

GEORGE W. BUSH



BIOGRAPHY

George W. Bush was born July 6, 1946, in New Haven, Connecticut. The eldest son of the former president, he earned a bachelor's degree from Yale in 1968 and a master's degree in business administration from Harvard in 1975. Bush started an oil and gas exploration company in Midland, Texas, and served as CEO from 1975 to 1987. Bush ran unsuccessfully for Congress in 1978. He was also general partner of the Texas Rangers baseball team from 1989 to 1994. Bush was elected governor of Texas in 1994 and re-elected in 1998, before narrowly defeating Democratic nominee Al Gore in the 2000 presidential race. He and his wife Laura have twin daughters.

OVERVIEW

President Bush's environmental performance may be gauged by the fact that he received an "F" on his most recent LCV Presidential Report Card—the first failing grade given to a president in LCV's history. On issue after issue—public lands, clean air and water, toxics, energy, wildlife conservation—the Bush administration, at the behest of its corporate allies, has worked systematically to dismantle and subvert fundamental environmental protections while obscuring their actions with "green" rhetoric. The results have been nothing short of disastrous for America's natural resources and have made unseating President Bush LCV's primary goal for 2004.

ISSUE AREAS

George W. Bush's campaign had not returned LCV's presidential environmental questionnaire as of October. The following text is a condensed and revised version of LCV's presidential report card, released in June 2003; President Bush received a grade of "F" on LCV's report card.

► CLEAN AIR

The Bush record on air has earned widespread criticism from the environmental and public health communities. During his 2000 campaign for office, George W. Bush pledged to reduce power plant emissions of sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxide, mercury and carbon dioxide.¹ However, in February 2002, the Bush administration announced its "Clear Skies" initiative, a plan to promote a "cap and trade" program for achieving only limited reductions of sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxide and mercury by the electric utility industry.² "Clear Skies" not only fails to address emissions of carbon dioxide, the primary cause of global warm-

ing, but also would allow individual facilities actually to boost their polluting emissions. Environmentalists maintain that the plan would raise sulfur emissions targets by up to 50 percent and delay by up to 10 years major cuts in sulfur emissions required by the Clean Air Act and allow millions more tons of smog-forming nitrogen oxides and three times more mercury emissions than current law.³

In November 2002, the Bush administration also finalized rules to weaken new source review, a Clean Air Act provision that requires older plants to upgrade their pollution controls if they make significant renovations or expansions that would increase emissions of harmful pollutants.⁴ In December 2002, nine northeastern states, citing their disproportionately high pollution burden, filed a legal challenge against the Bush administration proposal.⁵ In August 2003, the administration announced further changes to new source review, and again a number of northeastern states announced their intent to take legal action.⁶

THE CANDIDATE IN HIS OWN WORDS

Three decades after the first Earth Day, our air is cleaner, our water is purer, and our lands and natural resources are better protected.

My administration is building on these accomplishments through new and innovative policies. We will reduce power plant pollution by 70 percent. We will restore forest health, preventing catastrophic wildfires that devastate communities, wildlife habitat and the landscape. And we will promote energy efficiency and security, and improve and protect water quality, while encouraging economic growth. To help accomplish these goals I have proposed legislation—Clear Skies, Healthy Forests and the Hydrogen Fuel Initiative—which I call on Congress to pass this year.

— President George W. Bush, *Earth Day Statement*, 22 April 2003¹¹

In a lone positive note, in April 2003 the Bush administration announced proposed new rules that would reduce off-road diesel emissions by as much as 95 percent.⁷ If adopted, the new rules could prevent more than 9,600 premature deaths, 16,000 heart attacks, and 260,000 respiratory problems in children.⁸

► CLEAN WATER

As of 2000, according to the Environmental Protection Agency, some 45 percent of America's waterways remained too polluted for drinking, fishing or swimming.⁹ Yet in early 2003, the Bush administration proposed sweeping changes to the Clean Water Act that not only would preclude cleanup of the 45 percent of rivers, lakes and streams that remain polluted, but also would put more than 30 years of clean water progress at risk. In January 2003, administration officials began requiring Corps of Engineers and EPA regulators to seek permission from Washington, D.C. headquarters before they enforced clean water rules for "isolated" waters, including wetlands and seasonal streams.¹⁰ The administration also began a process that could further impair the Clean Water Act by limiting the law's jurisdiction to "navigable" waters. By EPA's own estimates, the rule changes under consideration could exempt as many as 20 million acres of wetlands and 60 percent of the nation's streams from federal protection.¹²

In addition, the Army Corps of Engineers and the EPA have weakened a regulation that requires developers who fill in wetlands to create or restore

wetlands in another area. The new policy would move away from ensuring acre-for-acre replacement of lost wetlands and would focus instead on restoring specific functions or ecological benefits—a far less specific objective and a fundamental abandonment of the "no net loss of wetlands" goal.¹³

