

CFACT ENERGY & ENVIRONMENT TRUTH FILE: 2014

What energy and environmental policies should Americans support?

America should pursue all its energy options: oil, gas, coal, nuclear, hydroelectric, geothermal, wind, solar, and biofuels - *but only if they make economic, environmental and technological sense*. If an energy source cannot be defended on these grounds, governments and taxpayers should no longer mandate or subsidize it.

We should still support *research and development* for wind, solar, and biofuels, but should *end subsidies and mandates* for large-scale projects like industrial wind facilities. Government mandates and subsidies for wind, solar, and biofuels have cost taxpayers billions of dollars over the last 20 years - while raising electricity costs, reducing electrical reliability, and costing numerous jobs in energy-dependent sectors.

We should open federal and state lands to leasing, exploration, drilling, production, timber harvesting, and mining. Right now, the vast majority of federal lands are closed by law, regulation, or court order. Regulations should let companies find the best ways to create jobs, produce resources, and generate revenue - but ensure that work is done carefully and responsibly, and that bad or negligent behavior is punished.

Fracking has unlocked centuries of oil and gas - via private investment and private technology on private (and state) lands. State and local regulations already govern these activities; the health and environmental record to date is excellent; and the industry is working with states and communities to develop new rules as the need arises. We do not need new federal regulations (except to protect truly sensitive federal public lands), and states and local communities should not impose moratoriums or bans on hydraulic fracturing.

We should also ensure that the same rules apply to all companies and technologies. None should receive exemptions from regulations governing harmful pollution, environmental studies, and especially endangered species laws, whether they are conducting fossil fuel, renewable energy, or other activities.

Why don't you trust data, studies, and regulations from the EPA and other federal agencies?

Scientific and regulatory actions must be honest, transparent, accountable, and independently peer-reviewed. Data and studies used by the EPA and other agencies to support rulemaking must be made available for review and analysis by outside experts -- to

ENERGY & ENVIRONMENT TRUTH FILE 2014

ensure that they are accurate and objective, comply with the Information Quality Act and other laws, and support the overall public interest. American taxpayers and consumers pay for these studies and must pay the costs of these resultant regulations. They have a fundamental right to ensure these principles apply to all local, state, and federal regulatory actions.

That is especially important today, because federal regulations alone cost the U.S. economy nearly *\$1.9 trillion per year* - almost one-eighth of our gross domestic product in 2013 - as calculated by the Competitive Enterprise Institute. EPA regulations alone account for *\$353 billion* of this total, which does not consider the effects of state and local rules. The impact on jobs, business survival, families, and the long-term well-being of our nation is profound, and the question must now be raised: Are the benefits of all these regulations sufficient to justify their costs, based on honest, accurate, complete analyses?

And yet, EPA Administrator Gina McCarthy has said she and her aides alone will decide "who is qualified to review" agency data and analyses. If EPA officials believe their work is accurate and valid, they should have nothing to hide and should be happy to share, defend, and debate it.

Why don't you support renewable energy proposals more vigorously?

America has vast oil, gas, coal, uranium, and other mineral resources. We should use them, as responsible stewards, to serve our citizens. Failure to do so is like starving while having freezers of untouched food. Responsible stewardship also means conserving energy, increasing energy efficiency, and improving technologies like fracking, to create new energy opportunities, safely produce more resources from existing deposits, and ensure maximum, sustained production, job creation, revenue generation, and human welfare.

We could also consider policies like using more natural gas for cars and buses; reducing postal deliveries to five days per week; and employing better "real time" traffic control using monitors, GPS, and computers to improve green light sequences and traffic flow during rush hour. All of these would result in less fuel burned, less pollution emitted, less time wasted in traffic, and probably fewer accidents.

Most wind, solar, and biofuel projects are inherently unsustainable. They require subsidies and/or mandates; fossil

ENERGY & ENVIRONMENT TRUTH FILE 2014

fuel backup generators, which mean additional land, transmission lines, and raw materials; and often exemptions from endangered species and other environmental laws that are rigorously enforced against other industries. They take billions of dollars from productive sectors and taxpayers, depriving them of needed funding - and then channel the money to politically connected companies that support friendly politicians. They also raise electricity costs, thereby killing two to four jobs in these other sectors for each renewable energy job created.

