



HEROES & ZEROS



2011

Who's Representing Your Values in the Minnesota State Legislature?

2011

HEROES

House

- Bruce Anderson (19A) ... 100%
- Kurt Bills (37B) 100%
- Kurt Daudt (17A) 100%
- Bob Dettmer (52A) 100%
- Keith Downey (41A) 100%
- Steve Draskowski (28B) 100%
- Glenn Gruenhagen (25A) 100%
- Tom Hackbarth (48A) 100%
- Ernie Leidiger (34A) 100%
- Kathy Lohmer (56A) 100%
- Joyce Peppin (32A) 100%
- Duane Quam (29A) 100%
- Doug Wardlow (38B) 100%

Senate

- Michelle Benson (49) 100%
- Ted Daley (38) 100%
- Al Dekruif (25) 100%
- Paul Gazelka (12) 100%
- David Hann (42) 100%
- Gretchen Hoffman (10) .. 100%
- Ted Lillie (56) 100%
- Sean Nienow (17) 100%
- Dave Thompson (36) 100%
- Ray Vandever (52) 100%

Career Heroes (lifetime)

- Bruce Anderson (19A) ... 100%
- Steve Draskowski (28B) 100%

Minnesota Majority's 2011 State Legislative Scorecard

Minnesota Majority tracked 10 House votes and 9 Senate votes in the 2011 legislative session, spanning a wide range of issues including taxes, government spending, elections, life, property rights and energy policy. This scorecard thus paints a complete picture of where legislators stand on social, fiscal and liberty issues. Their votes represent the front line in defense of Minnesota's core values.

We have scored each state legislator on how well they supported the traditional values position on the issues. In the 2011 session, 23 legislators earned a perfect 100% score and were our top "Heroes."

On the opposite side we have the "Zeros" – legislators who more often than not voted against the interests of everyday Minnesotans. Instead, these legislators supported policies that would raise your taxes, expand government and reduce your freedoms. A total of 43 legislators were perfect "Zeros."

Career Heroes and Zeros

2 state representatives have a lifetime score of 100%. That means that for as long as they have held their current office, they have reliably supported Minnesota Majority's traditional values positions.

Sadly, 33 lawmakers have made careers of consistently working against Minnesota's traditional values and have lifetime scores of 5% or less.

See How Your Senator and Representative Voted

We tracked the voting record of all 201 state legislators. Use the scorecard to see how yours performed this session.

You Can Make a Difference

Contact your legislators and tell them how you feel about their score. Help spread the word by distributing copies of this scorecard to your friends and neighbors. Register to receive our email updates by visiting our website at

MinnesotaMajority.org.



Standing Together for Traditional Values

1730 New Brighton Blvd, PMB 233
Minneapolis, MN 55413

www.MinnesotaMajority.org

ZEROS

House

- John Benson (43B) 0%
- Kathy Brynaert (23B) 0%
- Lyndon Carlson (45B) 0%
- BobbyJoe Champion (58B) 0%
- Andrew Falk (20A) 0%
- Kerry Gauthier (07B) 0%
- Marion Greene (60A) 0%
- Mindy Greiling (54A) 0%
- Rick Hansen (39A) 0%
- Alice Knuth (66B) 0%
- Jeff Hayden (61B) 0%
- Debra Hilstrom (46B) 0%
- Bill Hilty (08A) 0%
- Frank Homstein (60B) 0%
- Melissa Hortman (47B) 0%
- Thomas Huntley (07A) 0%
- Phyllis Kahn (59B) 0%
- Kate Knuth (50B) 0%
- Carolyn Laine (50A) 0%
- Diane Loeffler (59A) 0%
- Tim Mahoney (67A) 0%
- Carlos Mariani (65B) 0%
- Joe Mullery (58A) 0%
- Erin Murphy (64A) 0%
- Michael Paymar (64B) 0%
- Bev Scalze (54B) 0%
- Linda Slocum (64B) 0%
- Paul Thissen (63A) 0%
- Tom Tillberry (51B) 0%
- Jean Wagenius (62B) 0%

