



LEAGUE OF CONSERVATION VOTERS

## 2008 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 2008 LCV congressional questionnaire.

This questionnaire is designed to elicit and 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 action LCV takes in the 2008 congressional elections, 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 2008. Numerous opinion surveys, as well as the recent volume of news stories about energy and global warming issues, bear this out. 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 2008, we ask that you respond by a **deadline of February 29, 2008**. All responses need to be filed electronically in Microsoft Word format and sent to [political@lcv.org](mailto:political@lcv.org). Please ask for an electronic receipt.

Good luck on your campaign.

  
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](#)
- Global Warming & Energy: [Q.6: Mandatory Emissions Caps](#)  
[Q.7: International Action on Global Warming](#)  
[Q.8: A Green Economy](#)  
[Q.9: Renewable Energy Standards](#)  
[Q.10: California Waiver](#)  
[Q.11: Nuclear Energy](#)  
[Q.12: Liquid Coal](#)  
[Q.13: New Coal Plants](#)
- Public Health: [Q.14: Air Pollution](#)  
[Q.15: Superfund “Polluter Pays”](#)  
[Q.16: Chemical Security](#)  
[Q.17: Clean Water Act](#)  
[Q.18: Environmental Justice](#)
- Natural Heritage: [Q.19: Oceans: Marine Life](#)  
[Q.20: Oceans: Offshore Drilling](#)  
[Q.21: Endangered Species Act](#)  
[Q.22: Arctic National Wildlife Refuge](#)  
[Q.23: National Forest Roadless Areas](#)  
[Q.24: Mining](#)
- Adequate Funding: [Q.25: Land and Water Conservation Fund](#)  
[Q.26: National Parks](#)
- Other: [Q.27: International Trade Agreements](#)  
[Q.28: Federal Pre-emption of State Laws](#)  
[Q.29: World Population](#)  
[Q.30: National Environmental Policy Act \(NEPA\)](#)
- Ohio Specific: [Q.31: Nuclear Waste](#)  
[Q.32: Lake Erie Restoration](#)

SECTION ONE: General Questions

**Q.1:** There are a great many environmental or 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 as we head into 2008. Please give an indication of your overall view on issues related to energy and global warming.

Global warming is a natural phenomenon, and very unlikely to be caused by manmade CO2. I fear that this issue will destroy the credibility of liberalism, environmentalism and our universities. Temperatures peaked in 1998, the Southern Hemisphere is cooling, and yet CO2 continues to climb. If we are going to spend 5% of our GDP, or \$700 billion annually, on any issue it should be on something that will actually improve society like developing an AIDS vaccine, providing health care for the poor, better education, tax cuts, shoring up entitlements, or alternative energy research.

We need to be energy independent, and to do that we should drill in ANWR and earmark each barrel of oil with a tax to fund alternative energy research, buy up old growth and rain forests and fund other conservation projects. Basically we should sacrifice 2000 acres of barren tundra to same millions of acres of rain forest. They are already cutting down the rain forest to produce ethanol, and I don't believe the environmental movement can continue to make such outrageous errors.

**Q.2:** Please give an indication of which environmental or conservation issues other than energy and global warming you would consider most important if elected.

Removing the politics from our environmental organizations, and ensuring that our political policies reflect that man is also part of Nature.

**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.

I wrote the 29 Smoking Guns of Global Warming to expose the flaws in the anthropogenic global warming theory. Environmental policy should be based on good science if it plans to do society any good. We simply can't afford to waste \$700 billion each year.

[http://www.robertwagner08.com/pdf/smoking\\_guns\\_of\\_global\\_warming.pdf](http://www.robertwagner08.com/pdf/smoking_guns_of_global_warming.pdf)

**Q.4:** Would you say environmental or conservation issues are a priority for you when compared to other issues? Do you plan to personally attend to these issues? If so, why, and if not, why not?

We have left our children a 40 to 70 trillion debt, we are at war and our economy is stalling into a possible recession. Those issues take priority over issues such as global warming and protecting ANWR.

**Q5:** What are you doing to operate a green campaign?

I educate the public on be bad science behind global warming.  
[http://www.robertwagner08.com/pdf/smoking\\_guns\\_of\\_global\\_warming.pdf](http://www.robertwagner08.com/pdf/smoking_guns_of_global_warming.pdf)

SECTION TWO: Energy and Global Warming

**Q.6:** The League of Conservation Voters, together with the rest of the environmental community and much of the country, believe energy and global warming issues represent the most pressing environmental challenges facing this generation's leaders.

