



CONGRESSIONAL ARTS REPORT CARD

OCTOBER 2004

Table of Contents:

Overview	1
Arts Funding Still Inadequate	2
Evidence of Strong Support for the Arts	3
Support for the Arts Is Bipartisan	3
Significant Differences Still Exist Between the Parties	4
State and Regional Rankings	6
How to Read the Congressional Arts Report Card	8
The Grading System	9
The Votes and Point Values	10
The Report Card	13

OVERVIEW


Americans for the Arts Action Fund has produced a Congressional Arts Report Card for the U.S. House of Representatives, assigning each Member a letter grade and numerical score based on his or her record on numerous arts and arts education policy issues. Each state and region received an average score. The Congressional Arts Report Card includes a detailed voting record on the arts for each Member. We did not issue a report card for the Senate because it has taken no arts-specific votes in several years.

The Congressional Arts Report Card covers the U.S. House of Representatives in the 108th Congress (2003–2004). It is based on 11 factors, with the most weight given to four votes on funding for the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA). The average grade for all Members is a B.

Average grade of
all Members is a B.

In the big picture, the Congressional Arts Report Card illustrates that a convincing majority of the 435-member House favors modest funding increases for the NEA, and an even larger majority opposes any cuts (see chart 1). A full 21 percent went on the record in support of a significant increase.


FY 2005 NEA SUPPORT
(CHART 1)



ARTS FUNDING STILL INADEQUATE

With merely modest increases to inadequate funding, much work needs to be done just to restore arts funding to pre-1995 levels, when the NEA was cut by 40 percent. Following that cut, the NEA's budget stagnated for four years, during which time the arts community fought off total elimination of the agency (see chart 2). When adjusted for inflation, the current NEA budget of \$121 million is barely over half of its budget for 1992. Beginning in 2000, Congress has approved small annual increases for each succeeding fiscal year.

NEA APPROPRIATIONS HISTORY
FISCAL YEARS 1966 TO 2004
 (CHART 2)



EVIDENCE OF STRONG SUPPORT FOR THE ARTS

Other statistics that illustrate a strengthening of arts support include:

- In 2004, the House approved an increase for the NEA by its widest margin since 2000. The margin of victory in 2004 was 56 votes, while in 2000 it was just three votes.
- 187 Members joined the Congressional Arts Caucus, up from 146 in 2002 and 106 when it was established in 1997 (or more properly, when it was re-established after having been eliminated in 1995). Co-chaired by Reps. Louise Slaughter (D-NY) and Christopher Shays (R-CT), the Arts Caucus provides a solid core of support for a federal role in the arts.
- 104 Members cosponsored a bill to allow artists to claim a fair market value tax deduction for giving their work to nonprofit arts organizations, up from 83 in the 107th Congress.


Members responded positively to new evidence demonstrating the scope of arts-based employment in their own districts. In the 72 hours before the 2004 votes on NEA funding, each Member received a map of his or her district showing actual arts-related jobs. Created by the research department at Americans for the Arts, the *Creative Industries: Business & Employment in the Arts* (Americans for the Arts, 2004) report is based on an exact enumeration of arts-related businesses that have registered with the financial information firm of Dun & Bradstreet. As already noted, the House then approved an increase for the NEA by a record margin.

In 2004, twice as many Republicans supported an amendment to increase NEA funding compared to 2000.

SUPPORT FOR THE ARTS IS BIPARTISAN

Support for the arts is increasingly bipartisan, with growing numbers of Republicans joining a solid bloc of Democrats. In 2004, 48 Republicans supported a bipartisan amendment to increase NEA funding for FY 2005, as compared to only 25 who voted for a similar amendment in 2000 (see chart 3).


**MEMBERS VOTING FOR NEA INCREASE
2000 VS. 2004
(CHART 3)**




SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES STILL EXIST BETWEEN THE PARTIES

Chart 4 shows the overall grade distribution for the entire House, with 49 percent of Members earning an A or A+ by consistently voting for NEA increases and against NEA cuts. Charts 6 and 7 show the overall grade distribution among House Democrats and House Republicans, illustrating that significant differences still exist between the parties. Chart 5 shows that bipartisanship support between the parties increases on non-NEA-related issues in the House.


OVERALL GRADE DISTRIBUTION
(CHART 4)




SUPPORT OF ARTS-RELATED LEGISLATION BY PARTY
(CHART 5)



GRADE DISTRIBUTION BY PARTY—DEMOCRATS (205) (CHART 6)



GRADE DISTRIBUTION BY PARTY—REPUBLICANS (229) (CHART 7)



STATE AND REGIONAL RANKINGS


Charts 8, 9, and 10 show a broad range of average grades among the states and the national regions.

Among the states, Vermont earns a perfect score of 100, with Connecticut, Delaware, and Hawaii tied for second at a nearly perfect score of 98. It should be noted that these states have small House delegations, with only Connecticut having more than two House Members. Among states with delegations of 10 or more House Members, Massachusetts and New York finish in front, with scores of 97 and 88 respectively.

New England was the highest scoring region with an average grade of 94 and Vermont was the highest scoring state with a perfect score of 100.