Senate

- Linda Berglin (61) 0%
- Scott Dibble (60) 0%
- Barb Goodwin (50) 0%
- Linda Higgins (58) 0%
- Ken Kelash (63) 0%
- Ron Latz (44) 0%
- John Marty (54) 0%
- Mary Jo McGuire (66) 0%
- Larry Pogemiller (59) 0%
- Steve Murphy (28) 0%
- Ann Rest (45) 0%
- Patricia Torres Ray (62) 0%
- Charles Wiger (55) 0%

Minnesota Majority 2011 Legislative Scorecard for the MN House of Representatives

Representative	District	Term	Party	Energy		Gov. & Politics		Life		Marriage & Family		Rights & Liberties		Taxes & Spending		2011 Score	Career Score
				01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10				
Abeler, Jim	48B	7th	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	90%	77%	
Anderson, Bruce	19A	9th	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100%	100%	
Anderson, Diane	38A	1st	R	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	-	+	89%	na	
Anderson, Paul	13A	2nd	R	+	+			+	+		+	-	+	+	86%	89%	
Anderson, Sarah	43A	3rd	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	90%	90%	
Anzelc, Tom	03A	3rd	D	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	20%	16%	
Atkins, Joe	39B	5th	D	-	-	-	+	-		-	-	-	-	-	11%	10%	
Banaian, King	15B	1st	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	90%	na	
Barrett, Bob	17B	1st	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	90%	na	
Beard, Michael	35A	5th	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	90%	95%	
Benson, John	43B	3rd	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	9%	
Benson, Mike	30B	1st	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	90%	na	
Bills Kurt	37B	1st	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100%	na	
Brynaert, Kathy	23B	3rd	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	3%	
Buesgens, Mark	35B	7th	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	89%	96%	
Carlson, Lyndon	45B	20th	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	2%	
Champion, Bobby Joe	58B	2nd	D			-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	4%	
Clark, Karen	61A	16th	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	10%	6%	
Cornish, Tony	24B	5th	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	90%	86%	
Crawford, Roger	08B	1st	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	90%	na	
Daudt, Kurt	17A	1st	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100%	na	
Davids, Greg	31B	2nd	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	90%	91%	
Davnie, Jim	62A	6th	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	10%	7%	
Dean, Matt	52B	4th	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	90%	94%	
Dettmer, Bob	52A	3rd	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100%	97%	
Dill, David	06A	5th	D	-	-	+	+		+	+		-	-	-	50%	30%	
Dittrich, Denise	47A	4th	D	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	-	60%	47%	
Doepke, Connie	33B	2nd	R	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	90%	91%	
Downey, Keith	41A	2nd	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100%	93%	
Drazkowski, Steve	28B	3rd	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100%	100%	
Eken, Kent	02A	5th	D	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	60%	34%	
Erickson, Sondra	16A	7th	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	80%	na	
Fabian, Dan	01A	1st	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	90%	na	
Falk, Andrew	20A	2nd	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	5%	
Franson, Mary	11B	1st	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	90%	na	
Fritz, Patti	26B	4th	D	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20%	20%	
Garofalo, Pat	36B	4th	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	90%	91%	
Gauthier, Kerry	07B	1st	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	na	
Gottwalt, Steve	15A	3rd	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	90%	92%	
Greene, Marion	60A	1st	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	na	
Greiling, Mindy	54A	10th	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	4%	
Gruenhagen, Glenn	25A	1st	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100%	na	
Gunther, Bob	24A	9th	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	90%	87%	
Hackbarth, Tom	48A	8th	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100%	99%	
Hamilton, Rod	22B	4th	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	90%	84%	
Hancock, David	02B	1st	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	90%	na	
Hansen, Rick	39A	4th	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	7%	
Hausman, Alice	66B	12th	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	1%	
Hayden, Jeff	61B	2nd	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	4%	
Hilstrom, Debra	46B	6th	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	5%	
Hilty, Bill	08A	8th	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	3%	
Holberg, Mary	36A	7th	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		-	+	+	89%	96%	
Hoppe, Joe	34B	5th	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	90%	93%	
Hornstein, Frank	60B	5th	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	1%	
Hortman, Melissa	47B	4th	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	4%	
Hosch, Larry	14B	4th	D	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	50%	35%	
Howes, Larry	04B	7th	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	90%	85%	
Huntley, Thomas	07A	10th	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	5%	
Johnson, Sheldon	67B	6th	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	10%	5%	
Kahn, Phyllis	59B	20th	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	2%	
Kath, Kory	26A	2nd	D		-	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	56%	58%	
Kelly, Tim	28A	2nd	R	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	80%	85%	

