Garden City High School

**Summer Reading: ½ Year Economics & Government**

**Task:** Students entering Regents level Economics or Government (1/2 year course, not AP) must read and summarize the four articles below; summary sheets are also below. During the first week of school, students will engage in a class discussion and take an assessment. All summaries are due the first day of class.

**Rationale:** To encourage students to stay abreast economic and political issues relevant to their lives and to also advance the goal that they be informed citizens. By reading nonfiction/informational texts and responding to issues in the news, students will strengthen their reading, writing and thinking skills – all goals of the Common Core Learning Standards.
Is College Worth It? Clearly, New Data Say
MAY 27, 2014
David Leonhardt

Some newly minted college graduates struggle to find work. Others accept jobs for which they feel overqualified. Student debt, meanwhile, has topped $1 trillion.

It’s enough to create a wave of questions about whether a college education is still worth it.

A new set of income statistics answers those questions quite clearly: Yes, college is worth it, and it’s not even close. For all the struggles that many young college graduates face, a four-year degree has probably never been more valuable.

The pay gap between college graduates and everyone else reached a record high last year, according to the new data, which is based on an analysis of Labor Department statistics by the Economic Policy Institute in Washington. Americans with four-year college degrees made 98 percent more an hour on average in 2013 than people without a degree. That’s up from 89 percent five years earlier, 85 percent a decade earlier and 64 percent in the early 1980s.

Rising Value of a College Degree
The pay of people with a four-year college degree has risen compared to that of those with a high school degree but no college credit. The relative pay of people who attended college without earning a four-year degree has stayed flat.

Labels reflect group's highest level of education. "Graduates of 4-year college," for instance, excludes people with graduate degrees.

There is nothing inevitable about this trend. If there were more college graduates than the economy needed, the pay gap would shrink. The gap’s recent growth is especially notable because it has come after a rise in the number of college graduates, partly because many people went back to school during the Great Recession. That the pay gap has nonetheless continued growing means that we’re still not producing enough of them.

“We have too few college graduates,” says David Autor, an M.I.T. economist, who was not involved in the Economic Policy Institute’s analysis. “We also have too few people who are prepared for college.”
It’s important to emphasize these shortfalls because public discussion today — for which we in the news media deserve some responsibility — often focuses on the undeniable fact that a bachelor’s degree does not guarantee success. But of course it doesn’t. Nothing guarantees success, especially after 15 years of disappointing economic growth and rising inequality.

When experts and journalists spend so much time talking about the limitations of education, they almost certainly are discouraging some teenagers from going to college and some adults from going back to earn degrees. (Those same experts and journalists are sending their own children to college and often obsessing over which one.) The decision not to attend college for fear that it’s a bad deal is among the most economically irrational decisions anybody could make in 2014.

The much-discussed cost of college doesn’t change this fact. According to a paper by Mr. Autor published Thursday in the journal Science, the true cost of a college degree is about negative $500,000. That’s right: Over the long run, college is cheaper than free. Not going to college will cost you about half a million dollars.

Mr. Autor’s paper — building on work by the economists Christopher Avery and Sarah Turner — arrives at that figure first by calculating the very real cost of tuition and fees. This amount is then subtracted from the lifetime gap between the earnings of college graduates and high school graduates. After adjusting for inflation and the time value of money, the net cost of college is negative $500,000, roughly double what it was three decades ago.

This calculation is necessarily imprecise, because it can’t control for any pre-existing differences between college graduates and nongraduates — differences that would exist regardless of schooling. Yet other research, comparing otherwise similar people who did and did not graduate from college, has also found that education brings a huge return.

In a similar vein, the new Economic Policy Institute numbers show that the benefits of college don’t go just to graduates of elite colleges, who typically go on to earn graduate degrees. The wage gap between people with only a bachelor’s degree and people without such a degree has also kept rising. Tellingly, though, the wage premium for people who have attended college without earning a bachelor’s degree — a group that includes community-college graduates — has not been rising. The big economic returns go to people with four-year degrees. Those returns underscore the importance of efforts to reduce the college dropout rate, such as those at the University of Texas, which Paul Tough described in a recent Times Magazine article.

