



# INCUMBENT VULNERABILITY REPORT

District risk, voting record exposure, funding weaknesses, and research leads

## SC-04

Timmons, William R. (Republican)

SC-04

*Campaign / internal research view — verify all sourcing before public use.*

### Where is this incumbent exposed — and how can a challenger use it?

#### What's inside

- Vulnerability dashboard and 5-dimension scorecard
- Campaign bottom line and top usable vulnerabilities
- Weak or risky angles to avoid
- Funding, attendance, and party-line exposure
- Issue consistency and most attackable votes (with use ratings)
- Internal vs. public-safe campaign frames
- Debate prep and likely counterarguments

## VULNERABILITY DASHBOARD

<b>Incumbent</b>	Timmons, William R.
<b>District</b>	SC-04
<b>Party</b>	Republican
<b>Total raised (cycle)</b>	\$829,479
<b>PAC / committee share</b>	56%
<b>Small-donor share</b>	Less than 1% of reported receipts
<b>Largest PAC check</b>	NATIONAL AUTOMOBILE DEALERS ASSOCIATION PAC: \$50,000
<b>Party-line vote rate</b>	99%
<b>Roll-call participation</b>	58.2% of VoteStance-covered roll-call opportunities · 322 cast · 231 missed · 553 total
<b>Mixed-direction issue votes</b>	8
<b>Key votes reviewed</b>	30
<b>Overall research vulnerability</b>	High
<b>Primary risk type</b>	Low Grassroots Signal

Dashboard summarizes automated analysis. Verify all figures on [FEC.gov](https://www.fec.gov) and [Congress.gov](https://www.congress.gov) before public use.

This report identifies research and messaging vulnerabilities from public records. It does not predict election outcomes or measure district vote preference.

## 2. Vulnerability Scorecard

Each dimension is scored 0–100 based on publicly available data. Higher scores indicate stronger research threads for challengers, not certainty of electoral risk.

Dimension	Level	Score	Detail
PAC / Special Interest Exposure	<b>Moderate-High</b>	65	56% of receipts from PACs and committees
Low Grassroots Signal (Small-Donor Weakness)	<b>High</b>	90	Small-dollar donors: less than 1% of reported receipts
Party-Line Voting Exposure	<b>High</b>	85	Voted with party majority 99% of the time
Attendance / Missed Vote Exposure	<b>High</b>	80	Roll-call participation: 58%
Issue Consistency Exposure	<b>High</b>	80	Mixed-direction votes found on 8 issue areas, including Government Spending, Foreign Aid, and Defense Spending
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>High</b>	<b>79</b>	Primary risk: Low Grassroots Signal

### 3. Campaign Bottom Line

*Starting frame from verified public data — not proof of motive. Confirm every figure on FEC.gov and Congress.gov before mail, digital, debate, or paid media.*

Automated analysis rates Timmons, William R.'s overall research vulnerability as High, with the strongest threads in low grassroots signal / small-donor weakness, PAC-backed funding profile. Roll-call participation is 58.2% in VoteStance coverage (231 missed of 553 opportunities). In this Upstate district, auto-industry PAC support and missed votes on housing or manufacturing bills may carry extra local salience after verification. These are research leads — verify every figure on FEC.gov and Congress.gov before mail, digital, or debate.

#### Lead with these threads

1. **Low grassroots signal / small-donor weakness** — Grassroots contrast — pair with district geography if relevant
2. **PAC-backed funding profile** — Debate, mail, digital — verify FEC Form 3 totals
3. **Attendance exposure** — Debate, press, contrast mail — verify context before public use

#### Public-safe framing (after verify):

Timmons, William R.'s record shows PAC-backed committee funding, very high party alignment, and was absent from a large share of recorded roll calls in this coverage (231 missed) — verify each claim before public use.