Minnesota Majority 2011 Legislative Scorecard for the MN House of Representatives

Representative	District	Term	Party	Energy		Gov. & Politics		Life		Marriage & Family	Rights & Liberties		Taxes & Spending		2011 Score	Career Score
				01	02	03	04	05	06		07	08	09	10		
Kieffer, Andrea	56B	1st	R		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	89%	na
Kiel, Debra	01B	1st	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	90%	na
Kiffmeyer, Mary	16B	2nd	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	90%	91%
Knuth, Kate	50B	3rd	D	-	-			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	5%
Koenen, Lyle	20B	5th	D	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-		78%	43%
Kriesel, John	57A	1st	R	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	80%	na
Laine, Carolyn	50A	3rd	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		0%	2%
Lanning, Morrie	09A	5th	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	90%	84%
Leidiger, Ernie	34A	1st	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100%	na
LeMieur, Mike	12B	1st	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	90%	na
Lenczewski, Ann	40B	7th	D	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	40%	29%
Lesch, John	66A	5th	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-		-	11%	14%
Liebling, Tina	30A	4th	D	-	-	-	-	-		+	-	-		-	13%	9%
Lillie, Leon	55A	4th	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	20%	10%
Loeffler, Diane	59A	4th	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	3%
Lohmer, Kathy	56A	1st	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100%	na
Loon, Jennifer	42B	2nd	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	90%	88%
Mack, Tara	37A	2nd	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	90%	89%
Mahoney, Tim	67A	7th	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	0%	3%
Mariani, Carlos	65B	11th	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	2%
Marquart, Paul	09B	6th	D	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	60%	32%
Mazorol, Pat	41B	1st	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	90%	na
McDonald, Joe	19B	1st	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	90%	na
McElfatrick	03B	1st	R	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	-	+	-	89%	na
McFarlane, Carol	53B	3rd	R		+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	-	78%	79%
McNamara, Denny	57B	5th	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	90%	86%
Melin, Carly	05B	1st	D	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	20%	na
Moran, Rena	65A	1st	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	10%	na
Morrow, Terry	23A	3rd	D	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	20%	12%
Mullery, Joe	58A	8th	D		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	4%
Murdock, Mark	10B	2nd	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	90%	90%
Murphy, Erin	64A	3rd	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	3%
Murphy, Mary	06B	18th	D	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20%	17%
Murray, Rich	27A	1st	R	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	80%	na
Myhra, Pam	40A	1st	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	80%	na
Nelson, Mike	46A	5th	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	10%	8%
Nornes, Bud	10A	8th	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	90%	90%
Norton, Kim	29B	3rd	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	10%	14%
O'Driscoll, Tim	14A	1st	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	90%	na
Paymar, Michael	64B	8th	D	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	5%
Pelowski, Gene	31A	13th	D	+	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30%	31%
Peppin, Joyce	32A	4th	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100%	96%
Persell, John	04A	2nd	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	10%	10%
Petersen, Branden	49B	1st	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	90%	na
Peterson, Sandra	45A	4th	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	10%	12%
Poppe, Jeanne	27B	4th	D	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	20%	19%
Quam, Duane	29A	1st	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100%	na
Rukavina, Tom	05A	13th	D	+	-	-	-	-		+	-	-		-	25%	15%
Runbeck, Linda	53A	1st	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	90%	na
Sanders, Tim	51A	2nd	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	90%	93%
Scalze, Bev	54B	4th	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	22%
Schomacker, Joe	22A	1st	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	90%	na
Scott, Peggy	49A	2nd	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	90%	93%
Shimanski, Ron	18A	3rd	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	90%	96%
Simon, Steve	44A	4th	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	10%	9%
Slawik, Nora	55B	6th	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	10%	10%
Slocum, Linda	63B	3rd	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	2%
Smith, Steve	33A	11th	R	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	70%	84%
Stensrud, Kirk	42A	1st	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	90%	na
Swedzinski, Chris	21A	1st	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	90%	na
Thissen, Paul	63A	5th	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	5%
Tillberry, Tom	51B	3rd	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	0%	2%

