

FERREL GUILLORY

Director
guillory@unc.edu

THAD BEYLE

Associate Director
beyle@email.unc.edu

HODDING CARTER, III

Leadership Fellow
hoddincarter@unc.edu

KENDRA DAVENPORT COTTON

Assistant Director for Programs
kendradc@unc.edu

ANDREW HOLTON

Assistant Director for Research
holton@unc.edu

D. LEROY TOWNS

Research Fellow
dltowns@email.unc.edu

THE PROGRAM ON PUBLIC LIFE

is a non-partisan organization devoted to serving the people of North Carolina and the South by informing the public agenda and nurturing leadership.

To receive an electronic version or to subscribe to the printed version, send your name and email address to southnow@unc.edu.

The Program on Public Life is part of the Center for the Study of the American South at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Legislative Spending Trends Up

DREW ELLIOT*Graduate Assistant to the Program on Public Life*

This issue of Data-net takes a look at the spending patterns of the 2006 candidates and demographics of the 2007–08 North Carolina House and Senate. Inside, are charts on spending and demographics. Here are the trends:

- When adjusted for inflation, overall spending rose moderately from the 2004 election, from \$26.4 million to \$28.7 million, a increase of 8.4 percent. This is more than double the increase of only 3.84 percent from 2002 to 2004. However, most of that difference can be attributed to one primary in the 52nd House District. That internecine contest in 2006 saw Republicans Richard Morgan and Joe Boylan spend a combined \$1.1 million, with another \$78,000 spent by unaffiliated candidates. Boylan won the seat.

- Democrats continue to outspend Republicans—\$8.9 million in the Senate races to the GOP's \$5.1 million. In the House, Democrats outspent Republicans \$8.9 million to \$5.8 million.

- The candidate spending the most money won 110 of 120 House races, or 92 percent. In the Senate, the bigger spender won in 45 of the 50 races, or 90 percent.

- Exactly half of all General Assembly members (85 of 170) had no major-party opponent. This ratio is virtually the same as in the 2004 cycle, when 51 percent were unopposed.

- There are be 30 new General Assembly members, down from 33 new members in 2004. Counting both new members elected and appointments for deceased members, the senate has seven new members; the house has 23 new members. Just nine new members defeated an incumbent to win election. Five of those incumbents lost in the general election and four lost in a primary. Nineteen of the new members won in an open-seat election.

- In 2006, 88.8 percent of incumbents who defended their seat won it again.

- The 2006 elections in North Carolina set a new low for turnout—only 37 percent of registered voters went to the polls.

Democrats Outspend Republicans

As has been the case in every election since expenditure reports were required, Democrats outspent Republicans overall in the 2006 elections. Of the \$28.7 million spent, Democrats spent \$17.8 million, or 62 percent, while Republicans spent \$10.9 million, or 38 percent.

In the Senate, Democrats spent \$8.9 million, or 63.6 percent of the total. That percentage represents a slight drop from the last two election cycles, when they spent 69 percent of the total. In 2006 Republicans vying for the Senate spent \$5.1 million, or 36.4 percent. In adjusted dollars, spending for the Senate is on a two-cycle slight downward trend, with spending in 2006 less than 2004, which was less than 2002.

The House spending mirrored the Senate, with Democrats spending \$8.6 million (60.1 percent) and Republicans \$5.8 million (39.4 percent). Total spending for the House increased from \$14.0 million in 2004 to \$14.7 million in 2006.

The cost per seat increased slightly in 2006 to \$168,650, less than a \$3,000 increase over the cost in 2004 (in adjusted dollars). The share of total spending by each party continues to hold steady since 1992, at between 60 and 70 percent for the Democrats and between 30 and 40 percent for the Republicans. ☒

EXPENDITURES FROM BOTH HOUSES

YEAR	# OF DIST.	DEM. \$ (2006 \$)	%	REP. \$ (2006 \$)	%	TOTAL
1992	140	\$3,914,831	63.7	\$2,232,595	36.3	\$6,147,426
1994	140	\$5,341,869	58.2	\$3,840,428	41.8	\$9,182,297
1996	140	\$8,688,804	53.1	\$7,675,244	46.9	\$16,364,049
1998	140	\$11,166,076	59.8	\$7,510,476	40.2	\$18,676,552
2000	140	\$15,655,436	70	\$6,715,266	30	\$22,370,929
2002	170	\$16,113,371	63.3	\$9,245,564	36.3	\$25,466,255
2004	170	\$16,802,936	63.5	\$9,607,873	36.3	\$26,445,400
2006	170	\$17,756,665	62	\$10,913,775	38	\$28,670,440

Does not include \$78,263 (0.531% of total) expended by unaffiliated candidates in 2006.

COST PER SEAT, BOTH HOUSES

YEAR	# OF DIST.	DEM. \$ (2006 \$)	%	REP. \$ (2006 \$)	%	TOTAL (2006 \$)
1992	140	\$29,851	63.7	\$17,024	36.3	\$46,875
1994	140	\$34,575	58.2	\$29,298	24.3	\$63,873
1996	140	\$66,291	53.1	\$58,558	46.9	\$124,849
1998	140	\$85,081	59.8	\$57,227	40.2	\$142,309
2000	140	\$119,419	70	\$51,224	30	\$170,643
2002	170	\$105,968	63.3	\$54,881	36.3	\$160,849
2004	170	\$105,486	63.5	\$60,317	36.3	\$165,803
2006	170	\$104,451	62	\$64,199	38	\$168,650

STATE SENATE EXPENDITURES

YEAR	# OF DIST.	DEM. \$ (2006 \$)	DEM. \$ (ACTUAL)	%	REP. \$ (2006 \$)	REP. \$ (ACTUAL)	%	TOTAL (2006)	TOTAL (ACTUAL)
1992	42	\$1,843,871	\$1,283,334	69.8	\$796,948	\$554,676	30.2	\$2,640,819	\$1,838,010
1994	42	\$2,629,079	\$1,932,373	69.4	\$1,157,263	\$850,588	30.6	\$3,786,341	\$2,782,961
1996	42	\$5,141,343	\$3,999,965	66.9	\$2,541,527	\$1,977,308	33.1	\$7,682,870	\$5,977,273
1998	42	\$6,788,336	\$5,491,764	74.7	\$2,300,036	\$1,860,729	25.3	\$9,088,372	\$7,352,493
2000	42	\$8,066,005	\$6,888,368	80.2	\$1,986,077	\$1,696,110	19.8	\$10,052,082	\$8,584,478
2002	50	\$10,275,608	\$9,165,842	69.3	\$4,535,920	\$4,046,041	30.6	\$14,820,299	\$13,219,707
2004	50	\$9,824,261	\$9,205,333	69.1	\$4,362,649	\$4,087,802	30.7	\$14,221,092	\$13,325,163
2006	50	\$8,898,441	\$8,898,441	63.6	\$5,113,353	\$5,113,353	36.4	\$14,011,794	\$14,011,794