Wind and solar electricity costs 2 to 40 times more than coal or gas generation. According to the Energy Information Administration (EIA), generating electricity with coal, natural gas, or nuclear power costs \$6 to \$9 per megawatt-hour. By contrast, generating electricity with onshore wind costs \$75 to \$138 per MWH; with offshore wind, \$243; and with photovoltaic solar, \$210. That raises energy costs for businesses and families, kills manufacturing and other jobs, and hurts poor families most of all.

How can you justify the enormous subsidies given to oil and gas?

Most so-called oil subsidies involve tax treatment similar to what is given to all companies, to deduct costs of doing business, manufacturing products, employing workers, and depreciating assets. Many people could support ending *all* subsidies for *all* energy production. But at the very least we should evaluate subsidies *per unit of energy actually produced*.

EIA and other government data reveal that subsidies for generating electricity average \$0.44 per megawatt-hour with highly reliable coal or natural gas and \$1.59 per MWH (4 times higher) with nuclear reactors. Subsidies for wind-based electricity average \$23.37 per MWH (53 times higher than for coal or natural gas), and for solar \$24.34 per MWH (55 times higher).

Why do you criticize rules for coal-fired power plants and automobile mileage?

Emissions of key air pollutants *declined nearly 90%* from 1970 to 2010 - even as coal-based electricity generation increased 180% ... miles traveled rose 170% ... and the U.S. population grew by 110 million, according to EPA and other government data. A big part of the reason is that U.S. coal-fired generators invested over

ENERGY & ENVIRONMENT TRUTH FILE 2014

\$100 billion in technologies to reduce power plant emissions. Today's air quality is safe, and pollution continues to decline under pre-Obama regulations.

Today's "advanced supercritical" coal technologies are highly efficient. Combined with other state-of-the-art technologies, they are reducing key emissions by as much as two-thirds more than existing plants are able to do - while also reducing carbon dioxide emissions by up to 25% more than the oldest plants.

Many EPA health risk claims are exaggerated. Its new soot standard permits *one ounce* of super-fine dust to be dispersed in air one-half mile long, one-half mile wide, and one story tall. Such amounts are not dangerous. The EPA *illegally used human subjects* in laboratory tests, exposing them to levels of fine soot the agency said were very dangerous - but then ignored the test results when the subjects were not harmed.

The EPA's rules on coal-fired power plant carbon dioxide, soot, and mercury are shutting down facilities, preventing new ones from being built, pummeling coal mining communities, reducing the reliability of our power grid, sending electricity prices higher, and threatening millions of manufacturing and other jobs. The forced premature retirement of hundreds of coal-fired power plants by 2020 represents more than 15% of total U.S. installed capacity - enough electricity for nearly 90 million average homes or small businesses.

Replacing that lost capacity will take many years and many billions of dollars.

EPA's new 54.5-mpg automobile standards will make cars smaller, more light weight, and less safe - causing thousands of additional injuries, disabilities, and deaths every year. But the agency failed to include these human life, health, and welfare considerations in conducting its mpg cost-benefit analyses. The mileage rules are justified by appeals to energy resource conservation and prevention of "dangerous manmade climate change" - pitting theoretical benefits against very real human suffering and death.

Isn't renewable energy more environment-friendly than fossil fuel alternatives?

Wind turbines and solar panels impact vast wildlife habitats, scenic areas, and agricultural acreage. Turbines kill millions of raptors, other birds, and bats per year, yet no penalties are assessed on wind facility operators. Turbines also reduce local property values - and turbine noise, vibration, and shadow

ENERGY & ENVIRONMENT TRUTH FILE 2014

flicker adversely affect the sleep, health, and well-being of people living near turbines in western New York State and other rural areas. Because of lax health, safety, and environmental rules, Chinese rare-earth metals used in nearly all turbine magnets and solar panels destroy wildlife and agricultural areas, poison the air, release radioactive contamination, and endanger the health and lives of workers and nearby residents.