Among the national regions, each score is calculated by averaging the scores of all of the region's Members. New England finishes first, with an average score of 94. It should be noted that the New England delegation consists of only 22 Members, with 21 receiving scores above 90. All five of the other regions have much larger House delegations than New England and are therefore statistically more likely to show a more varied voting pattern, leading to lower average scores. Interestingly, the Midwest average score exactly matches the national average score of 59.

AVERAGE GRADE DISTRIBUTION BY REGION
(CHART 8)



STATE AND REGIONAL RANKINGS (CHARTS 9 AND 10)

State	Rank	Average Score	Grade
VT	1	100	A+
CT	2 (tie)	98	A
DE	2 (tie)	98	A
HI	2 (tie)	98	A
MA	5	97	A
ME	6	96	A
RI	7	95	A
WV	8	93	A
ND	9	89	A
NY	10	88	A
MD	11 (tie)	82	B
NJ	11 (tie)	82	B
AR	13	79	B
OR	14	77	B
IL	15	72	B
PA	16	71	B
CA	17 (tie)	67	B
WA	17 (tie)	67	B
NH	19 (tie)	64	B
MN	19 (tie)	64	B
MI	21	62	B
OH	22	55	B
IA	23 (tie)	54	B
TN	23 (tie)	54	B
NE	25	53	B
WI	26	50	B
NM	27 (tie)	49	C
TX	27 (tie)	49	C
NC	27 (tie)	49	C
SC	30	47	C
LA	31	46	C
FL	32 (tie)	44	C
GA	32 (tie)	44	C
VA	34	43	C
NV	35	38	C
AZ	36	37	C
UT	37 (tie)	36	C
KS	37 (tie)	36	C
IN	39 (tie)	35	C
ID	39 (tie)	35	C
AL	39 (tie)	35	C
OK	42 (tie)	34	C
MS	42 (tie)	34	C
MO	44	32	C
CO	45	30	C
MT	46	29	D
KY	47	26	D
AK	48	18	D
WY	49	8	D
SD	no rank	no score	INC

National Region	Rank	State	Average Score and Grade by Region
New England	1	Connecticut	94 A
		Maine	
		Massachusetts	
		New Hampshire	
		Rhode Island	
		Vermont	
Mid-Atlantic	2	Delaware	82 B
		Maryland	
		New Jersey	
		New York	
		Pennsylvania	
		West Virginia	
Midwest	3	Illinois	59 B
		Indiana	
		Iowa	
		Michigan	
		Minnesota	
		North Dakota	
		Ohio	
		South Dakota	
Western	4	Wisconsin	58 B
		Alaska	
		Arizona	
		California	
		Colorado	
		Hawaii	
		Idaho	
		Montana	
		Nevada	
		New Mexico	
		Oregon	
		Utah	
		Washington	
Mid-America	5	Wyoming	47 C
		Arkansas	
		Kansas	
		Missouri	
		Nebraska	
		Oklahoma	
Southern	6	Texas	44 C
		Alabama	
		Florida	
		Georgia	
		Kentucky	
		Louisiana	
		Mississippi	
		North Carolina	
		South Carolina	
		Tennessee	
		Virginia	

HOW TO READ THE CONGRESSIONAL ARTS REPORT CARD

Eleven separate actions are covered in the Congressional Arts Report Card. They are weighted differently based mainly on their importance to the arts. A perfect score equals 100 cumulative points. The correlation of the numerical scores to letter grades is shown below.

GRADE SCALE

A+	100
A	86–99
B	50–85
C	30–49
D	5–29
F	0–4
INC	no score*

*Incomplete Grade-missed more than two arts votes.

KEY OF SYMBOLS

Following each Member's grade and score are 11 columns showing each of their actions. Under each column appears one of five symbols:

+ Indicates support for the pro-arts position

- Indicates opposition to the pro-arts position

nv Indicates a missed vote

P Indicates a vote of Present

Members receiving a grade of A+ are highlighted in blue.

***** Means that the Member was not yet in office

The individual votes in columns 1–11 are explained on pages 10–12.

State/ District	Member of Congress	Party	Score	Grade	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
4	Turman	DEM	94	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-

Member's
District

Member's
Last Name

Party
Affiliation

Numerical
Score

Letter
Grade

“+” indicates
arts-friendly
position

“-” indicates
opposition to
arts-friendly
position

THE GRADING SYSTEM

Point values reflect the centrality of the NEA to the federal role in support of the arts. The other votes and optional actions mainly contribute to the overall numerical score, though in a few cases they actually raise a grade. A detailed listing of all votes and actions, along with their point values, follows this section. In almost every case, the letter grades are as follows:

- A+** Perfect record supporting NEA and other arts related issues
- A** Consistently voted *for* NEA increases and *against* decreases
- B** voted *for* NEA increase in 2003 but not in 2004 (or vice versa)
- C** voted for NEA “level” funding, i.e., no increases and no decreases
- D** voted at least once *for* a decrease in NEA funding
- F** always voted *against* NEA increases and *for* NEA decreases, and did not support more than one of the seven additional factors

A vote to increase NEA funding counts more than a vote against decreasing it, because it takes more political capital to support an increase than to oppose a cut.

