

2011 VOTING RECORD

www.labi.org



HOUSE VOTES

LAWSUIT ABUSE

HB 389, Connick – Would have imposed a medical monitoring regime with no regulations, limitations or oversight on how this monitoring was to take place. Basically, unlimited medical monitoring would have been made available to those who feared exposure to certain allegedly harmful substances.

As introduced, the bill would have rendered null and void any agreement entered into on or after April 20, 2010, that did not provide for future medical monitoring for those allegedly involved in the Gulf oil spill. Also of major interest was that the prescriptive period for future medical claims was unlimited. Although the bill was gutted in the committee of origin, Rep. Connick attempted to amend the bill on final passage to restore the medical monitoring provisions.

How the House Voted

A vote AGAINST final passage was a vote WITH LABI. The bill failed 15-79-11.

CHARTER SCHOOLS

HB 421, Carter – Allows businesses to partner with local communities to start a charter school by providing for an enrollment preference of up to 50% for their employees' children in exchange for donations that could include land, a building, major renovations to a building, or technology.

HB 421 has the potential to become a major economic development tool as well as to provide additional quality educational opportunities for children in underserved areas of the state. The lack of availability of quality public schools is often cited as a major detriment to drawing in new business or expanding businesses already in the state. HB 421 allows businesses to become larger stakeholders in public education, and everyone benefits: the business, their employees' children; and other children who live in the district who may be able to benefit from an educational option that otherwise may not have been there.

How the House Voted

A vote FOR final passage was a vote WITH LABI. The bill passed 72-23-10.

RETIREMENT

HB 530, Pearson – Would have changed the Final Average Compensation used to determine retirement benefits for state and higher education employees from a three-year to a five-year average. The estimated savings of over \$50 million would have helped pay down the ballooning unfunded accrued liability (UAL) of over \$17 billion.

This bill was filed with a provision increasing public employee contributions by two percent on certain public employees. In House Retirement Committee, the author removed the employee contribution portion of the bill and advanced it to the House floor. The bill passed the House floor, but ran into trouble in Senate Retirement Committee where it was ultimately killed.

How the House Voted

A vote FOR final passage was a vote WITH LABI. The bill passed 77-20-8.

SCHOOL CHOICE

HB 621, Talbot – This bill would have given businesses and individuals a dollar-for-dollar tax credit for donations made to an organization that would provide scholarships for children to attending participating nonpublic schools.

Tax credits are becoming increasingly popular around the nation as a viable way to increase parental choice. LABI supports increased choice and educational options, and tax credits present an innovative way to provide additional educational opportunities.

The first vote on HB 621 failed to pass the bill by only one vote but, upon consideration, proponents were not able to pick up the required extra votes to send it to the Senate.

How the House Voted

A vote FOR final passage was a vote WITH LABI. On the first vote, the bill failed 52-44-9. Upon reconsideration, the bill failed 50-41-14.

PROJECT LABOR AGREEMENTS

PUBLIC BID LAW

SB 76, Martiny – Prohibits governmental entities in Louisiana from mandating that private contractors adopt pro-union project labor agreements (PLAs) before they are allowed to perform public works.

PLAs effectively exclude non-union private contractors from working on public projects. The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics' data indicates that only 3 percent of Louisiana's private construction workforce is union. Thus, 97 percent of construction workers who would otherwise work on public construction projects would not be able to do so. This discrimination hurts small companies that are almost never union, but is especially hard on women- and minorityowned construction businesses with workers that are traditionally underrepresented in unions. Also, by limiting potential bidders through PLAs, the expense of a public project tends to go up, costing taxpayers more or reducing the amount of construction their tax dollars will buy.

How the House Voted

A vote FOR the bill was a vote WITH LABI. The bill passed 96-4-5.


SB 196, Marionneaux – At a cost to taxpayers, this bill would have created a 10% preference in public bidding for steel pipe manufactured in Louisiana.

LABI has historically opposed preferences, except legislation that imposes a reciprocal preference against companies headquartered in states that impose preferences that inhibit Louisiana companies from competing for public bids. Preferences tend to drive up the costs of public contracts, limit competition, and increase the burden on taxpayers.

Rep. Sam Jones amended the bill on the House floor allowing a Louisiana bidder who falls within 10% of the lowest responsible bid to have the option of matching the lowest bid price. The amendment went on without objection and LABI dropped its opposition to the bill. The amendment was stripped from the bill in conference committee, and LABI opposed the bill without the amendment when the bill returned from conference committee.

