



2008 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.

2008 LEGISLATIVE SHORT SESSION OVERVIEW

Welcome to the Conservation Council's Legislative Scorecard for the 2008 Short Session of the North Carolina General Assembly. By reading this scorecard you have chosen to take an important step to protect NC's environment. The purpose of this scorecard is to analyze the votes of members of the legislature on issues that are important to the environment, so that you can track how well your decision-makers are prioritizing the environmental issues you care about, and help hold them accountable for making better decisions.

With this Scorecard we have tried to accurately portray how a member voted on environmental issues in this session, and this session alone. The votes listed are not a comprehensive list of all votes taken on environmental bills, but represent key issues for the environmental community, including Environmental Priorities identified on the Common Agenda. The votes chosen may not be the final roll call vote, but were the most revealing for each bill.

One thing that stands out about this scorecard is the number of perfect 100% scores. There are 25 perfect scores for this session as compared to only 5 in the previous 2007 Long Session Scorecard. What can this be attributed to? There are many factors that would have to be considered for this jump, including greater public focus on energy and climate issues. However, we would like to give some of the credit to the NC Common Agenda: Priorities for the Environment.



The Common Agenda represents an effort to strengthen our collective environmental clout at the Legislature — we are stronger when we work together. In a landscape where we are consistently outspent and outmaneuvered by the “pollution lobby,” we need to be more strategic and more effective, and the Common Agenda is one tool to help us be more effective.

The Common Agenda is a set of priorities that a number of environmental groups come together to work on during the legislative session. The

This year there were nine groups that signed on to work on the four priority issues identified by the Common Agenda. We are happy to report that all of them were addressed in a positive manner this session (though in some cases, that meant that bills bad for the environment were not heard, and therefore are not reflected in the Scorecard).

The 2008 NC Common Agenda: Priorities for the Environment were: tougher storm water rules to protect our beaches from polluted run-off, a clean cars study bill to help NC address global warming, protecting our beaches from hardened structures, and tougher drought restrictions that increase water efficiency and conservation measures. Although the Common Agenda prioritizes key issues for a number of groups, there will always be additional issues that these and other groups are working on that are important for you and for NC — which we will include in the Legislative Scorecard.

In the following pages you will see a listing of member's names, their scores for the 2008 Short Session, and their previous scores so that you can see how well they are voting over time. There will also be a description of the votes that were used to calculate the scores and a brief explanation as to their importance to the environmental community.

Scorecards are a good indicator of where our legislators stand on important issues affecting our environment, but they are only a snapshot of the complexities of the legislative landscape. For example, scores are not able to reflect other decisions and actions that legislators make during a session, such as: bill sponsorship or co-sponsorship, whether the legislator actively “worked” to build broader support for a bill, or how much a legislator was able to buck party or leadership pressure on behalf of the environment. Therefore, it is important for you to ask tough questions of your elected officials and candidates in order to keep the pressure on them to make the right decisions on environmentally friendly legislation.

SCORED BILLS NC HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

[H1] **H2499 Drought/Water Management Recommendations**, Senate Committee Substitute: As Amended, M11 Concur: The drought legislation was one of the most important pieces of environmental legislation from the 2008 Short Session. NC went through one of the worst droughts in history in 2008 and this legislation was a big step in the right direction to help us better prepare for future drought periods. After going through a tough stakeholder negotiation process, the bill was amended numerous times on the House Floor, often weakening the protections provided by the original negotiated proposal. Luckily, the Senate made some good changes to get the bill back to some semblance of what was originally negotiated through the stakeholder process. This House vote was to concur with the Senate improvements, and send the bill to the Governor to become law. The bill passed 68-36 with **YES** being the pro-conservation vote.

