LEAGUE OF CONSERVATION VOTERS

2009-2010 Congressional Questionnaire

On behalf of the Board of Trustees and members of the League of Conservation Voters, thank you for taking the time to fill out the 2009-2010 LCV Congressional Questionnaire.

This questionnaire is designed to elicit your ideas regarding what environmental and conservation groups consider the most important national issues of the day. Responses may inform LCV's educational and legislative programs and actions LCV takes in the 2009-2010 congressional elections (special, primary and general).

Responses should be considered public. Although LCV may choose not to publicize responses to every question, verbatim responses may be reproduced and distributed publicly. If so, your responses may be shortened, if necessary, but will not be edited in substantive ways. If you choose to refer us to a position paper or website, please indicate exactly what text you would like us to cite. For candidates choosing not to respond to the questionnaire, LCV will note as much in its public materials.

LCV and its partners in the environmental policy arena believe that American voters are determined, to a greater degree than ever before, to make the environment a voting issue in 2009-2010. Numerous opinion surveys, as well as the recent volume of news stories about energy and global warming issues, demonstrate this interest. Voters will be interested not just in how you plan to respond to these challenges, but also what priority you assign to them. This questionnaire is one of the primary ways they will get this information.

Again, thank you for taking the time to respond. In order to make sure the voting public receives this information early enough to make sound judgments on their choices in 2009-2010, we ask that you respond by a **deadline of December 21st, 2009.** All responses need to be filed electronically in Microsoft Word format and sent to political@lcv.org. Please ask for an electronic receipt.

Good luck on your campaign.

Gene

Gene Karpinski
President

QUICK LINKS

General:
Q.1: Priorities, Energy and Global Warming
Q.2: Priorities, Other Environmental Issues
Q.3: Influences on Environmental Policy
Q.4: Priority Compared to Other Issues
Q.5: Campaign Integration
Q.6: Use of Endorsement

Global Warming & Energy:
Q.7: Mandatory Emissions Caps
Q.8: International Action on Global Warming
Q.9: Renewable Energy Standards
Q.10: Efficiency Standards
Q.11: Nuclear Energy
Q.12: Liquid Coal
Q.13: New Coal Plants
Q.14: Air Pollution
Q.15: Transportation

Public Health:
Q.16: Superfund "Polluter Pays"
Q.17: Chemical Security
Q.18: Clean Water Act
Q.19: Environmental Justice
Q.20: Toxic Chemicals

Natural Heritage:
Q.21: Oceans: Marine Life
Q.22: Oceans: Offshore Drilling
Q.23: Endangered Species Act
Q.24: Arctic National Wildlife Refuge
Q.25: National Forest Roadless Areas
Q.26: Mining

Adequate Funding:
Q.27: Land and Water Conservation Fund
Q.28: National Parks

Other:
Q.29: International Trade Agreements
Q.30: Federal Pre-emption of State Laws
Q.31: World Population
Q.32: National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)

SECTION ONE: General Questions

Q.1: The Obama Administration has vaulted energy, conservation and infrastructure issues to the top of the agenda. This year presents tremendous opportunities on a range of environmental, energy and conservation issues that are ripe for congressional action. The League of Conservation Voters and our colleagues in the environmental movement consider energy and global warming to be the most urgent issues we face. Please give an indication of your overall view on issues related to energy and global warming.

I consider climate change to be an issue of paramount importance and believe that the United States needs to be a leader in crafting ambitious and effective global responses. First, this will require domestic policies that adopt goal-specific energy efficiency and renewable energy measures. Second, it will require the US to promote and commit to international agreements that will engage the developed and developing world in holding atmospheric CO2 to 350PPM by 2050. Third, I believe strongly that the government must support research and development of new technologies that will be essential to meeting our climate change goals. And finally, government policies should serve to remove the current economic advantage of carbon heavy fuels, thereby giving businesses, institutions and individuals both motive and the means to move to low/no carbon energy sources.

Q.2: Please indicate which environmental or conservation issues other than energy and global warming you would consider most important if elected.

1 – Protect the environmental health of the Great Lakes and Illinois' shoreline;
2 – Focus on environmental justice to ensure that lower-income communities are not treated unfairly;
3 – Push for protection of our open spaces and for policies that provide for incentives for conservation (including better land use and mass transit support);
4 - Focus on better enforcement of existing laws, including adequate funding of EPA and other agencies with environmental enforcement responsibilities.

