

	VIRG BERNERO	MIKE BOUCHARD	MIKE COX	ANDY DILLON	TOM GEORGE	PETE HOEKSTRA	RICK SNYDER
1. Would you support reinstating the \$4,000 Michigan Promise Scholarship? If so, how would you fund it?	Yes. Would identify inefficiencies in state government and reprioritize how money is spent.	Yes. Would comb budget to find savings that could be reallocated.	Yes. There are billions of dollars worth of desperately needed and achievable spending cuts in Lansing.	Yes. Would reallocate savings found through reforms in state government to fund it.	No. Michigan can't afford it. If we continue our spending ways, the check to your local schools will bounce.	Should be restored for students who qualified but lost it. Committing that it should be put back permanently? No.	Yes, but as need-based scholarship. Devoting resources to programs that deliver best results could pay for it.
2. Do you support consolidating services or merging jurisdictions to save money on local governments and school districts?	Supports promoting consolidation by providing incentives through state revenue sharing and removing statutory barriers to cooperation.	Supports contracting out services to private sector, consolidating administration that does not impact core educational mission.	Would provide financial incentives to encourage school districts to combine services and remove physical borders.	Yes. Layers of bureaucracy must be eliminated to find savings. School districts should share services wherever possible.	Yes. Multiple layers of government stem from Michigan's territorial days and are no longer affordable.	Should provide opportunities to consolidate services and make Michigan a better place to do business, but not necessarily merge.	Supports cooperation to remove barriers, voluntary consolidation aided by the state to promote innovation and collaboration.
3. Should Michigan's tax incentives for movie and TV production, which cost \$100 million in the current fiscal year, be continued, modified or eliminated?	Incentives should bring in significant return to justify the spending. If incentives prove to be effective we'll keep them.	Eliminated. Michigan tax policy should not pick winners and losers.	Money would be better spent on overall tax relief, but eliminating it creates more uncertainty. Should be phased down.	Would continue incentives but make it a priority that local workers as well as local small businesses benefit from film and TV projects.	Did not answer.	I would not have supported the credit as written. However, we cannot whipsaw businesses by giving and then arbitrarily taking credits away.	Should be reduced dramatically and then eliminated in a responsible fashion.
4. Which main method would you use to reduce spending on Medicaid, the health program for the poor: Cut provider reimbursement across the board, or eliminate coverage (such as prescription drugs and mental health treatment) that is not mandated by the federal government?	Federal health insurance changes can reduce Medicaid costs by reducing the number of uninsured individuals. Will work to make sure Medicaid patients retain access to care.	The federal government demands more than Michigan can afford. Michigan can effectively manage these programs on its own.	Tough choices on Medicaid cuts have to be made that won't deny access to essential services or shift health care costs to businesses and individuals impact.	Reforms in state government can free up resources to protect health care, education and public safety. I would cut the state's Medicaid program as a last resort.	Reform programs by adding the missing element, personal responsibility. Our government programs have failed to make us healthier and they are diverting precious resources from core functions of government.	We need to review what benefits go beyond the minimum requirements. We also need to look at tightening the eligibility standards so that the benefit is used only for the neediest among us.	Reimbursement rates should be increased to improve access and reduce cost-shifting to employer-based insurance. State needs a health system that reduces costs, improves efficiency and promotes wellness.
5. Supporters say Michigan Economic Growth Authority breaks that forgive state taxes in exchange for job creation are critical to competing with other states for jobs. Critics say government should not be picking winners and losers in the private-sector economy. Where do you stand?	It's preferable to provide a partial reduction in taxes to secure new investment than to lose all the new tax revenues and jobs should that investment be made in another state or country.	Opposes picking winners and losers. Michigan's business tax should be profit-based, with low rates and easy compliance so all businesses benefit.	Best economic development policy is a low tax rate on all businesses and individuals. The MEDC has to produce credible measures of job creation, should have a regional focus and pay more attention to the business climate.	Supports a complete review of state tax credits provided by the MEDC to determine which are effective and which should be eliminated.	Did not answer.	I support tax incentives on a limited and very selective basis. The government needs to get out of the business of picking winners and losers. The MEDC is a reflection of how uncompetitive we have become as a state.	Incentives should be used only where they have clear, long-term economic impact. Growth will come from small business and entrepreneurial activity. I know how difficult it is to pick winners and losers. Politicians shouldn't be making those decisions.