STATE HOUSE EXPENDITURES

YEAR	# OF DIST.	DEM. \$ (2006 \$)	DEM. \$ (ACTUAL)	%	REP. \$ (2004 \$)	REP. \$ (ACTUAL)	%	TOTAL (2006 \$)	TOTAL (ACTUAL)
1992	98	\$2,335,323	\$1,625,385	59.5	\$1,586,411	\$1,104,142	40.5	\$3,921,734	\$2,729,527
1994	98	\$3,076,182	\$2,260,994	51.1	\$2,944,419	\$2,164,148	48.9	\$6,020,601	\$4,425,142
1996	98	\$4,139,371	\$3,220,431	42.3	\$5,656,581	\$4,400,820	57.7	\$9,795,952	\$7,621,251
1998	98	\$5,123,064	\$4,144,559	47.3	\$5,711,758	\$4,620,812	52.7	\$10,834,822	\$8,765,371
2000	98	\$8,652,681	\$7,389,390	62.5	\$5,185,260	\$4,428,212	37.5	\$13,838,184	\$11,817,809
2002	120	\$7,738,976	\$6,903,167	61.6	\$4,793,821	\$4,276,088	38.1	\$12,569,845	\$11,212,302
2004	120	\$8,108,434	\$7,597,603	57.9	\$5,891,218	\$5,520,071	42.1	\$14,002,387	\$13,120,237
2006	120	\$8,858,224	\$8,858,224	60.1	\$5,800,422	\$5,800,422	39.4	\$14,736,909	\$14,736,909

Source: North Carolina Board of Elections; NC FREE

Parties Divide State—District by District

In the North Carolina legislature, most General Assembly members come from districts with a clear Democratic or Republican advantage.

Some of this is the result of geography, such as urban districts typically voting for Democrats, and some is the result of creative drawing of districts by the legislature itself. Whatever the reason, few come from “swing districts,” as identified by NC FREE.

In the Senate, NC FREE characterized eight districts as swing districts before the elections were held. Of these, three became the top three most expensive races for Senate. Incumbents won two of those races, with the other race being Jean Preston’s (R) win over Pete Bland (D) in the open 2nd District.

The fourth race on the Senate list, Joe Sam Queen’s (D) defeat of Keith Presnell (R), is technically an upset of an incumbent. However, Queen held the seat from 2003–2004, lost to Presnell in the 2004 election, and decided to run again in 2006. In a mountain district that leans Republican, according to NC FREE, both candidates marshaled significant resources for the race. Queen won the seat by just 1,405 votes out of 54,465 cast, or 51.3 percent, while outspending Presnell \$737,211 to \$177,876. Presnell was outspent by about the same ratio when he won the seat from Queen in 2004.

In the House, NC FREE identified 15 swing districts, seven of which made the list of districts accounting for 50 percent of expenditures in House races. But the top two on the list were not swing districts; they listed strongly one way or the other. In the past, seeing the top two most expensive House races labeled as “strong” Democrat or Republican districts usually meant that the seat holder was raising money to give to his or her more vulnerable partisans, as Marc Basnight did in the Senate. By contrast, in 2006 the top two were hotly contested races.

Former House Speaker Jim Black spent almost one-tenth of the total amount spent in all House races, and won a short-lived victory over Hal Jordan by 30 votes out of 10,650 cast. Black’s race was also the most expensive

DISTRICTS ACCOUNTING FOR 50% OF TOTAL EXPENDITURES, 2006 GENERAL ASSEMBLY ELECTIONS

NC Senate (7 Districts)

DIST.	CANDIDATES	RACE TYPE	WINNER'S PARTY	INCUMB. FARE	TOTAL \$ SPENT	% OF TOTAL
1	Basnight # (i) v. Toppin	SW	DEM	W	\$1,543,718	11.02%
2	Preston v. Bland	SW	REP	OS	\$1,273,214	9.09%
9	Boseman (i) v. Roseman	SW	DEM	W	\$1,195,506	8.53%
47	Queen v. Presnell (i)	LR	DEM	L	\$915,087	6.53%
8	Soles (i) v. Fairley	LD	DEM	W	\$782,086	5.58%
12	Smith # (i) v. Altman	LR	REP	W	\$735,872	5.25%
50	Snow (i) v. McKim	LR	REP	W	\$611,348	4.36%
					\$7,056,831	50.36%

NC House (17 Districts)

DIST.	CANDIDATES	RACE TYPE	WINNER'S PARTY	INCUMB. FARE	TOTAL \$ SPENT	% OF TOTAL
100	Black (i) v. Jordan	SD	DEM	W	\$1,411,146	9.58%
52	Boylan * v. 2 others^	SR	REP	L	\$1,205,391	8.18%
36	Dollar (i) v. Beaty	SW	REP	W	\$446,131	3.03%
41	Harrell * v. Capps (i)	SW	DEM	L	\$430,288	2.92%
53	Lewis (i) v. Stewart	SW	REP	W	\$389,951	2.65%
79	Howard (i) (unopposed)	SR	REP	W	\$380,509	2.58%
3	Underhill v. Speciale	LR	DEM	OS	\$356,089	2.42%
90	Harrell (i) v. Conway	LR	DEM	W	\$345,824	2.35%
10	Braxton v. Starling *	SW	DEM	OS	\$343,664	2.33%
17	Stiller (i) v. Dameron	SW	REP	W	\$326,050	2.21%
69	Gibson (i) v. Bention	LD	DEM	W	\$319,409	2.17%
45	Glazier (i) v. Warner	LD	DEM	W	\$302,472	2.05%
116	Thomas v. Jones	LR	REP	OS	\$277,610	1.88%
93	Tarleton v. Wilson (i)	LR	DEM	L	\$245,801	1.67%
6	Williams (i) v. Richardson	SW	DEM	W	\$242,001	1.64%
115	Goforth (i) v. Gorny	SW	DEM	W	\$239,073	1.62%
12	Wainwright (i) v. Wetherington	SD	DEM	W	\$238,185	1.62%

* indicates a candidate who won a primary that featured significant expenditures by that candidate and/or his/her opponent(s).