Will you support legislation that achieves 15 to 20 % reductions in global warming pollution by 2020 and reductions on the order of 80% by 2050?

Yes:

No:

**Explanation:**

Absolutely not, such a law would be devastating to the Ohio coal, auto and manufacturing industries. We need more high paying manufacturing and mining jobs, not less.

**Q.7:** In March 2001, President Bush withdrew the United States from the Kyoto Protocol, which had been the driving force at the international level for mandatory commitments by countries to reduce their global warming pollution. While the rest of the world community has moved forward to meet their pollution reduction commitments, the lack of leadership and engagement from the U.S. has slowed international momentum for stronger action, and has kept U.S. businesses from participating in the growing international carbon markets created by Kyoto.

Would you support resolutions directing the United States to engage in negotiations for deeper pollution reduction commitments with our international partners and take on commitments to reduce U.S. global warming pollution, focusing on a deal that will achieve the 50% reduction in global emissions that scientists say is needed to avoid the most serious impacts from global warming?

Yes:

No:

**Explanation:**

Absolutely not, CO2 is not a pollutant; it is an essential component of life. CO2 is what we exhale, CO2 is airborne fertilizer and plant food, CO2 is the basis of life. The dangers of labeling CO2 a pollutant could result in the deaths of millions of “undesirables” in totalitarian states. China has already made comments that their one child policy has helped slow global warming. Once you start down that slippery slope you have no idea where it will lead.

**Q.8:** The US economy is slowing down and many experts fear we are facing an imminent recession. Reforming and recreating the way we create and use energy in the United States would provide a huge boost to the economy. Studies indicate that investing in renewable energies, such as wind and solar, create more jobs than investing in traditional pulverized coal plants. The United States is already among the world leaders in developing new clean energy technology, however, we simply do not produce it on a large scale domestically. Reinventing our energy economy will create jobs and stimulate our markets providing a much-needed economic boost.

Will you support legislation to create incentives for clean, renewable energy sources as well as providing support for an influx of green jobs?

Yes:

No:

**Explanation:**

I support a fair tax that would put all industries on a level playing field. If there is a commercially viable product out there, then the free market will discover it. I totally oppose the environmental disaster of corn based ethanol which has led to starvation and destruction of wetlands, rain forests and wildlife habitat. I support drilling in ANWR and taxing each barrel of oil to fund environmental conservation and alternative energy research projects.

**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, biomass, 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 20 percent of the nation's electricity come from clean, renewable sources like wind, solar, biomass, and geothermal energy by 2020?

Yes:

No:  XXX

**Explanation:**

If this is a viable energy source, it shouldn't need federal mandates. We simply can't afford another energy disaster like corn based ethanol. People are starving in this world and we are burning food. That is not a successful, and it totally ignores the harm done to humans, especially the poor.

**Q.10:** For over 40 years, California has had the right to set its own vehicle emissions standards. Nearly all the pollution control innovations on today's cars were pioneered in California. California has attempted to exercise leadership again in the fight against global warming by cutting emissions of carbon dioxide and other heat-trapping pollutants. Seventeen other states have adopted or are adopting the California standards with more states considering following suit. But the Environmental Protection Agency is blocking California and the other states by refusing to give the California a normally routine waiver that has been granted 50 times in the past.

Would you support legislation to grant CA the waiver for its greenhouse gas standards?

Absolutely not, that would cost many auto jobs, and push Ford and GM further towards bankruptcy. CO2 is not a pollutant, CO2 is not causing global warming, and we shouldn't lose high paying auto jobs over bad science.

**Q.11:** After five decades, more than \$85 billion in U.S. federal grants and 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, or should the government leave nuclear power to find its own way in the energy marketplace without further subsidies?

If we are going to subsidize any energy industry, it should be the proven ones. We simply can't gamble tax payers money on unproven theories. Nuclear Power is proven; France has proven that, so I would support tax cuts for the nuclear power industry.

**Q.12:** Some are advocating for the development of a liquid-coal industry in the United States to generate fuels for cars, trucks, and planes. 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, 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:

**Explanation:**

Absolutely, Ohio has a large coal industry. Once again, CO2 is not a pollutant, and I am not going to lose Ohio jobs over bad science. If you are truly concerned about atmospheric CO2, remove the subsidies for corn based ethanol.

**Q.13:** More than 100 new coal fired power plants are being planned in the United States. It is important that all new investments in power plants and other long-lived assets use the most advanced technology available, rather than lock in decades of excessive pollution. To accomplish this, new plants could be required to meet a strong environmental performance standard of “no net emissions”.