### 4. Top 5 Usable Vulnerabilities

*Ranked by evidence strength. Pair each thread with Most Attackable Votes and FEC/Congress.gov verification before any public contrast.*

#### Low grassroots signal / small-donor weakness

**Evidence:** Small-dollar donors accounted for less than 1% of reported receipts in this export.

*Confidence: High · Risk: Medium · Best use: Grassroots contrast — pair with district geography if relevant*

*Likely rebuttal: "We have broad support and comply with all campaign finance laws."*

*Follow-up: "Then why is the small-donor share near zero while PAC and committee lines dominate?"*

**Public-safe (after verify):** Timmons, William R.'s reported receipts show that small-dollar donors accounted for less than 1% of reported receipts in this export — a concrete grassroots contrast after verifying Form 3 totals.

#### PAC-backed funding profile

**Evidence:** 56% (\$464,000) from PACs and committees

*Confidence: High · Risk: Medium · Best use: Debate, mail, digital — verify FEC Form 3 totals*

*Likely rebuttal: "These donations are legal and disclosed — I follow all campaign finance laws."*

*Follow-up: "Then why do PACs and committees account for 56% of reported receipts?"*

**Public-safe (after verify):** Timmons, William R.'s campaign reports 56% of receipts from PACs and committees — a fair PAC-backed contrast point after verifying FEC filings.

### Attendance exposure

**Evidence:** 58.2% roll-call participation in VoteStance coverage (231 missed of 553 covered roll-call opportunities).

*Confidence: High · Risk: Medium–High · Best use: Debate, press, contrast mail — verify context before public use*

*Likely rebuttal: "I was present for the votes that mattered — coverage may not include every chamber action."*

*Follow-up: "Which missed votes involved issues important to your district, and why were you absent?"*

**Public-safe (after verify):** Timmons, William R.'s record shows 58.2% roll-call participation in VoteStance coverage (231 missed votes of 553 covered opportunities) — fair questions about availability after verifying context.

### Party-line voting exposure

**Evidence:** 99% party-line rate on recorded votes in coverage.

*Confidence: High · Risk: Medium · Best use: Independence angle — cite verified break votes*

*Likely rebuttal: "I vote my district and my conscience — party alignment reflects shared priorities."*

*Follow-up: "Can you name a significant vote where you broke with party leadership, and why?"*

**Public-safe (after verify):** Timmons, William R. voted with party leadership 99% of the time in this coverage — fair independence questions after verifying specific roll calls.

### Mixed issue consistency / spending contradictions

**Evidence:** Mixed-direction votes found on 8 issue areas, including Government Spending, Foreign Aid, and Defense Spending.

*Confidence: Medium · Risk: Medium · Best use: Consistency questions — verify bill text before use*

*Likely rebuttal: "Each bill is different — I vote on the merits of the legislation."*

*Follow-up: "What changed between the roll calls where you voted in opposite directions on the same tagged issue?"*

**Public-safe (after verify):** The mapped roll-call pattern includes votes in both directions on multiple issue areas — consistency questions are fair after reviewing underlying bills.

## 5. Weak or Risky Angles to Avoid

*Do not lead with these without bill-level verification and district context.*

- **Veterans / servicemember religious marker votes** — High backlash risk — do not lead with unless bill text and district context are verified.
- **Aviation safety / ALERT Act votes** — Substantive safety votes often read positive — weak attack without implementation critique.

- **Agricultural disaster aid votes** — Disaster and conservation aid often reads positive in rural districts — verify salience first.
- **Procedural rule votes (H.Res.)** — Useful for insiders only — hard for typical voters to follow.
- **Donor–vote alignment without timing evidence** — Do not assert quid pro quo — pair Schedule A dates with roll-call dates manually.
- **"Bought by donors" framing** — Avoid outright influence claims — stick to disclosed receipts and verified roll calls.
- **S 1318 — backfire risk** — Veterans, religion, or national-symbol framing — internal review only