(i) incumbent

indicates a candidate who gave a significant portion of expenditures to other candidates.

^ Boylan beat Morgan (i) in the Republican primary, then two unaffiliated candidates, Galloway and Shaver, in the general.

1. The winning candidate is the first name listed.

2. “Race Type” is based on voter party registration and comes from NC FREE’s classification system in the 2006 Almanac of North Carolina Politics; “SD”=Strong Democrat, “LD”=Leaning Democrat, “SW”=Swing, “LR”=Leaning Republican, “W/L”=Incumbent Won/Lost, “OS”=winner won Open Seat

3. “Total \$ Spent” shows total two-party expenditures.

4. % of Total” shows race expenditures as a percentage of the total spent in all of a chamber’s races.

race in the House in 2004, but for entirely different reasons. As Speaker of the House, Black spent more than \$1 million in the 2004 election cycle, but almost all of it went to help other Democrats win their seats. In the 2006 cycle, Black used his considerable war chest on his own race.

The second-most expensive race featured the most expensive primary in the state, in which Richard Morgan (R) lost the 52nd District primary to challenger Joe Boylan (R), who then bested two unaffiliated candidates in the general election. ☒

Source: North Carolina Board of Elections; NC FREE

Basnight, Black Top Spending List

Senate President Pro Tem Marc Basnight once again topped the list of big spenders for 2006, spending \$1.5 million this cycle. Basnight easily beat Republican Ron Toppin to win his 12th term in the Senate, and two-thirds of that \$1.5 million went to help other Democrats win seats in the General Assembly.

Including Basnight, four of the top five Senate spenders were Democrats, the only Republican being Fred Smith of Clayton, who is running for governor in 2008 and may have been trying to increase his name recognition. All of the top five won their races except Pete Bland, who lost to Jean Preston in one of the most expensive races in the state (\$1.3 million total).

Like much of North Carolina politics through the election, the House's top spending came against the background of Black's federal criminal investigation and charges. Black spent \$1.3 million to defend his seat. He won the seat by 30 votes, only to resign as part of a plea bargain in early 2007. Black's former co-speaker Republican Richard Morgan was defeated in the primary by eventual

TOP SPENDERS IN THE 2006 GENERAL ASSEMBLY ELECTION

NC SENATE Top Five – Both Parties

CANDIDATE	AMOUNT	\$ IN MILLIONS
Basnight (D)	\$1,521,485	1.52
Boseman (D)	\$834,904	0.83
Bland (D) *	\$754,941	0.75
Queen (D)	\$737,211	0.74
Smith (R)	\$709,828	0.71

Top Five Democrats

CANDIDATE (DIST. #)	AMOUNT	\$ IN MILLIONS
Basnight (1)	\$1,521,485	1.52
Boseman (9)	\$834,904	0.83
Bland (2) *	\$754,941	0.75
Queen (47)	\$737,211	0.74
Soles (8)	\$607,786	0.61

Top Five Republicans

CANDIDATE (DIST. #)	AMOUNT	\$ IN MILLIONS
Smith (12)	\$709,828	0.71
Hunt (15)	\$506,073	0.51
Preston (2)	\$505,233	0.51
Roseman (9) *	\$360,602	0.36
Apodaca (48)	\$286,112	0.29

winner Joe Boylan, even though Morgan spent more than four times as much on a race that featured plenty of interest from outside the Moore county district.

As opposed to the Senate, more Republicans (3) than Democrats (2) make up the top five spenders in the House. The Republican spender list is top-heavy, though. In fact, if the list is extended from top five to top 13, Republicans would still fill only three places, the other ten being Democrats.

NC HOUSE Top Five – Both Parties

CANDIDATE	AMOUNT	\$ IN MILLIONS
Black (D)	\$1,315,206	1.32
Morgan (R) #	\$910,523	0.91
Lewis (R)	\$357,727	0.36
Howard (R)	\$342,615	0.34
Underhill (D)	\$315,900	0.32

Top Five Democrats

CANDIDATE (DIST. #)	AMOUNT	\$ IN MILLIONS
Black (100)	\$1,315,206	1.32
Underhill (3)	\$315,900	0.32
Gibson (69)	\$307,915	0.31
Harrell (90)	\$307,510	0.31
Beaty (36) *	\$303,624	0.30

Top Five Republicans

CANDIDATE (DIST. #)	AMOUNT	\$ IN MILLIONS
Morgan (52) #	\$910,523	0.91
Lewis (53)	\$357,727	0.36
Howard (79)	\$342,615	0.34
Boylan (52)	\$216,605	0.22
Brubaker (78)	\$201,369	0.20

Source: North Carolina Board of Elections; NC FREE

The top five spenders for each party in the House each included one candidate who lost. The Republican was Richard Morgan. The Democrat, Greer Beaty, spent more than twice the amount that incumbent Republican Nelson Dollar spent, but lost a tight race by less than 400 votes. ☒

* denotes a candidate who lost in the general election
denotes a candidate who lost in the primary election

Demographics Change Little

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS IN THE NC GENERAL ASSEMBLY BY CHAMBER AND SESSION, 1973-2005

SENATE

Number of State Senators with Characteristic

SESSION	DEMOCRATIC	REPUBLICAN	MALE	FEMALE	WHITE	BLACK	HISPANIC	NEW	INCUMBENT
1973	35	15	49	1	50	0	0	15	35
1975	49	1	48	2	48	2	0	21	29
1977	46	4	46	4	48	2	0	11	39
1979	45	5	45	5	49	1	0	7	43
1981	40	10	47	3	49	1	0	8	42
1983	44	6	45	5	49	1	0	9	41
1985	38	12	46	4	47	3	0	18	32
1987	40	10	46	4	47	3	0	6	44
1989	37	13	46	4	46	4	0	5	45
1991	36	14	45	5	45	5	0	8	42
1993	39	11	43	7	43	7	0	8	42
1995	26	24	44	6	43	7	0	14	36
1997	30	20	44	6	43	7	0	11	39
1999	35	15	45	5	43	7	0	7	43
2001	35	15	45	5	43	7	0	5	45
2003	28	22	43	7	43	6	1	15	35
2005	29	21	43	7	42	7	1	12	38
2007	31	19	42	8	43	7	0	7	46

