

NEW HAMPSHIRE HOUSE VOTE **DESCRIPTIONS**



Club for Growth Foundation is a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization focused on educating the public about the value of free markets, pro-growth policies, and economic prosperity.

State Scorecards are created by the Club for Growth Foundation to educate the public about the voting records of the legislators who serve in state legislatures. This is part of a larger scorecard project that the Club for Growth Foundation has created to educate the public about the economic positions taken by legislators in states across the country.

Our Mission

THE FOUNDATION **EDUCATES THE** PUBLIC ABOUT PRO-**GROWTH POLICIES.**

THE FOUNDATION CONDUCTS **COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATIONS OF VOTING RECORDS.**

THE FOUNDATION'S **GOAL IS TO INFORM** THE PUBLIC AND **BRING AWARENESS** TO LAWMAKERS.

METHODOLOGY 2022 **NEW HAMPSHIRE**

SNAPSHOT

DESCRIPTIONS

SNAPSHOT

DESCRIPTIONS

Methodology | New Hampshire 2022

Club for Growth Foundation publishes the scorecard study so the public can monitor the actions and the voting behavior of New Hampshire's elected state lawmakers on economic growth issues.

The Foundation conducted a comprehensive examination of each lawmaker's record on votes related to pro-growth policies and computed an Economic Growth Score on a scale of 0 to 100. A score of 100 indicates the highest support for pro-growth policies.

The Foundation examines legislative votes related to the Club's immediate pro-economic growth policy goals, including:

- Reducing or eliminating tax rates and enacting tax reform
- Limited government through limited spending and budget reform
- Regulatory reform and deregulation
- Ending abusive lawsuits through medical malpractice and tort reform
- Expanding school choice
- Implementing term limits

Not all of these policy goals will come up for a vote in each legislative session.

The Foundation also examines votes on bills that would directly harm these goals.

This scorecard is based on selected votes of importance to the Foundation, and does not include the complete voting record of any legislator. There are inherent limitations in judging the overall qualifications of any legislator based on a selected voting record, and the Foundation does not endorse or oppose any legislator for public office.

LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS **CONSIDERED IN NEW HAMPSHIRE IN 2022**

The Foundation's study examined over 400 floor votes and, in the end, included 16 New Hampshire House votes and 11 New Hampshire Senate votes.

COMPUTATION

Scores are computed on a scale of 0 to 100. Each vote or action in the rating is assigned a certain number of points depending on its relative importance. If a lawmaker casts a correct vote, the scorecard will denote it with that number. If a lawmaker casts an incorrect vote, the scorecard will denote that vote with a hyphen (-). Absences are not counted signified as an "X" on the scorecard - though the Foundation reserves the right to do so if, in its judgment, a lawmaker's position was otherwise discernible. If a lawmaker was not officially sworn into office at the time of a vote, the scorecard will denote that vote with an "I".

To provide some additional guidance concerning the scores, each lawmaker was ranked. Aside from ties, lawmakers with 0%

scores are, by default, ranked #400 in the House and #24 in the Senate if all lawmakers are present. Scores and ranks cannot be directly compared between the House and Senate, as different votes were taken in each chamber. If applicable, the study also records a "Lifetime Score" for each lawmaker. This is a simple average of the scores from 2022 and all previous years where the lawmaker earned a score.

In some cases, a lawmaker was not present for enough votes for a meaningful score or ranking to be computed. In such cases "n.a." for "not applicable" appears. In computing lifetime scores, years with "n.a." listed instead of a score are not included. Comparing such scores to other members without "n.a." years may be misleading.

ADDITIONAL FACTORS

A study of roll call votes on the floor of the New Hampshire House and New Hampshire Senate and legislative actions is just that. It cannot account for a lawmaker's work in committee, advocacy in his party's caucus meetings, and effectiveness as a leader in advocating pro-growth policies.

"Through the release of this series, the Club for Growth Foundation is looking at how state legislatures perform in terms of pro-growth policies. We believe that this scorecard will help inform citizens and entrepreneurs about who supports the policies that are good for economic prosperity."

- DAVID McINTOSH PRESIDENT, CLUB FOR GROWTH FOUNDATION

METHODOLOGY 2022 **NEW HAMPSHIRE**

SNAPSHOT

SNAPSHOT

DESCRIPTIONS



24 MEMBERS

New Hampshire Senate Snapshot









HIGHEST-RATED REPUBLICANS (clockwise from Left) Senator Jeb Bradley (SD-3) | 71% Senator Gary Daniels (SD-11) | 71%

Senator James Gray (SD-6) | 71%

Senator Chuck Morse (SD-22) | 71%



14 Republicans

10 Democrats

O Independent

O Vacancies

Average Republican Score: 63% (Down from 66% in 2020)

Average Democrat Score: 8% (Up from 1% in 2020)



LOWEST-RATED REPUBLICAN Senator Bob Giuda (SD-2) | 48%



HIGHEST-RATED DEMOCRAT Senator Becky Whitley (SD-15) | 11%



LOWEST-RATED DEMOCRATS Multiple Senators | 8%

NEW HAMPSHIRE SENATE SNAPSHOT

SNAPSHOT

New Hampshire 2022 | Senate Scorecard

Name	District	Party	Score	Life- score	HB103	HB1417	HB1587	SB203	SB226	SB274	SB417	SB426	SB432	SB437	SB453	Rank
PRO-GROWTH POSITION					N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
POINTS					12	9	9	10	8	8	10	7	10	7	10	
Avard, Kevin	SD-12	R	57%	57%	-	9	-	х	8	-	-	7	10	7	10	13
Birdsell, Regina	SD-19	R	61%	59%	-	9	-	10	8	-	-	7	10	7	10	6
Bradley, Jeb	SD-03	R	71%	64%	-	9	-	10	8	-	10	7	10	7	10	1
Carson, Sharon	SD-14	R	61%	55%	-	9	-	10	-	8	-	7	10	7	10	6
Cavanaugh, Kevin	SD-16	D	8%	3%	-	-	-	-	-	8	-	-	-	-	-	17
D'Allesandro, Lou	SD-20	D	8%	3%	-	-	-	-	-	8	-	-	-	-	-	17
Daniels, Gary	SD-11	R	71%	71%	-	9	-	10	8	-	10	7	10	7	10	1
French, Harold	SD-07	R	61%	59%	-	9	-	10	8	-	-	7	10	7	10	6
Gannon, William	SD-23	R	61%	61%	-	9	-	10	8	-	-	7	10	7	10	6
Giuda, Bob	SD-02	R	48%	60%	-	9	-	10	х	-	-	х	10	7	х	14
Gray, James	SD-06	R	71%	64%	-	9	-	10	8	-	10	7	10	7	10	1
Hennessey, Erin	SD-01	R	61%	75%	-	9	-	10	8	-	-	7	10	7	10	6
Kahn, Jay	SD-10	D	8%	3%	-	-	-	-	-	8	-	-	-	-	-	17
Morse, Chuck	SD-22	R	71%	66%	-	9	-	10	8	-	10	7	10	7	10	1
Perkins Kwoka, Rebecca	SD-21	D	8%	8%	-	-	-	-	-	8	-	-	-	-	-	17
Prentiss, Suzanne	SD-05	D	8%	8%	-	-	-	-	-	8	-	-	-	-	-	17
Reagan, John	SD-17	R	69%	65%	Х	9	-	10	8	-	-	7	10	7	10	5
Ricciardi, Denise	SD-09	R	61%	61%	-	9	-	10	8	-	-	7	10	7	10	6
Rosenwald, Cindy	SD-13	D	8%	3%	-	-	-	-	-	8	-	-	-	-	-	17
Sherman, Tom	SD-24	D	9%	3%	-	-	-	-	-	8	-	-	х	-	-	16

Name	District	Party	Score	Life- score	HB103	HB1417	HB1587	SB203	SB226	SB274	SB417	SB426	SB432	SB437	SB453	Rank
PRO-GROWTH POSITION					N	N	N	Y	Υ	N	Υ	Y	Υ	Y	Y	
POINTS					12	9	9	10	8	8	10	7	10	7	10	
Soucy, Donna	SD-18	D	8%	3%	-	-	-	-	-	8	-	-	-	-	-	17
Ward, Ruth	SD-08	R	61%	62%	-	9	-	10	8	-	-	7	10	7	10	6
Watters, David	SD-04	D	8%	3%	-	-	-	-	-	8	-	-	-	-	-	17
Whitley, Becky	SD-15	D	11%	11%	-	-	-	-	Х	8	-	Х	-	-	Х	15

NEW HAMPSHIRE SENATE **VOTES**

HB 103

NEW MEDICAID EXPANSION

(CFGF OPPOSES)

This bill further expands New Hampshire's already costly Medicaid program. Specifically, the legislation requires the Department of Health and Human Services to contract with managed care organizations and extend dental benefits to all Medicaid recipients 21 years and older. The estimated cost through FY 2025 is \$15.5 million in state appropriations and outlays with another \$35 million in estimated federal spending. Medicaid is known for its high costs that devour state budgets, poor health outcomes, and low quality of care. The New Hampshire House passed the bill, 246-105, on May 26, 2022. The New Hampshire Senate passed it, 23-0, on May 5, 2022.