But what about all those alarming stories you hear about indebted, jobless college graduates? The anecdotes may be real, yet the conventional wisdom often exaggerates the problem. Among four-year college graduates who took out loans, average debt is about $25,000, a sum that is a tiny fraction of the economic benefits of college. (My own student debt, as it happens, was almost identical to this figure, in inflation-adjusted terms.) And the unemployment rate in April for people between 25 and 34 years old with a bachelor’s degree was a mere 3 percent.

I find the data from the Economic Policy Institute especially telling because the institute — a left-leaning research group — makes a point of arguing that education is not the solution to all of the economy’s problems. That is important, too. College graduates, like almost everyone else, are suffering
from the economy’s weak growth and from the disproportionate share of this growth flowing to the very richest households.

The average hourly wage for college graduates has risen only 1 percent over the last decade, to about $32.60. The pay gap has grown mostly because the average wage for everyone else has fallen — 5 percent, to about $16.50. “To me, the picture is people in almost every kind of job not being able to see their wages grow,” Lawrence Mishel, the institute’s president, told me. “Wage growth essentially stopped in 2002.”

From the country’s perspective, education can be only part of the solution to our economic problems. We also need to find other means for lifting living standards — not to mention ways to provide good jobs for people without college degrees.

But from almost any individual’s perspective, college is a no-brainer. It’s the most reliable ticket to the middle class and beyond. Those who question the value of college tend to be those with the luxury of knowing their own children will be able to attend it.

Not so many decades ago, high school was considered the frontier of education. Some people even argued that it was a waste to encourage Americans from humble backgrounds to spend four years of life attending high school. Today, obviously, the notion that everyone should attend 13 years of school is indisputable.

But there is nothing magical about 13 years of education. As the economy becomes more technologically complex, the amount of education that people need will rise. At some point, 15 years or 17 years of education will make more sense as a universal goal.

That point, in fact, has already arrived.
Using Executive Powers, Obama Begins His Last Big Push on Climate Policy
By PETER BAKER and CORAL DAVENPORT MAY 31, 2014
Continue reading the main story Video

Assessing the political landscape as President Obama prepares to introduce a new regulation to get states to cut carbon emissions and reduce pollution.

WASHINGTON — All but giving up on Congress, President Obama has spent the year foraging for issues he could tackle on his own, and largely coming up with minor executive orders. But on Monday, he will unveil a plan to take on climate change that may be his last, most sweeping effort to remake America in his remaining time in office.

The far-reaching regulations will for the first time force power plants in the United States to curb the carbon emissions that scientists say have been damaging the planet. By using authority already embedded in law, Mr. Obama does not need Congress — so, in this era of gridlock, he has a chance to transform the nation’s energy sector and, at the same time, his presidency.

“The shift to a cleaner-energy economy won’t happen overnight, and it will require tough choices along the way,” Mr. Obama said Saturday in his weekly radio and Internet address, previewing Monday’s announcement. “But a low-carbon, clean-energy economy can be an engine of growth for decades to come. America will build that engine. America will build the future, a future that’s cleaner, more prosperous and full of good jobs.”

While the administration was still completing crucial elements of the plan, it was already clear that the economic stakes are enormous. The new regulations could eventually shutter hundreds of coal-fired power plants. Critics wasted little time arguing that the president’s unilateral plan abuses his power in a way that will cost jobs and raise energy prices for consumers.

“The administration has set out to kill coal and its 800,000 jobs,” Senator Michael B. Enzi, Republican of Wyoming, the nation’s top coal-producing state, said in response to Mr. Obama’s Saturday address.
“If it succeeds in death by regulation, we’ll all be paying a lot more money for electricity — if we can get it. Our pocketbook will be lighter, but our country will be darker.”