[H2] **H2499 Drought/Water Management Recommendations**, Stam Amendment 3, 2nd Reading, ASB45(v2)3.6: This amendment would have added the NC Ground Water Association and the NC Farm Bureau to the Drought Management Advisory Council. The purpose of the Council is to improve communications between local, state, federal, and other agencies to improve the mitigation and management of the effects of a drought. The group is made up of government agencies with a scientific expertise pertaining to drought; the conservation community felt there was no place for private industries to be on the Council as they already participate in the process. We later opposed an amendment that would have added environmental groups to the Council as well. The amendment passed 86-26 with **NO** being the pro-conservation vote.

[H3] **H2499 Drought/Water Management**, Lewis Amendment 9, 3rd Reading: Amendment 9 was terrible and would have put a sunset timeline on Section 8, the water management emergency procedures, of the bill. This section outlines the powers that the Governor and Secretary of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources have during an emergency drought situation. The effects of a drought are lingering, and do not simply go away. There needed to be a plan in place so that, in the future, NC would be prepared to handle and manage a water emergency beyond a short term fix. Luckily the amendment failed 44-68 with a **NO** vote being the correct pro-conservation vote.

[H4] **SB 1967 Improve Coastal Stormwater Management**, 2nd reading: The coastal stormwater rules underwent an expanded stakeholder process throughout this Session, with environmental advocates, city/county government, citizens, and industry representatives meeting weekly to hash out a compromise piece of legislation. In the end, the final product went a long way to protect NC's prestigious coastline from stormwater runoff. One person commented that this must be a good bill because no one on either side of the issue was happy with the final outcome. In the end, our coastal counties had more stringent rules in place. The bill passed 105-4 with **YES** being a vote to protect our coastal counties. ... continued page 7

SCORED BILLS NC SENATE

[S1] **H2499 Drought/Water Management Recommendations**, 2nd reading: The importance of this bill has already been discussed previously under the House section. Luckily, the Senate had the courage of their convictions to return the bill to what it looked like before the House offered multiple weakening changes. The 2nd reading in the Senate was 36-9 where **YES** was a vote to help protect the drinking supply from future water shortages.

[S2] **H2499 Drought/Water Management Recommendations**, Jacumin Amendment 1: This amendment offered to strip section 6 of the Drought bill; specifically it would have removed a requirement to study whether local governments should be allowed to regulate groundwater. Not allowing the Department of Environment and Natural Resources to study something as it relates to the environment could mean a lot of things, but one that clearly comes to mind is that you may not like their findings. Most study bills easily flow through the body, so this attempt to remove this one from the Drought bill was not needed, and a clear instance of opponents trying to weaken the bill. The Amendment passed 41-5 with **NO** being a vote to protect the integrity of this bill that had weathered the storm of amendments in the House.

[S3] **H2499 Drought/Water Management Recommendations**, P. Berger Amendment 2: This was an attempt to forbid local governments from regulating or metering wells, which was totally unnecessary since local governments already lack this authority and the bill did not attempt to change this. This would have also affected municipalities whose primary source of water is well water. It was a clearly a political maneuver designed to create an issue to be used against amendment opponents in the election. The amendment passed 27-19 where **NO** was the right vote. Another amendment followed that limited the provision to private water drinking wells, which was better than this amendment, though still damaging.

[S4] **S1967 Improve Coastal Stormwater Management**, 2nd Reading: See House Vote Descriptions for a full explanation of the bill, but Senator Clodfelter said this bill was hanging by a thread and there was no room for any changes to be made in the Senate. His colleagues agreed and the bill passed unanimously 48-0 where **YES** was the pro-conservation vote.

[S5] **H2529 Extend Climate Change Commission**, 3rd Reading: Again, as was explained in the House votes, this was a simple request to extend the Climate Change commission for another year to allow them to finish their work. The bill passed 34-15 where a **YES** meant that you wanted to hear what the commission had to say on the effects of climate change.

