson	D	22	Bladen	+	+	+	+	-	+	83	71	77	57	N/A
Brown	R	73	Forsyth	+	-	+	+	+	+	83	22	53	52	72
Brubaker	R	78	Randolph	+	+	-	+	+	+	83	33	58	53	INC
Bryant	D	7	Nash	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	78	89	88	N/A
Burr	R	67	Stanly	+	-	-	+	-	+	50	44	47	N/A	N/A
Burris-Floyd	R	110	Gaston	+	+	-	+	-	+	67	44	55	N/A	N/A
Carney	D	102	Mecklenburg	E	+	E	+	+	+	100	80	90	69	77
Cleveland	R	14	Onslow	+	-	-	+	+	+	67	22	44	44	54
Coates	D	77	Rowan	+	+	+	+	-	+	83	78	81	75	67
Cole	D	65	Rockingham	+	+	+	+	-	+	83	44	64	63	72
Cotham	D	100	Mecklenburg	+	E	+	+	+	+	100	89	95	82	N/A
Crawford	D	32	Granville	+	-	+	+	-	+	67	33	50	67	65
Current	R	109	Gaston	+	+	-	+	-	+	67	44	55	64	67
Daughtry	R	26	Johnston	+	E	+	+	E	E	100	38	69	50	44
Dockham	R	80	Davidson	+	+	+	+	-	+	83	25	54	50	64
Dollar	R	36	Wake	+	+	+	+	-	+	83	44	64	63	67
Earle	D	101	Mecklenburg	+	-	+	+	+	+	83	44	64	56	INC
England	D	112	Rutherford	+	+	+	+	-	+	83	78	81	75	70
Faison	D	50	Orange	+	+	+	E	-	+	80	67	74	75	67
Farmer-Butterfield	D	24	Wilson	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	67	84	93	INC
Fisher	D	114	Buncombe	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	100	100	94	89
Floyd	D	43	Cumberland	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	78	89	N/A	N/A
Folwell	R	74	Forsyth	+	-	-	+	-	+	50	33	42	50	67
Frye	R	84	Mitchell	+	+	+	+	-	+	83	22	53	38	38

House	Party	District	County	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	2010 Short Session	2009 Long Session	2009-2010 Average	2007-2008 Average	2005-2006 Average
Gibson	D	69	Anson	+	+	+	+	-	+	83	67	75	75	70
Gill	D	33	Wake	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	INC	INC	N/A	N/A
Gillespie	R	85	McDowell	+	+	+	+	-	+	83	22	53	38	44
Glazier	D	45	Cumberland	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	100	100	87	94
Goforth	D	115	Buncomb	+	+	+	+	-	+	83	89	86	62	72
Goodwin	D	66	Richmond	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	86	93	82	83
Grady	R	15	Onslow	+	E	+	+	+	+	100	38	69	79	72
Guice	R	113	Transylvania	+	-	+	+	-	+	67	22	44	N/A	N/A
Gulley	R	103	Mecklenburg	E	+	E	+	-	+	75	22	49	63	49
Hackney	D	54	Orange	0	0	0	0	0	0	INC	INC	INC	INC	100
Haire	D	119	Jackson	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	89	95	79	86
Hall	D	29	Durham	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	100	100	94	INC
Harrison	D	57	Guilford	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	100	100	100	100
Heagarty	D	41	Wake	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hill	D	20	Brunswick	+	+	+	+	-	+	83	44	64	75	60
Hilton	R	96	Catawba	+	+	-	+	-	+	67	11	39	38	49
Holliman	D	81	Davidson	+	+	+	+	-	+	83	75	79	69	72
Holloway	R	91	Stokes	+	-	-	+	-	+	50	22	36	38	54
Howard	R	79	Davie	+	+	-	+	-	+	67	33	50	78	INC
Hughes	D	18	New Hanover	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	78	89	INC	N/A
Hurley	R	70	Randolph	+	-	-	+	+	+	67	56	61	63	N/A
Iler	R	17	Brunswick	+	+	-	+	-	+	67	40	53	N/A	N/A
Ingle	R	64	Alamance	+	+	+	+	-	+	83	20	52	N/A	N/A
Insko	D	56	Orange	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	100	100	88	INC
Jackson	D	39	Wake	+	-	+	+	+	+	83	88	86	N/A	N/A
Jeffus	D	59	Guilford	+	+	+	+	-	+	83	78	81	82	75
Johnson	R	83	Cabarrus	+	+	+	+	-	+	83	44	64	72	67
Jones	D	60	Guilford	+	-	+	+	-	-	50	67	59	88	83
Justice	R	16	Pender	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	67	84	94	83
Justus	R	117	Henderson	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	22	61	69	67
Killian	R	105	Mecklenburg	E	-	E	+	-	+	50	22	36	47	N/A
Langdon	R	28	Johnston	+	+	-	+	-	+	67	22	44	38	60
Lewis	R	53	Harnett	+	+	-	+	-	+	67	22	44	69	52
Love	D	51	Lee	+	+	+	+	-	+	83	67	75	81	N/A
Lucas	D	42	Cumberland	+	+	+	E	-	E	75	78	77	66	77
Luebke	D	30	Durham	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	100	100	100	100
Mackey	D	99	Mecklenburg	+	-	+	+	-	-	50	78	64	N/A	N/A
Martin	D	34	Wake	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	100	100	88	100
May	D	49	Franklin	+	+	+	+	-	+	83	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
McComas	R	19	New Hanover	+	+	+	+	-	+	83	56	70	63	68
McCormick	R	92	Yadkin	+	-	-	E	-	E	25	33	29	N/A	N/A
McElraft	R	13	Carteret	+	-	-	+	-	+	50	56	53	43	N/A
McGee	R	75	Forsyth	+	-	-	+	-	+	50	22	36	56	73
McLawhorn	D	9	Pitt	+	+	+	+	-	+	83	86	85	79	93
Michaux	D	31	Durham	+	-	+	+	-	+	67	78	72	80	65
Mills	R	95	Iredell	+	+	-	+	-	+	67	22	44	N/A	N/A
Mobley	D	5	Hertford	+	+	+	+	-	+	83	78	81	75	N/A
Moore	R	111	Cleveland	+	-	-	+	-	+	50	22	36	50	62