Q.3: What accomplishments or experiences would you cite as influences on your approach to environmental or conservation issues? These may be professional or personal.

As an Assistant U.S. Attorney in Chicago, I led and supervised numerous investigations with EPA criminal agents into serious violations of the federal environmental laws, including egregious actions by companies that dumped massive amounts of hazardous waste into local sewer systems in order to save money. These investigations led to high-level corporate officials being convicted and held accountable financially for their crimes. Subsequently, as Inspector General of Chicago, our office conducted successful investigations into efforts to illegally dump hazardous waste in the City's landfills, with the complicity of City workers.

As someone who grew up with asthma, I became alarmed years ago by the increasingly high rates of asthma in low-income, minority communities – a development clearly caused by an increase in industrial pollution in those areas. I became involved in the American Lung Association of Metropolitan Chicago (ALAMC), and was selected to its Board of Directors. I served on the Board for several years during the time that the ALAMC became a local leader in pushing the worst-polluting plants to clean up their emissions, and in pushing for laws that protect these communities from polluting industry.

Q.4: Would you say environmental or conservation issues are a priority for you when compared to other issues?

Yes: **Yes** **No:** **Explanation:**

My campaign for the US Senate requires me to be informed about a host of important issues, but my personal focus is on the environment and climate change, along with education, economic recovery, and job creation. I believe that a sustainable economic recovery will require better environmental policies, particularly those relating to energy and climate change.

Do you plan to personally prioritize these issues? If so, why, and if not, why not?

Yes: **Yes** **No:** **Explanation:**

My wife and I are passionate about protecting our natural, open spaces and our wildlife, about conserving our resources, and about protecting our planet from the ravages of pollution and emissions caused by short-sighted, old-school practices. I will speak out strongly about the critical importance of investing in the protection of our environment, and push for the enactment of tougher rules – and for their equally tough enforcement – to help reverse our disastrously high levels of carbon emissions, other pollution, and inefficient energy use.

Q.5: What are you doing to operate a green campaign?

We limit our use of paper by using electronic media wherever possible - we rely on it extensively for our fundraising efforts and field/volunteer programs. We try to recycle printed materials. We conserve energy by sharing workspace - with multiple occupants in offices and conference rooms - and by reducing our office heating requirements on weekends.

Q.6: Do you want an LCV endorsement and how would you use it?

Yes: **Yes** **No:** **Explanation:**

If I am honored with the LCV endorsement, I will work closely with LCV staff to maximize its value through its prominent inclusion in campaign publications and advertisements, website and in my personal presentations. I believe that it would be of great value in voter persuasion as well as in fundraising with donors who know that the LCV endorsement is an honor not easily earned.

SECTION TWO: Energy and Global Warming

Q.7: The League of Conservation Voters, together with the rest of the environmental community and much of the country, believes energy and global warming issues represent the most pressing environmental challenges facing this generation's leaders.

Would you support legislation that achieves at least 20% reductions in global warming pollution by 2020 and reductions of at least 80% by 2050?

Yes: **Yes** **No:** **Explanation:**

I am on record with this commitment. In addition, we need to pass legislation that sets ambitious near-term goals, rather than delaying substantial change to later decades. Although some economists suggest that a carbon tax may be a more efficient and effective approach to reducing atmospheric GHG, I support cap and trade legislation as the only practical approach to realize near term reform.

Q.8: In December 2009, world leaders will gather to finalize a global agreement to accelerate a shift to a clean energy economy and, in the process, revitalize our struggling economy, reduce our dependence on oil, and reduce the pollution which causes global warming. Would you support US participation in a global climate deal that is FAIR: providing support for poor countries that are the most vulnerable to global warming; AMBITIOUS: with emissions goals for the largest economies that cause the most pollution; and BINDING: with real commitments that can be legally monitored and enforced?

Yes: **Yes** **No:** **Explanation:**

Effective climate change measures must be inclusive of all these elements.

Q.9: One of the best ways to reduce America's dependence on fossil fuels and cut global warming emissions and other forms of air pollution is to increase our use of renewable energy sources, including wind, solar, and geothermal. More than twenty states have enacted policies requiring that a gradually increasing percentage of the state's electricity come from renewable sources.