[S6] **H822 Swine Farm Siting Act Amends**, 3rd reading: This bill stunk from the get go. Originally filed as an Environmental Technical Corrections bill, this bill rose from the ashes reincarnated as the Swine Farm Siting Act. The bill would have made several changes to pre-existing rules on Hog Farms. The bill was alleged to be an innocent bill that appeared out of nowhere as Session was nearing an end. It flew through committee ... continued page 7

SCORECARD

HOW TO READ THE SCORECARD

The following bills were ones scored in the 2008 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 2008 session, their 2008 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	H7	H8	2008 Short Session	2007 Long Session	2007-2008 Average	2005-2006 Average	
				Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	%	%	%	%
Pro-Conservation Vote																
Adams	D	58	Guilford	+	+	+	+	+	E	+	+	100	75	88	88	
Alexander, K.	D	107	Meck.	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	N/A	INC	N/A	
Alexander, M.	D	106	Meck.	+	+	+	+	+	E	+	+	100	88	94	100	
Allen	D	49	Franklin	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	75	63	69	77	
Allred	R	64	Alamance	-	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	50	63	57	50	
Avila	R	40	Wake	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	38	75	56	N/A	
Barnhart	R	82	Cabarrus	E	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	57	50	54	47	
Bell	D	21	Sampson	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	75	50	63	67	
Blackwood	R	68	Union	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	38	63	50	38	
Blue	D	33	Wake	+	-	+	+	0	+	+	+	75	63	69	N/A	
Blust	R	62	Guilford	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	+	38	75	56	55	
Bordsen	D	63	Alamance	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	88	INC	INC	78	
Boylan	R	52	Moore	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	63	50	56	N/A	
Braxton	D	10	Lenoir	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	75	50	63	N/A	
Brisson	D	22	Bladen	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	75	38	57	N/A	
Brown	R	73	Forsyth	-	E	E	E	+	-	-	+	40	63	52	72	
Brubaker	R	78	Randolph	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	63	43	53	INC	
Bryant	D	7	Nash	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	75	88	N/A	
Carney	D	102	Meck.	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	75	63	69	77	
Church	D	86	Burke	EV	E	E	+	+	-	+	+	80	50	65	62	
Clary	R	110	Cleveland	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	63	75	69	INC	
Cleveland	R	14	Onslow	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	38	50	44	54	
Coates	D	77	Rowan	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	88	63	75	67	
Cole	D	65	Rockingham	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	75	50	63	72	
Coleman	D	39	Wake	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	63	82	83	
Cotham	D	100	Meck.	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	63	82	N/A	
Crawford	D	32	Granville	+	-	+	+	0	E	+	+	71	63	67	65	
Current	R	109	Gaston	E	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	71	57	64	67	
Daughtridge	R	25	Nash	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	50	63	57	43	
Daughtry	R	26	Johnston	E	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	57	43	50	44	
Dickson	D	44	Cumberland	+	-	E	+	+	+	+	+	86	63	74	77	
Dockham	R	80	Davidson	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	50	50	50	64	
Dollar	R	36	Wake	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	75	50	63	67	
Earle	D	101	Meck.	0	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	63	50	56	INC	
England	D	112	Rutherford	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	75	75	75	70	
Faison	D	50	Orange	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	75	75	75	67	