Almost by default, climate change looks to be the defining domestic initiative of Mr. Obama’s second term. His aspirations to enact gun control measures, pass a jobs plan, overhaul the tax code and reach a grand bargain on long-term spending all have eluded him amid Republican opposition. He may yet negotiate legislation liberalizing immigration policy, but otherwise harbors little hope for major new domestic action.

In taking on climate change, Mr. Obama is returning to one of the themes of his first campaign for president, when he vowed that his election would be remembered as the moment when “our planet began to heal.” His difficulties living up to that rhetoric has deeply frustrated many supporters, and he personally urged his Environmental Protection Agency chief, Gina McCarthy, to draft an ambitious regulation in time to ensure that it is finalized before he leaves office.

“It’s the most significant executive action he can take probably in the entirety of his presidency,” said Neera Tanden, president of the left-leaning Center for American Progress. “The president is a relatively young president,” she added. “Not to do something would be something you wouldn’t want to live with for the next few decades.”

Having failed to pass climate legislation through the Senate in his first term, Mr. Obama has used his own power to advance his goals, including increased fuel-efficiency standards for cars and trucks. In seeking to limit power plants, he is finally addressing the most significant source of carbon pollution. “It’s the most important and the biggest reductions that we’ll get,” said John D. Podesta, the president’s counselor and a prime advocate of environmental policies. “Finally tackling climate in a significant way, this is a big deal.”

And yet the president seems to have chosen a low-wattage rollout of the plan. He will not unveil it in a televised East Room address or travel to some out-of-town venue for a big speech, as he has for moves of far less import. Instead, he will leave it to Ms. McCarthy to announce on Monday, while he plays a supporting role by making a telephone call to the American Lung Association.

That may reflect the complicated politics of the issue. Republicans are not the only ones concerned about economic costs, or for that matter political ones. Democrats from coal-producing states are acutely nervous with midterm elections approaching.

Representative Nick J. Rahall II, Democrat of West Virginia, for one, has already distanced himself from the plan. “I will oppose this rule as it will adversely affect coal miners and coal-mining communities throughout West Virginia and the nation,” he said.

White House officials denied playing down the announcement and said they were trying to be creative because an East Room event is no longer as useful as it once was. They are trying to frame the issue as a matter of public health. To tape his Saturday address, Mr. Obama traveled to Children’s National Medical Center in Washington to visit children with asthma aggravated by air pollution.
While studies show climate change may exacerbate respiratory diseases, that is hardly the most significant impact of global warming. But the White House hopes that focusing on sick children will play better politically than sweeping statements. An April Gallup poll found that one in four Americans is skeptical of the science of global warming.

The new regulation, which must go through a period of public comment before taking effect, will set a national standard to cut carbon from power plants. It will offer states a menu of options to achieve those cuts, such as adding wind and solar power and energy-efficient technology and joining or creating state-level emissions trading programs called cap and trade.

In 2012, the United States emitted 6.5 billion metric tons of greenhouse gases, of which two billion came from power plants, most burning coal. Experts close to the drafting of the rule said they expected it would lead to annual cuts of up to 500 million tons of carbon in the next decade and more than one billion tons of carbon annually in ensuing years.

But as recently as last week, according to people close to the process, officials had not decided which year to use as the baseline for determining cuts. The coal industry has pushed for 2005, when emissions were near their peak, while environmentalists want a baseline of 2012, when they were lower, meaning that cuts would have to be deeper.

By using the existing Clean Air Act, Mr. Obama will not be able to go as far as new legislation, which would have affected the entire economy. “It would have been better to get more done, absolutely,” said Carol Browner, the president’s former environmental adviser. “But if you can’t get there, using existing law to look at things on a sector basis is a very smart move.”