A vote on reauthorization of the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) is weighted less heavily than the other votes on cultural spending and cosponsorship of the artists’ tax deduction bill, because we have given priority to spending and tax measures. Also, it was uncontroversial, passing with near unanimity in both chambers—the House approved it by a vote of 416 to 2, while the Senate approved it by “unanimous consent” with no roll call vote—which means that Members expended little political capital to vote for it.

Members occasionally miss votes. We have given a grade of Incomplete (INC) to those who missed more than two of the seven floor votes, but we do not wish it to be read as implying a lack of support for the arts; rather, it should be read in the context of the rest of the Member’s record.

Given the weighting system, Members who missed one or two NEA votes could not achieve an excellent score. Readers should consider the totality of their records. While our expectation is that Members will vote, we recognize that factors such as family requirements or illness inevitably make a perfect record difficult to accomplish.

Delegates from the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the territories are not allowed to vote and therefore are not included.

A handful of Members came to office midway through the 108th Congress. We have noted the votes that they actually cast, but we did not assign grades. These Members are listed in italics, and they include Reps. G.K. Butterfield (D-NC), Ben Chandler (D-KY), and Stephanie Herseth (D-SD). The Speaker of the House, Dennis Hastert (R-IL), by tradition votes rarely, so we have not assigned a grade for him. Two districts currently have vacancies triggered by the resignations of Reps. Doug Bereuter (R-NE) and Porter Goss (R-FL). However, because both Members were able to participate in all of the votes, we have included their scores.

Finally, we want to note that a few Members with poor grades exercised leadership in a specific issue area. For example, Rep. Tom Petri (R-WI) led the fight to restore funding for transportation enhancements, which often include cultural projects, while Rep. Pete Hoekstra (R-MI) crafted the widely popular reauthorization of IMLS. Other Members took important action at the Committee level. The Congressional Report Card is as precise as we can make it, but like any grading system, it cannot reflect all aspects of each Member’s performance.

No floor votes on arts education are included, despite the importance of the issue to the arts community, because all meaningful activity occurred at the Committee level. We only included floor votes, in which the full House participates, and there were no floor votes on arts education.

Members receive points only for correct votes/actions. No points are subtracted for wrong votes or actions.

THE VOTES AND POINT VALUES

The 11 actions, corresponding to the 11 columns on the Report Card, are:

COLUMNS 1-4: VOTES ON NEA FUNDING

1. **Congressional Arts Caucus Amendment to increase FY 2005 funding for the NEA by \$10 million and NEH by \$3.5 million, offset by reduction in Department of Interior administrative funds. The amendment was offered by Reps. Louise Slaughter (D-NY), Christopher Shays (R-CT), Norm Dicks (D-WA), and Jim Leach (R-IA).**

Date: June 16, 2004

Result: succeeded by vote of 241 to 185

Citation: 108th Congress, 2nd session, roll call vote number 248

Pro-arts: Yes

Value: 28 points

2. **Congressional Arts Caucus Amendment to increase FY 2004 NEA funding by \$10 million and NEH by \$5 million, with offsets from the National Park Service, National Forest System, and Department of Interior management account. The amendment was offered by Reps. Louise Slaughter (D-NY), Christopher Shays (R-CT), Norm Dicks (D-WA), and Jim Leach (R-IA).**

Date: July 17, 2003

Result: succeeded by vote of 225 to 200

Citation: 108th Congress, 1st session, roll call vote number 376

Pro-arts: Yes

Value: 28 points

3. **Amendment offered by Rep. Tom Tancredo (R-CO) to cut FY 2005 NEA funding by \$60 million and provide increase to U.S. Forest Service law enforcement equivalently.**

Date: June 16, 2004

Result: failed by vote of 112 to 313

Citation: 108th Congress, 2nd session, roll call vote number 249

Pro-arts: No

Value: 14 points

THE VOTES AND POINT VALUES (CONT.)

4.	Amendment offered by Rep. Tancredo (R-CO) to cut FY 2004 NEA funding by \$57.4 million, with equivalent increase for Wildland Fire Management program.
Date:	July 17, 2003
Result:	failed by vote of 112 to 313
Citation:	108 th Congress, 1 st session, roll call vote number 379
Pro-arts:	No
Value:	14 points

COLUMN 5 AND 6: OTHER VOTES ON ARTS-RELATED

5.	Amendment to restore FY 2004 funding for transportation “enhancement” projects, offered by Reps. Tom Petri (R-WI) and John Olver (D-MA).
Date:	September 4, 2003
Result:	succeeded by vote of 327 to 90
Citation:	108 th Congress, 1 st session, roll call vote number 469
Pro-arts:	Yes
Value:	4 points

6.	Amendment to cut Smithsonian FY 2005 funding by \$13 million and NEH funding by \$2 million, with equivalent increase for Department of Interior, offered by Rep. Jeff Flake (R-AZ).
Date:	June 16, 2004
Result:	failed by vote of 94 to 332
Citation:	108 th Congress, 2 nd session, roll call vote number 255
Pro-arts:	No
Value:	4 points

THE VOTES AND POINT VALUES (CONT.)

