

**DEFENDERS OF WILDLIFE ACTION FUND
2012 CANDIDATE QUESTIONNAIRE**

Name:
Office sought:
State:
District (if applicable):
Party:
Office currently held (if applicable):
Email:
Phone:
Campaign website:
Campaign contact person:

Please check each answer individually. After answering each question by checking an option, please feel free to elaborate on your position on these issues, attaching any statements or supporting documents you wish. Once you have completed the form, please fax or mail it back to Defenders Action Fund, 1130 17th Street NW, Washington, DC 20036, Fax: (202) 463-8891. Please send it to the attention of William Lutz. Thank you in advance for your time and consideration.

Global warming – Scientists worldwide say that global warming constitutes the single most significant threat to imperiled wildlife, habitat and natural biological diversity, which support all life. They regard it as urgent that the nation significantly reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and adopt policies and programs that will help us minimize and adapt to the negative impact of global warming on habitat. Scientists have highlighted the need for adaptation measures since significant impacts are projected for some time, regardless of how quickly and thoroughly emissions are reduced.

Do you believe that global warming is indeed occurring and that it is caused primarily by human activity?

Yes No

If your answer is no, please explain:

If yes, would you be willing to vote on the record as such?

Yes No

If your answer is no, please explain:

Would you have voted for legislation that significantly reduces greenhouse gas emissions (17 percent by 2020) and helps minimize the negative impact on imperiled

wildlife and natural ecosystems from global warming?

Yes No

If your answer is no, please explain:

Clean air – A key part of addressing the threat of global warming is regulating greenhouse gases. The US Supreme Court has already ruled that the Environmental Protection Agency is required to regulate greenhouse gases under the Clean Air Act. Despite this ruling, some lawmakers in Congress are going to great lengths to limit EPA’s ability to regulate the harmful gases proven to contribute to global warming.

Do you agree that the EPA should fully enforce the Clean Air Act by regulating greenhouse gases?

Yes No

If your answer is no, please explain:

Would you have voted against legislation to remove or delay EPA’s ability to regulate greenhouse gases?

Yes No

If your answer is no, please explain:

Energy – To deal with global warming it is critical that our energy policies move us away from our extreme reliance on fossil fuels to embrace clean, renewable energy solutions. Wind and solar projects should be a key part of America’s energy future, but they can carry significant risks for imperiled wildlife, habitat, and biological diversity.

Do you support requiring adherence to science-based criteria to sustain imperiled wildlife populations and their habitat, when building new renewable energy projects on both federal and private lands, in a manner that would first avoid, then minimize and finally mitigate impacts to the fragile natural world?

Yes No

If your answer is no, please explain:

Do you support requiring adherence to science-based criteria to sustain imperiled wildlife populations and their habitat when building new transmission lines, in a manner that would first avoid, then minimize and finally mitigate impacts to the fragile natural world?

Yes No

If your answer is no, please explain:

Do you oppose expanded oil and gas drilling in environmentally sensitive areas on federal lands and waters, including Outer Continental Shelf areas previously closed to drilling by presidential or congressional moratoria?

Yes No

If your answer is no, please explain:

Do you oppose opening the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil drilling?

Yes No

If your answer is no, please explain:

Off-shore drilling – Oil drilling, even with the best available “clean” technology, is a dirty and risky business. Despite safety protocols, leaks and spills are inevitable. Look no further than the 2010 Deepwater Horizon oil disaster. Oil is toxic to the plants and microscopic animals that form the basis of the marine food chain. It also directly poisons birds, mammals and fish. Our coasts and the marine life that depend on them have already lost the protection of a 27-year-old bipartisan federal moratorium on offshore drilling, putting our fragile coastline ecosystems at risk. And an initial ban on drilling in the Gulf following the 2010 oil disaster has also been lifted. Predictably, we are now seeing attempts to encourage states to permit drilling off their coasts by providing federal revenue to states that allow drilling.

Do you oppose efforts to encourage states, through state-revenue sharing arrangements, to permit drilling off their coasts in these fragile areas?

Yes No

If your answer is no, please explain:

If elected, would you support efforts to protect coastal economies and marine resources from the dangers of offshore drilling?

Yes No

If your answer is no, please explain:

Clean water – Despite clean water consistently being rated as one of the top environmental concerns of voters across America, not all lawmakers recognize the importance of maintaining the integrity of laws that keep water clean and safe for people and wildlife. Recently, the Clean Water Act has come under attack in both the House and Senate, as some lawmakers attempt to insert exemptions for toxic pesticides into the landmark legislation.

Would you have voted against the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act (H.R.872) or similar bills such as S.718 that exempt pesticides from being regulated under the Clean Water Act?

Yes No

If your answer is no, please explain:

Do you agree that the Clean Water Act should be protected from attacks that lessen the effectiveness of the law?

Yes No

If your answer is no, please explain:

Endangered Species Act – The Endangered Species Act (ESA) is one of our nation’s most important and successful conservation laws. It is also a favorite target of some corporate and private property interests that have tried to weaken the law to benefit developers and extractive industries. While still fundamentally sound, the Act is overdue for reauthorization and clearly can be amended so that it better serves all stakeholders including endangered wildlife.

Do you oppose amending the Endangered Species Act in a way that weakens its ability to save species from extinction and help them to recover?

