
North Dakota's 62nd Legislative Assembly

Issues of Importance to the Women of North Dakota

Rachel Fode



Volume 5, Issue 1
October 25, 2011

North Dakota Women’s Network 2011 Legislative Summary

We offer this voting record with the belief that when you increase your knowledge base regarding legislative voting records, you will be compelled to stay informed on issues, hold your legislators accountable to you as a constituent, and work to assure policy makers are elected that serve North Dakota women and are responsive to issues of importance to the women of North Dakota.

Table of Contents

Education

<i>SB 2335: Expanding Childcare Assistance to Eligible Caretakers in Pursuit of a Postsecondary Degree.....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>HB 1229: Required Information within School Sexual Health Programs.....</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>HB 1373: Appropriation for Federally Designated Head Start Programs.....</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>HB 1465: Relating to Prevention of Bullying in Schools.....</i>	<i>5</i>

Health and Well-Being

<i>SB 2135: Children’s Health Insurance.....</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>SB 2247: Domestic Violence Fatality Review Commission.....</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>SB 2309: Nullification of Federal Health Care Reform.....</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>SB 2315: Licensing and Regulating Direct Entry or Lay Midwifery Services.....</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>SB 2334: Medical Assistance Eligibility Requirements for Pregnant Women.....</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>HB 1377: Children’s Health Insurance Program.....</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>HB 1410: Limitation on Interviews with Children in cases involving Physical or Sexual Abuse.....</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>HB 1450: Definition of Human Being and the Application of Certain Medical Procedures.....</i>	<i>12</i>

Tax Policy

<i>SB 2260: Relating to an Income Tax Credit Equal to a Portion of a Taxpayer’s Federal Earned Income Credit.....</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>HB 1402: Relating to an Individual Income Tax Deduction for Lower-Income Individuals.....</i>	<i>14</i>

Unemployment

<i>HB 1276: Relating to eligibility for unemployment compensation benefits.....</i>	<i>15</i>
---	-----------

<i>How They Voted.....</i>	<i>17</i>
----------------------------	-----------

<i>Voting Record</i>	<i>18-19</i>
----------------------------	--------------

Special thanks to our allied organization for their valuable contributions: Paul Ronningen of Children’s Defense Fund; JoAnn Brager of Public Policy for the North Dakota Association from the Education of Young Children; April Fairfield of North Dakota Economic and Public Policy; Tim Hathaway of Prevent Child Abuse North Dakota; Connie Hildebrand of American Association of University Women – North Dakota; Maurice Emsellem of National Employment Law Project; and Janelle Moos of North Dakota Council on Abused Women’s Services.

North Dakota Women's Network 2011 Legislative Summary

Education

SB 2335: Expanding Child care Assistance to Eligible Caretakers in Pursuit of a Postsecondary Degree

(NDWN supported bill; Failed in Senate 14-33)

Senate Bill 2335 was introduced by Senators Tim Mathern and Carolyn Nelson and Representatives Lois Delmore and Kathy Hogan, to provide an appropriation to the Department of Human Services to grant child care subsidies to low-income individuals in pursuit of a postsecondary degree. The passage of this bill would have directed the Department of Human Services to spend up to two million dollars in the child care assistance program.

Child care subsidies are given to low-income families and individuals enrolled in the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program in pursuit of a postsecondary degree or certification. In 2004, the policy that allowed these individuals to receive child care subsidies was decreased to two years of assistance when enrolled at a two-year institution due to budget cuts. For example, if a student enrolls in a program at a two-year technical college child care subsidies would be available, but if the student enrolled at a four-year university they would then be ineligible for any child care subsidiaries under the current program requirements. The current program places a limit on an individuals potential by only offering the child care subsidies if enrolled at a two-year institution. Students may select a two-year institution to continue their education simply because they cannot afford child care while a student. Individuals struggling to make ends meet with a desired to receive an education from a four-year institution are faced with the challenge of finding quality child care they can afford for the four years when they are pursuing their desired degree. Senate Bill 2335 would have restored the program in place prior to 2004, allowing individuals to receive child care assistance for up to two years of postsecondary education at any institution they choose to attend.

During the 2009 legislative session, the legislature passed a bill that gave the Department of Human Services the ability to expand the program to include four years postsecondary institutions, however, funding was subject to availability of funds within their current budget. The Department of Human Services was unable to expand the program because they lacked the funds. Senate Bill 2335 would have provided the funding needed to expand the program for all higher educational options.

Supporters of Senate Bill 2335 testify to the benefits of the program including the increase in the number of bachelor's degrees in the state would help individuals stay out of poverty permanently, create permanent taxpayers in the state, and enhance the intellectual well-being of the recipient. Achieving a postsecondary degree gives individuals the opportunity to acquire a higher paying jobs and as a result reduce the number of families enrolled in state supportive services such as Medicaid, food stamps, and housing and child care assistance. There was no testimony presented in opposition of Senate Bill 2335.

The Senate Human Services Committee gave Senate Bill 2335 a do not pass recommendation with a 3-2 vote. Senate Bill 2335 failed 14-33 in the Senate. North Dakota will continue to provide low-income individuals with child care assistance for two years of their postsecondary higher learning if

the individual is enrolled at a two-year institution. Students in four-year institutions will not have that benefit.

Additional Resources:

North Dakota Child Care Resource & Referral, *Demand and Costs of Child Care* - <http://www.ndchildcare.org/data-pub/index.html>

HB 1229: Required Information within School Sexual Health Programs

(NDWN opposed bill; Passed in House of Representatives 83-10, Passed in Senate 43-4)

House Bill 1229 was proposed by Representatives Bette Grande, Karen Rohr, Mike Schatz, Bob Hunsakor and Senators Larry Luick and David O'Connell, to ensure that all school districts enact a policy to include abstinence-based concepts for health education. After many amendments to the original bill, the final version of the bill reads: "Each school district and nonpublic school shall ensure that the portion of its health curriculum which is related to sexual health includes instruction pertaining to the risks associated with adolescent sexual activity and the social, psychological, and physical health gains to be realized by abstaining from sexual activity before and outside of marriage."

