

# Ethan Allen Institute

Newsletter - February 2016 (Printer Edition)

---

## Celebrating Our Founder

The Town of Kirby will be celebrating Moderator John McClaughry's 50th year of presiding over the Town of Kirby's Annual Town Meeting. We would like to collect letters or cards of congratulations (please include a memory you have of John's service as Moderator) to present to him on that day. You may email them to [townclerk.kirbyvermont@gmail.com](mailto:townclerk.kirbyvermont@gmail.com) or mail them to Town of Kirby, 346 Town Hall Road, Lyndonville, VT 05851. Please do so by February 15, 2016.

## Highlights and Red Flags from the Legislature

### Taxes

**Healthcare Provider Tax.** The Legislature is considering placing a 2.35 percent provider tax on independent doctors and dentists, which would generate roughly \$17 million a year, \$10 million plus from physicians and \$6 million from dentists. Interesting way to lower the cost of healthcare.

**Mandatory Sick Leave.** This is a de facto \$14 million tax on employers who almost by definition can't afford it. Most businesses offer their employees some ability to take time off for illness or other family obligations without docking them pay. This is a good policy for attracting and keeping quality employees. Those that don't overwhelmingly can't. They don't have to money, and are operating payroll to payroll. It's infuriating that the state is giving money (\$1,000,000) to Global Foundries, but taking more and more from our most vulnerable employers.

**Act 46: The Property Tax Increase.** When the legislature passed Act 46, it was in response to an outcry over rising property taxes. The only part of Act 46 that did anything to put downward pressure on property taxes was the penalty placed on school districts that spent beyond thresholds established in the law. Now the legislature has raised those thresholds for 2017 and removed them entirely for 2018. The result will be a 2¢ increase to the homestead property tax rate.

### School Choice

**Act 46: the Death of Tuitioning.** As we feared, despite the fact that most legislators believed that when they passed Act 46 school choice would be protected where it

currently exists, leadership in the personages of Rep. David Sharpe (D-Bristol), chair of the House Education Committee, and Speaker of the House Shap Smith (D-Morrison) is doing nothing to rectify the unintended consequences of this awful law. Sharpe, an virulent opponent of school choice, refuses to even discuss the issue (which leads us to believe this “unintended” consequence wasn’t really quite so unintended). If school choice is going to continue to exist in Vermont, citizens from choice towns are going to have to aggressively badger their representatives. If you’re not willing to do that, kiss 150 years of tuitioning good-bye.

## Second Amendment

**Burlington Gun Ordinances.** Time to take this issue seriously. Though conventional wisdom going into the 2016 session was that the legislature would never pass major Second Amendment restrictions in an election year, there is serious behind the scenes pressure by the Left to pass three Burlington Charter Changes. These would make it illegal to have a firearm on the premises of a business that sells alcohol, mandate that gun owners lock away or disable their firearms when not in their direct position, and give police the authority to confiscate the firearm(s) of someone accused of domestic violence. While the Speaker of the House, Shap Smith (D-Morrison), is saying publicly that he doesn’t think the votes are there to pass the charter changes, he is working hard to find those votes. If you are a supporter of the Second Amendment and the Vermont Sportsman’s Bill of Rights and are not registered to vote, this is the year to register to vote.

## Energy

**Renewable Energy Revolt.** Activists this past month filled the State House to demand a ban on industrial wind projects in Vermont and to restore local control over renewable energy project siting throughout the state. Senator John Rodgers (D-Essex/Orleans), flanked by two dozen fellow legislators from both the House and Senate, announced introduction of legislation that would accomplish these goals. “It’s time,” he said to loud cheers, “that industrial wind goes the way of the billboard, and is banned in Vermont.” Don Chioffi, a select board member from Rutland Town, spoke for a growing coalition of local communities demanding that control over renewable energy sitings be restored to local communities. “We want the lands of our state back. Town by town. We don’t want deference, we don’t want consideration, due or otherwise. What we want is standing. We want local and regional planning documents to control land use decisions within a municipality. No more, no less,” he said. The legislation that is actually being discussed in the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, however, does not do either of these things.

---

## Commentary: Make Big Wind Pay Its Own Way

*By John McClaughry*

An intriguing battle is shaping up in the legislature, over industrial wind power. On one side is the Shumlin administration, wind developers, and pro-renewable energy lobby groups like VPIRG.