The new rule will be announced hours before Mr. Obama leaves for Europe, where leaders have pressed him to be more assertive on climate change. “By increasing our credibility with this rule, we leverage everybody else and put the president back in a leadership position,” said Durwood Zaelke, president of the Institute for Governance and Sustainable Development, a research organization. “He becomes seen as a climate leader.”
Memorial Day 2050

MAY 24, 2014
By Thomas L. Friedman

How do we motivate people to do something about climate change?

Of the many things being said about climate change lately, none was more eloquent than the point made by Gov. Jay Inslee of Washington State in the Showtime series “Years of Living Dangerously,” when he observed: “We’re the first generation to feel the impact of climate change and the last generation that can do something about it.”

The question is how do we motivate people to do something about it at the scale required, when many remain skeptical or preoccupied with the demands of daily life — and when climate scientists themselves caution that it is impossible to attribute any single weather event to climate change, even if recent weather extremes fit their models of exactly how things will play out as the planet warms.

Andrew Sullivan’s Dish blog last week linked to a very novel approach offered by Thomas Wells, a Dutch philosopher: Since climate change and environmental degradation pit the present against the future, our generation versus those unborn, we should start by giving the future a voice in our present politics.

“Even if we can’t know what future citizens will actually value and believe in, we can still consider their interests, on the reasonable assumption that they will somewhat resemble our own (everybody needs breathable air, for example),” wrote Wells in Aeon Magazine. Since “our ethical values point one way, towards intergenerational responsibility, but our political system points another, towards the short-term horizon of the next election,” we “should consider introducing agents who can vote in a far-seeing and impartial way.”

Wells suggests creating a public “trusteeship” of nongovernmental civic and charitable foundations, environmental groups and nonpartisan think tanks “and give them each equal shares of a block of votes adding up to, say, 10 percent of the electorate,” so they can represent issues like “de-carbonizing the economy” and “guaranteeing pension entitlements” for the unborn generation that will be deeply impacted but has no vote.

Unrealistic, I know, but the need to incorporate longer time scales into our societal choices is very real — and right in the lap of our generation. Andy Revkin, who blogs at Dot Earth for The Times’s Opinion section, put it well: “We are coming of age on a finite planet and only just now recognizing that it is finite. So how we manage infinite aspirations of a species that’s been on this explosive trajectory, not just of population growth but of consumptive appetite — how can we make a transition to a stabilized and still prosperous relationship with the Earth and each other — is the story of our time.”

One way to get us to act with an intergenerational perspective is to enlarge the problem beyond climate — to make people understand that this is our generation’s freedom struggle. The abiding strategy of our parents’ generation was “containment” of communism in order to be free. The abiding strategy of our generation has to be “resilience.” We will only be free to live the lives we want if we make our cities, country and planet more resilient.
Even if we can’t attribute any particular storm to climate change, by continually pumping greenhouse gases into the atmosphere we are “loading the dice” in ways that climate scientists are convinced will continue to raise average temperatures, melt more ice, raise sea levels, warm oceans and make “normal” droughts drier, heat waves hotter, rainstorms more violent and the most disruptive storms even more disruptive. It is crazy to keep loading those dice and making ourselves more vulnerable to disruptions that will make us less free to live the lives we want. How free will we be when paying the exorbitant cleanup costs of endless weather extremes?

Moreover, acting today as if climate change requires an urgent response — like replacing income and corporate taxes with a carbon tax, introducing a national renewable portfolio standard to constantly stimulate more renewable energy and raising the efficiency standards for every home, building and vehicle — actually makes us healthier, more prosperous and more resilient, even if climate change turns out to be overblown. We would end up with cleaner air and a tax structure that rewards more of what we want (work and investment) and disincentivizes what we don’t want (carbon pollution). We would be taking money away from the worst enemies of freedom on the planet, the world’s petro-dictators; and we would be incentivizing our industries to take the lead in manufacturing clean air, water and power systems, which will be in huge demand on a planet going from 7 billion to 9 billion people by 2050. In short, by taking the climate threat seriously now, we’d make ourselves so much more economically, physically, environmentally and geopolitically resilient — and, therefore, more free.

