Climate Change and the Maryland 8th District Congressional Race

Before You Vote:

Learn Where the Candidates Stand on Global Warming and Clean Energy

Ahead of the April 26th primary, the CCAN Action Fund asked all the candidates for Congress in Maryland's 8th District (your district) to respond to a survey about global warming and clean energy. Several responded, providing the answers below that we hope will help voters like you understand their positions.

Here's how to use this survey: For your convenience, we have included clickable links to the answers to every question from every candidate. ***Just follow the grid below and click on the check mark, question mark, or "X" beside each candidate's name to see their verbatim answers.*** We have divided the candidates into two categories. The first set of candidates presently hold elected office or have in the past. The second set have not held elected office before.

CCAN Action Fund is the sister organization of the Chesapeake Climate Action Network. Our mission is to educate voters on the candidates' policy views on climate and energy. We do not endorse candidates.

Learn where and how to vote here.

Name and party	Years in elected office	Supports clean power plan?	Supports methane gas action?	Supports "cap and dividend"?	Supports clean tax credits?	Supports federal/state action?	Supports real bipartisan action?	Fought for these bills as lawmakers
Currently serves in elected office								
Jamie Raskin (Democrat)	10	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	MD Greenhouse Gas Reduction Act (Proponent) Marlyand Fracking Moratorium Law Green Maryland Act MD Watershed Protection and Restoration Program Act
Has not served in elected office								
William Jawando (Democrat)	-	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	No prior office
Nancy Wallace (Green Party)	-	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	No prior office

See next page for a list of all candidates for Congress in Maryland's 8th District

***Here's a list of all the candidates for Congress in Maryland's 8th District, including those who did not respond to this survey. Websites are provided so you can learn more.**

William Jawando - Democrat, http://willjawando.com/
Jamie Raskin - Democrat, www.jamieraskin.com
Nancy Wallace - Green, http://www.nancywallace.us/
David Anderson - Democrat, www.andersonforcongress.com
Kumar Barve - Democrat, http://www.kumarbarve.com/
Dan Bolling - Democrat, DanToCongress.com
Dan Cox - Republican, http://www.coxforcongress.org/
Elizabeth Croydon - Green, https://croydonforcongress.wordpress.com/
Charles Galloway - Green, http://www.galloway4congress.com/
Ana Sol Gutierrez - Democrat, http://www.anasolgutierrez.com/
Jeffrey Jones - Republican, http://www.jjones4congress8.org/
Elizabeth Matory - Republican, http://lizforcongress.nationbuilder.com/
Kathleen Matthews - Democrat, http://kathleenmatthewsforcongress.com/
Joel Rubin - Democrat, http://www.joelrubinforcongress.com/
Aryeh Shudofsky - Republican, http://www.aryehforcongress.com/
Shelly Skolnick - Republican, http://www.shellyskolnickforcongress.com/
David Trone - Democrat, http://davidtrone.com/
Jasen Wunder - Libertarian, http://www.facebook.com/jasenwunder

JAMIE RASKIN

1. In June 2014, President Obama and EPA announced the Clean Power Plan. The rule establishes the first-ever national standards to limit carbon pollution from power plants. Until this rule, existing power plants were not limited in the amount of carbon they could release. On August 3, 2015, the Clean Power Plan became final. Earlier this year, the Supreme Court halted implementation of the Clean Power Plan while legal issues are decided by the courts. What is your position on the Clean Power Plan? Do you think it should be strengthened? Weakened? More or less left the same? Please explain your answer.