Current ethanol production quotas require corn from an area the size of Iowa, plus huge quantities of water, fertilizers, pesticides, diesel fuel, and natural gas to grow those crops and turn them into alcohol. Some farmers make money from ethanol. But meat and fish producers must pay more for feed, which means family food bills increase - and international aid agencies pay more for corn and wheat, so more starving people go hungry. Fertilizer runoff from ethanol cornfields contributes significantly to algae blooms that kill Gulf of Mexico marine life.

Biofuel mandates, quotas, and subsidies were created when fears of imminent oil and gas depletion seemed reasonable. The fracking revolution and advances in onshore and offshore exploration and production technologies demonstrate that we still have a century of oil and gas, most of which remains off limits. Costly biofuel programs no longer make sense, nor do subsidized and mandated wind and solar programs. Moreover, when we consider the entire process of producing and using ethanol and biodiesel - and of manufacturing, installing, and backing up wind and solar facilities - carbon dioxide emissions are just as high for "renewable" energy as for fossil fuels.

Why aren't you more supportive of environment-friendly wind and solar power?

Actually, we *support* them on private lands and buildings, if they don't require taxpayer subsidies or exemptions from environmental laws and regulations, and make sense on practical and economic grounds. For example, we support solar power for water heating, photovoltaic power for highway lights and equipment, and wind and solar on farms or in locations where storms can cause power outages that would be especially disruptive and take a long time to repair.

But industrial-scale wind and solar projects are neither environment-friendly nor sustainable. Turbines and solar panels impact enormous tracts of wildlife habitat, scenic and agricultural land, and private property. Wind turbines kill

ENERGY & ENVIRONMENT TRUTH FILE 2014

millions of eagles, hawks, falcons, whooping cranes, snow geese, bats, and other flying species per year. Turbines also drive down property values and cause nausea, headaches, sleep deprivation, and other serious health problems for people who live near them.

Wind and solar receive exemptions and special treatment under environmental permitting, endangered species, migratory bird, eagle protection, and bat protection laws. That should no longer be permitted. All energy producers should be treated the same, and prosecuted and fined if they violate these laws.

Turbine noise, vibration, and shadow flicker adversely affect people's sleep, health, and well-being. Monstrous turbines reduce local property values, when located in suburban and rural communities.

Rare-earth metals (essential for turbine magnets and solar panels) are destroying Chinese and Mongolian wildlife and agricultural areas, poisoning the air, releasing huge quantities of radioactive materials, and endangering workers and nearby residents, because of lax health, safety, and environmental rules.

Wind and solar power are unreliable and are generally unavailable when needed most: hot summer days and cold winter nights, when the wind isn't blowing or sun isn't shining. Despite tens of billions in subsidies, turbines and photovoltaic panels still generate less than 3% of U.S. electricity.

But don't wind and solar power reduce dangers to birds and other wildlife?

Policies and regulations that compel greater reliance on wind and solar power result in the deaths of millions of raptors, other birds, and bats every year, based on statistics from studies in Spain, Germany, and Sweden. These are not rapidly breeding robins, sparrows, and other common birds killed by house cats; they include numerous eagles, falcons, and other protected species that are chopped up by turbine blades and incinerated by solar thermal energy facilities like Ivanpah in California's Mojave Desert. The Center for Biological Diversity estimates that Ivanpah kills 28,000 birds a year - far more than the plant's official year-to-date body count of 321, as of August 2014.

Meanwhile, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Bureau of Land Management are discussing rules that could prevent or delay leasing, drilling, and fracking in rich oil and gas areas,

ENERGY & ENVIRONMENT TRUTH FILE 2014

because the activities might “disturb” prairie chickens or sage grouse. This double standard cannot be defended.

Shouldn't we follow Europe, China, and India's lead on wind and solar?