Would you support federal legislation to require that at least 25 percent of the nation's electricity come from clean, renewable sources like wind, solar, and geothermal energy by 2025?

Yes: **Yes** **No:** **Explanation:**

Yes, if we are to reach our goal of 80% reduction in GHG by 2050, we will at least need to hit the benchmark of 25% use of renewable energy sources by 2025. To reach this essential mid-way goal we will need government policy reforms with GHG emission caps, as well as broad government (and private) investments in a new energy economy. Government support should include substantial investment in R&D as well as policies that will require verifiable emission reductions. Taken together these policy reforms and the public/private investments should create economic viability for energy efficiency and renewal energy.

Q.10: Raising fuel economy standards and addressing vehicle greenhouse emissions directly are key to achieving national goals in combating global warming. While the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 set new fuel economy standards for the first time since 1975 - at least 35 mpg in 2020 – we must accelerate these standards to achieve 42 mpg in 2020 if we are to meet our goals.

Would you support accelerating fuel economy standards?

Yes: **Yes** **No:** **Explanation:**

Yes, we have delayed setting ambitious fuel efficiency goals for too long.

Q.11: After five decades, more than $85 billion in U.S. direct subsidies, and 100 commercial reactors deployed and operating in the U.S., nuclear power generation is a mature energy technology controlled by multi-billion dollar companies. These companies are fully capable of privately financing new nuclear reactors whenever they can be economically constructed and operated with a suitable return on investment.

Do you favor continued federal government subsidies and tax breaks to these large energy companies?

Yes: [ ] **No:** [**No**] **Explanation:**

Nuclear power facilities should compete against other power sources without the unfair advantage of taxpayer subsidies.

Q.12: Some are advocating for the development or import of unconventional fuels such as liquid-coal, tar sands and oil shale to generate additional fuels for cars, trucks, and planes here in the United States. However, using these fuels produces nearly twice the global warming pollution compared with fuels we use today -- at a time when most believe we need to be reducing the emissions that even current fuels produce.

Do you support investment in unconventional fuels, such as liquid coal, tar sands and oil shale, which could reduce foreign oil imports but at the same time dramatically increase global warming pollution compared with the fuels we use today?

Yes: [ ] **No:** [**No**] **Explanation:**

We should strive for energy independence through measures that first of all enhance efficiency and conservation, and secondly rely on renewable resources to meet our transportation fuel needs. Policies that require and/or incentivize better (denser) land use development, more mass transit, more efficient vehicles and less carbon intensive fuels will obviate the need for carbon-heavy fuel sources.

Q.13: Nearly 100 new coal plants are being planned in the United States. It is important that all new power plants and other long-lived assets are only built if necessary to meet demand and use the most advanced technology available, rather than lock in decades of unnecessary, expensive and excessive pollution. To accomplish this, new plants could be required to meet a strong environmental performance standard of near zero emissions for conventional and global warming pollutants.

Would you support legislation that requires new power plants to achieve a strong environmental performance standard of "near zero emissions"?

Yes: [**Yes**] **No:** [ ] **Explanation:**

I encourage government support of measures that will help us in transitioning from our current level of coal-generated electricity to a more energy-efficient economy and one that is more reliant on renewable energy sources. I support measures to require that all coal plants utilize best available control technologies (BACT), which should include the cleanest-possible production methods. Understandably, as a Senator for Illinois, I want the transition to a lower carbon economy to be sensitive

to possible economic dislocations of those people who are currently dependent on the coal industry for their family income. I will therefore actively support programs that will provide financial assistance to power plants to help transition to either the 85% capture-and-sequester rate or a greener, renewable type of energy production. It is of critical importance that we take care of our workers in the coal industry, to ensure that achieving our environmental aims does not put hard-working people out of a job. It is also essential that we support research and development that will develop more effective carbon capture and sequestration technologies.

Q.14: Existing coal-fired power plants contribute more than 30 percent of total carbon dioxide emissions in the United States - nearly two billion tons annually. One of the fastest, cheapest and quickest ways to reduce dangerous global warming pollution is to reduce our dependence on the most inefficient and outdated coal-fired power plants.

Do you support standards or a timeline to reduce our dependence on inefficient and outdated coal plants?