The Clean Power Plan should be strengthened and expanded. I would work to ensure the EPA has the resources and authority it needs to fully implement the Clean Power Plan. The Clean Power Plan is, as the NRDC states, "the bottom line for climate action."[1] It is a necessary and promising first step but the EPA should take aggressive action to expand the rules to cover other large sources of greenhouse gas emissions beyond power plants.[2] Furthermore, the existing Plan only addresses carbon emissions—the EPA should also adopt a zero tolerance policy for methane leaks from oil and gas production processes. Fracking, for example, is a major source of methane emissions. Reducing carbon emissions from power plants but increasing methane emissions from fracking defeats the purpose. We need a sweeping and comprehensive overhaul of energy policy to slow and, if we are lucky, reverse the processes of climate change.[3]

2. On August 18, 2015 the Obama Administration proposed the first methane pollution standards for new and modified oil and gas facilities, a rule that will blunt the projected growth of methane emissions leakage from the industry. On March 10th, the Administration announced that it will also draft regulations to limit methane emissions from existing oil and gas facilities. Pound for pound, methane gas traps more than 80 times as much heat on our planet in the short term than carbon dioxide does. What is your opinion of the Administration's proposed methane rules? Do you think they should be strengthened? Weakened? More or less left the same? Please explain your answer.

I definitely support the Administration's proposed methane rules but am certain that they need to be strengthened. The proposed standards only address pollution from future facilities, so they need to be strengthened to include facilities currently in operation, which are the main source of methane pollution.[4] The United States government should take the lead and impose a ban on fracking—the destabilizing extraction process that is at the core of the problem of rising methane gas emissions.[5] While the proposed rules require oil and gas fields to install additional equipment on all new wells to capture methane during the fracking process and also seek to find and fix leaks in the production system, a ban on fracking would simply end this source of emissions entirely.[6] This is no time for baby-steps and band-aids.

3. "Cap and dividend" is a carbon-reduction policy tool that would set a steadily declining cap on the total amount of U.S. carbon pollution that can be released into the atmosphere. Any company that extracts new fossil fuels from the ground or imports them into the U.S. would have to buy a permit at a federally-organized auction for every ton of carbon dioxide those fossil fuels will emit into the atmosphere. All of the money raised would then be returned in equal amounts—through a quarterly "dividend"—to every U.S. resident with a valid Social Security number. What is your position on im-

1. https://secure.nrdconline.org/site/Advocacy?cmd=display&page=UserAction&id=3941&autologin=true&s_src=EMOFIPPETTBGD0116.
2. https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/green/news/2016/02/04/130436/5-reasons-why-the-epa-should-limit-methane-pollution-from-all-sources-in-the-oil-and-gas-sector/.
3. http://thehill.com/blogs/pundits-blog/energy-environment/222398-epas-clean-power-plan-encourages-expansion-of-fracking.
4. https://www.edf.org/energy/strong-national-policy-cut-methane-pollution.
5. http://www.realvail.com/colorado-methane-rule-held-up-as-national-model-as-debate-over-gas-heats-up/a2950.
6. http://www.dallasnews.com/business/energy/20150818-epa-proposal-to-reduce-methane-emissions-targets-gas-oil-fracking.ece.

plementing a cap-and-dividend policy in the U.S? Please explain your answer.

I have been an ardent supporter of cap-and-dividend policy ever since Mike Tidwell introduced me to it. In Congress, I would advocate for the same kind of policy that Congressman Chris Van Hollen has been introducing. Carbon pollution can be reduced most cost-effectively through a market-based approach that puts a price on carbon emissions which are degrading the commons of our climate system. I would champion carbon emission caps and auctions to stimulate competitive renewable energy development and to steadily and dramatically reduce consumption. The revenue generated from pricing carbon can be returned to the taxpayers and also fund the transition to a new green economy. I am calling for a "Green Deal," a massive infrastructural investment in American life—our transit and road systems, our water, our ports, our cybersecurity that is done in an environmentally positive way. The next industrial revolution is a green industrial revolution, and we must use government as a catalyst for it. We must show the vigor and creativity of the progressives who invented the New Deal. It is imperative that we move towards the renewable energy system necessary to save our species from catastrophic climate change.

4. The "Production Tax Credit" (PTC) and "Investment Tax Credit" (ITC) are the premier federal tax incentives to promote renewable energy. Both of these credits were recently renewed and extended, however their value is scheduled to decrease over time. What is your position regarding renewal and extension of the PTC and ITC? Please explain your answer.