How the House Voted

A vote FOR rejecting the conference committee report was a vote WITH LABI. The motion passed 78-16-11.





SENATE VOTES

PROJECT LABOR AGREEMENTS

SB 76, Martiny – Prohibits governmental entities in Louisiana from mandating that private contractors adopt pro-union project labor agreements (PLAs) before they are allowed to perform public works.

PLAs effectively exclude non-union private contractors from working on public projects. The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics' data indicates that only 3 percent of Louisiana's private construction workforce is union. Thus, 97 percent of construction workers who would otherwise work on public construction projects would not be able to do so. This discrimination hurts small companies that are almost never union, but is especially hard on women- and minorityowned construction businesses with workers that are traditionally underrepresented in unions. Also, by limiting potential bidders through PLAs, the expense of a public project tends to go up, costing taxpayers more or reducing the amount of construction their tax dollars will buy.

How the Senate Voted

A vote FOR the bill was a vote WITH LABI. The bill passed 27-4-8.

LIMIT LOCAL TAX ELECTIONS

SB 108, Riser – Would have required that bond or tax elections be held only on the same date as a regularly scheduled primary or general election for statewide or congressional offices.

LABI encourages increased voter participation in all elections. By reducing the number of elections and holding elections on routine dates, our government can create a cost-effective way to increase voter turnout, promote civic engagement in the community and bolster the legitimacy of tax and bond elections.

How the Senate Voted

A vote FOR final passage was a vote WITH LABI. The bill passed 23-12-4.

PUBLIC BID LAW

SB 196, Marionneaux – At a cost to taxpayers, this bill would have created a 10% preference in public bidding for steel pipe manufactured in Louisiana.

LABI has historically opposed preferences, except legislation that imposes a reciprocal preference against companies headquartered in states that impose preferences that inhibit Louisiana companies from competing for public bids. Preferences tend to drive up the costs of public contracts, limit competition, and increase the burden on taxpayers.

Rep. Sam Jones amended the bill on the House floor allowing a Louisiana bidder who falls within 10% of the lowest responsible bid to have the option of matching the lowest bid price. The amendment went on without objection and LABI dropped its opposition to the bill. The amendment was stripped from the bill in conference committee, and LABI opposed the bill without the amendment when the bill returned from conference committee.

The first Senate vote was to adopt the conference committee report. After that motion failed, the adoption of the conference report was reconsidered and that motion passed. However, the House rejected the conference report, which killed the bill.

How the Senate Voted

A vote AGAINST the adoption of the conference committee report was a vote WITH LABI. The motion failed 15-18-6. Upon reconsideration, the motion to adopt the conference report passed 22-15-2.

BUSINESS TAX INCREASE

Marionneaux Senate Floor Amendment to HB 282, Ellington – This proposed amendment would have substantially increased business taxes by phasingout several business exemptions, exclusions, rebates, and other tax benefits over a period of several years. Among the items proposed for elimination were the manufacturing sales tax exclusion for machinery and equipment and the sales tax exemption for business utilities.

This amendment was purportedly offered to partially off-set the future reduction in state revenues arising from the passage of SB 259, which would have eliminated the individual income tax over several years. There was no legal requirement for these new tax revenues to be used for this purpose – these new taxes likely would have been levied and collected whether or not SB 259 had passed. At the time this amendment was considered on the Senate floor, the corporate income tax was no longer included for phase-out under SB 259 by virtue of a House committee amendment.

Following debate on this amendment, Sen. Martiny made the motion to lay the amendment on the table. The motion to lay the amendment on the table was adopted. Following adoption of the motion, a vote of two-thirds of the Senate (26 senators) would have been required for the Senate to consider the amendment once again. This motion effectively ended the consideration of this amendment on HB 282.

How the Senate Voted

A vote FOR the motion was a vote WITH LABI. The motion was adopted 22-14-3.

CHARTER SCHOOLS

HB 421, Carter – Allows businesses to partner with local communities to start a charter school by providing for an enrollment preference of up to 50% for their employees' children in exchange for donations that could include land, a building, major renovations to a building, or technology.

HB 421 has the potential to become a major economic development tool as well as to provide additional quality educational opportunities for children in underserved areas of the state. The lack of availability of quality public schools is often cited as a major detriment to drawing in new business or expanding businesses already in the state. HB 421 allows businesses to become larger stakeholders in public education, and everyone benefits: the business, their employees' children; and other children who live in the district who may be able to benefit from an educational option that otherwise may not have been there.

