



# 2012 REPORT on the MINNESOTA LEGISLATURE

by the  
LEGISLATIVE EVALUATION ASSEMBLY  
of MINNESOTA, INC

for an  
INFORMED CITIZENRY



Founded in 1972 • [www.lea-mn.org](http://www.lea-mn.org)

**CREDO** — *The Legislative Evaluation Assembly of Minnesota (LEA) is a non-profit, non-partisan organization established to keep the citizens of Minnesota informed of both important legislation and the voting performance of each Senator and Representative in the Minnesota State Legislature. LEA bases its evaluation on the traditional American principles of constitutionalism, limited government, free enterprise, legal and moral order with justice and individual liberty and dignity. LEA encourages the use of the material in its Reports, in whole or in part by any group or individual.*

## 2012 LEA HONOREES

(No Senate Honorees)

### HOUSE



*Honorable Mention Senate:*

Al DeKruif, Gretchen Hoffman, Benjamin Kruse, Warren Limmer, Julianne Ortman, Dave Thompson, Ray Vanderveer

*Honorable Mention House:*

Bruce Anderson, Kurt Bills, Kurt Daudt, Tom Hackbarth, David Hancock, Mary Kiffmeyer, Ernie Leidiger, Tara Mack, Joyce Peppin, Chris Swedzinski

## 2012 LEGISLATIVE REVIEW

### Core Precepts of Good Government Hard to Find in Modern Minnesota Politics

Government exists to safeguard natural rights to life, liberty, and property, which it can do by ensuring access to due process and equal protection under just laws. Public officials should act ethically, but require checks and balances to protect against abuses of power. When the legislature delegates power to both make and enforce law a conflict of interest is created.

Precepts of good government have become hard to find in Minnesota. Constitutional safeguards and procedural standards are increasingly disregarded or willfully circumvented by all branches and levels of government. Rather than acting as guardians of these principles, the people have approved amendments for a state lottery and new transit and “legacy” taxes that have carved out extra protections for special interests. No group, no matter how respected and worthy its members, is immune to the temptation to use popular support to gain advantage. Recently, anything perceived to benefit military veterans and their families has sailed through the legislature. Hiring preferences for veterans were carved out to exempt them from unjust employment laws. Instead, it would be far better to repeal unjust laws, and to remove quotas and such artificial barriers to

employment as rigid occupational licensing, which hurts everyone, especially veterans.

Instead of the rule of law ensuring social order, the state is increasingly becoming a vehicle to enact the agendas of the influential and create protected classes, without much resistance from complicit courts. Political “elites” have been eager to advocate for giving unchecked power to bureaucratic administrative “experts.” With proper checks and balances, bureaucratic administration is necessary and useful, but when administrators are allowed to both make and enforce rules, society is exposed to arbitrary rule. The assumption that bureaucratic administrators can be “disinterested” is fiction, and is in stark contrast to the Founders’ understanding of human nature being driven by self-interest. Evidence that bureaucratic agencies are made of self-interested human beings is found within the agencies themselves. Unlike a market, where one has to perform a useful service to get paid, bureaucrats use their positions of power to resist budget cuts and to design new projects that will keep them perpetually funded, insulating them from normal pressures.

In the legislature there has been a steady decline in single-subject bills and a rise in omnibus bills and extraneous amendments. Article IV, Section 17 in Minnesota’s Constitution states that “no law shall embrace more than one subject.” Even during special sessions authorized for “extraordinary occasions,” when other rules may be relaxed

for expediency, the single-subject rule remains an important protection. In the latest special session, legislators should have considered separately the merits of transportation infrastructure aid, economic-development subsidies, and waiving penalties in affected areas for delayed property-tax payments, all of which were in the main disaster-relief bill just passed. In support of the single-subject constitutional requirement, the legislature has for many years adopted as a part of its rules Mason's Manual of Legislative Procedure, which includes this purpose statement: "...to secure the independent judgment of the members on each question and prevent members from being required to vote for one proposition, which they may not approve, in order to secure the enactment of another." In addition to the omnibus bills, other bills frequently violate this principle. For example, an amendment regulating conduct of political parties was tacked on to a bill changing absentee envelopes. There were four distinct provisions related to guns put into one bill: changing the standard for self-defense, providing reciprocity for gun permits across states, changing the background check system, and curtailing the use of emergency powers to confiscate weapons. However, legislators deserve credit for passing four distinct tort-reform bills this year, all of which were vetoed.

Article IV, Section 26 of the MN Constitution requires the accountability of a two-thirds vote to appropriate state-borrowed funds. The intent is that all bonding provisions be held to a supermajority standard to assure they have statewide interest. This objective is nullified in multi-subject omnibus bills when legislators barter their support for provisions they regard as unimportant in pursuit of gaining other members' support for their own legislative priority. Both the single-subject and two-thirds majority sections of the Constitution are violated in one vote for any omnibus bonding bill.

The use of multiple bills for a new NFL stadium was the most prominent example of disregarding constitutional safeguards and procedural standards to satisfy powerful constituencies. Once again, a coalition of interests secured a large subsidy for a professional sports stadium in Minnesota, creating preferences for owners, players, fans, political insiders, and other special interests. In addition, there were businesses, labor leaders, enviro/energy lobbyists, charitable gambling interests, and the licensed beverage association all committed to a sustained effort for a new subsidized stadium. A bipartisan capitulation to the powerful coalition of special interests neglected principles of good government and turned a blind eye to unethical procedural maneuvers. Good-government principles, such as equal protection, due process, checks and balances, and fiscal responsibility were all sacrificed. The acceptance of this deal was not the finest hour for Minnesotans, including public officials or the many citizens who tolerated the abuses of power that it contained.

## 1. Using Gambling and Local Tax Extensions to Subsidize a New NFL Stadium.

HF2958. Rep. Lanning. [SF2469. Sen. Rosen.]

This 86-page bill creates a new appointed public body, the Minnesota Sports Facilities Authority, whose members receive compensation and a budget for hiring an executive director to oversee its various actions. It specifies that the state's \$348 million contribution to the stadium should come from gambling receipts. The bill sets aside one percent of gambling-related revenues for acknowledged negative social costs for compulsive-gambling treatment and public-awareness programs. It includes two backup revenue options, a sports-themed state lottery game and a tax on stadium suite rentals, to cover gambling revenue shortfalls. There is a requirement that extra sales and hospitality taxes, initially imposed for the Minneapolis Convention Center, continue until 2047, and those taxes are to be redirected to this new stadium project and expenditures in support of the pro basketball arena.