HOUSE

Number of Representatives with Characteristic

SESSION	DEMOCRATIC	REPUBLICAN	MALE	FEMALE	WHITE	BLACK	NATIVE AMERICAN	HISPANIC	NEW	INCUMBENT
1973	85	35	112	8	117	3	1	0	50	70
1975	111	9	107	13	115	4	1	0	49	71
1977	114	6	101	19	115	4	1	0	24	96
1979	105	15	103	17	116	3	1	0	30	90
1981	96	24	101	19	116	3	1	0	33	87
1983	102	18	101	19	109	11	0	0	31	89
1985	82	38	104	16	107	13	0	0	39	81
1987	84	36	100	20	107	13	0	0	25	95
1989	74	46	99	21	107	13	0	0	25	95
1991	81	39	100	20	105	14	1	0	21	99
1993	78	42	96	24	101	18	1	0	42	78
1995	52	68	98	22	101	17	1	1	22	98
1997	59	61	97	23	101	17	1	1	22	98
1999	66	54	96	24	101	17	1	1	39	81
2001	62	58	93	27	100	18	1	1	15	105
2003	60	60	92	28	100	18	1	1	36	84
2005	63	57	88	32	99	19	1	1	21	99
2007	68	52	84	36	100	19	0	1	23	104

Source: North Carolina Center for Public Policy Research

TRENDS IN LEGISLATOR'S OCCUPATIONS, 1971-2005

State Senate

YEAR	LAW	SALES	FARMING	EDUCATION	INSURANCE	REAL ESTATE	HEALTHCARE	SELF-EMPLOYED	RETIRED
1971	22	17	4	1	2	1	1	0	4
1973	19	13	3	1	5	2	1	0	2
1975	15	14	2	3	5	5	1	1	2
1977	14	18	4	5	5	5	1	0	0
1979	13	13	3	4	6	7	1	0	3
1981	10	20	2	4	7	12	0	0	4
1983	14	19	6	4	6	8	0	0	6
1985	17	21	6	3	4	8	0	0	6
1987	21	19	6	3	4	6	0	0	4
1989	20	15	5	3	2	6	0	0	6
1991	17	16	6	4	1	6	2	0	6
1993	18	12	7	7	2	4	3	0	8
1995	16	15	6	5	2	6	3	0	7
1997	19	14	7	3	2	7	4	0	8
1999	19	15	8	2	1	4	3	3	10
2001	21	13	8	4	1	3	4	1	9
2003	15	12	3	4	0	6	4	5	11
2005	18	15	4	4	0	5	2	9	14
2007	15	12	2	5	0	4	3	9	16

State House

YEAR	LAW	SALES	FARMING	EDUCATION	INSURANCE	REAL ESTATE	HEALTHCARE	SELF-EMPLOYED	RETIRED
1971	46	49	17	6	7	6	0	0	7
1973	37	28	14	11	7	5	3	0	4
1975	36	35	20	16	12	9	4	0	5
1977	26	41	22	16	11	7	4	0	8
1979	25	37	22	10	13	10	5	0	6
1981	26	43	18	11	10	15	3	0	15
1983	26	45	24	10	6	19	5	1	12
1985	24	45	16	15	10	20	4	0	13
1987	23	43	12	12	10	15	4	0	17
1989	25	37	8	7	8	17	4	0	22
1991	18	33	11	15	12	20	7	0	28
1993	21	34	12	14	9	13	10	3	24
1995	16	31	10	14	10	13	5	1	30
1997	17	39	8	8	8	18	3	5	23
1999	18	39	8	8	9	18	1	4	28
2001	17	40	8	19	9	9	3	10	37
2003	17	41	5	21	6	9	2	8	33
2005	21	41	3	16	5	10	8	10	34
2007	18	35	3	15	4	13	4	12	33

Source: North Carolina Center for Public Policy Research, Article II (various years); North Carolina Manual (Raleigh: Department of State, 1971, 1973, 1975); www.ncga.state.nc.us