The first Senate vote was snagged by a tie, but the following day, after a heavy lobbying effort, the vote was reconsidered and enough senators changed their votes to enable the bill to pass.

How the Senate Voted

A vote FOR final passage was a vote WITH LABI. The bill failed due to a tie vote, 18-18-3. Upon reconsideration, the bill passed 22-16-1.





we really take care of business.

Whether you need traditional banking services, a loan, line of credit, or innovative services like online deposits, you can count on us to be there, there and there for you. Discover the benefits of banking with the credit union for business. Contact us at business@campusfederal.org.



225.769.8841 | campusfederal.org BUSINESS LOANS
BUSINESS eDEPOSIT SMARTCARE
& MORE

NCUA Membership eligibility requirements apply. Eligible for membership if you live, work or worship in Baton Rouge, Shreveport or New Orleans.

Voting Record Criteria

There are certain rules that apply consistently to LABI voting records and to LABI's use of those records:

- ✓ Only KEY business votes are included in the record. Only bills on which LABI has taken a clear, broad-based position are considered.
- ✓ A vote may be on an amendment or procedural motion, as well as on final passage, if that vote was crucial to the fate of the bill.
- Because of factors such as committee action or amendments, the inclusion of a vote on a bill in one house doesn't necessarily mean that it will be a record vote in the second house.
- ✓ Votes are weighted according to their importance to the business community. See voting record chart for specific point values.
- ✓ Each term stands alone. Every legislator has an equal opportunity for a good four-year record, despite historical voting patterns.
- ✓ The annual and cumulative voting averages are based upon the number of points actually earned, compared to the number of points that could have been earned over the period.
- ✓ Legislators are not penalized in LABI voting records for absences due to hospitalization or immediate family illness or death, nor for abstentions due to conflicts of interest.
- ✓ The voting record is based on votes as recorded in the Official Journals of the House and Senate.