Supporters of the bill testified the bill would ensure that key concepts are included with abstinence education, and make abstinence based education uniform, creating consistency between school districts. Testimony also suggested abstinence based educational programs are successful. Opposing testimony was offered with the belief that the policy is overarching and curriculum guidelines should be left up to school districts because they are most knowledgeable in determining educational needs for the children in that specific region. Opposition also argued that abstinence-only education limits the information available to young people. Information concerning contraception, pregnancy prevention, and STD's can be censored in these types of programs. Abstinence is already being taught in the school system, but not all teens choose abstinence. According to the 2009 Youth Risk Behavior Survey, 59.8% of twelfth grade students reported having sexual intercourse. Testifiers in opposition of House Bill 1229 supported abstinence plus programs, which includes information related to the importance of abstinence as well as contraceptives.

House Bill 1229 was placed in the House Education Committee and after amendments were accepted the bill received a 14-1 do pass recommendation. The bill was then placed in the Senate Education Committee and after further amendments, the Committee unanimously voted in favor of a do pass recommendation. The bill was amended further on Senate floor and then placed in the House and Senate Conference Committee and when a final amended version was decided upon in the Conference Committee, it was sent to the House of Representatives and Senate for voting. The bill eventually passed in the House of Representatives with an 83-10 vote and in the Senate with a 43-4 vote. House Bill 1229 was signed by Governor Dalrymple on May 9, 2001 and is North Dakota's first and only policy governing sex education.

HB 1373: Providing an Appropriation for Federally Designed Head Start Programs

(NDWN supported bill; Failed in House of Representatives 25-67)

Introduced by Representatives Lee Kaldor, Kathy Hawken, Nancy Johnson, Phillip Mueller and Senators Rich Wardner and Tim Mathern, House Bill 1373 would have provided a \$6,150,000 appropriation to increase the number of children enrolled in Head Start programs throughout the state. Head Start is a federal program designed for low income or at risk children and families. The

money was going to be granted through Department of Human Services simply because the Head Start State Collaboration Administrator is located there. The bill provided the state with an opportunity to invest in early childhood education, since North Dakota currently does not fund any pre-kindergarten education. Senate Bill 2150 would have authorized \$50,000 to begin pre-kindergarten, half of which would be applied to the cost of setting up a developmentally appropriate classroom, leaving approximately \$25,000 to cover teaching staff and other needs.

A number of national studies have already been conducted with regards to the Head Start program. The National Conference of State Legislators recently published a brief indicating that at-risk children who attend Head Start are more likely to be literate by third grade, graduate from high school, and be employed as an adult. These children are also less likely to need special education, be retained in first grade, and be arrested. Although North Dakota is currently serving 2,348 income eligible children in the thirteen Head Start programs throughout the state, the demand for additional Head Start slots is growing.

The Dickinson Mayor joined supporters in testifying to the strong public demand for head start, the economical benefits of the program, and the impact it can have on a child's life. Currently, North Dakota is the only state that does not provide some state funds for the Head Start program. With the addition of state funding, North Dakota could build a federal/local partnership to enhance the head start program, meeting the needs of the children in the state. During the 2011 session, there were 803 children who qualify due to income eligibility and an additional 508 on waiting lists who are above the income eligibility line. The amount of federal funds available to the state for Head Start has not changed. Income eligibility for Head Start follows 100% of the Federal Poverty Guidelines, which in 2011 for a family of four is \$22,350 however; more children are becoming income eligible each year, which indicates an increase in poverty rather than population.

Head Start is not only valuable for those families and children enrolled in the program, but yields many valuable public benefits such as a more competitive workforce and larger tax base, and a reduced public expense in special education, public assistance, and crime control. The Head Start program reduces future expenses for the state by collaborating with the school districts to provide special education services to those children struggling with disabilities. The passage of House Bill 1373 would have provided more families with the option to enroll their children in an early education program, giving them the same opportunities as their peers whose families are able to pay for expensive early education programs. House Bill 1373 was passed in the House of Representatives with a 64-29 vote, failed in the Senate 22-23. Senators Nething and Laffen were absent during the vote on the bill.

Additional Resources:

National Head Start Association, *"Benefits to Head Start and Early Head Start Programs"* -

http://www.nhsa.org/research/head_start_benefits -

National Head Start Association, *Dialog Briefs* - http://www.nhsa.org/research/dialog_briefs

CNN, *"Cutting Head Start is bad fiscal policy"* -

<http://www.cnn.com/2011/OPINION/03/14/mccartney.head.start/index.html?iref=allsearch>

House Bill 1465: Relating to Prevention of Bullying in Schools

(NDWN Supported Bill; Passed in House of Representatives 76-18, Passed in Senate 36-10)

Under the leadership of the North Dakota Attorney General, Wayne Stenejhem, a working group was convened prior to the legislative session to draft the anti-bullying law (HB 1465). Members of the working group included the North Dakota Department of Public Instruction, the North Dakota

Department of Health, the North Dakota Education Association (NDEA), the North Dakota Council of Educational Leaders, the North Dakota School Board Association, and the North Dakota Council on Abused Women's Services (NDCAWS). House Bill 1465 was introduced by Representatives RaeAnn Kelsch, Don Vigesaa, Ed Gruchalla and Senators Tim Flakoll, Rich Wardner, and John Warner, to define the term bullying and what type of conduct it included in the definition. Bullying is defined in House Bill 1465 as a "conduct that is received by a student which is so severe, pervasive, or objectively offensive that it substantially interferes with the student's educational opportunities." The bill was written to apply to any conduct on any school property and will include technology or other electronic media as well. Prior to the passage of House Bill 1465, North Dakota was one of five states without any type of bullying legislation.

When reviewing House Bill 1465, the House Education Committee also reviewed House Bills 1250 and 1147, which were bills pertaining to the issue of bullying. The hope of the House Education Committee was to address all of the issues from each bill simultaneously, so by the end there would be one bill that would encompass each of the separate issues addressed in each bill. House Bill 1465 ensures that every school will have an anti-bullying policy by next year, both public and non-public school. School districts have the responsibility of developing policy that is congruent with their district and reporting it to the Department of Public Instruction. The school districts are also responsible for reviewing and revising of the policy as they see necessary. Every new policy in school districts must have two public readings to ensure that the public is given sufficient notice of the new bullying policies.

Sponsor of House Bill 1250, Senator Tim Flakoll, argues the need for a uniform set of policies around this issue because of the evolution of bullying, which now includes both physical and mental bullying. Many testified in support of this legislation, including students who shared how they are affected by bullying at their school and what is available for them to remedy the problem. One student addressed the intimidation factor that is present when reporting bullying, which is the possibility of making the bullying worse. This bill would provide students with a definition of bullying and information on how to report instances of bullying they witness.