The Governor has been a consistently outspoken advocate for renewable energy. He issued an edict in 2011 that Vermont must be made to obtain 90% of its total energy from renewables by 2050, in the name of defeating the menace of “climate change”.

Last year the Governor asked the legislature to pass a Renewable Portfolio Standard (renamed RESET) to mandate utilities to steadily increase their purchases of wind, solar, hydro, wood, and landfill methane power, until 75% of their power comes from these sources by 2032.

In his January state of the state address Shumlin strongly endorsed “more smartly-sited renewables to power Vermont”, and went on to favor “renewables on a Vermont scale...homegrown, not corporate grown.” But, curiously, he referred only to solar energy, completely ignoring corporate grown wind power on an industrial scale.

In the 2016 Comprehensive Energy Plan released last week, the Shumlin administration reiterates the “90% by 2050” and “75% by 2032” goals, and proposes a strategy “to facilitate development of in-state wind projects in order to achieve the state’s renewable energy goals...”.

The report offers three scenarios for achieving 100% renewable electricity by 2050. Two of the three scenarios require increasing industrial wind generation (from turbines producing more than 500kw) to 750 Mw.

Achieving this level from in-state wind farms would mean an increase of 631 Mw. At 2.75 Mw per turbine, this works out to 229 more ridgeline towers measuring 427 feet to the rotor tip. However the best located and most efficient turbines produce their rated power only 37% of the time. To get the full rated power, there would have to be either many more turbines, or natural gas backup plants near each wind farm (unlikely), or backup power from the grid.

To make way for this flood of renewables, the administration has pushed Green Mountain Power to reduce its dependence on safe, low-cost, reliable, emission-free HydroQuebec electricity by 53% from 2011 to 2017. The Shumlin plan will surely cause Big Wind to see Vermont as “the Beckoning Country”.

On the other side of the issue are a rapidly increasing number of citizens and towns near present and proposed wind farm sites, joined by free marketeers disgusted with the corporate welfare subsidies, and some environmentalists concerned about the impact of huge turbines on wildlife, water, and viewsheds. Two Senate bills have been introduced to curb the wind explosion.

S.210, from Democratic Sens. John Rodgers and Bobby Starr of Essex-Orleans, would simply prohibit industrial wind towers. It has the advantage of simplicity, but it starkly threatens the Shumlin plan and the developers eager to install more turbines on Vermont ridges.

Another approach is contained in S.191, offered by Democratic Senator Jane Kitchel of Caledonia- Orange. It would require the Public Service Board to “defer to municipalities or regional recommendations [about proposed wind towers] unless there is a clear and convincing demonstration that [the proposed project] lacks a rational basis, or that other factors affecting the general good of the state outweigh application of the recommendation or measure.”

Translation: small rural towns and their citizen groups are welcome to bring their Big Wind objections into the labyrinthine PSB forum, and try to overcome “other factors

affecting the general good of the state” urged by the Shumlin administration and the Big Wind legal team. Lots of luck with that. They’ll be whacked like a careless raptor hit by a spinning turbine blade.

There’s a far better way to defeat Big Wind in Vermont. Big Wind developers are crucially dependent on an array of Federal tax subsidies. The vital one is the Production Tax Credit that gives the wind farm owner 2.3 cents per kwhr of power delivered.

Impose a 2.3 cents per kwhr environmental protection tax on every new industrial-sized wind project in Vermont. That will exactly cancel the major federal subsidy that makes Big Wind profitable. Result: Vermont will never see another Big Wind project again.

A bill to achieve this fits on one page. No costly, complicated, prolonged and lawyer-intense PSB process. No arguments about municipal plans or regulatory takings. And, let it be noted, there won’t be any revenues from this tax, because there will never be another Big Wind installation in Vermont to produce power subject to the tax. Problem solved. Sorry, Governor.

*- John McClaughry is the founder and vice president of the Ethan Allen Institute ([www.ethanallen.org](http://www.ethanallen.org)).*

## Commentary: Act 46: Fix It All, or Repeal It All

*by Rob Roper*

This week (January 24-30) is national School Choice Week, celebrating the great steps forward school choice has made in states around the country. Confronted with many of the same concerns Vermonters are facing about the high cost and quality of their schools, states from Florida to Texas to Wisconsin to Nevada have expanded options and access to resources for parents to choose the best educational setting for their children.

Sadly, Vermont is heading in the other direction, throwing away a national leadership position we have held on school choice for a century and a half -- by accident! At least that’s what our legislators are saying, and most seem to be sincere.

