

# North Carolina League of Conservation Voters

**2015 LEGISLATIVE SCORECARD**

## About Us

The North Carolina League of Conservation Voters (NCLCV) has worked for clean air, land, and water for nearly 50 years. We mobilize voters like you to hold our leaders accountable for their decisions, and we advocate for sound environmental policies at the state legislature. Through our affiliated political action committee (Conservation PAC), we help elect candidates who recognize that a healthy, sustainable environment creates strong communities and economies, leading to a better quality of life for everyone. We hope you find this legislative scorecard to be a useful tool in seeing how your legislators are representing your environmental values.

## About the Legislative Scorecard

The Legislative Scorecard records members' votes on selected bills throughout the 2015 legislative session. While it is not a comprehensive listing of all session votes, the Scorecard provides a record of the most significant votes cast on bills and amendments with the greatest environmental impact.

This Scorecard is only one tool to evaluate our legislators. Despite the importance of legislators' votes, the Scorecard cannot represent the full complexity of what it takes to be an environmental champion. Sponsorship of legislation and leadership in support or opposition to bills can be equally important. In addition, many pieces of legislation never make it to the full floor for a vote; committee votes are not recorded, and issues may be inserted into the budget.

No single session perfectly captures a legislator's conservation voting record, so to better evaluate individuals' voting histories, we have included a column containing their lifetime NCLCV score, which averages their votes across all sessions they served between 1999 (our first Scorecard) and the present.

**For more information and past Scorecards, visit [nclcv.org](http://nclcv.org).**

## Scorecard Content

- 2 A Message From Our Director...**
- 3 The Story of the 2015 Long Session**
- 7 Duke Energy Update after the 2014 Coal Ash Spill**
- 9 House and Senate Vote Descriptions**
- 11 Scores**
- 33 Allies, Adversaries, and It's Complicated**
- 35 Governor's Report**
- 36 Now that you know the score... take action!**
- Who We Are – Board of Directors and Staff**

# A message from our Director...



## **Dear Conservation Voter,**

Thank you for taking time to review this year's Legislative Scorecard. Environmental issues grace headlines almost daily across North Carolina, and citizens are becoming increasingly aware of the impact these issues have on their quality of life. It is imperative that we educate ourselves on how our elected officials are voting on key environmental legislation. Here at NCLCV, your support has allowed us to fight back with strength and conviction against bills that pose a relentless attack on our water, land, air, and citizens.

During this legislative session, far too many elected officials voted to roll back rules designed to preserve our natural resources. We saw state laws effectively protecting our clean air, safe water, and health of our communities for decades eliminated with little or no public debate. We saw the budget and staffing of the state agency responsible for enforcing our environmental laws decimated. What was the reason lawmakers gave? Too many regulations. This tagline has been used over and over, as a rationale to repeal laws designed to keep our drinking water safe, our air clean and our land free from pollution.

I am committed to holding my elected officials accountable and fostering more champions who understand that our environment and economy go hand in hand, and believe in a just transition to a clean energy future. I know you share these values.

As you read this year's Scorecard, I hope you will not become disheartened at the low scores. Instead, we can use this time to recommit to our mission. With your continued advocacy and participation, we can shift the narrative of how state leaders treat our natural resources. If we grow our movement and work together to push our environmental priorities to the forefront, we can make next session's Scorecard tell a different story.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Carrie". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

**Carrie Clark, Executive Director**  
*NC League of Conservation Voters*

# The Story of the 2015 Long Session

The environmental picture of the 2015 legislative session was dominated by a continuing series of ideological-driven attacks on laws and programs created to ensure clean air, safe water, and a good quality of life. The most prominent targets were clean energy development and effective air and water pollution control.

*Below, we unpack two major themes from the 2015 legislative session.*

## The slow demise of our environment, one regulatory rollback at a time

Lawmakers like to use the term “regulations” as a way to demonstrate real government reform. In their words, regulations create inefficiencies and hurt economic progress. In reality, regulations are often the very protections and safeguards that strengthen our economy and keep dangerous pollution out of our air, land, and water.

Current leadership has chipped away at our state’s air pollution programs by removing expert oversight provided by various boards and commissions. They have rolled back rules to clean up drinking water supplies and have weakened valuable wetland protections designed to improve water quality and protect our lands from flooding.

The rollback narrative reached a crescendo as three regulation bills came to the Chamber floors this year. Each bill started as a simple, single-issue piece of legislation from the NC House. But, once in the hands of the NC Senate, these bills were morphed into legislation that endangered decades of laws protecting North Carolina’s natural heritage.

Arguably, the most egregious example was HB 765 – Regulatory Reform Act of 2015. It started as a one-page bill addressing the transportation of gravel. This bill was 57 pages long leaving the Senate, chock-full of provisions curtailing the progress North Carolina has made to clean up the air we breathe and the water we drink. For example,


legislators added language to allow polluters to “self-audit” if they “accidentally” spill dangerous toxins into a nearby river or stream. The House rejected the Senate’s version of the bill, commonly referred to as the “Polluter Protection Act,” punting HB 765 into a conference committee for further compromise.

In the final days of session, HB 765 made its triumphant return as a conference report. Unfortunately, most of the polluter provisions remained intact, including allowing the NC Department of Environmental Quality (formerly DENR) to eliminate air monitors and roll back protections on intermittent streams.

Environmental and conservation groups made a last-ditch effort to put a stop to HB 765 both inside and outside the NC General Assembly. Despite the calls and notes from tens of thousands of North Carolinians, the final HB 765 conference report passed both the Senate and House in the final days of session.

## Relentless attack on North Carolina’s clean energy economy

North Carolina has become a national leader in the clean energy sector. Much of this growth is due to proactive policies that invested state dollars into growing and supporting a budding industry. Over the last few years, the investments have paid off greatly, from generating state and local tax revenues to creating jobs to increasing the role renewable energy plays in meeting our electricity needs.