Congressional legislation to extend the incentives for a limited time is insufficient. As the Union of Concerned Scientists states about the extension of the PTC, "By effectively extending the credit for only two weeks, Congress is not providing the certainty the renewable energy industry needs to develop projects, secure financing, and sign power purchase agreements, which can often take up to two years or more." Congressional efforts to let the incentives expire and to extend them "has resulted in a boom-bust cycle of development."[7] We need stable and predictable federal incentives to fund a massive infrastructural investment done in an environmentally positive fashion. In order for renewable energy to compete on a level playing field with traditional energy sources, it is essential that these tax incentives become enduring.

I also would propose the following:

- Eliminate subsidies for all fossil fuels. Given all we know about the risks, it is dangerous and foolish to continue to subsidize fossil fuels. I will move immediately to cut off all carbon subsidies.
- Feed-in tariffs for renewable energy. Well-designed feed-in tariffs can generate rapid growth for renewable energy technologies. I will work to increase incentives for local jurisdictions to offer feed-in tariffs.
- 100% Renewable Electricity Standard by 2050. I will work to set a national, cross-sector standard to achieve 100% renewable electricity by 2050.
- Build a national "smart grid." Build a national smart grid by providing tax credits for installation of residential and commercial metering systems and helping utilities and municipalities expand real-time grid monitoring and control.

5. State governments have played a large role in advancing climate change and clean energy policies. What state climate change/clean energy policies do you think have been the most effective? Do you have a position on climate change/clean energy policies Maryland should adopt? Finally, how do you think the federal government should work with states in its response to climate change? Please explain your answers.

California has led the way in fighting climate change. As the New York Times reports, "at least a dozen states have challenged the Obama administration's new rule regulating carbon dioxide emissions from power

7. http://www.ucsusa.org/clean_energy/smart-energy-solutions/increase-renewables/production-tax-credit-for.html#.Vv1HCWP0gdc.

plants and have vowed to do everything they can to see it overturned in court. And then there is California, which stands apart in its commitment to a healthier, cleaner and less carbon-intensive energy future." California has been demanding efficiency standards for appliances and equipment and stringent rules regulating fuel (they "played a decisive role in establishing the landmark federal fuel economy standards finalized by the Obama administration in 2012.") California passed legislation as early as 2006 to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. California continued its progressive leadership in October 2015 when Governor Jerry Brown signed legislation mandating a 100 percent increase in energy savings in homes, businesses, and factories and requiring utilities to purchase half of their power from renewable sources by 2030 (includes penalties for non-compliance).[8]

A growing number of state governments, as well as the federal agencies and some large corporations, are beginning to leverage their vast purchasing power to cut carbon pollution and address other sustainability issues through initiatives like the Sustainable Purchasing Leadership Council, modeled after the U.S. Green Building Council.[9] By some estimates, two thirds of all carbon emissions in the U.S. are linked to the purchasing and supply chains of institutional purchasers—government agencies, universities, and corporations. I would work hard to reduce carbon emissions in the federal supply chain and assist state governments in doing the same. As a market participant, the federal government should be as green as it gets.

Maryland has also led the way in combating climate change, and as a State Senator, I have a strong record fighting climate change. I have worked hard in Annapolis to cut carbon pollution and raise clean energy standards. I helped push for Maryland's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan, which calls for a 25 percent emissions reduction by 2020. In 2010, I sponsored the successful Green Maryland Act, which encourages environmentally preferable purchasing throughout state government. I am also proud of my Senate record on natural resource protection. In 2015, I cosponsored a bill that increased funding for the Chesapeake Bay Trust by 50 percent. In 2012, I led the Senate floor fight to pass a bill creating the Watershed Protection and Restoration Program, which imposed a stormwater pollution fee to raise revenue to clean up the Chesapeake Bay. In 2015 and again this year, I introduced legislation with Senator Bobby Zirkin that imposes strict liability on drilling companies for any injury, death, or loss to person or property caused by fracking. I also supported the two-year fracking moratorium, which was the compromise measure introduced in response to the complete fracking ban I proposed.

The federal government should set aggressive goals for reducing carbon and other greenhouse gas emissions and encourage states to also set aggressive carbon pollution reduction goals as well.

