United States Senate †

	GRADE	SCORE
ALABAMA		
Sessions		
Shelby		
State Average		96%
ALASKA Begich Murkowski		
Begich	F	13%
Murkowski	B	89%
State Average		51%
ARIZONA Kyl		
Kyl	A	97%
McCain	A	99.5%
State Average		98%
ARKANSAS		
ARKANSAS Lincoln	D	39%
Pryor		
State Average		
CALIFORNIA		
CALIFORNIA Boxer	F	6%
Feinstein	F	7%
State Average		
COLORADO Bennet Udall, M	n	200/2
IIdall M	E	15%
State Average		17%
State Average		17 /0
CONNECTICUT Dodd	-	70/
Dodd	F	
Lieberman	ע	120/
State Average		
DELAWARE Carper		420/
Carper	t	12%
Coons		
State Average		12%
FLORIDA LeMieux		020/
Nelson, Bill		
State Average		55%
GEORGIA		
Chambliss	A	97%
Isakson		
State Average		97%
HAWAII		
Akaka		
Inouye		
State Average		7%
IDAIIO		
Crapo	A	99%
Risch	A	99%
State Average		99%
ILLINIOIC		
Durbin	F	6%
Kirk		
State Average		
INIDIANIA		
Bayh	C-	43%
Lugar	B+	91%
State Average		
, 		

	GRADE	SCORE
IOWA		
Grassley	B+	93%
Harkin		
State Average		
KANSAS BrownbackRoberts		
Brownback	A	99.5%
Roberts	A	97%
State Average		98%
KENTIICKY		
KENTUCKY Bunning	A	97%
McConnell	A	97%
State Average		97%
ΙΟΙΙΙΚΙΛΝΑ		
LOUISIANA Landrieu	F	11%
Vitter	Δ	95%
State Average		
MAINE Collins	C :	720/
Snowe	C+	7/10/
State Average		
MARYLAND Cardin Mikulski	-	
Cardin	t	5%
Ct-t- A	F	b%
State Average		5%
MASSACHUSET Brown, Scott	<u>TS</u>	
Brown, Scott	B	84%
Kerry	F	6%
State Average		44%
MICHIGAN Levin		
Levin	F	2%
Stabenow		
State Average		
MINNESOTA FrankenKlobuchar		
Franken	F	5%
Klobuchar	F	15%
State Average		10%
MISSISSIPPI		
Cochran	B+	90%
Wicker		
State Average		92%
MICCOLIDI		
Bond		
McCaskill	D	24%
State Average		55%
BACRITARIA		
Baucus		
Tester	F	16%
State Average		13%
MEDDACKA		
Johanns	A	95%
Nelson, Ben	C	52%
State Average		
_		
NEVADA Ensign	B+	94%
Reid		

State Average51%

	GRADE	SCORE
NEW HAMPSHIR	E	
NEW HAMPSHIR Gregg	B+	94%
Shaheen	F	12%
State Average		52%
NEW JEDGEV		
Lautenberg Menendez	F	3%
Manandaz	E	7%
State Average		50/
NEW MEXICO Bingaman	_	20/
Bingaman	F	3%
Udall, T		
State Average		4%
NEW YORK		
Gillibrand	F	3%
Schumer		
State Average		4%
NORTH CAROLIN	A	97%
Hagan	F	14%
State Average		
NORTH DAKOTA		
Conrad	F	7%
Conrad Dorgan	 E	/10/2
State Average		4 /0 60/ ₂
OHIO Brown, Sherrod	_	20/
Brown, Snerrod	F	3%
Voinovich		
State Average		
OKLAHOMA Coburn		
Inhofe		
State Average		96%
OREGON		
OREGON Merkley Wyden	F	4%
Wyden	F	5%
State Average		5%
PENNSYLVANIA Casey		
Casev	F	8%
Specter	F	7%
State Average		
RHODE ISLAND		
Reed	E	6%
Whitehouse		
State Average		
State Average	• •	
SOUTH CAROLIN	<u>IA</u>	0.00/
Graham		
State Average		9/%
SOUTH DAKOTA Johnson		
Johnson	F	7%
Inune	A	99%
State Average		
TENNESSEE		
TENNESSEE Alexander	B+	93%
Corkor	٨	00%

State Average96%

GRADE S	CORE
TEXAS	
CornynA	99%
HutchisonA	98%
State Average	98%
UTAH	
BennettA	
Hatch A	
State Average	97%
VERMONT LeahyF	_
LeahyF	2%
SandersF	3%
State Average	2%
VIRGINIA	
WarnerD	19%
Webb D	21%
State Average	
WASHINGTON CantwellF	
CantwellF	16%
MurrayF	6%
State Average	11%
WEST VIRGINIA	
Manchin	
RockefellerF	9%
State Average	
WISCONSIN FeingoldD	
FeingoldD	25%
Kohl F	
State Average	17%
WYOMING	
BarrassoA	98%
Enzi	97%
State Average	97%

SENATE KEY

SCORE G	RADE	COMMENTS
95% or mor	e A	Taxpayers' Friend
90%-94%	B+	
80%-89%	В	Good
76%-79%	B-	
62%-75%	C+	
50%-61%	C	Satisfactory
40%-49%	C-	
19%-39%	D	Poor
18% 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.