Senator Oley Larson offered testimony in opposition to the bill stating "if we actually succeed in raising children who never experience any abuse or neglect, they would grow up to be emotional marshmallows, frustrated when they don't get what they want; and unable to handle people mean or inconsiderate towards them." Senator Larson believes that in order "to develop emotional resilience, children need to be exposed to this type of aggression and learn to deal with it effectively." He testifies to his belief that bullying is not the issue, that a bully will not abandon his bullying ways unless he is educated, or the victims are educated not to be victimized. Therefore, our state should adopt a policy "to educate students on how not to be victimized and how not to be the bully." Senator Larson states the proposed policy had good intentions, but will not deter anyone from bullying, and we need to enact victim-proofing policy to empower children.

The House Education Committee granted the bill a do pass recommendation and the bill was passed in the House of Representatives with a 76-18 vote. The bill also came out of the Senate Education Committee with a do pass recommendation and passed the Senate with a vote of 36-10. In passing House Bill 1465, North Dakota will join forty-five other states who have passed anti-bullying legislation, providing students with support and presenting options that are available to them if they encounter an instance of bullying. House Bill 1465 was signed by Governor Dalrymple on April 25, 2011.

Health and Well-Being

SB 2135: Children's Health Insurance Program

(NDWN Supported Bill; Failed in Senate 11-35)

Senate Bill 2135 was introduced by Senators Tim Mathern, Joan Heckaman, Ryan Taylor and Representatives Lee Kaldor, Corey Mock, Richard Holman, to increase the number of children covered by the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP). Senate Bill 2135 proposed an increase to the current 160 percent income eligibility limit to 250 percent of the federal poverty line. The Department of Health's website displays the eligibility requirements for CHIP, indicating a family's NET income (after subtracting childcare costs and payroll taxes such as social security tax, Medicare tax, and income tax) must be greater than the Medicaid level, but cannot exceed 160 percent of the federal poverty level to qualify for CHIP. The increase in the CHIP program would have cost the state \$1,748,203 for two years. However, the state's general fund for these two years is estimated at \$51,000,000.

In 2009, the Senate passed a similar bill increasing coverage to 200 percent income eligibility, but the House of Representatives rejected the increase to 200 percent. Instead, House Bill 1465 was enacted in 2009, which increased the eligibility coverage to 160 percent from the previous 150 percent. According to the Kid Count Data Center, there were 18,000 North Dakota children living in poverty in 2009.¹ Supporters of the bill testified to the great need for an increase in the income eligibility for the Children's Health Insurance Program. Oil production within our state has created an economic upturn, but North Dakota still provides the lowest state health insurance coverage for children in the United States.

Senator Ryan Taylor joined supporters of the bill addressing the issue that the current coverage leaves many families unable to afford health insurance and do not qualify for Medicaid. This bill would have accounted for a significant number of these families, ensuring more children's health needs would be met throughout North Dakota. An increase in CHIP could prevent deaths, reduce future health care costs for society, and ensure children are given an opportunity to live healthy lives. No testimony was presented in opposition. The bill came out of the Senate Human Services Committee with a vote of 4-1 do not pass recommendation and the bill failed in the Senate 11-35. North Dakota continues to provide the lowest state coverage for children in the United States at 160%.

Additional Resources:

US Census Website, *Children Below Poverty Level in North Dakota* -

http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/ACSSAFFPeople?_event=Search&_geo_id=01000US&_geoContext=01000US&_street=&_county=&_cityTown=&_state=04000US38&_zip=&_lang=en&_sse=on&_ActiveGeoDiv=geoSelect&_useEV=&_pctxt=fph&_pgsl=010&_submenuId=people_9&_ds_name=null&_ci_nbr=undefined&_qr_name=undefined&_reg=undefined%3Aundefined&_keyword=&_industry=

Data Resource Center for North Dakota -

<http://www.cshcndata.org/Content/StatePrevalence2005.aspx?geo=North%20Dakota>

Study by NDSU, "Making Ends Meet" - Fe577 - <http://www.ag.ndsu.edu/pubs/fammgmt.html>

¹ Kids Count Data Center, *North Dakota State Data Center*

<http://datacenter.kidscount.org/data/bystate/stateprofile.aspx?state=ND&group=DataBook&loc=36&dt=1%2c3%2c2%2c4>

Children's Defense Fund, *CDF-ND Congressional Scorecard (PDF)* - <http://www.childrensdefense.org/state-offices/cdf-north-dakota/>
Kaiser Family Foundation - www.kff.org

SB 2247: Domestic Violence Fatality Review Commission

(NDWN Supported Bill; Passed in Senate 47-0, Passed in House of Representatives 78-13)

Senate Bill 2247 was proposed by Senators Curtis Olafson, Stanley Lyson, Carolyn Nelson and Representatives Duane DeKrey, Lois Delmore, and Mark Sanford, to allow the attorney general's office to establish a domestic violence fatality review commission to review domestic violence deaths that have occurred in the state. Attorney General Wayne Stenehjem provided a Crime in North Dakota 2009 report in support of Senate Bill 2247. According to this report, out of a total of 217 homicide cases, 116 of those cases are determined to be domestic violence type cases.² The report also identified the increase in aggravated assault cases from 300 in 2000 to 800 in 2003. This is a substantial increase in the number of reported aggravated assault cases occurring in the state.

Domestic violence fatality review involves the analysis of a death caused by, related to, or somehow traceable to domestic violence. The review creates a greater understanding of the tragedy and ideally leads to the implementation of preventive interventions. Comprehensive fatality review allows us to make sense of the death(s) by recreating the experiences of the victims, perpetrators, and other parties involved in the case, exploring the compromises and challenges parties faced in accessing services, making decisions, and exploring strategies. Teams gather information by a variety of means, including the use of Freedom of Information Law (FOIL) requests through public record. In a limited number of cases, the testimony of family members, co-workers, and others augment the information. State statutes enable entities to review cases of domestic violence related deaths by providing a variety of guidelines, assurances, prescriptions, and protections for teams and their members. The domestic violence fatality review commission would be similar to the current child fatality review commission already in place. No testimony was offered in opposition of Senate Bill 2247, the bill passed unanimously in the Senate and with a 78-13 vote in the House of Representatives. The Governor signed Senate Bill 2247 on April 27, 2011 establishing a domestic violence fatality review commission.

