



2022 Candidate Survey on the Environment

Mark Stewart Greenstein All American Freedom
House , 4

OPEN QUESTION

Community activism. Outspoken and ACTIVE community residents gird almost all aspects of AAF's proposed policies. Activism can and SHOULD include consumer boycotts of predatory corporations. Environmental predations are best stopped by consumers. We come first, before the legislature, because a) consumers are more aware than legislators, b) consumers are more AFFECTED by environmental harms than legislators, and c) consumers are not compromised like legislators often are. When community action still fails, the legislature at that point gets wind and is usually prompted to act.

1) ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE:

- Yes
Yes. Citizens' reasoned complaints MUST be respected. A process that still shuts out families in need is a process that needs to be reformed.

2) WASTE MANAGEMENT:

- Yes
Yes. We ALWAYS need to look at long-term costs of manufacturing and distributing. Manufacturers know those costs best, and need to clarify what they are. Where manufacturers are better than consumers for environmental compliance, they should be asked to take the lead, possibly with an "opt-out", as in "I am a consumer dedicated to responsible waste disposal; I am getting a discount in return for my contractual pledge to recycle this product." This allows the manufacturers to raise their prices for everybody else and have active consumers keep their own costs low. Now, manufacturers is a free market would face price competition from China, but a state legislature can and SHOULD hold the line and keep non-compliant international manufacturers OUT.

3) POLYSTYRENE:

- Yes

Anyone can pay a few cents more for environmentally good products. We are a rich country; we shouldn't be polluting ourselves like third world pockets do.

4) PFAS:

- Uncertain
"Ban" is an extreme word. Surely there are some PFA uses that are not deleterious. I don't know them and thus my "uncertain" comment. But I am certain that use of extremes is rarely called for.

5) NEONICOTINOIDS:

- Uncertain
I would PROBABLY support such legislation. State (as opposed to Federal) environmental legislation IS proper, and these Neonicotinoids seem unnecessarily deleterious. But "Ban" is an extreme word. There may be some uses that are not deleterious. I don't know them, and thus my "uncertain" comment.

6) RODENTICIDES:

- yes
I'd go further: it's worth restricting BEYOND parks, to private farms and to even wilderness spaces. If the science is trustworthy, we would use it to enhance all species.

7) DIESEL BACKUP GENERATORS/DATA CENTERS:

- Yes
Yes. Big business, even ones that give us nice computing speeds, can't be destroying our quality of life. If all our computers went down, Americans would still have a thriving lifestyle -- ask anyone who came into adulthood before there was a Commodore 64; if our environment is made toxic, so that we can't comfortably go outside, we will have squelched most of what we live for.

8) BEARS:

- yes
No-brainer.

But there's MORE to this question and proposed policy: this is the epitome of what a good NON-commanding state government does. Its agents are good at gathering data and measuring effects, and its ombudsmen (perhaps its House Members) are entrusted to make recommendations, or approve a "working group"s recommendations.

That what SHOULD have happened instead of Covid lockdowns, and what should occur in many realms where government perSUASION is better than government comMAND. Your proposal represents a beautiful merger between libertarianism and environmentalism.

9) TREE CUTTING PROTOCOLS:

- Yes
No brainer. And almost anything that curtails the predatory management at Eversource is good for Connecticut consumers.

10) COMMUNITY SUSTAINABILITY:

- Yes
No Brainer: "ALLOW but not REQUIRE" is a phrase we need more of. Permit municipalities, or just enclaves within municipalities "the Barry Square neighborhood group" for example, to enhance their own environments. So long as one group is not permanently harming another, this citizen / municipality activity is VERY GOOD.

11) RIPARIAN BUFFERS:

- Uncertain
VERY complex issues here, including identifying the causes of overflows and pollutants.

12) RANKED CHOICE VOTING:

- yes
- I have been a fan of RCV for over 20 years (see the CSPAN "Lesser Known Candidates" video from the New Hampshire Presidential primary January 2000). Rank choice voting IS fairer. It helps get voters more good candidates to choose from. And most importantly, it rids us of extremes. Example: In a Republican presidential primary using RCV, Donald Trump would have finished 11th (out of 11) in 2016. Trump would go the way of George Pataki and Mike Huckabee.