HB 1417

TABLING MASSIVE TAXPAYER-FUNDED **PENSION BOONDOGGLE**

(CFGF SUPPORTS)

This bill requires New Hampshire taxpayers to increase funding for pensions associated with specific government workers. Specifically, the legislation requires the state to pay 7.5 percent of the costs incurred by municipalities to fund retirement pensions for teachers, firefighters, and police officers. The state previously paid zero percent. The estimated cost to taxpayers of the new pension plan is a combined \$56 million in FY 2024 and FY 2025 with near-certain spending increases in the future. The New Hampshire House passed the bill, 186-159, on March 31, 2022. The New Hampshire Senate tabled the bill. 14-10. on April 28, 2022. A vote in the affirmative is to block the taxpayer-funded pensions.

HB 1587

GOVERNMENT WORKER PENSION INCREASE

(CFGF OPPOSES)

This bill modifies the pension formula for Group Il government worker retirees. Specifically, the legislation alters the average final compensation for government employees who commenced service on or after July 1, 2011, by including the highest five years of the retiree's service. The cost of this pension adjustment to taxpavers is estimated at \$43 million for FY 2023 with guaranteed future spending increases through at least FY 2026. The New Hampshire House passed the bill, 231-113, on February 17, 2022. The New Hampshire Senate passed it, 24-0, on May 5, 2022.

SNAPSHOT

NEW HAMPSHIRE SENATE VOTE DESCRIPTIONS

SNAPSHOT

VOTES

DESCRIPTIONS

SB 203

BLOCKING ANTI-SMALL BUSINESS MINIMUM WAGE HIKE

(CFGF SUPPORTS)

This bill increases the state minimum wage by 50 percent. Specifically, the legislation ratchets up the minimum wage from \$10 per hour to \$15 per hour by 2024. Empirical data has been consistently clear that minimum wage increases result in fewer jobs and place onerous constraints on small businesses through diminished profit margins due to sudden increases in mandatory hourly wages. These costs are then passed on to consumers. The New Hampshire Senate blocked the bill, 13-10, on February 24, 2022. The New Hampshire House did not take it up. A vote in the affirmative was a vote to block the minimum wage increase.

SB 226

TABLING GOVERNMENT WORKER RECRUITMENT PROGRAM

(CFGF SUPPORTS)

This bill creates a new government worker recruitment and retention program. Specifically,

the legislation authorizes the Department of Administrative Services to craft a taxpayer-funded subsidy program designed to retain or increase taxpayer-funded workers. The bill is open-ended with regard to total costs and scope. Additionally, the legislation includes \$1,000 referral bonuses for current state employees who recruit new government workers and a one-time \$2,000 bonus for full-time workers who continue to remain employed with the state government. The New Hampshire Senate tabled the bill, 12-10, on March 24, 2022. The New Hampshire House did not take it up. A vote in the affirmative was to block the subsidy program.

SB 274

BLOCKING PRO-WORKER LABOR AGREEMENTS

(CFGF OPPOSES)

This bill ensures that construction projects are an open bid process. Specifically, the legislation prohibits government infrastructure and construction projects from requiring labor affiliation or other labor-imposed wage and benefit criteria from serving as eligibility

requirements for contractors. Over 90 percent of New Hampshire construction workers choose not to affiliate with labor unions. The bill requires the state government to remain neutral in favor of privately negotiated agreements instead of cost-driving, crony project labor agreements. The New Hampshire House blocked the bill, 177-154, on May 4, 2022. The New Hampshire Senate passed it, 13-11, on February 3, 2022. A vote in opposition to this bill was a vote in support of pro-worker labor agreements.

SB 417

BLOCKING ELECTRIC SCHOOL BUS PROGRAM

(CFGF SUPPORTS)

This bill creates an electric school bus pilot program within the Department of Environmental Services. Specifically, the legislation includes an estimate showing that five such school buses plus the associated charging infrastructure would cost between \$1 million and \$1.4 million. The average annual cost of a traditional school bus is \$35,000. Further, the total amount that the program

METHODOLOGY 2022 NEW HAMPSHIRE

NEW HAMPSHIRE SENATE SNAPSHOT

NEW HAMPSHIRE SENATE VOTES

NEW HAMPSHIRE
SENATE
VOTE
DESCRIPTIONS

NEW HAMPSHIRE HOUSE SNAPSHOT

NEW HAMPSHIRE HOUSE VOTES

will cost taxpayers remains indeterminable due to both unknown appropriations and potential expansions of the program. The New Hampshire Senate failed to block the bill, 4-20, on March 31, 2022. The New Hampshire House did not take it up. A vote in the affirmative was a vote to block the electric school bus program.

SB 426

BLOCKING EDUCATION GRANT SPENDING SUPPLEMENTAL

(CFGF SUPPORTS)

This bill implements a funding formula change for adequate education grants. Specifically, the legislation requires the commissioner of education to use the highest of the daily average membership in residence for 2020, 2021, and 2022 school years to determine grant allocations for FY 2023. This change results in \$30.4 million in new costs to taxpayers for the education grant program. The New Hampshire Senate blocked the bill, 13-9, on March 24, 2022. The New Hampshire House did not take it up. A vote in the affirmative was a vote to block the supplemental spending.

SB 432

BLOCKING SCHOOL CHOICE REPEAL (CFGF SUPPORTS)

This bill repeals New Hampshire's Education Freedom accounts. Specifically, the legislation eliminates the statutory authorization for the Education Freedom account program which allows households at or below 300 percent of the federal poverty level to apply for school choice funding equivalent to the state's \$4,600 per pupil allocation. These accounts may be used for various educational expenses at any eligible K-12 school, empowering parents and focusing on achieving better student outcomes. The New Hampshire Senate blocked the bill. 14-9, on February 16, 2022. The New Hampshire House did not take it up. A vote in the affirmative was a vote to block the repeal of school choice in NH. A vote in the affirmative was a vote to block the repeal of school choice in NH.

SB 437

BLOCKING MUNICIPAL TRANSPORTATION FEE INCREASE

(CFGF SUPPORTS)

This bill implements a new maximum fee for municipalities to charge for transportation projects. Specifically, the legislation increases the existing \$5 fee by 300 percent for a new maximum of \$15. This legislation is little more than a statewide tax increase on hardworking families and households to benefit niche special interests. The New Hampshire Senate blocked the bill, 14-10, on March 17, 2022. The New Hampshire House did not take it up. A vote in the affirmative was a vote to block the fee increase.

SB 453

BLOCKING MASSIVE PRE-K GOVERNMENT TAKEOVER

(CFGF SUPPORTS)

This bill crafts a new statewide government pre-K mandate for every school district. Specifically, the legislation provides new construction grants

SNAPSHOT

NEW HAMPSHIRE SENATE VOTE DESCRIPTIONS

SNAPSHOT

VOTES

to cover up to 100 percent of the design and construction cost for new government-run pre-K programs. Additionally, the bill allows an alternative Pre-K program, but imposes strict guidelines for school districts that do not wish to conform to the traditional government program. Adequate funding grants for Pre-K are set at 50 percent of the current per-pupil allocation. Importantly, the total cost to taxpayers from this new program remains indeterminable. The New Hampshire Senate blocked the bill, 13-9, on March 24, 2022. The New Hampshire House did not take it up. A vote in the affirmative was a vote to block the pre-K government takeover.

NEW HAMPSHIRE SENATE VOTE DESCRIPTIONS



400 MEMBERS

New Hampshire House Snapshot



206 Republicans

184 Democrats

1 Independent

9 Vacancies

Average Republican Score: 84%

(Down from 94% in 2020)

Average Democrat Score: 1%

(Down from 2% in 2020)



LOWEST-RATED REPUBLICAN

HIGHEST-RATED REPUBLICANS

Multiple Reps | 100%

Rep. Dan Wolf (Merrimack 5) | 29%





HIGHEST-RATED DEMOCRATS

Rep. Jeffrey Goley (Hillsborough 8) | 13%

Rep. Edith Tucker (Coos 5) | 13%



SNAPSHOT

NEW HAMPSHIRE HOUSE **SNAPSHOT**





New Hampshire 2022 | House Scorecard

Name	District	Party	Score	Lifescore	CACR14	HB103	HB172	HB1165	HB1298	HB1337	HB1342	HB1417	HB1432	HB1587	HB1657	HB1683	HR17	SB274	SB326	SB404	Rank
PRO-GROWTH POSITION					Υ	N	N	Υ	Υ	Υ	N	N	Υ	N	Υ	Υ	Υ	N	Υ	N	
POINTS					5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	
Abbas, Daryl	Rockingham 8	R	73%	82%	5	-	6	-	5	6	5	9	5	-	4	7	3	8	3	7	139
Abbott, Michael	Cheshire 1	D	0%	3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Abel, Richard	Grafton 13	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Abrami, Patrick	Rockingham 19	R	72%	81%	5	-	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	-	4	7	3	8	3	-	141
Abramson, Max	Rockingham 37	R	59%	74%	-	-	-	6	Х	6	5	9	5	-	-	7	-	8	3	7	175
Acton, Dennis	Rockingham 10	R	51%	76%	5	-	6	6	5	6	5	-	5	-	-	7	3	-	3	-	190
Adjutant, Joshua	Grafton 17	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Aldrich, Glen	Belknap 2	R	100%	100%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	х	7	3	х	х	Х	1
Alexander, Joe	Hillsborough 6	R	76%	87%	5	12	6	-	5	6	5	х	5	-	4	7	3	8	3	-	132
Alicea, Caroletta	Merrimack 8	D	0%	0%	-	-	х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Allard, James	Merrimack 21	R	40%	75%	5	-	6	6	-	6	5	-	5	-	4	-	-	-	3	-	194
Alliegro, Mark	Grafton 7	R	100%	100%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	1
Almy, Susan	Grafton 13	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Altschiller, Debra	Rockingham 19	D	0%	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	х	-	-	-	-	-	213
Ames, Richard	Cheshire 9	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	х	-	-	-	213
Ammon, Keith	Hillsborough 40	R	100%	100%	5	х	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	х	х	Х	1
Andrus, Louise	Merrimack 1	R	95%	95%	5	12	6	6	-	6	5	9	5	Х	4	7	3	8	3	7	73
Ankarberg, Aidan	Strafford 10	R	100%	100%	5	12	6	6	5	х	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	Х	Х	Х	1
Aron, Judy	Sullivan 7	R	88%	93%	5	-	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	96
Avellani, Lino	Carroll 5	R	100%	100%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	1