6. The United States can do more to address climate change by making meaningful long- term investments in carbon-reducing technologies. Gridlock in Washington has largely prevented Congress from taking substantive steps to tackle the problem. Would you work to build consensus in Congress to pass climate change legislation? How have you demonstrated your ability to build consensus in the past?

Climate change is a civilizational emergency requiring comprehensive and bipartisan national action. Fighting climate change would be one of my main priorities if elected to Congress. I would work to increase federal R&D investment through the national energy labs and other means in clean renewable energy, energy storage technology, and energy efficiency.

I plan to put my effective political leadership, cross-party coalition-building experience to work to tackle the problem. Specifically, in the Maryland Senate, I worked to build bipartisan support for the Green Maryland Act that I introduced (it passed unanimously) and the two-year moratorium the General Assembly adopted nearly unanimously (45-2) in 2015. I have worked very effectively with both Republicans and Democrats throughout my decade in the Maryland State Senate. Since I was first elected to the Senate in 2006, 118 bills

8. http://takingnote.blogs.nytimes.com/2015/10/14/california-leads-the-way-on-climate-change/
9. https://www.sustainablepurchasing.org

that I introduced have passed into law. Of those, 95 percent (112) have passed with Republican Senate support—with Republican cosponsors and/or floor votes. I built consensus for marriage equality, repeal of the death penalty, the Second Chance Act, comprehensive gun safety legislation, marijuana decriminalization, and budget transparency. Additionally, more than one-third of my bills have been adopted with unanimous Republican Senate support.

7. Can you describe examples where you showed legislative leadership on climate change and clean energy issues? Please provide details of your personal involvement in your examples.

In my decade as the Maryland State Senator representing Silver Spring and Takoma Park, I have worked hard to combat climate change. I have worked to cut carbon pollution and raise clean energy standards. I was an early proponent of Maryland's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan, which calls for a 25 percent emissions reduction by 2020. In 2010, I sponsored the successful Green Maryland Act, which encourages environmentally preferable purchasing throughout state government. I am also proud of my Senate record on natural resource protection. In 2015, I worked to successfully increase funding for the Chesapeake Bay Trust by 50 percent. In 2012, I led the Senate floor fight to pass the bill creating the Watershed Protection and Restoration Program, which imposed a stormwater pollution fee to raise revenue to clean up the Chesapeake Bay. In 2015 and again this year, I introduced legislation with Senator Bobby Zirkin that imposes strict liability on drilling companies for any injury, death, or loss to person or property caused by fracking.

8. How long have you held elected office in Maryland? What office(s) did you hold?

I've been the State Senator representing Silver Spring and Takoma Park for a decade. In 2006, I was elected with 67 percent of the vote in the Democratic primary against a 32-year incumbent and with 99 percent in the general election. I was reelected in 2010 with more than 99 percent of the vote and again in 2012 with more than 99 percent of the vote. I represent a majority-African American and Latino district. It would be an honor to represent the people, values and priorities of the 8th Congressional District in Congress, and it would be an honor to run with the support of CCAN. I would wear your endorsement as a badge of pride.

WILL JAWANDO

1. In June 2014, President Obama and EPA announced the Clean Power Plan. The rule establishes the first-ever national standards to limit carbon pollution from power plants. Until this rule, existing power plants were not limited in the amount of carbon they could release. On August 3, 2015, the Clean Power Plan became final. Earlier this year, the Supreme Court halted implementation of the Clean Power Plan while legal issues are decided by the courts. What is your position on the Clean Power Plan? Do you think it should be strengthened? Weakened? More or less left the same? Please explain your answer.

I wholeheartedly support the Clean Power Plan as a good first step towards reducing carbon emissions and preserving our environment. The United States needs to be a leader in reversing climate change, lowering our carbon footprint, and developing new renewable energy sources. Ultimately, I'd like to see the deal strengthened so we can reduce carbon emissions by more than just 32%. We need to also continue working with our international partners on this and lead a global effort to preserve our planet. We owe it to everyone who comes after us to take care of the planet and our environment as best we can.