Act 46, the law passed just last year ostensibly to curb education costs (thereby reducing property taxes) and restructure the public school bureaucracy to create larger and more efficient districts, is in the words of one of its lead authors, “a mess.” Both halves of Act 46, cost containment and governance restructuring, have blown up. Neither aspect of the law is doing what it was supposed to do.

The cost containment side of the fiasco has garnered the most attention. The people who drafted the spending penalties school district face failed to consider factors like the rising cost of health insurance, and the mandate they themselves recently passed forcing school districts to pay for expensive universal pre-k programs. This has made it difficult to impossible for many school districts to conform to the new budget limitations, they would argue through no fault of their own.

Adding to the chaos, the Administration misinterpreted legislative intent as to how costs under the threshold formula were to be calculated, and provided school districts with incorrect data necessary to formulate their budgets.

On the governance front, Act 46’s major unintended consequence is the potential

destruction of Vermont's 150-year-old tradition of "tuitioning" – full school choice – for ninety plus towns that don't operate a public school. Since passage of Act 46, two such towns, Westford and Elmore, have lost school choice because a majority of their voters felt they had no other practical options under the law but to give it up. Many other choice towns find themselves in similar binds facing similar votes.

This was not the intent of the legislature. To hear the people who wrote and passed the law tell it, towns like Westford and Elmore were supposed to be able to merge with other districts yet still retain their choice. During a discussion in the Senate Education Committee, for example, Sen. Philip Baruth (D-Chittenden), the Majority Leader in the Senate, said, "Last year, as I remember it, everybody left the building thinking that these mergers would not change anybody's choice situation. And that it would be like it is now. We'd have towns side by side, one that could tuition and one that cant."

Sen. Anne Cummings (D-Washington), Chair of the Senate Education Committee, agreed with Baruth, as did every other senator in the room. The State Board of Education, however, chose to interpret the law differently, much as the Administration misinterpreted how to calculate the spending caps. This unleashed bitter and divisive battles between communities forced to the table by a deeply flawed law to discuss merging school districts of very different structures and cultures.

So the legislature is scrambling, but only to solve half of the Act 46 problem.

The Senate has voted to repeal the spending caps entirely, and the House is currently trying to find a way to raise the penalty threshold, but not eliminate it entirely. Either solution throws the cost containment aspect of the law, and expectations for lower property taxes, out the window. For school choice, there appears to be little urgency for a fix.

Bills have been presented in the House and Senate that would protect and preserve Vermont's school choice where it exists. To its credit, the Senate Education Committee has at least begun a conversation about the issue. Unfortunately, the House Education Committee Chair, Dave Sharpe (D-Bristol), has flat out refused to discuss, let alone fix, the school choice issue. He likely has the support of Speaker of the House, Shap Smith (D-Morristown).

School Choice Week would be a good time for Vermont's remaining school choice towns to speak up, tell their stories, and demand the legislature fix Act 46 to do what they promised it would do when passed – protect and preserve school choice in Vermont – by either amending the law appropriately, or repealing the law entirely.

*- Rob Roper is president of the Ethan Allen Institute. He lives in Stowe.*

## Commentary: Abandoning Low Cost Hydro for Costly Renewables

*By Willem Post*

Gov. Shumlin has decreed that Vermont must obtain 90% of its total energy from renewable sources by 2050, to "make Vermont energy independent, fight global warming

and climate change, do our part, and be a leader”, and Act 56 of 2015 requires utilities to market electricity that is 55% from renewable sources in 2017, increasing to 75% in 2032.

In its pursuit of these goals, Green Mountain Power, the state’s largest electric utility, has significantly decreased its low-cost, renewable, near-zero CO2 emitting hydro energy. In its place GMP is buying high-priced, variable, intermittent, heavily subsidized wind and solar energy.

In 2013, GMP bought nearly a third of its energy from Hydro-Quebec. That contract expired in October. It was supplanted with a contract signed in 2012 that began at 8 MW a year and will increase to 148 MW in 2018.

The effect of these changes will be a decrease of 53% of energy purchased from Hydro-Quebec (from 1.87 MWh to 1.0 MWh) between 2011 and 2017.

Some of that shortfall will be made up by nuclear energy, which is ironic since the renewable energy advocates led the decades-long campaign to drive Vermont Yankee out of operation. When its Vermont Yankee contracts terminated in 2012, GMP bought replacement power from the Seabrook nuclear plant, starting at 15 MW and increasing to 60 MW at the start of 2016.