**“Unfortunately, this session brought another round of false propaganda from clean energy foes seeking to undermine not only Renewable Energy Portfolio Standards, but also the entire clean energy sector.”**

## Clean Energy: A Good Investment

After warding off attacks on our state’s Renewable Energy Portfolio Standards (REPS) in previous legislative sessions, clean energy and environmental groups hoped 2015 would be different. Unfortunately, this session brought another round of false propaganda from clean energy foes seeking to undermine not only REPS, but also the entire clean energy sector. This played out in the NC General Assembly in a variety of bills.

Bills often undergo damaging and sometimes frivolous revisions. They receive minimal explanation if any; serve as bargaining chips both in public and behind closed doors; and ultimately legislators enact them with no real thought toward their implications on the people and places of this state. Let’s open the curtains to reveal the scenes in the 2015 clean energy performance:

In Act I, we witnessed the introduction of legislation that would have gutted REPS entirely, eliminating a successful and positive measure that was formed in 2007 through a bipartisan effort. When this threat reached the public stage, legislators backed off from proposing complete elimination, instead proposing a “freeze” at the current renewable energy goals and stopping any future increase in renewable standards.


At this point, the NC General Assembly was only warming up to destroying the progress clean energy made for our state’s economy and environment.

Begin Act II: The state Renewable Energy Investment Tax Credit (REITC), established in 1999, was designed to increase the diversity of our state’s electricity generation. It allowed renewable energy companies to utilize a 35

Between 2007 and 2013



### NC Investments in Clean Energy



Economic Impact Analysis of Clean Energy Development in North Carolina—2014 Update  
[http://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.energync.org/resource/resmgr/Resources\\_Page/NCSEA\\_econimpact2014.pdf?hhSearchTerms=%22renewable+and+energy+and+economic%22](http://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.energync.org/resource/resmgr/Resources_Page/NCSEA_econimpact2014.pdf?hhSearchTerms=%22renewable+and+energy+and+economic%22)





## **“What happened after legislators introduced HB 571 – Implement Clean Power Plan – is a perfect illustration of how partisan the environment has become in the NC General Assembly.”**

percent tax credit for eligible installation costs in order to attract needed investment, and to increase financing and customer-choice opportunities.

Rather than champion the clean energy sector as a model of successful policy, House and Senate leadership went after the REITC, arguably the most critical driver of this economic boom, electing to eliminate the extension of the REITC in the state budget (HB 97 – Appropriations Act of 2015).

Despite pleas from solar and other business leaders, faith-based communities, and conservationists, the REITC will expire December 31, 2015, leaving an uncertain future for North Carolina’s clean energy jobs, investments, and small businesses.

Shifting gears slightly in Act III, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) release of the federal Clean Power Plan (CPP) in August 2015 serves as another example of how anti-clean energy voices are attempting to circumvent pro-health, pro-people policies in the state’s General Assembly.

The CPP is the first-ever federal guideline to reduce carbon pollution from existing coal-fired power plants. Carbon pollution leads to poor air quality and also contributes to climate change. The CPP allows states to find the best pathway to reduce carbon pollution while providing reliable, affordable energy. If a state chooses not to develop its own plan, the EPA will impose a Federal Implementation Plan.

What happened after legislators introduced HB 571 – Implement Clean Power Plan – is a perfect illustration of how partisan the environment has become in the NC General Assembly. In its original form the bill aimed to establish a statewide strategy, including allowing public input, to reduce carbon emissions to comply with the

federal plan. The bill passed the House with bipartisan support.

Sen. Trudy Wade proposed new language that essentially forbade North Carolina from drafting any plan until legal battles over the CPP were resolved (or until July 1, 2016, whichever came later). Many lawmakers scratched their heads over this decision, as any delay in crafting a state plan would open the likelihood for federal intervention.

Sen. Wade ultimately changed her tune from “no plan” to “plan of ignorance.” The newly amended bill would require North Carolina to retrofit existing coal-fired power plants to make them cleaner and more efficient, ignoring the other emission-reducing options available to states, such as increasing the use of renewable energy and energy-efficiency technology. It would also require DEQ to challenge the CPP in court.

Sen. Wade’s ill-advised amendment takes the most expensive path toward meeting the required carbon pollution reductions and would likely make North Carolina noncompliant, lining up our state for federal intervention. Additionally, Sen. Wade’s amendment leaves North Carolina citizens and stakeholders out of the process.

Both the amendment and bill passed the Senate for further concurrence in the House.

This bill remains waiting in the House Rules Committee for a potential appearance in 2016. We hope this bill never sees the light of day again, so our state can take action to draft an actual plan that creates a path to a clean energy future.



Photo provided by the Dan River Basin Association (DRBA)

## Anatomy Of A Sweatheart Deal



- **\$25,100,000**  
the amount levied against Duke Energy by DEQ in March 2015
- **\$7,000,000**  
the outrageous reduction given arbitrarily by the same department in September 2015
- **\$500,000**  
the laughably small fine for every coal ash pond in NC

“Once again, Duke Energy avoids taking full responsibility for its own mess, and the timeline for how quickly it cleans up coal ash in our state (and where it goes) is still up for debate.”

# Duke Energy Update after the 2014 Coal Ash Spill

Duke Energy, the nation's largest electric utility company, pled guilty in May 2015 to nine violations of the federal Clean Water Act. Duke Energy is responsible for 39,000 tons of coal ash spilled into the Dan River in February 2014. The company was also illegally discharging pollution at five North Carolina power plants.