What containment was for our parents’ generation — their strategy to fight for freedom against the biggest threat of their day — resiliency will be for our generation against the multiple threats of our day: climate change, petro-dictatorship and destruction of our environment and biodiversity. Let’s act so the next generation will want to honor us with a Memorial Day, the way we honor the sacrifice of previous generations.
What Makes a Positive College Experience?
By TAMAR LEWIN APRIL 11, 2014
Daniel F. Chambliss. Credit Nancy L. Ford

After a decade of research, Daniel F. Chambliss, an organizational sociologist at Hamilton College, believes he knows what most determines how students feel about their time at college. It comes down to factors like dorm design, friends and extracurricular involvement more than what happens in the classroom. In their new book, “How College Works,” Dr. Chambliss and Christopher G. Takacs describe the findings from an ambitious study of Hamilton students and alumni, using interviews, surveys and even an analysis of academic writing samples to tease out how college has affected them. Although Hamilton, a small, selective, expensive liberal arts college in upstate New York, has little in common with the large state universities and community colleges that most students attend, Dr. Chambliss said the lessons learned could apply everywhere.

What's the most important element in shaping the college experience?
What really matters in college is who meets whom, and when. It’s the people, not the programs, that make a difference.

So what should students do to get more out of college?
As a freshman, live in one of the old-fashioned dorms with the long hallways, multiple roommates and communal bathroom, where you’ll have to bump into a lot of different people every day. Apartment dorms look appealing, but they’re isolating and disastrous for freshmen. In choosing classes, pick the teacher over the topic. Over and over, we found that contact with one great professor sent students in a new direction. Try to get to know a lot of people your first year, when everyone is looking for friends. Most students don’t make their friends in classes. It helps to join a large high-contact activity, like a sports team or choir, where people see each other at least twice a week. We found that it only takes two or three close friends and one or two great professors to have a fulfilling college experience.

You describe a paradox about small classes, one of the measures U.S. News & World Report uses in its rankings.
The smaller the class, the less chance there is of getting in. Usually, when people do research on small classes, they talk to the students in the class, who think it’s swell, and the professor, who likes it, and not the people who didn’t get in. If you had 99 tiny classes and one huge class for all the thousands of students who didn’t get into one of them, U.S. News would report that 99 percent of your classes were small, but it wouldn’t feel like that to most students.

So should students take as many small classes as they can get into?
Small classes are great. But most colleges also have some wonderful very large classes, like Michael Sandel’s “Justice” at Harvard, where professors deliver engaging lectures and students learn a lot. Introductory courses are important turning points. An introductory course with a boring lecturer stops many students from ever taking another class in the department, but a lively intro course, no matter how big, draws students into the field.

What should colleges do to make students’ experiences better?
They should be looking for things that give the biggest payoff for the least effort. One hospital study found that patients reported a better experience if a nurse had offered them a warm blanket while they were on the gurney waiting for surgery. There are all kinds of “warm blankets” colleges can offer. Students who had a single dinner at a professor’s house were significantly more likely to say they would choose the college again. In learning to write, it made a lasting difference if students had at least one experience of sitting down with a professor to go over their work, paragraph by paragraph; for the students it was someone serious saying their writing was important.

**What do colleges do that doesn’t improve the experience?**

Strategic plans. I used to be so into those mission statements and goals, and I read hundreds of them when I was on the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, which accredits colleges. But I’ve never seen one that actually helped. The president of one highly ranked liberal arts college told me, in the middle of his big campaign, that he knew it wouldn’t help the education. When I asked why they were doing it, he said the trustees wanted something grand and millennial. I guess presidents have to keep their jobs, too.
After 5 Months of Sales, Colorado Sees the Downside of a Legal High
By JACK HEALY MAY 31, 2014

DENVER — Five months after Colorado became the first state to allow recreational marijuana sales, the battle over legalization is still raging.