The bill establishes findings in law that government assistance to pro football provides "highly valued intangible benefits that are virtually impossible to quantify," but flowery language written into law to justify public purpose cannot transform government subsidy of any privately-owned business into a public good. Many special interests get something in this bill at public expense. The NFL franchise, despite paying less than the half the costs, gets an exclusive five-year option to establish a major-league soccer franchise at the stadium, with naming rights and concession revenues. The mandate of "2000 parking spaces within one block of the stadium, connected by skyway or tunnel to the stadium" will generate revenue for special interests. Each year, for the next 30 years, \$2.7 million will be appropriated from the general fund for a grant to the city of St. Paul for operating and capital costs of new and existing sports facilities. The state also violated Minneapolis taxpayers—as it did for the baseball stadium in 2006—by exempting Minneapolis' large subsidy of the Vikings stadium from a charter provision requiring such a subsidy request be put to a referendum. Quotas were piled on top of quotas, with preferences established to retain woman/minority/disabled employment recruiters to meet Minneapolis' percentage quotas for minority contractors and workers, and to utilize workers "from city zip codes that have high rates of poverty and unemployment." Also, "to the extent practicable," the stadium design will be "architecturally significant," follow "sustainable" building guidelines that would make it eligible to receive "green" design certification, and "be built with American-made steel made from Minnesota iron ore." At least 25 percent of the materials, supplies and equipment (?) used in the construction, operation, and maintenance of the stadium and related infrastructure (?) is supposed to be made or produced by Minnesota businesses. It is unclear how the poorly-defined and unenforceable standards will be met.

Procedural standards were ignored. The bill addressed many different subjects, maximizing appeal and minimizing accountability.

It was reassigned to different committees when opposition was encountered, some committees only took action by voice vote, and committee deadlines were waived. Sections requiring a referendum and a greater reliance on user fees passed, only to be reconsidered or removed from the final bill because they were unacceptable to the NFL franchise. Spurred on by the media and the governor, the bill acquired such an aura of inevitability that some legislators attempted to tack on unrelated special-interest concerns like early-childhood funding and internet sales taxes. Once a bill passed through both legislative bodies, conferees ignored the spirit of open-meeting law by rotating people out of the conference room to stay just under the legal threshold of an official meeting. Finally, the bill's sponsors retitled an unrelated veterans' appropriations bill to amend it with a new delete-all stadium bill, based on the latest results of negotiations with the privately-owned NFL team without being tied to what was originally sent to the conference committee. Left with a conference report in name only, other legislators and citizens had to wait right up to the time of debate to learn the details of the bill being moved for final passage.

LEA's believes that the sweeping scope of this bill and the assaults it made on free enterprise and governmental integrity made it crucial that legislators vote NO, but it passed the Senate 36-30, the House 71-60, and was signed by the governor.

## **2. Removing Internet Sales Tax Language from Vikings Stadium Bill.**

Ortman Amendment to Rosen Amendment to SF2391. Sen. Rosen [SJ pages 7222-23].

The Rosen delete-all amendment to rewrite this version of the Vikings stadium bill included a redefinition of Minnesota sales tax law that would expand taxes on internet sales. The Ortman amendment was proposed to remove the tax expansion from the Rosen amendment. LEA believes the tax expansion clause violated the single-subject rule and the constitutional concept of open and transparent public debate on new laws. LEA favored a YES vote on Sen. Ortman's amendment. Internet sales tax supporters and legislators who had ceded control over the details in pursuit of getting the stadium deal done combined to defeat the Ortman amendment in the Senate 24-42. The internet sales tax language was not, however, included in the final version of the Vikings stadium bill.

## **3. Removing DEED's Capital Projects Grant Program from the Bonding Bill.**

Draskowski/Parry amendment to HF1752. Rep. Howes [SJ page 7133, HJ page 9635].

This proposed amendment to the omnibus bonding bill would have deleted a new four-year program authorizing the Department of Employment and Economic Development (DEED) to implement Business Development Through Capital Projects grants. The amendment reallocated the program's \$50 million budget to Local Road Improvement Fund grants, administered through Minnesota's Department of Transportation, for county-state aid highways and roads of regional significance.

DEED already has a decade-old Greater MN Business Development Public Infrastructure Grant Program, created for publicly-owned physical infrastructure to facilitate economic development in greater MN. There is a \$1 million cap per biennium on how much any local government unit can receive from the program and a 50/50 nonstate funding match requirement for eligibility. Although any such program establishes an unwise and unconstitutional practice of ceding appropriation decisions to an unelected bureaucracy, DEED's new program targeted for removal by this amendment is worse, increasing both the size and scope of unchecked bureaucratic power. There is no cap on how large any grant can be, and grants are not limited to cities and counties for public infrastructure. DEED's new program further allows grants to be made to any political subdivision anywhere in the state for capital costs of any project for which general obligation bonds could be issued, including design, construction/renovation, and furnishing of buildings. This new grant program can even be used for additional stadium funding. The Ballpark Authority statute is referenced with a specific provision that eliminates the need for consent or approval from another political subdivision before exercising these rights or powers.

The legislature has now given an unelected bureaucracy the discretion to approve optional bonding projects. This abdication of legislative responsibility has left us with one arm of the governor's administration, the Met Council, applying for a light-rail corridor grant from another arm, the DEED bureaucracy. Now the governor, rather than the legislature, will determine the fate of the grant request. Under this legislation, lobbyists for appropriations avoid the hurdle of trying to secure approval from a supermajority of the people's representatives. LEA sees a lack of checks and balances in this program, and supported a YES vote on this amendment to remove it from the bonding bill. It failed in the Senate 25-40 and in the House 47-84. The program got \$47.5 million for appropriating funds in the 2012 bonding bill signed by the governor.

## **4. Voter ID/Provisional Ballot Constitutional Amendment.**

HF2738. Rep. Kiffmeyer. [SF1577. Sen. Newman.]