The Charlotte-based utility, however, agreed to pay federal agencies \$102 million for its violations: \$68 million in fines and \$34 million toward restorative justice measures to improve rivers and wetlands in North Carolina and Virginia.

Here at home, Duke Energy secured itself a much sweeter deal. In March 2015, DEQ levied a \$25.1 million fine for leaks at coal ash ponds. Fast-forward a few months, and this fine was reduced to \$7 million. In other words, Duke Energy has to pay a paltry \$500,000 for each coal ash pit and pond in North Carolina.

Once again, Duke Energy avoids taking full responsibility for its own mess, and the timeline for how quickly it cleans up coal ash in our state (and where it goes) is still up for debate.

The bill descriptions are based on the text of the legislation at the time the scored vote was cast. Although subsequent amendments or changes in context may have altered the substance of many of the final bills, we believe it is appropriate to describe exactly what the legislators were proposing and voting on at the time, rather than any changes that followed.

## HOUSE VOTES

### [H1] HB 760 3rd Reading *Regulatory Reform Act of 2015*

This bill made significant changes to state laws on how local governments could (or could not) use riparian buffers to protect local water quality. Additionally, this bill contained provisions to scale back our Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Portfolio Standard (REPS). Passed 3rd Reading 77-32.

*Pro-conservation vote: NO.*

### [H2] HB 760 House Amendment 1 *Regulatory Reform of 2015*

An amendment by Reps. Jeter and Hager would have frozen our state's REPS. Amendment passed 97-19.

*Pro-conservation vote: NO.*

### [H3] HB 760 House Amendment 6 *Regulatory Reform of 2015*

Rep. Pricey Harrison's amendment would have effectively eliminated the REPS freeze from the bill (see H2 description). Amendment failed 39-70.

*Pro-conservation vote: YES.*

### [H4] HB 795 Adoption of Conference Report *State Environmental Policy Act Reform*

This bill aimed to limit the number of projects that would fall under North Carolina's State Environmental Policy Act jurisdiction, essentially making the law ineffective. In addition, the bill narrowed the scope of the Environmental Impact Studies for future projects, requiring it to focus strictly on direct impacts and overlooking often-critical indirect and cumulative impacts. The House adopted the Conference Report 74-40.

*Pro-conservation vote: NO.*

### [H5] HB 157 2nd Reading *Amend Environmental Laws*

One key provision would amend a state law requiring the Environmental Management Commission (EMC) to adopt air toxics rules for hydraulic fracturing (fracking) sites. HB 157 allows the EMC to establish air pollution rules only if it deems current state and federal rules on air emissions inadequate. Passed 2nd Reading 76-40.

*Pro-conservation vote: NO.*

### [H6] HB 765 Adoption of Conference Report *Regulatory Reform Act of 2015*

The final report – commonly known as the “Polluter Protection Act” – still contained some of the most egregious provisions. It allows DEQ to eliminate non-EPA required air quality monitors, permits companies to self-report environmental damage with little consequence, and eliminates state requirements to offset damage to intermittent streams, subsequently threatening downstream drinking water supplies. Conference report adopted 73-39.

*Pro-conservation vote: NO.*

### [H7] HB 571 2nd Reading *Implementation of Carbon Dioxide Requirements*

This bill would mandate DEQ to conduct a stakeholder process in order to draft a state plan to comply with the federal Clean Power Plan. Passed 2nd Reading 84-33.

*Pro-conservation vote: YES.*

### [H8] HB 169 2nd Reading *Limit Motor Vehicle Emissions Inspections*

Sponsored by Rep. Hager, this bill worked to eliminate vehicle emission testing in 29 of the 48 counties where required. Passed 2nd Reading 72-35.

*Pro-conservation vote: NO.*

### [H9] HB 44 Adoption of Conference Report *Local Government Regulatory Reform 2015*

While the conference report was slightly improved over the original bill, it still prevents local control and weakens riparian buffer protections. Section 2 of HB 44 prohibits local governments from enforcing repealed or suspended state rules, and rules not yet in effect, including the Jordan Lake Rules. Section 13 undermines existing riparian buffers, which are crucial for protection of water quality in our rivers, reservoirs, and estuaries. The conference report passed 83-25.

*Pro-conservation vote: NO.*

### [H10] HB 593 2nd Reading *Amend Environmental Laws 3*

Sponsored by Rep. Pat McElraft, a new version of HB 593 was introduced, providing fewer protections for streams and wetlands in our state. This version would allow critical resources to be destroyed without mitigating or taking

alternative steps to protect them. This provision ultimately weakens protections for our rivers, streams, and wetlands from pollution. The bill passed 2nd Reading 86-29.

*Pro-conservation vote: NO.*

### **[H11] HB 97 Adoption of Conference Report 3rd Round 2015 Appropriations Act**

The budget, signed by Governor McCrory, allowed the Renewable Energy Investment Tax Credit (REITC) to sunset. The budget also shifted parks, aquariums, zoos, and the Museum of Natural Sciences from the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) to the Department of Cultural Resources (DCR), and renames both state agencies. The DENR is now the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) while DCR becomes the Department of Natural and Cultural Resources (DNCR).

The budget jeopardizes clean water by weakening penalties for erosion and sedimentation from new development; undercuts groundwater protection by eliminating the noncommercial leaking underground storage tank cleanup fund; delays key rules for cleanup of Jordan Lake, throwing more money – another \$1.5 million – into the boondoggle SolarBee project instead; and uses \$500,000 of public money to subsidize shale gas exploration. Conference report adopted 81-33.

*Pro-conservation vote: NO.*

## **SENATE VOTES**

### **[S1] HB 157 3rd Reading Amend Environmental Laws**

See H5 description in the House Votes section. Passed 3rd Reading 39-10.