Minnesota Majority 2011 Legislative Scorecard for the MN House of Representatives

Representative	District	Term	Party	Energy		Life		Marriage & Family	Rights & Liberties				Taxes & Spending		2011 Score	Career Score
				01	02	03	04		05	06	07	08	09	10		
Torkelson, Paul	21B	2nd	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	90%	90%
Urdahl, Dean	18B	5th	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	90%	87%
Vogel, Bruce	13B	1st	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	90%	na
Wagenius, Jean	62B	13th	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	2%
Ward, John	12A	3rd	D	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	50%	30%
Wardlow, Doug	38B	1st	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100%	na
Westrom, Torrey	11A	8th	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	90%	92%
Winkler, Ryan	44B	3rd	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	10%	9%
Woodard, Kelby	25B	1st	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	90%	na
Zellers, Kurt	32B	5th	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	90%	95%

LEGEND Voted with the Minnesota Majority position (+) Voted against the Minnesota Majority position (-) Did not vote on this legislation (|) Not in office when vote was taken (na)

ENERGY

01. Reduce Energy Prices by Eliminating Carbon Offset Requirements – SF86 would have rolled back certain carbon offset requirements imposed on power plants that were meant to combat “global warming,” thereby reducing energy costs. Vetoed by the governor. Our position: For. + indicates a “Yes” vote. House Journal page 4971

GOVERNMENT & POLITICS

02. 21st Century Voting Act – SF509 would have required voters to present photo ID when voting, improved recordkeeping and transparency, modernized and streamlined Minnesota’s election system and would have ensured that all voters’ eligibility was verified by equal standards before they vote. Vetoed by the governor. Our position: For. + indicates a “Yes” vote. House Journal page 3561

LIFE

03. Prohibit State-Funding of Abortions – HF201 would ensure that tax dollars collected by the state of Minnesota would not be used to pay for abortions. Vetoed by governor Dayton. Our position: For. + indicates a “Yes” vote. House Journal page 4712

04. Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act – HF936 – Abortions after 20 weeks (at which point, medical science has determined unborn children are capable of experiencing and reacting to pain) would have been prohibited under this bill. Vetoed by the governor. Our position: For. + indicates a “Yes” vote. House Journal page 4720

MARRIAGE & FAMILY

05. Marriage Protection Amendment – SF1308 puts a ballot question to the voters on whether to amend the constitution to preserve the definition of marriage as the union of one man and one woman. The question will be on the general election ballot in 2012. Our position: For. + indicates a “Yes” vote to put the question on the ballot, but does not necessarily indicate support for passage. House Journal page 4916

RIGHTS & LIBERTIES

06. Castle Doctrine Bill – HF1467 would restore the constitutional principle of presumption of innocence regarding an individual who used deadly force in self-defense, requiring prosecutors to prove any guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. In addition, it repeals the “duty to retreat” from an assailant. This bill was passed in the House, but has yet to come to a final vote in the Senate. It may be taken up in 2012. Our position: For. + indicates a “Yes” vote. House Journal page 3818

07. Prohibiting Sprinkler Requirements for Single-Family Homes – HF460 would have prohibited State or Local building codes from requiring costly installation of fire-suppressing sprinkler systems in detached, single-family dwellings. Vetoed by the governor. Our position: For. + indicates a “Yes” vote. House Journal page 4669

08. Personal Responsibility in Food Consumption Act (the “Cheeseburger Bill”) – HF 264 would have prevented legal actions against persons or corporations for weight gain as a result of consuming certain foods. Vetoed by the governor. Our position: For. + indicates a “Yes” vote. House Journal page 4734