This bill authorizes a ballot question to amend the Minnesota Constitution to require a government-issued photo ID for voting, or the right to a provisional ballot if unable to present an ID. The state would issue a voter-identification card, free of charge, to any eligible citizen who does not already have a valid Minnesota photo ID. If the amendment passes, language will be added in Article VII, Section I regarding eligibility requirements.

Revelations and convictions of voter fraud in the wake of recent contested elections provide strong evidence of fraudulent voters canceling out the voting strength of legitimate voters. This has eroded Minnesotans' confidence in the state's electoral system. Free and fair elections, based on the principle of "one man, one vote" as codified in the 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, are essential to a free republic. Many Minnesotans are rightly concerned about voting procedures that do not adequately prevent fraud. Photo ID is frequently required in society

## SENATE

Pty	Dist	Name	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	12%	C%
D	6	Bakk, T.	N	N	N	Y		Y		N		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	A	N	N	N	Y	N	14	18
R	49	Benson, Michelle	Y	Y	Y	N		Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	84	80
D	43	Bonoff, T.	N	N	N	Y		Y		Y		Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	47	14
R	16	Brown, D.	Y	Y	Y	N		Y		A		N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	75	75
R	4	Carlson, J.	N	N	N	N		Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	68	74
R	53	Chamberlain, R.	Y	Y	Y	N		Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	84	86
D	64	Cohen, R.	N	A	N	Y		N		N		N	N	Y	N	N	A	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	7	6
R	21	Dahms, G.	Y	N	N	N		Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	68	75
R	38	Daley, T.	Y	Y	Y	N		Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	84	89
R	25	DeKruif, A.	Y	Y	Y	N		Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	89	89
D	60	Dibble, D.S.	Y	N	Y	Y		N		N		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	A	N	14	6
D	59	Dziedzic, K.	Y	N	N	Y		N		N		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	11	11
D	46	Eaton, C.	Y	N	N	Y		N		N		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	11	11
R	14	Fischbach, M.	N	N	N	N		Y		A		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	64	63
R	12	Gazelka, P.	Y	Y	N	N		Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	79	73
R	37	Gerlach, C.	Y	Y	A	N		Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	81	79
R	13	Gimse, J.	N	N	N	N		Y		Y		A	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	N	Y	Y	59	49
D	50	Goodwin, B.	N	N	N	Y		N		N		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	11	22
R	40	Hall, D.	Y	Y	Y	N		Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	84	81
R	42	Hann, D.	Y	Y	Y	N		Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	84	76
D	67	Harrington, J.	N	N	A	Y		N		N		N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	14	20
D	61	Hayden, J.	Y	N	N	Y		N		N		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	11	8
D	58	Higgins, L.	N	N	N	Y		N		N		N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	11	7
R	10	Hoffman, G.	Y	Y	Y	N		Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	89	92
R	28	Howe, J.	Y	Y	Y	N		Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	84	83
R	11	Ingebrigtsen, B.	N	N	N	N		Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	68	66
R	48	Jungbauer, M.	N	Y	Y	N		Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	79	66
D	63	Kelash, K.	N	N	N	Y		Y		N		N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	16	6
R	19	Koch, A.	N	Y	Y	N		Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	81	70
R	47	Kruse, B.	Y	Y	Y	N		Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	89	89
D	20	Kubly, G.	X	X	X	X		X		X		X	X	X	X	N	Y	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	50	18
D	9	Langseth, K.	N	N	N	A		Y		N		N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	A	Y	36	28
D	44	Latz, R.	N	N	N	Y		N		N		N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	16	8
R	56	Lillie, T.	Y	Y	Y	N		Y		Y		Y	Y	A	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	83	86
R	32	Limmer, W.	Y	Y	Y	N		Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	89	82
D	8	Lourey, T.	Y	N	N	Y		N		N		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	16	6
R	22	Magnus, D.	N	N	N	N		Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	68	62
D	54	Marty, J.	Y	N	N	Y		N		N		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	11	9
D	66	McGuire, M.	Y	N	N	Y		N		N		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	11	17
D	39	Metzen, J.	N	N	N	Y		Y		N		N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	32	21
R	41	Michel, G.	N	N	N	A		Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	A	Y	65	57
R	31	Miller, J.	N	N	N	Y		Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	74	78

NO SENATE VOTE

NO SENATE VOTE

NO SENATE VOTE

### KEY

**R** – Republican  
**D** – Democratic-Farmer-Labor  
**Y** Vote favored by LEA  
**N** Vote not favored by LEA  
**A** indicates legislator excused, absent, or not voting  
**X** – not a member at time of vote

**Governor's Action**  
**S** - Sign  
**V** - Veto  
**N** - Not Applicable

**52.65%** = % of legislator's votes favored by LEA in 2012 session

**C%** = legislator's career average LEA score

LEA calculates the voting percentages using votes actually cast by each legislator and then deducting half a vote for each time that legislator did not cast a vote.

**Honorees** for 2012 scored **90% or higher**, those receiving honorable mentions scored **at least 85%**.

This report may be copied, or purchased @ \$1.00 ea., 10 for \$5.00, or 100 for \$35. E&O excluded. Corrections made to website if errors are discovered.

\*Rep. Koenen (listed in House) sworn into Senate on 4/18/12

## SENATE

Pty	Dist	Name	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	12%	C%	
R	30	Nelson, C.	N	N	N	N		Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	68	75	
R	18	Newman, S.	Y	Y	Y	N		Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	84	69	
R	17	Nienow, S.	Y	Y	Y	N		Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	84	73	
R	33	Olson, G.	N	N	N	N		Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	N	Y	Y	64	70	
R	34	Ortman, J.	Y	Y	Y	N		Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	86	69	
D	65	Pappas, S.	A	N	N	Y		N		N		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	3	5
R	26	Parry, M.	Y	Y	Y	N		Y		Y		A	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	N	Y	Y	77	75	
R	15	Pederson, J.	N	N	N	N		Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	68	72	
D	7	Reinert, R.	N	N	N	Y		Y		N		A	N	A	N	Y	N	N	N	N	A	A	Y	A	15	9	
D	45	Rest, A.	N	N	N	Y		Y		N		N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	32	21	
R	35	Robling, C.	N	N	Y	N		Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	74	61
R	24	Rosen, J.	N	N	N	N		Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	N	A	A	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	54	48	
D	3	Saxhaug, T.	N	N	N	Y		Y		N		N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	32	17	
R	29	Senjem, D.	N	Y	N	N		Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	79	58	
D	23	Sheran, K.	N	N	N	Y		Y		N		N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	26	10	
D	57	Sieben, K.	N	N	N	Y		N		N		N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	16	11	
D	2	Skoe, R.	N	N	Y	Y		Y		Y		A	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	A	N	Y	N	36	19		
D	27	Sparks, D.	N	N	Y	Y		Y		N		N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	47	23	
D	1	Stumpf, L.	N	N	N	Y		Y		N		N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	37	27	
R	36	Thompson, D.	Y	Y	Y	N		Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	89	92	
D	5	Tomassoni, D.	N	N	N	Y		Y		N		N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	21	16	
D	62	Torres Ray, P.	Y	N	N	Y		N		N		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	11	5	
R	52	Vandever, R.	Y	Y	Y	N		Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	89	82	
D	55	Wiger, C.	N	N	N	Y		N		N		N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	26	16	
R	51	Wolf, P.	Y	Y	Y	N		Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	84	86	

