



# NTU Rates Congress

## 111th Congress, First Session (2009)

### UNITED STATES SENATE†

#### GRADE SCORE

**ALABAMA**

Sessions, J.....**A**.....91%

Shelby, R.....**B-**.....74%

State Average .....**83%**

**ALASKA**

Begich, M.....**F**.....7%

Murkowski, L.....**B-**.....71%

State Average .....**38%**

**ARIZONA**

Kyl, J.....**A**.....91%

McCain, J.....**A**.....93%

State Average .....**92%**

**ARKANSAS**

Lincoln, B.....**F**.....16%

Pryor, M.....**F**.....9%

State Average .....**13%**

**CALIFORNIA**

Boxer, B.....**F**.....5%

Feinstein, D.....**F**.....6%

State Average .....**6%**

**COLORADO**

Bennet, M.....**F**.....10%

Udall, M.....**F**.....8%

State Average .....**9%**

**CONNECTICUT**

Dodd, C.....**F**.....5%

Lieberman, J.....**F**.....10%

State Average .....**7%**

**DELAWARE**

Carper, T.....**F**.....9%

Kaufman, T.....**F**.....6%

State Average .....**7%**

**FLORIDA**

LeMieux, G.....N.A.....N.A.\*\*

Nelson, B.....**F**.....10%

State Average .....**10%**

**GEORGIA**

Chambliss, S.....**A**.....90%

Isakson, J.....**A**.....90%

State Average .....**90%**

**HAWAII**

Akaka, D.....**F**.....6%

Inouye, D.....**F**.....5%

State Average .....**6%**

**IDAHO**

Crapo, M.....**B+**.....86%

Risch, J.....**B+**.....87%

State Average .....**86%**

**ILLINOIS**

Burris, R.....**F**.....5%

Durbin, D.....**F**.....4%

State Average .....**5%**

**INDIANA**

Bayh, E.....**C-**.....39%

Lugar, D.....**B-**.....76%

State Average .....**57%**

#### GRADE SCORE

**IOWA**

Grassley, C.....**B+**.....88%

Harkin, T.....**F**.....4%

State Average .....**46%**

**KANSAS**

Brownback, S.....**B**.....83%

Roberts, P.....**B**.....84%

State Average .....**83%**

**KENTUCKY**

Bunning, J.....**A**.....92%

McConnell, M.....**B+**.....88%

State Average .....**90%**

**LOUISIANA**

Landrieu, M.....**F**.....10%

Vitter, D.....**B+**.....88%

State Average .....**50%**

**MAINE**

Collins, S.....**C**.....50%

Snowe, O.....**C**.....51%

State Average .....**51%**

**MARYLAND**

Cardin, B.....**F**.....5%

Mikulski, B.....**F**.....5%

State Average .....**5%**

**MASSACHUSETTS**

Kerry, J.....**F**.....4%

Kirk, P.....N.A.....N.A.\*\*

State Average .....**4%**

**MICHIGAN**

Levin, C.....**F**.....6%

Stabenow, D.....**F**.....6%

State Average .....**6%**

**MINNESOTA**

Franken, A.....N.A.....N.A.\*\*

Klobuchar, A.....**F**.....12%

State Average .....**12%**

**MISSISSIPPI**

Cochran, T.....**B-**.....72%

Wicker, R.....**B**.....82%

State Average .....**77%**

**MISSOURI**

Bond, C.....**C+**.....69%

McCaskill, C.....**D**.....25%

State Average .....**47%**

**MONTANA**

Baucus, M.....**F**.....7%

Tester, J.....**F**.....10%

State Average .....**9%**

**NEBRASKA**

Johanns, M.....**B+**.....87%