HOUSE	Party	District	County	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	2008 Short Session	2007 Long Session	2007-2008 Average	2005-2006 Average
Farmer-Butterfield	D	24	Wilson	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	86	93	INC
Fisher	D	114	Buncombe	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	88	94	89
Folwell	R	74	Forsyth	-	E	-	E	+	+	-	+	50	50	50	67
Frye	R	84	Mitchell	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	38	38	38	38
Furr	R	67	Stanly	E	-	+	+	E	+	+	+	83	INC	INC	N/A
Gibson	D	69	Anson	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	75	75	75	70
Gillespie	R	85	McDowell	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	25	50	38	44
Glazier	D	45	Cumberland	E	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	86	88	87	94
Goforth	D	115	Buncombe	E	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	86	38	62	72
Goodwin	D	66	Richmond	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	63	82	83
Grady	R	15	Onslow	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	88	71	79	72
Gulley	R	103	Meck.	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	63	63	63	49
Hackney	D	54	Orange	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	INC	INC	INC	100
Haire	D	119	Jackson	+	+	+	+	+	E	+	+	100	57	79	86
Hall	D	29	Durham	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	88	94	INC
Harrell, J.	D	90	Surry	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	88	71	79	78
Harrell, T.	D	41	Wake	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	88	75	81	N/A
Harrison	D	57	Guilford	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	100	100	100
Hill	D	20	Columbus	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	88	63	75	60
Hilton	R	96	Catawba	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	25	50	38	49
Holliman	D	81	Davidson	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	75	63	69	72
Holloway	R	91	Stokes	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	25	50	38	54
Holmes	R	92	Yadkin	E	-	-	+	E	0	+	+	50	29	40	32
Howard	R	79	Davie	+	E	E	E	0	+	+	+	80	75	78	INC
Hughes	D	18	New Hanover	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	N/A	INC	N/A
Hurley	R	70	Randolph	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	63	63	63	N/A
Insko	D	56	Orange	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	75	88	INC
Jeffus	D	59	Guilford	+	+	+	+	+	E	+	+	100	63	82	75
Johnson	R	83	Cabarrus	-	E	E	E	+	+	+	+	80	63	72	67
Jones	D	60	Guilford	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	75	88	83
Justice	R	16	Pender	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	88	94	83
Justus	R	117	Henderson	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	63	75	69	67
Killian	R	105	Meck.	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	38	57	47	N/A
Kiser	R	97	Lincoln	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	50	63	57	44
Langdon	R	28	Johnston	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	38	38	38	60
Lewis	R	53	Harnett	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	63	75	69	52
Love	D	51	Lee	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	88	75	81	N/A
Lucas	D	42	Cumberland	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	75	57	66	77
Luebke	D	30	Durham	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	100	100	100
Martin	D	34	Wake	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	75	88	100
McAllister	D	43	Cumberland	+	-	+	0	+	+	+	0	63	75	69	76
McComas	R	19	New Hanover	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	63	63	63	68
McElraft	R	13	Carteret	E	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	43	43	43	N/A
McGee	R	75	Forsyth	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	63	50	56	73
McLawhorn	D	9	Pitt	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	88	71	79	93
Michaux	D	31	Durham	+	+	+	+	0	E	+	+	86	75	80	65
Mobley	D	5	Hertford	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	88	63	75	N/A
Moore	R	111	Cleveland	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	38	63	50	62