## HOUSE

Pty	Dist	Name	1	2	2	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	12%	C%		
R	48B	Abeler, J.	N		N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	57	46		
D	61B	Allen, S.	Y		N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	A	Y	A	16	16	
R	19A	Anderson, B.	Y		Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	86	91		
R	38A	Anderson, D.	Y		N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	81	76		
R	13A	Anderson, P.	N		Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	76	61		
R	43A	Anderson, S.	Y		N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	76	69		
D	3A	Anzelc, T.	N		N	Y	N	Y	N	A	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	18	13	
D	39B	Atkins, J.	N		N	A	A	Y	A	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	10	10	
R	15B	Banaian, K.	Y		N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	A	Y	68	65	
R	17B	Barrett, B.	Y		Y	N	Y	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	78	74	
R	35A	Beard, M.	N		N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	A	73	65		
D	43B	Benson, J.	N		N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	14	4	
R	30B	Benson, Mike	Y		Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	81	81	
R	37B	Bills, K.	Y		Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	88	87	
D	23B	Brynaert, K.	N		N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	19	5
R	35B	Buesgens, M.	Y		Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	93	90	
D	45B	Carlson, L.	Y		N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	19	18	
D	58B	Champion, B.	N		N	Y	N	A	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	8	2	
D	61A	Clark, K.	Y		N	Y	A	A	A	Y	N	N	A	A	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	A	6	13	
R	24B	Cornish, T.	N		N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	67	57	
R	8B	Crawford, R.	Y		N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	76	76	
R	17A	Daudt, K.	Y		Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	86	83	
R	31B	Davids, G.	N		N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	57	68		
D	62A	Davnie, J.	Y		N	Y	N	N	N	Y	A	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	13	10	
R	52B	Dean, M.	Y		N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	76	78	

# HOUSE

Pty	Dist	Name	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	12%	C%	
R	52A	Dettmer, B.	Y		Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	81	79	
D	6A	Dill, D.	N		N	Y	N	A	N	A	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	16	25	
D	47A	Dittrich, D.	N		N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	A	N	Y	Y	38	25	
R	33B	Doepke, C.	N		Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	81	69	
R	41A	Downey, K.	Y		Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	90	71	
R	28B	Drazkowski, S.	Y		Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	90	89	
D	2A	Eken, K.	N		N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	38	32	
R	16A	Erickson, S.	Y		Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	95	76	
R	1A	Fabian, D.	N		Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	81	76	
D	20A	Falk, A.	Y		N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	24	15	
R	11B	Franson, M.	Y		Y	N	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	83	84
D	26B	Fritz, P.	N		N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	19	15
R	36B	Garofalo, P.	N		N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	76	63	
D	7B	Gauthier, K.	N		N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	A	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	13	7
R	15A	Gottwalt, S.	N		N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	N	Y	Y	69	62	
D	60A	Greene, M.	Y		N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	A	N	N	N	N	N	A	11	6	
D	54A	Greiling, M.	Y		N	A	A	N	A	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	4	14
R	25A	Gruenhagen, G.	Y		Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	76	83	
R	24A	Gunther, B.	N		N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	76	62
R	48A	Hackbarth, T.	Y		Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	86	75
R	22B	Hamilton, R.	N		Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	76	59
R	2B	Hancock, D.	Y		Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	86	81
D	39A	Hansen, R.	Y		N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	19	9
D	66B	Hausman, A.	Y		N	Y	A	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	A	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	11	7
D	46B	Hilstrom, D.	N		N	Y	N	A	N	Y	N	N	N	N	A	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	16	14	
D	8A	Hilty, B.	Y		N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	A	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	18	13
R	36A	Holberg, M.	Y		Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	81	87
R	34B	Hoppe, J.	N		Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	81	75
D	60B	Hornstein, F.	Y		N	Y	N	N	A	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	13	6
D	47B	Hortman, M.	N		N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	19	11	
D	14B	Hosch, L.	N		N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	29	26	
R	4B	Howes, L.	N		N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	62	54	
D	7A	Huntley, T.	A		N	A	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	16	16	
D	67B	Johnson, S.	N		N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	10	9
D	59B	Kahn, P.	Y		N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	A	N	13	9	
D	26A	Kath, K.	N		Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	62	34
R	28A	Kelly, T.	N		Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	A	A	Y	Y	N	Y	A	71	61	
R	56B	Kieffer, A.	Y		Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	83	79
R	1B	Kiel, D.	N		Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	76	71
R	16B	Kiffmeyer, M.	Y		Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	86	73
D	50B	Knuth, K.	N		N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	A	N	N	A	Y	N	16	3	
D	20B*	Koenen, L.	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	X	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	29	34	
R	57A	Kriesel, J.	N		N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	68	65
D	50A	Laine, C.	Y		N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	19	0
R	9A	Lanning, M.	N		N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	71	53
R	34A	Leidiger, E.	Y		Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	86	81
R	12B	LeMieur, M.	N		N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	71	73	
D	40B	Lenczewski, A.	Y		N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	33	35	
D	66A	Lesch, J.	N		N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	A	N	N	N	N	Y	13	12	
D	30A	Liebling, T.	Y		N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	24	11
D	55A	Lillie, L.	N		N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	14	10
D	59A	Loeffler, D.	Y		N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	14	4
R	56A	Lohmer, K.	Y		Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	90	88
R	42B	Loon, J.	Y		Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	81	65
R	37A	Mack, T.	Y		Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	85	66
D	67A	Mahoney, T.	N		N	Y	N	Y	N	A	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	13	16