Yes: **Yes** **No:** **Explanation:**

This transition must be sensitive to and supportive of the people currently working in the old coal supported energy economy. The transition should be supported with programs designed to train/educate workers in skills that will be valued in a low carbon clean energy economy. The transition should also include support for developing effective carbon capture and sequestration with newer coal-fired power plants.

Q.15: Transportation policy has far-reaching impacts, including on greenhouse gas emissions, oil consumption and national security, land use, public health, and quality of life. The transportation sector accounts for two-thirds of US oil consumption and nearly one-third of annual US greenhouse gas emissions, making transportation the fastest-growing source of emissions in recent years. The current transportation bill, SAFETEA-LU expired in September 2009, and has been extended for a short time. The next transportation reauthorization bill presents Congress with a significant opportunity.

Would you support national goals for reducing the transportation sector's greenhouse gas emissions and oil consumption, increasing funding for transportation planning and investment in transportation choices (rail, bicycle and pedestrian access) that fosters efficiency among modes that will enable Americans to drive fewer miles, and prioritizing investment in fixing what we have before building new roads?

Yes: **Yes** **No:** **Explanation:**

With the right incentives and requirements we can realize substantial reductions in transportation emissions without a cost to our quality-of-life or our economy. I am enthusiastically committed to investments in alternative transportation modes. The

greater Chicago area stands to realize substantial economic gains from enhanced inter-city rail travel.

SECTION THREE: Public Health

Q.16: According to the EPA, nearly 70 million Americans, including 10 million children, live within four miles of a Superfund toxic waste site. The federal Superfund law's liability provisions and its "polluter pays" fees have allowed federal agencies to respond to thousands of hazardous material emergencies and clean up many of the nation's most serious contamination cases. In 1995, however, authority for the "polluter pays" fees expired, and since then the Superfund Trust Fund, the backbone of the cleanup effort, has been virtually depleted. Cleanup costs have shifted from industry to the general taxpayer, funding has dropped, and the pace of cleanup has slowed dramatically.

Do you support Congressional action to reinstate the Superfund "polluter pays" program?

Yes: **Yes** **No:** **Explanation:**

"Polluter pays" has the advantage of creating incentives for pollution prevention while generating funding for much needed cleanup of historic pollution and relieving pressure on taxpayers.

Q.17: Since September 11th, security experts have agreed that the thousands of industrial facilities that use or store toxic chemicals provide a target for terrorists, or as one expert called them, "pre-positioned weapons of mass destruction."

The use of safer and more secure technologies can not only eliminate the consequences of an attack on these plants, but also protect plant employees and surrounding communities better than conventional security. Neutralizing these hazards also allows finite security resources and personnel to be used at facilities that cannot be converted, such as airports and government buildings.

Would you support legislation that requires the most high-risk facilities to convert to safer and more secure processes where feasible and cost effective in order to eliminate the consequences of a terrorist attack on one of these plants?

Yes: **Yes** **No:** **Explanation:**

The public interest demands reforms in this area.

Q.18: The Clean Water Act, long considered one of the country's most successful environmental laws, is broken. When the Clean Water Act was passed by Congress in 1972, 60% of waters across the United States did not meet baseline standards for use as set by the EPA. By 2001, that number was down to 40%, and many of those waters were cleaner than they were before.

However, Clean Water Act enforcement fundamentally changed as a result of activist-driven Supreme Court decisions in 2001 and 2005 and ensuing misguided Bush Administration directives. Today, the drinking water of over 110 million Americans is at risk, and 59% of U.S. stream miles along with 20% of our wetlands have either lost or are at risk of losing protections, and many have already. The Obama Administration and most environmental scholars agree that the only way to restore the original Clean Water Act protections is for Congress to pass legislation that supersedes the Supreme Court decisions.

Would you support legislation to reaffirm the historic scope of the Clean Water Act to protect the nation's waters, including these intermittent streams and isolated wetlands?

Yes: **Yes** **No:** **Explanation:**

Congress should act to restore the protective measures and scope envisioned in the original act.

Q.19: Some communities in America, especially communities of color and poorer communities, suffer disproportionate impacts from environmental degradation. Evidence of environmental disparities includes: higher incidences of childhood lead poisoning among African-American and lower-income children; higher exposures to air pollution in people of color; higher penalties for violations of federal environmental laws levied in white communities compared to minority communities, and many others.