Name	District	Party	Score	Lifescore	CACR14	HB103	HB172	HB1165	HB1298	HB1337	HB1342	HB1417	HB1432	HB1587	HB1657	HB1683	HR17	SB274	SB326	SB404	Rank
PRO-GROWTH POSITION					Υ	N	N	Υ	Y	Υ	N	N	Υ	N	Υ	Υ	Υ	N	Υ	N	
POINTS					5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	
Ayer, Paul	Rockingham 3	R	85%	85%	5	х	Х	6	Х	6	5	9	5	-	4	7	3	Х	Х	Х	103
Bailey, Glenn	Strafford 1	R	100%	100%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	1
Baldasaro, Al	Rockingham 5	R	100%	96%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	х	1
Baroody, Benjamin	Hillsborough 43	D	0%	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	х	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Bartlett, Christy	Merrimack 19	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Baxter, Tim	Rockingham 20	R	100%	100%	5	12	6	6	Х	6	5	9	5	х	х	7	3	8	3	х	1
Bean, Harry	Belknap 2	R	100%	95%	Х	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	1
Beaulieu, Jane	Hillsborough 45	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Belanger, Cody	Rockingham 9	R	100%	100%	5	12	х	6	5	6	5	Х	5	х	4	7	Х	х	х	х	1
Berch, Paul	Cheshire 1	D	n/a	1%	Х	х	х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	х	х	х	Х	х	Х	х	
Berezhny, Lex	Grafton 9	R	100%	100%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	1
Bergeron, Paul	Hillsborough 29	D	0%	5%	-	-	-	Х	-	Х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Bernardy, JD	Rockingham 16	R	84%	84%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	-	4	7	3	8	3	-	107
Berry, Ross	Hillsborough 44	R	100%	100%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	1
Bershtein, Alan	Rockingham 2	R	100%	97%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	1
Binford, David	Grafton 15	R	100%	100%	Х	х	Х	6	Х	6	5	Х	5	9	4	7	Х	8	3	х	1
Bixby, Peter	Strafford 17	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	Х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Blasek, Melissa	Hillsborough 21	R	100%	100%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	1
Boehm, Ralph	Hillsborough 20	R	92%	94%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	х	4	7	3	8	3	-	84
Booras, Efstathia	Hillsborough 33	D	n/a	n/a	-	-	-	Х	Х	х	Х	Х	Х	-	-	-	Х	Х	Х	Х	

Name	District	Party	Score	Lifescore	CACR14	HB103	HB172	HB1165	HB1298	HB1337	HB1342	HB1417	HB1432	HB1587	HB1657	HB1683	HR17	SB274	SB326	SB404	Rank
PRO-GROWTH POSITION					Υ	N	N	Υ	Υ	Y	N	N	Y	N	Υ	Υ	Υ	N	Υ	N	
POINTS					5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	
Bordenet, John	Cheshire 5	D	0%	0%	ı	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	ı	-	-	213
Bordes, Mike	Belknap 3	R	59%	59%	-	12	6	-	Х	Х	5	-	5	-	4	7	3	Х	Х	Х	175
Bouchard, Donald	Hillsborough 11	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Bouldin, Amanda	Hillsborough 12	D	n/a	4%	-	х	х	-	х	-	-	х	Х	-	х	-	х	Х	х	х	
Bouldin, Andrew	Hillsborough 12	D	0%	3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Х	213
Boyd, Bill	Hillsborough 21	R	63%	63%	5	-	6	6	5	6	5	-	5	-	4	7	3	8	3	-	167
Boyd, Stephen	Merrimack 24	R	72%	72%	5	-	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	-	4	7	3	8	3	-	141
Bradley, Amy	Hillsborough 43	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	х	-	Х	Х	-	Х	-	-	х	-	-	-	-	213
Buco, Thomas	Carroll 2	D	5%	14%	-	-	х	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	х	-	-	-	206
Bunker, Lisa	Rockingham 18	D	0%	0%	Х	-	-	-	х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Burroughs, Anita	Carroll 1	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Burt, John	Hillsborough 39	R	100%	100%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	1
Cahill, Michael	Rockingham 17	D	0%	0%	-	х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Х	213
Cali-Pitts, Jacqueline	Rockingham 30	D	5%	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	206
Callum, John	Sullivan 6	R	71%	86%	5	-	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	-	4	7	х	8	3	-	153
Cambrils, Jose	Merrimack 9	R	100%	100%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	1
Cannon, Gerri	Strafford 18	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Caplan, Tony	Merrimack 6	D	0%	0%	-	-	Х	Х	-	Х	-	-	-	х	-	х	-	-	-	-	213
Chase, Wendy	Strafford 18	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	х	-	-	-	-	-	х	213
Chretien, Jacqueline	Hillsborough 42	D	0%	0%	Х	-	-	-	Х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Х	-	213

Name	District	Party	Score	Lifescore	CACR14	HB103	HB172	HB1165	HB1298	HB1337	HB1342	HB1417	HB1432	HB1587	HB1657	HB1683	HR17	SB274	SB326	SB404	Rank
PRO-GROWTH POSITION					Υ	N	N	Υ	Υ	Υ	N	N	Υ	N	Υ	Υ	Υ	N	Υ	N	
POINTS					5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	
Cleaver, Skip	Hillsborough 35	D	n/a	1%	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	-	-	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	
Cloutier, John	Sullivan 10	D	0%	0%	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Cohen, Bruce	Hillsborough 28	D	0%	4%	Х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Comtois, Barbara	Belknap 7	R	100%	100%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	х	х	7	1
Conley, Casey	Strafford 13	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	х	х	х	213
Connors, Erika	Hillsborough 15	D	0%	0%	-	х	-	х	-	х	Х	-	Х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Cordelli, Glenn	Carroll 4	R	100%	95%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	1
Cornell, Patricia	Hillsborough 18	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	х	х	х	213
Cote, David	Hillsborough 31	D	n/a	0%	Х	х	Х	х	х	Х	х	х	Х	Х	х	х	х	х	х	х	
Craig, Kevin	Coos 4	R	100%	98%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	1
Crawford, Karel	Carroll 4	R	47%	54%	5	-	6	х	х	х	Х	9	Х	-	х	х	3	-	3	х	192
Creighton, Jim	Hillsborough 38	R	72%	72%	5	-	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	-	4	7	3	8	3	-	141
Cross, Kenna	Merrimack 3	R	n/a	n/a	Х	12	Х	х	х	Х	Х	х	Х	-	4	7	Х	8	3	-	
Cushing, Robert Renny	Rockingham 21	D	n/a	1%	I	ı	ı	ı	I	I	I	ı	ı	Х	х	ı	ı	I	ı	I	
Cushman, Leah	Hillsborough 2	R	100%	100%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	х	х	1
Davis, Arnold	Coos 2	R	49%	49%	5	-	6	х	5	х	х	-	Х	9	4	Х	3	-	3	-	191
DeLemus, Susan	Strafford 24	R	100%	100%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	1
DePalma IV, Joseph	Grafton 1	R	56%	56%	Х	-	х	-	Х	6	5	9	5	х	4	7	3	-	3	-	182
Deshaies, Brodie	Carroll 6	R	52%	52%	-	-	6	-	5	6	5	9	5	-	4	7	х	-	3	-	188
DeSimone, Debra	Rockingham 14	R	58%	81%	5	-	6	-	5	6	5	9	5	-	4	7	3	-	3	-	177

Name	District	Party	Score	Lifescore	CACR14	HB103	HB172	HB1165	HB1298	HB1337	HB1342	HB1417	HB1432	HB1587	HB1657	HB1683	HR17	SB274	SB326	SB404	Rank
PRO-GROWTH POSITION					Υ	N	N	Υ	Υ	Y	N	N	Υ	N	Υ	Υ	Υ	N	Υ	N	
POINTS					5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	
DiLorenzo, Charlotte	Rockingham 17	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Х	213
DiSilvestro, Linda	Hillsborough 9	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	Х	-	Х	х	х	х	-	-	-	Х	-	-	-	213
Dodge, Dustin	Rockingham 3	R	100%	100%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	1
Dolan, Tom	Rockingham 5	R	81%	83%	5	-	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	-	117
Dontonville, Roger	Grafton 10	D	0%	0%	Х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	ı	-	-	213
Doucette, Fred	Rockingham 8	R	69%	80%	5	-	6	6	5	6	5	Х	5	-	4	7	3	8	3	-	158
Dutzy, Sherry	Hillsborough 30	D	0%	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Х	х	х	213
Eaton, Daniel	Cheshire 3	D	0%	3%	-	-	-	-	Х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	х	213
Ebel, Karen	Merrimack 5	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Edgar, Michael	Rockingham 21	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Edwards, Jess	Rockingham 4	R	63%	84%	5	-	6	-	5	6	5	-	5	х	4	7	3	8	3	-	167
Egan, Timothy	Grafton 2	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	Х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Elliott, Robert	Rockingham 8	R	n/a	80%	х	Х	Х	Х	Х	х	Х	Х	х	х	Х	х	х	х	х	Х	
Ellis, Donna	Strafford 8	D	n/a	2%	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	х	Х	х	х	Х	х	Х	
Ellison, Arthur	Merrimack 27	D	0%	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Emerick, J. Tracy	Rockingham 21	R	65%	65%	5	-	6	-	х	6	х	9	х	-	4	7	3	8	3	Х	164
Erf, Keith	Hillsborough 2	R	88%	93%	5	-	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	96
Espitia, Manny	Hillsborough 31	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Х	-	-	213
Fargo, Kristina	Strafford 14	D	6%	3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	Х	х	х	201
Faulkner, Barry	Cheshire 12	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213