► TOXICS

From the Bush administration's earliest days in office, it has exhibited a disregard for the public health impacts of toxic chemicals. In March 2001, EPA Administrator Christie Whitman announced she was delaying the implementation of regulations to lower the allowable amount of arsenic in drinking water to 10 parts per billion—a new standard proposed by the Clinton administration—arguing that the stricter standard would unduly burden drinking water suppliers with little benefit to the public's health.¹⁴ Only after a storm of public criticism did Whitman reverse direction and, in October 2001, announce the adoption of the proposed Clinton standard.¹⁵

In 2001 the Bush administration signed an international treaty phasing out 12 persistent organic pollutants (POPs), including PCBs, dioxins, and DDT—chemicals that are directly toxic to people, wildlife and ecosystems.¹⁶ Although the president has formally requested that the Senate ratify the treaty, environmentalists and some senators have charged that White House obstruction and stalling over legislation needed to carry out the treaty have helped to delay the Senate's ratification of the agreement.¹⁷

Superfund

President Bush has all but abandoned the Superfund program to clean up the nation's worst toxic waste sites. Funded since its inception by a corporate "polluter pays" fee, Superfund was signed into law by President Reagan in 1980, reauthorized by President George H.W. Bush, and supported by President Clinton. However, the fee expired in 1995 and since that time, Superfund's assets have declined from more than \$2 billion in 1995 to near exhaustion in 2003.¹⁸ To address this shortfall, the Bush administration has begun to shift the funding burden from corporate polluters to citizens. In 2004, for example, revenue from taxpayers will make up nearly 80 percent of Superfund's budget, as opposed to only 18 percent in 1995. By 2005, taxpayers will fund virtually all of the cost of toxic cleanups. Meanwhile, Superfund's dwindling resources have forced EPA officials to cut back on cleanups. By the late 1990s, the EPA was cleaning up an average of 76 sites per year; in 2002 and 2003, the pace of cleanups dropped by nearly 50 percent.¹⁹

► PUBLIC LANDS

From its very first day, President Bush's administration has declared virtual war against America's public lands. As a *New York Times* editorial noted: "From the beginning, President Bush has been far more interested in exploiting the public lands for commercial purposes than in protecting their environmental values."²⁰ In April 2003, for example, Interior Secretary Gale Norton announced that the Interior Department would halt the process of reviewing the 262 million acres managed by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) for potential protection as wilderness and would restrict the amount of BLM land eligible for such protection nationwide to wilderness areas and wilderness study areas designated prior to 1993. This change in policy leaves more than 200 million acres nationwide without protection from mining, oil and gas development and off-road vehicle use—activities that could make them permanently ineligible for future wilderness designation.²¹

At the same time, the Bush administration announced yet another anti-wilderness decision. Following several years of closed-door negotiations between the state of Utah and the Interior Department, the administration signed a memorandum of understanding to begin recognizing rights of way, and allowing roads to be built, on public lands through the use of a loophole in the outdated Mining Act of 1866. That loophole, known as Revised Statute 2477, could allow local governments and property rights

advocates to claim thousands of miles of long-abandoned dirt roads, mining routes, wagon trails, and cattle paths as rights of way for the use and benefit of logging companies, mining companies and off-road vehicle enthusiasts.²²

President Bush has also failed to live up to campaign pledges to "fully fund" the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF), which authorizes up to \$450 million annually to acquire land for national parks, forests and wildlife refuges and an additional \$450 million in matching grants for states to cover the costs of state parks and recreation facilities. In reality, the funds specifically earmarked for LWCF acquisition declined from \$429 million in fiscal year 2002 to \$187 million proposed for fiscal year 2004—a far cry from President Bush's pledge and far less than America's parks, forests and refuges require.²³

National Forests

Upon taking office at the end of January 2001, the Bush administration immediately began dismantling a Clinton administration rule that would have banned new road building on 58.5 million acres of national forests in 38 states. Environmentalists had hailed the "roadless rule" for providing important long-term protection for America's few remaining wild forests. In 2002, after a federal judge blocked the rule from taking effect, the Bush administration reopened the rule for public comment, claiming that they wanted more input from rural communities. Environmentalists, noting that the Forest Service had held 600 public meetings and received 1.6 million comments before it initially issued the rule, claimed that this new comment period was a prelude to the Bush administration reversing the rule.²⁴ In December 2002, a federal appeals judge lifted the injunction on the roadless rule and it is now the law of the land.²⁵

Environmentalists were also highly critical of President Bush's "Healthy Forests" initiative, arguing that it used the pretext of fire prevention to increase logging in national forests. The proposal would limit public involvement, circumvent the environmental review required by the National Environmental Policy Act, and curtail the ability of the federal courts to halt logging while hearing legal challenges. In addition, because the plan would allow the logging of large, fire resistant trees and the building of new logging roads, it could actually increase the risk of catastrophic fires.²⁶