Nelson, B.....**D**.....27%

State Average .....**56%**

**NEVADA**

Ensign, J.....**A**.....93%

Reid, H.....**F**.....6%

State Average .....**49%**

#### GRADE SCORE

**NEW HAMPSHIRE**

Gregg, J.....**B**.....80%

Shaheen, J.....**F**.....8%

State Average .....**42%**

**NEW JERSEY**

Lautenberg, F.....**F**.....5%

Menendez, B.....**F**.....5%

State Average .....**5%**

**NEW MEXICO**

Bingaman, J.....**F**.....4%

Udall, T.....**F**.....5%

State Average .....**4%**

**NEW YORK**

Gillibrand, K.....**F**.....6%

Schumer, C.....**F**.....5%

State Average .....**5%**

**NORTH CAROLINA**

Burr, R.....**A**.....92%

Hagan, K.....**F**.....8%

State Average .....**50%**

**NORTH DAKOTA**

Conrad, K.....**F**.....10%

Dorgan, B.....**F**.....13%

State Average .....**11%**

**OHIO**

Brown, S.....**F**.....4%

Voinovich, G.....**C+**.....63%

State Average .....**33%**

**OKLAHOMA**

Coburn, T.....**A**.....97%

Inhofe, J.....**A**.....93%

State Average .....**95%**

**OREGON**

Merkley, J.....**F**.....6%

Wyden, R.....**F**.....9%

State Average .....**7%**

**PENNSYLVANIA**

Casey, B.....**F**.....6%

Specter, A.....**D**.....26%

State Average .....**16%**

**RHODE ISLAND**

Reed, J.....**F**.....4%

Whitehouse, S.....**F**.....4%

State Average .....**4%**

**SOUTH CAROLINA**

DeMint, J.....**A**.....97%

Graham, L.....**A**.....90%

State Average .....**93%**

**SOUTH DAKOTA**

Johnson, T.....**F**.....6%

Thune, J.....**A**.....91%

State Average .....**49%**

**TENNESSEE**

Alexander, L.....**B-**.....72%

Corker, B.....**B**.....83%

State Average .....**78%**

#### GRADE SCORE

**TEXAS**

Cornyn, J.....**B+**.....89%

Hutchison, K.....**B**.....81%

State Average .....**85%**

**UTAH**

Bennett, B.....**B**.....80%

Hatch, O.....**B**.....83%

State Average .....**81%**

**VERMONT**

Leahy, P.....**F**.....6%

Sanders, B.....**F**.....9%

State Average .....**7%**

**VIRGINIA**

Warner, M.....**F**.....11%

Webb, J.....**F**.....13%

State Average .....**12%**

**WASHINGTON**

Cantwell, M.....**F**.....10%

Murray, P.....**F**.....7%

State Average .....**9%**

**WEST VIRGINIA**

Byrd, R.....**F**.....11%

Rockefeller, J.....**F**.....5%

State Average .....**8%**

**WISCONSIN**

Feingold, R.....**D**.....23%

Kohl, H.....**F**.....9%

State Average .....**16%**

**WYOMING**

Barrasso, J.....**A**.....91%

Enzi, M.....**A**.....92%

State Average .....**92%**

### Senate Key

SCORE	GRADE	COMMENTS
90% or more	A	Taxpayers' Friend
85%-89%	B+	
80%-84%	B	Good
70%-79%	B-	
60%-69%	C+	
50%-59%	C	Satisfactory
39%-49%	C-	
17%-38%	D	Poor
16% or less	F	Big Spender

\*\* Voted on 50% or less of weighted total of votes cast; score and grade not issued.

†Based on every roll call vote affecting fiscal policy; see back page for methodology.