HOUSE	Party	District	County	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	2008 Short Session	2007 Long Session	2007-2008 Average	2005-2006 Average
Neumann	R	108	Gaston	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	63	50	56	N/A
Owens	D	1	Pasquotank	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	88	50	69	48
Parmon	D	72	Forsyth	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	75	57	66	86
Pate	R	11	Wayne	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	50	50	50	45
Pierce	D	48	Scotland	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	88	50	69	72
Rapp	D	118	Madison	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	88	75	81	94
Ray	R	95	Iredell	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	50	63	57	INC
Ross	D	38	Wake	E	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	75	88	100
Samuelson	R	104	Meck.	E	E	E	E	E	+	+	+	INC	63	INC	N/A
Saunders	D	99	Meck.	E	E	+	E	+	0	+	+	80	63	72	64
Setzer	R	89	Catawba	-	-	-	EV	+	-	+	+	43	50	46	60
Spear	D	2	Washing.	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	88	50	69	INC
Stam	R	37	Wake	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	75	63	69	67
Starnes	R	87	Caldwell	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	63	75	69	55
Steen	R	76	Rowan	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	50	38	44	55
Stiller	R	17	Brunswick	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	75	75	75	65
Sutton	D	47	Robeson	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	75	50	63	72
Tarleton	D	93	Watauga	E	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	86	63	74	N/A
Thomas	R	116	Buncombe	+	-	-	E	+	+	+	+	71	88	80	N/A
Tillis	R	98	Meck.	-	-	-	0	+	+	+	+	50	43	47	N/A
Tolson	D	23	Edgecombe	+	-	+	+	+	E	+	+	86	63	74	77
Tucker	D	4	Duplin	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	75	50	63	73
Underhill	D	3	Craven	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	88	INC	INC	83
Wainwright	D	12	Craven	E	+	E	+	E	+	+	+	100	71	86	66
Walend	R	113	Transyl.	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	63	88	75	75
Walker	R	94	Wilkes	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	50	50	50	55
Warren, E.	D	8	Pitt	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	88	63	75	77
Warren, R.	D	88	Alexander	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	88	38	63	N/A
Weiss	D	35	Wake	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	100	100	100
West	R	120	Cherokee	-	-	-	-	+	E	-	+	29	38	33	44
Wiley	R	61	Guilford	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	50	88	69	54
Wilkins	D	55	Person	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	75	50	63	78
Williams	D	6	Beaufort	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	88	63	75	67
Womble	D	71	Forsyth	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	75	57	66	75
Wray	D	27	Northampton	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	88	63	75	INC
Yongue	D	46	Scotland	+	-	+	+	+	E	+	+	86	50	68	70

SENATE	Party	District	County	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	2008 Short Session	2007 Long Session	2007-2008 Average	2005-2006 Average
Pro-Conservation Vote				Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	%	%	%	%
Albertson	D	10	Duplin	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	88	67	77	85
Allran	R	42	Catawba	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	50	80	65	83
Apodaca	R	48	Henderson	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	38	50	44	69
Atwater	D	18	Chatham	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	75	83	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	2008 Short Session	2007 Long Session	2007-2008 Average	2005-2006 Average
Basnight	D	1	Dare	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	75	83	79	61
Berger, D	D	7	Franklin	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	88	67	77	100
Berger, P	R	26	Rockingham	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	38	33	35	59
Bingham	R	33	Davidson	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	E	57	67	62	83
Blake	R	22	Moore	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	50	33	42	61
Boseman	D	9	New Han.	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	75	83	79	77
Brock	R	34	Davie	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	38	67	52	54
Brown	R	6	Onslow	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	38	33	35	61
Brunstetter	R	31	Forsyth	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	50	40	45	INC
Clodfelter	D	37	Meck.	+	-	+	+	+	0	+	+	75	83	79	75
Cowell	D	16	Wake	E	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	86	100	93	100
Dalton	D	46	Rutherford	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	63	67	65	77
Dannelly	D	38	Meck.	E	E	E	+	+	-	+	+	80	60	70	76
Dorsett	D	28	Guilford	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	75	83	79	85
East	R	30	Surry	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	38	33	35	54
Foriest	D	24	Alamance	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	75	67	71	N/A
Forrester	R	41	Gaston	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	50	80	65	61
Garrou	D	32	Forsyth	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	75	80	78	76
Goodall	R	35	Union	-	-	-	E	-	-	+	+	29	33	31	54
Goss	D	45	Watauga	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	63	67	65	N/A
Graham	D	40	Meck.	E	E	E	+	E	+	+	+	100	60	80	80
Hagan	D	27	Guilford	E	E	E	+	+	-	+	+	80	83	82	85
Hartsell	R	36	Cabarrus	+	-	-	+	+	E	+	+	71	60	66	77
Hoyle	D	43	Gaston	+	-	-	E	+	-	+	+	57	75	66	69
Hunt	R	15	Wake	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	63	83	73	83
Jacumin	R	44	Burke	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	50	50	50	55
Jenkins	D	3	Edgecombe	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	75	60	68	92
Jones	D	4	Halifax	+	-	+	+	+	-	0	+	63	67	65	N/A
Kerr	D	5	Wayne	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	63	67	65	69
Kinnaird	D	23	Orange	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	100	100	100
Malone	D	14	Wake	+	-	+	+	+	-	E	+	71	67	69	85
McKissick	D	20	Durham	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100	83	92	N/A
Nesbitt	D	49	Buncombe	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	0	63	67	65	85
Preston	R	2	Carteret	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	50	33	42	72 (H)
Purcell	D	25	Scotland	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	75	67	71	77
Queen	D	47	Haywood	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	63	83	73	N/A
Rand	D	19	Cumberland	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	75	83	79	76
Rucho	R	39	Meck.	+	-	-	+	-	-	N/A	N/A	33	N/A	N/A	N/A
Shaw	D	21	Cumberland	E	E	E	+	+	-	E	+	75	60	68	70
Smith	R	12	Johnston	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	38	75	56	INC
Snow	D	50	Cherokee	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	63	67	65	84
Soles	D	8	Columbus	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	75	67	71	69
Stevens	R	17	Wake	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	75	67	71	77
Swindell	D	11	Nash	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	75	60	68	77
Tillman	R	29	Randolph	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	50	67	59	61
Weinstein	D	13	Robeson	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	75	60	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