Name	District	Party	Score	Lifescore	CACR14	HB103	HB172	HB1165	HB1298	HB1337	HB1342	HB1417	HB1432	HB1587	HB1657	HB1683	HR17	SB274	SB326	SB404	Rank
PRO-GROWTH POSITION					Υ	N	N	Υ	Y	Υ	N	N	Υ	N	Υ	Υ	Υ	N	Υ	N	
POINTS					5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	
Fedolfi, Jim	Hillsborough 1	R	91%	89%	5	12	6	6	Х	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	-	3	х	87
Fellows, Sallie	Grafton 8	D	0%	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Fenton, Donovan	Cheshire 8	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Folsom, Beth	Grafton 11	R	81%	81%	5	-	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	-	117
Fontneau, Timothy	Strafford 7	D	0%	7%	Х	-	-	-	Х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Ford, Oliver	Rockingham 4	R	84%	84%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	-	4	7	3	8	3	-	107
Foster, William	Hillsborough 5	R	100%	100%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	1
Fox, Dru	Cheshire 6	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Freitas, Mary	Hillsborough 14	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	Х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	х	Х	х	213
Frost, Sherry	Strafford 16	D	n/a	0%	-	-	-	Х	Х	Х	Х	-	Х	х	Х	-	-	х	Х	х	
Gagne, Larry	Hillsborough 13	R	93%	94%	Х	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	-	76
Gallager, Eric	Merrimack 15	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Gay, Betty	Rockingham 8	R	74%	81%	5	-	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	-	4	7	3	х	Х	Х	138
Gilman, Julie	Rockingham 18	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Goley, Jeffrey	Hillsborough 8	D	13%	10%	-	Х	-	-	-	6	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	196
Gomarlo, Jennie	Cheshire 12	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Gordon, Edward	Grafton 9	R	81%	83%	5	-	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	-	117
Gorski, Ted	Hillsborough 7	R	86%	86%	5	Х	6	6	5	6	-	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	-	101
Gottling, Suzanne	Sullivan 2	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Gould, Linda	Hillsborough 7	R	90%	93%	5	12	Х	6	5	6	5	9	5	-	4	7	3	8	3	7	94

Name	District	Party	Score	Lifescore	CACR14	HB103	HB172	HB1165	HB1298	HB1337	HB1342	HB1417	HB1432	HB1587	HB1657	HB1683	HR17	SB274	SB326	SB404	Rank
PRO-GROWTH POSITION					Υ	N	N	Υ	Y	Υ	N	N	Υ	N	Υ	Υ	Υ	N	Υ	N	
POINTS					5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	
Gourgue, Amanda	Strafford 25	D	n/a	1%	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	-	-	х	Х	Х	Х	Х	
Graham, John	Hillsborough 7	R	61%	81%	5	-	6	-	-	6	5	9	5	-	4	7	3	8	3	-	173
Grassie, Chuck	Strafford 11	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Green, Dennis	Rockingham 13	R	100%	97%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	1
Greene, Bob	Hillsborough 37	R	100%	97%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	1
Greeson, Jeffrey	Grafton 16	R	100%	100%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	1
Griffin, Barbara	Hillsborough 6	R	85%	94%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	-	3	-	103
Griffin, Gerald	Hillsborough 5	R	93%	93%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	-	76
Griffin, Mary	Rockingham 7	R	n/a	93%	Х	х	х	Х	Х	х	Х	Х	Х	х	х	х	х	Х	Х	х	
Griffith, Willis	Hillsborough 18	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	Х	-	-	-	-	-	-	х	Х	Х	-	213
Groen, Fenton	Strafford 23	R	100%	100%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	1
Grossman, Gaby	Rockingham 18	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Grote, Jaci	Rockingham 24	D	0%	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Guthrie, Joseph	Rockingham 13	R	66%	75%	5	-	6	6	Х	-	5	х	5	Х	Х	7	3	8	3	-	162
Hakken-Phillips, Mary	Grafton 12	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Hall, Muriel	Merrimack 23	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Ham, Bonnie	Grafton 5	R	43%	43%	5	-	6	6	-	6	5	-	5	-	4	-	3	-	3	-	193
Hamblet, Joan	Rockingham 31	D	6%	6%	-	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	201
Hamer, Heidi	Hillsborough 17	D	0%	5%	-	-	х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Harb, Robert	Rockingham 14	R	81%	86%	5	-	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	-	117

Name	District	Party	Score	Lifescore	CACR14	HB103	HB172	HB1165	HB1298	HB1337	HB1342	HB1417	HB1432	HB1587	HB1657	HB1683	HR17	SB274	SB326	SB404	Rank
PRO-GROWTH POSITION					Υ	N	N	Υ	Y	Υ	N	N	Y	N	Υ	Υ	Υ	N	Υ	N	
POINTS					5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	
Harley, Tina	Rockingham 20	R	86%	86%	5	-	6	6	Х	6	5	9	Х	9	4	7	3	8	3	Х	101
Harrington, Michael	Strafford 3	R	100%	96%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	Х	5	9	4	7	Х	8	3	7	1
Harriott-Gathright, Linda	Hillsborough 36	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	х	х	х	-	-	-	-	213
Harvey, Cathryn	Cheshire 1	D	0%	0%	-	х	-	х	Х	х	х	-	Х	-	-	х	-	-	-	-	213
Harvey-Bolia, Juliet	Belknap 4	R	72%	72%	5	-	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	-	4	7	3	8	3	-	141
Hatch, William	Coos 6	D	0%	0%	-	-	х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	х	-	-	-	-	-	213
Hayward, Peter	Strafford 1	R	80%	90%	5	-	Х	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	-	124
Healey, Bob	Hillsborough 21	R	72%	72%	5	-	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	-	4	7	3	8	3	-	141
Heath, Mary	Hillsborough 14	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	Х	х	х	Х	-	х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Herbert, Christopher	Hillsborough 43	D	6%	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	х	Х	Х	201
Hill, Gregory	Merrimack 3	R	93%	94%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	-	76
Hobson, Deborah	Rockingham 35	R	100%	94%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	Х	4	7	3	8	3	7	1
Homola, Susan	Hillsborough 27	R	79%	79%	5	-	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	-	4	7	3	8	3	7	128
Hopper, Gary	Hillsborough 2	R	n/a	93%	Х	Х	х	Х	Х	х	Х	Х	Х	х	Х	х	Х	8	3	Х	
Horgan, James	Strafford 2	R	80%	90%	5	-	6	6	Х	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	-	124
Horrigan, Timothy	Strafford 6	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Hough, Gregg	Belknap 3	R	93%	93%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	-	76
Howard, Raymond	Belknap 8	R	85%	95%	5	12	х	6	-	6	5	-	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	103
Hunt, John	Cheshire 11	R	55%	86%	5	-	6	Х	х	Х	Х	9	х	9	4	х	-	-	3	-	184
Infantine, William	Hillsborough 13	R	84%	84%	5	-	6	Х	5	6	5	Х	5	9	4	7	Х	8	3	Х	107

Name	District	Party	Score	Lifescore	CACR14	HB103	HB172	HB1165	HB1298	HB1337	HB1342	HB1417	HB1432	HB1587	HB1657	HB1683	HR17	SB274	SB326	SB404	Rank
PRO-GROWTH POSITION					Υ	N	N	Υ	Y	Υ	N	N	Υ	N	Υ	Υ	Υ	N	Υ	N	
POINTS					5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	
Jack, Martin	Hillsborough 36	D	12%	4%	5	-	6	ı	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Х	ı	ı	-	-	198
Janigian, John	Rockingham 8	R	70%	84%	5	-	Х	6	5	6	5	9	5	-	4	7	3	8	3	-	155
Jeudy, Jean	Hillsborough 10	D	0%	0%	Χ	-	-	Х	-	Х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Х	213
Johnson, Dawn	Belknap 3	R	100%	100%	5	12	6	6	5	Х	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	1
Kaczynski, Thomas	Strafford 22	R	100%	100%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	1
Katsakiores, Phyllis	Rockingham 6	R	72%	79%	5	-	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	-	4	7	3	8	3	-	141
Kelley, Diane	Hillsborough 25	R	100%	100%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	х	8	3	7	1
Kelley, Eamon	Coos 3	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Kelsey, Niki	Hillsborough 7	R	70%	70%	5	-	6	6	5	6	5	Х	5	-	4	7	х	х	х	х	155
Kennedy, Margaret	Merrimack 7	R	100%	100%	5	12	х	Х	5	х	Х	9	Х	х	х	7	3	8	3	7	1
Kenney, Cam	Strafford 6	D	n/a	1%	Х	-	х	Х	х	х	-	-	Х	х	-	-	Х	-	Х	х	
Khan, Aboul	Rockingham 20	R	57%	74%	5	-	6	-	5	6	5	-	5	-	4	7	3	8	3	-	181
Kilanski, Ben	Cheshire 13	R	n/a	n/a	Х	х	х	х	Х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	Х	Х	х	х	
Kimball, Mary Ann	Rockingham 6	R	100%	100%	5	12	х	6	5	6	5	9	5	х	х	х	3	Х	Х	х	1
King, Bill	Hillsborough 23	R	73%	73%	5	-	6	6	Х	6	5	9	5	-	4	7	3	Х	х	х	139
King, Mark	Hillsborough 33	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Kittredge, Mac	Strafford 12	R	91%	89%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	-	4	7	3	8	3	7	87
Klee, Patricia	Hillsborough 30	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Klein-Knight, Nicole	Hillsborough 11	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	х	Х	Х	Х	х	213
Klose, John	Merrimack 21	R	60%	76%	5	-	6	6	5	6	Х	9	Х	-	4	7	3	•	3	_	174