In retrospect, it appears the greatest problem of Vermont Yankee was that it supplied Vermont with about 250 MW of safe, reliable, low-cost electricity – thereby decreasing by 250 MW the potential market for wind and solar power produced by the renewable energy interests that clamored for Gov. Shumlin’s “90% renewable by 2050” goal.

In sum: The Vermont State government is obsessed with achieving Gov. Shumlin’s “90% renewables by 2050” goal, and is making the utilities unload low-cost, dependable, near-zero CO2 emitting hydro energy, and replace it with high-cost, variable, intermittent and increasingly unpopular wind and solar energy, and thus enrich the promoters of the renewable energy sector.

In doing so, we have created the arcane Public Service Board as a fourth branch of government. The legislature delegates enormous power to the PSB. Its deliberations are shrouded in complicated proceedings, and the only effective players are the Department of Public Service (beholden to the Governor), the utilities and their lawyers, and businesses that want exemptions from burdensome requirements.

Most legislators have little or no idea how this administrative labyrinth works. This has been called “government by unaccountable strangers”, and for good reason.

If Vermont really wants to reduce its carbon dioxide emissions, its best approach would be to encourage increased energy efficiency of buildings and vehicles, which together produce about 70% of the state’s CO2 emissions.

There are already Vermont-based companies that will design and install energy efficiency improvements, and take payment over time from the customer’s energy savings. Many people (aided by tax advantages) are reducing their fuel consumption by operating hybrid or plug-in vehicles. Given good information and a free market, people will act to reduce inefficient expenditures because they can find better uses for the savings.

It’s time for the legislature to reconsider the implications of Gov. Shumlin’s “90% renewable by 2050” decree, and to reduce the PSB to a more traditional role of assuring reliable energy supply and protecting the people against monopoly power.

The legislature’s job is not to make sure that the heavily politicized renewable energy

sellers pocket huge profits, but to establish a policy to set Vermont on a path to assure safe, reliable and competitively priced energy that will make possible a strong, competitive and growing economic base, both for the creation of new wealth and income for the people of the state, and for expanded tax revenues to enable the state to meet its fiscal obligations.

- *Willem Post is a retired mechanical engineer who lives in Woodstock and frequently posts to The Energy Collective blog.*

---

## Roll Call Reports

**House Votes to Raise Education Spending Caps, Raise Property Taxes, 94-52.**

**House Votes to Adjust FY 2016 Budget Upward by \$91.8 Million, 90-54**

**Senate Votes to Repeal Act 46 Education Spending Caps, 28-1.**

---

## News & Views

**No White Means No Green Christmas.** The lack of snow this winter has had a negative impact on service jobs. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the accommodation and food services sector lost 2,200 jobs from November to December.

**Vermont Has Second Highest Cost of Health Insurance Premiums.** This according to GOBankingrates.com (cited in VermontBiz 1/20/162) “Vermont's cheapest silver option has the highest monthly premium of any state, charging \$469 a month, or \$5,628 a year in premiums. New York is #1. It’s what we get as a result of a decade of government reform efforts designed to “bend the cost curve” down.

**Pension Crisis Getting Worse.** [David Coats](#), Vermont’s unfunded liability guru, writes, “Vermont’s unfunded liability for the state workers and teacher pensions and retiree health care benefits (OPEB) increased in 2015 by over \$500 million. As of June 30, 2015, these liabilities total \$3.8 billion versus \$3.3 billion in 2014, a 15 percent increase in one year. By contrast, Vermont’s economy grew at 2 percent over the previous year. This is a remarkable amount considering general fund revenues are expected to be \$1.7 billion this fiscal year. In other words, Vermont would have to dedicate over two years of our revenues to just balance the amount due state workers and teachers as of June 30, 2015, per the actuary’s report.”