U.S. families in coal-using states pay 7 to 10 cents per kilowatt-hour. British families pay 14 cents; German families pay 32 cents; Danes pay 38 cents. EU prices would harm U.S. families, jobs, health, and welfare.

Britain's government is expected to reduce wind turbine installations and permit fracking for natural gas - to reduce family fuel poverty, create jobs, and save energy-intensive industries and jobs. Some provinces may soon ban building new wind turbines, according to the UK's *Daily Telegraph*.

India is building 455 coal-fired power plants (520,000 MW); China is building 350 new plants; Germany 25. Worldwide, countries are building more than 1,200 coal-fueled generating plants. That means global carbon dioxide will continue to increase, no matter what the U.S. does. Eliminating all fossil fuel use in America would do nothing to prevent global warming or climate change, even if CO₂ actually affects the Earth's climate the way alarmist scientists claim it does.

Most Chinese wind turbines and solar panels were sold in the U.S. and the EU. Most U.S. wind and solar jobs have been for installation and maintenance, not manufacturing, so U.S. job creation has been minimal. Earnings for China's top wind turbine manufacturers plummeted by 90% in the first half of 2012, compared to 2011, and their profits plunged 70%, the *Wall Street Journal* has pointed out.

Siemens, the big German manufacturer, is now marketing its wind turbines heavily in the U.S., because European countries have slashed their once-generous wind and solar subsidies. Soaring electricity prices were costing two to four jobs in other industries for each wind and solar energy job created. Why would the United States want to emulate Europe or prop up failed EU renewable energy business models?

Won't cap-and-trade or carbon dioxide restrictions improve human health?

The Institute for Energy Research, IHS Global Insights, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and other analysts calculate that the EPA's

ENERGY & ENVIRONMENT TRUTH FILE 2014

CO₂ regulations will raise business and family energy costs by up to \$50 billion per year - with the impacts falling disproportionately on Southern and Midwestern communities and lower income families. Many households in these regions will suffer a staggering \$1,200 reduction in effective annual incomes and spending, with few or no health or environmental benefits in return.

In too many cases, EPA rules *actually impair* health, welfare, and ecological values. Millions will be laid off - from coal mines, power plants, factories, shops, and other businesses. Entire families and communities will have their living standards reduced. People's hopes, dreams, pride, and work ethic will be replaced by despair and dependency. Breadwinners will be forced to work multiple jobs, commute longer distances, and suffer severe sleep deprivation, if they can find work.

The higher energy costs kill jobs and raise costs for electricity, heating, air conditioning, business, manufacturing, hospital, school, commuting, and food. They force people to work multiple lower paying jobs, commute longer distances, and suffer sleep deprivation. Families must deal with more tension, stress, depression, drug and alcohol abuse, and spousal and child abuse. Nutrition and medical care suffer. More people have strokes and heart attacks, die prematurely, or commit suicide. However, the EPA refuses to consider these factors in developing its regulations.

The agency also ignores the impacts of wind and solar facilities on wildlife, habitats, and human health. It fails to mention what has been happening in Germany and Greece: As heating costs soared, people began cutting down countless trees - damaging wildlife habitats - and burning wood in stoves and fireplaces, worsening local air quality and impairing human health.

Won't your energy and environmental policies hurt poor and minority families?

They will actually help those families improve their living standards and health, and help them achieve their dreams. Real health, welfare, and environmental justice come from abundant, reliable, affordable energy. For elderly, poor, minority, and middle-class families, money spent on rising transportation, heating, and air conditioning costs is unavailable for food, healthcare, shelter, home and car repairs, and other necessities.

ENERGY & ENVIRONMENT TRUTH FILE 2014

In July 2014, only 48% of adults in the U.S. were working full time. More than 10 million are still unemployed; 7.5 million are involuntary part-timers (compared to 4.4 million in 2007); 2.4 million became discouraged and dropped out of the workforce; and 47 million were still on food stamps. The "real" unemployment rate is still 9.8% - and it is much higher for blacks, Hispanics, and teens.