Additional Resources:

National Domestic Violence Fatality Review Initiative - www.ndvfri.org/

North Dakota Office of Attorney General Crime/Homicide Reports, *Crime in North Dakota, 2009 PDF* <http://www.ag.nd.gov/Reports/BCIReports/CrimeHomicide/CrimeHomicide.htm>

New York City Domestic Violence Fatality Review Committee, *Annual Report 2008* (link must be copied and pasted into browser) - http://www.nyc.gov/html/ocdv/downloads/pdf/FRC_2008.pdf

² North Dakota Office of Attorney General Crime/Homicide Reports, *Crime in North Dakota, 2009 PDF* - <http://www.ag.nd.gov/Reports/BCIReports/CrimeHomicide/CrimeHomicide.htm>

SB 2309: Nullification of Federal Health Care Reform

(NDWN Opposed Bill; Passed in Senate 27-19, Passed in House of Representatives 65-25)

Senators Margaret Sitte, Spencer Berry, Dick Dever and Representatives Jim Kasper, George Keiser, and Dan Ruby introduced Senate Bill 2309 that would enact a new section of the North Dakota Century code relating to the nullification of federal health care reform legislation. The engrossed bill provides that the federal law known as Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA) may violate the United States Constitution and that the legislative assembly shall consider enacting any measure to prevent enforcement of the law and that the law may not interfere with an individuals choice of a medical or insurance provider.

During the Senate Human Services Committee discussion Senator Tim Mathern addresses the fact that Senate Bill 2309 was sent to the Human Services Committee rather than the Judiciary Committee. As a result, he feels the committee needs to consider the health affects the bill will have on the citizens of North Dakota. Senator Margaret Sitte disagreed and in her opinion, “we do not need to look at this as getting into the details because this is bill is to show the will of the people.” Senator Margaret Sitte also submitted testimony in support of Senate Bill 2309 stating that the federal government assumed powers that are not delegated to them when passing the Federal Health Care Reform bill. The federal government is limited to the enumerated powers in the Constitution and that this policy is unconstitutional because the Tenth Amendment states, “the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, not prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.”

The bill proposed initially made it a crime for state agencies and employees to enforce the federal health care reform law. A number of committee members had a problem with this language, so the committee amended the bill and granted a do not pass as amended with a 3-1-1 vote. Senator Spencer Berry did not vote on Senate Bill 2309 when it was in Committee. The bill eventually passed the Senate with a 32-15 vote. After another amendment the House Industry, Labor, and Business Committee voted 9-5 in favor of a do pass recommendation. The committee also notes that Senate Bill 2309 will not supplant or change House Bill 1165, which deals with the mandate that no citizens in North Dakota can be required to purchase health insurance. The amended Senate Bill 2309 passed the House of Representatives with a 69-24 vote. The Governor signed Senate Bill 2309 on April 27, 2011.

SB 2315: Licensing and Regulating Direct Entry or Lay Midwifery Services

(NDWN Supported Bill; Failed in Senate 20-26)

Senate Bill 2315 proposed to create a new section in the North Dakota Century Code, relating to licensing and regulating direct entry or law midwifery services and to preserve the right of women and families to home delivery of infants. The bill was introduced by Senators Judy Lee, Karen Krebsbach, Larry Robinson and Representatives Lois Delmore, Lawrence Klemin, and Andrew Maragos. The proposed legislation was a lengthy bill that would establish a midwife advisory board, licensure requirements for midwives, regulations on the practice of midwifery, education grants, requirements for disclosure and written agreement, limitations of practice, immunity from liability, birth records, and protected titles and licensure and penalty. The intention of the bill was to provide adequate care and safety for mothers and their newborns at the time of delivery when opting for midwife care.

The passage of Senate Bill 2315 would have established a midwife advisory board, which would include an appointed certified nurse midwife. The certified nurse midwife could participate in the

board of nursing matters relating to the licensure and practice of licensed midwives. The legislation provided definitions for an advisory board on lay midwives, a licensed midwife, and midwifery. The bill defined a licensed midwife as “an individual who is not licensed as a physician or nurse and who holds a current license issued by the board pursuant to the provision of this chapter to engage in the practice of midwifery, who must be designated L.M.” Licensing for midwives varies from state to state, but currently in North Dakota midwives are not licensed or subject to any regulation by any professional body. The licensure requirements proposed in this bill would require a lay midwife, or any individual providing midwifery services in North Dakota to be licensed.

Many testified in both opposition and neutral position of Senate Bill 2315. The President of the Board of Nursing, Buzz Benson, offered neutral testimony stating the Board of Nursing surveyed the Certified Nurse Midwives on the regulation of lay midwives and the respondents unanimously agreed that the practice of lay midwifery in ND should be regulated. Testimony presented in opposition felt the bill was overly restrictive and removed the parents right to determine the logistics around the delivery of their child. On the other hand, Physicians from around the state testify neutrally on the bill, speaking to their personal experiences with patients who have been cared for by lay midwives, stressing the significant risks and dangers of the practice, and refused by some to be involved in any care involving midwives unless their care is necessitated by complications.

The bill was placed in the Senate Human Services Committee and received a 4-1 Do Pass recommendation, but failed in the Senate with a vote of 20-26.

Additional Resources:

North American Registry of Midwives - <http://narm.org/>

SB 2334: Medical Assistance Eligibility Requirements for Pregnant Women

(NDWN Supported Bill; Failed in Senate 20-26)

Senate Bill 2334 was introduced by Senators Ryan Taylor, Tim Mathern, Connie Triplett and Representatives Kathy Hawken, Richard Holman, and Scott Kelsh, to increase Medicaid eligibility for pregnant women in our state from 133% (federal minimum) of federal poverty guidelines to 200%. A woman with a net family income up to 133% of the federal poverty level is making \$14,404 annually and a woman at 200% makes less than \$21,660 annually. Once a woman becomes eligible for Medicaid she is eligible for Medicaid services and remains eligible without regard to any increase income.

According to the Kaiser Commission on Medicaid and the Uninsured, North Dakota ranks among nine states with the lowest eligibility rates for Medicaid coverage for pregnant women. Currently, North Dakota is economically prosperous due to the revenue from oil production in western North Dakota. Despite the recent economic growth the state is experiencing, the legislature refused to increase state funding for programs to aid the individuals who need it the most, especially the children of North Dakota. The increased state revenue generated by the oil production could be used to diminish the number of families living in poverty, which would increase the quality of life for all North Dakotans. During the 2011 legislative session, Representative Kathy Hawken was quoted stating, “this particular session has not been kind to children. We have pretty much defeated most of the bills that had to do with kids, whether it was health care or prenatal care or Children’s

Health Insurance Program.”³ The fiscal note attached to the bill indicated that an additional 1,302 pregnant women in North Dakota would have qualified for coverage annually. The total fiscal impact for 18 months is \$10,231,167, of which \$4,573,074 is general funds.