Law enforcement officers in Colorado and neighboring states, emergency room doctors and legalization opponents increasingly are highlighting a series of recent problems as cautionary lessons for other states flirting with loosening marijuana laws.

There is the Denver man who, hours after buying a package of marijuana-infused Karma Kandy from one of Colorado’s new recreational marijuana shops, began raving about the end of the world and then pulled a handgun from the family safe and killed his wife, the authorities say. Some hospital officials say they are treating growing numbers of children and adults sickened by potent doses of edible marijuana. Sheriffs in neighboring states complain about stoned drivers streaming out of Colorado and through their towns.

“I think, by any measure, the experience of Colorado has not been a good one unless you’re in the marijuana business,” said Kevin A. Sabet, executive director of Smart Approaches to Marijuana, which opposes legalization. “We’ve seen lives damaged. We’ve seen deaths directly attributed to marijuana legalization. We’ve seen marijuana slipping through Colorado’s borders. We’ve seen marijuana getting into the hands of kids.”

Despite such anecdotes, there is scant hard data. Because of the lag in reporting many health statistics, it may take years to know legal marijuana’s effect — if any — on teenage drug use, school expulsions or the number of fatal car crashes.

It was only in January, for example, that the Colorado State Patrol began tracking the number of people pulled over for driving while stoned. Since then, marijuana-impaired drivers have made up about 12.5 percent of all citations for driving under the influence of drugs or alcohol.

Proponents of legalization argue that the critics are cherry-picking anecdotes to tarnish a young industry that has been flourishing under intense scrutiny.

The vast majority of the state’s medical and recreational marijuana stores are living up to stringent state rules, they say. The stores have sold marijuana to hundreds of thousands of customers without incident. The industry has generated $12.6 million in taxes and fees so far, though the revenues have not matched some early projections.

Marijuana supporters note that violent crimes in Denver — where the bulk of Colorado’s pot retailers are — are down so far this year. The number of robberies from January through April fell by 4.8 percent from the same time in 2013, and assaults were down by 3.7 percent. Over all, crime in Denver is down by about 10 percent, though it is impossible to say whether changes to marijuana laws played any role in that decline.
“Every major institution said this would be horrible and lead to violence and blood in the streets,” said Brian Vicente, one of the authors of Amendment 64, which legalized marijuana in Colorado. “None of that’s happened. The sky did not fall.”

The argument is being waged with fervor because both sides say Colorado’s successes and failures with regulating marijuana will shape perceptions of legalization for voters considering similar measures in other states and for leery federal law enforcement officials. After the 2012 legalization votes in Colorado and Washington State — where recreational sales are expected to begin this summer — Justice Department officials gave the states a cautious green light. But they warned that they might intervene if marijuana ended up fueling violence or drug trafficking, or flowing across state lines or into the hands of children.

Marijuana opponents like Thomas J. Gorman of the Rocky Mountain High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area program, which helps law enforcement, say Colorado is already falling short of those standards. “In any other state if they were making as much money and growing as much dope, they’d be taken out by the feds,” Mr. Gorman said.

Few agree on how much legally purchased marijuana is being secreted out of Colorado. Michele Leonhart, the head of the Drug Enforcement Administration, told a Senate panel in April that officials in Kansas had tallied a 61 percent increase in seizures of marijuana that could be traced to Colorado. But according to the Kansas Highway Patrol, total marijuana seizures fell to 1,090 pounds from 2,790 pounds during the first four months of the year, a 61 percent decline.

Some sheriffs and police chiefs along Colorado’s borders say they have noticed little change. But in Colby, Kan., which sits along an interstate highway running west to Colorado, Police Chief Ron Alexander said charges for sale, distribution or possession related to marijuana were rising fast. This year, he tallied 20 such cases through May 23. Two years ago, there were six during that same time period.