2. On August 18, 2015 the Obama Administration proposed the first methane pollution standards for new and modified oil and gas facilities, a rule that will blunt the projected growth of methane emissions leakage from the industry. On March 10th, the Administration announced that it will also draft regulations to limit methane emissions from existing oil and gas facilities. Pound for pound, methane gas traps more than 80 times as much heat on our planet in the short term than carbon dioxide does. What is your opinion of the Administration's proposed methane rules? Do you think they should be strengthened? Weakened? More or less left the same? Please explain your answer.

I support the Obama Administration's proposals for methane pollution standards for new and modified oil and gas facilities as well as the regulations to limit methane emissions on existing oil and gas facilities and if I were Congress I would proudly advocate for this proposal and many others to ensure we are doing our part to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and setting an example for the rest of the world to follow. As I stated above, I believe it is our obligation to our children and grandchildren to preserve the planet and if these rules can help lessen climate change and eventually begin reversing the extreme weather we've been experiencing I am all for it.

3. "Cap and dividend" is a carbon-reduction policy tool that would set a steadily declining cap on the total amount of U.S. carbon pollution that can be released into the atmosphere. Any company that extracts new fossil fuels from the ground or imports them into the U.S. would have to buy a permit at a federally-organized auction for every ton of carbon dioxide those fossil fuels will emit into the atmosphere. All of the money raised would then be returned in equal amounts—through a quarterly "dividend"—to every U.S. resident with a valid Social Security number. What is your position on implementing a cap-and-dividend policy in the U.S? Please explain your answer.

I have supported "cap and trade" legislation and I would support this policy as well as a bipartisan solution to reducing carbon emissions. The 2009 legislation introduced by Congressman Van Hollen had a few Republican co-sponsors so we know that bipartisan agreement is possible. One difference between the "cap and trade" legislation and this that I particularly am in support of is that "cap and dividend" encourages consumers to actively reduce their carbon footprint by rewarding them with the dividends. For us to reduce carbon emissions and other greenhouse gases we need to encourage individuals to make lifestyle changes that are environmentally friendly and this legislation can be a model moving forward of how to incentivize those changes.

4. The "Production Tax Credit" (PTC) and "Investment Tax Credit" (ITC) are the premier federal tax incentives to promote renewable energy. Both of these credits were recently renewed and extended, however their value is scheduled to decrease over time. What is your position regarding renewal and extension of the PTC and ITC? Please explain your answer.

I support these policies and generally believe we need to do everything we can to incentivize and promote our renewable energy industry. I also don't believe we should decreasing these credits in value just yet while we're still establishing renewable energy sources as the energy source of the future. We should be decreasing the tax credits and incentives we provide to fossil fuel companies over time instead as to encourage these companies to invest in renewable energy technology.

5. State governments have played a large role in advancing climate change and clean energy policies. What state climate change/clean energy policies do you think have been the most effective? Do you have a position on climate change/clean energy policies Maryland should adopt? Finally, how do you think the federal government should work with states in its response to climate change? Please explain your answers.

Generally I believe that policies which requires localities and businesses to lower their energy consumption or use energy efficient or renewable sources has the most immediate impact in fighting climate change. Energy Performance Contracting is another great way that has helped localities transition to energy efficient and renewable technologies while lowering costs.

Three state/local examples that I have admired are:

A. California's efforts to ensure revenues from greenhouse gas reduction efforts are targeted at communities most in need of sustainable economic development.
B. Maryland's efforts to ensure that wind energy business opportunities produce benefits for underrepresented business leaders.
C. Efforts in several states to ensure that companies cannot hide from public view the chemicals that are putting into our air and water.

6. The United States can do more to address climate change by making meaningful long- term investments in carbon-reducing technologies. Gridlock in Washington has largely prevented Congress from taking substantive steps to tackle the problem. Would you work to build consensus in Congress to pass climate change legislation? How have you demonstrated your ability to build consensus in the past?