Senator Ryan Taylor’s testimony included a significant amount of data and research that supported the passage of Senate Bill 2334 some of which is addressed in this summary. The passage of Senate Bill 2334 would have provided pregnant mothers with the opportunity to address significant medical concerns such as the importance of prenatal care and education on healthy care giving for newborns. Mothers who do not receive prenatal care are three times more likely to give birth to a low weight baby and the risk of infant mortality is five times greater than babies whose mothers receive prenatal care. In 2008, 610 babies were born low birth weight babies weighing less than 5.5 pounds.⁴ It is essential to healthy lives for mothers and babies that mothers have access to medical care. The Kaiser Family Foundation ranks North Dakota in the 38th percentile for mothers who receive prenatal care in the first trimester, a critical time in a pregnancy. In addition to health concerns for the mother and children, the cost of having a child is very expensive. The average cost of delivery for an uninsured individual ranges from \$9,000 to \$17,000 with increased costs if the baby needs special medical attention. Supporting evidence suggests that many uninsured mothers are going to the emergency room to have their child, which places the financial burden on the hospitals, communities, and taxpayers. Senate Bill 2334 would have reduced the number of uninsured mothers going to the emergency room to give birth, increased prenatal care, increased physical health of the mother and baby, and provided pregnant women with the knowledge they need to provide a healthy life for their child. No testimony was presented in opposition of Senate Bill 2334.

The Senate Human Services Committee amended the bill to 160% of the federal poverty level. The bill was then sent to appropriations where it received a 9-4 do not pass recommendation. The bill failed in the Senate 20-26 and North Dakota’s Medicaid eligibility level for pregnant women seeking medical assistance remains at 133%.

Additional Resources:

National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, “*Care Before and During Pregnancy – Prenatal Care*” - http://www.nichd.nih.gov/womenshealth/research/pregbirth/prenatal_care.cfm

HB 1377: Children’s Health Insurance Program

(NDWN Supported; Failed in House of Representatives 25-67)

Representatives Richard Holman and Kathy Hogan and Senator Tim Mathern introduced House Bill 1377, to expand the state’s Children’s Health Insurance Program to 250 percent of the federal poverty level up from the current 160 percent eligibility limit, which would allow more children the opportunity to access medical care. In 2009, House Bill 1463 was enacted, raising the eligibility limit from 150 percent of the federal poverty level to 160 percent. The increase in the CHIP

³ National Institute for Early Education Research, “*The Bottom Ten: A Closer look at no program states.*” <http://preschoolmatters.org/2011/06/06/the-bottom-ten-a-closer-look-at-no-program-states/>

⁴ Kids Count Data Center, *North Dakota State Data Center*
<http://datacenter.kidscount.org/data/bystate/stateprofile.aspx?state=ND&group=DataBook&loc=36&dt=1%2c3%2c2%2c4>

program would have cost the state \$1,748,203 for two years. However, the states general fund for these two years is estimated at \$51,000,000.

According to the fiscal note attached to the bill, the expansion of the program would have provided approximately 1,320 more children with health care. The passage of House Bill 1377 would have decreased the number of children who do not qualify for Medicaid and whose families cannot afford health insurance. The Kids Count Data Center reports that in North Dakota 29,000 children do not have a parent with a full-time, year round job.⁵ Therefore, the likelihood of the parent being able to provide health care or having a job that provides a family health care plan is slim.

An increase in the CHIP could prevent deaths, reduce future health care costs for society, and ensure all children are equally given the opportunity to live healthy lives. There is interest among legislators to increase the income eligibility, but still the legislature refuses to pass a bill that would expand the CHIP. The state has seen an increase in the number of families in poverty, and with the state's growing population we may continue to see an increase in the number of families living in poverty. There was a zero percent increase in CHIP, and the income eligibility remains at 160 percent.

Representative Holman spoke in support of the bill addressing two issues: money and caring for children. In his opinion, preventive care for children saves money because the number of children forced to use emergency rooms as healthcare will be reduced. He believes that the state has "a moral responsibility to take care of those who cannot take care of themselves."

No testimony was offered in opposition of the bill. The bill was placed in the House of Human Services and came out with a 10-3 do not pass recommendation. The bill resulted in a 25-67 failure in the House of Representatives.

Additional Resources:

Study by NDSU, "Making Ends Meet" - Fe577 - <http://www.ag.ndsu.edu/pubs/fammgmt.html>

Children's Defense Fund, *ND Congressional Scorecard (PDF)* -

<http://www.childrensdefense.org/state-offices/cdf-north-dakota/>

Kaiser Family Foundation - www.kff.org

HB 1410: Limitation on Interviews with Children in cases involving Physical or Sexual Abuse
(NDWN Opposed Bill; Failed in House of Representatives 23-71)

House Bill 1410 proposed to amend a section of law changing the interview process for child victims of physical or sexual abuse. The bill was introduced by Representatives Robin Weisz and Duane DeKrey and Senator Judy Lee as a way to "protect the rights of the parent." The language of the original proposed bill reads; "in cases involving direct or threatened physical or sexual abuse of a child, if the victim is interviewed by the prosecuting attorney, the court, or appropriate law enforcement personnel, the interview must be video recorded and the parent or a representative of the parent must be allowed to be present at the interview." Currently, audio and visual recordings are made at some interviews, which increases protection for non-offending parents and interviewers. House Bill 1410 was intended to address the current policy that allows anyone to file a report alleging sexual or physical abuse of a child. After a report is filed, an interview with the

⁵ Kids Count Data Center, *North Dakota State Data Center*

<http://datacenter.kidscount.org/data/bystate/stateprofile.aspx?state=ND&group=DataBook&loc=36&dt=1%2c3%2c2%2c4>

child is conducted. Interviews are done without parental consent to prevent a number of potentially conflicting situations such as, intimidation, coaching the child, threatening the child, etc. This bill would allow parents to be present to prevent false accusations made by the child. Testifiers in opposition of the bill argued this would inflict more harm upon the child than protection. The intention of the interview is to ensure children are being protected and sufficiently attended to.