[H5] H1889 Wildlife Land Property Tax Changes, M11 to concur with Senate changes: NC is a remarkably beautiful and diverse state, and we have some of the fastest growing regions in the country. As we grow, we must protect the quality of life that makes our state so appealing, including protecting our natural areas and open space. H1889 was an act to provide property tax relief for qualifying conservation land, clarify the present-use valuation of property subject to a conservation easement, and to provide a property tax exemption for leasehold interest in certain exempted properties in NC. This bill went through many changes to tighten it up in order to help it pass. It originally passed in the Long Session of 2007, but then went through additional changes in the Senate; the House needed to concur with the Senate revisions this Short Session in order to become law. It passed 107-4 with YES being the vote for the environment.

[H6] H2720 Energy Efficient State Motor Vehicle Fleet, 2nd reading: This bill would have basically done what the name suggests; it would have required cars purchased for the state motor fleet be in the top 15% of their class in fuel economy, with some exceptions for emergency vehicles. It seems logical that the state would want to make this a priority with gas prices soaring to new heights. The big three car manufacturers may become the big two, and the shift is clearly toward fuel efficient vehicles. The bill passed the House 62-46 with YES being a vote to help the state reduce emissions from its motor fleet; the bill stalled in the Senate.

[H7] H2529 Extend Climate Change Commission, M11 to concur with Senate Changes: The Legislative Commission on Global Climate Change was established to provide an in-depth examination of the effects of climate change and report back to the General Assembly. The Commission requested more time to complete its charge, and needed legislative action to extend the Commission for another year. The vote to concur with the Senate was 105-13 where YES was a vote to allow them more time to complete their work on this complex and critical issue.

[H8] S 847 Prevent Agriculture Pesticide Exposure, 2nd Reading: This was a small piece of legislation that will make a big difference in the lives of farm workers in the field. The bill prohibits retaliation against workers who report pesticide safety problems on the job. It also requires employers to keep a more detailed record of pesticide use. The bill passed the House 118-0 with YES obviously being the vote to protect the workers that help put food on our tables.

where people were not allowed to speak against the bill, and went quickly to the floor. In a time when NC is trying to shed itself of scandal that has plagued Jones Street in recent years, this was no way to make the citizens of our state feel good about the process. There are two things that you never want to see made — sausage and laws —, and this was clearly demonstrated with this bill. The bill passed the Senate 40-8 where a NO vote was a vote for fairness and open government. The House had the foresight not to let the bill get out of committee but it is expected this bill will rear its ugly head next session.