In February of 1994, Bill Clinton signed Executive Order 12898, the President's Order on Environmental Justice, which mandates that each federal agency make achieving environmental justice part of its mission, by identifying and addressing disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs. However, problems persist with enforcement and implementation of the order. Would you support legislation to strengthen compliance with Executive Order 12898?

Yes: **Yes** **No:** **Explanation:**

Environmental justice is a personal concern. I look forward to working with LCV and other advocates (including environmental, civil rights and social justice organizations) to develop policies that will rectify imbalances in environmental protections. I will work to see that the EPA, Justice and other government agencies are even-handed in their administration of the law.

As I mentioned earlier, I became involved as a board member of the American Lung Association of Metropolitan Chicago because of my personal experience with asthma as a child and my concern about how hard asthma has hit low income and minority communities.

Q.20: New science is continually linking the increase in serious and chronic health problems among Americans to the increase in exposure to toxic chemicals. These toxic chemicals are in our homes, workplaces and everyday products. Although asthma, diabetes, childhood cancers, infertility, and learning and behavioral disorders continue to increase, the federal system has failed to protect American citizens from toxic chemicals.

The Toxic Substance Control Act (TSCA) is one of the most outdated environmental statutes on the books. TSCA has not been reauthorized since it was passed in 1976. Since then more than 80,000 chemical s have been produced and used in the United States and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has only been required to test 200 of them. Of that 200, only 5 have been restricted. Among the most notable failures of TSCA has been EPA's inability to restrict asbestos exposure.

Would you support legislation that would update TSCA by immediately initiating action on the most hazardous chemicals, hold industry accountable for demonstrating chemical safety, and in particular protect vulnerable groups such as children and pregnant women?

Yes: **Yes** **No:** **Explanation:**

We should act to protect all populations – especially those most at risk – from substances known to cause severe health and developmental impacts. In considering "health care reform" and "cost controls", we should place a much higher priority on addressing avoidable health and developmental impairments associated with environmental contamination.

SECTION FOUR: Natural Heritage

Q.21: Ocean-related activities directly contribute more than $117 billion to American prosperity and support well over two million jobs. Yet, two recent blue-ribbon commissions have detailed declines in ocean health ranging from depleted fish populations to the detrimental impacts of climate change on ocean productivity. Both commissions called for a fundamental shift in how the federal government manages America's oceans from a single-species approach to a more comprehensive approach known as ecosystem-based management.

Do you support management of America's oceans that will fully protect and restore the health of marine eco-systems, even if it may result in short term economic hardship?

Yes: **Yes** **No:** **Explanation:**

Long term environmental protections may cause short term economic dislocations, but this should not deter us from making a commitment to policies that will provide sustainable protections for both the environment and the fishing industry. Doing otherwise will only cost everyone more in the long term. As possible and practical, the federal government should, assist with transitional supports for people (in the fishing industry and other industries as well) who suffer temporary economic dislocations associated with environmental protections. I am also concerned about the Great Lakes and will support policies to restore and protect their long term health.

Q.22: In 1982, the perils associated with oil and gas development along the country's outer continental shelf prompted Congress to create the first offshore oil and gas drilling moratorium. In 1991, President George H. W. Bush instituted a separate set of executive deferrals on new coastal drilling, which President Bill Clinton extended through 2012 to protect sensitive areas off the Atlantic, Pacific, and eastern Gulf coasts while also including executive protection for Alaska's fishery-rich Bristol Bay - until it was removed last year by the White House. In 2006, for the first time in more than twenty-five years, Congress voted to allow offshore oil and gas drilling in 500,000 acres of previously protected waters off of Florida's Gulf Coast in the eastern Gulf of Mexico. Two years later, President George W. Bush rescinded his father's executive orders on coastal drilling, and Congress, under intense political pressure, did not vote to renew the Congressional ban on developing federal waters.

Would you support restricting drilling to areas NOT protected prior to 2006?

Yes: **Yes** **No:** **Explanation:**

I believe that the recent actions of Congress and President George W. Bush were misguided. If we implement policies to support better land use practices, more mass transit and walkable/bikable cities, as well as more fuel-efficient vehicles and vehicles that are powered by renewable energy generated electricity, we can obviate the need for most off-shore drilling.

