

## Report to GAC re use of/utility of Genuine Progress Indicator (GPI) (as of August 11, 2021)

### Responses from Committee Chairs

- ~ **Senate Agriculture:** GPI not used.
- ~ **Senate Appropriations:** GPI not used.
- ~ **Senate Economic Development, Housing & General Affairs:** GPI not used.
- ~ **Senate Institutions:** GPI not used.
- ~ **Senate Natural Resources & Energy:**

“SNRE has not formally used GPI, but has spoken with Jon Erickson at UVM, and much of our work is informed by the GPI concept of addressing negative externalities (such as air and water pollution) in our policy and program work. For instance, we asked the PUC two years ago to develop the metrics to do full lifecycle, full cost-benefit analysis of any energy proposal under consideration (thereby doing the accounting for negative externalities).

“In addition, our energy savings work includes negative externality calculations, such as avoided air pollutants, including greenhouse gases; this includes our recent push on weatherization, and is also be part of the nascent clean heat work.

“So, yes and no. We use the concepts but not in the form of a formal GPI calculation.”

#### ~ **House Agriculture & Forestry:**

“The Agency of Agriculture assesses itself based on Results-Based Accountability as do we, but I don’t think we formally use GPI other than being interested in customer satisfaction.”

#### ~ **House Appropriations:**

“We do not use the genuine progress indicator and other tools--such as livable wage--in understanding our work. With regard to the GPI, I think it needs to be better supported (and the argument is that we should fund it) in order to be actionable.

“In general, I think we all are challenged to find and use consistently good analytic tools that we all agree on in our work. I think it would be a huge benefit to all if we did.”

#### ~ **House Commerce & Economic Development:**

“We haven’t used GPI for many years. If I remember correctly it’s not being funded any longer and hasn’t been updated.”

~ **House Corrections & Institutions:** GPI not used.

~ **House Energy & Technology:** GPI not used.

~ **House Government Operations:** See responses from House Appropriations and House Natural Resources, Fish & Wildlife.

#### ~ **House Human Services:**

“I’ll say nothing specific related to this. We do talk about cost benefit and we do consider the importance of upstream interventions to address downstream costs. No one from the Gund Institute ever contacted me as Chair to make sure I knew what it

was, etc. It is, however, implied in what we do in Human services... harm reduction, child care, poverty reduction, etc.”

~ **House Judiciary:** GPI not used.

~ **House Natural Resources, Fish & Wildlife:**

“I cannot say that House Natural Resources, Fish and Wildlife has actively used GPI to inform the discussion of policy decisions. However, I do think it is more important than ever that we measure our economy’s success by the health and happiness of our people rather than its dollar output and so I support bringing it back and including it when we measure state outcomes and Vermonter’s well-being.”

~ **House Ways & Means:**

See response from House Natural Resources, Fish & Wildlife.

Also... “We don’t use it, but I wish we did.”

## **Responses from JFO**

~ “To be honest about it, it has not been a useful tool. I think we looked at it and, for our work, it just didn’t directly apply. We do use the GDPE, but only has part of the revenue forecasting process. In the budgeting process, we are on an annual basis and it’s hard to take that measure and successfully use it.”

~ “At a national comparative level, if consistently calc’d, it could be useful but for local state purposes, I don’t know that I have ever seen it produced or, more importantly, really applied to a policy issue.”