COLUMN 7: POSITION ON TAX BREAK FOR GIFTS BY ARTISTS

7. Cosponsorship of H.R. 806, offered by Rep. Amo Houghton (R-NY), allowing artists to claim a tax deduction for the full market value of gifts of their own work to nonprofit arts organizations.

Result: Pending

Pro-arts: Yes

Value: 4 points

COLUMN 8: VOTE ON INSTITUTE OF MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES

8. Final passage of H.R. 13, offered by Rep. Pete Hoekstra (R-MI), reauthorizing the Institute of Museum and Library Services through 2009.

Date: March 6, 2003

Result: Succeeded by a vote of 416 to 2

Citation: 108th Congress, 1st session, roll call vote number 47

Pro-arts: Yes

Value: 1 point

COLUMNS 9-11: OTHER ARTS POSITIONS

To register questions or
comments, please contact
ArtsActionFund@artsusa.org

9. Membership in the Congressional Arts Caucus. The list is maintained by the office of Rep. Louise Slaughter.

10. Cosigned Congressional Arts Caucus "Dear Colleague" letter to House appropriators asking for an increase of \$36 million for NEA for FY 2005. The letter was sent on April 23, 2004.

11. Cosigned Congressional Arts Caucus "Dear Colleague" letter to House appropriators asking for an increase of \$18 million for the Department of Education's arts-in-education program for FY 2005. The letter was sent on April 23, 2004.

The text of the amendments and cosponsorship status of bills are available online at the Library of Congress legislative website: <http://thomas.loc.gov>.

THE REPORT CARD

State/ District	Member of Congress	Party	Score	Grade	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
ALABAMA															
1	Bonner	REP	9	D	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
2	Everett	REP	19	D	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	-
3	Rogers, Michael D.	REP	9	D	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
4	Aderholt	REP	19	D	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	-
5	Cramer	DEM	94	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-
6	Bachus	REP	5	D	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-
7	Davis, Artur	DEM	93	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-

ALASKA															
1	Young, Don	REP	18	D	-	-	+	-	nv	+	-	nv	-	-	-

ARIZONA															
1	Renzi	REP	5	D	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-
2	Franks	REP	1	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
3	Shadegg	REP	1	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
4	Pastor	DEM	94	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-
5	Hayworth	REP	1	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
6	Flake	REP	0	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7	Grijalva	DEM	100	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
8	Kolbe	REP	94	A	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	-

ARKANSAS															
1	Berry	DEM	93	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
2	Snyder	DEM	93	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	nv	+	-	-
3	Boozman	REP	34	C	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	-	-
4	Ross	DEM	96	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+

CALIFORNIA															
1	Thompson, Mike	DEM	94	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-
2	Herger	REP	16	D	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-
3	Ose	REP	33	C	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	-
4	Doolittle	REP	1	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
5	Matsui	DEM	100	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
6	Woolsey	DEM	94	A	+	+	+	+	nv	+	+	+	+	-	-
7	Miller, George	DEM	93	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
8	Pelosi	DEM	80	B	+	+	+	nv	+	+	-	+	+	-	-

State/ District	Member of Congress	Party	Score	Grade	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
CALIFORNIA (cont.)															
9	Lee	DEM	100	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
10	Tauscher	DEM	98	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-
11	Pombo	REP	1	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
12	Lantos	DEM	100	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
13	Stark	DEM	94	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-
14	Eshoo	DEM	98	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-
15	Honda	DEM	96	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
16	Lofgren	DEM	94	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-
17	Farr	DEM	94	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-
18	Cardoza	DEM	93	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
19	Radanovich	REP	33	C	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-
20	Dooley	DEM	93	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
21	Nunes	REP	19	D	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-
22	Thomas	REP	37	C	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
23	Capps	DEM	94	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-
24	Gallegly	REP	9	D	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
25	McKeon	REP	90	A	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-	-
26	Dreier	REP	33	C	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	-
27	Sherman	DEM	66	B	+	P	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-
28	Berman	DEM	98	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-
29	Schiff	DEM	100	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
30	Waxman	DEM	94	A	+	+	+	+	nv	+	+	+	+	-	-
31	Becerra	DEM	94	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-
32	Solis	DEM	94	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-
33	Watson	DEM	93	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
34	Roybal-Allard	DEM	89	A	+	+	+	+	nv	+	-	+	-	-	-
35	Waters	DEM	95	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+
36	Harman	DEM	94	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-
37	Millender-McDonald	DEM		INC	+	nv	+	nv	+	+	-	nv	+	+	+
38	Napolitano	DEM	93	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
39	Sanchez, Linda	DEM	100	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
40	Royce	REP	1	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
41	Lewis, Jerry	REP	34	C	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-
42	Miller, Gary	REP	9	D	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
43	Baca	DEM	93	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
44	Calvert	REP	37	C	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-

THE REPORT CARD

State/ District	Member of Congress	Party	Score	Grade	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
CALIFORNIA (cont.)															
45	Bono	REP	94	A	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	-
46	Rohrabacher	REP	1	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
47	Sanchez, Loretta	DEM	98	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-
48	Cox	REP	1	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
49	Issa	REP	33	C	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-
50	Cunningham	REP	13	D	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	-
51	Filner	DEM		INC	nv	+	nv	+	+	nv	+	+	+	+	+
52	Hunter	REP	4	F	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	nv	-	-	-
53	Davis, Susan	DEM	100	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

