

1. There are many ways the federal government subsidizes energy sources. While direct handouts are the most explicit form of subsidy, preferential treatment in the tax code also accounts for a substantial portion of federal energy handouts. Some argue that certain types of tax benefits function as subsidies, even though they are standard provisions that apply to industries across the board. **Do you support ending all energy subsidies, including cleaning up the tax code to treat all types of energy the same?**
2. The Environmental Protection Agency justifies many of its air regulations based on studies where EPA and the authors of the studies refuse to disclose the data and models they base their conclusions on. **Do you support the use of open and transparent science? Should federal agencies be required to publicly disclose all the data they use to justify their regulations?**
3. The Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS) was created in 2005 and then expanded in 2007. The RFS mandates the use of billions of gallons of biofuel each year. The program also includes a mandate for so-called “advanced” biofuels such as cellulosic ethanol, which is expensive and not commercially viable. **Should Congress repeal the Renewable Fuel Standard?**
4. Between the four major land owning agencies—the [BLM](#), [Forest Service](#), [Fish and Wildlife Service](#), and the [National Park Service](#) -- the federal government owns or manages approximately [755 million acres](#) of onshore subsurface mineral estate and 1.76 billion acres in the outer continental shelf (OCS). The combined roughly 2.515 billion acres is larger than the total surface land area of Canada. **The federal government is the largest landowner in the United States. Should the federal government continue to acquire land, or should they begin selling land back to states and private entities?**
5. Federal lands contain vast energy resources. At the current rate of use, there is enough technically recoverable oil to last over 200 years, enough natural gas to last over 100 years, and enough coal to last over 400 years.¹ Since 2008, oil production on private and state lands has increased over 80 percent and natural gas production has increased over 30 percent. Production on federal lands, however, has stagnated. **Should federal lands be managed more like private and state lands, or should the government continue to stifle natural resource production on federal lands?**
6. One of the Obama administration’s most controversial regulations concerns the attempted re-definition of “waters of the United States” under the Clean Water Act. The vague language in the rule could cover virtually any body of water, giving the federal government more control than it originally had under the Clean Water Act. **Does the Obama administration’s definition of waters of the United States go too far and, if so, how should the responsibility for the**

Institute for Energy Research, *North American Energy Inventory*, <http://instituteforenergyresearch.org/studies/energy-inventory/>.

protection of waters be divided between the states and the federal government?

7. Known as the “Clean Power Plan,” the administration’s carbon rules will shutter dozens of GW of reliable power, result in job losses, and seriously damage various state economies. This legally dubious rule is being fought tooth-and-nail in the courts, and Chief Justice Roberts recently requested the EPA submit a brief in defense of their position. This rule will likely be heard in front of the Supreme Court. **In 2015, the Obama administration finalized their regulation of carbon dioxide emissions for power plants under the Clean Air Act. Does this regulation exceed the federal government’s regulatory authority? Does it make sense to impose a regulation that, according to EPA, produces a temperature savings of 0.01°C² in exchange for billions of dollars of economic costs?**
8. A [carbon tax](#) is, quite simply, a tax on energy. Carbon tax proposals all necessarily increase the cost of both transportation fuels and fossil fuel generated electricity, as well as goods and services across virtually every economic sector. This tax is inherently regressive, as the poor spend a higher proportion of their income on energy. Additionally, funds generated by a carbon tax will undoubtedly be used to fund further government spending – just as federal income taxes have become. Thus, any notion that this tax would be revenue neutral or offsetting falls flat. **Do you support a carbon tax? Do you support the Obama administration’s use of the social cost of carbon in rulemakings?**
9. Increasingly, regulations are being issued without regard to the real cost to families, businesses, and even people’s health. The benefits are also being misleadingly quantified by considering benefits from other regulations already in effect, calling these co-benefits and indirect benefits. **Do you think federal agencies have abused the cost-benefit process to suit their political agenda and would your administration end the process of underestimating costs and inflating benefits of agency regulations?**
10. In 2007 in *Massachusetts v. EPA*, the Supreme Court found that EPA had the authority to regulate carbon dioxide under the Clean Air Act. The Supreme Court required EPA to make a decision of whether greenhouse gas emissions endangered public health and welfare. The Obama administration found that carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases harmed public health and welfare. However, since 2007 many scientific studies and additional information on global warming have come to light. **Will your administration review the Obama administration’s finding that carbon dioxide endangers public health and welfare, also known as the “endangerment finding”?**

² Patrick J. Michaels & Paul C. Knappenberger, *Spin Cycle: EPA’s Clean Power Plan*, Aug. 5, 2015, <http://www.cato.org/blog/spin-cycle-epas-clean-power-plan>