## 6. Funding Vulnerabilities

### Top PAC and Committee Contributors

Committee / PAC	Amount
NATIONAL AUTOMOBILE DEALERS ASSOCIATION PAC	\$50,000
SPACE EXPLORATION TECHNOLOGIES CORP. PAC	\$50,000
AMERICAN CRYSTAL SUGAR COMPANY PAC	\$50,000
AMERICAN FINANCIAL SERVICES ASSOCIATION PAC	\$42,500
FEDERAL BIPARTISAN VOLUNTARY PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE OF THE PNC FINANCIAL SERVICES GROUP, INC. (...)	\$40,000
ANTI-WOKE FUND	\$40,000
CRH AMERICAS, INC. PAC	\$37,500
ALLSTATE INSURANCE COMPANY PAC	\$25,000
DELOITTE PAC	\$25,000
MORTGAGE BANKERS ASSOCIATION PAC (MORPAC)	\$25,000

- See **Top 5 Usable Vulnerabilities** for PAC share, grassroots signal, and named-PAC research threads. The table below lists the largest Schedule A committee checks in this export.

*Source: FEC Schedule A (itemized individual contributions). These are legal, disclosed donations. Research threads require further verification.*

## 7. Attendance Vulnerability

- **Roll-call participation rate: 58.2%** of VoteStance-covered roll-call opportunities — Attendance exposure rated **High**.
- **Votes cast: 322.**
- **Missed votes: 231.**
- **Total covered opportunities: 553.**
- **Campaign use:** A participation rate below 90% is one of the most voter-accessible attack angles — it does not require policy knowledge. Challengers can ask: which votes were missed, and what priorities did they represent?
- **Best frame:** "At 58.2% participation in this coverage, voters can ask what district priorities were missed when the incumbent was absent."

- **Likely defense:** Missing votes is sometimes necessary due to official duties, committee work, constituent travel, or district events.
- **Suggested follow-up:** Ask which votes were missed, and whether any related to locally important issues — healthcare, agriculture, housing, infrastructure, or defense spending.

## 8. Party-Line Voting Exposure

- **Party-line loyalty (High):** 99% of recorded votes aligned with party majority. A challenger can ask: when has the incumbent put district priorities above party leadership?

## 9. Issue Consistency Exposure

*Issues where the voting record includes votes in both supportive and opposing directions (by VoteStance issue tags). This does not automatically mean inconsistency — bills are complex and may contain multiple provisions. It identifies areas where the record requires explanation.*

### Government Spending

- HRES 5 — Yea (Con) · 2025-01-03T18:08:00-05:00
- HR 192 — Yea (Pro) · 2025-01-13T18:53:00-05:00
- HR 152 — Yea (Pro) · 2025-01-13T19:00:00-05:00
- HR 153 — Yea (Pro) · 2025-01-14T14:28:00-05:00
- HR 144 — Yea (Pro) · 2025-01-15T16:34:00-05:00

### Foreign Aid

- HR 249 — Yea (Pro) · 2025-05-13T19:01:00-04:00
- HR 4 — Yea (Con) · 2025-06-12T15:52:00-04:00
- HR 3424 — Yea (Pro) · 2025-09-08T18:56:00-04:00
- HR 5107 — Yea (Pro) · 2025-11-19T20:45:00-05:00
- HR 4423 — Yea (Con) · 2025-12-01T19:05:00-05:00

### Defense Spending

- HR 856 — Yea (Pro) · 2025-03-03T18:54:00-05:00
- HR 249 — Yea (Pro) · 2025-05-13T19:01:00-04:00
- HRES 537 — Yea (Con) · 2025-06-24T14:00:00-04:00
- HR 4016 — Yea (Pro) · 2025-07-18T00:45:00-04:00
- HR 4216 — Yea (Pro) · 2025-09-02T18:56:00-04:00

### Public Education Funding

- HR 1048 — Yea (Pro) · 2025-03-27T10:52:00-04:00
- HR 249 — Yea (Pro) · 2025-05-13T19:01:00-04:00
- HR 3424 — Yea (Pro) · 2025-09-08T18:56:00-04:00
- HR 5107 — Yea (Pro) · 2025-11-19T20:45:00-05:00
- HR 1005 — Yea (Pro) · 2025-12-03T17:03:00-05:00