Yes No

If your answer is no, please explain:

ESA precedent – In 2009, wolves in the northern Rockies were removed from the federal list of endangered species, in spite of the absence of state plans that assure continued wolf recovery. The courts have since overturned that action. Despite that, one state in the region devised a large-scale wolf hunting program that could lead to the deaths of up to 50% of wolves in the state. And in 2011, Congress eliminated ESA protections for the wolf in the first ever incident of Congress overriding the administrative process to delist a species protected under the Endangered Species Act.

Do you agree that states in the northern Rockies should have been required to demonstrate concrete commitments to wolf recovery within their borders before the species was delisted and federal endangered species protections removed?

Yes No

If your answer is no, please explain:

Would you oppose piecemeal efforts to legislatively undermine the ESA for particular species, interests or geographic areas?

Yes No

If your answer is no, please explain:

Unscientific aerial wildlife gunning – While it is generally considered permissible to use aircraft for legitimate wildlife predator control, some Western states prepare to use this controversial practice in an attempt to artificially boost the moose, caribou or elk populations. These efforts typically are not supported by credible science, could be conducted on federal lands and, in some cases, by federal agencies.

Do you support placing a firm prohibition on the non-scientifically justified use of aircraft to hunt and kill wild predators to boost big game populations?

Yes No

If your answer is no, please explain:

Do you support upholding the integrity and mission of federal lands by fighting states' unscientific predator control proposals?

Yes No

If your answer is no, please explain:

Sustaining wildlife on public lands — The U.S. Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management (BLM) together manage nearly 450 million acres of federal land for multiple social, economic and conservation purposes. Managing for wildlife is one of the primary tenets of their multiple-use missions. Yet, both agencies lack balanced wildlife policies and science-based land management planning tools to ensure that wildlife is adequately accounted for in land planning decisions. In 2011 the U.S. Forest Service issued a regulatory proposal to revise its basic national forest planning regulations but the proposal fell short on effectively sustaining wildlife according to many conservation groups, scientists and Members of Congress. The America’s Wildlife Heritage Act is a bill that would: establish a standard of native wildlife sustainability for both the Forest Service and BLM; create a practical, flexible and effective monitoring protocol to provide land managers the information they need to make informed planning decisions; and substantially improve cooperation among the federal, state and tribal land management agencies to enhance data-sharing and planning.

Do you support a wildlife sustainability standard for the BLM and the Forest Service to ensure that wildlife sustainability becomes an integral objective of land planning decisions on lands managed by these agencies?

Yes No

If your answer is no, please explain:

Would you co-sponsor the America’s Wildlife Heritage Act, if elected?

Yes No

If your answer is no, please explain:

Border issues — America’s nearly 2,000-mile border with Mexico includes many national parks, forests, wildlife refuges, wilderness areas, tribal reservations and other environmentally important areas. Some of this country’s most spectacular wildlife, including jaguar, ocelot, pronghorn, and hundreds of bird and butterfly species depend upon maintaining connected and intact habitat on public borderlands. Illegal border crossings and related enforcement activities, including the construction of hundreds of miles of large-scale walls have created serious obstacles for federal land management agencies trying to minimize significant long-term damage to sensitive natural and cultural resources.

Do you believe protection of environmentally-sensitive border areas and resources such as national parks, monuments, wildlife refuges, and endangered species should be taken into consideration when developing and approving border enforcement legislation?

Yes No

If your answer is no, please explain:

Do you support repealing the sweeping and controversial provision enacted in the 2005 Real ID Act that gives the Secretary of Homeland Security unprecedented authority to waive all federal, state and local laws to construct border barriers and walls?

Yes No

If your answer is no, please explain:

Some members in the House of Representatives introduced a sweeping bill that would effectively take away Department of the Interior and U.S. Forest Service land and resource management authority and cede it to the Department of Homeland Security. The bill explicitly exempts DHS from complying with dozens of environmental laws within 100 miles of the U.S. land and maritime borders. Would you oppose this and other similar bills?

Yes No

If your answer is no, please explain:

Funding for wildlife and habitat - To effectively protect our nation's wildlife and habitat, it is crucial to adequately fund federal programs that protect national wildlife refuges, forests, monuments and other federal lands, endangered species, migratory birds and other sensitive species as well as the science and planning that supports sound management. Our nation is facing severe budgetary constraints, but these programs constitute only a small portion of the federal budget, have never been adequately funded and have been among the first on the chopping block for anti-environmental interests in Congress.

Do you support protecting funding to safeguard federal programs that protect wildlife and habitat?

Yes No

If your answer is no, please explain:

Anti-environmental riders - Opponents of environmental protection in Congress often attach extraneous anti-environmental provisions – known as “riders” – to yearly appropriations or other must-pass bills. Efforts such as this prevent a full and fair debate on the merits and often result in enactment of these provisions due to the urgency of the vehicles to which they are attached. For example, the version of the final FY 2011 continuing resolution that initially passed the House of Representatives in February 2011 contained 24 such anti-environmental provisions including ones that would undermine the Endangered Species Act, the Clean Water Act and the Clean Air Act.

Will you oppose the practice of including anti-environmental riders on must pass bills?
O Yes O No

If your answer is no, please explain:

IMPORTANT: Committee Assignments

In order of priority, what are your three top choices for congressional committees to which you will ask to be assigned if elected?

Other

If it is not evident from the above, what conservation issue will you make your main priority in Congress? Please feel free to discuss any environmental issues that you feel are important and anticipate addressing in Congress.

Signed,

Candidate