# U.S. HOUSE OF RE

GRADE	SCORE
<b>ALABAMA</b>	
Aderholt, R	B .....82%
Bachus, S	B .....84%
Bonner, J	B+ .....85%
Bright, B	C .....58%
Davis, A	F .....11%
Griffith, P	C- .....39%
Rogers, M	C+ .....68%
<b>State Average</b>	<b>.....61%</b>
<b>ALASKA</b>	
Young, D	C+ .....60%
<b>ARIZONA</b>	
Flake, J	A .....99%
Franks, T	A .....94%
Giffords, G	F .....14%
Grijalva, R	F .....3%
Kirkpatrick, A	C .....33%
Mitchell, H	C- .....39%
Pastor, E	F .....2%
Shadegg, J	A .....95%
<b>State Average</b>	<b>.....47%</b>
<b>ARKANSAS</b>	
Berry, M	F .....13%
Boozman, J	B+ .....86%
Ross, M	F .....14%
Snyder, V	F .....4%
<b>State Average</b>	<b>.....30%</b>
<b>CALIFORNIA</b>	
Baca, J	F .....3%
Becerra, X	F .....2%
Berman, H	F .....2%
Bilbray, B	B- .....75%
Bono Mack, M	B- .....70%
Calvert, K	B .....80%
Campbell, J	B+ .....88%
Capps, L	F .....2%
Cardoza, D	F .....7%
Chu, J	N.A. N.A. **
Costa, J	F .....11%
Davis, S	F .....3%
Dreier, D	B .....80%
Eshoo, A	F .....3%
Farr, S	F .....3%
Filner, B	F .....5%
Gallegly, E	B .....84%
Garamendi, J	N.A. N.A. **
Harman, J	F .....3%
Herger, W	A .....90%
Honda, M	F .....3%
Hunter, D	B+ .....85%
Issa, D	B+ .....89%
Lee, B	F .....4%
Lewis, J	B .....80%
Lofgren, Z	F .....5%
Lungren, D	B+ .....85%
Matsui, D	F .....2%
McCarthy, K	B+ .....87%
McClintock, T	A .....95%
McKeon, B	B .....82%
McNerney, J	F .....9%
Miller, Gary	B .....82%
Miller, George	F .....3%
Napolitano, G	F .....2%
Nunes, D	B+ .....89%
Pelosi, N	N.A. N.A. **
Radanovich, G	B+ .....88%
Richardson, L	F .....3%
Rohrabacher, D	B+ .....88%
Roybal-Allard, L	F .....1%

GRADE	SCORE
Royce, E	A .....94%
Sánchez, Linda	F .....3%
Sanchez, Loretta	F .....4%
Schiff, A	F .....3%
Sherman, B	F .....2%
Speier, J	F .....7%
Stark, P	F .....13%
Thompson, M	F .....4%
Waters, M	F .....5%
Watson, D	F .....2%
Waxman, H	F .....1%
Woolsey, L	F .....4%
<b>State Average</b>	<b>.....35%</b>
<b>COLORADO</b>	
Coffman, M	B+ .....88%
DeGette, D	F .....2%
Lamborn, D	A .....93%
Markey, B	D .....19%
Perlmutter, E	F .....3%
Polis, J	F .....8%
Salazar, J	F .....8%
<b>State Average</b>	<b>.....32%</b>
<b>CONNECTICUT</b>	
Courtney, J	F .....4%
DeLauro, R	F .....2%
Himes, J	F .....10%
Larson, J	F .....2%
Murphy, C	F .....5%
<b>State Average</b>	<b>.....5%</b>
<b>DELAWARE</b>	
Castle, M	C .....56%
<b>FLORIDA</b>	
Bilirakis, G	B- .....77%
Boyd, A	D .....17%
Brown, C	F .....2%
Brown-Waite, G	C+ .....69%
Buchanan, V	C+ .....69%
Castor, K	F .....2%
Crenshaw, A	B- .....77%
Diaz-Balart, L	C+ .....64%
Diaz-Balart, M	C+ .....64%
Grayson, A	F .....6%
Hastings, A	F .....1%
Klein, R	F .....4%
Kosmas, S	D .....19%
Mack, C	B+ .....89%
Meek, K	F .....5%
Mica, J	B .....82%
Miller, J	A .....91%
Posey, B	B .....84%
Putnam, A	B- .....78%
Rooney, T	B- .....78%
Ros-Lehtinen, I	C .....58%
Stearns, C	B+ .....85%
Wasserman Schultz, D	F .....2%
Wexler, R	F .....2%
Young, B	C+ .....69%
<b>State Average</b>	<b>.....48%</b>
<b>GEORGIA</b>	
Barrow, J	D .....18%
Bishop, S	F .....4%
Broun, P	A .....96%
Deal, N	A .....91%
Gingrey, P	B+ .....88%
Johnson, H	F .....2%
Kingston, J	B+ .....89%
Lewis, J	F .....3%
Linder, J	A .....93%
Marshall, J	D .....27%