I've worked on the Hill as a staffer in the House and the Senate when Democrats were in the minority and when they were in the majority. In all cases we were able to make progress on important issues in education, health and workforce issues. For example, when I worked on the Senate Health and Education Committee, we were able to expand Head Start and Pell Grants for low income students and we cut student interest rates. We accomplished this by building consensus with our republican colleagues and I would work on doing this to advance climate change legislation as well. Congressman Van Hollen sets a good example with the cap and dividend legislation discussed above and I'd pursue similar strategies.

7. Can you describe examples where you showed legislative leadership on climate change and clean energy issues? Please provide details of your personal involvement in your examples.

In addition to being an advocate for environmental justices as a NAACP Law Fellow and Vice President of the DC branch of the NAACP, during my time as a senior official at the U.S. Department of Education, I helped launch the U.S. Green Ribbon Schools Program. This program aims to inspire schools, districts and Institutions of Higher Education to strive for 21st century excellence, by highlighting promising practices and resources. The award recognizes schools that:

» Reduce environmental impact and costs;

» Improve the health and wellness of schools, students, and staff; and

» Provide environmental education, which teaches many disciplines, and is especially good at effectively incorporating STEM, civic skills, and green career pathways.

8. How long have you held elected office in Maryland? What office(s) did you hold?

I have not previously held elected office in Maryland.

NANCY WALLACE

1. In June 2014, President Obama and EPA announced the Clean Power Plan. The rule establishes the first-ever national standards to limit carbon pollution from power plants. Until this rule, existing power plants were not limited in the amount of carbon they could release. On August 3, 2015, the Clean Power Plan became final. Earlier this year, the Supreme Court halted implementation of the Clean Power Plan while legal issues are decided by the courts. What is your position on the Clean Power Plan? Do you think it should be strengthened? Weakened? More or less left the same? Please explain your answer.

My top priority is reversing climate change. **I call for implementing a national emergency transition to renewable energy, including 100% renewable electricity by 2020. My 12-point plan with specific steps may be found on my website, www.nancywallace.us under Issues**. Our model is the quick transition of our economy during World War II to military production, in approximately 18 months. Since we've done it once, we can do it again. The ocean acidification levels threaten our very oxygen supply, since the Antarctic and Southern Ocean phytoplankton provide 50% of our oxygen, and they need a balanced calcium level for their shells. We need bold, scientifically grounded emergency measures now to address this existential threat, and it should be the central focus of our national public policy. The Green Party is the only political party in the United States that takes no funding from any corporation, PAC, or union, so we can present the proposals that match the enormous crisis facing civilization and life on Earth. We cannot wait for incremental politics to try to balance "how we're used to doing things", our comfort and convenience and current elite power structure, with our CO2 levels over 400 ppm and the recent methane spike of 400 ppb. Those concerned with climate change must bring new leadership and a new emergency message to the public discussion.

The Clean Power Plan is a useful interim step, especially given the gridlock that has paralyzed Congress in recent years with only the two parties that both take millions from the fossil fuel industry including President Obama. Improving power plant efficiency and building renewable energy generation are both important steps that we should be taking. The third method outlined by the plan, switching from coal to natural gas, is not advisable due to the enormous amount of methane that is released during drilling and transportation, and the greater impact of methane on climate than carbon dioxide at the molecular level. The fracking process used during drilling for shale gas is particularly bad in releasing methane. I oppose investing in natural gas at this time, instead of using those capital and natural resources for direct investment in wind, solar, geothermal, and tidal energy. We don't have time at this point to be building an alternate energy supply that still worsens climate change.

2. On August 18, 2015 the Obama Administration proposed the first methane pollution standards for new and modified oil and gas facilities, a rule that will blunt the projected growth of methane emissions leakage from the industry. On March 10th, the Administration announced that it will also draft regulations to limit methane emissions from existing oil and gas facilities. Pound for pound, methane gas traps more than 80 times as much heat on our planet in the short term than carbon dioxide does. What is your opinion of the Administration's proposed methane rules? Do you think they should be strengthened? Weakened? More or less left the same? Please explain your answer.