[S7] S1872 Extend Water Allocation Study, 2nd Reading: The Environmental Review Commission and the UNC at Chapel Hill School of Government needed more time to complete their comprehensive study on the allocation of water resources, and their availability and maintenance in the state. There was no opposition to this bill but it is considered important enough that we wanted to thank everyone for their vote. In a year when NC experienced record drought, this is an important piece of legislation with the results being used to shape the way NC grows in the future. YES was the pro-conservation vote, and the bill passed 46-0.

[S8] S847 Prevent Agriculture Pesticide Exposure, 2nd Reading: As state previously this small bill will go a long way to prevent harm done to those working tirelessly in the fields to help bring our farmers' products to the market. The bill passed unanimously 48-0.

BILL SPONSORSHIP

One thing that is not reflected in the scores is other decisions that legislators make during a session that may be detrimental to the environment. Bill sponsorship is an important way for legislators to show additional support for or opposition to an issue, beyond their final vote. Voting on issues is important, but when you take the time to sponsor or cosponsor a pro-environmental bill, that is the big leap in support of an issue.

However, this session, there were many legislators who co-sponsored legislation that would have overturned the coastal stormwater rules, which is unacceptable. These rules had undergone a comprehensive stakeholder process, and had been passed by the Environmental Management Commission (EMC). The EMC is a 19-member Commission appointed by the Governor, the Senate Pro-Tempore, and the Speaker of the House that is responsible for adopting rules for protection, preservation, and enhancement of the State's air and

water resources; most seats are specifically designated for professionals like physicians, hydrologist, engineers, biologists, manufacturers, and local government administrators. "Disapproval bills" like the one this Session on coastal stormwater can undermine rules aimed at protecting our state's resources, and sponsorship of such legislation reveals legislators who are not working to protect our clean air and safe water.

If Legislators keep stepping in every time environmental commissions like the EMC or the Coastal Resources Commission make rules, pretty soon no qualified person will want to waste their time on these important issues -- they know the General Assembly will pass a disapproval bill and disembowel all their hard work. We encourage citizens to contact their legislators, and ask them to stay out of these commissions' way and let them do the work they were commissioned to do.

NOW THAT YOU KNOW THE SCORE...

Join Conservation Council Today

to help hold our legislators accountable!

\$25 Individual Member \$150 Organization

\$35 Family 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

THE DIRTY DOZEN IS GETTING CLEANER!

In the 2007 Scorecard, we included a controversial listing of the "Dirty Dozen" and "Filthy Five" from the NC House and Senate, respectively. These were a list of members who distinguished themselves for having a terrible record on environmental legislation. This year, we would like to focus on some of these decision-makers who have improved their scores significantly from their 2007 scores.

NAME	2008	2007
Rep. William Brisson (D-Bladen)	75%	38%
Rep. Bruce Goforth (D-Buncombe)	86%	38%
Rep. Ray Warren (D-Alexander)	88%	38%

We would like to extend a heartfelt thank you to these three members for such an improvement in their scores. Almost every one of these members doubled or almost doubled their previous score. Hopefully these scores reflect a growing commitment to protecting our environment for the long term.

Conservation Council is working over the long-term to build a pro-conservation majority. Educating legislators on issues and advocating at the General Assembly, holding legislators accountable for their votes, educating citizens about how their legislators are voting, and ultimately holding them accountable at the ballot box on Election Day are all important pieces of building a pro-environmental majority. A strong, healthy environment benefits everyone in the state. If workers are missing work because of a child suffering an asthma attack on a Code Red air pollution day, or because drought has caused a factory to slow production, we all pay the price.

AVERAGE PARTY SCORES	Senate		House	
	2008 Short Session	Average 2007-2008	2008 Short Session	Average 2007-2008
Total Senate	65%	66%	71%	69%
Republicans	48%	51%	55%	57%
Democrats	75%	74%	87%	78%
Total House	75%	74%	71%	69%
Republicans	48%	51%	55%	57%
Democrats	75%	74%	87%	78%

919.839.0066 | www.conservationcouncilinc.org

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