Most of jobs "created" in recent months have been part-time or reflect the conversion of full-time positions to part-time. Over 28 million Americans are now working part time - many involuntarily - for lower pay, diminished benefits, and reduced job security. At the same time, they are paying \$4 per gallon for gasoline, and electricity bills continue to climb for families and businesses, according to the *Wall Street Journal*, *US News & World Report*, and other sources.

Safely and responsibly developing our hydrocarbon resources would generate the jobs and revenues America needs. Our nation has many decades of oil and gas, and centuries of coal - if government would allow us to find, tap, and use these resources. Arguments against doing so employ fallacious claims that wind, solar, and biofuel power can replace hydrocarbon and nuclear power ... and false assertions that the fuels, which provide 93% of U.S. energy needs are environmentally harmful or risky for our climate.

Most "Green" jobs are temporary and/or low paying - or are created by taking money from productive, profitable companies, and giving it to politically connected companies, campaign contributors, and bankrupt schemes like Solyndra and Fisker. That also hurts taxpayers and working families.

Isn't hydraulic fracturing or fracking dangerous? Why do you support it?

Fracking can give us centuries of new oil and gas supplies. Natural gas is needed to back up wind turbines, provide petrochemical feed stocks, and replace coal that the EPA is shutting down over exaggerated health concerns. Domestic oil can replace imports from dangerous, unstable, unfriendly countries.

Fracking has reduced U.S. natural gas prices from \$8 to \$3 per thousand cubic feet (million Btu). That's good for electricity generation, factories, petrochemicals, jobs, and families. It conserves energy by increasing oil and gas production from old and new wells and fields, leaving less behind in the ground.

ENERGY & ENVIRONMENT TRUTH FILE 2014

By 2020, shale gas is expected to create 3.6 million U.S. jobs, both directly and indirectly (via lower costs for energy and chemical feed stocks). It will also generate hundreds of billions of dollars in bonus, royalty, and tax payments, while substantially reducing CO₂ emissions that many blame for climate change.

Most fracking occurs 10,000 feet or more below surface, more than a mile below water aquifers and wells. Most of the few problems that occurred during the past 60 years of fracking were due to improper cementing of well casing pipes. Fracking fluids are 99.5% water and clay, plus mostly organic chemicals used in kitchens and food. Water can be fresh or brackish and much of it is increasingly recycled.

The U.S. Department of Energy says fracking requires 0.6 to 5.8 gallons of water per million Btu of energy produced. By comparison, corn-based ethanol requires 2,500 to 29,100 gallons per million Btu of usable energy - and biodiesel from soybeans consumes an astounding (and unsustainable) 14,000 to 75,000 gallons of water per million Btu! Moreover, new high-pressure pumps reduce water use, and companies are also experimenting with natural gas liquids to replace water in fracking.

Fracking-related "earthquakes" are barely detectable - rarely reaching more than a 3 on the Richter scale, equivalent to a dump truck going down a street. Larger tremors (around a 4 or 5 on the Richter scale) appear to be due to large-scale injection of waste liquids into underground reservoirs at high pressure over many years. The U.S. Geological Survey says no serious quakes have ever been linked to fracking.

The real reason some groups oppose fracking is that it produces fossil fuels, demolishes claims that we are running out of oil and gas, and makes expensive wind, solar, and biofuel energy even harder to justify. But fossil fuels have brought incredible improvements in human living standards, health, welfare, longevity, prosperity, and environmental quality. It would be silly and unethical not to use this energy.

We only have 3% of the world's oil reserves. We need biofuels to bridge the gap.

"Reserves" refers to oil that drilling has confirmed actually exists and can be produced under current prices, technologies, laws, and land management rules. Prior to fracking and new discoveries, the U.S. had only 3% of world reserves. Thanks to horizontal drilling, hydraulic fracturing, and major advances in

ENERGY & ENVIRONMENT TRUTH FILE 2014

seismic and deep-water drilling technologies, America's reserves rose markedly, oil output jumped 30% between 2011 and 2013 (to 7.4 million barrels per day), and natural gas production skyrocketed.