Name	District	Party	Score	Lifescore	CACR14	HB103	HB172	HB1165	HB1298	HB1337	HB1342	HB1417	HB1432	HB1587	HB1657	HB1683	HR17	SB274	SB326	SB404	Rank
PRO-GROWTH POSITION					Υ	N	N	Υ	Y	Y	N	N	Υ	N	Υ	Υ	Υ	N	Υ	N	
POINTS					5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	
Knirk, Jerry	Carroll 3	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Kofalt, Jim	Hillsborough 4	R	100%	100%	5	12	6	6	Х	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	1
Labranche, Tony	Hillsborough 22	I	0%	0%	-	-	х	-	-	-	-	х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Ladd, Rick	Grafton 4	R	81%	89%	5	-	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	-	117
Laflamme, Larry	Coos 3	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Lane, Connie	Merrimack 12	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Lang, Timothy	Belknap 4	R	80%	85%	5	-	6	6	х	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	-	124
Langley, Diane	Hillsborough 8	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Х	-	-	-	х	х	х	213
Lanzara, Tom	Hillsborough 28	R	56%	56%	5	-	6	6	5	-	5	-	5	-	4	7	3	-	3	7	182
Lascelles, Richard	Hillsborough 20	R	84%	87%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	-	4	7	3	8	3	-	107
Laughton, Stacie-Marie	Hillsborough 31	D	n/a	n/a	5	-	х	Х	х	х	х	х	Х	-	-	х	х	х	х	Х	
Layon, Erica	Rockingham 6	R	100%	100%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	1
Leavitt, John	Merrimack 24	R	78%	78%	5	-	6	6	5	6	5	х	5	9	4	7	Х	8	3	-	131
Leishman, Peter	Hillsborough 24	D	0%	3%	-	-	х	-	-	-	х	-	Х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Lekas, Alicia	Hillsborough 37	R	100%	96%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	1
Lekas, Tony	Hillsborough 37	R	100%	96%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	1
Levesque, Cassandra	Strafford 4	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Х	213
Lewicke, John	Hillsborough 26	R	76%	76%	5	-	6	6	-	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	-	132
Litchfield, Melissa	Rockingham 11	R	100%	100%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	1
Littlefield, Richard	Belknap 3	R	68%	68%	5	-	6	6	Х	6	5	9	5	-	4	Х	3	8	3	-	160

Name	District	Party	Score	Lifescore	CACR14	HB103	HB172	HB1165	HB1298	HB1337	HB1342	HB1417	HB1432	HB1587	HB1657	HB1683	HR17	SB274	SB326	SB404	Rank
PRO-GROWTH POSITION					Υ	N	N	Υ	Υ	Y	N	N	Υ	N	Υ	Υ	Υ	N	Υ	N	
POINTS					5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	
Long, Patrick	Hillsborough 10	D	0%	0%	ı	-	-	-	Х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	ı	-	Х	213
Loughman, Tom	Rockingham 21	D	n/a	0%	-	-	х	х	Х	Х	Х	Х	х	х	х	х	Х	-	-	Х	
Love, David	Rockingham 6	R	91%	94%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	-	4	7	3	8	3	7	87
Lundgren, David	Rockingham 5	R	n/a	n/a	х	-	6	х	Х	Х	Х	Х	х	-	Х	х	х	х	х	Х	
Luneau, David	Merrimack 10	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Lynn, Bob	Rockingham 7	R	93%	93%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	-	76
MacDonald, John	Carroll 6	R	58%	77%	5	-	6	-	5	6	5	9	5	-	4	7	3	-	3	-	177
MacDonald, Wayne	Rockingham 5	R	72%	72%	5	-	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	-	4	7	3	8	3	-	141
MacKay, James	Merrimack 14	D	6%	7%	-	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	х	-	-	-	201
Mackie, Jonathan	Belknap 2	R	n/a	95%	Х	12	х	Х	х	х	х	х	Х	9	4	7	х	8	3	Х	
Maggiore, Jim	Rockingham 22	D	0%	0%	Х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Major, Norman	Rockingham 14	R	100%	94%	5	х	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	Х	Х	Х	1
Malloy, Dennis	Rockingham 23	D	6%	2%	-	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	201
Maneval, Andrew	Cheshire 9	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Mangipudi, Latha	Hillsborough 35	D	0%	0%	-	-	х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Mann, John	Cheshire 2	D	9%	4%	5	-	-	-	Х	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	199
Marsh, William	Carroll 8	D	0%	59%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Marston, Richard	Hillsborough 19	R	91%	91%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	-	4	7	3	8	3	7	87
Mason, James	Merrimack 2	R	58%	58%	5	-	6	Х	Х	Х	Х	9	Х	-	4	х	3	8	3	-	177
Massimilla, Linda	Grafton 1	D	0%	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213

METHODOLOGY 2022 NEW HAMPSHIRE

NEW HAMPSHIRE SENATE SNAPSHOT

NEW HAMPSHIRE SENATE VOTES

NEW HAMPSHIRE SENATE VOTE DESCRIPTIONS

NEW HAMPSHIRE HOUSE SNAPSHOT

NEW HAMPSHIRE HOUSE VOTES

Name	District	Party	Score	Lifescore	CACR14	HB103	HB172	HB1165	HB1298	HB1337	HB1342	HB1417	HB1432	HB1587	HB1657	HB1683	HR17	SB274	SB326	SB404	Rank
PRO-GROWTH POSITION					Υ	N	N	Y	Υ	Y	N	N	Υ	N	Υ	Υ	Υ	N	Υ	N	
POINTS					5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	
Mayville, Mary	Hillsborough 21	R	79%	79%	Х	-	6	6	Х	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	-	128
McAleer, Chris	Carroll 7	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
McBeath, Rebecca	Rockingham 26	D	n/a	0%	Χ	-	х	Х	Х	-	-	Х	-	х	-	Х	Х	Χ	Х	-	
McBride, Everett	Rockingham 8	R	69%	66%	5	-	6	6	х	6	5	9	х	-	Х	7	3	Х	х	Х	158
McConkey, Mark	Carroll 3	R	100%	100%	5	12	6	6	х	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	Х	1
McGhee, Kat	Hillsborough 27	D	0%	5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
McGuire, Carol	Merrimack 29	R	100%	96%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	1
McKinney, Betsy	Rockingham 5	R	n/a	76%	Х	х	х	6	х	6	Х	9	х	-	4	7	3	Х	х	х	
McLean, Mark	Hillsborough 44	R	92%	92%	Х	х	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	-	84
McMahon, Charles	Rockingham 7	R	62%	73%	5	-	6	-	5	6	Х	9	х	-	4	7	3	8	3	-	172
McWilliams, Rebecca	Merrimack 27	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	Х	-	Х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Melvin, Charles	Rockingham 15	R	72%	90%	5	-	6	6	х	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	-	3	-	141
Merchant, Gary	Sullivan 4	D	0%	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Merner, Troy	Coos 7	R	66%	70%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	-	5	-	4	7	х	-	3	-	162
Meuse, David	Rockingham 29	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Milz, David	Rockingham 6	R	76%	85%	5	х	6	Х	5	х	Х	-	Х	9	4	7	3	8	3	-	132
Moffett, Michael	Merrimack 9	R	88%	88%	5	-	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	96
Mooney, Maureen	Hillsborough 21	R	81%	81%	5	-	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	-	117
Moran, Melbourne	Hillsborough 34	D	n/a	n/a	Х	-	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	-	-	Х	Х	Х	х	
Muirhead, Russell	Grafton 12	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213