Opposition testimony also stated that this bill would hinder their ability to provide the best service possible to children by allowing the child to tell their story in a safe, friendly, and neutral environment. Testifiers opposed the bill for a number of other reasons, such as influence of the interview process, protection of a neutral interview environment, and the negative impact this bill would have on the child outweighs the need to protect a non-offending parent. Opposition testimony stated that 39% of all reported sexual assaults on children are committed by family members, and in 2010, 32% were committed by a mother or father. In addition, nearly 90% of physical abuse cases are committed by a parent. It is important for a child in this situation to continue to have support from a non-offending parent or guardian throughout this period of their life, but the interview process must remain a private place for the child. For example, while the child is sharing their story with a trained interviewer child at the Dakota Children's Advocacy Center, the non-offending parent(s) are counseled on handling the traumatic event that their child has endured and how to emotionally support their child at this time and in the future.

Supporters urge the bill be passed to protect parents who are unjustly accused. The bill failed in the House of Representatives. In this case, the state did their part in protecting individuals who cannot protect themselves, child victims. The interview process will remain a safe, friendly, neutral environment for children to come tell their story, and their parents will continue to receive protections put in place through electronic recording and the judicial system. House Bill 1410 came out Human Services committee with a 7-6 do pass recommendation, but failed in the House with a 23-71 vote.

HB 1450: Definition of Human Being and the Application of Certain Medical Procedures
(NDWN Opposed Bill; Passed in House of Representatives 68-25, Tabled in Senate 28-19)

House Bill 1450 was introduced by Representatives Dan Ruby, Karen Karls, Jim Kasper and Senators Oley Larsen, George Nodland, Margaret Sitte. The proposed bill defined a human being as "an individual member of the species homo sapiens at every stage of development" and this language would have been added into the Criminal Code of the North Dakota Century Code. House Bill 1450 also included language that would make it a crime to injure or kill an unborn child in circumstances where it would be a crime to harm anyone else under circumstances where the state has the ability to prosecute.

Many people stepped forward to argue in support and in opposition of House Bill 1450. Supporters of House Bill 1450 argue this bill would prove equal protection under the law for all human beings in North Dakota, including unborn children. Testimony in support of the new language is based on the belief that one's life begins at the point of conception and the inclusion of the definition of human being would provide meaning and clarity. This bill sought to recognize fetal personhood and to criminalize all abortion options. House Bill 1450 recognized a fertilized egg as a person, which means every time an egg is destroyed or injured the woman and potentially her physician risk facing criminal liability.

Opposition testimony argued that this bill interferes with women's personal decisions regarding pregnancy and childbirth. A physician testified in opposition of the specific language used to define

a human being illustrating that reproduction is a complex process and a large percentage of early development stages are abnormal and not compatible with life. Testifiers claimed this bill would limit the medical treatment available to women throughout the state and could limit access to fertility treatment. Since House Bill 1450 would ban all abortion, even in cases of rape and incest there was opposition testimony offered to protect these victims, allowing them to remain in control of their decision making powers. Arguments in opposition of House Bill 1450 were not directly opposing abortion, but the language included in the bill. If a fetus is seen as an independent person women would lose some of their rights to make medical decision for themselves and their children. The current standard allows a woman who is faced with a life threatening complication during the pregnancy to have the option to terminate the pregnancy. In this case, the woman would be stripped of her right to determine what is in the best interest of herself and her child's health. House Bill 1450 would have given North Dakota's courts the final say in a situation where there is a discrepancy between a doctor and a pregnant woman.

House Bill 1450 was placed in the House Human Services Committee where it received a 10-3 do pass recommendation. The House of Representatives passed the amended bill with a vote of 68-25. The bill received a do pass recommendation from the Senate Judiciary Committee with a vote of 5-1, Senator Carolyn Nelson was the only member of the Senate Judiciary Committee to vote in opposition of bill. The conclusion drawn by the Senate was a rare outcome with regards to House Bill 1450. The bill was tabled in the Senate with a vote of 28-19, thus defeating the bill without further debate.

Tax Policy

SB 2260: Relating to an Income Tax Credit Equal to a Portion of a Taxpayer's Federal Earned Income Credit

(NDWN Supported Bill; Failed in Senate 14-33)

Senators Connie Triplett, Tim Mathern, Ryan Taylor and Representatives Ed Gruchalla, Ron Guggisberg, and Jerry Kelsh introduced Senate Bill 2260, which proposes the creation of an earned income tax credit (EITC) for working families. The bill would have created a credit equal to 10% of an individual or family's federal earned income tax credit. Currently, there is a federal earned income tax credit in place to help low- and moderate- income families offset payroll taxes and to supplement low wages. The Federal EITC has had much success since it was established in 1875; The National Center for Children in Poverty reports the federal EITC reduces child poverty by nearly 25%, and The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities reported the federal EITC lifted 6.5 million people out of poverty, including 3.3 million children in 2009.⁶ Typically, states enact EITC to supplement the existing federal EITC, creating similar positive results as the federal EITC has in the past. Twenty-three other states and the District of Columbia have a state earned income tax credit, with an average credit of 17%.⁷ When a state enacts an EITC they are given the flexibility to design the credit to best fit their individual populations. For example, states determine the amount of the credit, whether the credit will be refundable, and have the option to provide incentives.

⁶ Arloc Sherman, "Stimulus Keeping 6 Million Americans Out of Poverty in 2009, Estimates Show," Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, September 9, 2009.

⁷ April Fairfield, "A State Earned Income Tax Credit for North Dakota's Working Families," North Dakota Economic Policy Project.

The proposed state earned income tax credit specifically targeted families and workers who need it the most and economically beneficial to those communities where those recipients live. The EITC can only be obtained if the tax filer has earned wages, creating an incentive for families to join or remain in the workforce. North Dakotans working low wage jobs end up paying a higher portion of their income in state and local taxes than highly paid workers.⁸ Implementing a state EITC would have made it easier for low- and moderate- income individuals and families to meet their daily needs, and allow families the opportunity to start saving for a financially sound future. There are studies that have indicated some families use EITC to build assets or to pay off debt.⁹ A state EITC would have benefited families and the economic prosperity of the entire state. The credit would have put money back into local communities, reducing the amount of people utilizing public assistance programs like Medicaid.

Senate Bill 2260 was placed in Senate Finance and Taxation Committee. The bill received a 5-2 do not pass recommendation from the Committee and ultimately failed in the Senate with an 11-34 vote. The state opted against the creation of an earned income tax credit that would have benefited low-wage worker in North Dakotans.