### Energy Costs

- HR 164 — Yea (Pro) · 2025-01-15T16:27:00-05:00
- HR 26 — Yea (Pro) · 2025-02-07T10:57:00-05:00
- HJRES 20 — Yea (Con) · 2025-02-27T10:26:00-05:00
- HJRES 42 — Yea (Con) · 2025-03-05T16:42:00-05:00
- HR 359 — Yea (Pro) · 2025-03-24T18:55:00-04:00

### Data Privacy

- HR 859 — Yea (Pro) · 2025-04-29T17:34:00-04:00
- HR 249 — Yea (Pro) · 2025-05-13T19:01:00-04:00
- HR 1919 — Yea (Pro) · 2025-07-17T16:01:00-04:00
- HR 3424 — Yea (Pro) · 2025-09-08T18:56:00-04:00
- HR 6019 — Yea (Con) · 2025-11-19T21:00:00-05:00

**Issue consistency assessment: High** — Mixed-direction votes found on 8 issue areas, including Government Spending, Foreign Aid, and Defense Spending

## 10. Most Attackable Votes

*Key votes re-ranked by campaign usability: missed votes, kitchen-table issues, and clear messaging come first. Backlash-risk votes are flagged. Verify all figures before public use.*

### 1. HR 1531 — Not Voting · The PROTECT Taiwan Act

**Use rating:** Lead with — Missed vote — voter-accessible without deep policy knowledge

**Why vulnerable:** Roll-call absence on HR 1531 — the PROTECT Taiwan Act

**Best frame:** Missed a national security vote — the incumbent was absent for the PROTECT Taiwan Act.

**Follow-up:** Ask whether the incumbent supports the PROTECT Taiwan Act and why they were absent for a vote involving U.S. commitments in the Indo-Pacific.

### 2. HR 6644 — Not Voting · The Housing for the 21st Century Act

**Use rating:** Lead with — Missed vote — voter-accessible without deep policy knowledge

**Why vulnerable:** Roll-call absence on HR 6644 — the Housing for the 21st Century Act

**Best frame:** When affordable housing financing was on the floor, the incumbent was absent.

**Follow-up:** Ask whether the incumbent supports the Housing for the 21st Century Act's housing finance and community development provisions, and why they missed the vote.

### 3. HJRES 142 — Not Voting · D.C. Council disapproval resolution

**Use rating:** Lead with — Missed vote — voter-accessible without deep policy knowledge

**Why vulnerable:** Roll-call absence on HJRES 142 — D.C. Council disapproval resolution

**Best frame:** The incumbent was absent for the vote on D.C. Council disapproval resolution.

**Follow-up:** Ask whether the incumbent supports D.C. Council disapproval resolution and what prevented attendance.

### 4. HR 4090 — Not Voting · The Critical Mineral Dominance Act

**Use rating:** Lead with — Missed vote — voter-accessible without deep policy knowledge

**Why vulnerable:** Roll-call absence on HR 4090 — the Critical Mineral Dominance Act

**Best frame:** The incumbent missed a vote on the Critical Mineral Dominance Act — tied to energy security and domestic supply chains.

**Follow-up:** Ask how missing the vote on the Critical Mineral Dominance Act aligns with stated positions on energy security, domestic supply chains, and manufacturing.

### 5. SCONRES 33 — Yea · The FY2026 budget resolution

**Use rating:** Use carefully — Verify district salience and bill text before public use

**Why vulnerable:** Voted in favor of the FY2026 budget resolution

**Best frame:** Backed the FY2026 budget resolution — ask which district priorities were protected and what spending tradeoffs the vote represented.

**Follow-up:** Ask which district priorities were protected or cut in the FY2026 budget resolution, and what tradeoffs the yea vote represented.

**6. S 1318 — Yea** · The Fallen Servicemembers Religious Heritage Restoration Act [*sensitive topic — review framing carefully*]

**Use rating:** **Backfire risk** — Veterans, religion, or national-symbol framing — internal review only

**Why vulnerable:** Voted in favor of the Fallen Servicemembers Religious Heritage Restoration Act

**Best frame:** Voted Yea on the Fallen Servicemembers Religious Heritage Restoration Act — approach as a spending or process question rather than an attack on the bill's subject matter.