The Bush administration has also proposed new forest management regulations that would fundamentally change the way national forests are managed,

giving economic considerations the same weight as ecological ones and removing a requirement developed during the Reagan administration that forests be managed to protect populations of native wildlife.²⁷

Mining

In October 2001, under pressure from the mining industry, the Bush administration announced it was reversing key provisions of Clinton administration regulations on hard-rock mining on public lands—including provisions to set environmental performance standards for mining operations and to give the Bureau of Land Management authority to deny permits to environmentally damaging mines.²⁸ Interior Secretary Gale Norton did sign off on a Clinton-era regulation requiring mining companies to post a financial guarantee to ensure cleanups of toxic mining waste. In April 2002, however, she convened an internal task force to further study the issue, leaving many environmentalists concerned that she would bow to industry pressure and weaken the bonding requirement.²⁹

Bush administration officials have also continued to allow coal companies to remove the tops of the mountains where they are mining and dump the rubble into nearby valleys and streams. In addition to scarring the land and destroying freshwater wildlife, this practice also pollutes local water sources. In May 2002, the administration issued a rule that essentially granted this destructive practice an exemption from the Clean Water Act by classifying the waste as “fill material” and allowing it to be dumped in rivers and streams. In May 2003, the Bush administration issued a draft Environmental Impact Statement that confirmed that mountaintop removal mining practices are highly destructive to the environment. However, rather than putting a stop to the practice, the draft EIS proposes to “streamline” the permitting process for mountaintop removal.³⁰

National Parks

During his presidential campaign, George W. Bush pledged to eliminate the National Park System’s \$4.9 billion maintenance backlog within five years. Although in April 2003, the administration claimed to have made significant progress towards reducing the backlog, environmentalists charged that the administration had reduced the backlog by only \$370 million in new funding, using creative accounting techniques to credit *all* funding for park maintenance and construction with reducing the backlog.³¹

In 2002, the Bush administration ignored the findings of its own scientists and the comments of

more than 333,000 citizens in overturning a proposed phase-out of snowmobiles in Yellowstone and Grand Teton National Parks, which have poor winter air quality due to heavy snowmobile use. Instead, administration officials put forth a much weaker proposal to limit snowmobiles to 1,100 per day and to require quieter, less polluting machines.³²

► ENVIRONMENTAL ENFORCEMENT AND REGULATORY REFORM

From the very beginning of his administration, President Bush’s appointees to key environmental posts within his administration have been highly controversial. The nomination of Secretary of Interior Gale Norton drew the fire of the environmental community, and her tenure in office, as detailed throughout this profile, has seen rollbacks in numerous protections for public lands and wildlife. Environmentalists viewed EPA Administrator Christine Todd Whitman as a potentially moderate Bush appointee.³³ However, when she resigned her office in May 2003 the *New York Times* noted: “[S]he must surely be thankful to leave behind a bureaucratic struggle in which she usually emerged the loser.”³⁴ In August 2003, President Bush announced his appointment to replace Whitman—Governor Mike Leavitt of Utah.³⁵ Leavitt’s gubernatorial record has been criticized by environmentalists and Democratic senators have seized on his nomination as an opportunity to highlight the Bush administration’s poor environmental record.³⁶

One of President Bush’s most controversial appointments—John Graham, head of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (OIRA) at the White House Office of Management and Budget (OMB)—has taken an increasingly hands-on role in shaping regulations according to so-called economic calculations, which has had the consistent effect of weakening or eliminating key environmental regulations. Among the regulations flagged by Graham was a rule for reducing emissions from off-road vehicles like snowmobiles.³⁷ Graham even pushed for EPA and other agencies to include age as a factor in cost-benefit analyses and to lower the value of human life for those over 70 to only \$2.3 million. In May 2003, following protests from senior groups and environmentalists, the EPA announced that it would discontinue using age adjusted cost-benefit analysis.³⁸

Another controversial appointee was Deputy Interior Secretary J. Steven Griles, a former coal company executive and industry lobbyist. Griles has played an instrumental role in the policy rollbacks instituted by

the Interior Department—many of which benefit his former clients. His alleged continuing contacts with these clients—including officials from the National Mining Association and the Edison Electric Institute—have made him the subject of an ethics investigation by the Interior Department’s inspector general.³⁹

Under the guise of reforming or streamlining regulations, the Bush administration has been quietly rolling back many key environmental protections. Perhaps the administration’s biggest target has been the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). On everything from the “Healthy Forests” initiative to seismic and sonar testing, Bush administration officials have been trying to sidestep NEPA provisions that require them to solicit public participation and to undertake extensive environmental reviews of any projects that could harm natural resources.⁴⁰