Q.23: For more than 30 years, the Endangered Species Act has helped prevent the extinction of our nation's wildlife treasures, including the bald eagle, the Florida manatee, and the California condor. But despite the Act's outstanding success, there have been numerous attempts in recent years to significantly weaken it both administratively and legislatively. These include proposals to weaken habitat protection, make it more difficult to add species, undermine scientific decision-making, weaken oversight of federal agency actions, remove or undermine the goal of recovering listed species, and write into law monetary compensation for developers who claim their property has been "taken" by the act's protections.

Do you support maintaining the strong protections of the Endangered Species Act, and do you think the Act is fundamentally sound?

Yes: **Yes** **No:** **Explanation:**

The Act is not only fundamentally sound, it is one of the most effective environmental policies ever enacted. We should not disrupt its success.

Q.24: The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is our nation's largest refuge and the only untouched Arctic ecosystem in the United States. It is home to the calving grounds of the migratory Porcupine caribou herd. It is also the most important land denning habitat for the imperiled polar bear and more than 135 different species of migratory birds. Existing law requires an act of Congress before oil and gas exploration or development could proceed in the refuge. Conservationists advocate its designation as wilderness so as to ensure its permanent protection for future generations.

Do you support legislation to protect the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge from repeated attempts at oil and gas development by permanently designating it as wilderness?

Yes: **Yes** **No:** **Explanation:**

This is a pristine area so rich in rare wildlife and wildlife habitat that it deserves to be protected.

Q.25: In recent years, policies and procedures have been implemented that bypass environmental reviews in order to give extractive industries greater access to public lands, including national forests. In 2005, the widely popular Roadless Area Conservation Rule was repealed and briefly replaced by a weaker state-by-state petition process. The courts have since reinstated the 2001 Roadless Rule.

Would you support legislation to codify the 2001 Roadless Area Conservation Rule, allowing some of our last substantially untouched public lands to remain intact for future generations?

Yes: **Yes** **No:** **Explanation:**

It's always preferable to have environmental protections written into law, so that future presidents will not be able to reverse them with the stroke of a pen. The Roadless Area Conservation Rule is a critical part of our fabric of environmental protections. As an avid hiker, I know that I am only one among millions of Americans who cherish our open space and natural areas. Protecting these areas will be a high priority for me.

Q.26: Passed 137 years ago, the 1872 Mining Law still governs hardrock mining on public lands, even though the mining industry has greatly changed. The law allows private companies to take valuable minerals, including gold, silver, and uranium, from public lands without payment to the taxpayers and without consideration for the environment, which has led to pollution in 40% of the headwaters of all western watersheds. Federal land management agencies have consistently argued that, because of the law, they cannot deny hardrock mining proposals regardless of the potential environmental impacts.

Would you support reforming the 1872 Mining law in a way that safeguards water resources, gives a fair return to the taxpayer, and allows land managers to balance mining equally against other potential uses of public lands?

Yes: **Yes** **No:** **Explanation:**

This reform is long overdue.

SECTION FIVE: Adequate Funding

Q.27: The Land and Water Conservation Fund, established in 1964, is one of our nation's best tools to address the increasing loss of open space, forests, and wildlife habitat. It provides funding for acquisition of lands for our national wildlife refuges, parks, forests, monuments, and recreation areas. It also provides matching funds for state purchase of open space and development of parks. The Fund is authorized to receive $900 million annually in dedicated funding from receipts from oil and gas drilling off of the outer continental shelf of the U.S. But, past congresses and administrations from both parties have failed to appropriate the full $900 million annually, diverting most of the money to the general fund of the federal treasury.

Do you support fully funding the Land and Water Conservation Fund?

Yes: **Yes** **No:** **Explanation:**

These funds are enormously helpful supplements to the meager funds that state and local governments have to protect open space and support park development. We need to take a page from the life of Teddy Roosevelt and other conservationists to continue these essential quality-of-life investments.

Q.28: From Acadia to Yosemite, America's 391 national parks protect and interpret some of the nation's most treasured natural and cultural resources. The recent Ken Burns documentary series reminded all Americans of the importance of national parks to our national heritage and identity. Unfortunately, the National Park System currently has an

annual operating deficit in excess of $800 million, a land acquisition shortfall of $2 billion, and a multi-billion dollar maintenance backlog. The National Park Service will celebrate its centennial in 2016, less than ten years from now, and the American people are united around the idea of fully addressing the needs of the National Park System in time to celebrate the Centennial.