**Follow-up:** Ask what fiscal or procedural principle guided the vote. Caution: high backlash risk — use only as a spending or process question, not as an attack on the bill's subject matter.

**7. HR 7613 — Yea** · The ALERT Act

**Use rating:** **Weak attack** — Substantive vote may read positive without donor timing or district tie-in

**Why vulnerable:** Voted in favor of the ALERT Act

**Best frame:** Backed the ALERT Act — ask whether the vote aligned with transportation and infrastructure priorities in the district.

**Follow-up:** Ask what the yea vote on the ALERT Act meant for transportation and infrastructure.

**8. HR 1011 — Yea** · The Emergency Conservation Program Improvement Act of 2025

**Use rating:** **Weak attack** — Substantive vote may read positive without donor timing or district tie-in

**Why vulnerable:** Voted in favor of the Emergency Conservation Program Improvement Act of 2025

**Best frame:** Supported the Emergency Conservation Program Improvement Act of 2025 — ask whether this reflects consistent support for agricultural communities or a selective position.

**Follow-up:** Ask what the Emergency Conservation Program Improvement Act of 2025 meant for agricultural and rural communities in the district, and whether this reflects a consistent approach to farm-sector support.

**9. HR 2189 — Yea** · The Law-Enforcement Innovate to De-Escalate Act

**Use rating:** **Use carefully** — Verify district salience and bill text before public use

**Why vulnerable:** Voted in favor of the Law-Enforcement Innovate to De-Escalate Act

**Best frame:** Voted Yea on the Law-Enforcement Innovate to De-Escalate Act — ask whether this aligned with constituent priorities or party leadership direction.

**Follow-up:** Ask what the yea vote on the Law-Enforcement Innovate to De-Escalate Act meant for constituents in the district.

**10. S 1383 — Yea** · The Safeguard American Voter Eligibility Act

**Use rating:** **Use carefully** — Verify district salience and bill text before public use

**Why vulnerable:** Voted in favor of the Safeguard American Voter Eligibility Act

**Best frame:** Voted Yea on the Safeguard American Voter Eligibility Act — ask whether this aligned with constituent priorities or party leadership direction.

**Follow-up:** Ask what the yea vote on the Safeguard American Voter Eligibility Act meant for constituents in the district.

*Ranking by campaign usability: missed votes and kitchen-table issues ranked highest; votes touching veterans, religion, or national symbols carry backlash risk and are ranked lower. Verify on Congress.gov before any public use.*

## 11. Best Campaign Frames — Internal vs. Public-Safe

*Distilled from the funding and voting record above. Internal research language vs. public-safe lines after verification — confirm every figure before paid media or public statements.*

Topic	Internal research frame	Public-safe (after verify)
Overall vulnerability frame	PAC-backed (56% institutional share), low grassroots signal, highly party-aligned (99% party-line), 58% roll-call participation.	Timmons, William R.'s record shows PAC-backed committee funding, very high party alignment, and was absent from a large share of recorded roll calls in this coverage (231 missed) — verify each claim before public use.

Topic	Internal research frame	Public-safe (after verify)
Funding contrast	Institutional share 56% vs small-dollar share less than 1%.	Small-dollar donors accounted for less than 1% of reported receipts, compared with 56% from PACs and committees in this export.

Frame type	Starting language
<b>Best overall frame</b>	"PAC-backed, highly party-aligned, was absent from a large share of recorded roll calls in this coverage."
<b>Best money frame</b>	"PACs and committees supplied 56% of reported receipts, while small-dollar donors accounted for less than 1%."
<b>Best attendance frame</b>	"At 58.2% roll-call participation (231 missed votes of 553 covered opportunities), voters can ask what district priorities were missed."
<b>Best party-line frame</b>	"Voted with party leadership 99% of the time — when has the district come first?"
<b>Best debate question</b>	"Your campaign received \$50,000 from NATIONAL AUTOMOBILE DEALERS ASSOCIATION PAC. Can you point to a vote where you disagreed with their policy interests?"