In another disturbing trend, the Bush administration has worked systematically to “stack” scientific advisory committees by replacing eminent scientists with industry representatives. Advisors with direct financial ties to the chemical industry, for example, replaced virtually all the members of a Health and Human Services committee charged with assessing the impacts of chemicals on human health. In addition, Bush administration officials have shown no compunction about overriding, ignoring, or even distorting the findings of their own government scientists—including a U.S. Geological Survey study that concluded oil drilling posed significant harm for the wildlife of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.⁴¹ In June 2003, the EPA released a report on the state of the environment that deleted references to scientific studies showing that human activities are a cause of global warming.⁴²

On a related front, the Bush administration has been using budget cuts to undermine the EPA’s ability to crack down on polluters. Since President Bush took office, the EPA’s Office of Enforcement and Compliance has lost more than 120 inspection and civil enforcement positions. The total number of EPA staffers conducting inspections and enforcing environmental regulations is now at its lowest level since the agency’s founding. These budget and staff reductions, coupled with the weakening of existing environmental laws and regulations, have hamstrung EPA’s ability to secure appropriate penalties from polluting industries. During fiscal year 2002, for example, the number of penalties recovered in federal settlements was half that of the previous three years.⁴³

Environmentalists have also charged the Bush administration with using lawsuit settlements as a pretext to make fundamental, back-door changes in

environmental policy. Lawsuits brought by the timber industry have prompted the government to review Endangered Species Act protections for the northern spotted owl and marbled murrelet, to discontinue biological surveys of federal forest lands, and to block protections for declining forest species in the Pacific Northwest. Litigation by the snowmobile industry resulted in a reversal of a snowmobile ban in Yellowstone and Grand Teton national parks, and a lawsuit by the state of Utah was resolved when Interior Secretary Norton halted all wilderness reviews of Bureau of Land Management lands in the West.⁴⁴

► ENERGY

On energy more than any other issue, the Bush administration’s policy approach reflects its strong ties to industry and its willingness to adopt policies that reflect corporate interests. In May 2001, the Bush administration released an energy plan that relied heavily on traditional sources of energy—oil, gas, coal and nuclear power—and was developed by an internal task force, headed by Vice President Cheney and operating in secret.⁴⁵ The media reported numerous meetings between task force members and officials from the energy industry. However, administration officials refused to identify who had advised the task force, prompting an unprecedented lawsuit from the General Accounting Office.⁴⁶ A federal judge dismissed the lawsuit in December 2002, but the courts have yet to rule on a lawsuit filed by the Sierra Club, Natural Resources Defense Council and Judicial Watch, seeking more information on energy task force meetings.⁴⁷

Nuclear Issues

President Bush’s national energy plan, released in May 2001, called for more nuclear energy production.⁴⁸ In addition, in 2002, President Bush signed off on plans to build a permanent nuclear repository at Yucca Mountain, Nevada—a site that environmentalists and public health advocates believe carries too great a risk of nuclear contamination to the surrounding community and communities nationwide as waste is shipped to Nevada by truck and rail.⁴⁹

Fuel Economy/Energy Efficiency

After months of stonewalling, the Bush administration announced in December 2002 a very modest increase in fuel efficiency standards for sports utility vehicles and light trucks—1.5 miles per gallon over the next three years. Administration officials, how-

ever, did nothing to raise mileage requirements for other passenger cars, which have remained static for more than a decade due, in large part, to well-funded and highly vocal opposition from the auto industry.⁵⁰ A recently issued EPA report found that in 2002, the average fuel economy of cars and trucks purchased by U.S. consumers fell to its lowest level in 22 years, with the new car fleet averaging only 20.4 miles per gallon for the 2002 model year.⁵¹

In May 2002, the Bush administration announced it would weaken a regulation designed to require greater energy efficiency from residential air conditioners.⁵² Consumer groups and the EPA criticized this rollback, noting that the higher standard would reduce both energy demand and air pollution.⁵³

Oil Drilling

President Bush made oil drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge a central feature of his national energy plan, despite the fact that the refuge's coastal plain houses large concentrations of wildlife, including caribou, polar bears and migratory birds. Environmentalists have also pointed out that investing in energy efficient technologies and developing clean, renewable energy sources would do more to reduce our dependence on foreign oil than drilling for oil in the Arctic refuge, which would amount to only six months of U.S. supply. The Senate has so far resisted drilling efforts, but Interior Secretary Norton has vowed that the administration will press forward with its plans to develop the refuge.⁵⁴

In addition, the Bush administration has pushed for energy exploration in such sensitive areas as the Upper Missouri Breaks National Monument, a remote and spectacular region of sandstone cliffs along the Missouri River, named a national monument by President Clinton.⁵⁵ The Bureau of Land Management has also announced plans to streamline its oil and gas permitting requirements and expedite the approval process—steps that environmentalists warned could mean less time for thorough environmental review and public input.⁵⁶

The Bush administration did call off efforts to drill for oil in the waters off Florida, where President Bush's brother Jeb serves as governor. However, the administration failed to extend the same offer to California, where Governor Gray Davis asked the federal government to buy back offshore oil and gas leases as it had done in Florida. Interior Secretary Norton denied the request in June 2002; however, after a federal appeals court called a halt to drilling in California

waters, Secretary Norton announced that it would not appeal the court decision.⁵⁷