Would you support legislation that requires new power plants to achieve a strong environmental performance standard of “no net emissions”?

Yes:

No:

**Explanation:**

The American consumer is already paying too much for energy, and additional unnecessary regulations will simply make it more costly. CO2 is not a pollutant, it is plant food, and we shouldn't lose US jobs over bad science.

\* \* \*

SECTION THREE: Public Health

**Q.14:** More than 150 million Americans still live in areas that exceed the U.S. EPA’s health standards for particulate air pollution and smog. These pollutants impose a significant burden on public health, causing premature death, heart attacks, hospitalizations, asthma attacks, and lost productivity at work and school, especially with poor people and people of color. Yet, recent research shows that current health standards for particulates and smog must be substantially tightened in order to adequately protect the public from these health hazards.

Would you support legislation to substantially tighten federal health standards for particulate air pollution and smog to assure protection of public health and the environment?

Yes:

No:  XXX

**Explanation:**

Americans are healthier than they have ever been. America is an extremely clean country. Life expectancy is at an all time high. We don’t need any new and unnecessary regulation to cost US jobs and drive up prices.

**Q.15:** According to 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:

No:  XXX

**Explanation:**

Once again, we don’t want to cost US jobs over unnecessary issues. If there is a health hazard, yes it should be cleaned up, but I would need to see the evidence of actual harm being done before I drive more companies out of business.

**Q.16:** Since September 11<sup>th</sup>, 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.” In 2006, the House Homeland Security Committee passed a comprehensive chemical security bill, H.R. 5695. The bill would have required the most high-risk facilities to switch to safer materials unless their operators could show that costs were prohibitive or that safer technologies did not exist. Facilities would also be required to create security plans that would be tested in a similar manner to the drills conducted with nuclear plants. This legislation was set aside by Congressional leadership in favor of much weaker language.

Q: Would you support new comprehensive chemical security legislation modeled after H.R. 5695?

Yes:

No:  XXX

**Explanation:**

Once again these are tremendously costly, and the benefits are speculative at best. We banned Freon because it supposedly caused the ozone hole to grow, and 20 years later the ozone hole is reaching record levels. Once again, I favor protecting US jobs over speculative science and benefits.

**Q.17:** The Clean Water Act has been the foundation of the nation’s clean water protections for the last 35 years, protecting rivers, streams, lakes and ponds from pollution and destruction. Small rivers, intermittent streams, and so-called “isolated” wetlands play a crucial role in maintaining water quality. Efforts are underway in the current administration and the courts to limit the ability of the federal government to protect these resources, which account for up to 60% of the nation’s waters.

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:

No:  XXX

**Explanation:**

Here in Ohio these laws have been used to trample on the property rights of many of our land owners. I support the farmers and property right. If you want to save the wetlands, stop giving farmers ethanol subsidies to destroy them.

**Q.18:** 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.

Would you support legislation to strengthen compliance with Executive Order 12898, the President's Order on Environmental Justice (2/11/94), 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, policies, and activities on minority and low income populations?

If you truly want to help our inner city children you should support school choice, and the privatization of social security so poor families can accumulate wealth. Another solid policy would be enterprise zones to stimulate the economies of the inner cities. Economic growth would level the old building, and replace them with new cleaner ones. In order to do that however the community needs money and an educated work force. Government Pension choice and school choice accomplishes both those goals.

\* \* \*

SECTION FOUR: Natural Heritage

**Q.19:** 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:

No:  XXX

**Explanation:**

I would oppose that law unless it was shown that it would not cost US worker's jobs.

**Q.20:** 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, protecting large and sensitive areas off the Atlantic, Pacific, and eastern Gulf coasts. In 2006, for the first time in more than twenty-five years, Congress voted to allow oil and gas drilling in 500,000 acres of previously protected waters in the eastern Gulf of Mexico. And in April 2007, the Bush administration's Department of the Interior released its 5-year plan for offshore oil and gas drilling in the Outer Continental Shelf, calling for drilling in Alaska's Bristol Bay and for the first time off the Virginia coast.

Do you support maintaining current moratoriums on new offshore oil and natural gas drilling?

Yes:

No:  XXX

**Explanation:**

China and India are drilling off Cuba, Canada is drilling next to ANWR. Sitting back and watching foreign countries drain out oil fields dry isn't a very sound policy.

**Q.21:** 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:

No:

**Explanation:**

The endangered species act, while well intentioned, has been used as an economic WMD and abused in a manner that has violated the private property rights of many US citizens. A balance needs to be returned to the administering of this law, a balance that includes the rights of humans and land owners.