Name	District	Party	Score	Lifescore	CACR14	HB103	HB172	HB1165	HB1298	HB1337	HB1342	HB1417	HB1432	HB1587	HB1657	HB1683	HR17	SB274	SB326	SB404	Rank
PRO-GROWTH POSITION					Υ	N	N	Υ	Y	Y	N	N	Υ	N	Υ	Υ	Υ	N	Υ	N	
POINTS					5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	
Mullen, Sue	Hillsborough 7	D	5%	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	206
Murphy, James	Grafton 12	D	0%	0%	-	-	Х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Х	Х	Х	213
Murray, Kate	Rockingham 24	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Murray, Megan	Hillsborough 22	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Myler, Mel	Merrimack 10	D	n/a	1%	Х	-	-	х	Х	Х	х	х	Х	Х	х	Х	Х	-	-	-	
Nelson, Bill	Carroll 5	R	68%	77%	5	-	Х	х	5	6	5	9	5	-	4	7	3	8	3	-	160
Nelson, Jodi	Rockingham 6	R	81%	81%	5	-	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	-	117
Newman, Ray	Hillsborough 29	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Newman, Sue	Hillsborough 29	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Newton, Clifford	Strafford 9	R	100%	100%	5	12	6	6	х	6	5	9	5	Х	х	7	3	8	3	7	1
Nordgren, Sharon	Grafton 12	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Х	-	213
Notter, Jeanine	Hillsborough 21	R	84%	91%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	-	4	7	3	8	3	-	107
Nunez, Hershel	Hillsborough 37	R	100%	98%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	1
Nutter-Upham, Frances	Hillsborough 33	D	0%	3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Nutting-Wong, Allison	Hillsborough 32	D	0%	1%	-	-	Х	-	-	-	-	-	Х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
O'Brien, Michael	Hillsborough 36	D	0%	0%	-	х	-	-	Х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	х	213
O'Hara, Travis	Belknap 9	R	90%	90%	5	Х	6	6	5	6	5	х	5	Х	4	7	Х	8	3	-	94
O'Hearne, Andrew	Sullivan 3	D	0%	0%	-	-	Х	-	-	-	Х	х	Х	-	Х	-	Х	-	-	Х	213
Osborne, Jason	Rockingham 4	R	100%	100%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	Х	7	3	8	3	Х	1
Oxaal, Ariel	Strafford 15	D	n/a	n/a	-	-	-	Х	-	Х	Х	-	Х	Х	Х	Х	-	Х	Х	Х	

Name	District	Party	Score	Lifescore	CACR14	HB103	HB172	HB1165	HB1298	HB1337	HB1342	HB1417	HB1432	HB1587	HB1657	HB1683	HR17	SB274	SB326	SB404	Rank
PRO-GROWTH POSITION					Υ	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Υ	N	Υ	Y	Υ	N	Υ	N	
POINTS					5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	
Oxenham, Lee	Sullivan 1	D	0%	1%	Х	Х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Packard, Sherman	Rockingham 5	R	n/a	93%	Х	х	Х	х	х	Х	х	Х	Х	Х	Х	х	Х	Х	Х	х	
Paige, Mark	Rockingham 18	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	Х	-	Х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Pantelakos, Laura	Rockingham 25	D	4%	3%	Х	-	Х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	212
Parshall, Lucius	Cheshire 10	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Pauer, Diane	Hillsborough 26	R	100%	100%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	1
Pearl, Howard	Merrimack 26	R	71%	87%	5	-	6	6	5	Х	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	-	3	-	153
Pearson, Mark	Rockingham 34	R	55%	73%	5	-	6	6	5	6	5	-	5	-	4	7	3	-	3	-	184
Pearson, Stephen	Rockingham 6	R	55%	76%	5	-	6	6	5	6	5	-	5	-	4	7	3	-	3	-	184
Pedersen, Michael	Hillsborough 32	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Perez, Maria	Hillsborough 23	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Х	-	-	-	-	Х	-	-	-	213
Petrigno, Peter	Hillsborough 23	D	0%	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Piedra, Israel	Hillsborough 9	D	0%	0%	Х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Piemonte, Tony	Rockingham 4	R	100%	96%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	х	х	х	1
Pimentel, Roderick	Merrimack 6	D	0%	0%	-	-	х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Pitaro, Matthew	Merrimack 22	R	87%	87%	5	12	6	6	5	Х	5	9	-	9	4	7	3	8	3	-	99
Pitre, Joseph	Strafford 2	R	91%	89%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	-	4	7	3	8	3	7	87
Plett, Fred	Hillsborough 6	R	64%	83%	5	-	6	6	Х	-	5	-	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	-	165
Ploszaj, Tom	Belknap 1	R	100%	100%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	1
Porter, Marjorie	Hillsborough 1	D	0%	0%	-	Х	Х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Х	213

Name	District	Party	Score	Lifescore	CACR14	HB103	HB172	HB1165	HB1298	HB1337	HB1342	HB1417	HB1432	HB1587	HB1657	HB1683	HR17	SB274	SB326	SB404	Rank
PRO-GROWTH POSITION					Υ	N	N	Υ	Υ	Υ	N	N	Υ	N	Υ	Υ	Υ	N	Υ	N	
POINTS					5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	
Post, Lisa	Hillsborough 4	R	100%	100%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	1
Potucek, John	Rockingham 6	R	100%	97%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	1
Pratt, Kevin	Rockingham 3	R	63%	80%	5	-	6	6	5	6	5	-	5	-	4	7	3	8	3	-	167
Prout, Andrew	Hillsborough 37	R	100%	100%	Х	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	1
Prudhomme-O'Brien, Katherine	Rockingham 6	R	72%	84%	5	-	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	-	4	7	3	8	3	-	141
Qualey, Jim	Cheshire 11	R	100%	100%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	1
Query, Joshua	Hillsborough 16	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	Х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Read, Ellen	Rockingham 17	D	0%	0%	-	х	-	х	-	х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	х	-	213
Renzullo, Andrew	Hillsborough 37	R	100%	97%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	1
Rhodes, Jennifer	Cheshire 15	R	85%	85%	5	12	6	-	5	6	5	9	5	х	х	7	3	8	3	-	103
Rice, Kimberly	Hillsborough 37	R	52%	82%	5	-	Х	Х	5	х	5	9	5	-	4	х	3	-	3	-	188
Rich, Cecilia	Strafford 18	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	Х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Richards, Beth	Merrimack 13	D	0%	1%	-	-	х	-	х	-	Х	-	-	х	х	-	-	Х	Х	х	213
Rogers, Katherine	Merrimack 28	D	0%	0%	-	ı	ı	-	Х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	ı	ı	ı	213
Rollins, Skip	Sullivan 6	R	72%	82%	5	х	6	6	5	6	5	-	5	-	4	7	3	8	3	-	141
Rombeau, Catherine	Hillsborough 7	D	5%	5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	206
Rouillard, Claire	Hillsborough 6	R	64%	64%	5	-	6	6	5	6	5	-	5	9	4	7	3	-	3	-	165
Roy, Terry	Rockingham 32	R	87%	89%	5	-	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	х	4	7	3	8	3	7	99
Rung, Rosemarie	Hillsborough 21	D	0%	8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Salloway, Jeffrey	Strafford 5	D	n/a	12%	-	-	6	Х	Х	Х	Х	-	Х	Х	Х	Х	-	-	-	Х	

Name	District	Party	Score	Lifescore	CACR14	HB103	HB172	HB1165	HB1298	HB1337	HB1342	HB1417	HB1432	HB1587	HB1657	HB1683	HR17	SB274	SB326	SB404	Rank
PRO-GROWTH POSITION					Υ	N	N	Υ	Y	Y	N	N	Υ	N	Υ	Υ	Υ	N	Υ	N	
POINTS					5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	
Sanborn, Gail	Grafton 6	R	100%	100%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	1
Sanborn, Laurie	Hillsborough 41	R	100%	100%	5	х	Х	6	5	6	5	9	5	Х	Х	7	3	Х	3	7	1
Sandler, Catt	Strafford 21	D	5%	3%	Х	-	X	-	Х	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	206
Santonastaso, Matthew	Cheshire 14	R	100%	100%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	1
Schamberg, Thomas	Merrimack 4	D	5%	3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	Х	206
Schapiro, Joe	Cheshire 16	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Schmidt, Janice	Hillsborough 28	D	0%	0%	-	х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	х	213
Schmidt, Peter	Strafford 19	D	0%	0%	х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Х	х	х	-	-	-	-	-	213
Schuett, Dianne	Merrimack 20	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	х	-	-	-	-	х	-	-	-	213
Schultz, Kristina	Merrimack 18	D	0%	1%	-	-	х	-	Х	-	-	-	-	-	х	-	-	-	-	-	213
Seaworth, Brian	Merrimack 20	R	100%	100%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	х	х	8	3	7	1
Sheehan, Vanessa	Hillsborough 23	R	93%	93%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	-	76
Shurtleff, Stephen	Merrimack 11	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Silber, Norman	Belknap 2	R	100%	100%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	1
Simon, Matthew	Grafton 14	R	83%	83%	х	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	-	4	7	3	8	3	-	113
Simpson, Alexis	Rockingham 36	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Smith, Denise	Hillsborough 37	R	100%	100%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	Х	Х	х	1
Smith, Jonathan	Carroll 5	R	91%	91%	5	12	6	6	Х	6	5	9	5	-	4	7	3	8	3	7	87
Smith, Marjorie	Strafford 6	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Smith, Steven	Sullivan 11	R	70%	87%	5	-	6	6	5	6	5	9	Х	-	4	7	Х	8	3	_	155