GRADE	SCORE
Price, T	A .....93%
Scott, D	F .....2%
Westmoreland, L	A .....91%
<b>State Average</b>	<b>.....54%</b>
<b>HAWAII</b>	
Abercrombie, N	F .....1%
Hirono, M	F .....1%
<b>State Average</b>	<b>.....1%</b>
<b>IDAHO</b>	
Minnick, W	C .....51%
Simpson, M	B- .....72%
<b>State Average</b>	<b>.....62%</b>
<b>ILLINOIS</b>	
Bean, M	D .....17%
Biggart, J	B- .....73%
Costello, J	F .....12%
Davis, D	F .....1%
Foster, B	F .....14%
Gutierrez, L	F .....3%
Halvorson, D	F .....12%
Hare, P	F .....2%
Jackson, J	F .....2%
Johnson, T	B- .....79%
Kirk, M	C+ .....60%
Lipinski, D	F .....8%
Manzullo, D	B+ .....86%
Quigley, M	F .....6%*
Roskam, P	B .....84%
Rush, B	F .....2%
Schakowsky, J	F .....2%
Schock, A	B- .....70%
Shimkus, J	B .....81%
<b>State Average</b>	<b>.....33%</b>
<b>INDIANA</b>	
Burton, D	B+ .....88%
Buyer, S	B .....81%
Carson, A	F .....1%
Donnelly, J	D .....21%
Ellsworth, B	D .....25%
Hill, B	D .....18%
Pence, M	A .....92%
Souder, M	B- .....74%
Visclosky, P	F .....10%
<b>State Average</b>	<b>.....45%</b>
<b>IOWA</b>	
Boswell, L	F .....4%
Braley, B	F .....2%
King, S	A .....92%
Latham, T	B- .....72%
Loebach, D	F .....2%
<b>State Average</b>	<b>.....35%</b>
<b>KANSAS</b>	
Jenkins, L	B .....82%
Moore, D	F .....3%
Moran, J	B .....84%
Tiahrt, T	B+ .....86%
<b>State Average</b>	<b>.....64%</b>
<b>KENTUCKY</b>	
Chandler, B	F .....13%
Davis, G	B .....83%
Guthrie, B	B- .....79%
Rogers, H	B- .....75%
Whitfield, E	B- .....74%
Yarmuth, J	F .....2%
<b>State Average</b>	<b>.....54%</b>
<b>LOUISIANA</b>	
Alexander, R	B .....81%
Boustany, C	B+ .....88%
Cao, J	C- .....47%