Spending in the 2006 State Senate Races

SEAT	DEMOCRATS	\$ SPENT	REPUBLICANS	\$ SPENT	TOTAL SPENT	SEAT	DEMOCRATS	\$ SPENT	REPUBLICANS	\$ SPENT	TOTAL SPENT
1	<i>Basnight</i> (i)	\$1,521,485	Toppin	\$12,534	\$1,543,718	29	no candidate		<i>Tillman</i> (i)	\$95,807	\$95,807
			Richardson	\$9,699		30	no candidate		<i>East</i> (i)	\$18,230	\$18,230
2	Bland	\$754,941	<i>Preston</i>	\$505,233	\$1,273,214	31	no candidate		<i>Brunstetter</i>	\$269,684	\$428,058
			Sanderson	\$13,040					Tabor	\$118,616	
3	<i>Jenkins</i> (i)	\$157,104	no candidate		\$157,104				Wisenhunt	\$39,758	
	Willingham					32	<i>Garrou</i> (i)	\$162,207	no candidate		\$162,207
4	<i>Holloman</i> (i)	\$25,846	Chandler (e)		\$25,846	33	no candidate		<i>Bingham</i> (i)	\$49,744	\$49,744
5	<i>Kerr</i> (i)	\$7,525	Siebels	\$61,135	\$68,660	34	Brown (e)		<i>Brock</i> (i)	\$35,446	\$35,446
6	Pittman-Dorsey	\$1,484	<i>Brown</i> (i)	\$42,422	\$43,906	35	no candidate		<i>Goodall</i> (i)	\$115,771	\$115,771
7	<i>Berger</i> (i)	\$80,583	Stires	\$25,322	\$105,905				Brooks (NR)		
8	<i>Soles</i> (i)	\$607,786	Fairley	\$160,542	\$782,086	36	Helms (e)		<i>Hartsell</i> (i)	\$143,196	\$143,196
			Babson	\$13,758		37	<i>Clodfelter</i> (i)	\$116,205	no candidate		\$116,205
9	<i>Boseman</i> (i)	\$834,904	Roseman	\$360,602	\$1,195,506	38	<i>Dannelly</i> (i)	\$23,091	no candidate		\$23,091
10	<i>Albertson</i> (i)	\$185,328	Arnett (e)		\$185,328	39	no candidate		<i>Pittenger</i> (i)	\$218,493	\$218,493
11	<i>Swindell</i> (i)	\$230,981	Lytton	\$8,931	\$239,912	40	<i>Graham</i> (i)	\$31,497	Mulheren (NR)		\$31,497
12	Altman	\$26,044	<i>Smith</i> (i)	\$709,828	\$735,872	41	no candidate		<i>Forrester</i> (i)	\$2,417	\$2,417
13	<i>Weinstein</i> (i)	\$94,652				42	Helton	\$246,913	<i>Allran</i> (i)	\$91,683	\$338,596
	Clark	\$17,839				43	<i>Hoyle</i> (i)	\$230,801	no candidate		\$230,801
14	<i>Malone</i> (i)	\$276,380	Doeffinger	\$1,032	\$277,412	44	no candidate		<i>Jacumin</i>	\$22,696	\$22,696
15	Bowles	\$22,596	<i>Hunt</i> (i)	\$506,073	\$528,668	45	Goss	\$48,674	Blust	\$94,988	\$244,882
16	<i>Cowell</i>	\$209,424	no candidate		\$209,424				Garwood	\$101,220	
17	no candidate		<i>Stevens</i> (i)	\$119,881	\$119,881	46	<i>Dalton</i> (i)	\$282,401	Westmoreland	\$141,638	\$424,039
18	<i>Atwater</i> (i)	\$48,312	no candidate		\$48,312	47	<i>Queen</i>	\$737,211	Presnell (i)	\$177,876	\$915,087
19	<i>Rand</i> (i)	\$592,918	no candidate		\$592,918	48	no candidate		<i>Apodaca</i> (i)	\$286,112	\$286,112
	Williams (e)					49	<i>Nesbitt</i> (i)	\$85,418	Clark (e)		\$85,418
20	<i>Lucas</i> (i)	\$28,627	no candidate		\$28,627				Cooper (e)		
21	<i>Shaw</i> (i)	\$42,124	Gonzalez	\$26,075	\$68,406	50	<i>Snow</i> (i)	\$398,749	McKim	\$185,661	\$611,348
	Worthy (NR)		Evans	\$207					Ledford	\$2,710	
	Smith (e)								Crawford	\$6,257	
22	Oudeh	\$22,612	<i>Blake</i> (i)	\$57,121	\$79,733				Bagley	\$17,971	
23	<i>Kinnaird</i> (i)	\$32,954	Alston	\$6,309	\$39,263						
24	Foriest	\$342,730	<i>Webster</i> (i)	\$158,108	\$508,695						
	Purgason (e)		Harrison	\$7,857							
25	<i>Purcell</i> (i)	\$97,955	Bowen (e)		\$97,955						
26	Miller (NR)		<i>Berger</i> (i)	\$71,670	\$71,670						
	Hux (NR)										
27	<i>Hagan</i> (i)	\$221,411			\$221,411						
28	<i>Dorsett</i> (i)	\$50,728	no candidate		\$50,728						
	Roberson (e)										
Totals								\$8,898,441		\$5,113,353	\$14,011,794
% of Total								63.51%		36.49%	

Note: Winners in italics, incumbents have at (i) following their names.
Exempt candidates have an (e) after their names.
(Candidates who raise or spend less than \$3,000 are exempt from reporting.)