NO HOUSE VOTE

# HOUSE

Pty	Dist	Name	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	12%	C%			
D	65B	Mariani, C.	N	NO HOUSE VOTE	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	A	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	8	6			
D	9B	Marquart, P.	N		N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	33	35		
R	41B	Mazorol, P.	Y		Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	81	76		
R	19B	McDonald, J.	Y		Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	N	A	Y	79	75	
R	3B	McElfatrick, C.	Y		Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	76	71	
R	53B	McFarlane, C.	N		N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	67	48	
R	57B	McNamara, D.	N		N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	71	50	
D	5B	Melin, C.	N		N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	24	23	
D	65A	Moran, R.	N		N	Y	N	A	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	13	14	
D	23A	Morrow, T.	N		N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	19	6	
D	58A	Mullery, J.	Y		N	Y	A	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	18	16	
R	10B	Murdock, M.	N		A	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	79	60
D	64A	Murphy, E.	Y		N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	14	4	
D	6B	Murphy, M.	N		N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	14	21
R	27A	Murray, R.	N		Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	81	71	
R	40A	Myhra, P.	Y		Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	81	76	
D	46A	Nelson, M.	N		N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	14	11	
R	10A	Nornes, B.	N		N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	71	61	
D	29B	Norton, K.	N		N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	29	12	
R	14A	O'Driscoll, T.	N		N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	A	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	69	70	
D	64B	Paymar, M.	Y		N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	14	11	
D	31A	Pelowski, G.	N		N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	38	33	
R	32A	Peppin, J.	Y		Y	N	A	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	85	84	
D	4A	Persell, J.	N		N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	24	10
R	49B	Petersen, B.	Y		N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	78	82		
D	45A	Peterson, S.	A		A	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	A	A	N	A	N	N	N	N	N	A	A	A	Y	A	20	8		
D	27B	Poppe, J.	N		N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	38	14		
R	29A	Quam, D.	Y		Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	90	86		
D	5A	Rukavina, T.	N		N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	A	N	N	N	Y	Y	23	16		
R	53A	Runbeck, L.	Y		Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	90	81		
R	51A	Sanders, T.	N		N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	73	68		
D	54B	Scalze, B.	Y		N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	29	14		
R	22A	Schomacker, J.	N		Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	76	73		
R	49A	Scott, P.	Y		Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	90	77		
R	18A	Shimanski, R.	N		Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	81	84	
D	44A	Simon, S.	N		N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	24	7	
D	55B	Slawik, N.	N		N	A	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	A	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	16	15		
D	63B	Slocum, L.	N		N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	19	5	
R	33A	Smith, S.	N		N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	A	A	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	48	70			
R	42A	Stensrud, K.	Y		N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	81	76		
R	21A	Swedzinski, C.	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	86	83			
D	63A	Thissen, P.	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	19	10		
D	51B	Tillberry, T.	N	N	A	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	A	N	N	N	Y	N	6	2			
R	21B	Torkelson, P.	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	76	67		
R	18B	Urdahl, D.	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	67	54		
R	13B	Vogel, B.	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	A	Y	Y	74	77		
D	62B	Wagenius, J.	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	19	11		
D	12A	Ward, J.	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	24	15		
R	38B	Wardlow, D.	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	90	85			
R	11A	Westrom, T.	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	81	65			
D	44B	Winkler, R.	N	N	Y	N	A	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	13	5		
R	25B	Woodard, K.	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	76	78		
R	32B	Zellers, K.	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	78	79		

Governor's Action	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
Dayton, Mark	S	N	N	V	N	S	N	V	N	V	V	V	S	V	V	V	V	N	V	S	S	V

for important transactions. Every college student has an ID, as do almost all recipients of government funds. Since the state would provide photo ID to eligible voters at no charge to them, this amendment would not burden those receiving IDs, other than to provide proof they are Minnesota residents. The opponents of photo ID have not been able to substantiate disenfranchisement or harmful discrimination in the identification process.

Unfortunately, the effectiveness of this proposed constitutional amendment is threatened by vagueness, inconsistency, and the absence of implementation standards. The most serious issue is that it does not ensure all voters are subject to the same identification requirements, as is stated in the ballot question. The proposed referendum question mentions nothing about approving a right to provisional ballots, but the bill expressly creates that right without providing a clear requirement for those ballots to only be counted with the same standard of integrity. The 2011 Voter ID bill SF509, which LEA supported, would have established certification criteria for provisional ballots and precluded vouching, but that was vetoed. In the absence of any legislation, and with no guarantee that any new legislation would or could be passed without being vetoed, courts would be empowered to determine verification standards apart from photo ID. If voters are to be asked to amend their state's constitution, the language must be commonly understood, and the ballot question should clearly convey the proposed change. Also, it would be better to establish legislative requirements to set uniform voter ID standards that include documentation of US citizenship and Minnesota residency, adaptable to technological changes without making more constitutional changes, rather than putting a specific method (photo ID) into the constitution.

LEA is thus left with a terrible dilemma on this effort to bring much-needed improvements to election integrity. LEA's credo highlights constitutionalism among our evaluatory principles, and our own members have indicated that voter ID should be a top legislative priority. Tragically, this proposed amendment is vague and inconsistent. Though the legislature will be constrained by the amendment's language, it was not written to sufficiently guarantee voter ID of all voters. Respect for the People's Constitution requires a higher standard for evaluating proposed changes to it. Therefore, LEA favored a NO vote on putting this version of a proposed constitutional amendment on the 2012 general election ballot. This evaluation ought not to be interpreted as advocating the amendment should be rejected by voters. LEA recognizes that effective steps must be taken to improve election integrity. The bill passed the Senate 35-29 and the House 72-57 to get on the ballot, despite the governor's unauthorized veto.

## **5. Prohibiting Free Associations of Political Parties from Penalizing Unendorsed Candidates.**

Winkler amendment to SF2296. Sen. Chamberlain [H] page 8278].