*Pro-conservation vote: NO.*

### **[S2] HB 765 3rd Reading Regulatory Reform Act of 2015**

This bill was 57 pages leaving the Senate, chock-full of provisions curtailing the progress North Carolina has made to clean up the air we breathe and the water we drink. For example, the Senate added language to allow polluters to “self-audit” if they “accidentally” spill dangerous toxins into a nearby river or stream. Passed 3rd Reading 31-17.

*Pro-conservation vote: NO.*

### **[S3] HB 765 Senate Amendment 8 Regulatory Reform Act of 2015**

This positive amendment worked to repeal the provision aimed at changing the laws overseeing isolated wetlands by removing them from the bill. Amendment failed 15-29.

*Pro-conservation vote: YES.*

### **[S4] HB 765 Senate Amendment 12 Regulatory Reform Act of 2015**

This amendment, introduced by Sen. Josh Stein, would have eliminated the detrimental section from HB 765 entirely, allowing coastal and vegetative buffers to be cleared and graded, damaging water quality and the coast’s structural integrity. Amendment failed 15-28.

*Pro-conservation vote: YES.*

### **[S5] HB 765 Adoption of Conference Report Regulatory Reform Act of 2015**

Despite some claims of legislators that the conference report was now an environmental wonderland – so clean and green – in reality it still contained multiple provisions that created loopholes for polluters, putting our waters and coastal areas at great risk. The conference report was adopted 28 – 16.

*Pro conservation: NO.*

### **[S6] HB 571 2nd Reading Implement Clean Power Plan**

Sen. Trudy Wade’s floor amendment required the state to retrofit coal-fired power plants to improve heat rates, ignoring the other facets of the Clean Power Plan. This amendment, which passed 31-12 on party lines, gutted the previous version of the bill. The newest version of the bill passed 2nd Reading 31-12.

*Pro-conservation vote: NO.*

### **[S7] HB 44 Senate Amendment 5 Local Government Regulatory Reform 2015**

Sen. Josh Stein’s amendment sought to remove the entire riparian buffer reforms from the bill. See H9 in the House vote descriptions. The amendment failed 21-27.

*Pro-conservation Vote: YES.*

### **[S8] HB 44 Senate 3rd Reading Local Government Regulatory Reform 2015**

See H9 description in the House Votes section. Passed 3rd Reading 32-16.

*Pro-conservation Vote: NO.*

### **[S9] HB 795 2nd Reading State Environmental Policy Act Reform**

See H4 description in the House Votes section. Passed 2nd Reading 33-14.

*Pro-conservation vote: NO.*

### **[S10] HB 97 Adoption of Conference Report 2015 Appropriations Act**

See H11 description in the House votes descriptions. Conference report was adopted 37 – 13.

*Pro-conservation vote: NO.*

# HOW TO READ THE SCORECARD

Eleven House and ten Senate votes were scored. We included floor votes, motions, and amendments on particularly important bills. It is important to note which version of the bill was scored. Second readings are more reflective than the third and final reading because members may vote their preference on second read, but vote with the majority on third, when it is clear what the outcome will be.

At the top of the Scorecard you will see a number that correlates with the bill descriptions. The big update this year is our scorecard is organized by county so you know exactly how the people representing you are voting. Also, you'll see each legislator's score right under their name. Keep reading to see how they voted on each bill.

“Lifetime Scores” start in 1999, when our first Legislative Scorecard was published.

- 0** Anti-conservation vote
- ▲** Pro-conservation vote
- NV** Missed vote counted as anti-conservation vote
- E** Excused absence/vote not scored

## Alamance

### Riddell (R) House District - 64

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

### Ross (R) House District - 63

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
9	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	▲	0	0	0	0

### Gunn (R) Senate District - 24

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	S11
0	0	2	0	0	E	E	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

## Alexander

### Zachary (R) House District - 73

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
10	NA	10	0	0	0	E	0	0	▲	0	0	0	0

### Wells (R) Senate District - 42

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	S11
0	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

## Alleghany

### Elmore (R) House District - 94

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

### Soucek (R) Senate District - 45

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	S11
0	INC	2	E	0	0	0	0	0	NV	NV	0	0	0

## Anson

### Brody (R) House District - 55

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
0	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

### McInnis (R) Senate District - 25

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	S11
0	NA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

## Ashe

### Jordan (R) House District - 93

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
18	4	13	0	0	0	0	0	▲	▲	0	0	0	0

### Soucek (R) Senate District - 45

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	S11
0	INC	2	E	0	0	0	0	0	NV	NV	0	0	0

## Avery

### Dobson (R) House District - 85

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
9	15	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	▲	0	0	NV	0

### Soucek (R) Senate District - 45

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	S11
0	INC	2	E	0	0	0	0	0	NV	NV	0	0	0

## Beaufort

### Speciale (R) House District - 3

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
9	15	13	0	0	0	0	▲	0	0	0	0	0	0

### Tine (U) House District - 6

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
11	62	44	E	0	E	0	0	0	▲	0	0	0	0

### Cook (R) Senate District - 1

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	S11
0	5	6	0	0	0	0	E	E	0	0	0	0	0





## Chatham

### Foushee (D) Senate District - 23

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	
100	100	100	▲	▲	E	E	▲	E	▲	▲	▲	▲	

## Cherokee

### West (R) House District - 120

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
9	0	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	▲	0	0	0	0

### Davis, J. (R) Senate District - 50

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	
0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

## Chowan

### Steinburg (R) House District - 1

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
0	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	E	0	0	0	0

### Smith-Ingram (D) Senate District - 3

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	
78	NA	78	0	▲	▲	▲	▲	E	▲	▲	▲	0	

## Clay

### West (R) House District - 120

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
9	0	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	▲	0	0	0	0

### Davis, J. (R) Senate District - 50

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	
0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