 $[\]dagger$ Based on every roll call vote affecting fiscal policy; see back page for methodology.

	GRADE	SCORE
ALABAMA		
ALABAMA Aderholt	B	85%
Bachus	B	85%
Bonner	B	85%
Bright	C+	70%
Davis, A	D	34%*
Griffith		
Rogers, Michael D	B	85%
State Average		77%
ALASKA		
ALASKA Young, D	C+	74%
ARIZONA Flake	A	97%
Franks		90%
Giffords		24%
Grijalva		7%
Kirkpatrick		26%
Mitchell		34%
Pastor	F	10%
Shadegg	A	90%
State Average		47%
ΔΡΚΔΝΣΔΣ		
ARKANSAS Berry	C	41%
Boozman	В	86%
Ross	D	39%
Snyder	F	10%
State Average		
CALIFORNIA		
Baca	F	5%
Becerra		6%
Berman	F	6%
Bilbray	B	78%
Bono Mack		
Calvert	B	86%
Campbell	A	93%
Capps	F	5%
Cardoza		10%
Chu		5%
Costa		16%
Davis, S		5%
Dreier		89%
Eshoo		6%
Farr		7%
Filner		9%
Gallegly Garamendi		5%
Harman		7%
Herger		94%
Honda		6%
Hunter		
Issa		90%
Lee, B		8%
Lewis, Jerry		
Lofgren		7%
Lungren		84%
Matsui		6%
McCarthy, K		86%
McClintock		94%
McKeon		85%
McNerney		11%
Miller, Gary		
Miller, George	F	6%
Napolitano	F	6%
Nunes		90%
Pelosi	N.A	N.A.**
Radanovich		88%*
Richardson		7%
Rohrabacher		91%
Roybal-Allard	F	2%

_	GRADE	
Royce		90%
Sánchez, Linda		5%
Sanchez, Loretta Schiff		4% 6%
Sherman		5%
Speier		5%
Stark		9%
Thompson, M		9%
Waters		6%
Watson		3%
Waxman		9%
Woolsey		6%
State Average		36%
COLORADO		
Coffman		90%
DeGette Lamborn		3% 91%
Markey, B		18%
Perlmutter		4%
Polis		14%
Salazar	F	15%
State Average		34%
CONNECTICUT		
Courtney	F	10%
DeLauro		5%
Himes		13%
Larson		5%
Murphy, C		8%
State Average		8%
DELAWARE Castle	C	59%
FLORIDA Bilirakis	R_	79%
Boyd		14%
Brown, C		5%
Brown-Waite		82%
Buchanan	B	84%
Castor		7%
Crenshaw		84%
Deutch		8%*
Diaz-Balart, L Diaz-Balart, M		
Grayson		8%
Hastings, A		6%
Klein		9%
Kosmas	F	13%
Mack		90%
Meek		7%
Mica		85%
Miller, J	B+	89%
Posey Putnam		81%
Rooney		
Ros-Lehtinen		
Stearns		
Wasserman Schultz		
Young, B	B	80%*
State Average		54%
GEORGIA		
Barrow		32%
Bishop, S		9%
Broun		94% 91%
Graves, T		
Johnson, H		8%
Kingston		
Lewis, John	F	7%
Linder	A	92%