COLORADO															
1	DeGette	DEM	90	A	+	+	+	+	nv	+	-	+	+	-	-
2	Udall, Mark	DEM	96	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
3	McInnis	REP	9	D	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	-
4	Musgrave	REP	1	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
5	Hefley	REP	5	D	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-
6	Tancredo	REP	1	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
7	Beauprez	REP	5	D	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-

CONNECTICUT															
1	Larson	DEM	96	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
2	Simmons	REP	100	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
3	DeLauro	DEM	95	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-
4	Shays	REP	100	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
5	Johnson, Nancy	REP	98	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-

DELAWARE															
1	Castle	REP	98	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-

FLORIDA															
1	Miller, Jeff	REP	1	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
2	Boyd	DEM	89	A	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-
3	Brown, Corrine	DEM	96	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
4	Crenshaw	REP	33	C	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	-
5	Brown-Waite	REP	1	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
6	Stearns	REP	5	D	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-
7	Mica	REP	65	B	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-

State/ District	Member of Congress	Party	Score	Grade	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
FLORIDA (cont.)															
8	Keller	REP	9	D	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
9	Bilirakis	REP	37	C	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
10	Young, C.W. "Bill"	REP	37	C	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
11	Davis, Jim	DEM	95	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+
12	Putnam	REP	19	D	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-
13	Harris	REP	68	B	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
14	Goss	REP	33	C	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	-
15	Weldon	REP	5	D	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-
16	Foley	REP	70	B	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-
17	Meek	DEM	96	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
18	Ros-Lehtinen	REP	32	C	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	nv	-	-	-
19	Wexler	DEM	94	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	nv	-	+	+
20	Deutsch	DEM	96	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
21	Diaz-Balart, Lincoln	REP	37	C	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
22	Shaw	REP	37	C	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
23	Hastings	DEM		INC	nv	+	nv	+	+	nv	-	+	+	-	-
24	Feeney	REP	1	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
25	Diaz-Balart, Mario	REP	9	D	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	-

GEORGIA															
1	Kingston	REP	5	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-
2	Bishop, Sanford	DEM	94	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-
3	Marshall	DEM	96	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
4	Majette	DEM	93	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
5	Lewis, John	DEM	98	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-
6	Isakson	REP	9	D	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
7	Linder	REP	1	F	-	-	-	-	nv	-	-	+	-	-	-
8	Collins	REP	19	D	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	-
9	Norwood	REP	5	D	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-
10	Deal	REP	19	D	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-
11	Gingrey	REP	5	D	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-
12	Burns	REP	37	C	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
13	Scott	DEM	93	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-

HAWAII															
1	Abercrombie	DEM	100	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
2	Case	DEM	96	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+

THE REPORT CARD

State/ District	Member of Congress	Party	Score	Grade	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
IDAHO															
1	Otter	REP	1	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
2	Simpson	REP	69	B	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-

ILLINOIS															
1	Rush	DEM	96	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
2	Jackson	DEM	93	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
3	Lipinski	DEM	98	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-
4	Gutierrez	DEM	94	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-
5	Emanuel	DEM	93	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
6	Hyde	REP	9	D	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
7	Davis, Danny	DEM	100	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
8	Crane	REP	9	D	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
9	Schakowsky	DEM	100	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
10	Kirk	REP	94	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-
11	Weller	REP	27	D	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	-
12	Costello	DEM	95	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	+
13	Biggert	REP	93	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
14	<i>Hastert</i>	REP		INC	nv	nv	nv	nv	nv	nv	-	nv	-	-	-
15	Johnson, Timothy	REP	95	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-
16	Manzullo	REP	5	D	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-
17	Evans	DEM	93	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
18	LaHood	REP	93	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
19	Shimkus	REP	13	D	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	-

INDIANA															
1	Visclosky	DEM	93	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
2	Chocola	REP	37	C	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
3	Souder	REP	5	D	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-
4	Buyer	REP	9	D	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
5	Burton	REP	1	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
6	Pence	REP	5	D	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-
7	Carson	DEM	94	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-
8	Hostettler	REP	5	D	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-
9	Hill	DEM	68	B	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+

State/ District	Member of Congress	Party	Score	Grade	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
IOWA															
1	Nussle	REP	33	C	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	-
2	Leach	REP	100	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
3	Boswell	DEM	94	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-
4	Latham	REP	41	C	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-
5	King	REP	1	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-

KANSAS															
1	Moran, Jerry	REP	34	C	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	-	-
2	Ryun	REP	5	D	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-
3	Moore	DEM	100	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
4	Tiahrt	REP	5	D	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-

KENTUCKY															
1	Whitfield	REP	33	C	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-
2	Lewis, Ron	REP	9	D	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	-
3	Northup	REP	37	C	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-
4	Lucas	DEM	23	D	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
5	Rogers	REP	29	D	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
6	<i>Chandler</i>	DEM		INC	+	*	+	*	*	+	-	*	+	-	-