Name	District	Party	Score	Lifescore	CACR14	HB103	HB172	HB1165	HB1298	HB1337	HB1342	HB1417	HB1432	HB1587	HB1657	HB1683	HR17	SB274	SB326	SB404	Rank
PRO-GROWTH POSITION					Υ	N	N	Υ	Υ	Y	N	N	Υ	N	Υ	Υ	Υ	N	Υ	N	
POINTS					5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	
Smith, Suzanne	Grafton 8	D	0%	1%	ı	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	х	Х	х	213
Smith, Timothy	Hillsborough 17	D	0%	1%	-	-	-	-	Х	-	-	Х	х	-	-	-	х	Х	х	х	213
Snow, Kendall	Hillsborough 19	D	0%	7%	-	Х	х	Х	Х	Х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Х	Х	х	213
Sofikitis, Catherine	Hillsborough 34	D	n/a	0%	-	-	Х	х	х	Х	Х	Х	х	х	-	х	х	-	-	х	
Somero, Paul	Hillsborough 25	R	80%	89%	5	-	Х	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	-	124
Somssich, Peter	Rockingham 27	D	0%	2%	-	Х	-	-	х	-	-	-	-	-	х	-	-	-	-	-	213
Soti, Julius	Rockingham 7	R	100%	100%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	1
Soucy, Timothy	Merrimack 16	D	0%	3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Southworth, Thomas	Strafford 20	D	0%	0%	Х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	х	х	-	-	-	-	-	213
Spang, Judith	Strafford 6	D	0%	1%	х	-	-	х	х	Х	Х	-	х	х	х	-	-	-	-	-	213
Spillane, James	Rockingham 2	R	93%	96%	5	12	6	х	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	-	76
Spilsbury, Walter	Sulivan 8	R	100%	100%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	1
Stapleton, Walter	Sullivan 5	R	58%	72%	5	-	6	6	5	6	5	-	-	-	4	7	3	8	3	-	177
Stavis, Laurel	Grafton 13	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	х	-	-	-	х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Stevens, Deb	Hillsborough 34	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	Х	-	х	Х	-	Х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Sullivan, Brian	Sullivan 1	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Sweeney, Joe	Rockingham 8	R	92%	92%	5	Х	6	-	5	6	5	Х	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	84
Sykes, George	Grafton 13	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Sylvia, Michael	Belknap 6	R	100%	100%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	1
Sytek, John	Rockingham 8	R	79%	86%	5	-	6	6	5	6	Х	9	Х	9	4	7	3	8	3	-	128

Name	District	Party	Score	Lifescore	CACR14	HB103	HB172	HB1165	HB1298	HB1337	HB1342	HB1417	HB1432	HB1587	HB1657	HB1683	HR17	SB274	SB326	SB404	Rank
PRO-GROWTH POSITION					Υ	N	N	Υ	Y	Υ	N	N	Υ	N	Υ	Υ	Υ	N	Υ	N	
POINTS					5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	
Tanner, Linda	Sullivan 9	D	0%	0%	ı	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	ı	-	-	213
Telerski, Laura	Hillsborough 35	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Terry, Paul	Belknap 5	R	93%	93%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	-	76
Testerman, Dave	Merrimack 2	R	100%	94%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	х	1
Theberge, Robert	Coos 3	R	54%	54%	5	-	х	6	5	6	5	-	5	-	х	7	3	-	3	х	187
Thomas, Douglas	Rockingham 5	R	63%	87%	5	-	6	6	5	6	5	-	5	-	4	7	3	8	3	-	167
Thompson, Dennis	Coos 1	R	83%	83%	5	-	6	6	5	Х	Х	9	5	9	4	7	3	Х	Х	Х	113
Toll, Amanda	Cheshire 16	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Toomey, Dan	Hillsborough 32	D	0%	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Torosian, Peter	Rockingham 14	R	100%	100%	5	Х	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	1
Treleaven, Susan	Strafford 17	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Tripp, Richard	Rockingham 6	R	84%	84%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	-	4	7	3	8	3	-	107
Trottier, Douglas	Belknap 6	R	75%	75%	Х	12	6	6	Х	6	5	-	5	-	4	7	3	Х	х	Х	136
True, Chris	Rockingham 4	R	100%	100%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	1
Tucker, Edith	Coos 5	D	13%	8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	7	-	-	-	Х	196
Tudor, Paul	Rockingham 1	R	n/a	n/a	Х	-	6	х	Х	Х	Х	Х	х	х	4	х	х	8	3	-	
Turcotte, Leonard	Strafford 4	R	100%	100%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	1
Ulery, Jordan	Hillsborough 37	R	76%	90%	Х	-	6	6	х	6	х	9	х	9	4	7	3	8	3	-	132
Umberger, Karen	Carroll 2	R	75%	75%	5	-	6	-	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	-	136
Vail, Suzanne	Hillsborough 30	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	Х	-	Х	Х	-	Х	-	-	Х	-	-	-	-	213

Name	District	Party	Score	Lifescore	CACR14	HB103	HB172	HB1165	HB1298	HB1337	HB1342	HB1417	HB1432	HB1587	HB1657	HB1683	HR17	SB274	SB326	SB404	Rank
PRO-GROWTH POSITION					Υ	N	N	Υ	Y	Υ	N	N	Υ	N	Υ	Υ	Υ	N	Υ	N	
POINTS					5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	
Van Houten, Constance	Hillsborough 45	D	0%	0%	ı	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	ı	-	-	-	213
Vandecasteele, Susan	Rockingham 8	R	n/a	n/a	Х	Х	х	Х	5	Х	Х	Х	Х	9	х	7	Х	Х	Х	Х	
Vann, Ivy	Hillsborough 24	D	0%	0%	-	Х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Х	-	-	-	х	-	-	213
Varney, Peter	Belknap 5	R	82%	82%	Х	12	6	х	Х	х	5	-	5	х	4	7	3	х	х	х	115
Veilleux, Daniel	Hillsborough 22	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Verville, Kevin	Rockingham 2	R	100%	97%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	х	х	7	3	х	х	х	1
Vincent, Kenneth	Strafford 17	D	8%	4%	Х	Х	-	-	Х	-	-	Х	-	-	4	-	Х	х	Х	Х	200
Von Plinsky, Sparky	Cheshire 7	D	0%	1%	-	-	-	х	-	-	-	Х	-	-	-	-	Х	-	х	Х	213
Vose, Michael	Rockingham 9	R	82%	91%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	-	5	-	4	7	3	8	3	7	115
Wall, Janet	Strafford 6	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	Х	-	Х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Wallace, Scott	Rockingham 12	R	100%	100%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	1
Wallner, Mary Jane	Merrimack 10	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Х	213
Walsh, Thomas	Merrimack 24	R	100%	98%	5	12	6	6	Х	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	х	3	7	1
Walz, Mary Beth	Merrimack 23	D	0%	0%	Х	-	-	х	Х	Х	х	-	х	-	-	х	-	-	-	-	213
Ward, Gerald	Rockingham 28	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Warden, Mark	Hillsborough 15	R	100%	100%	5	12	6	6	Х	6	х	9	5	9	4	7	Х	8	3	7	1
Wazir, Safiya	Merrimack 17	D	0%	0%	-	-	х	-	-	-	-	Х	-	-	-	-	Х	-	-	х	213
Weber, Lucy	Cheshire 1	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Welch, David	Rockingham 13	R	63%	80%	5	-	6	6	5	Х	5	Х	5	Х	Х	7	3	-	3	-	167
Welkowitz, Lawrence	Cheshire 4	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213

Name	District	Party	Score	Lifescore	CACR14	HB103	HB172	HB1165	HB1298	HB1337	HB1342	HB1417	HB1432	HB1587	HB1657	HB1683	HR17	SB274	SB326	SB404	Rank
PRO-GROWTH POSITION					Υ	N	N	Y	Υ	Υ	N	N	Υ	N	Υ	Υ	Υ	N	Υ	N	
POINTS					5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	
Wells, Natalie	Merrimack 25	R	72%	72%	5	-	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	-	4	7	3	8	3	ı	141
Weston, Joyce	Grafton 8	D	0%	0%	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	213
Weyler, Kenneth	Rockingham 13	R	72%	87%	5	-	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	-	4	7	3	8	3	-	141
White, Nick	Merrimack 20	R	100%	100%	Х	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	Х	Х	Х	1
Wilhelm, Matthew	Hillsborough 42	D	0%	0%	ı	-	Х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	ı	ı	-	ı	213
Wolf, Dan	Merrimack 5	R	29%	35%	Х	-	-	-	-	6	5	-	5	-	-	-	Х	8	3	ı	195
Woodcock, Stephen	Carroll 2	D	0%	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Х	-	-	-	-	Х	-	-	-	213
Woods, Gary	Merrimack 23	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	213
Wuelper, Kurt	Strafford 3	R	95%	98%	5	12	6	6	5	6	-	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	73
Yakubovich, Michael	Merrimack 24	R	91%	97%	5	12	6	6	5	6	5	9	5	-	4	7	3	8	3	7	87
Yokela, Josh	Rockingham 33	R	94%	98%	5	12	-	6	5	6	5	9	5	9	4	7	3	8	3	7	75

NEW HAMPSHIRE HOUSE VOTES

CACR 14

BLOCKING PRO-UNION CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

(CFGF SUPPORTS)

This resolution proposes an amendment to the New Hampshire Constitution that expands unionization. Specifically, this amendment would expand unionization to all workers in the state of New Hampshire through constitutional fiat, making unionization efforts all the more challenging to defeat and further entrenching a corrupt system that too often puts the financial and political interests of union bosses ahead of the rights of workers. The New Hampshire House blocked the resolution, 182-159, on March 10, 2022. The New Hampshire Senate did not take it up. A vote in the affirmative was a vote to block this constitutional amendment.