**Q.22:** 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 over 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:

No:

**Explanation:**

Absolutely not, we should be drilling in ANWR and using the tax revenues to fund alternative energy research and protect old growth and rain forests. Canada is already drilling in that area, we should too. It was projected that drilling would harm the caribou back in the 70’s. Well, 30 years later the caribou herd is 5 times larger, and growing. There are environmentally friendly ways to drill, and we should be doing just that.

**Q.23:** In recent years, policies and procedures have been implemented that bypass environmental reviews in order to give industries greater access to public lands, including national forests. In 2005, the widely popular Roadless Area Conservation Rule was repealed and replaced by a state-by-state petition process. The courts have since reinstated the 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:

No:

Explanation:

Man is part of Nature, and that must be respected.

**Q.24:** Passed 135 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:

No:

Explanation:

Unless the pollution was shown to be at a level that was truly harmful, I would favor protecting jobs over a minimal increase of pollution. The cost of a slight increase in pollution is less than the benefits of all the jobs. I'm pro-US jobs on this issue.

\* \* \*

SECTION FIVE: Adequate Funding

**Q.25:** 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:  XXX

No:

**Explanation:**

I would support expanding it by adding revenues from oil produced in ANWR, as well as diverting the subsidies currently going to farmers to produce corn for ethanol.

**Q.26:** From Acadia to Yosemite, America's 390 national parks protect and interpret some of the nation's most treasured natural and cultural resources. Unfortunately, the National Park System has an annual operating deficit in excess of \$800 million, a land acquisition shortfall of \$1.9 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 ten years to establish reliable sources of funding and eliminate the National Park Service funding shortfall?

Yes:  XXX

No:

**Explanation:**

I would support partial privatization of the National Parks so that they can fund themselves. The government continues to demonstrate that they are inadequate at running them so it is time we give the professionals a try.

\* \* \*

SECTION SIX: Environment In a Larger Context

**Q.27:** Many recent international trade agreements do not include strong and enforceable environmental standards to combat problems such as trade in illegally logged timber, nor do they require countries to enforce their obligations under international environmental treaties. Multinational companies can also use them to challenge state and federal environmental and public health laws before international tribunals. Since "fast track" authority does not allow for amendments or real debate, congressional attempts to correct environmental deficiencies have failed.

Would you oppose trade agreements that do NOT include the following: Binding requirements for compliance with environmental laws and environmental treaties, a prohibition on trade in illegally logged timber, provisions to ensure trade agreements do not undermine our own environmental laws, and greater congressional involvement in developing our trade policy?

Yes:

No:  XXX

**Explanation:**

What right do we have to force our environmental laws on sovereign Nations? Would we allow them to do the same to us?

**Q.28:** 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:

No:  XXX

**Explanation:**

Once again, this is clearly directed at California and the Auto Industry. I do not believe California should be allowed to set the standard for the rest of the Nation.

**Q.29:** World population is increasing by 77 million people per year. Continued population growth aggravates virtually every environmental problem, including deforestation, extinction of species through habitat loss, land degradation, global warming, 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 increased funding for the U.S. portion of international population assistance necessary to achieve universal access to contraception by the year 2015?

Yes:

No:

**Explanation:**

This smacks of eugenics and Malthusian economics. We have already had one holocaust, we don't need to be planting the seeds for another. Man is not the enemy of the earth, and talks of population control remind me of Nazism.

**Q.30:** 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 projects before taking steps that may significantly affect the quality of the human environment. It has helped ensure that public resources are managed, and public funds are spent, through a public process. Critics of NEPA say it impedes development and costs too much money and time.

Do you support NEPA as is, and what, if any, changes to NEPA would you support?

I do not support NEPA and I believe that it should include cost benefit analysis. I also oppose "salutory directives" and tend to favor more flexible rules. Rarely does one size fit all.

**Q.31:** The US Dept. of Energy has proposed using the old Piketon gaseous diffusion plant as a facility to attempt to recycle fuel rod uranium. Are you in favor of Ohio becoming a destination for nuclear waste?

Yes:

No:

**Explanation:**

If it can be done safely, creates jobs and the Ohio voters support it.

**Q.32:** Lake Erie supplies drinking water, jobs, and recreation for millions of Ohioans. But sewage overflows, toxic hot spots, and invasive species have forced the lake to a tipping point. What specific actions would you take to ensure adequate funding for Great Lakes restoration projects?

I don't believe it is at a "tipping point." That argument was used with global warming as well, and it is beginning to sound a lot like the boy that cried wolf. The real "tipping point" America faces is the \$40 to 70 trillion entitlement debt we have left our children.