GRADE RoyceA		Price, T	GRADE	SCORE	UNITED S
Sánchez, LindaF		Scott, D			
Sanchez, LorettaF		Westmoreland			(
SchiffF		State Average			Cassidy
ShermanF		l 			Fleming
Speier F		Djou	C+	69%*	Melancon
Stark F		Hirono			Scalise
Thompson, MF		State Average			State Average
Waters F					MAINE
WatsonF		IDAHO Minnick	C :	620/	Michaud
WaxmanF	9%	Simpson			Pingree
WoolseyF	6%	State Average			State Average
State Average	36%				MARYLAND
COLORADO		ILLINOIS Bean	-	170/	Bartlett
COLORADO CoffmanA	90%	Biggert	F	1/%	Cummings
DeGetteF					Edwards, D
LambornA		Costello Davis, D			Hoyer
Markey, B F		Foster			Kratovil
PerlmutterF		Gutierrez			Ruppersberger
PolisF		Halvorson			Sarbanes
Salazar F		Hare			Van Hollen
State Average		Jackson			State Average
		Jackson			MASSACHUSETTS
CONNECTICUT CourtneyF	10%	Kirk			Capuano
DeLauroF		Lipinski			Delahunt
HimesF		Manzullo			Frank
LarsonF		Quigley			Lynch
Murphy, C F		Roskam			Markey, E
State Average		Rush			McGovern
		Schakowsky			Neal
DELAWARE CastleC	E00/.	Schock			Olver
		Shimkus			Tierney
FLORIDA	700/	State Average			Tsongas
BilirakisB					State Average
BoydF		INDIANA Burton	Δ.	000/	MICHIGAN
Brown, C F		Buyer			Camp
Brown-Waite B		Carson			Conyers
Buchanan B F		Donnelly			Dingell
		Ellsworth			Ehlers
Crenshaw B F		Hill			Hoekstra
Diaz-Balart I B-		Pence			Kildee
2102 201019 211111111		Stutzman			Kilpatrick
Diaz-Balart, MB		Visclosky			Levin
Grayson F Hastings, A F		State Average			McCotter
KleinF		IOWA			Miller, C
KosmasF		Boswell	-	70/	Peters
Mack					Rogers, Michael J
MeekF		Braley			Schauer
MicaB		King, S			Stupak
Miller, JB+		Latham Loebsack			Upton
•					State Average
Posey BB		State Average			MINNESOTA
		KANSAS Jenkins			Bachmann
RooneyB+					Ellison
Ros-Lehtinen B B+		Moore, D			Kline
Wasserman SchultzF		Moran, Jerry			McCollum
		Tiahrt			Oberstar
Young, BB		State Average		68%	Paulsen
State Average		KENTUCKY			Peterson
GEORGIA	220/	Chandler			Walz
BarrowD		Davis, G			State Average
Bishop, SF		Guthrie			_
Broun A		Rogers, H			MISSISSIPPI
Gingrey		Whitfield			Childers
Graves, TB+		Yarmuth			Harper
Johnson, HF		State Average	······	61%	Taylor
KingstonB+		LOUISIANA			Thompson, B
Lewis, JohnF		Alexander			State Average
LinderA MarshallC–		Boustany	B+	89%	MISSOURI
		Cao			Akin

United States House

	CDADE	CCORE
Cassidy	GRADE	SCORE
Fleming		
Melancon		
Scalise		
State Average		
MAINE Michaud	F	12%
Pingree	F	
State Average		
MARYLAND		
Bartlett	B	86%
Cummings		5%
Edwards, D		7%
Hoyer		5%
Kratovil		41%
Ruppersberger	F	6%
Sarbanes		4%
Van Hollen		4%
State Average		20%
MASSACHUSET	ΓS	
Capuano	F	7%
Delahunt	F	6%*
Frank		4%
Lynch		12%
Markey, E		3%
McGovern		5%
Neal		6%
Olver		6%
Tierney		6%
Tsongas		6%
State Average		
MICHIGAN Camp	D .	000/
Conyers		88%
Dingell		4%
Ehlers		
Hoekstra		
Kildee		5%
Kilpatrick		5%
Levin		4%
McCotter		78%
Miller, C		84%
Peters	F	16%
Rogers, Michael J		85%
Schauer		9%
Stupak		7%
Upton		86%
State Average		42%
MINNESOTA		
Bachmann		87%
Ellison		6%
Kline		
McCollum		
Oberstar		7%
Paulsen		
Peterson Walz		
State Average		
-		4170
MISSISSIPPI Childers		400/
Uniders	C	48%
Harper Taylor	R+	88%
Thompson, B		
State Average		50%
MISSOURI Akin	D :	000/
AKIII	b+	89%

se of Representatives†

	CDADE	CCORE
Blunt	GRADE	
Carnahan		
Clay		
Cleaver		4%
Emerson		
Graves, S		
Luetkemeyer		
Skelton		
State Average		
State Average		
MONTANA Rehberg	R	85%
NEDDACKA		
NEBRASKA Fortenberry	D	900/
Smith, Adrian Terry	A	90%
State Average		
NEVADA Berkley		
Heller	B	84%
Titus		
State Average		34%
NEW HAMPSH	IRE	
Hodes	F	16%
Shea-Porter	F	6%
State Average		11%
NEW JERSEY		
NEW JERSEY Adler	C	40%
Andrews		5%
Frelinghuysen		85%
Garrett		91%
Holt		5%
Lance		84%
LoBiondo		
Pallone		7%
Pascrell		6%
Payne		7%
Rothman		4%
Sires		4%
Smith, C		
State Average		
_		
NEW MEXICO Heinrich	-	6%
Luján		4%
		33%
Teague		
State Average		1470
NEW YORK		20/
Ackerman		2%
Arcuri		31%
Bishop, T		6%
Clarke		6%
Crowley		7%
Engel		4%
Hall, J		7%
Higgins		4%
Hinchey		5%
Israel		6%
King, P		
Lee, C		
Lowey		6%
Maffei		13%
Maloney		8%
McCarthy, C		5%
McMahon		37%
Meeks		7%
Murphy, S		17%
Nadler	F	6%
MATIONIAL TANDAY	**	