A Solution of the first of the										
Η	வ்		ï			ments	ject		gu	H
Ō	torin	ols.	eform	redit.	redit.	gree	v. Re	e	Voti	$\overline{0}$
U	Moni	schoo	nt Re	ax Cı	ax Cı	or A	l Lav rt	entag	ative	U
U	ical I e	rter S e	reme e	ion T e	ion T tion	t Lal e	ic Bid Repo	Perce	Inmu	U
S	Med assag	Chai	Reti	Tuiti assag	Tuitidera	rojec assag	Publi ance]	ting	11 C age	S
U S E	3 389 al Pa	8 421 1al Pa	8 530 al Pa	8 621 nal Pa	s 621 consi	76 P aal Pâ	196 nfere	11 Vo)8-20 rcent	
	HIB	HH	HIB	HH	HBRe	E:B	83	201	20(Pei	
Adramson Anders	a° 1	1 1	$\overline{\overset{2}{0}}$	a- 0	4 a-	$ \frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{2} 0 $	U	75 75	81 64	Abramson Anders
Armes Arnold	1 aº	a- 1	$\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$ $\frac{1}{2}$	a^{o}		$\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$	$ \frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}} 0 $	67 83	51 67	Armes Arnold
Aubert	1	1	$\frac{\frac{2}{1}}{2}$	$ \frac{\frac{1}{4}}{\frac{1}{4}} \frac{1}{4} 0 $	$ \begin{array}{c} \frac{1}{4} \\ \frac{1}{4} \\ \frac{1}{4} \\ 0 \end{array} $	$\frac{\frac{2}{1}}{2}$	$\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$	100	84	Aubert
Badon, Austin Badon, Bobby	1 1	1 1	0 a-	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	0 1	$\frac{1}{2}$	75 63	77 63	Badon, Austin Badon, Bobby
Baldone	0	0		0	a-	$\begin{array}{c} \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} \end{array}$	0	25	60	Baldone
Barras	1	1	$\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$ 0	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$	100	86	Barras
Barrow Billiot	1 0	0 1	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	0 0	<u>2</u> a-	$\frac{1}{2}$	50 56	51 68	Barrow Billiot
Bishop	1	0	0	0	a-	$\frac{1}{2}$	a-	38	38	Bishop
Brossett Burford	1 1	0 1	0 1	0 1	0 1	0 1	$ \frac{1}{2} $	38 100	29 83	Brossett Burford
Burns, Henry	1	1	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\begin{array}{c} \frac{1}{4} \\ \frac{1}{4} \\ \frac{1}{4} \\ \frac{1}{4} \end{array}$	4 1 4	$\begin{array}{c} \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} \end{array}$	$\frac{\overline{2}}{1}$	100	88 88	Burns, Henry
Burns, Tim	1	1	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	100	83	Burns, Tim
Burrell Carmody	a⁰ 1	0 1	$\frac{1}{2}$ 1	$ \frac{1}{4} $	0 1	0 1	$\frac{1}{2}$	33 88	39 88	Burrell Carmody
Carter	1	1	$\frac{2}{1}{2}$	4 a-	$\frac{4}{\frac{1}{4}}$	$\frac{2}{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	94	85	Carter
Champagne	1	1	12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	$ \frac{\frac{1}{4}}{\frac{1}{4}} $	$\frac{\frac{1}{4}}{\frac{1}{4}} \frac{1}{\frac{1}{4}} \frac{1}{1$	$\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}$	$\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$ $\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$ $\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$	100	78	Champagne
Chandler Chaney	1 1	1 1	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$	88 100	70 91	Chandler Chaney
Connick	0	1	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	75	69	Connick
Cortez	1 0	1 1	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	1 4 a ⁰	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	100 67	86 75	Cortez Cromer
Cromer Danahay	1	1	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	100	75 79	Danahay
Dixon	a°	0	$\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$	0	0	$\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	50	48	Dixon
Doerge Dove	1 aº	0 1	$\frac{1}{2}$ 1	0 $\frac{1}{4}$	0	$\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$	$\frac{\overline{1}}{2}$	63 75	58 55	Doerge Dove
Dove Downs	a° 1	1	$\frac{\overline{2}}{1}$	0	а- а-	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	75 88	55 86	Dove Downs
Edwards	0	0	$\frac{\frac{2}{1}}{2}$	0	0	0	a-	13	45	Edwards
Ellington	1	1	$\frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	100	70	Ellington
Fannin Foil	1 1	0 1	$\frac{1}{2}$	0 $\frac{1}{4}$	0 $\frac{1}{4}$	$ \begin{array}{r} \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} \end{array} $	$\frac{1}{2}$ 0	63 88	65 85	Fannin Foil
Franklin	1	a-	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	0	$\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	63	59	Franklin
Gallot	1 1	0	0	0	0	$\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$	a-	38	41	Gallot
Geymann Gisclair	0	1 a-	$\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$	$\frac{1}{4}$ 0	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	0 a-	88 25	75 62	Geymann Gisclair
Greene	1	1	$\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$	$\frac{1}{4}$ $\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$	0	88	75	Greene
Guillory Cuinn	1 1	1 1		$\frac{1}{4}$ $\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	94 75	71	Guillory Cuinn
Guinn Hardy	1 0	1	0 $\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$	$ \frac{1}{2} $	75 63	68 70	Guinn Hardy
Harrison	1	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	a-	a-	0	38	55	Harrison
Hazel Henderson	1 0	1 1	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{4}$ 0	$\frac{\frac{1}{4}}{\frac{1}{4}}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	100 56	81 56	Hazel Henderson
Henderson Henry	0 1	1	$\frac{a}{\frac{1}{2}}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{\overline{4}}{1}$	$\frac{\overline{2}}{1}$	$\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$	50 100	50 82	Henderson Henry
Hensgens	1	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	63	63	Hensgens
Hill Hines	1 1	0 1	$\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$	0 $\frac{1}{4}$	0 $\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$	63 100	52 84	Hill Hines
Hines Hoffmann	1	1	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	100 88	84 85	Hines Hoffmann
Honoré	1	a-	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	0	1/2	$\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$	63	63	Honoré
Howard Hutter	1 0	1 1	$\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$	a- 0	0 1	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{\frac{1}{1}}{\frac{1}{2}}$	88 69	78 63	Howard Hutter
Hutter Huval	0 1	1	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{4}$ 0	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$	69 94	63 94	Hutter Huval

a- Was absent when LABI needed a "yes" vote, or the motion required only a majority or supermajority of those present and voting.

a^o Was absent when LABI needed a "no" vote and the motion required a majority or supermajority of the elected members.