Renewable Energy

President Bush's national energy plan slighted clean, innovative, available renewable energy technologies—such as wind, solar and geothermal energy—in favor of more domestic oil and gas drilling, increased nuclear power production and an upsurge in coal production and use.⁵⁸

► GLOBAL WARMING

Although the United States has only four percent of the world's population, it produces 25 percent of all greenhouse gas emissions.⁵⁹ President Bush has steadfastly rejected the Kyoto climate treaty, negotiated in Japan in 1997, which calls for 38 industrialized countries to make cuts in greenhouse gas emissions.⁶⁰ He called instead, for more research before the U.S. considers mandatory restrictions on global warming emissions. The administration's research plan was subsequently criticized by a National Academy of Sciences panel for failing to set priorities and rehashing questions that have largely been settled.⁶¹

The Bush administration has failed to institute any meaningful reductions in the carbon dioxide pollution that contributes to global climate change. In February 2003, the Bush administration announced a new, voluntary initiative aimed at reducing "emissions intensity"—defined as CO₂ pollution relative to economic output.⁶² Environmentalists pointed out that, with expected economic growth, total emissions will actually increase under the Bush plan.⁶³

The Bush administration also supported U.S. automakers in their suit against a new California law that requires carbon dioxide reductions in all vehicles sold in the state, beginning in 2009.⁶⁴

► WILDLIFE

Under the direction of Interior Secretary Norton, the cash-starved Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) has proven unable to carry out many of its core programs to protect endangered wildlife, and the Interior Department has developed a reputation for basing conservation decisions on politics, not biology. In May 2003, for example, Assistant Interior Secretary Craig Manson announced that the Fish and Wildlife Service had run out of funding to designate critical habitat for endangered species. Manson blamed the funding

shortfall on litigation and argued that critical habitat offers little conservation benefit to declining wildlife. Conservationists countered that the financial crisis was of the administration's own making—they have consistently failed to request sufficient funds from Congress for the program—and that the identification of critical habitat is an essential component in helping species to recover.⁶⁵

The Bush administration has a generally poor record of protecting endangered species. In early 2003, the Fish and Wildlife Service announced that gray wolves would be downlisted from “endangered” to “threatened” in the Upper Midwest and Northern Rockies—a move that environmentalists called premature and potentially dangerous for still-imperiled wolf populations.⁶⁶ Interior Secretary Norton also scrapped a previously approved plan for reintroducing grizzly bears into the Selway-Bitterroot wilderness area along the Idaho-Montana border.⁶⁷ The Fish and Wildlife Service took years, risking a contempt citation, to put together a court-ordered protection plan for Florida manatees threatened by powerboat collisions.⁶⁸ And in 2002, Bush administration officials ignored the findings of government scientists and ordered more water to be diverted for farmers around Washington state's Upper Klamath Lake and Klamath River—prompting the largest recorded salmon dieoff in U.S. history.⁶⁹

On another front, in the spring of 2002, the Defense Department, citing the need for military readiness, asked Congress for exemptions from some of the nation's most important environmental and public health laws, including the Endangered Species Act, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, the Clean Air Act, and the Superfund toxic waste cleanup law.⁷⁰ In 2002, President Bush signed a narrower bill that exempts the Defense Department from the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, a 1918 law that protects some 850 species of birds.⁷¹ In 2003, the Pentagon continued to pursue exemptions to the Endangered Species Act in Congress.⁷²

► INTERNATIONAL

The Bush administration has abandoned its leadership role on the paramount environmental issues facing the global community. This was particularly evident when the President decided not to attend the second United Nations Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg, South Africa in the summer of 2002.⁷³ And at the November 2002 meeting of the

Convention on Trade in Endangered Species, administration officials wavered on, and in some cases, abandoned long-standing U.S. support for several at-risk species.⁷⁴

Population

On his first working day in office, President Bush reissued a policy, suspended during much of the previous administration, which restricts U.S. funding for international population programs. The so-called “Mexico City policy” or “global gag rule,” denies funding to any foreign non-governmental organizations that use their own private funds to provide abortion services, counseling or referrals.⁷⁵

In January 2002, President Bush went a step further, placing a temporary hold on U.S. contributions to the United Nations Population Fund, which works in over 140 countries to give women access to voluntary family planning, economic opportunities, and education. Administration officials cited concerns over UNFPA support of China's family planning programs, even though a team of investigators appointed by President Bush confirmed that the UNFPA supported only voluntary family planning in China and recommended that the U.S. release the funding. Nevertheless, in July 2002, the Bush administration cut the entire U.S. contribution of \$34 million for UNFPA.⁷⁶