The Winkler amendment was an addition to SF2296, a bill to eliminate the date requirement on the back of absentee-ballot return envelopes. (A number of legislators tried to tack on other

election-law changes they wanted but could not get passed on their own merits, such as moving the primary from August to June.) The Winkler amendment, which survived to the final version of the bill, added prohibitions on political parties to existing language prohibiting people from inducing someone to become or refrain from becoming a candidate. Much of the language that has regulated or prohibited certain types of election behavior stems from the 1980s, including language stating that "a person may not directly or indirectly use . . . undue influence" or "temporal or spiritual injury against an individual to compel the individual to vote for or against a candidate or ballot question." With the addition of this amendment, a party unit may not impose or threaten to impose any penalty on any individual who does not have official party endorsement as a means to prevent that person from filing for office.

LEA objects to the Winkler amendment for a number of reasons, not the least of which is that prohibiting conduct with regard to elections is a different subject than the technical change of removing a date requirement on a return envelope. These subjects should not be lumped into one bill. It is also a conflict of interest for sitting legislators to regulate party behavior in ways that improve chances of their renomination, insulating themselves against negative consequences for failing to maintain support from a party organization. There also is no penalty specified for violation, meaning that resources will be used to determine if a party has violated a law that has no enforcement mechanism. Finally, whether one regards parties as valuable or a nuisance, they undeniably should have freedom to associate or not associate, and the Winkler amendment ignores this First Amendment protection. LEA favored a NO vote on the Winkler amendment, but it passed 74-53 and was included in the final bill the governor signed into law.

## **6. Expediting Environmental Permit Decisions.**

SF1567. Sen. Ingebrigtsen. [HF2095. Rep. Fabian.]

This bill requires government agencies to approve or deny environmental permits within 150 days. It corrects a deficiency in agency accountability that allowed permits to languish, for political or other reasons, after they were prepared in good faith by applicants. Though 150 days is a long delay for some permits, LEA supported a YES vote as a step in the right direction. It passed the Senate 50-16 and the House 92-36, and was signed by the governor.

## **7. Allow Use of Cultural Heritage Legacy Funds for Capitol Restoration.**

Buesgens amendment to SF2493. Sen. Ingebrigtsen [H] page 8282].

Over an eight-year span beginning in July 2014, the Buesgens amendment would have appropriated \$30 million annually from the arts and cultural heritage fund for restoration of the crumbling State Capitol Building to preserve Minnesota's history and cultural heritage.

This amendment, which would have preserved our Capitol yet avoided burdening future generations with bonding and debt-service costs, was another attempt to authorize the use of legacy funds for a widely-recognized need. The opposition to this amendment



demonstrates why putting a legacy sales tax into Minnesota's constitution and creating a bureaucratic network to allocate the funds were such bad ideas in the first place. Advocates for the legacy constitutional amendment sales tax increase in 2008 are now taking advantage of a clause in its language: "The dedicated money under this section must supplement traditional sources of funding . . . and not be used as a substitute." The legacy bureaucracy is interpreting this "traditional sources" clause to ensure that the only projects to receive legacy funds are "wish list" extras, which generally lack broad-based support. If any other source of funds can arguably be secured, the project is disqualified for legacy funds. The original claim that this dedicated tax was needed to ensure natural-resource and cultural-heritage preservation projects were not neglected during budget crises is now being fully discredited.

LEA favored a YES vote on this amendment, to allow the legislature to carry out its role in prioritizing public appropriations, but it failed 52-77 in the House.

### **8. Prohibiting the Enforcement of Unadopted Rules by the Commissioner of Education.**

SF2183. Sen. Thompson. [HF2596. Rep. Doepke.]

This bill requires the Commissioner of Education to include a transparent and truthful notice of unenforceability when a policy, guideline, bulletin, criterion, manual or standard that meets the definition of a rule is announced to school districts, but has not been formally adopted.

Lawmakers are elected to make law. They have over the years inappropriately given away that authority to various unelected government bodies under the constitutionally questionable guise of "rule making." This bill seeks to hold the Commissioner of Education to the rulemaking process with the reasonable expectation that if a bureaucracy is going to make a rule that has the force of law, it needs to do it legally—not simply by dictatorial decree. LEA favored a YES vote. The bill passed the Senate 37-27 and the House 128-1. The governor vetoed the bill.

### **9. Public School Employees Prohibited from Using Public Funds and Resources for Political Advocacy.**

HF329. Rep. Bills.

This bill would prohibit public school employees from using public funds and resources to support or defeat a political candidate, ballot question, or pending legislation.

Classrooms should be a place to engage students in thoughtful, educational discussions regarding pertinent public policy ideas so they become responsible citizens. It is, however, a serious conflict of interest for public schools to engage in political advocacy that could enrich their own position. Devoting public funds and/or institutional authority to indoctrinate students or other citizens with particular political viewpoints is reprehensible. Thomas Jefferson's famous warning about the tyranny of forcibly taking money from citizens for purposes of indoctrination very much applies here. Since tax-exempt corporations jeopardize their tax-exempt status when they engage in political advocacy,

there should certainly be prohibitions on public schools using funds and resources for political advocacy. People employed in government education must not use money taken from the public treasury for actions that could constitute a conflict of interest or sway the outcome of the political process. The LEA favored a YES vote. The bill passed the House with a 73-60 vote, but the Senate never scheduled a vote on it.

### **10. End Seniority-Only Decisions for Teacher Firing and Layoffs.**

HF1870. Rep. Petersen. [SF1690. Sen. Wolf.]

This bill allows local school districts to use the result of teacher evaluations in hiring and firing decisions. The currently strict seniority policy on employment decisions is eliminated, and replaced with a formula based primarily on teacher evaluations. The bill's weak point is that it does not define these newly-required evaluations, leaving enough ambiguity in the law to possibly circumvent its intent. It is, however, a step in the right direction. LEA favored a YES vote. The bill passed the Senate 35-28 and the House 70-61, but was vetoed by the governor.

### **11. Making Wage and Benefit Increases Contained in Public Employee Contracts Expire.**

HF1974. Rep. Draskowski. [SF2078. Sen. Parry.]

This bill would prevent the continuation of wage or benefit increases under bargained contract agreements after the contracts have expired. The bill exempts some police, fire, and corrections employees.