Methane leaks during the production and storage of natural gas are a significant and growing problem. U.S. methane emissions increased a dramatic thirty percent between 2002 and 2014. Fracking is causing a significant portion of that increase. The Porter Ranch gas leak dramatically showed how serious the problem is. Further, studies have shown that natural gas and renewables are in direct competition. A 2014 study

claimed that even if methane leakage were reduced to zero, "increased natural gas use for electricity will not substantially reduce US greenhouse gas emissions, and by delaying deployment of renewable energy technologies, may actually exacerbate the climate change problem in the long term." We should ban fracking which causes other serious pollution problems besides producing global warming gasses and move rapidly to a renewable energy economy. I support a ban on new oil and gas facilities, in line with the emergency plan outlined above and on my website. We need to phase out current facilities as rapidly as possible as new renewable production comes on line.

3. "Cap and dividend" is a carbon-reduction policy tool that would set a steadily declining cap on the total amount of U.S. carbon pollution that can be released into the atmosphere. Any company that extracts new fossil fuels from the ground or imports them into the U.S. would have to buy a permit at a federally-organized auction for every ton of carbon dioxide those fossil fuels will emit into the atmosphere. All of the money raised would then be returned in equal amounts—through a quarterly "dividend"—to every U.S. resident with a valid Social Security number. What is your position on implementing a cap-and-dividend policy in the U.S? Please explain your answer.

I support cap and dividend plans, not only as means to reduce carbon emissions, but also to connect Americans to this reduction in a positive way. Cap and dividend plans avoid one problem with some cap and trade or carbon tax plans in that they return money to the people who would be most hurt by energy price increases. They give a market based advantage to clean energy sources without putting the burden on the poor. The effectiveness of a cap and trade program depends on how well it is designed. When Europe instituted a cap and trade system it set the price of carbon credits too low so that utilities found it cheaper to run their coal fired power plants than switch to cleaner alternatives. Any attempt to institute a cap and dividend plan should closely study the plans already implemented to ensure that the plan is well designed and strong.

We emit several other gases that contribute to climate change besides carbon-based gases, such as nitrous oxide from agriculture. We should extend this cap and dividend plan to these gases. The US Department of Agriculture should be formally supporting a national transition to nitrogen-free fertilizers, using our tax money in every way to support the most rapid reduction and reversal of climate change humanly possible.

4. The "Production Tax Credit" (PTC) and "Investment Tax Credit" (ITC) are the premier federal tax incentives to promote renewable energy. Both of these credits were recently renewed and extended, however their value is scheduled to decrease over time. What is your position regarding renewal and extension of the PTC and ITC? Please explain your answer.

These two tax credits, PTC and ITC, have been vital to the expansion of renewable energy production in the U.S, the PTC by providing a per kilowatt-hour incentive for production and the ITC by providing tax credits to homeowner who installs renewable energy systems. The PTC and ITC provide the industry with stability and the ability to plan for future development. In years when Congress let them expire, new installation dropped precipitously, causing a boom and bust cycle. Both the PTC and ITC should be renewed on a permanent basis, combined with revoking all tax subsidies and financial incentives for the oil and gas industry. I also support increasing renewable incentives above the current levels, and providing emergency financial support to enable maximum production by existing facilities.

If we can provide hundreds of millions of dollars in extreme weather emergency through the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), how much wiser and more cost-effective is it to provide emergency assistance to the renewable energy industry, to build new factories for solar panel production, keep the factories running at maximum production, increase these incentives for energy efficiency, and take every other measure possible before these disasters and loss of life? This should be our national priority.

5. State governments have played a large role in advancing climate change and clean energy policies. What state climate change/clean energy policies do you think have been the most effective? Do

you have a position on climate change/clean energy policies Maryland should adopt? Finally, how do you think the federal government should work with states in its response to climate change? Please explain your answers.

Two of the most important state policies for increasing clean energy production have been Renewable Portfolio Standards (RPS) which require utilities to include a certain percentage of renewable electricity, and the Mandatory Green Power Option (MGPO) which requires utilities to offer and publicize green power options to customers. RPS programs have had mixed results that depend on their design. In Maryland, for example, the RPS contains a number of energy sources that are not clean such as trash incineration, burning chicken waste, and burning wood pellets (which has resulted in clear cutting of forests in Virginia). These dirty energy sources should be removed and the percentages allotted to clean energy sources should be increased. MGPO plans have shown a significant, positive impact on renewable energy production.