Trade

A self-avowed “free trader,” President Bush has shown strong support for a new round of global trade talks under the World Trade Organization (WTO) and for the development of a free trade area among the countries in the Western Hemisphere. The president and his trade representative, Robert Zoellick, actively pushed Congress to pass a bill granting the president “fast track” authority to negotiate trade agreements, arguing that the war against terrorism makes pursuing open markets even more urgent. Unfortunately, this legislation, approved by Congress in 2002, makes environmental negotiating objectives strictly voluntary and does nothing to protect U.S. environment and public health laws from closed-door challenges under trade agreements.⁷⁷

The Bush administration was involved in other issues that clearly demonstrated the impact of trade policies on the environment. In December 2002, the administration quietly announced it would weaken the “dolphin safe” label requirement for tuna sold in the United States to reflect the findings of a WTO panel that the regulation was a barrier to trade.⁷⁸ And

in May 2003, the administration filed a formal WTO challenge to the European Union's moratorium on the sale of foods that contain genetically modified organisms. The temporary moratorium applies to both U.S. and European products and reflects widespread European concerns that these foods may pose a threat to public health.⁷⁹

ENDNOTES

- ¹ Senator Jim Jeffords, "Jeffords: Clean Air is an American Right," *The Hill*, 9 April 2003
- ² EPA Administrator Whitman to discuss the Administration's environmental goals and "Clear Skies Initiative," EPA Press Release, February 22, 2003 (<http://www.epa.gov/air/clearskies/presrels.html>)
- ³ "The Bush Administration's Air Pollution Plan," National Resources Defense Council, 15 June 2003; David L. Greene, "Old power plants, clean air dilemma," *Baltimore Sun*, 7 September 2001
- ⁴ Gary Polakovic, Elizabeth Shogren, "Power Plants: EPA Proposes a Sweeping Change," *Los Angeles Times*, 27 July 2001; Matthew L. Wald, "EPA Says it Will Change Rules," *New York Times*, 23 November 2002
- ⁵ "Nine States Sue Bush Administration on emissions," *Reuters (Health Wire)*, 31 December 2002.
- ⁶ David Kocieniewski, "States to Fight Easing of Rules on Pollution by Power Plants," *New York Times*, 29 August 2003.
- ⁷ "EPA to Cut Air Pollution," *USA Today (Reuters Wire)*, 15 April 2003
- ⁸ "Reining in Diesel Exhaust," *CBS News*, 15 April 2003
- ⁹ "Water Quality Conditions in the United States," Environmental Protection Agency, August 2002 (<http://www.epa.gov/305b/2000report/>)
- ¹⁰ Osha Gray Davidson, "Wetlands Left High and Dry in Bush Plan," *The Los Angeles Times*, 10 January 2003
- ¹¹ www.georgewbush.com/Environment
- ¹² Eric Pianin, "Administration Establishes New Wetlands Guidelines," *The Washington Post*, 11 January 2003; Editorial, "Danger to the Wetlands," *The New York Times*, 11 January 2003; Tom Ichniowski, "EPA, Corps Issue Guidance on 'Isolated' Wetlands," *ENR (NewsWire)*, 10 January 2003
- ¹³ Elizabeth Shogren, "Buffers Ebb for Wetlands," *Los Angeles Times*, 9 August 2001
- ¹⁴ Elizabeth Shogren, "EPA Study Undercuts Arsenic Step," *Los Angeles Times*, 24 August 2001.
- ¹⁵ Franzen, "Tougher Rules for Arsenic," *Milwaukee Journal Sentinel*, 7 October 2001.
- ¹⁶ John Heilprin, "Bush Administration Decides Against Making it Easier to Eliminate Toxic Chemicals," *Associated Press*, 11 April 2002
- ¹⁷ Scott Lindlaw, "President Asks Senate to Ratify Treaty on Toxic Releases, Democrats Say His Plan Falls Short," *Associated Press*, 7 May 2002; Neil Franz, "Senate Heats Up Debate on POPs Treaty," *Chemical Week*, 22 May 2002; Mary Beth Polley, "POPs Implementation Bill Passed By Senate EPW," *Pesticide and Toxic Chemical News*, 4 August 2003
- ¹⁸ "Superfund Program: Current Status and Future Fiscal Challenges," GAO Report, July 2003 <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d03850.pdf>
- ¹⁹ "Cleanup Slowdown: How Under-funding the Superfund Program Harms Communities Across America," U.S. Public Interest Research Group, August 2003
- ²⁰ "The End of Wilderness," *New York Times*, 4 May 2003
- ²¹ Robert Gehrke, "U.S. Agency to Suspend West Wilderness Reviews," *Chicago Tribune*, 13 April 2003; Timothy Egan, "Bah Wilderness," *New York Times*, 4 May 2003; Stuart Leavenworth, "Babbitt Faults Norton Policies," *Sacramento Bee*, 22 July 2003
- ²² "Bush Opens Way for Counties and States to Claim Wilderness Roads," *Los Angeles Times*, 21 January 2003; "Assaulting Wilderness," *Salt Lake Tribune*, 20 April 2003
- ²³ "Land and Water Conservation Fund Slashed," *Environmental News Service*, 19 June 2003, "There He Goes Again: Bush Budget Bashes the Environment," Natural Resources Defense Council, 5 February 2003 (www.nrdc.org)
- ²⁴ Theo Stein, "Forest Fight Turns Over New Leaf," *Denver Post*, 4 September 2001; Zachary Coile, "Democrats Urge Bush to Listen to Forest Preservation Advocates," *San Francisco Chronicle*, 7 September 2001
- ²⁵ Bettina Boxall and Elizabeth Shogren, "Ban on Roads in Pristine National Forests Reinstated," *Los Angeles Times*, 13 December 2002; Ted Williams, "A Crossroad for Wilderness," *Mother Jones*, September/October 2002
- ²⁶ Sandra Sobieraj, "Bush Proposes Easing Logging Restrictions," *Associated Press*, 22 August 2002; Jim Robbins, "Forest Thinning Challenged as Tactic to Control Fires," *New York Times*, 27 August 2002.
- ²⁷ Ted Williams, "A Crossroad for Wilderness," *Mother Jones*; September/October 2002; Press Release, "Bush Administration Proposes Recasting Decades of Forest Policy for the Timber Industry," Defenders of Wildlife, 27 November 2002; Factsheet, "Bush Proposal Undermines 25 Years of Science-based Protection for National Forest Wildlife, Defenders of Wildlife (www.defenders.org)
- ²⁸ John Fialka, "Interior Prepares to Modify Mining Rules," *Wall Street Journal*, 24 October 2001; John Heilprin, "Bush Administration's New Mining Rules Reverse Some Clinton-Era Regulations, Keep Others," *Associated Press*, October 25, 2001.
- ²⁹ Friends of the Earth, Mineral Policy Center, Taxpayers for Common Sense, Press Release, 11 October 2002 (www.mineralpolicy.org/media)
- ³⁰ Nancy Zuckerbrod, "Bush Administration's Mountaintop Mining Rule Criticized at Hearing," *Associated Press*, 7 June 2002; Matt Spangler, "Green Groups Prepping for Challenge to New Mountaintop Mining Rules," *Inside Energy*, 4 August 2003