LOUISIANA															
1	Vitter	REP	1	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
2	Jefferson	DEM	52	B	+	nv	+	nv	+	+	-	+	+	-	-
3	Tauzin	REP	19	D	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	-
4	McCrery	REP	33	C	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-
5	Alexander	REP	94	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-
6	Baker	REP	37	C	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
7	John	DEM	85	B	+	+	+	+	nv	-	-	+	-	-	-

MAINE															
1	Allen	DEM	96	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
2	Michaud	DEM	96	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+

THE REPORT CARD

State/ District	Member of Congress	Party	Score	Grade	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
MARYLAND															
1	Gilchrest	REP	65	B	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
2	Ruppersberger	DEM	95	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+
3	Cardin	DEM	100	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
4	Wynn	DEM	98	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-
5	Hoyer	DEM	98	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-
6	Bartlett	REP	5	D	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-
7	Cummings	DEM	98	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-
8	Van Hollen	DEM	95	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	nv	+	+	+

MASSACHUSETTS															
1	Olver	DEM	98	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-
2	Neal	DEM	100	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
3	McGovern	DEM	100	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
4	Frank	DEM	98	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-
5	Meehan	DEM	95	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-
6	Tierney	DEM	93	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
7	Markey	DEM	94	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-
8	Capuano	DEM	96	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
9	Lynch	DEM	93	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
10	Delahunt	DEM	98	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-

MICHIGAN															
1	Stupak	DEM	89	A	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	nv	+	-	-
2	Hoekstra	REP	23	D	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
3	Ehlers	REP	97	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-
4	Camp	REP	37	C	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
5	Kildee	DEM	94	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-
6	Upton	REP	41	C	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-
7	Smith, Nick	REP	19	D	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	-
8	Rogers, Michael J.	REP	37	C	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
9	Knollenberg	REP	37	C	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
10	Miller, Candice	REP	37	C	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
11	McCotter	REP	37	C	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
12	Levin	DEM	95	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-
13	Kilpatrick	DEM	93	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
14	Conyers	DEM	95	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	nv	+	+	+
15	Dingell	DEM	95	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-

State/ District	Member of Congress	Party	Score	Grade	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
MINNESOTA															
1	Gutknecht	REP	13	D	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	-
2	Kline	REP	5	D	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-
3	Ramstad	REP	98	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-
4	McCollum	DEM	100	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
5	Sabo	DEM	98	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-
6	Kennedy, Mark	REP	9	D	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
7	Peterson, Collin	DEM	94	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-
8	Oberstar	DEM	96	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+

MISSISSIPPI															
1	Wicker	REP	19	D	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	-
2	Thompson, Bennie	DEM	94	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-
3	Pickering	REP	15	D	-	-	-	+	nv	-	-	+	-	-	-
4	Taylor	DEM	9	D	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	-

MISSOURI															
1	Clay	DEM	96	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
2	Akin	REP	5	D	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-
3	Gephardt	DEM		INC	nv	nv	nv	nv	nv	nv	-	nv	-	-	-
4	Skelton	DEM	27	D	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	-
5	McCarthy, Karen	DEM	100	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
6	Graves	REP	5	D	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-
7	Blunt	REP	15	D	-	-	-	+	-	nv	-	+	-	-	-
8	Emerson	REP	1	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
9	Hulshof	REP	5	D	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-

MONTANA															
1	Rehberg	REP	29	D	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
NEBRASKA															
1	Bereuter	REP	99	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+
2	Terry	REP	23	D	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
3	Osborne	REP	37	C	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-

THE REPORT CARD

State/ District	Member of Congress	Party	Score	Grade	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
NEVADA															
1	Berkley	DEM	48	C	+	nv	+	nv	+	-	-	+	+	-	-
2	Gibbons	REP	5	D	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-
3	Porter	REP	61	B	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-

NEW HAMPSHIRE															
1	Bradley	REP	34	C	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	-	-
2	Bass	REP	93	A	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	-

NEW JERSEY															
1	Andrews	DEM	94	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-
2	LoBiondo	REP	94	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-
3	Saxton	REP	93	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
4	Smith, Christopher	REP	37	C	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
5	Garrett	REP	15	D	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
6	Pallone	DEM	100	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
7	Ferguson	REP	53	B	+	nv	+	nv	+	+	-	+	-	+	+
8	Pascrell	DEM	96	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
9	Rothman	DEM	94	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-
10	Payne	DEM	96	A	+	+	+	+	nv	+	+	+	+	+	+
11	Frelinghuysen	REP	97	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-
12	Holt	DEM	100	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
13	Menendez	DEM	100	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

NEW MEXICO															
1	Wilson, Heather	REP	19	D	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-
2	Pearce	REP	29	D	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
3	Tom Udall	DEM	100	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

NEW YORK															
1	Bishop, Tim	DEM	98	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-
2	Israel	DEM	93	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
3	King	REP	23	D	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
4	McCarthy, Carolyn	DEM	94	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-
5	Ackerman	DEM	96	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
6	Meeks	DEM	52	B	nv	+	nv	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-
7	Crowley	DEM	94	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-
8	Nadler	DEM	100	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