Additional Resources:

The North Dakota Economic Policy Project, “*ND State EITC Report*” - <http://www.ndepp.org/issues/>
Study by NDSU, “*Making Ends Meet*” - Fe577 - <http://www.ag.ndsu.edu/pubs/fammgmt.html>

HB 1402: Relating to an Individual Income Tax Deduction for Lower-Income Individuals
(NDWN Supported Bill; Failed in House of Representatives 35-59)

House Bill 1402 was proposed by Representative Jerry Kelsh, to create an individual income tax deduction for lower-income individuals. This bill was intended to provide lower income and working families with a tax break. An individual who has an income under \$40,000 would be nontaxable and under \$50,000, if filing a joint return. After the individual began to earn a higher income, a formula would determine the amount of taxes for that individual. This bill was proposed as an alternate program to provide for low- and moderate- income families rather than a tax break across the board. Fifty thousand dollars is not a lot of money to raise a family, even in North Dakota. This bill presented the state with the opportunity to help those individuals struggling to make ends meet by providing an income tax deduction. Recipients of this income tax deduction would have been likely to invest the money in their community, creating a means to stimulate our economy. House Bill 1402 was placed in the House Finance and Taxation Committee where the bill received a 8-6 vote in favor of a do not pass recommendation. The bill failed in the House of Representatives with a final 35-59 vote.

Additional Resources:

The North Dakota Economic Policy Project, “*Analysis of 2011 Individual Tax Reductions*”
<http://www.ndepp.org/news/>

The Corporation for Enterprise Development *Corporation for Enterprise development*, “*North Dakota’s Assets and Opportunity Scorecard*”- <http://scorecard.cfed.org>

⁸ April Fairfield, “*A State Earned Income Tax Credit for North Dakota’s Working Families*,” North Dakota Economic Policy Project.

⁹ Holt, “*The Earned Income Tax Credit at 30: What We Know*” Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution

Unemployment

HB 1276: Relating to Eligibility for Unemployment Compensation Benefits

(NDWN Supported Bill; Failed in the House of Representatives 24-67)

House Bill 1276 was introduced by Representatives Bill Amerman, Andrew Maragos, Corey Mock and Senators Carolyn Nelson, Mac Schneider, and Connie Triplett, to expand the number of people eligible for unemployment compensation benefits. The Unemployment Insurance (UI) program is a federal and state funded program, but states determine eligibility standards and the amount of benefits.

The UI program was designed in 1935, over 75 years ago, for a workforce that no longer reflects the state's present workforce. Today, employment in the state includes more low-wage workers, part-time workers, women workers, and workers displaced by globalization. The current composition of workers has significantly contributed to the decrease in effectiveness of the UI program. The National Employment Law Project reported that 57% of jobless North Dakotans were unable to collect state unemployment benefits in 2009. Congress recognized there was a growing problem and passed the American Recovery Act in 2009, to help states provide benefits for those workers who do not qualify under the states' current UI program. House Bill 1276 would have allowed those workers who often slip through the cracks of the current UI program to become eligible for unemployment benefits. After conducting two studies on the current UI program, the U.S. Government Accountability Office concluded the current UI program actually benefits higher-wage workers more than low-wage workers.

If states adopted appropriate changes to the UI program, they were eligible to receive \$14.6 million dollars in federal funding through the American Recovery Act. However, it is possible for the state to only receive partial funding if they choose not to adhere to the second requirement. In order to receive federal funding, the state was required to amend two parts of the current UI program. First, the state needed to adopt an alternative base period to qualify for the first one third or \$4.9 million in federal incentive award. Our current base period model determines the amount of benefit entitlement with the first four of the last five completed calendar quarters. The alternate base period considers the four most recent completed calendar quarters to determine benefit entitlements. Alternate base period would benefit low-wage workers by allowing the employees entire amount of time worked to be taken into account. Secondly, the state needed to provide benefits to workers in at least two of the following four categories: part-time worker coverage, extended benefits while training, domestic violence, spousal relocation, illness & disability. North Dakota already recognizes part-time worker coverage, so the state only needed to adopt one other option to receive the additional \$9.7 million federal incentive. In the 2011 session, North Dakota did change the law to allow unemployment for domestic violence victims. However, the state was not eligible to receive the \$9.7 million in federal incentive funds because the state failed to meet the first requirement, the adoption of the alternative based period. The expansion to the UI program would have provided support for domestic violence victims, helping them get back on their feet financially. By choosing not to adopt the alternative base period, the state essentially left \$14.6 million in federal incentive funds on the table and those funds now have reverted to the federal treasury. North Dakota and Wyoming were the only two Plains states to not take the federal incentive money.

House Bill 1276 was placed in the House Industry, Business, and Labor Committee, where it received a 10-3-1 vote for a do not pass recommendation. The Vice Chairman, Representative

George Kaiser, voted against the passage of House Bill 1276 stating “our federal government is broke and we have unfunded liabilities of a trillion dollars.” In reference to the state receiving federal incentive money, Representative Kaiser asked the committee, “is it right?” If North Dakota expanded the program through state funds rather than with federal incentive money that would also be welcomed, but the state does not provide the funds for the expansion. The expansion of the UI program would have encompassed a significant number of low-wage workers who need help getting back on their feet, and if it is not ‘right’ to take federal incentive money that leaves the question of what should the state be doing to provide support for these individuals? The bill was defeated in the House of Representatives by a 24-67 vote.

Additional Resources:

National Employment Law Project, *“Building a Modern Unemployment Program for North Dakota’s New Workforce”* - http://www.nelp.org/site/publications?issue=Federal_Policy_Initiatives

National Employment Law Project, *States who have Modern Unemployment Program* - http://www.nelp.org/content/content_issues/category/modernizing_unemployment_insurance

* Unless otherwise noted all statistics presented throughout this report can be found in the individual bill’s testimony available at the legislative counsel website: www.legis.nd.gov.