2011	Regular	Legislative	Session
		its	

H O	HB 389 Medical Monitoring. Final Passage	hools.	HB 530 Retirement Reform. Final Passage	HB 621 Tuition Tax Credit. Final Passage	HB 621 Tuition Tax Credit. Reconsideration	SB 76 Project Labor Agreement Final Passage	SB 196 Public Bid Law. Reject Conference Report	tage	2008-2011 Cumulative Voting Percentage	H O
U	ical M	ter Sc e	:ement	on Tax e	on Tax tion	t Labo e	c Bid] Report	Percen	1mulat	U
	HB 389 Medic Final Passage	HB 421 Charter Schools. Final Passage	0 Retin Passag	HB 621 Tuitio Final Passage	HB 621 Tuition TReconsideration	SB 76 Project Final Passage	SB 196 Public Bid I Conference Report	2011 Voting Percentage	2011 Cu ntage	S
S E	HB 38 Final]	HB 42 Final]	HB 53 Final	HB 62 Final]	HB 62 Recon	SB 76 Final	SB 19 Confe	2011 V	2008-2 Percei	E
Jackson, Girod Jackson, Michael	0 1	0 0	a- 0	0 0	0 0	12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 1	1 2 a-	25 38	38 60	Jackson, Girod Jackson, Michael
Johnson	0	1	Ő	Ő	Ő	$\frac{\frac{2}{1}}{\frac{2}{2}}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	50	43	Johnson
Jones, Rosalind	1	0	0	0	a-	$\frac{1}{2}$	a-	38	38	Jones, Rosalind
Jones, Sam	1	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	a-	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	63	72	Jones, Sam
Katz	1	1	$\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$ $\frac{1}{2}$	$ \frac{\frac{1}{4}}{\frac{1}{4}} \frac{1}{4} 0 $	$ \begin{array}{c} \frac{1}{4} \\ \frac{1}{4} \\ \frac{1}{4} \\ \frac{1}{4} \\ 0 \end{array} $	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac$	100	95	Katz
Kleckley LaBruzzo	1 1	1 1	$\frac{1}{2}$	4 1	4 1	2	U <u>1</u>	88 100	74 85	Kleckley LaBruzzo
LaFonta	a°	a-	2 a-	4 0	4 0	$\frac{2}{1}$	$\frac{2}{1}$	33	44	LaFonta
Lambert	1	1	a-	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{\frac{2}{1}}{\frac{1}{2}}$	$\frac{\frac{2}{1}}{\frac{1}{2}}$	88	70	Lambert
Landry	1	1	$\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$	a-	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	94	85	Landry
LeBas	1	a-	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	0	1 2 1	1/2	69	52	LeBas
Leger	1 1	1 1	0 1	0 1	0 1	$\frac{1}{2}$ 1	$\frac{1}{2}$ 1	75 100	61 89	Leger
Ligi Little	1	1	$\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2}$	$ \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 4 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 4 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ $	$\frac{\frac{1}{4}}{\frac{1}{4}}$	2	2	100	89 79	Ligi Little
Lopinto	a°	1	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{4}{1}$	$\frac{4}{\frac{1}{4}}$	2 a-	$\frac{1}{2}$	83	75	Lopinto
Lorusso	1	1	$\frac{1}{2}$	1/4	$\frac{1}{4}$		$\frac{1}{2}$	100	85	Lorusso
McVea	1	1	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	a-	$\frac{1}{2}$		94	88	McVea
Monica	1	1	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	a-	$\frac{1}{2}$	a-	81	73	Monica
Montoucet Moreno	aº aº	a- 1	0 1	0 1	0 1	$\frac{1}{2}$ 1	$\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$	33 100	58 100	Montoucet Moreno
Morris	a 1	1	$\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$ $\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$	$\frac{1}{4}$ $\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{\frac{1}{4}}{\frac{1}{4}}$	1211212121212121212121212121212121212121	² 0	88	86	Morris
Norton	1	0	$\frac{2}{\frac{1}{2}}$	4 0	4 0	$\frac{2}{\frac{1}{2}}$	a-	50	48	Norton