GRADE SCORE Fattah F. P. C/R		GRADE	SCORE	GRADE	SCORE
Beed					
Serano					
Slaughter	Reed	N.A	N.A.**	HoldenD	35%
Tonko F 4% Towns F 5% Yelazquez F 5% Weiner F 6% State Average 14% Schwartz F 6% North Carolina State Average 14% Schwartz F 5% Morth Carolina State Average 14% Schwartz F 5% Morth Carolina State Average 37% Shuster B+ 88% Foxx B+ 88% F 5% Shuster B+ 88% Jones C+ 71% Kissell D 26% RHODE ISLAND Kenedy F 4% Kissell D 26% Mchenny F 4% State Average 590 RHODE ISLAND Kenedy F 4% State Average 590 Mchenny F 4% South Mcheny F 4% South Mcheny F 4% South Mcheny F 4% South Astevage	Serrano	F	5%		
Pitts	Slaughter	F	4%	Murphy, P F	8%
Pitts	Tonko	F	4%		
Velázquez	Towns	F	5%		
State Average					
Sestak	Weiner	F	6%		
NORTH CAROLINA Butterfield.				1	
State Number State Average					
State Average 37%	NUKIH CAR	COLINA	40/		
Etheridge					
Dones					
Dones				RHODE ISLAND	40/
Kissell D 2-5% McHenry B+ 89% McHenry B+ 89% Miller, B. F. 3% Myrick A 9.90% Price, D. F. 44% Shuler C- 44% Watt. F. 11% State Average 44% NORTH DAKOTA Pomeroy F. 10% DHIO Austria B+ 87% Boccieri F. 12% Boehner A 92% Driehaus F. 12% Jordan A 91% Kaptur F. 6% Kilroy F. 4% Kuclnich F. 13% Kaptur F. 6% Kuclnich F. 13% LaTourette C+ 71% Lata A 90% Kuclnich B+ 88% Space D 34% Space D 34% State Average 54% DKLAHOMA Boren C- 46% Cole. B 84% Fallin A 90%* State Average 79% Cole. B 8.86% State Average 79% Cole. B 8.89% Col					
McHenry					
McIntyre					
Miller, B. F. 39% Myrick. A. 90% Price, D. F. 49% Shuler C. C. 44% Watt. F. 119% State Average 44% NORTH DAKOTA Pomeroy F. 10% OHIO Austria B. B. 87% Bocher A. 92% Driehaus F. 12% Dordan A. 91% Kaptur F. 6% Kilroy F. 4% Kaptur F. 6% Kilroy F. 4% Lata A. 90% Ryan, T. F. 5% Schmidt B. B. 88% State Average 52% Chemit B. 88% State Average 579% Wilson, C. F. 79% State Average 79% Wilson, C. F. 79% Wilson, C.				SOUTH CAROLINA	
Miller, B. F. 33% Myrick				BarrettA	91%*
Myrick A 90% Price, D F 4% Shuler C- 44% Shuler C- 44% State Average 44% State Average Spratt F 6% Syratt A 96% Syratt A 86% Syratt A 96% Syratt A 96% Syratt B 86% Syratt Cohen. F 86% Syratt <th< td=""><td>Miller, B</td><td>F</td><td>3%</td><td></td><td></td></th<>	Miller, B	F	3%		
Price, D.					
Shuler					
Watt. F					
State Average					
NORTH DAKOTA					
Definition Def				_	
TENNESSE Blackburn A 93% Societic F 12% Blochner A 92% Cooper D 38% Cooper D	Pomerov	F	10%	Horoth Candlin	F20/
Backburn	OILLO		10 /0		
Boccieri F 12% Cooper D 8% Boehner A 92% Cooper D 38% Driehaus F 12% Davis, L D 38% Fudge F 5% Duncan A 91% Gordon F 8% Kaptur F 6% Kilroy F 4% Gordon F 8% Kucinich F 13% Wamp B 87% Kucinich F 13% Wamp B 88% Latta A 90% State Average 52% Schmidt B+ 38% Barton B+ 89% Schmidt B+ 38% Brady, K. A 91% Sutton F 6% Carter A 90% Tiberi B 85% Brady, K. A 91% State Average 44% Gonawy A 90% State Average 44% Gone B 86% Gone <th< td=""><td>ОНІО</td><td></td><td>070/</td><td>TENNESSEE</td><td></td></th<>	ОНІО		070/	TENNESSEE	
Doehner					
Driehaus F 12% Davis, L D 38% Fudge F 55% Duncan A 91% Jordan A 91% Gordon F 8% Kaptur F 6% Roe B+ 87% Kilroy F 4% Tanner D 34% Kucinich F 13% Wamp B- 82% Kucinich F 13% Wamp B- 82% Schmidt B+ 88% State Average 52% Schmidt B+ 88% Barton B+ 89% Sutton F 6% Carter A 90% Sutton F 6% Carter A 90% State Average 44% Burgess B 86% Carter A 90% Cuellar F 14% Cole B 84% Gonzalez F 7% <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>					
Fudge					
Gordon					
Kaptur F .6% Kilroy F .4% Kucinich F .4% Kucinich F .13% LaTourette C+ .71% Latta A .90% Ryan, T. F .5% Schmidt B+ .88% Space D .34% Sutton F .6% Tiberi B .85% Turner B- .79% Wilson, C. F .7% State Average .44% OKLAHOMA Boren .C- .46% Cole B .84% Gole B .84% Gole B .84% Gulivan B+ .89% State Average .7% Granger A .92% Granger A .92% Green, G F .6% State Average .79% Hensarling <th< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></th<>					
Kilroy F .4% Kucinich F .13% LaTourette C+ .71% Latta A .90% Ryan, T F .5% Schmidt B+ .88% Space D .34% Sutton F .6% Sutton F .6% Tiberi B .85% Turner B- .79% Wilson, C F .7% State Average .44% OKLAHOMA Boren C- .46% Cole B .84% Fallin A .90%* Cole B .84% Sullivan B+ .89% State Average .79% Correct, G F .7% Green, G F .6% State Average .79% Hensarling A .94% Hensarling A .94% Hensarling				GordonF	8%
Kucinich F 13% LaTourette C+ .71% Latta A .90% Ryan, T. F .5% Schmidt B+ .88% Space D .34% Sutton F .6% Sutton F .6% Tiberi B .85% Turner B- .79% Wilson, C F .7% State Average .44% OKLAHOMA Lucas B .84% Fallin A .90%* .90%* .90%* Lucas B .86% .9% .9% .9% .9% State Average .79% .90%* .9%				RoeB+	87%
LaTourette	Kilroy	F	4%	Tanner D	34%