*These frames are data-derived starting points. Legal review is recommended before use in paid media.*

## 12. Debate and Interview Prep

*Campaign-ready questions for forums, press events, and candidate interviews. Verify every figure cited before use.*

- Q1.** Your campaign received **\$50,000** from **NATIONAL AUTOMOBILE DEALERS ASSOCIATION PAC**. What are that committee's primary policy interests, and can you point to a vote where you disagreed with them?
- Q2.** VoteStance data shows you voted with your party **99%** of the time. Can you name a significant vote where you broke with leadership, and what drove that decision?
- Q3.** Your record shows votes going in both directions on **Government Spending**. What principle determines when you support and when you oppose measures in that area?
- Q4.** On SCONRES 33, you voted **Yea** on the FY2026 budget resolution. What was the primary reason for that vote, and what did it mean for your constituents?
- Q5.** Your campaign raised **56%** of reported receipts from PACs and committees, while small-dollar donors accounted for **less than 1%**. How should voters understand the balance between institutional and grassroots support?
- Q6.** Roll-call records show a participation rate of **58.2%** (231 missed of 553 covered opportunities). Which missed votes do you most wish you had been present for, and what prevented your attendance?

## 13. Likely Counterarguments

*Anticipate these responses before using this report's findings publicly.*

### **Campaign angle:** PAC and committee contributions

**Likely defense:** These donations are legal and fully disclosed — all campaign finance laws were followed.

**Suggested follow-up:** Correct. The question is not legality; it is whether institutional donors have disproportionate access compared to small-dollar constituents.

### **Campaign angle:** Party-line voting record

**Likely defense:** Voting with party leadership reflects shared values and constituent priorities.

**Suggested follow-up:** Ask for specific examples where district needs came before party leadership. The rate is a data point, not proof of rubber-stamp behavior.

### **Campaign angle:** Mixed issue record

**Likely defense:** Bills are complex — no two bills on the same issue are identical.

**Suggested follow-up:** Ask the incumbent to explain the principle behind the votes in both directions. Bill-specific analysis is appropriate here.

### **Campaign angle:** Attendance record

**Likely defense:** Missing votes is sometimes necessary due to official duties, committee work, or district events.

**Suggested follow-up:** Ask which votes were missed, and whether any related to locally important issues. The context matters.

### **Campaign angle:** General framing

**Likely defense:** This report is opposition research and should not be taken at face value.

**Suggested follow-up:** Correct — this report identifies research leads, not proven facts. All figures are sourced from FEC.gov and Congress.gov and should be verified independently.

## 14. Methodology and Sources

This report identifies political vulnerabilities and research leads based on publicly available FEC filings and congressional roll-call records. It does not allege illegality, corruption, quid pro quo, or improper conduct. Vulnerability scores are computed from fundraising ratios, vote participation, party-line rate, and issue-tag consistency — they are research indicators, not predictions of electoral outcomes. All figures should be verified against FEC.gov and Congress.gov before any public use.

- **Electoral vulnerability** — not yet scored (requires election result data).
- **PAC / Special interest exposure** — PAC share of FEC-reported total receipts.
- **Low grassroots signal** — small-donor share of FEC-reported receipts.
- **Party-line voting exposure** — share of roll calls aligned with party majority.
- **Attendance exposure** — roll-call participation rate.
- **Issue consistency exposure** — count of issues with votes in both directions.
- **Priority research findings** — rule-based ranker combining vote messageability, issue viscerality, donor-sector alignment, and committee context.

**Data sources:** FEC.gov (Schedule A, Form 3/3X) · Congress.gov (roll-call records) · Vote Stance issue tags and sector mappings · VoteStance interest group ratings.

**Generated:** May 24, 2026 · **Report type:** Campaign Edition · **Platform:** Vote Stance