Suddenly, the United States was importing less oil than at any time since 1995; millions of oil patch and related jobs were created; frack state royalty and tax revenues skyrocketed; natural gas prices plummeted; and the cheaper fuels and feed stocks fostered a U.S. petrochemical and manufacturing renaissance.

However, enormous U.S. prospects are *off limits* to leasing, exploration, and drilling, especially under President Obama. That means *170 billion barrels* of oil (plus huge amounts of natural gas) in the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS), Rockies, Great Lakes, Southwest, Alaska's Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR), and other areas are *locked up* and *can never become* "reserves." In fact, U.S. reserves will again *decrease*, if we deplete existing reserves and aren't allowed to replace them.

Energy deposits cannot be developed overnight. However, 40 years is not overnight. But that's how long America has kept ANWR, OCS, and western states' oil and gas off limits to leasing and drilling. If we had started 10 or 20 years ago, oil would be flowing now - and we would be benefitting from lower prices, more jobs, and greater royalty and tax revenues.

Locking up U.S. oil, gas, and coal means we must send more money to unstable, repressive, terror-supporting dictatorships; make our foreign policies and national interests subservient to oil import politics; and reduce job creation, revenue generation, and economic, personal, and national security.

Using the hydrocarbon resources we once again have in abundance will also give us time to develop wind, solar, biofuel, thorium, nuclear fusion, and other energy sources that actually make economic and environmental sense. That could be as revolutionary in a few decades as coal, oil, natural gas, and nuclear fission have been over the past century and a half.

Why do you support the Keystone XL Pipeline and dirty oil that causes climate change?

Keystone would deliver 800,000 barrels of oil a day from friendly, stable Canada and North Dakota to refineries in Texas. Building it would create 20,000 U.S. manufacturing and construction jobs - plus thousands of jobs in refining,

ENERGY & ENVIRONMENT TRUTH FILE 2014

manufacturing, and petrochemical industries that would use that oil.

Not building Keystone would mean this oil will be shipped to China and be burned there, under far less responsible environmental rules and technologies. Amid worsening troubles in the Middle East and oil-producing African countries, not building it would also mean spending more U.S. dollars to buy oil from unfriendly, repressive, anti-women, and terrorist-sponsoring and perpetrating countries.

Keystone oil sands oil is far less "dirty" - and far less "unethical" - than oil from Iran, Iraq, Libya, Nigeria, Russia, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, or Venezuela. Environmental practices, workplace safety, and human rights are far better in Canada than in these alternative oil supply countries. Oil extraction techniques, water use, land restoration, and air and water emissions are far better today for oil sands than just a few years ago. Keystone provides real energy, jobs, and revenues, whereas "Green" energy remains mostly "fantasy fuel" that requires mandates and subsidies, raises energy costs, and kills jobs.

Catastrophic manmade climate change remains an unproven, controversial theory - and burning oil sands fuels in China (under environmental rules and technologies that result in far more pollution) will emit much more carbon dioxide than would burning them in America.

Hydrocarbons are the energy of the past. Shouldn't renewable energy be our future?

Hydrocarbons are hardly the energy of the past. They are the energy of the present and future, for many decades at least - or until creative people develop new energy sources that can actually replace them. Right now, they provide over 80% of the United States' and the world's energy, ensuring jobs and revenues, lifting billions of people out of abject poverty, and improving health, living standards, social justice, and human rights everywhere.

New seismic, drilling, hydraulic fracturing, and production methods - that can function in the coldest, deepest, most inhospitable places on Earth - have given us many decades of petroleum and centuries of coal. That's why countries all over the world are embracing these proven, economical sources.

Oil, gas, and coal provide real energy, real jobs, and real revenues, from relatively small areas of land. Under proper

ENERGY & ENVIRONMENT TRUTH FILE 2014

safeguards, as required in the U.S. and Canada, they protect human health and the environment.