State/ District	Member of Congress	Party	Score	Grade	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
NEW YORK (cont.)															
9	Weiner	DEM	94	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-
10	Towns	DEM	94	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-
11	Owens	DEM	93	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
12	Velazquez	DEM	94	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-
13	Fossella	REP	93	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
14	Maloney	DEM	100	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
15	Rangel	DEM	94	A	+	+	+	+	nv	+	+	+	+	-	-
16	Serrano	DEM	98	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-
17	Engel	DEM	96	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
18	Lowe	DEM	98	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-
19	Kelly	REP	94	A	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	-
20	Sweeney	REP	61	B	+	-	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	-
21	McNulty	DEM	98	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-
22	Hinchey	DEM	98	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-
23	McHugh	REP	69	B	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-
24	Boehlert	REP	99	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
25	Walsh	REP	65	B	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
26	Reynolds	REP	65	B	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
27	Quinn	REP	95	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-
28	Slaughter	DEM	100	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
29	Houghton	REP	98	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-

NORTH CAROLINA															
1	<i>Butterfield</i>	DEM		INC	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	-	*	*
2	Etheridge	DEM	95	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	nv	+	+	+
3	Jones	REP	1	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
4	Price	DEM	100	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
5	Burr	REP	37	C	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
6	Coble	REP	5	D	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-
7	McIntyre	DEM	42	C	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-
8	Hayes	REP	5	D	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-
9	Myrick	REP	5	D	-	-	-	-	nv	-	+	+	-	-	-
10	Ballenger	REP	94	A	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	-
11	Taylor	REP	19	D	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	-
12	Watt	DEM	93	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
13	Miller, Brad	DEM	95	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	nv	+	+	+

THE REPORT CARD

State/ District	Member of Congress	Party	Score	Grade	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
NORTH DAKOTA															
1	Pomeroy	DEM	89	A	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-
OHIO															
1	Chabot	REP	1	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
2	Portman	REP	65	B	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
3	Turner, Michael	REP	65	B	+	nv	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-
4	Oxley	REP	33	C	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	-
5	Gillmor	REP	37	C	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
6	Strickland	DEM	75	B	+	+	+	nv	+	-	-	+	-	-	-
7	Hobson	REP	33	C	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	-
8	Boehner	REP	19	D	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	-
9	Kaptur	DEM	94	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-
10	Kucinich	DEM	90	A	+	+	+	+	nv	+	-	+	+	-	-
11	Jones	DEM	96	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
12	Tiberi	REP	33	C	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	-
13	Brown, Sherrod	DEM	57	B	nv	+	nv	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+
14	LaTourette	REP	89	A	+	+	+	+	+	nv	-	+	-	-	-
15	Pryce	REP	65	B	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
16	Regula	REP	33	C	-	-	+	+	nv	+	-	+	-	-	-
17	Ryan, Tim	DEM	100	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
18	Ney	REP	9	D	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
OKLAHOMA															
1	Sullivan	REP	9	D	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
2	Carson	DEM	96	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
3	Lucas	REP	26	D	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	nv	-	-	-
4	Cole	REP	33	C	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	-
5	Istook	REP	5	D	-	-	-	nv	-	+	-	+	-	-	-
OREGON															
1	Wu	DEM	94	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-
2	Walden	REP	33	C	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-
3	Blumenauer	DEM	95	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	+
4	DeFazio	DEM	68	B	+	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
5	Hooley	DEM	94	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-

State/ District	Member of Congress	Party	Score	Grade	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
PENNSYLVANIA															
1	Brady	DEM	95	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+
2	Fattah	DEM	93	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
3	English	REP	99	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+
4	Hart	REP	90	A	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-
5	Peterson, John	REP	65	B	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
6	Gerlach	REP	93	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
7	Weldon	REP	98	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-
8	Greenwood	REP	99	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+
9	Shuster	REP	23	D	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
10	Sherwood	REP	23	D	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
11	Kanjorski	DEM	93	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
12	Murtha	DEM	93	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
13	Hoefel	DEM	97	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-
14	Doyle	DEM	94	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-
15	Toomey	REP	1	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
16	Pitts	REP	9	D	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
17	Holden	DEM	96	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
18	Murphy	REP	19	D	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	-
19	Platts	REP	71	B	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+

RHODE ISLAND															
1	Kennedy, Patrick	DEM	94	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-
2	Langevin	DEM	96	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+

SOUTH CAROLINA															
1	Brown, Henry	REP	37	C	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
2	Wilson, Joe	REP	6	D	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	-
3	Barrett	REP	1	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
4	DeMint	REP		INC	nv	-	nv	-	-	nv	-	+	-	-	-
5	Spratt	DEM	96	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
6	Clyburn	DEM	93	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-

SOUTH DAKOTA															
1	<i>Herseth</i>	DEM		INC	+	*	+	*	*	+	-	*	+	*	*

THE REPORT CARD

State/ District	Member of Congress	Party	Score	Grade	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
TENNESSEE															
1	Jenkins	REP	37	C	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
2	Duncan	REP	51	B	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
3	Wamp	REP	23	D	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
4	Davis, Lincoln	DEM	69	B	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-
5	Cooper	DEM	94	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-
6	Gordon	DEM	70	B	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-
7	Blackburn	REP	9	D	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-
8	Tanner	DEM	33	C	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-
9	Ford	DEM	100	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