Nowlin	1	1	0	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{\frac{2}{1}}{2}$		88	91	Nowlin
Pearson	1	1	$\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$ $\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$	0	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$ $\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$ $\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$	88	77	Pearson
Ponti	1	1	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{4}$ 0	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	100	86	Ponti
Pope	1	0 1	$\frac{1}{2}$	0 1	0	$\frac{1}{2}$ 1	1 2 1	63 91	80 80	Pope
Pugh Richard	1 aº	1	1	$\frac{\frac{1}{4}}{\frac{1}{4}}$	a-	2	2	81 100	80 82	Pugh Richard
Richardson	a 1	1	$\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$	$\frac{4}{1}$	$\frac{\frac{1}{4}}{\frac{1}{4}}$	$\frac{2}{\frac{1}{2}}$	$\frac{2}{\frac{1}{2}}$	100	93	Richardson
Ritchie	1	1	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	a-	75	59	Ritchie
Robideaux	1	1	a-	$\frac{\frac{1}{4}}{\frac{1}{4}}$	$\frac{\frac{1}{4}}{\frac{1}{4}}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$	88	86	Robideaux
Roy	0	1	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	75	49	Roy
Schroder	1	1 1	$\frac{1}{2}$ 1	0 $\frac{1}{4}$	0 1	$\frac{1}{2}$ 1	$\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$	88 100	87 100	Schroder
Seabaugh Simon	1 1	0	2	4 a-	$\frac{\frac{1}{4}}{\frac{1}{4}}$	2	$\frac{1}{2}$	100 69	100 74	Seabaugh Simon
Smiley	1	1	$ \begin{array}{c} \underline{1}\\ \underline{2}\\ \underline{1}\\\underline{2}\\ \underline{1}\\ \underline{2}\\ \underline{1}\\\underline{2}\\ \underline{1}\\\underline{2}\\ \underline{1}\\\underline{2}\\ \underline{1}\\\underline{2}\\ \underline{1}\\\underline{2}\\\underline{2}\\\underline{2}\\\underline{2}\\\underline{2}\\\underline{2}\\\underline{2}\\2$	$\frac{1}{4}$	4 0	12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 1	$\frac{\frac{2}{1}}{\frac{2}{2}}$	94	92	Smiley
Smith, Gary	1	1	$\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$	a-	0	$\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$	Ő	75	46	Smith, Gary
Smith, Jane	1	1		$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	a-	88	84	Smith, Jane
Smith, Patricia	1	a-	0	0	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	50	53	Smith, Patricia
St. Germain Stiaes	1 0	a° 0	0 0	0 0	a- 0	$\frac{1}{2}$ 1	$\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$	67 25	57 44	St. Germain
Talbot	1	1	$\frac{1}{2}$		$\frac{1}{4}$	2	² 0	25 88	44 84	Stiaes Talbot
Templet	0	1	$\frac{2}{\frac{1}{2}}$	$\frac{\frac{1}{4}}{\frac{1}{4}}$	4 1 4	$\frac{2}{\frac{1}{2}}$	0	63	66	Templet
Thibaut	1	1	Õ	1/4	$\frac{\frac{1}{4}}{\frac{1}{4}}$	$\frac{\frac{2}{1}}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	88	88	Thibaut
Thierry	1	0	0	0	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	50	56	Thierry
Tucker	aº	a-	$\frac{1}{2}$	a-	$\frac{1}{4}$	a-	a-	25	71	Tucker
White Williams	1 1	1 0	a-	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$	$\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$	88 50	79 62	White Williams
Willmott	1	0	a- 0	a- 0	0	2 a-	$\frac{1}{2}$	50 63	62 54	Willmott
Wooton	0	1	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$	63	54 63	Wooton
	-		_		-	_	_			
With LABI	79	72	77	52	50	96	78		h LABI	
Against LABI	15	23	20	44	41	4	16		inst LA	BI
Absent	11	10	8	9	14	5	11	Abs	ent	