GRADE	SCORE
Cassidy, B	B .....81%
Fleming, J	B+ .....86%
Melancon, C	D .....22%
Scalise, S	B+ .....89%
<b>State Average</b>	<b>.....71%</b>
<b>MAINE</b>	
Michaud, M	F .....9%
Pingree, C	F .....4%
<b>State Average</b>	<b>.....6%</b>
<b>MARYLAND</b>	
Bartlett, R	B+ .....86%
Cummings, E	F .....1%
Edwards, D	F .....3%
Hoyer, S	F .....2%
Kratovil, F	C- .....37%
Ruppersberger, D	F .....5%
Sarbanes, J	F .....2%
Van Hollen, C	F .....2%
<b>State Average</b>	<b>.....17%</b>
<b>MASSACHUSETTS</b>	
Capuano, M	F .....2%
Delahunt, B	F .....3%
Frank, B	F .....2%
Lynch, S	F .....3%
Markey, E	F .....2%
McGovern, J	F .....2%
Neal, R	F .....3%
Olver, J	F .....1%
Tierney, J	F .....5%
Tsongas, N	F .....4%
<b>State Average</b>	<b>.....3%</b>
<b>MICHIGAN</b>	
Camp, D	B- .....76%
Conyers, J	F .....5%
Dingell, J	F .....3%
Ehlers, V	C+ .....61%
Hoekstra, P	B .....84%
Kildee, D	F .....3%
Kilpatrick, C	F .....4%
Levin, S	F .....3%
McCotter, T	B- .....71%
Miller, C	C+ .....61%
Peters, G	F .....11%
Rogers, M	B .....81%
Schauer, M	F .....8%
Stupak, B	F .....11%
Upton, F	C+ .....61%
<b>State Average</b>	<b>.....36%</b>
<b>MINNESOTA</b>	
Bachmann, M	B+ .....88%
Ellison, K	F .....4%
Kline, J	B+ .....89%
McCollum, B	F .....3%
Oberstar, J	F .....2%
Paulsen, E	B- .....76%
Peterson, C	D .....25%
Walz, T	F .....6%
<b>State Average</b>	<b>.....37%</b>
<b>MISSISSIPPI</b>	
Childers, T	C- .....36%
Harper, G	B+ .....85%
Taylor, G	C .....54%
Thompson, B	F .....1%
<b>State Average</b>	<b>.....44%</b>
<b>MISSOURI</b>	
Akin, T	A .....91%

\*Based on every roll call vote affecting fiscal policy; see back page for methodology.

# REPRESENTATIVES<sup>†</sup>

	GRADE	SCORE
Blunt, R	B+	85%
Carnahan, R	F	3%
Clay, W	F	3%
Cleaver, E	F	1%
Emerson, J	C+	68%
Graves, S	B+	89%
Luetkemeyer, B	B+	86%
Skelton, I	F	12%
<b>State Average</b>	<b>48%</b>	

## MONTANA

Rehberg, D	B-	77%
------------	----	-----

## NEBRASKA

Fortenberry, J	B-	73%
Smith, A	B+	89%
Terry, L	B-	77%
<b>State Average</b>	<b>80%</b>	

## NEVADA

Berkley, S	F	4%
Heller, D	B	80%
Titus, D	F	6%
<b>State Average</b>	<b>30%</b>	

## NEW HAMPSHIRE

Hodes, P	F	11%
Shea-Porter, C	F	5%
<b>State Average</b>	<b>8%</b>	

## NEW JERSEY

Adler, J	D	21%
Andrews, R	F	2%
Frelinghuysen, R	C+	67%
Garrett, S	A	93%
Holt, R	F	1%
Lance, L	C+	60%
LoBiondo, F	C-	48%
Pallone, F	F	1%
Paycrell, B	F	2%
Payne, D	F	3%
Rothman, S	F	2%
Sires, A	F	2%
Smith, C	C-	49%
<b>State Average</b>	<b>27%</b>	

## NEW MEXICO

Heinrich, M	F	7%
Lujan, B	F	4%
Teague, H	D	25%
<b>State Average</b>	<b>12%</b>	

## NEW YORK

Ackerman, G	F	3%
Arcuri, M	D	20%
Bishop, T	F	3%
Clarke, Y	F	1%
Crowley, J	F	2%
Engel, E	F	1%
Hall, J	F	3%
Higgins, B	F	2%
Hinchey, M	F	2%
Israel, S	F	2%
King, P	C+	61%
Lee, C	C+	69%
Lowey, N	F	2%
Maffei, D	F	7%
Maloney, C	F	2%
Massa, E	D	19%
McCarthy, C	F	4%
McMahon, M	D	16%
Meeks, G	F	2%
Murphy, S	D	21%