## Cleveland

### Hastings (R) House District - 110

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	E	0	E

### Moore, T. (R) House District - 111

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
0	0	27	0	0	NV	0	0	0	NV	0	0	NV	0

### Daniel (R) Senate District - 46

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	
0	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

## Columbus

### Waddell (D) House District - 46

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
9	60	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	▲	0	0	0	0

### Smith (D) Senate District - 13

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	
80	NA	80	0	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	0	

## Craven

### Bell, J. (R) House District - 10

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

### Graham, G. (D) House District - 12

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
82	83	81	▲	0	▲	▲	▲	0	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲

### Speciale (R) House District - 3

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
9	15	13	0	0	0	0	▲	0	0	0	0	0	0











## Iredell

### Curtis (R) Senate District - 44

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

## Jackson

### Queen (D) House District - 119

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
89	80	81	▲	▲	▲	E	▲	▲	▲	E	0	▲	▲

### Davis, J. (R) Senate District - 50

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	
0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

## Johnston

### Brisson (D) House District - 22

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
14	24	37	E	0	E	E	0	0	▲	0	0	E	0

### Daughtry (R) House District - 26

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
9	5	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	▲	0	0	0	0

### Langdon (R) House District - 28

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
11	5	30	E	0	E	0	0	0	▲	0	0	0	0

### Jackson, B. (R) Senate District - 10

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	
0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

### Newton (R) Senate District - 11

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	
0	5	4	0	0	0	NV	E	0	0	0	0	0	0

### Rabin (R) Senate District - 12

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	
0	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

## Jones

### McElraft (R) House District - 13

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
0	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

### Brown (R) Senate District - 6

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	
0	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

## Lee

### Reives (D) House District - 54

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
100	INC	87	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲

### Salmon (D) House District - 51

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
89	NA	89	E	▲	E	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	NV	▲

### Rabin (R) Senate District - 12

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	
0	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

## Lenoir

### Bell, J. (R) House District - 10

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

### Graham, G. (D) House District - 12

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
82	83	81	▲	0	▲	▲	▲	0	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲

## Lenoir

### Davis, D. (D) Senate District - 5

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	
100	76	83	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	

### Pate (R) Senate District - 7

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	
0	0	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

## Lincoln

### Saine (R) House District - 97

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
13	4	5	E	0	E	0	0	0	▲	E	0	0	0

### Curtis (R) Senate District - 44

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

## Macon

### West (R) House District - 120

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
9	0	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	▲	0	0	0	0

### Davis, J. (R) Senate District - 50

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	
0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

## Madison

### Presnell (R) House District - 118

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

### Hise (R) Senate District - 47

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	
0	5	4	0	0	NV	NV	0	0	0	0	0	0	

## Martin

### Willingham (D) House District - 23

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
100	NA	94	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲

### Smith-Ingram (D) Senate District - 3

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	
78	NA	78	0	▲	▲	▲	▲	E	▲	▲	▲	0	

## McDowell

### Dobson (R) House District - 85

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
9	15	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	▲	0	0	NV	0

### Hise (R) Senate District - 47

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	
0	5	4	0	0	NV	NV	0	0	0	0	0	0	

## Mecklenburg

### Alexander (D) House District - 107

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
64	75	78	▲	0	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	0	▲	0	0

### Bishop (R) House District - 104

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
0	NA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	E	0	0	0

### Bradford (R) House District - 98

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
9	NA	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	▲	0	0	0	0

### Brawley, W. (R) House District - 103

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
18	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	▲	▲	0	0	0	0

## Mecklenburg

### Bryan (R) House District - 88

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
11	0	4	0	0	0	E	0	0	▲	E	0	0	0

### Carney (D) House District - 102

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
71	72	79	▲	0	▲	▲	▲	E	▲	E	E	0	E

### Cotham (D) House District - 100

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	h2	h3	h4	h5	h6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
64	54	78	0	0	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	0	0	▲

### Cunningham (D) House District - 106

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
91	83	83	▲	0	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲

### Earle (D) House District - 101

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
78	79	76	E	0	E	▲	▲	0	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲

### Jeter (R) House District - 92

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
36	16	23	0	0	0	▲	▲	▲	▲	NV	0	0	0

### Moore, R. (D) House District - 99

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
27	56	57	0	0	▲	0	▲	0	▲	0	0	0	0

### Schaffer (R) House District - 105

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
10	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	E	▲	0	0	0	0

### Ford (D) Senate District - 38

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	
70	58	62	0	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	0	0	▲	

### Jackson, J. (D) Senate District - 37

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	
100	80	90	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	

### Rucho (R) Senate District - 39

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	
0	0	27	0	0	0	0	E	0	0	0	0	0	

### Tarte (R) Senate District - 41

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

### Waddell (D) Senate District - 40

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	
90	NA	90	0	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	

## Mitchell

### Dobson (R) House District - 85

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
9	15	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	▲	0	0	NV	0

### Hise (R) Senate District - 47

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	
0	5	4	0	0	NV	NV	0	0	0	0	0	0	

## Montgomery

### Burr (R) House District - 67

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
10	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	▲	E	0	0	0

### Goodman (D) House District - 66

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
18	39	51	0	0	▲	0	0	0	▲	0	0	0	0

## Montgomery

### Bingham (R) Senate District - 33

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	
0	0	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

## Moore

### Boles (R) House District - 52

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
0	0	11	0	0	0	0	NV	0	0	0	0	0	0

### McNeill (R) House District - 78

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
0	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	E	0	0

### Tillman (R) Senate District - 29

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	
0	0	32	0	0	0	0	0	E	0	0	0	0	

## Nash

### Collins (R) House District - 25

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	E	0	0	NV

### Richardson, B. (D) House District - 7

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
100	90	93	▲	▲	▲	▲	E	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲

### Bryant (D) Senate District - 4

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	
90	88	89	0	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	

### Newton (R) Senate District - 11

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	
0	5	4	0	0	0	NV	E	0	0	0	0	0	

## New Hanover

### Catlin (R) House District - 20

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
20	18	19	0	0	0	▲	0	E	0	▲	0	0	0

### Davis (R) House District - 19

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
10	6	5	0	E	0	0	0	0	▲	0	0	0	0

### Hamilton (D) House District - 18

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
50	65	64	E	0	E	▲	▲	E	▲	▲	0	0	0

### Lee (R) Senate District - 9

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	
INC	NA	INC	0	0	E	E	0	E	E	E	0	0	

### Rabon (R) Senate District - 8

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	
0	0	2	0	E	0	0	0	0	0	0	E	0	

## Northampton

### Wray (D) House District - 27

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
27	83	70	0	0	▲	0	▲	0	▲	0	0	0	0

### Smith-Ingram (D) Senate District - 3

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	
78	NA	78	0	▲	▲	▲	▲	E	▲	▲	▲	0	

## Onslow

### Cleveland (R) House District - 14

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
11	5	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	▲	0	E	0	E

## Onslow

### Millis (R) House District - 16

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

### Shepard (R) House District - 15

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
0	4	6	0	NV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

### Brown (R) Senate District - 6

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10
0	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

## Orange

### Insko (D) House District - 56

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
100	100	98	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	E	▲	▲

### Meyer (D) House District - 50

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
90	INC	91	▲	0	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	E	▲	▲

### Foushee (D) Senate District - 23

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10
100	100	100	▲	▲	E	E	▲	E	▲	▲	▲	▲

## Pamlico

### Speciale (R) House District - 3

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
9	15	13	0	0	0	0	▲	0	0	0	0	0	0

### Sanderson (R) Senate District - 2

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10
0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

## Pasquotank

### Hunter (D) House District - 5

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
60	NA	60	0	▲	0	E	0	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	0

### Steinburg (R) House District - 1

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
0	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	E	0	0	0	0

### Cook (R) Senate District - 1

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10
0	5	6	0	0	0	0	E	E	0	0	0	0

## Pender

### Millis (R) House District - 16

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

### Rabon (R) Senate District - 8

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10
0	0	2	0	E	0	0	0	0	0	0	E	0

## Perquimans

### Steinburg (R) House District - 1

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
0	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	E	0	0	0	0

### Cook (R) Senate District - 1

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10
0	5	6	0	0	0	0	E	E	0	0	0	0

## Person

### Yarborough (R) House District - 2

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
9	NA	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	▲	0	0	0	0

**Person**

**Woodard (D) Senate District - 22**

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10
100	85	89	▲	▲	▲	▲	E	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲

**Pitt**

**Brown, B. (R) House District - 9**

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
9	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	▲	0	0	0	0

**Farmer-Butterfield (D) House District - 24**

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
100	90	86	▲	E	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲

**Martin, S. (R) House District - 8**

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
9	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	▲	0	0	0	0

**Davis, D. (D) Senate District - 5**

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10
100	76	83	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲

**Pate (R) Senate District - 7**

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10
0	0	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Polk**

**Whitmire (R) House District - 113**

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Hise (R) Senate District - 47**

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10
0	5	4	0	0	NV	NV	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Randolph**

**Hurley (R) House District - 70**

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
0	4	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**McNeill (R) House District - 78**

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
0	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	E	0	0	0

**Gunn (R) Senate District - 24**

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10
0	0	2	0	0	E	E	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Tillman (R) Senate District - 29**

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10
0	0	32	0	0	0	0	0	E	0	0	0	0

**Richmond**

**Goodman (D) House District - 66**

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
18	39	51	0	0	▲	0	0	0	▲	0	0	0	0

**Pierce (D) House District - 48**

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
82	88	80	▲	0	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	0	▲

**McInnis (R) Senate District - 25**

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10
0	NA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Robeson**

**Goodman (D) House District - 66**

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
18	39	51	0	0	▲	0	0	0	▲	0	0	0	0



## Scotland

### Goodman (D) House District - 66

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
18	39	51	0	0	▲	0	0	0	▲	0	0	0	0

### Pierce (D) House District - 48

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
82	88	80	▲	0	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	0	▲

### McInnis (R) Senate District - 25

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	S11
0	NA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

## Stanly

### Burr (R) House District - 67

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
10	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	▲	E	0	0	0

### McInnis (R) Senate District - 25

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	S11
0	NA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

## Stokes

### Holloway (R) House District - 91

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
9	32	34	0	0	0	0	▲	0	0	0	0	0	0

### Randleman (R) Senate District - 30

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	S11
0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

## Surry

### Stevens (R) House District - 90

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
11	4	17	E	0	E	0	0	0	▲	NV	0	0	0

### Randleman (R) Senate District - 30

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	S11
0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

## Swain

### Queen (D) House District - 119

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
89	80	81	▲	▲	▲	E	▲	▲	▲	E	0	▲	▲

### Davis, J. (R) Senate District - 50

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	S11
0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

## Transylvania

### Whitmire (R) House District - 113

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

### Apodaca (R) Senate District - 48

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	S11
0	0	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

## Tyrrell

### Steinburg (R) House District - 1

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
0	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	E	0	0	0	0

### Smith-Ingram (D) Senate District - 3

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	S11
78	NA	78	0	▲	▲	▲	▲	E	▲	▲	▲	0	0

## Union

### Arp (R) House District - 69

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
9	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	▲	0	0	0	0

## Union

### Brody (R) House District - 55

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
0	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

### Horn (R) House District - 68

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
18	5	11	0	0	0	0	0	▲	▲	0	0	0	0