Presently, a loophole allows contracts to remain in effect after their expiration dates, making it difficult for the legislature to exercise its fiduciary responsibility. In practice, public-employee unions use this loophole to insulate themselves from market conditions. Public-employee unions with generous expired contracts have little incentive to negotiate for new contracts until the majority of those in the legislature are sympathetic to their demands. LEA favored a YES vote to put a damper on this practice. It passed in the Senate 37-30 and in the House 68-63, but was vetoed by the governor.

### **12. Require State Budgets to Include Federal Insolvency Contingency Planning.**

HF545. Rep. Downey. [SF1600. Sen. Daley.]

This bill would require state budget documents to include federal insolvency contingency planning. Minnesota agencies are to include the contingency plan for loss of all or some federal funds along with their budgets. The contingency plan is to address possible events that could endanger funds from federal agencies, methods for monitoring federal funding risks, the impact on services for lack of federal funds, and strategies to minimize the impact.

Many Minnesota government agencies have budgets that reflect expected federal funds. Reasons federal funds may not be forthcoming include: federal government shutdown for lack of

a budget, withheld funds for failure to meet federal criteria, federal and/or state agency mismanagement of federal funds, and federal agency insolvency in times of crisis. The federal government as a whole is approaching insolvency due to out-of-control borrowing and spending. If expected federal funds are not forthcoming to state agencies, their contractual expenditures become liabilities to the citizens of Minnesota.

Given the nature of systemic risk engendered by a centralized system of financing, the failure of a fund transfer to one agency is likely to coincide with a similar failure for other state agencies. As such, the risk can have a substantial bearing on Minnesota liabilities and the state's solvency. Fiduciaries in private banking, finance, and pensions cannot ignore risks to their primary funding sources. Neither should government, particularly when the funding is ultimately derived from one non-diversified, poorly-disciplined, centralized source. Considering the present and past financial straits of the United States Post Office and other agency programs with looming insolvency (such as Medicare, Social Security, etc.), this bill was a prudent response. LEA favored a YES vote. It passed the Senate 52-12 and the House 70-60, but was vetoed by the governor.

### **13. Economic Development Commissioner Authorized to Make and Forgive Redevelopment Demolition Loans, etc.**

HF1721. Rep. Gunther. [SF1441. Sen. Rosen.]

This bill establishes the procedures and criteria for the commissioner of the Department of Employment and Economic Development (DEED) to make loans at a two percent rate to other governmental units for the purpose of "redevelopment," "demolition," land acquisition and other costs. The commissioner is granted broad authority to determine what projects are worthy, and the power to simply forgive up to 50% of the loans. Two unrelated provisions are also included. There is a "small business advocate office" established within DEED to provide help to small businesses for acquiring licenses and permits and for resolving conflicts with other state agencies. This office does not replace but is in addition to two other programs that have been established in recent years for the same purpose. There is also a grant of authority to the city of Albert Lea to establish an industrial sewer rate rebate program for new or expanding businesses.

The broad authority given the politically-appointed commissioner to grant and forgive loans invites waste and/or abuse from those seeking to garner political loyalty for delivering redevelopment. The legislation even goes so far as to generally prohibit judicial review of the decisions of the commissioner, handing enormous discretion to an appointed position.

The intent of this bill is to give discretion to the Commissioner of Economic Development to provide low-interest loans to other governmental units in support of "worthwhile" redevelopment projects in blighted areas. Unfortunately, it establishes a slush fund and incentives for governmental units to acquire more property to make more areas eligible for the low-interest loans, and displaces traditional bankers with bureaucratic lenders. The

"small business advocate office" is an admission that the burden of regulations and licensing requirements has become a major issue for small business. The proper solution to the problem is to reduce the burden, not to set up yet another government entity that purports to help carry the burden. LEA favored a NO vote. The legislation passed the Senate 65-0, the House 111-17, and was signed by the governor.

### **14. Reducing the Limitation Period for Bringing Certain Civil Actions.**

SF373. Sen. Ortman. [HF654. Rep. Wardlow.]

This bill changes the statute-of-limitations period for bringing most civil suits to four years, down from six years. Minnesota's current period of six years is the longest in the country, creating an extra risk factor for businesses operating in this state. The greater time exposure that businesses have, the greater amount of funds they have to set aside for possible claims.

Minnesotans, when aggrieved, should be responsible to file their claims in a timely fashion. LEA believes that having four years in which to bring most claims is sufficient, but more extraordinary claims may require longer periods. This bill agrees with that sentiment, and LEA favored a YES vote on its passage. It passed the Senate 46-20, and the House 71-56, but was vetoed by the governor.

### **15. Eliminating Ten-Percent Interest Standard on Awards from Most Civil Verdicts.**

SF530. Sen. Ortman. [HF770. Rep. Mazorol.]

This bill amends the law providing for an award of interest owed to or by the state (or one of its political subdivisions) on verdicts, awards, and judgments to eliminate the separate interest rate of ten percent for a judgment or award over \$50,000. In addition to other conforming changes in the law, it states that its provisions would not apply to a judgment or award upon which interest is entitled to be recovered under the law governing breach of an insurance policy. The bill made no changes to current statutes regarding damages (non-compensatory punitive damages, future damages, workers' comp cases, etc.) for which interest is generally not allowed.

Changing from a ten-percent requirement to a market-driven rate with a floor of four percent is a step in the right direction toward reducing unnecessary costs related to the civil court system. LEA favored a YES vote. It passed the Senate 44-21 and the House 75-55, but was vetoed by the governor.

### **16. Requiring the Government to Verify New-Hire Eligibility with the Federal E-Verify Program.**

HF1976. Rep. Leidiger. [SF1842. Sen. DeKruif.]

This bill requires that appointing authorities in the legislative, executive, and judicial branches must verify the employment eligibility of all newly hired employees using the federal E-Verify program and conduct periodic reviews to ensure the same

compliance as employers in the private sector. Ensuring that those hired by the government are actually citizens and eligible to work for the government is a common-sense idea. LEA favored a YES vote. It passed the Senate 39-27 and the House 78-51. The Governor vetoed the bill.

### 17. Licensure of Certain Facilities that Perform Abortions.

SF1921. Sen. Robling. [HF2340. Rep. Holberg.]