Sheriff Adam Hayward of Deuel County, Neb., said he was locking up more people for marijuana-related offenses. “It’s kind of a free-for-all,” he said. “The state or the federal government needs to step up and do something.”

Criminal marijuana cases in Colorado plunged by 65 percent in 2013, the first full year of legalization for personal recreational use, but the police in some areas have been writing dozens of tickets to crack down on public marijuana smokers. Police and fire officials across the state have been contending with a sharp rise in home explosions, as people use flammable butane to make hashish oil. And despite a galaxy of legal, regulated marijuana stores across the state, prosecutors say a dangerous illicit market persists.

In February, for example, in the Denver suburb of Aurora, a 17-year-old planning to rob an out-of-state marijuana buyer instead accidentally shot and killed his girlfriend, law enforcement officials said. Many of Colorado’s starkest problems with legal marijuana stem from pot-infused cookies, chocolates and other surprisingly potent edible treats that are especially popular with tourists and casual marijuana users.
On Colorado’s northern plains, for example, a fourth grader showed up on the playground one day in April and sold some of his grandmother’s marijuana to three classmates. The next day, one of those students returned the favor by bringing in a marijuana edible he had swiped from his own grandmother. “This was kind of an unintended consequence of Colorado’s new law,” said John Gates, the district’s director of school safety and security. “For crying out loud, secure your weed. If you can legally possess it, that’s fine. But it has no place in an elementary school.”

So far this year, nine children have ended up at Children’s Hospital Colorado in Aurora after consuming marijuana, six of whom got critically sick. In all of 2013, the hospital treated only eight such cases.

In March, the state logged what appeared to be its first death directly tied to legal recreational marijuana when a 19-year-old African exchange student, Levy Thamba Pongi, plunged to his death in Denver. He and three other students had driven from their college in Wyoming to sample Colorado’s newly legal wares. Mr. Pongi ate marijuana-infused cookies, began acting wildly and leapt from a hotel balcony, officials said; the medical examiner’s office said marijuana intoxication had made a “significant” contribution to the accident.

In April, the shooting death of Kristine Kirk raised even more concerns about regulating edible marijuana. Minutes before she was killed, Ms. Kirk called 911 to say her husband, Richard, was “talking like it was the end of the world” and had consumed marijuana and possibly prescription medication for back pain, according to a police affidavit. Police later confirmed that Mr. Kirk had bought the Karma Kandy and a pre-rolled joint from a licensed marijuana shop that evening.

Those two deaths, combined with reports of groggy, nauseated children visiting emergency rooms, forced the state to tighten its labeling and packaging rules for edible marijuana. Regulators are also considering whether to set lower limits on the amount of THC, the psychoactive component of marijuana, that can be packed into one cookie or chocolate bonbon.

Even supporters of legalization such as Mr. Vicente say Colorado needs to pass stricter rules about edible marijuana. He said the state was racing up a sharp learning curve. “Marijuana was illegal for 80 years,” Mr. Vicente said. “Now it’s legal, and everyone’s just trying to figure out how to approach these new issues.”

**Correction: June 8, 2014**

An article last Sunday about efforts by Colorado to adapt to the legalization of marijuana for recreational use misstated the percentage of marijuana-impaired traffic citations by the Colorado State Patrol. It is 12.5 percent, not 1.5 percent. The article also referred incorrectly to the use of butane in the making of hashish oil. It is used as a solvent; it is not used to cook the oil.
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I already knew… but I was surprised to learn…
**Economics/Government News Summary Sheet**

(Complete one summary sheet for each of the four news pieces in your portfolio. *Staple the article to this sheet.*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>News Article</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Publication Date</th>
<th>Type of news piece (article, op-ed, editorial, cartoon, etc.)</th>
<th>Summary of the news piece (Include the who, what, when where, why, how of the piece; if it is an opinion, piece include the author’s opinion.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I already knew…</td>
<td>New York Times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>but I was surprised to learn…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>