- ³¹ “Bush Pitches Plan for Upgrading National Parks,” *USA Today (AP Wire)*, 15 August 2003.
- ³² Katharine Seelye, “Flooded With Comments, Officials Plug Their Ears,” *New York Times*, 17 November 2002; Katharine Seelye, “Report Concludes Snowmobile Ban is Best for Parks,” *New York Times*, 31 January 2003
- ³³ “Presidential Report Card,” League of Conservation Voters, January 2002
- ³⁴ “Christie Whitman’s Troubled Tenure,” *New York Times*, 22 May 2003
- ³⁵ “John Heilprin, “Bush Again Picks GOP Governor with Moderate Image to Head EPA,” *Associated Press*, 12 August 2003
- ³⁶ Elizabeth Shogren, “EPA Nominee’s Balancing Act Has Its Critics,” *Los Angeles Times*, 17 August 2003; John Heilprin, “Debate on Utah Governor’s Nomination for EPA Focuses on Bush Environmental Record,” *Associated Press*, 24 September 2003
- ³⁷ “Rewriting the Rules Year End Report 2002,” Natural Resources Defense Council, January 2003
- ³⁸ Cindy Skrzycki, “The Wrong Price on a Life Lost?” *Washington Post*, 10 December 2002; Katharine Seelye and John Tierney, “EPA Drops Age-based Cost Studies,” *New York Times*, 8 May 2003
- ³⁹ Eric Pianin, “Official’s Lobbying Ties Decried,” *Washington Post*, 25 September 2002; Michael Shnayerson, “Sale of the Wild,” *Vanity Fair*, September 2003
- ⁴⁰ “Weakening the National Environmental Policy Act,” Defenders of Wildlife, May 2003; Eric Pianin, “Panel Backs Faster Environment Review,” *Washington Post*, 25 September 2003
- ⁴¹ “Rewriting the Rules Year End Report 2002,” Natural Resources Defense Council, January 2003
- ⁴² Andrew Revkin and Katharine Seelye, “Report by EPA Leaves Out Data on Climate Change,” *New York Times*, 19 June 2003
- ⁴³ “Rewriting the Rules Year End Report 2002,” Natural Resources Defense Council, January 2003
- ⁴⁴ Matthew Daly, “Bush and Environment: Getting His Way By Settling Lawsuits,” *Associated Press*, 18 April 2003
- ⁴⁵ “Bush Energy Plan Sent to Congress,” *Environmental News Network*, 29 June 2001
- ⁴⁶ “GAO Sues White House,” *CBS News*, 22 February 2002
- ⁴⁷ “Judge Cans GAO Lawsuit Against Veep,” *CBS News*, 9 December 2002.
- ⁴⁸ “Bush Energy Plan Sent to Congress,” *Environmental News Network*, 29 June 2001
- ⁴⁹ Alison Mitchell, “Senate Approves Nuclear Waste Site in Nevada Mountain,” *New York Times*, 10 July 2002
- ⁵⁰ “Fuel Economy Proposal Called Trivial,” *CBS News*, 13 December 2002
- ⁵¹ Danny Hakim, “Fuel Economy Hit 22-Year Low,” *New York Times*, 3 May 2003
- ⁵² “Consumer Groups Charge DOE Regulation on Heating/Cooling Systems Doesn’t Go Far Enough,” *White House Bulletin*, 23 May 2002
- ⁵³ Jeff Beattie, “‘Misinformation’ Alleged EPA Rips DOE Rollback of Air Conditioning Efficiency Standards,” *Energy Daily*, 24 October 2001