TEXAS															
1	Sandlin	DEM	94	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-
2	Turner, Jim	DEM	33	C	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-
3	Johnson, Sam	REP	5	D	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-
4	Hall	REP	23	D	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
5	Hensarling	REP	15	D	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
6	Barton	REP	19	D	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-
7	Culberson	REP	4	F	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	nv	-	-	-
8	Brady	REP	1	F	-	nv	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
9	Lampson	DEM	94	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-
10	Doggett	DEM	100	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
11	Edwards	DEM	93	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
12	Granger	REP	33	C	-	-	+	+	+	nv	-	+	-	-	-
13	Thornberry	REP	1	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
14	Paul	REP	0	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
15	Hinojosa	DEM	94	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-
16	Reyes	DEM	94	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-
17	Stenholm	DEM	37	C	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
18	Jackson-Lee	DEM	94	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-
19	Neugebauer	REP	5	D	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-
20	Gonzalez	DEM	99	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+
21	Smith, Lamar	REP	19	D	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-
22	DeLay	REP	5	D	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-
23	Bonilla	REP	19	D	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	-
24	Frost	DEM	100	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
25	Bell	DEM	93	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
26	Burgess	REP	5	D	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-
27	Ortiz	DEM	93	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	nv	+	-	-

State/ District	Member of Congress	Party	Score	Grade	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
TEXAS (cont.)															
28	Rodriguez	DEM	89	A	+	+	+	+	nv	+	-	+	-	-	-
29	Green, Gene	DEM	96	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
30	Johnson, Eddie Bernice	DEM	99	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+
31	Carter	REP	5	D	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-
32	Sessions	REP	1	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-

UTAH															
1	Rob Bishop	REP	15	D	-	-	nv	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
2	Matheson	DEM	92	A	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
3	Cannon	REP	1	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-

VERMONT															
1	Sanders	IND	100	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

VIRGINIA															
1	Davis, Jo Ann	REP	1	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
2	Schrock	REP	37	C	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
3	Scott	DEM	94	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-
4	Forbes	REP	9	D	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
5	Goode	REP	9	D	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
6	Goodlatte	REP	5	D	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-
7	Cantor	REP	1	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
8	Moran, Jim	DEM	96	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
9	Boucher	DEM	94	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-
10	Wolf	REP	37	C	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
11	Davis, Tom	REP	90	A	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-

WASHINGTON															
1	Inslee	DEM	96	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
2	Larsen	DEM	96	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
3	Baird	DEM	98	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-
4	Hastings	REP	1	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
5	Nethercutt	REP	33	C	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-
6	Dicks	DEM	94	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-
7	McDermott	DEM	56	B	nv	+	nv	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-
8	Dunn	REP	33	C	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	-
9	Smith, Adam	DEM	94	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-

State/ District	Member of Congress	Party	Score	Grade	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
WEST VIRGINIA															
1	Mollohan	DEM	90	A	+	+	+	+	nv	+	-	+	+	-	-
2	Capito	REP	94	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-
3	Rahall	DEM	94	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-

WISCONSIN															
1	Ryan, Paul	REP	5	D	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-
2	Baldwin	DEM	100	A+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
3	Kind	DEM	93	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
4	Kleczka	DEM	94	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-
5	Sensenbrenner	REP	1	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
6	Petri	REP	5	D	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-
7	Obey	DEM	93	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-
8	Green, Mark	REP	9	D	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	-

WYOMING															
8	Cubin	REP	8	D	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	nv	-	-	-



1000 Vermont Avenue NW
6th Floor
Washington, DC 20005

Phone: 202.371.2830
Fax: 202.371.0424
www.ArtsActionFund.org

The Americans for the Arts Action Fund champions the need for public support of the arts and arts education. The Arts Action Fund is a national voice for the arts—join us today and help us foster excellence in and access to the arts and arts education.

JOIN NOW

Individuals who join with a minimum membership contribution of \$20 are entitled to all the benefits of membership including, The Arts Action Newsletter, E-Advocacy Alerts, invitations to special events, and special member-only information. Membership contributions are not tax-deductible. Join today by visiting www.ArtsActionFund.org.

Chair
Ann Sheffer

Vice Chair
Steven D. Spiess

Secretary
Michael Spring

Treasurer
Ken Fergeson

President and CEO
Robert L. Lynch

Vice President
Nina Ozlu

ARTS ACTION FUND

The Arts Action Fund is a 501(c)(4) nonprofit membership organization created by Americans for the Arts, the nation's leading 501(c)(3) tax-exempt nonprofit organization for advancing arts in America. Launched on October 4, 2004, the Arts Action Fund is spearheading a national movement to engage citizens in education and advocacy to increase support for the arts and arts education. The Arts Action Fund's goal is to enlist and mobilize 100,000 citizen activists who will help ensure that arts-friendly public policies are adopted at the federal, state, and local levels, and public and private resources are maximized.

Americans for the Arts and its new Arts Action Fund are governed by a Board of Directors and are supported by a distinguished committee of artists representing diverse disciplines.