### Hartsell (R) Senate District - 36

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	S11
33	INC	57	0	E	E	E	E	0	▲	▲	0	0	

### Tucker (R) Senate District - 35

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	S11
0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

## Vance

### Baskerville (D) House District - 32

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
91	88	87	▲	0	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲

### Bryant (D) Senate District - 4

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	S11
90	88	89	0	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	

## Wake

### Adcock (D) House District - 41

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
82	NA	82	▲	0	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	0

### Avila (R) House District - 40

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
0	8	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	E	0	0	0

### Dollar (R) House District - 36

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
18	10	37	0	0	0	▲	0	0	▲	0	0	0	0

### Gill (D) House District - 33

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
100	95	94	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲

### Hall, D. (D) House District - 11

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
91	100	97	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	NV	▲	▲

### Holley (D) House District - 38

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
91	86	87	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	0	▲	▲

### Jackson (D) House District - 39

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
80	71	81	▲	0	▲	▲	▲	▲	E	▲	▲	0	▲

### Malone (R) House District - 35

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
0	17	13	0	0	0	0	0	NV	0	0	0	0	0

### Martin, G. (D) House District - 34

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
100	100	97	▲	▲	▲	▲	E	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲

### Pendleton (R) House District - 49

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
0	NA	0	0	0	0	0	0	NV	0	0	E	0	E

### Stam (R) House District - 37

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
9	8	37	0	0	0	NV	0	0	▲	0	0	0	0



## Wilkes

### Elmore (R) House District - 94

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

### Zachary (R) House District - 73

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
10	NA	10	0	0	0	E	0	0	▲	0	0	0	0

### Stevens (R) House District - 90

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
11	4	17	E	0	E	0	0	0	▲	NV	0	0	0

### Randleman (R) Senate District - 30

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	S11
0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

## Wilson

### Farmer-Butterfield (D) House District - 24

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
100	90	86	▲	E	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲

### Martin, S. (R) House District - 8

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
9	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	▲	0	0	0	0

### Bryant (D) Senate District - 4

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	S11
90	88	89	0	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲

### Newton (R) Senate District - 11

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	S11
0	5	4	0	0	0	NV	E	0	0	0	0	0	0

## Yadkin

### Zachary (R) House District - 73

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
10	NA	10	0	0	0	E	0	0	▲	0	0	0	0

### Krawiec (R) Senate District - 31

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	S11
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

## Yancey

### Presnell (R) House District - 118

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H11
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

### Hise (R) Senate District - 47

2015 Scores %	2013-2014 Average %	Lifetime %	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	S11
0	5	4	0	0	NV	NV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0



# Allies, Adversaries, and It's Complicated

## ALLIES

### The 100% Club

During a session when supporting our environmental priorities was increasingly difficult, we tip our hat to the representatives and senators who grounded themselves in protecting our natural resources. They refused to vote in favor of bills that rolled back regulations for our air and water. Many offered amendments to ensure critical protections remained intact, attempting to preserve our quality of life in North Carolina. We thank our legislative champions for their pragmatism to recognize how even seemingly insignificant cuts to environmental laws have disastrous consequences for our future.

## ADVERSARIES

### Department of Environmental "Quality" aka the State Agency Once Known as the Department of Environment and Natural Resources

NC DEQ Secretary Donald van der Vaart has been a staunch proponent for offshore drilling off our coast, a move that puts jobs, communities, and ecosystems at risk. Back inland, DEQ tried to put a stop to an agreement drawn up between Duke Energy and conservation groups to increase the number of coal ash ponds the company would be required to clean up. Crying foul, DEQ used the Coal Ash Management Act to hinder broader coal ash cleanup efforts put forward by Duke Energy and conservation groups. While adhering to the principle of law is commendable, it should worry North Carolinians that our state environmental agency, rather than encourage a swift and more thorough coal ash cleanup, is trying to slow it down.

Secretary van der Vaart has remained steadfast in his commitment to fight the Clean Power Plan. While he

offered a state response to the federal policy, his proposal will not actually meet the required reductions in carbon pollution set for North Carolina. It is also the most expensive course of action and creates a platform for him to tout nuclear as a viable option. This behavior does not reflect a good faith use of taxpayer dollars and does not set a good precedent for North Carolina.

### Senator Trudy Wade

As Co-Chair of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Environment and Natural Resources, Sen. Trudy Wade was unapologetic for her consistent anti-environmental behavior. Over the last nine months, Sen. Wade:

- Led the charge to prohibit North Carolina from acting on a state Clean Power Plan (a bill later amended to push state agencies toward a pathway to suing the EPA rather than addressing the real threat of carbon pollution);
- Supported efforts to reduce compensation required for developers to pay when they damage our streams; and
- Advocated for anti-environmental bill drafts (such as HB 765 – the Regulatory Reform Act of 2015) that even DEQ opposed.

Sen. Wade has been unwilling to offer real answers to questions from the public and her peers on the impacts of her proposals. Her behavior exemplifies the current political polarization inside the General Assembly.

### NC Senate Leadership

In step with Sen. Wade's blatant disregard for the people and resources of this state, the actions of Senate leadership reaffirmed this storyline repeatedly. Take Sen. Bob Rucho's headline moment during a discussion on HB



332, which included language to freeze North Carolina’s renewable energy targets. Sen. Rucho upset both Democrat and Republican members when he prevented discussion and rushed the bill through the Senate Finance Committee with no debate. After ignoring the audible “Nos” in the voice vote (which sounded louder than the “Ayes”) and refusing a headcount, he declared the bill passed.