Source: North Carolina Board of Elections; NC FREE

Spending in the 2006 State House Races

SEAT	DEMOCRATS	\$ SPENT	REPUBLICANS	\$ SPENT	TOTAL SPENT	SEAT	DEMOCRATS	\$ SPENT	REPUBLICANS	\$ SPENT	TOTAL SPENT
1	Owens (i)	\$59,172	no candidate		\$59,172	29	Hall	\$32,263	no candidate		\$99,534
2	Spear	\$76,210	Beall	\$8,830	\$85,040		Ogburn	\$34,588			
3	Underhill	\$315,900	Speciale	\$39,238	\$356,089		Jacobs	\$16,249			
			Gorman	\$951			Winslow	\$15,621			
4	Tucker	\$110,577	Kaiser	\$4,021	\$114,598		Langley	\$812			
	Herring (e)					30	Luebke (i)	\$21,510	no candidate		\$21,510
5	Hunter (NR)		Jones (e)		\$0	31	Michaux (i)	\$8,349	no candidate		\$8,349
6	Williams (i)	\$222,078	Richardson	\$19,923	\$242,001	32	Crawford (i)	\$55,016	no candidate		\$55,016
7	Jones	\$909	no candidate		\$909	33	Allen (i)	\$18,570	no candidate		\$18,570
8	Warren (i)	\$69,707	no candidate		\$151,284	34	Martin (i)	\$144,178	Ross (e)		\$144,178
	Brown	\$81,578				35	Weiss (i)	\$41,244	no candidate		\$41,244
9	McLawhorn (i)	\$197,863	Moore	\$11,662	\$209,525	36	Beaty	\$303,624	Dollar (i)	\$142,508	\$446,131
10	Braxton	\$179,614	Starling	\$58,246	\$343,664	37	Ridpath	\$54,986	Stam (i)	\$77,501	\$132,487
			LaRoque (i)	\$105,804		38	Ross (i)	\$78,450	no candidate		\$78,450
11	Griffin	\$55,027	Pate (i)	\$113,576	\$168,603		Dellinger (NR)				
12	Wainwright (i)	\$219,262	Wetherington	\$18,923	\$238,185	39	Coleman (i)	\$128,500	Blackwell	\$4,841	\$133,341
13	Fulcher	\$9,272	McElraft	\$21,031	\$39,666	40	no candidate		Avila	\$81,133	\$195,061
			Fowler	\$9,363					Eddins (i)	\$113,929	
14	Clark	\$10,224	Cleveland (i)	\$26,146	\$36,370	41	Harrell	\$303,545	Capps (i)	\$23,393	\$430,288
	Midgett (NR)						Mintz	\$103,350			
15	Hawley	\$9,258	Grady (i)	\$85,084	\$95,082	42	Lucas (i)	\$13,902	no candidate		\$13,902
			Shaeffer	\$740		43	McAllister (i)	\$25,512	no candidate		\$32,389
			Pollard (NR)				Floyd	\$6,877			
16	no candidate		Justice (i)	\$18,431	\$18,431	44	Dickson (i)	\$41,235	no candidate		\$41,235
17	Dameron	\$191,778	Stiller (i)	\$134,272	\$326,050	45	Glazier (i)	\$268,372	Warner	\$34,099	\$302,472
18	Wright (i)	\$51,884	Roberts (e)		\$80,524	46	Yongue (i)	\$21,700	no candidate		\$21,700
	Padgett	\$28,640				47	Sutton (i)	\$25,951	no candidate		\$25,951
19	no candidate		McComas (i)	\$136,856	\$136,856	48	Pierce (i)	\$4,324	no candidate		\$4,324
20	Hill (i)	\$105,755	Gilbert (e)		\$105,755	49	Allen (i)	\$81,095	Harker	\$12,750	\$93,845
21	Bell (i)	\$14,584	no candidate		\$14,584	50	Faison (i)	\$44,735	no candidate		\$44,735
22	Brisson	\$101,356	no candidate		\$226,537	51	Love	\$164,618	McNeill	\$41,055	\$213,480
	Nye (i)	\$125,181							Hall	\$7,807	
23	Tolson (i)	\$45,327	Williams (e)		\$45,327	52	No Dem. Candidate		Boylan	\$216,605	\$1,127,128
24	Butterfield (i)	\$22,190	no candidate		\$22,190				Morgan (i)	\$910,523	
25	Taylor	\$16,425	Daughtridge (i)	\$143,304	\$159,730	53	Stewart	\$32,224	Lewis (i)	\$357,727	\$389,951
	Nielsen (e)					54	Hackney (i)	\$112,319	Reed (NR)		\$112,319
26	no candidate		Daughtry (i)	\$29,788	\$29,788	55	Wilkins (i)	\$21,648	no candidate		\$21,648
27	Wray (i)	\$71,740	no candidate		\$71,740	56	Insko (i)	\$53,242	no candidate		\$53,242
	Butler (NR)					57	Harrison (i)	\$183,601	Styers	\$11,480	\$195,082
	Ervin (NR)								Rahenkamp (e)		
28	no candidate		Langdon (i)	\$8,604	\$8,604	58	Adams (i)	\$54,928	Wright	\$10,355	\$65,283
						59	Jeffus (i)	\$100,830	Rumley	\$8,513	\$109,342
						60	Jones (i)	\$6,716	Wright	\$25,884	\$32,600
						61	no candidate		Wiley (i)	\$6,011	\$6,011
						62	no candidate		Blust (i)	\$11,451	\$11,451

SEAT	DEMOCRATS	\$ SPENT	REPUBLICANS	\$ SPENT	TOTAL SPENT
63	<i>Bordsen (i)</i>	\$56,006	no candidate		\$56,006
64	no candidate		Allred (i)	\$622	\$622
65	<i>Cole (i)</i>	\$123,179	Moore (e)		\$123,179
66	<i>Goodwin (i)</i>	\$26,220	Browder	\$0	\$26,220
67	no candidate		<i>Almond (i)</i>	\$31,272	\$46,580
			Burr	\$15,308	
68	no candidate		<i>Blackwood (i)</i>	\$1,127	\$1,127
69	<i>Gibson (i)</i>	\$307,915	Bention	\$11,494	\$319,409
70	Spivey	\$13,876	<i>Hurley</i>	\$42,479	\$162,771
			Parker (e)		
			Wilson	\$106,416	
71	<i>Womble (i)</i>	\$4,245	no candidate		\$4,245
72	<i>Parmon (i)</i>	\$17,538	no candidate		\$17,538
73	no candidates		<i>Brown (i)</i>	\$10,778	\$10,778
74	no candidate		<i>Folwell (i)</i>	\$42,256	\$42,256
75	no candidate		<i>McGee (i)</i>	\$20,463	\$20,463
76	no candidate		<i>Steen (i)</i>	\$50,343	\$50,343
77	<i>Coates (i)</i>	\$85,189	Morris	\$22,258	\$107,448
78	no candidate		<i>Brubaker (i)</i>	\$201,369	\$201,369
79	no candidate		<i>Howard (i)</i>	\$342,615	\$380,509
			Mitchell	\$37,894	
80	no candidate		<i>Dockham (i)</i>	\$188,160	\$188,160
81	<i>Holliman (i)</i>	\$85,869	no candidate		\$85,869
82	no candidate		<i>Barnhart (i)</i>	\$51,382	\$51,382
83	no candidate		<i>Johnson (i)</i>	\$60,531	\$60,531
84	no candidate		<i>Frye (i)</i>	\$28,432	\$39,043
			Buchanan	\$10,611	
85	<i>Aldridge</i>	\$15,623	<i>Gillespie (i)</i>	\$61,581	\$77,204
86	<i>Church (i)</i>	\$137,380	Blackwell	\$18,503	\$155,883
87	no candidate		<i>Starnes (i)</i>	\$3,306	\$3,306
88	<i>Warren</i>	\$52,128	Hollo (i)	\$56,337	\$108,465
89	no candidate		Setzer (i)	\$38,312	\$38,312
90	<i>Harrell (i)</i>	\$307,510	Conaway	\$38,314	\$345,824
91	Gambill (NR)		<i>Holloway (i)</i>	\$27,986	\$27,986
92	no candidate		<i>Holmes (i)</i>	\$123,716	\$123,716
			St. John (e)		
93	<i>Tarleton</i>	\$185,428	<i>Wilson (i)</i>	\$60,373	\$245,801
			Hense (e)		
94	Porter	\$16,615	<i>Walker (i)</i>	\$30,886	\$52,162
			Brown	\$4,661	
95	no candidate		<i>Ray (i)</i>	\$131,251	\$132,123
			Brawley	\$872	
96	no candidate		<i>Hilton (i)</i>	\$20,015	\$20,015
97	no candidate		<i>Kiser (i)</i>	\$25,626	\$25,626
98	no candidate		<i>Tillis</i>	\$143,997	\$190,025
			Rhodes (i)	\$46,028	