TAXES & SPENDING

09. Omnibus Bonding Bill – HF23 (Special Session) borrows \$500 million for construction and other projects, appropriating money for the Minnesota Zoo, Minnesota colleges and universities and several government agencies. The bill was passed as a compromise with the governor to provide more spending without raising taxes this year. Bonding bills are normally enacted in even years so this additional borrowing to spend more money is unwarranted. Our position: Against. + indicates a “No” vote. House Journal page 26 (2011 1st Special Session)

10. Omnibus Tax Bill – HF42 would have created \$300 million in tax relief for Minnesota’s families and small businesses, curbed the estate tax and create greater tax fairness for interstate corporations and workers. Vetoed by the governor. Our position: For. + indicates a “Yes” vote. House Journal page 1279

Minnesota Majority 2011 Legislative Scorecard for the MN Senate

Senator	District	Term	Party	Energy		Gov. & Politics		Life		Marriage & Family		Rights & Liberties		Taxes & Spending		2011 Score	Career Score
				01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09					
Bakk, Thomas	6	3rd	D	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11%	13%	
Benson, Michelle	49	1st	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100%	na	
Berglin, Linda	61	10th	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	0%	8%	
Bonoff, Terri	43	3rd	D	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11%	12%	
Brown, David	16	1st	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	78%	na	
Carlson, John	4	1st	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	89%	na	
Chamberlain, Roger	53	1st	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	89%	na	
Cohen, Richard	64	8th	D	-	-	-	-	-		+	-	-	-	-	13%	8%	
Dahms, Gary	21	1st	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	89%	na	
Daley, Ted	38	1st	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100%	na	
DeKruif, Al	25	1st	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100%	na	
Dibble, Scott	60	3rd	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	3%	
Fischbach, Michelle	14	6th	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	89%	84%	
Gazelka, Paul	12	1st	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100%	na	
Gerlach, Chris	37	3rd	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	89%	91%	
Gimse, Joe	13	2nd	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	89%	75%	
Goodwin, Barb	50	1st	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	na	
Hall, Dan	40	1st	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	89%	na	
Hann, David	42	3rd	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100%	96%	
Harrington, John	67	1st	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	11%	na	
Higgins, Linda	58	5th	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	6%	
Hoffman, Gretchen	10	1st	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100%	na	
Howe, John	28	1st	R	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	78%	na	
Ingebriksen, Bill	11	2nd	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	89%	82%	
Jungbauer, Michael	48	3rd	R	+	+	+	+	+		-	-	-	-	+	75%	79%	
Kelash, Kenneth	63	2nd	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	4%	
Koch, Amy	19	3rd	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	89%	91%	
Kruse, Benjamin	47	1st	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	89%	na	
Kubly, Gary	20	3rd	D	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	-			-	43%	25%	
Langseth, Keith	9	10th	D	+	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	44%	22%	
Latz, Ron	44	2nd	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	3%	
Lillie, Ted	56	1st	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100%	na	
Limmer, Warren	32	6th	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	89%	92%	
Lourey, Tony	8	2nd	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	11%	6%	
Magnus, Doug	22	1st	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	89%	na	
Marty, John	54	8th	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	9%	
McGuire, Mary Jo	66	1st	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	na	
Metzen, James	39	8th	D	-		-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	13%	12%	
Michel, Geoff	41	3rd	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	89%	76%	
Miller, Jeremy	31	1st	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	89%	na	
Nelson, Carla	30	1st	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	89%	na	
Newman, Scott	18	1st	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	78%	na	
Nienow, Sean	17	1st	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100%	na	
Olson, Gen	33	9th	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	89%	66%	
Ortman, Julianne	34	3rd	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	89%	87%	
Pappas, Sandra	65	7th	D	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	11%	8%	
Parry, Mike	26	2nd	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	89%	94%	
Pederson, John	15	1st	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	89%	na	
Pogemiller, Larry	59	9th	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	5%	
Reinert, Roger	7	1st	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	25%	na	
Rest, Ann	45	4th	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	9%	
Robling, Claire	35	5th	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	89%	81%	
Rosen, Julie	24	3rd	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	89%	73%	
Saxhaug, Tom	3	3rd	D	+	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	33%	17%	