**Chief Architect of Act 46 Admits....** “It’s a mess.” This is what Rep. David Sharpe (D-Bristol), who chairs the House Education Committee said. Sharpe, it should be noted, was appointed by Speaker of the House, Shap Smith (D-Morrissett) in January 2015 specifically to shepherd this “reform” bill through. Great job all around! (Source: [7 Days](#))

**How Messed Up Is Act 46?** As Ways and Means Committee member Patti Komline (R-Dorset) said, “It was hard to justify that a town like Weybridge is allowed to be spending \$20,200 with no penalty, and the town of Franklin, which spent over \$11,800, they’re going to get a penalty.” This is nuts. (Source: VT Watchdog)

**Another Mess: Vermont Health Connect.** Just when you thought it was safe to go back in the pool, VHC software fails again. The backlog of customers, which was briefly gone, is back up to 3,000. [According to VPR](#), “... the state’s largest insurance carrier, Blue Cross Blue Shield of Vermont, says technological shortcomings at Vermont Health Connect have made it impossible for them to process changes to their customers’ policies. ‘We were definitely optimistic that the software upgrades that were put in last year ... would bring about a fully functioning system, but it doesn’t seem like that’s the case today.’ says Cory Gustafson, director of government relations at Blue Cross.”

**Vermont Green Energy Not So Green.** [The Valley News cited](#) the University of California at Berkeley’s analysis of Vermont renewable energy policy of selling credits, “If you’ve installed solar at your home and are now basking in the I’m-saving-the-planet warm glow, you may be in for a splash of ice water. There’s a good chance someone else has purchased your halo and is wearing it right now.” As a result, “the Vermont Attorney General’s Office recently issued a warning letter to solar industry players saying some could face penalties for deceptive advertising if they are not clear when consumers are buying electrons but not environmental benefits.”

**Dartmouth Hitchcock Follows Through on Lawsuit Threats.** DHMC is suing Vermont over Medicaid reimbursement rates. As reported by WCAX, “DHMC provides more Medicaid services to Vermonters than any hospital other than UVM Medical Center, but DHMC gets paid about 18 percent less on a per patient basis according to a federal complaint filed by its lawyers. Attorneys for the medical center say that violates the constitution.”

**Vermont Population Is Falling.** UVM Economist Art Woolf points out, “A few weeks ago, the Census Bureau reported that there were 626,042 Vermonters on July 1, 2015. That’s 725 fewer than one year earlier, and 1,100 less than in 2013. Vermont’s population has fallen in three of the past four years. The last time that happened was in the mid-1950s — more than a half century ago.”

**Preschool Flunks Again:** Yet another study of universal preschooling, conducted by Vanderbilt University and involving a thousand Tennessee kids, found some early learning gains for preschoolers, but “by the end of their first year in school (kindergarten) there were no longer significant differences between the two groups on any achievement measures.” By the end of the second grade, the children who had been assigned to the pre-K programs performed slightly worse than the control group. (Peter Suderman, Reason, 1/16)

**Lt. Gov. Scott: No on Carbon Tax.** “The Legislature’s interest in a carbon tax, Scott said, would drive away businesses from the state. ‘It has the same feeling as the single payer conversation, which was allowed to continue for too long,’ Scott said. He described

the carbon tax as a distraction from lawmakers'.... "We need to stop it in its tracks now," Scott said. (VtDigger 1/9/16). Gubernatorial candidate Bruce Lisman earlier described the carbon tax as "insane".

**How the Left Attacks Climate Realists.** Mark Steyn recently gave dazzling testimony to a Senate committee on how the climate thought police are trying to stamp out any dissenting views on "climate change". Read it at <http://wattsupwiththat.com/2015/12/08/mark-steyns-illuminating-and-entertaining-testimony-to-the-cruz-hearing-on-climate-today/>

**FDR on Public Employee Unions:** "All Government employees should realize that the process of collective bargaining, as usually understood, cannot be transplanted into the public service. It has its distinct and insurmountable limitations when applied to public personnel management. The very nature and purposes of Government make it impossible for administrative officials to represent fully or to bind the employer in mutual discussions with Government employee organizations. The employer is the whole people, who speak by means of laws enacted by their representatives in Congress. Accordingly, administrative officials and employees alike are governed and guided, and in many instances restricted, by laws which establish policies, procedures, or rules in personnel matters." (Letter to NFFE 8/16/37)

**Jefferson to Sanders.** "To take from one because it is thought that his own industry and that of his father's has acquired too much, in order to spare to others, who, or whose fathers have not exercised equal industry and skill, is to violate arbitrarily the first principle of association--the guarantee to every one of a free exercise of his industry and the fruits acquired by it." --Thomas Jefferson: Note in Tracy's "Political Economy," 1816.