- ⁵⁴ “Bush Energy Plan Sent to Congress,” *Environmental News Network*, 29 June 2001; Tom Doggett, “Norton Wants Energy Bill Veto If No ANWR Drilling,” *Reuters*, 19 September 2002
- ⁵⁵ Bob Burtman, “Open Season on Open Space,” *Mother Jones*, July/August 2002
- ⁵⁶ “BLM Eases Gas, Oil Well Permitting Processes,” *Billings Gazette*, 15 April 2003
- ⁵⁷ Glen Martin, “Davis Rebuffed On Oil Leases,” *San Francisco Chronicle*, 8 June 2002; “US Won’t Fight Calif.’s Power to Regulate Leases,” *Greenwire*, 1 April 2003
- ⁵⁸ “The Bush Cheney Energy Plan: Players, Profits and Paybacks,” Natural Resources Defense Council, June 2001
- ⁵⁹ “Global Warming 101,” Natural Resources Defense Council, 21 January 2003 (www.nrdc.org)
- ⁶⁰ Dick Thompson, “Why US Environmentalists Pin Hopes on Europe,” *Time Magazine*, 26 March 2001
- ⁶¹ Andrew Revkin, “Panel of Experts Faults Bush Plan to Study Climate,” *New York Times*, 26 February 2003
- ⁶² “Bush Administration Launches ‘Climate VISION,’” Department of Energy Press Release, 12 February 2003
- ⁶³ “Analysis of Bush Administration Greenhouse Target,” World Resources Institute, revised 12 February 2003 (http://newsroom.wri.org/newsrelease_text.cfm?NewsReleaseID=237)
- ⁶⁴ Rich Heffern, “Activists Battle Bush Assault on California Green Laws,” *National Catholic Reporter*, 14 March 2003
- ⁶⁵ Guy Gugliotta, “Species Act ‘Broken,’ Interior Official Says,” *Washington Post*, 29 May 2003
- ⁶⁶ Elizabeth Shogren, “U.S. Changes Status of Grey Wolf to ‘Threatened,’” *Los Angeles Times*, 19 March 2003
- ⁶⁷ Guard the Grizzly Bear Campaign, “Selway-Bitterroot Reintroduction: Bears On Ice,” Sierra Club (www.sierraclub.org/grizzly/pdfs/Selway_Bitterroot.PDF)
- ⁶⁸ Ludmilla Lelis, “2 Court Rulings Uphold Manatee Speed Zones,” *Orlando Sentinel*, 20 March 2003
- ⁶⁹ Paul Rogers, “Salmon Kill Blamed on Water Sent to Farmers,” *San Jose Mercury News*, 5 January 2003
- ⁷⁰ “DOD: Pentagon Pushes Congress for Enviro Law Exemptions,” *Greenwire*, 30 April 2002
- ⁷¹ “DOD Gets Bird Law Altered in Final Authorization Bill,” *Environment and Energy Daily*, 2 December 2002
- ⁷² Matt Stearns, “Congress Ponders Endangered Species Exemptions,” *Kansas City Star*, 1 June 2003
- ⁷³ “UN Summit Pledges Action,” *CNN*, 28 August 2002.
- ⁷⁴ “CITES Concludes in Chile,” Defenders of Wildlife press release, 15 November 2003 (www.defenders.org)
- ⁷⁵ “Bush Reinstates Ban on International Family Planning Funds”; *CNN*; 22 January 2001
- ⁷⁶ Viewpoint: House to Consider UNFPA Funding,” Population Action International, 12 June 2003 (www.populationaction.org)
- ⁷⁷ Doug Palmer, “House Lawmakers Reach Agreement on Bush Trade Bill,” *Reuters*, 26 September 2001
- ⁷⁸ Kenneth R. Weiss, “Court Blocks Easing of Dolphin Safe Tuna Labeling Rules,” *Los Angeles Times*, 11 April 2003
- ⁷⁹ Martin Crutsinger, “US Presses Biotech Food Case with EU,” *Associated Press*, 7 August 2003