House	Party	District	County	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	2010 Short Session	2009 Long Session	2009-2010 Average	2007-2008 Average	2005-2006 Average
Neumann	R	108	Gaston	+	+	+	+	-	+	83	63	73	56	N/A
Owens	D	1	Pasquotank	+	+	+	+	-	+	83	67	75	69	48
Parfitt	D	44	Cumberland	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Parmon	D	72	Forsyth	+	+	+	-	-	+	67	56	61	66	86
Pierce	D	48	Scotland	+	+	+	E	-	+	80	78	79	69	72
Randleman	R	94	Wilkes	+	-	-	+	+	+	67	33	50	N/A	N/A
Rapp	D	118	Madison	+	+	+	+	-	+	83	89	86	81	94
Rhyne	R	97	Lincoln	+	+	+	+	-	E	80	33	57	N/A	N/A
Ross	D	38	Wake	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	75	88	88	100
Sager	R	11	Wayne	+	+	-	+	-	+	67	22	44	N/A	N/A
Samuelson	R	104	Mecklenburg	+	E	+	+	E	+	100	50	75	INC	N/A
Setzer	R	89	Catawba	+	-	-	+	-	+	50	22	36	46	60
Spear	D	2	Washington	+	+	+	+	-	+	83	44	64	69	INC
Stam	R	37	Wake	+	-	-	+	-	+	50	33	42	69	67
Starnes	R	87	Caldwell	+	E	-	+	+	+	80	22	51	69	55
Steen	R	76	Rowan	+	-	-	+	-	+	50	44	47	44	55
Stevens	R	90	Surry	+	+	-	+	-	+	67	22	44	N/A	N/A
Stewart	D	25	Nash	+	+	+	+	E	+	100	67	84	N/A	N/A
Sutton	D	47	Robeson	+	E	+	E	-	E	67	56	61	63	72
Tarleton	D	93	Watauga	+	+	+	+	-	+	83	89	86	74	N/A
Tillis	R	98	Mecklenburg	+	+	-	+	-	+	67	38	52	47	N/A
Tolson	D	23	Edgecombe	+	+	+	+	-	+	83	67	75	74	77
Tucker	D	4	Duplin	+	E	+	-	E	+	75	63	69	63	73
Underhill	D	3	Craven	+	+	+	-	-	+	67	100	83	INC	83
Wainwright	D	12	Craven	+	+	+	+	-	+	83	78	81	86	66
Warren, E.	D	8	Pitt	+	+	+	+	-	+	83	67	75	75	77
Warren, R.	D	88	Alexander	+	+	+	+	-	+	83	67	75	63	N/A
Weiss	D	35	Wake	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	100	100	100	100
West	R	120	Cherokee	+	+	-	+	-	+	67	22	44	33	44
Whilden	D	116	Buncomb	+	+	+	+	-	+	83	89	86	N/A	N/A
Wiley	R	61	Guilford	+	+	+	+	-	+	83	33	58	69	54
Wilkins	D	55	Person	+	+	+	+	-	+	83	56	70	63	78
Williams	D	6	Beaufort	+	+	+	+	-	+	83	44	64	75	67
Womble	D	71	Forsyth	+	+	+	+	-	+	83	78	81	66	75
Wray	D	27	Northampton	+	+	+	+	-	+	83	78	81	75	INC
Yongue	D	46	Scotland	E	E	E	E	E	E	INC	67	INC	68	70