---

## Book of the Month

### **Smaller Faster Lighter Denser Cheaper**

*How Innovation Keeps Proving the Catastrophists Wrong*

by Robert Bryce 2014

Robert Bryce is optimistic about our energy future, and indeed, the future of humanity. His books and op-eds are carefully researched and clearly written. Bryce does not claim that every problem will have a technological fix, but our frequently-successful search for such fixes have led to a world in which more people are living longer and healthier lives. For example, in 1970, the average life span in the least-developed countries was 43 years. In 2011, the average for those same countries was 59 years. Almost everywhere in the world, literacy is up, mortality and maternal mortality is down, and lives are longer and better.

In this book, Bryce shows that this happy result is a direct consequence of our human quest to achieve more results while using less resources. In other words, we seek to do our work in ways that are "Smaller Faster Lighter Denser Cheaper." His book

covers some of the same ground as his earlier book, *Power Hungry*. In this book, he expands the scope to fields beyond energy.

Some of the areas that he describes are familiar to all of us: the fact that computers are smaller is no surprise to anyone. But other aspects of “smaller faster” were new to me. For example, in poor countries, cell phones can encourage commerce. In Africa and Afghanistan, most people do not have bank accounts. The ability to buy goods by cell-phone has increased commerce and partially disabled corruption. (The account is held by the cell phone company, and there are kiosks for people to deposit or withdraw cash.) In one case, Afghan policemen, paid through their cell phones, thought they had gotten a major raise. Actually, the policemen were merely getting their full pay, without their superiors skimming about 30% of their cash payments before the policemen ever saw the money.

In expected ways, and in surprising ways, the world of making things smaller, faster, lighter, denser and cheaper has led to unprecedented prosperity and health. For the energy to power this world, Bryce recommends the N2N plan described in *Power Hungry*: Use natural gas (N) while building advanced nuclear (N). I would amend this slightly to be sure to Keep Existing Nuclear while building advanced nuclear, but his basics are correct.

Some parts of the book are painful to read. The title of one section is pretty direct: “Biofuels are a crime against humanity.” Government and academic reports question both the practicality and the morals of biofuel production. Using land for biofuels increases the cost of food, increases the volatility of food prices, decreases the ability of poor nations to import food, and indeed, decreases our ability to feed the poor and hungry.

With many examples, Bryce shows that moving to low-density “renewable” energy would be a step backwards for human health and happiness. His analysis of McKibben’s “Energy Starvation” plan is well-referenced and scathing.

I hate to say that anything is “required reading” for everyone, but I strongly recommend that people in Vermont read this book. Why Vermont? Well, right now, Vermont has an official state energy plan that claims we will reduce statewide energy use by more than 1/3 by 2050. Further, the state of Vermont “plans” to have 90% of the remaining energy come from renewable sources by 2050. The energy plan admits that renewable sources are not as dense as conventional sources, and that the ridges planned for wind turbines are important wildlife and watershed resources. (Quote from plan, below). The Vermont plan is the opposite of N2N. The Vermont plan is not about making things smaller, faster, lighter, cheaper.

Will Vermonters allow this plan continue to be our state plan, in which everything is justified on the basis of “low greenhouse gases”? Are we going to use the “Energy Starvation” plan proposed by those who hate nuclear energy (which also produces no greenhouse gases) and who also don’t seem to care very much about wildlife habitat? Or will we take some reasonable version of N2N, choosing dense, relatively low-emissions energy sources.

Will Vermont continue to move to Smaller, Faster, Lighter, Denser, Cheaper, as humanity has always aimed to do? Or will we go backwards? It’s up to us, right here in Vermont, to choose a happy and prosperous future. Let’s not mess it up.

*- Review by Meredith Angwin*

---

## The Final Word

### February Survey

*Senator John Rodgers (D-Essex/Orleans) proposed legislation to ban industrial wind in Vermont. Should the legislature pass such a ban?*

Make your voice heard. Take the survey [HERE!](#)

### January Survey Results

**What's the dumbest thing the Vermont Legislature will do in 2016?**

- Pass a Carbon Tax - 25.37%
- Mandate Paid Sick Leave - 1.49%
- Snuff Out School Choice - 7.46%
- Legalize Marijuana - 14.93%
- Expand Dr. Dynasaur (Medicaid) to 26 year olds - 2.99%
- Take Over Medicare Payments Through "All Payer Waiver" - 8.96%
- Pass a payroll tax to cover Medicaid funding shortfall - 4.48%
- Other (Please Specify) - 34.33% (Most said all o the above -- cheaters!)