a- Was absent when LABI needed a "yes" vote, or the motion required only a majority or supermajority of those present and voting.

a^o Was absent when LABI needed a "no" vote and the motion required a majority or supermajority of the elected members.

HOUSE

		2008-2011			2008-2011
		Cumulative			Cumulative
Party	Representatives	Voting %	Party	Representatives	Voting %
(D)	Moreno	100	(D)	Guillory	71
(R)	Seabaugh	100	(R)	Tucker	71
(R)	Katz	95	(R)	Chandler	70
(R)	Huval	94	(R)	Ellington	70
(R)	Richardson	93	(D)	Hardy	70
(R)	Smiley	92	(R)	Lambert	70
(R)	Chaney	91	(R)	Connick	69
(R)	Nowlin	91	(D)	Billiot	68
(R)	Ligi	89	(R)	Guinn	68
(R)	Burns, Henry	88	(D)	Arnold	67
(R)	Carmody	88	(R)	Templet	66
(R)	McVea	88	(D)	Fannin	65
(D)	Thibaut	88	(D)	Anders	64
(R)	Schroder	87	(D)	Badon, Bobby	63
(D)	Barras	86	(R)	Hensgens	63
(R)	Cortez	86	(D)	Honoré	63
(R)	Downs	86	(R)	Hutter	63
(R)	Morris	86	(I)	Wooton	63
(R)	Ponti	86	(Ď)	Gisclair	62
(I)	Robideaux	86	(D)	Williams	62
(Ŕ)	Carter	85	(D)	Leger	61
(R)	Foil	85	(D)	Baldone	60
(R)	Hoffmann	85	(D)	Jackson, Micha	
(R)	LaBruzzo	85	(D)	Franklin	59
(R)	Landry	85	(D)	Ritchie	59
(R)	Lorusso	85	(D)	Doerge	58
(D)	Aubert	84	(D)	Montoucet	58
(R)	Hines	84	(D)	St. Germain	57
(R)	Smith, Jane	84	(D)	Henderson	56
(R)	Talbot	84	(D)	Thierry	56
(R)	Burford	83	(R)	Dove	55
(R)	Burns, Tim	83	(R)	Harrison	55
(R)	Henry	82	(R)	Willmott	54
(I)	Richard	82	(D)	Smith, Patricia	
(Ď)	Abramson	81	(D)	Hill	52
(R)	Hazel	81	(D)	LeBas	52
(R)	Pope	80	(D)	Armes	51
(R)	Pugh	80	(D)	Barrow	51
(D)	Danahay	79	(D)	Roy	49
(R)	Little	79	(D)	Dixon	48
(R)	White	79	(D)	Norton	48
(R)	Champagne	78	(D)	Smith, Gary	46
(R)	Howard	78	(D)	Edwards	45
(D)	Badon, Austin	77	(D)	LaFonta	44
(\mathbf{R})	Pearson	77	(D)	Stiaes	44
(R)	Cromer	75	(D)	Johnson	43
(R)	Geymann	75	(D)	Gallot	41
(R)	Greene	75	(D)	Burrell	39
(R)	Lopinto	75	(D)	Bishop	38
(R)	Kleckley	74	(D)	Jackson, Girod	
(R)	Simon	74	(D)	Jones, Rosalino	
(R)	Monica	73	(D)	Brossett	29
(D)	Jones, Sam	72			-
<u> </u>	- ,				