LaTourette	Kucinich	F	13%	WampB	82%*
TEXAS Barton B + 89% Barton Barton Barton B + 89% Barton B + 89% Barton	LaTourette	C+	71%		
Ryan, I. F 5% Schmidt B+ .88% Space D .34% Sutton F .6% Tiberi B .85% Turner B- .79% Wilson, C. F .7% State Average .44% .4% OKLAHOMA Boren .C- .46% Cole B .84% Fallin A .90%* Fallin A .90%* Gullivan B+ .89% State Average .79% Hall, R. B+ .87% OREGON Blumenauer F .7% DeFazio F .12% Wulmenauer F .12% Wulmenauer F .12% Wulmenauer F .12% Schrader F .13% Wulmenauer F .13% Wulmenauer F .13%	Latta	A	90%		
Schmidt B+ 88% Space D 34% Sutton F .6% Tiberi B .85% Turner B- .79% Wilson, C F .7% State Average .44% Culberson A .90% OKLAHOMA Edwards, C .C- .40% Cole B .84%	Ryan, T	F	5%	Parton P.	900/2
Space D 34% Sutton F .6% Tiberi B .85% Turner B- .79% Wilson, C F .7% State Average .44% OKLAHOMA CC- .46% Boren C- .46% Cole B .84% Fallin A .90%* Lucas B .86% Sullivan B+ .89% State Average .79% Hall, R B+ .87% OREGON Hensarling A .94% Blumenauer F .7% Hinojosa F .8% Schrader F .13% Johnson, E F .5% Wu F .10% Marchant A .90% Vu F .10% Marchant A .92% Vu F .10% Marchant A .92% Stat	Schmidt	B+	88%		
Sutton F 6% Tiberi B 85% Turner B- .79% Wilson, C F .7% State Average .44% Cullerson A .90% OKLAHOMA Edwards, C C- .40% Boren C- .46% Gohmert B+ .89% Cole B .84% Gonzalez F .7% Fallin A .90%* Granger A .92% Lucas B .86% Green, A .F .6% Sullivan B+ .89% Green, G .F .6% State Average .79% Hall, R B+ .87% DeFazio F .12% Jackson Lee F .6% Schrader F .13% Johnson, E F .5% Wu F .10% Marchant A .92% Wu F .10% Marchant <					
Tiberi B 85% Turner B- .79% Wilson, C. F .7% State Average .44% Cullerson A .90% OKLAHOMA Edwards, C. C- .40% Boren .C- .46% Gohmert .B+ .89% Cole .B .84% Gonzalez .F .7% Fallin .A .90%* Granger .A .92% Lucas .B .86% Green, A .F .6% Sullivan .B+ .89% Green, G .F .6% State Average .79% Hall, R .B+ .87% DeFazio .F .7% Hensarling .A .94% Walden .B+ .88% Johnson, E .F .5% Wu .F .13% Johnson, E .F .5% Wu .B .85% Neugebauer .A .92% <td< td=""><td>Sutton</td><td>F</td><td>6%</td><td></td><td></td></td<>	Sutton	F	6%		
Turner. B- 79% Cuellar F 14% Wilson, C. F 7% Culberson A 90% State Average 44% Doggett F 12% OKLAHOMA Edwards, C. C- 40% Boren C- 46% Gohmert. B+ 89% Cole B 84% Gonzalez F 7% Fallin A 90%* Granger A 92% Lucas B 86% Green, A F 6% Sullivan B+ 89% Green, A F 6% State Average 79% Hall, R B+ 87% DeFazio F 12% Jackson Lee F 6% Schrader F 13% Johnson, E F 5% Wu F 10% Marchant A 90% State Average 27% McCaul B 85% PENNS	Tiberi	В	85%		
Wilson, C. F 7% Culberson. A 90% State Average 44% Doggett F 12% Boren C- 46% Gohmert. B+ 89% Cole B 84% Gonzalez F 7% Fallin A 90%* Granger A 92% Lucas B 86% Green, A F 6% Sullivan B+ 89% Green, A F 6% State Average 79% Hall, R B+ 87% DeFazio F 12% Jackson Lee F 6% Schrader F 13% Johnson, E F 5% Wu F 10% Marchant A 90% State Average 27% McCaul B 85% PENNSYLVANIA Neugebauer A 92% Altmire D 33% Ortiz F 8% </td <td>Turner</td> <td>B</td> <td>79%</td> <td></td> <td></td>	Turner	B	79%		
State Average 44% OKLAHOMA Boren C- 46% Edwards, C. C- 40% Cole B 84% Gonzalez F 7% Fallin A 90%* Granger A 92% Lucas B 86% Green, A F 6% Sullivan B+ 89% Green, A F 6% State Average 79% Hall, R B+ 87% OREGON Hensarling A 94% Walden B+ 88% Johnson, E F 5% Wu F					
OKLAHOMA Boren C- .46% Cole B .84% Fallin A .90%* Fallin A .90%* Lucas B .86% Sullivan B+ .89% State Average .79% Green, A F .6% State Average .79% Hall, R B+ .87% DeFazio F .7% Hinojosa F .8% DeFazio F .12% Jackson Lee F .6% Schrader F .13% Johnson, E F .5% Wu F .10% Marchant A .92% Wu F .10% Marchant A .92% PENNSYLVANIA Neugebauer A .92% Altmire D .33% Neugebauer A .92% Critz F .5% Ortiz F .8% Critz				1	
Boren C- .46% Gohmert B+ .89% Cole B .84% Gonzalez F .7% Fallin A .90%* Granger A .92% Lucas B .86% Green, A F .6% Sullivan B+ .89% Green, A F .6% Sullivan B+ .89% Green, G F .6% State Average .79% Hall, R B+ .87% DeFazio F .7% Hensarling A .94% Schrader F .12% Jackson Lee F .6% Schrader F .13% Johnson, E F .5% Wu F .10% Marchant A .92% Wu F .10% Marchant A .92% PENNSYLVANIA Neugebauer A .92% Neugebauer A .92% Ortiz	01/1 4110844				
Cole B .84% Gonzalez F .7% Fallin A .90%* Granger A .92% Lucas B .86% Green, A F .6% Sullivan B+ .89% Green, A F .6% Sullivan B+ .89% Green, G F .6% State Average .79% Hall, R B+ .87% Hall, R B+ .87% .8% .94% Hensarling A .94% <td>Poron</td> <td><u> </u></td> <td>160/</td> <td></td> <td></td>	Poron	<u> </u>	160/		