SEAT	DEMOCRATS	\$ SPENT	REPUBLICANS	\$ SPENT	TOTAL SPENT
99	<i>Saunders (i)</i>	\$47,768	no candidate		\$47,768
100	<i>Black (i)</i>	\$1,315,206	Jordan	\$95,940	\$1,411,146
101	<i>Earle (i)</i>	\$31,126	no candidate		\$31,126
102	<i>Carney (i)</i>	\$34,769	no candidate		\$34,769
103	Passaly	\$4,053	<i>Gulley (i)</i>	\$25,889	\$29,942
			Hale (NR)		
104	McSwain (NR)		<i>Samuelson (e)</i>		\$0
105	no candidate		<i>Killian</i>	\$12,506	\$12,506
106	<i>Alexander (i)</i>	\$7,453	no candidate		\$7,453
107	<i>Cunningham (i)</i>	\$22,432			\$22,432
108	Wyatt	\$6,328	<i>Neumann</i>	\$38,576	\$44,905
109	no candidate		<i>Current</i>	\$5,895	\$5,895
110	Long	\$2,394	<i>Clary (i)</i>	\$85,712	\$88,105
111	Fonvielle	\$48,016	<i>Moore (i)</i>	\$92,493	\$140,508
112	England (i)	\$102,199	Reno	\$207	\$102,406
113	no candidate		<i>Walend (i)</i>	\$2,145	\$2,145
114	<i>Fisher (i)</i>	\$117,496	Harrison	\$30,693	\$148,189
115	<i>Goforth (i)</i>	\$219,583	Gorny	\$19,490	\$239,073
			Reynolds (e)		
116	Jones	\$171,842	<i>Thomas</i>	\$59,439	\$277,610
	Hughes	\$25,885	Porter	\$20,137	
	Latimore (e)				
	Cathcart	\$307			
117	Hoots (e)		<i>Justus (i)</i>	\$46,271	\$46,271
			Baldwin (e)		
118	<i>Rapp (i)</i>	\$70,931	Gowan	\$895	\$71,826
119	<i>Haire (i)</i>	\$179,519	Carpenter	\$52,931	\$232,450
120	no candidate		<i>West (i)</i>	\$11,270	\$11,270
	Totals	\$8,858,224		\$5,800,422	\$14,658,647
	% of Total	60.43%		39.57%	100.00%

Note: Winners in italics, incumbents have at (i) following their names.
Exempt candidates have an (e) after their names.
(Candidates who raise or spend less than \$3,000 are exempt from reporting.)

Source: North Carolina Board of Elections; NC FREE

2006 Voting Hits Record Low

STATEWIDE VOTE TOTALS FOR NC STATE HOUSE CANDIDATES, 1968-2006

YEAR	TOTAL VOTES (MILLIONS)			PERCENT		SEATS WON		UNCONTESTED	
	DEM.	REP.	TOTAL	DEM.	REP.	DEM.	REP.	DEM.	REP.
1968	1.2	0.63	1.83	65.6	34.4	91	29	19	2
1970	0.77	0.41	1.18	65.2	34.8	96	24	24	1
1972	1.32	0.65	1.97	67.1	32.9	85	35	28	1
1974	1.12	0.45	1.57	71.5	28.5	111	9	25	0
1976	1.32	0.38	1.7	77.8	22.2	114	6	47	0
1978	-	-	-	-	-	106	14	--	--
1980	1.7	0.84	2.53	67	33	96	24	27	0
1982	1.32	0.43	1.75	75.4	24.6	102	18	40	5
1984	1.51	0.75	2.26	66.8	33.2	82	38	41	0
1986	1.19	0.83	2.02	59.1	40.9	84	36	17	2
1988	1.51	1.2	2.71	55.7	44.3	74	46	20	6
1990	1.54	0.97	2.51	61.3	38.7	81	39	22	7
1992	1.73	1.2	2.92	59.2	40.8	78	42	32	12
1994	0.98	1	1.98	49.4	50.6	52	68	36	22
1996	1.54	1.6	3.14	48.9	51.1	59	61	20	21
1998	1.23	1.22	2.45	50.2	49.8	67	53	31	26
2000	1.71	1.79	3.5	48.9	51.1	62	58	25	23
2002	0.89	1.09	1.98	44.9	55.1	59	61*	26	31
2004	1.37	1.49	2.92	47	51.1	63	57	36	35
2006	0.83	0.86	1.7	49.1	50.9	68	52	32	31

BY LEROY TOWNS
Research Associate

The 2006 “blue moon” elections in North Carolina set a record, but it is not one to brag about.

Only 37 percent of North Carolina voters went to the polls to elect members of Congress, members of the General Assembly, judges and local officials. That is the lowest turnout since the State Board of Elections began posting statistics in 1974.

Every 12 years in North Carolina, the general election ballot contains no major statewide races, a phenomena some call “blue moon election.” The result is lower-than-usual turnout. In 1994, the last such election, 42 percent of registered voters went to the polls.

A look at Senate and House races in 2006

STATEWIDE VOTE TOTALS FOR NC STATE SENATE CANDIDATES, 1968-2006

YEAR	TOTAL VOTES (MILLIONS)			PERCENT		SEATS WON		UNCONTESTED	
	DEM.	REP.	TOTAL	DEM.	REP.	DEM.	REP.	DEM.	REP.
1968	1.1	0.57	1.67	65.8	34.2	38	12	13	1
1970	0.67	0.4	1.06	62.7	37.3	43	7	13	1
1972	1.42	0.62	2.04	69.5	30.5	35	15	23	1
1974	1.16	0.52	1.67	69.1	30.9	49	1	15	0
1976	1.92	0.65	2.57	74.8	25.2	46	4	21	0
1978	1.04	0.49	1.53	67.9	32.1	45	5	16	0
1980	1.85	0.73	2.57	71.7	28.3	40	10	18	0
1982	1.19	0.56	1.75	67.9	32.1	44	6	17	1
1984	1.55	0.93	2.48	62.4	37.6	38	12	16	0
1986	1.2	0.82	2.02	59.3	40.7	40	10	8	1
1988	1.48	1.12	2.6	56.8	43.2	37	13	12	2
1990	1.36	1.19	2.55	53.3	46.7	36	14	6	4
1992	1.56	1.26	2.86	55.2	44.8	39	11	3	6
1994	0.93	0.87	1.8	51.7	48.3	26	24	13	5
1996	1.55	1.51	3.06	50.7	49.3	30	20	6	4
1998	1.17	1.17	2.34	50.2	49.9	35	15	8	10
2000	1.68	1.64	3.32	50.6	49.4	35	15	6	8
2002	1.02	1.11	2.13	48	52	28	22	6	5
2004	1.51	1.57	3.13	48.2	50.2	29	21	7	9
2006	0.89	0.83	1.72	51.9	48.1	31	19	12	10

Note (House Candidates): Totals may not equal due to rounding. Uncontested races are those in which a candidate ran unopposed or with not opposition from the other major party.