Minnesota Majority 2011 Legislative Scorecard for the MN Senate

Senator	District	Term	Party	Energy		Gov. & Politics		Life		Marriage & Family		Rights & Liberties		Taxes & Spending		2011 Score	Career Score
				01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09					
Scheid, Linda	46	5th	D			-										0%	5%
Senjem, David	29	3rd	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	89%	76%
Sheran, Kathy	23	2nd	D	-		-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	13%	10%
Sieben, Katie	57	2nd	D	-	-	-	-	-	+	-		-	-	-	-	13%	11%
Skoe, Rod	2	3rd	D	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	22%	17%
Sparks, Dan	27	3rd	D	-		-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	25%	28%
Stumpf, LeRoy	1	9th	D	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	56%	34%
Thompson, Dave	36	1st	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100%	na
Tomassoni, David	5	4th	D	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	22%	17%
Torres Ray, Patricia	62	2nd	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	5%
Vanderveer, Ray	52	2nd	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100%	91%
Wiger, Charles	55	5th	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	7%
Wolf, Pam	51	1st	R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	89%	na

LEGEND Voted with the Minnesota Majority position (+) Voted against the Minnesota Majority position (-) Did not vote on this legislation (|)
Not in office when vote was taken (na)

ENERGY

01. Reduce Energy Prices by Eliminating Carbon Offset Requirements – SF86 would have rolled back certain carbon offset requirements imposed on power plants that were meant to combat “global warming,” thereby reducing energy costs. Vetoes by the governor. Our position: For. + indicates a “Yes” vote. Senate Journal page 3049

GOVERNMENT & POLITICS

02. 21st Century Voting Act – SF509 would have required voters to present photo ID when voting, improved recordkeeping and transparency, modernized and streamlined Minnesota’s election system and would have ensured that all voters’ eligibility was verified by equal standards before they vote. Vetoes by the governor. Our position: For. + indicates a “Yes” vote. Senate Journal page 1452

LIFE

03. Prohibit State-Funding of Abortions – HF201 would ensure that tax dollars collected by the state of Minnesota would not be used to pay for abortions. Vetoes by governor Dayton. Our position: For. + indicates a “Yes” vote. Senate journal page 2957

04. Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act – HF936 – Abortions after 20 weeks (at which point, medical science has determined unborn children are capable of experiencing and reacting to pain) would have been prohibited under this bill. Vetoes by the governor. Our position: For. + indicates a “Yes” vote. Senate Journal page 2062

MARRIAGE & FAMILY

05. Marriage Protection Amendment – SF1308 puts a ballot question to the voters on whether to amend the constitution to preserve the definition of marriage as the union of one man and one woman. The question will be on the general election ballot in 2012. Our position: For. + indicates a “Yes” vote to put the question on the ballot, but does not necessarily indicate support for passage. Senate Journal page 1978

RIGHTS & LIBERTIES

06. Prohibiting Sprinkler Requirements for Single-Family Homes – HF460 would have prohibited State or Local building codes from requiring costly installation of fire-suppressing sprinkler systems in detached, single-family dwellings. Vetoes by the governor. Our position: For. + indicates a “Yes” vote. Senate Journal page 2084

07. Personal Responsibility in Food Consumption Act (the “Cheeseburger Bill”) – HF 264 would have prevented legal actions against persons or corporations for weight gain as a result of consuming certain foods. Vetoes by the governor. Our position: For. + indicates a “Yes” vote. Senate Journal page 3270

TAXES & SPENDING

08. Omnibus Bonding Bill – HF23 (Special Session) borrows \$500 million for construction and other projects, appropriating money for the Minnesota Zoo, Minnesota colleges and universities and several government agencies. The bill was passed as a compromise with the governor to provide more spending without raising taxes this year. Bonding bills are normally enacted in even years so this additional borrowing to spend more money is unwarranted. . Our position: Against. + indicates a “No” vote. Senate Journal page 35 (2011 1st Special Session)

09. Omnibus Tax Bill – HF42 would have created \$300 million in tax relief for Minnesota’s families and small businesses, curbed the estate tax and create greater tax fairness for interstate corporations and workers. Vetoes by the governor. Our position: For. + indicates a “Yes” vote. Senate Journal page 2628