Fallin A 90%* Granger A 92% Lucas B 86% Green, A F 6% Sullivan B+ 89% Green, G F 6% State Average 79% Hall, R B+ 87% DeFacon F 7% Hensarling A 94% Blumenauer F 7% Hinojosa F 8% DeFazio F 12% Jackson Lee F 6% Schrader F 13% Johnson, E F 5% Wu F 10% Marchant A 92% Wu F 10% Marchant A 90% State Average 27% McCaul B 85% PENNSYLVANIA Neugebauer A 92% Altmire D 33% Ortiz F 8% Carney F 14% Poe B+ 89%				1	
Lucas B 86% Sullivan B+ 89% State Average 79% OREGON Hall, R. B+ 87% Blumenauer F .7% Hensarling A .94% DeFazio F .12% Jackson Lee F .6% Schrader F .13% Johnson, E F .5% Walden B+ .88% Johnson, S A .92% Wu F .10% Marchant A .90% State Average .27% McCaul B .85% PENNSYLVANIA Neugebauer A .92% Altmire D .33% Ortiz F .8% Carney F .14% Poe B+ .89% Critz F .15%* Poe B+ .89% Dent C+ .68% Rodriguez F .5%					
Sullivan B+ 89% Green, G. F 6% State Average 79% Hall, R. B+ 87% DREGON Hensarling. A 94% Blumenauer F .7% Hinojosa F 8% DeFazio F .12% Jackson Lee F .6% Schrader F .13% Johnson, E. F .5% Wul F .10% Marchant A .92% Wu F .10% Marchant A .90% State Average .27% McCaul B .85% PENNSYLVANIA Neugebauer A .92% Altmire D .33% Ortiz F .8% Carney F .14% Paul A .95% Critz F .15%* Poe .8+ .89% Dahlkemper F .13% Reyes F .5% Dent					
State Average 79% Hall, R. B+ 87% DeFazio F .7% Hinojosa F .8% DeFazio F .12% Jackson Lee F .6% Schrader F .13% Johnson, E. F .5% Walden B+ .88% Johnson, S. A .92% Wu F .10% Marchant A .90% State Average .27% McCaul B .85% PENNSYLVANIA Neugebauer A .92% Altmire D .33% Ortiz F .8% Carney F .14% Paul A .95% Critz F .15%* Poe B+ .89% Dahlkemper F .13% Reyes F .5% Dent C+ .68% Rodriguez F .8%				1	
OREGON Blumenauer F 7% Hinojosa F 8% DeFazio F 12% Jackson Lee F 6% Schrader F 13% Johnson, E F 5% Walden B+ 88% Johnson, S A 92% Wu F 10% Marchant A 90% State Average 27% McCaul B 85% PENNSYLVANIA Neugebauer A 92% Altmire D 33% Ortiz F 8% Carney F 14% Paul A 95% Critz F 15%* Poe B+ 89% Dahlkemper F 13% Reyes F 5% Dent C+ 68% Rodriguez F 8%				1	
Blumenauer F .7% Hinojosa F .8% DeFazio F .12% Jackson Lee F .6% Schrader F .13% Johnson, E. F .5% Walden B+ .88% Johnson, S. A .92% Wu F .10% Marchant A .90% State Average .27% McCaul B .85% PENNSYLVANIA Neugebauer A .92% Olson A .91% Ortiz F .8% Carney F .14% Paul A .95% Critz F .15%* Poe B+ .89% Dahlkemper F .13% Reyes F .5% Dent C+ .68% Rodriguez F .8%			79%	1	
DeFazio F 12% Jackson Lee F 6% Schrader F 13% Johnson, E. F 5% Walden B+ 88% Johnson, S. A 92% Wu F 10% Marchant A 90% State Average 27% McCaul B 85% PENNSYLVANIA Neugebauer A 92% Altmire D 33% Olson A 91% Carney F 14% Paul A 95% Critz F 15%* Poe B+ 89% Dahlkemper F 13% Reyes F 5% Dent C+ 68% Rodriguez F 8%	OREGON				
Schrader F 13% Johnson, E. F 5% Walden B+ 88% Johnson, S. A 92% Wu F 10% Marchant A 90% State Average 27% McCaul B 85% PENNSYLVANIA Neugebauer A 92% Altmire D 33% Olson A 91% Grady, R F 5% Ortiz F 8% Carney F 14% Paul A 95% Critz F 15%* Poe B+ 89% Dahlkemper F 13% Reyes F 5% Dent C+ 68% Rodriguez F 8%					
Walden B+ 88% Johnson, S. A 92% Wu F 10% Marchant A 90% State Average 27% McCaul B 85% PENNSYLVANIA Neugebauer A 92% Altmire D 33% Olson A 91% Brady, R. F 5% Ortiz F 8% Carney F 14% Paul A 95% Critz F 15%* Poe B+ 89% Dahlkemper F 13% Reyes F 5% Dent C+ 68% Rodriguez F 8%					
Wu F 10% Marchant A 90% State Average 27% McCaul B 85% PENNSYLVANIA Altmire D 33% Neugebauer A 92% Olson A 91% Carney F 14% Paul A 95% Critz F 15%* Poe B+ 89% Dahlkemper F 13% Reyes F 5% Dent C+ 68% Rodriguez F 8%				Johnson, E F	5%
PENNSYLVANIA Neugebauer A 92% Altmire D 33% Olson A 91% Brady, R. F .5% Ortiz F .8% Carney F .14% Paul A .95% Critz F .15%* Poe B+ .89% Dahlkemper F .13% Reyes F .5% Dent C+ .68% Rodriguez F .8%					
PENNSYLVANIA Neugebauer A 92% Altmire D 33% Olson A 91% Brady, R. F 5% Ortiz F 8% Carney F 14% Paul A 95% Critz F 15%* Poe B+ 89% Dahlkemper F 13% Reyes F 5% Dent C+ 68% Rodriguez F 8%					
PENNSYLVANIA Neugebauer A 92% Altmire D 33% Olson A 91% Brady, R. F 5% Ortiz F 8% Carney F 14% Paul A 95% Critz F 15%* Poe B+ 89% Dahlkemper F 13% Reyes F 5% Dent C+ 68% Rodriguez F 8%	State Average		27%		
Altmire D 33% Olson A 91% Brady, R. F 5% Ortiz F 8% Carney F 14% Paul A 95% Critz F 15%* Poe B+ 89% Dahlkemper F 13% Reyes F 5% Dent C+ 68% Rodriguez F 8%				NeugebauerA	92%
Brady, R. F .5% Ortiz F .8% Carney F .14% Paul A .95% Critz F .15%* Poe B+ .89% Dahlkemper F .13% Reyes F .5% Dent C+ .68% Rodriguez F .8%	Altmire	D	33%		
Carney F 14% Paul A 95% Critz F 15%* Poe B+ 89% Dahlkemper F 13% Reyes F 5% Dent C+ 68% Rodriguez F 8%				Ortiz F	8%
Critz F 15%* Poe B+ 89% Dahlkemper F 13% Reyes F 5% Dent C+ 68% Rodriguez F 8%				1	
Dahlkemper F 13% Reyes F 5% Dent C+ 68% Rodriguez F 8%				1	
Dent				1	
70	Dent				
19/2 19/2 1 1 19/2 1 1 19/2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1					