U.S. oil and gas companies created *37,000 direct jobs* and *111,000 indirect jobs* in 2011 - nearly one of ten jobs created nationwide. *Another 530,000 jobs* could be created if American companies could explore and drill for oil and gas in areas that are currently off limits. That would generate \$150 billion in increased government taxes and fees by 2025, and expand domestic production by 4 million barrels of oil equivalent a day, slashing our dependence on oil from despotic regimes (according to the World Economic Forum, IHS Global, Wood Mackenzie, Bloomberg News, and other sources).

Utilities will add some *10,000 megawatts of new coal plants* in seven central European countries in the next four years and many times that amount in China, India, Indonesia, South Africa, and elsewhere. For those concerned about carbon dioxide emissions and "dangerous manmade climate change," that means even eliminating *all* fossil fuel use in the United States would have no effect whatsoever.

Wind, solar, and biofuels are actually our least sustainable option. They require billions in subsidies, kill jobs, and provide costly and unreliable energy, using large quantities of fossil fuels and raw materials, and impacting large tracts of land for wind turbines, solar arrays, biofuel crops, raw materials mining, backup power generation, and long electricity transmission lines from power generation sites to cities.

Why do you support drilling all over America, in our parks and other protected areas?

No one advocates that. However, 97% of our oil and gas is off limits to leasing, exploration, drilling, and production. Most of the federal (public or taxpayer-owned) lands that could be producing these energy resources are not parks and protected areas. Opening more public lands to careful exploration and development will greatly increase energy production, job creation, and government revenues, without harming truly special wildlife or scenic areas.

Moreover, many politicians, regulators, and environmental groups that oppose oil, gas, and coal activities on these lands seem to have no problem with installing gigantic wind and solar facilities - and enormous transmission lines from the facilities to cities hundreds of miles away - despite the significant wildlife, habitat, and scenic impacts that these projects cause.

ENERGY & ENVIRONMENT TRUTH FILE 2014

These hydrocarbon resources could generate trillions of dollars in lease bonuses, royalties, family income, and taxes, while helping us further reduce imports from unfriendly nations. But short-sighted bureaucrats, environmental pressure groups, judges, and politicians will not let us develop and use them.

For example, ANWR is the size of South Carolina. Drilling and production operations would impact only 2,000 acres (1/20th of Washington, D.C.) of its frozen coastal plain, to produce 15 billion gallons of oil annually. Yet it is still off limits.

This energy belongs to all Americans. It's not the private property of environmental pressure groups, or of politicians who cater to them in exchange for re-election contributions and support.

Why do you support our continued addiction to oil and fossil fuels?

An addiction is something that is habit-forming and harmful. That is not the case with oil, gas, and coal. These energy sources have fueled incredible improvements in human living standards, health, welfare, environmental quality, longevity, and prosperity - at rates and extents unprecedented in world history.

These energy sources power our transportation, electricity generation, manufacturing, communication, and homes. They provide feed stocks for petrochemical products that improve, safeguard, and enrich our lives. They create jobs and generate revenue for countless families, businesses, and investment, charitable, and government programs.

This dependable, affordable energy gets us to work, school, church, and vacation; transports food and clothing and gets people to hospitals; produces paints, plastics, fabrics, cosmetics, and pharmaceuticals; gives us more leisure time and better health and living standards; and ensures longer, safer, more fulfilling lives.

Thanks to modern technologies, sensible regulations, and responsible development practices, we use these hydrocarbon energy sources with fewer harmful impacts on health and environmental quality every year.

At this time, we have no viable, reliable, or affordable alternatives that can replace hydrocarbons - except to some extent nuclear and hydroelectric power, which radical environmentalists also oppose.

ENERGY & ENVIRONMENT TRUTH FILE 2014

We have to be careful in producing and using these energy resources, to prevent accidents and pollution that harm the environment and injure people. But it would be immoral and unethical not to use them.

Saying we are "addicted" to oil, gas, coal, and the countless benefits they bring is like saying we are addicted to abundant, reliable, affordable energy - and would be better off living the way our ancestors did 150 years ago, or the way billions of impoverished people still live today in Africa, India, and other minimally developed areas.

Committee For A Constructive Tomorrow ♦ Washington, DC ♦ 202-429-2737
www.CFACT.org