* = Republicans won 61 seats in the 2002 election, but Rep. Michael Decker’s subsequent switch to the Democratic Party resulted in a 60-60 split. The votes that Decker received are counted in the Republican column because that was his affiliation at the time of the election.

Part of the difference in the vote totals between 2000 and 2002 is due to the elimination of multi-member districts under the 2002 districting plan. Prior to 2002 voters in multi-member districts could cast several votes.

Note (Senate Candidates): Totals may not equal due to rounding. Uncontested races are those in which a candidate ran unopposed or with no opposition from the other major party. Part of the difference in vote totals between 2000 and 2002 is due to the elimination of multi-member districts under the 2002 districting plan. Prior to 2002 voters in multi-member districts could cast several votes.

Source: NC Center for Public Policy Research; NC State Board of Elections; NC FREE.

shows turnout in many districts was less than half the dismal statewide number. In the 13th Senate District, for example, only 17 percent of registered voters turned out. David F. Weinstein was unopposed in that race. In the 21st District, where Larry Shaw had opposition, only 23.9 percent turned out.

At the other end of the Senate vote spectrum, the 50th District saw a 51.8 percent turnout.

In the 42nd House District, 16.7 percent went to the polls in an uncontested race. However, even contested races, several districts turned out low numbers. At the top end, 54.2 percent turned out in the 115th contested race.

In part, the turnout figures reflect a wide variance in registered voters among both House and Senate districts. In the senate, the lowest number of registered voters, 81,812, is in the Down East 6th District. The highest, 144,377, is in the 39th District around Charlotte.

The lowest registration among House districts is in the eastern 15th, which has 25,210. The highest is in the 98th in the Charlotte area, which has 69,700 registered voters.

Total population in each district is much closer because that is the number used to determine apportionment.

Finally, the demographics of this assembly look much like assemblies in recent years. While Democrats picked up five seats to increase their House majority to 68-52, Republicans overall won 50.9 percent of the total vote for House members. That was reversed in the Senate, where Democrats won 51.9 percent of the total vote for Senators as the Democratic Party increased its Senate majority to 31-19. ☒

HOUSE LOW AND HIGH VOTE, 2006

District	Candidate	Party	Winning Vote	Total Vote	Turnout %
Lows					
42	Marvin W. Lucas (U)	DEM	5610	5610	16.7
43	Mary E. McAllister (U)	DEM	5645	5645	18.2
47	Ronnie Sutton (U)	DEM	5791	5791	16.5
15	Robert Grady (Hawley)	REP	3920	6335	25.1
71	Larry Womble (U)	DEM	7101	7101	22.4
7	Edward (Ed) Jones (U)	DEM	7264	7264	20.2
46	Douglas Y. Yongue (U)	DEM	7684	7684	2
107	W. Pete Cunningham (U)	DEM	7826	7826	16.5
72	Earline W. Parmon (U)	DEM	7971	7971	24.6
Highs					
118	Ray Rapp (Gowan)	DEM	16712	24157	51.2
36	Nelson Dollar (Beaty)	REP	12305	24275	43.5
93	Cullie Tarleton (Wilson)	DEM	13414	24483	41
13	Patricia (Pat) McElraft (Fulcher)	REP	14304	24505	45.1
117	Carolyn K. Justus (Hoots)	REP	16783	24871	44.7
114	Susan C. Fisher (Harrison)	DEM	16073	25006	49.3
116	Charles C. Thomas (Jones)	REP	12840	25260	47.1
41	Ty Harrell (Capps)	DEM	13051	25275	37.9
37	Paul Stam (Ridpath)	REP	15459	27087	40.4
115	D. Bruce Goforth (Gorny)	DEM	18584	27476	54.2

SENATE LOW AND HIGH VOTE, 2006

District	Candidate	Party	Winning Vote	Total Vote	Turnout %
Lows					
13	David F. Weinstein (U)	DEM	15992	15992	17
3	Clark Jenkins (U)	DEM	19633	19633	20
32	Linda Garrou (U)	DEM	19663	19633	23.7
37	Daniel G. Clodfelter (U)	DEM	20018	20018	19
38	Charlie Dannelly (U)	DEM	20372	20372	16.9
28	Katie G. Dorsett (U)	DEM	20955	20955	19.4
43	David W. Hoyle (U)	DEM	21419	21419	21.7
6	Harry Brown (Pittman-Dorsey)	REP	13917	21499	26
21	Larry Shaw (Gonzalez)	DEM	13412	21756	23.9
19	Tony Rand (U)	DEM	22731	22731	21.2
Highs					
23	Ellie Kinnaird (Alston)	DEM	31947	43347	38.3
9	Julia Boseman (Roseman)	DEM	27804	44137	34.3
1	Marc Basnight (Toppin)	DEM	30398	44156	38.6
45	Steve Goss (Blust)	DEM	24269	48219	39.2
2	Jean Preston (Bland)	REP	28340	49392	42.7
8	R. C. Soles, Jr. (Fairley)	DEM	26407	50209	38.9
47	Joe Sam Queen (Presnell)	DEM	27935	54465	47.7
49	Martin Nesbitt (Clark)	DEM	36901	56219	48.7
15	Neal Hunt (Bowles)	REP	31478	57332	47.6
50	John Snow (McKim)	DEM	37130	61953	51.8

Source: North Carolina Board of Elections; NC FREE