This bill would have required the licensure of health care facilities performing ten or more abortions per month. It set a license fee for facilities and a process for collection and deposit of license fees, and it also required the Commissioner of Health to perform facility inspections and investigations. The bill provided for the suspension, revocation and refusal to renew a license under certain conditions.

While the ultimate goal must be to uphold the foundational principle of protecting the right to life and see *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Gomez* overturned, measures such as this, which should reduce dangers to the mothers, are welcome additions for the guarantee of civil rights. Those public officials who support abortion as they profess a desire to make abortion “safe” and rare demonstrate by their opposition to such measures that they are not at all interested in deterring the irresponsible practice of abortion. This bill would have held abortion clinics to health standards required of other medical facilities. LEA favored a YES vote. The bill passed 43-23 in the Senate, 80-47 in the House, and was vetoed by the governor.

### 18. Nurse Licensure Compact.

SF230. Sen. Gerlach. [HF462. Rep. Norton.]

This bill would allow Minnesota to recognize the licenses of several types of Nurses (Registered, Licensed Practical, Vocational) from other states that choose to participate in the compact and whose license standards are equivalent to ours. It would also allow Minnesota licensees to provide care to patients in other compact states under the laws governing practice in the state where the care is provided. (There are currently 24 such states, including all states that border Minnesota.) This bill contains significant protections, recourse, oversight and a provision to allow the Governor to withdraw at any time should a state lower its standards below ours.

This bill would enable qualified and licensed nurses to serve across borders without excessive red tape. Congress has recommended this type of action in telecommunications and health-care bills as one step that could be taken to reduce health-care costs. The LEA favored a YES vote on this pro-market bill. It passed the Senate 38-29 and was amended by the House before it passed 75-56. The bill did not make it to the governor’s desk because no floor votes were taken in either body on adoption of the conference committee report, which reduced the bill to mandating a Nurse Licensure Compact study with an option to join the compact by executive order.

### 19. Personal Health Premium Accounts.

HF8. Rep. Gottwalt. [SF32. Sen. Hann.]

This bill would allow the creation of health premium accounts from multiple sources (such as employers, past employers, and family members) for payment of health insurance premiums. It would be administered by qualified insurance providers and financial institutions. More flexibility and choice in health care would be added, and personal responsibility would be encouraged by allowing individuals—not just their employers—to pay for health insurance with tax-exempt funds. LEA favored a YES vote on this proposal because it would encourage and enable more individuals to supervise their own health choices and reduce the burden of health care on the state. The bill passed the Senate 34-28 and the House 69-60. It was vetoed by the governor.

### 20. Dental Laboratory Regulation.

SF288. Sen. Howe. [HF614. Rep. Kelly.]

This bill forces dental laboratories to pay a fee to register with the state. It includes a requirement that dental labs inform doctors of the content of any materials used in prostheses. It also requires dentists to use only registered labs within the state of MN, but not when working with out-of-state laboratories; this is likely to drive business to out-of-state or overseas labs. Requiring registration from MN labs also opens the door for further regulation from the state. The registration will enable the state to collect monies, though no service is provided to the dentist or lab by the state. LEA favored a NO vote on the bill that passed the Senate 57-8 and the House 120-9, and was signed into law.

**Become a Member of LEA**

**Join LEA! Dues are only \$10/yr! You will receive:**

- a copy of our annual report
- an invitation to attend the annual awards banquet
- an invitation to our annual membership meeting
- and the ability to give input on what issues to score.

Dues are used to print and mail the annual report and cover the costs of our annual dinner.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Street: \_\_\_\_\_

City: \_\_\_\_\_ State: \_\_\_\_\_ Zip: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone: \_\_\_\_\_ Email: \_\_\_\_\_

**Pay online or make checks payable to LEA and mail to:**  
Legislative Evaluation Assembly  
P.O. Box 25803, Woodbury, MN 55125

## 21. County Attorneys and Assistant County Attorneys Authorized to Carry Arms While on Duty.

HF1829. Rep. Cornish. [SF 1648. Sen. Ingebrigtsen.]

This bill creates an exemption to the statutes that prohibit any state or local government employees or agents (other than licensed peace officers) from carrying a firearm when on duty. However, courts would still retain the authority to ban or regulate firearms in court-controlled spaces. Absent such a ban, county attorneys with a valid permit to carry would also be allowed to do so when they are working. Assistant county attorneys would also be permitted to carry on duty if their supervising county attorney approves.

This legislation stemmed from an incident where a county attorney was shot in Northern Minnesota. Unlike most legislation that springs from tragedy, it doesn't propose to make us safer with more laws against law-abiding citizens. Besides giving prosecutors the ability to better defend themselves against threats to their personal safety, the bill represents a bipartisan acknowledgement that a greater public good may be served by allowing some law-abiding citizens beyond licensed peace officers to be armed. Though a greater good could be served by broadening the scope of who is allowed to carry on duty, LEA favored a YES vote on the bill as a step in the right direction. It passed the Senate 53-10 and the House 116-15, and the governor signed it into law.

## 22. Authorizing the Sale and Personal Use of Aerial and Audible Fireworks.

SF1694. Sen. Jungbauer. [HF 1774. Rep. Kriesel.]

This bill would have allowed adults to purchase and use many types of aerial and audible fireworks in Minnesota, between June 1 and July 7 of every year. It would have prevented localities from banning aerial and audible fireworks or imposing fees on the sale of sparkling devices and novelties, but allowed fees to be charged to retailers related to inspections.

The complete banning of fireworks has never been workable, nor has the more recent step which only allowed stationary devices that gave off sparks. LEA favored a YES vote on this bill as a step toward enhancing freedom by reducing the problem of widespread disrespect for an unenforceable and unpopular law, essentially restoring law-abiding status to otherwise responsible citizens who have been traveling to neighboring states to purchase their fireworks. The bill passed the Senate 48-17 and the House 77-50. The Governor vetoed the bill. The Senate failed to re-pass the bill because it did not get the two-thirds necessary to override. LEA is scoring the Senate vote to reconsider the veto that failed 37-29.

2012 LEGISLATIVE REPORT

Phone: (651) 398-9316  
Woodbury, MN 55125  
P.O. Box 25803

Legislative Evaluation Assembly of Minnesota

This report may be copied or purchased.