2011 ND Legislative Session Voting Record

SENATE		Prime Sponsor		Grande	Kaldor	R Kelsch	Mathern	Olafson	Triplett	Sitte	Taylor	J. Lee	Mathern	Prime Sponsor
		Our Position		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Our Position
Senator	Dist rict	Gender	Party	1229	1373	1465	2135	2247	2260	2309	2334	2315	2335	Percentage aligned with NDWN position
Andrist	2	M	R	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	20%
Berry	27	M	R	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	50%
Bowman	39	M	R	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	20%
Buckhard	5	M	R	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	20%
Christman	33	M	R	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	20%
Cook	34	M	R	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	20%
Dever	32	M	R	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	30%
Dotzenrod	26	M	D	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	80%
Erbele	28	M	R	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	20%
Fischer	46	M	R	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	50%
Flakoll	44	M	R	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	30%
Freborg	8	M	R	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	40%
Grindberg	41	M	R	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	30%
Heckaman	23	F	D	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	90%
Hogue	38	M	R	-	-	A	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	20% Absent 10%
Holmberg	17	M	R	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	40%
Kilzer	47	M	R	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	20%
Klein	14	M	R	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	30%
Krebsbach	40	F	R	-	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	60%
Laffen	43	M	R	-	A	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	30% Absent 10%
Larsen	3	M	R	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	10%
G Lee	22	M	R	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	30%
J Lee	13	F	R	-	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	60%
Luick	25	M	R	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	20%
Lindaas (Resigned 12/10)	20	M	D	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A N/A
Lyon	1	M	R	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	10%
Marcellais	9	M	D	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	80%
Mathern	11	M	D	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	80%
Miller	16	M	R	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	40%
Murphy	20	M	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100%
C Nelson	21	F	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	90%
Nothing	12	M	R	-	A	+	-	+	-	-	A	-	-	20% Absent 20%
Nodland	36	M	R	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	30%
O'Connell	6	M	D	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	70%
Oehike	15	M	R	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	40%
Olafson	10	M	R	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	20%
Robinson	24	M	D	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	70%
Schaible	31	M	R	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	10%
Schneider	42	M	D	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	80%
Sitte	35	F	R	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	20%
Sorvaag	45	M	R	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	30%
Stenhjem	30	M	R	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	20%
Taylor	7	M	D	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	80%
Triplett	18	F	D	+	+	+	A	+	+	+	+	A	+	80% Absent 20%
Uglen	19	M	R	-	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	50%
Wanzek	29	M	R	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	20%
Wardner	37	M	R	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	30%
Warner	4	M	D	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	90%
Final Outcome				Passed	Failed	Passed	Failed	Passed	Failed	Passed	Failed	Failed	Failed	Final outcome

HOUSE				Grande	Amerman	Kaldor	Holman	J Kelsch	Weisz	Ruby	R Kelsch	Olafson	Sitte	Prime Sponsor
				N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Our Position
LastName	District	Gender	Party	1229	1276	1373	1377	1402	1410	1450	1465	2247	2309	Percentage aligned with NDWN position
Amerman	26	M	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100%
Anderson	7	M	R	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	40%
Beadle	27	M	R	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	70%
Bellew	38	M	R	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	10%
Belter	22	M	R	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	A	-	10% 10% Absent
Boe	9	M	D	-	A	+	+	+	+	-	+	A	+	60% 20% Absent
Boehning	27	M	R	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	A	-	10% 10% Absent
Brabandt	5	M	R	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	20%
Brandenburg	28	M	R	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	30%
Carlson	41	M	R	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	40%
Clark	44	M	R	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	40%
Conklin	4	M	D	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	90%
Dahl	42	F	R	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	50%
Damschen	10	M	R	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	20%
DeKrey	14	M	R	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	20%
Delmore	43	F	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100%
Delzer	8	M	R	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%
Devlin	23	M	R	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	30%
Dosch	32	M	R	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	10%
Drovdal	39	M	R	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	30%
Frantsvog	40	M	R	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	A	40% 10% Absent
Froseth	6	M	R	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	30%
Glassheim	18	M	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100%
Grande	41	F	R	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	20%
Gruchalla	45	M	D	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	90%
Guggisberg	11	M	D	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	90%
Hanson	12	M	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100%
Hatlestad	1	M	R	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	50%
Hawken	46	F	R	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	50%
Headland	29	M	R	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	10%
Heilman	45	M	R	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	50%
Heller	33	F	R	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%
Hofstad	15	M	R	-	A	+	A	-	+	-	+	+	-	40% 20% Absent
Hogan	21	F	D	-	A	+	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	70% 20% Absent
Holman	20	M	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100%
Hunskor	6	M	D	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	80%
D Johnson	15	M	R	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	40%
N Johnson	37	F	R	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	50%
Kaldor	20	M	D	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	90%
Karls	35	F	R	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	20%
Kasper	46	M	R	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	40%
Keiser	47	M	R	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	50%
R Kelsch	34	F	R	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	-	50%
J Kelsh	26	M	D	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	80%
S Kelsh	11	M	D	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	90%
Kempenich	39	M	R	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	30%
Kilichowski	16	M	D	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	70%
Kingsbury	16	F	R	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	40%
Klein	40	M	R	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	20%
Klein	47	M	R	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	40%
Koppelman	13	F	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	20%
Kreidt	33	M	R	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%
Kretschmar	28	M	R	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	50%
Kreun	43	M	R	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	40%
Kroeber	12	M	D	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	90%
Louser	5	M	R	-	-	A	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	20% 10% Absent
Maragos	3	M	R	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	60%
Martinson	35	M	R	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	50%
Meier	32	F	R	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	-	50%
Metcalf	24	M	D	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	70%
Meyer	36	F	D	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	80%
Mock	42	M	D	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	90%
Monson	10	M	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	30%
Mueller	24	M	D	A	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	80% 10% Absent
Nathe	30	M	R	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	20%
J Nelson	7	M	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	30%
M Nelson	9	M	D	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	80%
Onstad	4	M	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100%
Owens	17	M	R	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	40%
Paur	19	M	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	30%
Pietsch	22	F	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	40%
Pollert	29	M	R	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	10%
Porter	34	M	R	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	-	50%
Rohr	31	F	R	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%
Ruby	38	M	R	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	30%
Rust	2	M	R	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	30%
Sanford	17	M	R	+	-	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	50%
Schatz	36	M	R	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	20%
Schmidt	31	M	R	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	40%
Skarphol	2	M	R	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	30%
Steiner	37	F	R	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	40%
Streyle	3	M	R	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	20%
Sukut	1	M	R	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	50%
Thoreson	44	M	R	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	30%
Trottier	19	M	R	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	+	-	10% 10% Absent
Vigesaa	23	M	R	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	30%
Wall	25	M	R	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	40%
Weiler	30	M	R	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	20%
Weisz	14	M	R	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	20%
Wieland	13	M	R	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	40%
Williams	25	M	D	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	70%
Winrich	18	M	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100%
Wrangham	8	M	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
Zaiser	21	M	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100%

Passed Failed Passed Failed Failed Failed Failed Passed Passed Passed Passed Passed Final outcome