	GRADE	SCORE
Nadler, J	F	2%
Owens, B	N.A.	N.A.**
Rangel, C	F	2%
Serrano, J	F	4%
Slaughter, L	F	3%
Tonko, P	F	2%
Towns, E	F	3%
Velázquez, N	F	2%
Weiner, A	F	3%
<b>State Average</b>	<b>9%</b>	

## NORTH CAROLINA

Butterfield, G	F	2%
Coble, H	B+	85%
Etheridge, B	F	4%
Foxx, V	A	94%
Jones, W	B-	73%
Kissell, L	D	18%
McHenry, P	A	92%
McIntyre, M	D	28%
Miller, B	F	3%
Myrick, S	B+	89%
Price, D	F	2%
Shuler, H	D	25%
Watt, M	F	2%
<b>State Average</b>	<b>40%</b>	

## NORTH DAKOTA

Pomeroy, E	F	9%
------------	---	----

## OHIO

Austria, S	B-	77%
Boccieri, J	F	10%
Boehner, J	B+	89%
Driehaus, S	F	15%
Fudge, M	F	1%
Jordan, J	A	93%
Kaptur, M	F	10%
Kilroy, M	F	4%
Kucinich, D	D	21%
LaTourette, S	C	53%
Latta, B	A	90%
Ryan, T	F	3%
Schmidt, J	B+	86%
Space, Z	F	13%
Sutton, B	F	2%
Tiberi, P	B-	74%
Turner, M	C	55%
Wilson, C	F	7%
<b>State Average</b>	<b>39%</b>	

## OKLAHOMA

Boren, D	C-	30%
Cole, T	B	84%
Fallin, M	B+	86%
Lucas, F	B+	85%
Sullivan, J	B+	88%
<b>State Average</b>	<b>74%</b>	

## OREGON

Blumenauer, E	F	3%
DeFazio, P	F	11%
Schrader, K	F	10%
Walden, G	B-	70%
Wu, D	F	2%
<b>State Average</b>	<b>19%</b>	

## PENNSYLVANIA

Altmire, J	D	25%
Brady, R	F	1%
Carney, C	D	16%
Dahlkemper, K	F	12%
Dent, C	C+	64%
Doyle, M	F	1%
Fattah, C	F	1%

	GRADE	SCORE
Gerlach, J	C+	60%
Holden, T	F	15%
Kanjorski, P	F	6%
Murphy, P	F	8%
Murphy, T	C	55%
Murtha, J	DECEASED	N.A.
Pitts, J	B+	88%
Platts, T	C+	60%
Schwartz, A	F	3%
Sestak, J	F	5%
Shuster, B	B	81%
Thompson, G	B	80%
<b>State Average</b>	<b>32%</b>	

## RHODE ISLAND

Kennedy, P	F	2%
Langevin, J	F	3%
<b>State Average</b>	<b>2%</b>	

## SOUTH CAROLINA

Barrett, G	A	93%
Brown, H	B+	85%
Clyburn, J	F	1%
Inglis, B	B+	87%
Spratt, J	F	4%
Wilson, J	B+	89%
<b>State Average</b>	<b>59%</b>	

## SOUTH DAKOTA

Herseth Sandlin, S	D	22%
--------------------	---	-----

## TENNESSEE

Blackburn, M	A	91%
Cohen, S	F	2%
Cooper, J	F	15%
Davis, L	D	17%
Duncan, J	B+	88%
Gordon, B	F	10%
Roe, P	B	84%
Tanner, J	D	17%
Wamp, Z	B	83%
<b>State Average</b>	<b>45%</b>	