Senate	Party	District	County	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	2010 Short Session	2009 Long Session	2009-2010 Average	2007-2008 Average	2005-2006 Average
<b>Pro Env. Vote:</b>				<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>					
Albertson	D	10	Duplin	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	75	80	78	77	85
Allran	R	42	Catawba	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	75	60	68	65	83
Apodaca	R	48	Henderson	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	63	70	66	44	69
Atwater	D	18	Chatham	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	75	100	88	79	92
Basnight	D	1	Dare	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	63	80	71	79	61

+ 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	2010 Short Session	2009 Long Session	2009-2010 Average	2007-2008 Average	2005-2006 Average
Berger, D	D	7	Franklin	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	88	80	84	77	100
Berger, P	R	26	Rockingham	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	50	40	45	35	59
Bingham	R	33	Davidson	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	63	100	81	62	83
Blake	R	22	Moore	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	13	63	38	42	61
Blue	D	14	Wake	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	63	100	81	69 H	N/A
Boseman	D	9	New Han.	+	E	+	E	-	-	+	E	60	100	80	79	77
Brock	R	34	Davie	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	50	30	40	52	54
Brown	R	6	Onslow	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	50	44	47	35	61
Brunstetter	R	31	Forsyth	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	63	78	70	45	INC
Clary	R	46	Cleveland	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	63	70	66	69 H	INC H
Clodfelter	D	37	Mecklenburg	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	75	90	83	79	75
Dannelly	D	38	Mecklenburg	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	63	90	76	70	76
Davis	D	5	Greene	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	75	90	83	N/A	N/A
Dickson	D	19	Cumberland	+	E	-	E	-	+	+	E	60		30		
Dorsett	D	28	Guilford	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	63	90	76	79	85
East	R	30	Surry	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	63	50	56	35	54
Foriest	D	24	Alamance	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	63	90	76	71	N/A
Forrester	R	41	Gaston	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	50	60	55	65	61
Garrou	D	32	Forsyth	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	63	78	70	78	76
Goodall	R	35	Union	+	E	-	E	E	-	+	E	50	50	50	31	54
Goss	D	45	Watauga	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	63	90	76	65	N/A
Graham	D	40	Mecklenburg	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	63	100	81	80	80
Hartsell	R	36	Cabarrus	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	63	90	76	66	77
Hoyle	D	43	Gaston	E	+	-	+	-	E	+	+	67	75	75	66	69
Hunt	R	15	Wake	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	75	60	68	73	83
Jacumin	R	44	Burke	+	+	-	+	E	-	+	+	71	50	61	50	55
Jenkins	D	3	Edgecombe	+	+	-	+	EV	-	+	+	71	88	79	68	92
Jones	D	4	Halifax	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	63	90	76	65	N/A
Kinnaird	D	23	Orange	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	88	100	94	100	100
McKissick	D	20	Durham	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	38	90	64	92	N/A
Nesbitt	D	49	Buncombe	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	63	89	76	65	85
Preston	R	2	Carteret	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	50	70	60	42	72 H
Purcell	D	25	Scotland	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	63	90	76	71	77
Queen	D	47	Haywood	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	63	90	76	73	N/A
Rouzer	R	12	Johnston	+	+	E	-	-	-	E	+	50	50	50	N/A	N/A
Rucho	R	39	Mecklenburg	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	38	50	44	N/A	N/A
Shaw	D	21	Cumberland	-	E	E	E	-	E	E	E	INC	88	INC	68	70
Snow	D	50	Cherokee	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	63	90	76	65	84
Soles	D	8	Columbus	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	63	90	76	71	69
Stein	D	16	Wake	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	90	95	N/A	N/A
Stevens	R	17	Wake	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	75	INC	INC	71	77
Swindell	D	11	Nash	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	63	80	71	68	77
Tillman	R	29	Randolph	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	50	60	55	59	61
Vaughan	D	27	Guilford	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	63	90	76	N/A	N/A
Walters	D	13	Robeson	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	63	N/A	INC	N/A	N/A

+ 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



how to allocate future water use. North Carolina needs such models to manage the growing demand on its water resources, and to avoid potential emergencies in the future. This Common Agenda priority passed 109-2 where YES was the pro-conservation vote.