Other “highlights” from state Senate leadership, led by President Pro Tem Phil Berger, included the multiple anti-environmental provisions added to the state budget. These included lifting the cap on terminal groins, which were still being studied for their impacts on coastal landscapes; delaying implementation of the Jordan Rules for another three years; and dumping another \$1.5 million in taxpayer dollars to the unproven SolarBee project.

These acts are just a sampling from the dozen anti-environmental provisions riddled into the Senate’s version of how North Carolina should – and should not – spend our money.

## **IT’S COMPLICATED**

### **Representative Gary Pendleton**

Rep. Gary Pendleton sponsored HB 172 – Fracking-Protecting the Public – in an attempt to make the state’s air quality standards stronger around fracking. The bill would have directed the Environmental Management Commission (EMC) to develop clear rules that would protect our health and the air we breathe from potential hazards. Unfortunately, the bill died before meeting a required deadline. If passed, the bill would have addressed a major gap in the state’s fracking rules. We commend Rep. Pendleton’s initiative and willingness to ensure our protection from dangerous toxins like methane. However,

he also cast several anti-conservation votes that will put state air at greater harm from pollution. We hope to continue working with Rep. Pendleton on how these rollbacks do more harm than good for our environment and our economy, in addition to moving his improvements for fracking regulations.

### **Representative John Szoka**

Rep. John Szoka introduced HB 245 – Energy Freedom Act. This bill would have legalized third-party sales of electricity to individuals, businesses, churches, schools, military bases, and more. Today, energy consumers must purchase their electricity directly from the utility.

HB 245 would have allowed a third party, such as a renewable energy company, to provide electricity directly to consumers and allow greater access to renewable energy – solar in particular, resulting in lower energy costs, creation of clean energy jobs, and growth in state and local revenues. Long-term: the bill would result in less pollution to our air, water, and land, and therefore fewer illnesses and health costs associated with toxic air.

Despite not making it out of Committee this session, we have high hopes to see this bipartisan bill move forward in 2016 to drive us toward a clean energy future. We also have high hopes that we can continue to work with Rep. Szoka to raise his conservation score next session.

# Governor McCrory's Progress Report



photo credit: Hal Goodtree

**Overall, Governor McCrory earns a D- for taking actions that put our communities, economy, and public health at risk by failing to protect our environment. Visit [nclcv.org/scorecard2015](http://nclcv.org/scorecard2015) for more information.**

Dirty, dated, and detached. This is the picture Governor McCrory has painted of himself based on his actions toward our state's natural resources, environment, and public health. In the nearly three years since he took office, Gov. McCrory's positions on conservation-related legislation, questionable administrative appointments, and proposed budgets indicate indifference to the environment at best, and opposition at worst. Furthermore, he has failed to develop strong relationships with leaders of the NC House and Senate, adding more conflict to an already charged atmosphere.

Because the governor does not vote on bills, the basis for his grades comes from what he signs into law, public statements, and other executive actions.

SUBJECT	GRADE
Opposing federal policies (Clean Power Plan, Clean Water Rules) that would reduce carbon pollution and protect more of North Carolina's state waters	<b>F</b>
Supporting opening NC's coast to offshore oil and gas drilling despite coastal pushback, while also undermining the potential for offshore wind development	<b>F</b>
Appointing leaders to positions of power who lack the expertise or willingness to protect our air, land, and water	<b>F</b>
Suing for control of executive power over commissions, including the Coal Ash Management Commission, granted by the state Constitution	<b>B</b>
Proposing a budget subsidizing fracking and gutting DEQ's oversight on environmental matters, but still providing some additional funding for conservation and land trusts	<b>D-</b>
Protecting polluters instead of people by signing HB 765 into law despite thousands of calls and emails urging him to veto the bill	<b>F</b>
<b>Overall</b>	<b>D-</b>

# Now that you know the score... take action!

## Help us hold legislators accountable.

Thank legislators who stood up for sound environmental policies. If they earned a low score, let your elected officials know what you think about their votes. You can find out who represents you at: [bit.ly/NCrepresents](http://bit.ly/NCrepresents).

Find out where your candidates for local, state, and federal office stand on these issues. Use this Legislative Scorecard to make informed decisions when choosing which state candidates deserve your support in the upcoming election. Visit [LCV.org](http://LCV.org) to see how your members of Congress are voting on federal issues. Ask candidates for public office where they stand on protections for clean air and water.

## Become a member of NCLCV today!

You can help turn environmental values into North Carolina priorities by becoming a member of NCLCV today at [nclcv.org/member](http://nclcv.org/member).

**Sign up for the Conservation Insider Bulletin to stay informed at [nclcv.org](http://nclcv.org).**

## WHO WE ARE

### Board of Directors

Courtney Crowder, *President*  
Mac Montgomery, *Vice-President*  
Dan Bruer, *Treasurer*  
Maria Kingery, *Immediate Past President*  
John Wallace, *Legal Counsel*  
Guenevere Abernathy  
Everett Bowman  
Robert S. Hodgman  
Valerie Ann Johnson  
Jim Overton  
Marion S. Sullivan  
Al Swanstrom  
Nina Szlosberg Landis  
Dr. Amy Tiemann

### Staff

Dan Besse, *Conservation Insider Bulletin Editor*  
Claire Chen, *Stanback Intern 2015*  
Carrie Clark, *Executive Director*  
Dan Crawford, *Director of Governmental Relations*  
Aisander Duda, *Director of Advancement*  
Aiden Graham, *Field and Mobilization Director*  
Peter Magner, *Stanback Intern 2015*  
Justine Oller, *Outreach Director*  
Sara Price, *Stanback Intern 2015*  
Judy Sirykissoo, *Stanback Intern 2015*  
Robin Smith, *Enforcement Program Director*  
Katie Todd, *Director of Digital Strategies*

# North Carolina League of Conservation Voters

**2015 LEGISLATIVE SCORECARD**

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