	GRADE	SCORE
Fattah Gerlach	F	7%
Holden		
Kanjorski Murphy, P	F	3%
Murphy, T	F	8%
Pitts		
Platts		
Schwartz		
Sestak		
Shuster		
Thompson, G	B	86%
State Average		37%
RHODE ISLAND Kennedy)	
Kennedy	<u>F</u>	4%
Langevin		
State Average SOUTH CAROLI Barrett		6%
SOUTH CAROLI	NA	010/ *
Brown, H	A	86%
Clyburn		2%
Inglis		90%
Spratt		6%
Wilson, J		86%
State Average		57%
SOUTH DAKOTA Herseth Sandlin	C	52%
TENNESSEE Blackburn	A	93%
Cohen		8%
Cooper	D	38%
Davis, L	D	38%
Duncan	A	91%
Gordon		8%
Roe		
Tanner Wamp	D	34%
State Average		
		52%
TEXAS Barton	D .	900/
Brady, K		
Burgess	A R	86%
Carter		90%
Conaway		90%
Cuellar		14%
Culberson		90%
Doggett	F	12%
Edwards, C	C	40%
Gohmert		
Gonzalez		7%
Granger		92%
Green, A		6%
Green, G		6%
Hall, R		
Hensarling		94%
Hinojosa Jackson Lee		8% 6%
Johnson, E		5%
Johnson, S		92%
Marchant		90%
McCaul		85%
Neugebauer		92%
Olson	A	91%
Ortiz		8%
Paul		95%
Poe		
Reyes		5%
Rodriguez	t	8%