## TEXAS

Barton, J	B	84%
Brady, K	A	91%
Burgess, M	B+	88%
Carter, J	B+	88%
Conaway, M	A	93%
Cuellar, H	F	7%
Culberson, J	A	90%
Doggett, L	F	12%
Edwards, C	F	15%
Gohmert, L	A	91%
Gonzalez, C	F	3%
Granger, K	B+	85%
Green, A	F	2%
Green, G	F	3%
Hall, R	B	83%
Hensarling, J	A	95%
Hinojosa, R	F	2%
Jackson-Lee, S	F	2%
Johnson, E	F	1%
Johnson, S	A	92%
Marchant, K	A	91%
McCaul, M	B+	86%
Neugebauer, R	A	93%
Olson, P	B+	89%
Ortiz, S	F	8%
Paul, R	A	96%
Poe, T	B+	87%
Reyes, S	F	3%
Rodriguez, C	F	8%
Sessions, P	A	92%

	GRADE	SCORE
Smith, L	B	84%
Thornberry, M	A	92%
<b>State Average</b>	<b>58%</b>	

## UTAH

Bishop, R	A	90%
Chaffetz, J	A	93%
Matheson, J	C-	30%
<b>State Average</b>	<b>70%</b>	

## VERMONT

Welch, P	F	6%
----------	---	----

## VIRGINIA

Boucher, R	F	10%
Cantor, E	B+	89%
Connolly, G	F	6%
Forbes, R	B	82%
Goodlatte, B	A	90%
Moran, J	F	2%
Nye, G	C-	41%
Perriello, T	D	17%
Scott, B	F	4%
Wittman, R	B-	79%
Wolf, F	C+	67%
<b>State Average</b>	<b>45%</b>	

## WASHINGTON

Baird, B	F	15%
Dicks, N	F	3%
Hastings, D	B+	87%
Inslee, J	F	5%
Larsen, R	F	3%
McDermott, J	F	5%
McMorris Rodgers, C	B	84%
Reichert, D	C	50%
Smith, A	F	8%
<b>State Average</b>	<b>29%</b>	

## WEST VIRGINIA

Capito, S	C+	64%
Mollohan, A	F	8%
Rahall, N	F	7%
<b>State Average</b>	<b>26%</b>	

## WISCONSIN

Baldwin, T	F	4%
Kagen, S	F	7%
Kind, R	D	16%
Moore, G	F	2%
Obey, D	F	1%
Petri, T	B	80%
Ryan, P	A	90%
Sensenbrenner, J	A	95%
<b>State Average</b>	<b>37%</b>	

## WYOMING

Lummis, C	A	93%
-----------	---	-----

House Key		
SCORE	GRADE	COMMENTS
90% or more	A	Taxpayers' Friend
85%-89%	B+	
80%-84%	B	Good
70%-79%	B-	
60%-69%	C+	
50%-59%	C	Satisfactory
30%-49%	C-	
16%-29%	D	Poor
15% or less	F	Big Spender

\* Score based on less than 75%, but more than 50%, of weighted total of votes cast.

\*\* Voted on 50% or less of weighted total of votes cast; score and grade not issued.



Every year National Taxpayers Union (NTU) rates U.S. Representatives and Senators on their actual votes—*every* vote that significantly affects taxes, spending, debt, and regulatory burdens on consumers and taxpayers. Unlike most organizations that publish ratings, we refuse to play the “rating game” of focusing on only a handful of Congressional votes on selected issues. The NTU voting study is the fairest and most accurate guide available on Congressional fiscal policies. It is a completely unbiased accounting of votes.

NTU assigned weights to the votes, reflecting the importance of each vote’s effect.\*

NTU has no partisan axe to grind. All Members of Congress are treated the same regardless of political affiliation. Our only constituency is the overburdened American taxpayer. Grades are given impartially, based on the Taxpayer Score.

## TAXPAYER SCORE

The Taxpayer Score measures the strength of support for reducing spending and regulation and opposing higher taxes. In general, a higher score is better because it means a Member of Congress voted to lessen or limit the burden on taxpayers. The Taxpayer Score can range between 0 and 100. We do not expect anyone to score a 100, nor has any legislator ever achieved a 100 in the multi-year history of the comprehensive NTU scoring system. A high score does not mean that the Member of Congress was opposed to all spending or all programs. High-scoring Members have indicated that they would vote for many programs if the amount of spending were lower. A Member who wants to increase spending on some programs can achieve a high score if he or she votes for offsetting cuts in other programs. A zero score would indicate that the Member of Congress approved every spending proposal and opposed every pro-taxpayer reform.