HB 103

NEW MEDICAID EXPANSION

(CFGF OPPOSES)

This bill further expands New Hampshire's already costly Medicaid program. Specifically, the legislation requires the Department of Health and Human Services to contract with managed care organizations and extend dental benefits to all Medicaid recipients 21 years and older. The estimated cost through FY 2025 is \$15.5 million in state appropriations and outlays with another \$35 million in estimated federal spending. Medicaid is known for its high costs that devour state budgets, poor health outcomes, and low quality of care. The New Hampshire House passed the bill, 246-105. on May 26, 2022. The New Hampshire Senate passed it, 23-0, on May 5, 2022.

HB 172

REVIVING GREEN NEW DEAL

BOONDOGGLE (CFGF OPPOSES)

This bill adopts a catastrophic Green New Deal economic plan to achieve net zero greenhouse gas emissions. Specifically, the legislation calls for reaching net zero by 2050 through the implementation of renewable energy mandates and instructs all state agencies to incorporate this goal into their rulemaking process. New Hampshire has the second-highest residential retail electricity costs in the nation. Fossil fuels and nuclear energy constitute 84 percent of New Hampshire's total power generation with green renewables comprising just 16 percent of all power generation. This proposal would further accelerate electricity costs, decimate jobs, and impose significant hardships on hardworking New Hampshire families. The New Hampshire House prevented the bill from coming to the floor, 152-181, on April 21, 2022. The New Hampshire Senate did not take it up.

SNAPSHOT

SNAPSHOT

VOTES

HB 1165

REPEALING COSTLY PAID LEAVE **PROGRAM**

(CFGF SUPPORTS)

This bill repeals the Sununu paid family leave program. Specifically, the legislation repeals the statutory authorization for the family medical leave insurance program which was added as a last-minute compromise in the previous session. The program creates a governmentsubsidized insurance plan that would allow private-sector employers to opt into a paid leave program buttressed by New Hampshire's 10,000 government employees. The program is little more than an entitlement program for government workers that will explode in cost and burden hardworking families and taxpayers. The New Hampshire House passed the bill, 172-164, on March 17, 2022. The New Hampshire Senate did not take it up.

HB 1298

EXPANDED SCHOOL CHOICE TAX CREDIT (CFGF SUPPORTS)

This bill increases the eligibility threshold

for households for the education tax credit. Specifically, the legislation increases household eligibility from 300 percent of the federal poverty level to 500 percent, expanding access to the state's school choice scholarship program for families with household income up to \$138,000. The program is primarily funded through business donations which then receive a credit on their business taxes. The New Hampshire House passed the bill, 159-152, on March 15, 2022. The New Hampshire Senate killed the legislation through unanimous consent.

HB 1337

SIGNIFICANT UNEMPLOYMENT **INSURANCE REFORM**

(CFGF SUPPORTS)

This bill implements substantial structural reforms to the state's unemployment insurance program. Specifically, the legislation reduces the maximum number of weeks from 26 down to 16 weeks if the state's unemployment rate is below 3 percent. The number of weeks increases by one for every half percentage point increase in the unemployment rate up to the previous maximum of 26 weeks if state unemployment is higher than 8 percent. This reform ensures healthier labor force participation while preventing a safety net from serving as a benefit hammock. The New Hampshire House passed the bill, 179-153, on March 17, 2022. The New Hampshire Senate did not take it up.

HB 1342

OVERRIDING LOCAL TAX CAP

(CFGF OPPOSES)

This bill would increase municipal taxes across the entire state of New Hampshire. Specifically, this legislation modifies municipal charters that have adopted tax caps by creating an override trigger that would override the tax cap with a two-thirds vote by the governing body of the town or city charter. At a time of record inflation and skyrocketing costs, this measure circumvents existing safeguards for taxpayers to further burden hardworking families and households. The New Hampshire House did not pass the bill, 157-181, on March 17, 2022. The New Hampshire Senate did not take it up.

SNAPSHOT

SNAPSHOT

VOTES

HB 1417

MASSIVE TAXPAYER-FUNDED PENSION **BOONDOGGLE**

(CFGF OPPOSES)

This bill requires New Hampshire taxpayers to increase funding for pensions associated with specific government workers. Specifically, the legislation requires the state to pay 7.5 percent of the costs incurred by municipalities to fund retirement pensions for teachers, firefighters, and police officers. The state previously paid zero percent. The estimated cost to taxpayers of the new pension plan is a combined \$56 million in FY 2024 and FY 2025 with near-certain spending increases in the future. The New Hampshire House passed the bill, 186-159, on March 31, 2022. The New Hampshire Senate tabled the bill, 14-10, on April 28, 2022.

HB 1432

DEFUNDING CRONY RAIL PROJECT

(CFGF SUPPORTS)

This bill defunds the Nashua to Concord Capitol Corridor commuter rail boondoggle. Specifically, the legislation prohibits state

taxpayer funding for the project through 2028 without a specific legislative appropriation. The cost estimate for the Capitol Corridor commuter rail is nearly \$800 million with taxpayers also bearing the brunt of the guaranteed future subsidies required to keep the rail profitable. The New Hampshire House passed the bill, 187-144, on March 17, 2022. The New Hampshire Senate did not take it up.

HB 1587

GOVERNMENT WORKER PENSION INCREASE

(CFGF OPPOSES)

This bill modifies the pension formula for Group Il government worker retirees. Specifically, the legislation alters the average final compensation for government employees who commenced service on or after July 1, 2011, by including the highest five years of the retiree's service. The cost of this pension adjustment to taxpayers is estimated at \$43 million for FY 2023 with guaranteed future spending increases through at least FY 2026. The New Hampshire House passed the bill, 231-113, on February 17, 2022.

The New Hampshire Senate passed it, 24-0, on May 5, 2022.

HB 1657

BLOCKING TAXPAYER-FUNDED FOOD REIMBURSEMENT PROGRAM

(CFGF SUPPORTS)

This bill requires taxpavers to reimburse school districts for purchasing food from New Hampshire producers. Specifically, the legislation reimburses school districts up to 33 percent of their costs for purchasing produce and dairy food from New Hampshire producers with an estimated total annual cost of \$1.8 million. While presumably well-intentioned, this program creates taxpayer subsidies for a handful of well-connected agribusiness special interests. The New Hampshire House blocked this bill, 186-164, on February 16, 2022. The New Hampshire Senate did not take it up. A vote in the affirmative was a vote to block this legislation.

SNAPSHOT

SNAPSHOT

VOTES

HB 1683

BLOCKING SCHOOL CHOICE REPEAL (CFGF SUPPORTS)

This bill repeals New Hampshire's Education Freedom accounts. Specifically, the legislation eliminates the statutory authorization for the Education Freedom account program which allows households at or below 300 percent of the federal poverty level to apply for school choice funding equivalent to the state's \$4,600 per pupil allocation. These accounts may be used for various educational expenses at any eligible K-12 school, empowering parents and focusing on achieving better student outcomes. The New Hampshire House blocked the bill, 189-166, on March 16, 2022. The New Hampshire Senate did not take it up. A vote in the affirmative was a vote to block this legislation to repeal school choice.

HR 17

RESOLUTION OPPOSING FEDERAL **CARBON TAX**

(CFGF SUPPORTS)

This resolution declares that New Hampshire

opposes a federal carbon tax. Specifically, the resolution opposes any federal or state efforts to impose a carbon tax on fuel for electricity or transportation. At a time of record inflation, a carbon tax would further fuel high costs and pain on already overburdened households and working families. Such destructive policies should be uniformly rejected. The New Hampshire House passed the resolution, 178-159, on March 31, 2022. The New Hampshire Senate did not take it up.

SB 274

BLOCKING PRO-WORKER LABOR AGREEMENTS

(CFGF OPPOSES)

This bill ensures that construction projects are an open bid process. Specifically, the legislation prohibits government infrastructure and construction projects from requiring labor affiliation or other labor-imposed wage and benefit criteria from serving as eligibility requirements for contractors. Over 90 percent of New Hampshire construction workers choose not to affiliate with labor unions. The bill requires the state government to remain neutral in favor of privately negotiated agreements instead of cost-driving, crony project labor agreements. The New Hampshire House blocked the bill. 177-154, on May 4, 2022. The New Hampshire Senate passed it, 13-11, on February 3, 2022. A vote in opposition to this bill was a vote in support of pro-worker labor agreements.

SB 326

BLOCKING EARLY CHILDHOOD GOVERNMENT AGENCY

(CFGF SUPPORTS)

This bill authorizes the creation of a Department of Early Childhood Education. Specifically, the legislation instructs the commissioner of the Department of Health and Human Services to develop a plan to create the new government agency. Analysis of the legislation is indeterminate with regard to total cost and appropriations. Over 2 million parents have moved their children out of failing government schools in the past two years. Instead of further entrenching the government in the education of children, lawmakers should be freeing parents

SNAPSHOT

SNAPSHOT

VOTES

and students from corrupt bureaucratic elites. The New Hampshire House blocked the bill, 178-151, on May 4, 2022. The New Hampshire Senate did not take it up. A vote in the affirmative was a vote to block the creation of the new government agency.

the reach and cost of programs funded by hardworking taxpayers. The New Hampshire House passed the bill, 226-76, on May 4, 2022. The New Hampshire Senate did not take it up.

SB 404

EXPANDING STATE FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

(CFGF OPPOSES)

This bill requires the Department of Health and Human Services to create a new outreach program to expand food stamp recipients. Specifically, the legislation requires private or federal funds to cover the cost of the new program which is aimed at enrolling thousands more households in government assistance. Lawmakers should be focused on transforming welfare safety nets into trampolines that propel individuals and households back into the workforce instead of seeking to expand

SNAPSHOT

SNAPSHOT