A second major area for reducing global warming gasses is by increasing building efficiency. Buildings are a major source of energy consumption and greenhouse gas production. The International Green Building Code is the most comprehensive effort yet to improve building efficiency. Maryland has passed legislation allowing local jurisdictions to implement the IGBC but so far only Baltimore has passed a version of the regulations. Montgomery County has been working on its version, but it appears to have significant problems and actually reduces building efficiency; our local Green Party has been helping pressure the county to use the IGBC opportunity to strongly increase building efficiency.

6. The United States can do more to address climate change by making meaningful long- term investments in carbon-reducing technologies. Gridlock in Washington has largely prevented Congress from taking substantive steps to tackle the problem. Would you work to build consensus in Congress to pass climate change legislation? How have you demonstrated your ability to build consensus in the past?

I have had extensive experience working with Congress and national coalitions to pass environmental legislation. I worked for 14 years on Capitol Hill building several coalitions of national environmental groups, and representing those coalitions on international environmental issues including stopping offshore oil drilling in the Antarctic Ocean, endangered species, and reproductive health care for women in developing countries. I developed and led the movement to stop a treaty renewal that was thought unstoppable, opposing the US State Department, Department of Commerce, Canadian, and Japanese governments. I mobilized grassroots through the coalition of many groups, and stopped this treaty which overrode the US Marine Mammal Protection Act and Endangered Species Act. I also obtained a two thirds majority Senate commitment to continue US support for the world whaling moratorium, with many Republicans, on behalf of Monitor International. See more of my political biography at "Meet Nancy" on my website, www.nancywallace.us. I love tough challenges, and enjoy working with all parts of the political spectrum. Common sense, scientific facts, and thousands of letters (per member) tend to be very persuasive on Capitol Hill, no matter what the party. I am very experienced at communicating complex scientific and technical subjects to the public, and to members of Congress, including in testimony before committees.

7. Can you describe examples where you showed legislative leadership on climate change and clean energy issues? Please provide details of your personal involvement in your examples.

My primary experience working with legislators on environmental legislation other than climate change (see question 6). Locally, as co-chair of the Montgomery County Green Party, I facilitated our support for the fossil fuel divestment campaign. I provided strategic help recently to a coalition of groups seeking to get Montgomery County to pass the International Green Building Code, which addresses the 40% of our energy use for building needs. The County government is proposing to reduce efficiency standards, and we are lobbying to increase the efficiency standards.

8. How long have you held elected office in Maryland? What office(s) did you hold?

The severity of the climate change crisis has motivated me to run for office now for the first time. The current legislative bodies, at the national, state, and local level, have overseen the disastrous and continuing increase in climate change, to the point we have already lost one entire town in Maryland on the Eastern Shore to the rise of the Chesapeake, we lose lives in tornadoes now annually, and have out of season hurricanes. We are losing a football field every hour on the Louisiana coast, which is important wetlands and fisheries nurseries for the Gulf of Mexico. We are ever closer to the extreme drought that can wipe out much of our agriculture, which happened in Australia with their 10 year drought. The glaciers in South America are melting fast, which provide the drinking water for tens of millions of people in coastal cities. Entire Andes mountains that were 100% ice covered, are now entirely exposed. Our oxygen supply is threatened with the acidification of excess CO2 absorption.

It is time for a new generation of elected officials, who put science and human survival above party identity, and see what can be done, instead of what others say cannot be done – it's "too much, too dramatic, too much change". The time is now. I have five major successes on Capitol Hill, and we need fresh new ideas, new parties, and new people to lead us to real success in reversing climate change and stabilizing our climate. With 14 years already on Capitol Hill, and an intimate knowledge of the committee system, floor procedures, caucuses, and success working the budget and appropriations process as well as the authorization bills, I believe I am the best candidate to bring our nation to stronger, immediate action on climate change that humanity and all life on Earth deserves.