Smith, L	GRADE	SCORE
Smith, L	B+	89%
Thornberry		
State Average		60%
UTAH		
Bishop, R	B+	88%
Chaffetz		
Matheson		
State Average		
VERMONT		
VERMONT Welch	-	70/
VIRGINIA Boucher		
Cantor		90%
Connolly		12%
Forbes	B	83%
Goodlatte	B+	89%
Moran, James	F	8%
Nye		51%
Perriello		17%
Scott, R		6%
Wittman	B-	80%
Wolf		
State Average		
WASHINGTON Baird		400/
Baird	<u>F</u>	
Dicks		6%
Hastings, D		91%
Inslee		8%
Larsen		6%
McDermott		8%
McMorris Rodgers		
Reichert	C+	74%
Smith, Adam	F	8%
State Average		33%
WEST VIRGINIA		
WEST VIRGINIA	B-	76%
Mollohan	F	7%
Mollohan Rahall	F	9%
State Average		
WISCONSIN		
WISCONSIN Baldwin	<u>F</u>	6%
Kagen	F	9%
Kind		7%
Moore, G		8%
Obey		5%
Petri		86%
Ryan, P		92%
Sensenbrenner	A	92%
State Average		38%
Lummis	Α	91%
Hous	E KEY	

HOUSE KEY

SCORE G	RADE	COMMENTS
90% or more	e A	Taxpayers' Friend
87%-89%	B+	
84%-86%	В	Good
75%-83%	B-	
62%-74%	C+	
50%-61%	C	Satisfactory
40%-49%	C-	•
21%-39%	D	Poor
20% 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.

 $\ensuremath{\dagger}$ Based on every roll call vote affecting fiscal policy; see back page for methodology.



Methodology

very 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 ax 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 minimum 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 in 2010 (2nd 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 165 House and 142 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 votes used in the study, including the weight assigned to each, is available on our website at www.ntu.org.

* 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		
45%	Average	42%		
19%	Median	18%		
99.5%	High	97%		
2%	Low	2%		
Party Scores				
11%	Democratic Average	12%		
7%	Democratic Median	7%		
94%	Republican Average	86%		
96%	Republican Median	88%		