2011 R	eg	ula	ar	Le	gi	sla	ati	ve	S	ession
S										S
E	nents.	ctions.		pt Jeratio	se le				50	E
E N	Agreen	ax Elec	w. port	w. Ado econsic	Increa to Tabl	ols.	ols.	ge	e Votin	Ν
Α	Labor /	ocal T	Bid La nce Re	Bid La port R	ss Tax Iotion	er Scho	er Scho n	rcentag	nulativ	A
T	oject I ssage	Jimit L ssage	Public] onfere	Public]	Busine nent. N	Charte ssage	Charte leratio	ing Pe	l1 Cun 1ge	T
T E	SB 76 Project Labor Agreements. Final Passage	SB 108 Limit Local Tax Elections. Final Passage	SB 196 Public Bid Law. Adopt Conference Report	SB 196 Public Bid Law. Adopt Conference Report Reconsideration	HB 282 Business Tax Increase Amendment. Motion to Table	HB 421 Charter Schools. Final Passage	HB 421 Charter Schools. Reconsideration	2011 Voting Percentage	2008-2011 Cumulative Voting Percentage	Ē
Adley			$\frac{\frac{1}{4}}{\frac{1}{4}}$	$\frac{\frac{1}{4}}{\frac{1}{4}}$	1	$\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$		100	72	Adley
Alario Amedee	$ \begin{array}{r} 1\\2\\1\\2\\1\\2\\1\\2\\1\\2\end{array} \end{array} $	$\begin{array}{c} \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} \end{array}$	$\frac{1}{4}$ \mathbf{a}^{0}	$\frac{1}{4}$ \mathbf{a}^{0}	1 1	$\frac{1}{2}$ a-	$ \begin{array}{r} 1 \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ $	100 83	76 66	Alario Amedee
Appel		$\frac{\frac{2}{1}}{\frac{2}{2}}$	a°	\mathbf{a}^{0} $\frac{1}{4}$	1	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{\frac{2}{1}}{2}$	100	100	Appel
Broome Chabert	$\frac{1}{2}$	0 0	0 $\frac{1}{4}$	0	0	$\frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	0 50	41 53	Broome
Chaisson	2 a-	0	0	0	u a-	$\overline{\begin{smallmatrix} 2\\ 0 \end{smallmatrix}}$	$\overline{\overset{2}{0}}$	50 0	55 45	Chabert Chaisson
Cheek			$\frac{\frac{1}{4}}{\frac{1}{4}}$	aº	1	0		85	65	Cheek
Claitor	$ \begin{array}{r} 1\\ 2\\ 1\\ 2\\ 1\\ 2\\ 1\\ 2\\ 1\\ 2\\ 1\\ 2\end{array} $	$ \begin{array}{r} \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \end{array} $	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	1 1	$\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$ $\frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}}$	$\begin{array}{r} \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} \end{array}$	100 86	89 77	Claitor
Crowe Donahue	2 1 2	2 1 2	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	1	2 1 2	2	00 100	88	Crowe Donahue
Dorsey	$\overset{2}{0}$	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	Dorsey
Erdey	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	$\frac{1}{4}$	0	1	a-	a-	50	53	Erdey
Gautreaux Guillory	$\frac{1}{2}$ <u>1</u>	0 $\frac{1}{2}$	0 $\frac{1}{4}$	0 0	0 1	0 0	$\frac{1}{2}$ <u>1</u>	29 79	43 74	Gautreaux Guillory
Heitmeier	$\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} \end{array}$	2 0	4 a ⁰	0	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	$ \begin{array}{r} \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} \end{array} $	46	64	Heitmeier
Jackson	a-	0	0	0	a-	0	0	0	45	Jackson
Kostelka	$\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$	$\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	a-	0	0	43	62	Kostelka
LaFleur Long	1 2 a -	1 2 a-	$\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ \frac{1}{4} \end{array}$	0 0	0 1	$\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	57 64	54 77	LaFleur Long
Long Marionneaux	a-	$\frac{1}{2}$	4 0	0	0	2 a-	$\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$	14	25	Long Marionneaux
Martiny	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	a	$\frac{1}{4}$	1	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	85	74	Martiny
McPherson	a-	$\frac{1}{2}$	a°	0	0	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	31	49	McPherson
Michot Mills	\mathbf{a}^{0} $\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	0 0	1 1	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	92 57	81 73	Michot Mills
Morrell		2 a-	0	$\frac{1}{4}$	0	0	0	21	40	Morrell
Morrish	$ \begin{array}{r} \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} \end{array} $	a-	$\frac{1}{4}$	0	1	0	0	50	75	Morrish
Mount		$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	1	0	0	71	83	Mount
Murray Nevers	0 $\frac{1}{2}$	0 $\frac{1}{2}$	0 aº	0 0	0 0	0 $\frac{1}{2}$	0 0	0 46	30 63	Murray Nevers
Perry	$\frac{2}{\frac{1}{2}}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	1	2 0	0	71	75	Perry
Peterson	0	Ō	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	Peterson
Quinn	$\frac{1}{2}$	a-	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	1	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	86	67	Quinn
Riser Shaw	$\frac{1}{2}$ a -	$\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$	0 $\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{4}$ $\frac{1}{4}$	1 0	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$ 0	93 29	88 48	Riser Shaw
Smaw		$\frac{2}{\frac{1}{2}}$	$\frac{\overline{4}}{1}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	1	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	29 100	40 70	Smith
Thompson	$\frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$	$\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$	0	0	1	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	86	63	Thompson
Walsworth	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	1	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	100	88	Walsworth
Willard-Lewis	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Willard-Lewis
With LABI	27	23	18	15	22	18	22	Wit	h LAB	SI
Against LABI	4	12	15	22	14	18	16	Aga	inst L	
Absent	8	4	6	2	3	3	1	Abs	ent	

a- Was absent when LABI needed a "yes" vote, or the motion required only a majority or supermajority of those present and voting.

a° Was absent when LABI needed a "no" vote and the motion required a majority or supermajority of the elected members.



Party	Senators	Cumulative Voting %
(R)	Appel	100
(R)	Claitor	89
(R)	Donahue	88
(R)	Riser	88
(R)	Walsworth	88
(D)	Mount	83
(R)	Michot	81
(R)	Crowe	77
(R)	Long	77
(R)	Alario	76
(R)	Morrish	75
(R)	Perry	75
(D)	Guillory	74
(R)	Martiny	74
(R)	Mills	73
(R)	Adley	72
(R)	Smith	70
(R)	Quinn	67
(R)	Amedee	66
(R)	Cheek	65
(D)	Heitmeier	64
(D)	Nevers	63
(D)	Thompson	63
(R)	Kostelka	62
(D)	LaFleur	54
(R)	Chabert	53
(R)	Erdey	53
(D)	McPherson	49
(R)	Shaw	48
(D)	Chaisson	45
(D)	Jackson	45
(D)	Gautreaux	43
(D)	Broome	41
(D)	Morrell	40
(D)	Dorsey	32
(D)	Murray	30
(D)	Marionneaux	25
(D)	Peterson	23
(D)	Willard-Lewis	0