NTU believes a score qualifying for a grade of “A” indicates the Member is one of the strongest supporters of responsible tax and spending policies. We are pleased to give these Members of Congress our

“**Taxpayers’ Friend Award**” (subject to attendance criteria).

A score qualifying for a grade of “**B**” represents a “good” voting record on controlling spending and taxes. A “**B**” grade indicates that the Member voted for taxpayers most of the time, but slightly less than those who attained the grade of “**A**.”

A score qualifying for a grade of “**C**” represents a minimally acceptable voting record on controlling taxes and spending. To qualify for a grade of “**C**” a Member must have a Taxpayer Score of at least 50 percent. While such a score may be “satisfactory,” there is clearly room for improvement.

We are also issuing pluses and minuses for the grades of “**B**” and “**C**” in order to better recognize the differences in the voting records of Members with these grades.

A score qualifying for a grade of “**D**” indicates the Member has a “poor” voting record on controlling taxes and spending.

A score significantly below average qualifies for a grade of “**F**.” This failing grade places the Member into the “**Big Spender**” category.

## VOTE SELECTION

We analyzed every roll call vote taken during 2009 (1st Session of the 111th Congress) and selected all votes that could significantly affect the amounts of federal taxes, spending, debt, or regulatory impact. A total of 333 House and 227 Senate roll call votes were selected. We included votes cast on appropriations bills, authorization bills, budget target resolutions, tax bills, amendments, and certain procedural votes that could affect the burden on taxpayers. Votes that simply shifted equal amounts of spending from one area to another were excluded. Also excluded were votes where there was a significant difference of opinion on how to vote to reduce or control government and unanimous votes.

We believe the number of votes used in the analysis, the objective and nonpartisan weighting of the votes, computerized calculations, and many error checks all combine to ensure the highest possible standards of accuracy.

## OTHER FACTORS

Although we believe this voting analysis is the most accurate guide available on Congressional fiscal performance, no study of roll call votes can fully evaluate a Member’s overall record. A Member’s committee work, leadership, and effectiveness with other Members also affect his or her influence on the amount of federal spending, taxes, debt, and regulatory impact. Because of the complexity of the calculations and the number of votes involved, we do not have space to reprint the votes of each Representative and Senator here. A list of the votes used in the study, including the weight assigned to each vote, is available on request.

### \* Computation

NTU’s federal budget experts assigned a weight to each vote ranging from 0 to 100. A low weight was assigned to votes that had relatively little effect, while a high weight was assigned to votes with the most significant effect on federal spending, taxes, debt, and regulation.

Weights were based solely on the relative effect of each vote on the total amount of federal spending, taxes, debt, or regulatory impact. Consideration was given to the long-term effect of a vote, even though relatively little might be immediately at issue. A vote with average importance should have a weight close to 10.

Scores were computed by dividing the weighted total of votes cast *against* higher spending, taxes, or regulation or *for* lower spending, taxes, or regulation, by the weighted total number of fiscal issues on which the Member of Congress voted. Average state scores were also computed, using the weighted total of votes cast by each delegation.

In computing these scores, we included only those votes on which the Member actually voted for or against a bill, resolution, or amendment. Paired votes, announced positions, and absences were excluded. Because some Members were absent frequently (or otherwise failed to vote yes or no), their scores and grades, based on relatively few votes, may not accurately reflect fiscal attitudes. The Members falling into this category are noted.

## TAXPAYER SCORES

SENATE		HOUSE
39%	Average	38%
11%	Median	16%
97%	High	99%
4%	Low	1%

### Party Scores

9%	Democratic Average	8%
6%	Democratic Median	4%
83%	Republican Average	81%
87%	Republican Median	85%