**[H5] SB 778 Application of the State Environmental Policy Act to Incentives**, 3rd Reading. This bill became extremely important when the House refused to simply overturn the court decision to apply SEPA to incentives payments by amending HB 1973 (see the description of Amendment 4 to HB 1973 in S3). To their credit, the House wanted a fuller consideration of this important legislation, and so refused to concur with HB 1973. Instead, they ran the measure as part of a separate and more related bill, SB 778. Unfortunately, the legislature placed more importance on streamlining approval of incentive deals than on thorough reviews of environmental impact, opening the door to taxpayer dollars funding environmentally destructive projects without proper consideration. The bill passed 72-35 where NO was the pro-conservation vote. This was one of the worst bills to pass the General Assembly in a long time, and will have far-reaching effects on our environment.

**[H6] HB 1292 University Energy Savings/Local Education Agency Operation**, M11 to Concur. This bill requires all state universities and colleges to report on efforts to increase energy efficiency and make use of alternative energy as part of their annual management plans. Furthermore, the bill provides important incentives to these public institutions by allowing the universities to keep any unused credit balance for their utility bills into the following year's budget. This provides the university a financial incentive to pursue important energy efficiency projects. This bill helps make our proud universities better models of energy management, and with many YES pro-conservation votes, the bill passed the house 108-1.

**[S6] HB 1708 Clean Marinas Amendments**, Amendment 1. The Senate continued the unhappy tradition of trying to overturn NC's sensible ban on terminal groins by amending the otherwise fine Clean Marinas bill. The ban has successfully protected our beaches by preventing the construction of expensive and ultimately counterproductive beach armoring structures on our coastline. Thankfully, the House wisely chose not to take up this misguided, and ultimately damaging, proposal. NO was the pro-conservation vote, but the amendment passed the Senate by a vote of 37-11.

**[S7] SB 1114 Local Energy Efficiency/Renewable**, Motion 8/ To Concur. This bill allows the cities of Chapel Hill, Carrboro, Asheville, Raleigh, and Winston-Salem to avoid competitive bidding requirements for contracts for pilot programs to increase energy efficiency. This would allow a simpler process for moving early-stage energy efficiency projects forward. Another helpful step in advancing the Common Agenda priority of promoting solar energy, the correct vote was YES, and the Senate passed the bill 48-0.

**[S8] HB 1747 Water Supply System Capacity Planning**, 2nd Reading. This bill charges all local governments providing public water services to prepare and submit an amended water allocation plan outlining ideas to address future water demand when average daily demand exceeds 80% of the water supply or seasonal demands exceed 90%. Receiving a favorable report from a study commission before the legislative session began, and also from the Senate Agriculture and Environment committee, the bill passed second reading unanimously where the pro-conservation vote was YES.

## THIRTY-TWO OSTRICHES

Although certainly not the most important vote of the session, the thirty-two legislators who voted against HB 1804, Energy Policy Council Green Energy Study, took an impressive position to keep their heads in the sand. The committee hearings on the bill made it clear that the opponents considered the bill a pre-cursor to stronger action on addressing our looming climate crisis. The talking points were familiar: climate change is a myth, and any action to address the issue will be economically disastrous.

Meanwhile, the very real impacts of our changing climate kept passing them by. Moscow, not exactly a place known for its balmy climate, hit over one hundred degrees for the first time in recorded history. And more than three hundred wildfires across Russia consumed over two hundred thousand acres as the country literally burned under unprecedented heat. The 2010 record snowfalls in

the mid-Atlantic region (dubbed "Snowmageddon") and the string of massive flooding events elsewhere in the country in 2010 were also consistent with projections associated with global warming. Meanwhile the arctic ice is melting so rapidly that the mythic Northwest Passage may finally one day open for shipping. Overall, to date 2010 has been the hottest year on record. And NC's own record heat wave this summer, subsequent drought and the current extreme rainfall and flooding are a local example of our significantly changing climate, including the very real economic impacts of these events.

Far from sparing North Carolina, our state, with our beautiful outer banks and low-lying Eastern counties, will be one of the most impacted areas in the entire United States. Of particular note,

... continued on Page 8