Do you support reinvesting in our national parks through a sustained effort over the next six years to establish reliable sources of funding for the National Park Service and eliminate funding shortfalls?

Yes: **Yes** **No:** **Explanation:**

Millions of people (including my wife and I) are regular-users of our parks each year, and the parks should be supported in accordance with this great public demand. The amount of money that it would take to adequately maintain the parks in five-star shape is small relative to the overall federal budget.

SECTION SIX: Environment In a Larger Context

Q.29: First put forward in 2008 by Sen. Sherrod Brown (D-OH) and Rep. Mike Michaud (D-ME), "The TRADE Act" initially had 80 house and senate colleagues sign on in support, and over 115 members from both parties have already cosponsored it in 2009. The bill received strong institutional backing from labor, faith, farm and environmental organizations, with over 350 national, state and local groups calling for it to be reintroduced.

The bill sets forth a progressive vision for future trade agreements, outlining a more balanced way to expand trade. It maps a fair path forward, explaining what we care about in a good agreement. It shifts the debate towards discussing a new and improved trade and globalization model, moves us beyond repeatedly fighting against expansions of failed policies, and sets a marker for where new discussion should start. Importantly, the bill includes provisions that would fix long standing failed policies that grant foreign investors greater rights than states, much to the detriment of our and trading partners' ability to enact public health and environmental laws. The bill also ensures parity between violations of commercial and environmental chapters.

If elected, would you join 115 members from 2009, and sign on as a cosponsor to the Trade Act in 2010?

Yes: **Yes** **No:** **Explanation:**

This approach makes sense from an environmental and economic perspective. It certainly makes sense from the perspective of the interests of Illinois' workers. We are living in an increasingly globalized economy and need to pursue policies that can

level the economic playing field, protect the environment and encourage better protections for future generations of people in developing nations as well those in our own country.

Q.30: The states have long been the laboratories for innovative environmental and public health policy, often enacting protections that are stronger than those provided by federal law or filling gaps where protections do not exist. In recent years, states have enacted tougher laws on global warming-causing pollution from automobiles, for example.

Would you oppose legislation that pre-empts states from enacting these kinds of environmental and public health standards that are more protective than federal standards?

Yes: **Yes** **No:** **Explanation:**

For the reasons stated above, I do not support changes in the historic ability of states to pass stronger environmental protection laws. Several significant federal environmental laws arose out of state laws that required better environmental protections. In many cases, without the state leadership it is unlikely that the federal government would ever have acted. Advocates for a single standard for environmental laws are almost always seeking to weaken environmental and/or public health protections.

Q.31: World population is increasing by 79 million people per year. Continued population growth aggravates virtually every environmental problem, including deforestation, extinction of species through habitat loss, land degradation, climate change, air and water pollution, and freshwater scarcity. Through its assistance for family planning services, the U.S. government has contributed significantly to the fertility decline that has occurred in developing countries since the 1960s. By law, no U.S. foreign assistance funds may be used to provide abortion services.

Do you support increasing funding for population and family planning to $1 billion annually in order to provide the U.S. fair share of the financial resources necessary to meet the unmet need for contraception of more than 200 million women in developing countries (who seek to postpone childbearing, space births, or want no more children but are not using a modern method of contraception)?

Yes: **Yes** **No:** **Explanation:**

The anti-family planning policies of George W. Bush need to be reversed. We should strongly support culturally appropriate policies for family planning and assist in other programs that enhance educational opportunities and the economic independence of women around the world.

Q.32: The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) provides federal agencies with clear statutory direction to incorporate environmental values into their decision-making. NEPA requires federal agencies to disclose publicly the environmental consequences of and possible alternatives to proposed projects before taking steps that may significantly affect the quality of the human environment. NEPA has helped ensure that public resources are managed, and public funds are spent, through a meaningful, transparent, public process. Critics of NEPA say it impedes development and costs too much money and time.

Do you support NEPA?

Yes: **Yes** **No:** **Explanation:**

This Act is fundamental to the fabric of US environmental law and should be supported and enforced.