

This lists all answers to Question Six of North Carolina Health News' voter guide questionnaire. Unless otherwise noted, the answers were given directly to one of our reporters.

Question 6: What should the federal government do to protect drinking water North Carolinians rely on from contamination by unregulated chemicals, in these and other locations? Is it time to re-examine the Clean Water Act, which is more than four decades old? Should the law be restructured? What are your ideas, if any, for updating these environmental statutes?

[NC 1](#)

G.K. Butterfield: From pulling out of the Paris Agreement, to pushing reckless executive orders to undermine clean air and clean water, the Trump Administration has continuously threatened the health of our communities. Forty-six years after passage of the Clean Water Act, I remain committed to protecting our environment and the clean water we rely on. As we saw from the tragedy in Flint Michigan, it is time to invest in our nation's water infrastructure to ensure that people have clean water to drink.

Roger W. Allison did not answer the survey.

[NC 2](#)

George Holding did not answer the survey.

Linda Coleman did not answer the survey.

Jeff Matemu did not answer the survey.

[NC 3](#)

Walter Jones did not answer the survey.

[NC 4](#)

David Price: I believe in the wise stewardship of our natural resources and am a strong supporter of efforts to protect the environment and public health. We must continue to build on our important environmental laws – like the Clean Water Act (CWA) and Clean Air Act (CAA) – to ensure a cleaner and healthier environment for future generations. The Clean Water Act was enacted in 1972 in response to heavy contamination brought on by an increase in pollution from industrial manufacturers. Waterways and public health alike were suffering from industrial waste, with the Cuyahoga River notably erupting in flames in 1969.

Despite decades of progress, President Trump has unfortunately rescinded important provisions of this law, specifically the Stream Protection Rule, which was implemented to protect surface and groundwater from coal mining pollution. Additionally, Republicans have attempted time and time again, often through Appropriations riders, to withdraw the Waters of the United States (WOTUS) Rule, which protected the waterways such as intermittent, headwater, and ephemeral streams, sources that provide drinking water to millions of Americans. I have opposed these attempts and believe that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) should be empowered to administer the CWA and CAA to best protect Americans. I am also the author of legislation that would promote the installation of cleaner waste management technologies on hog farms, which pose a threat to water quality.

Barbara Howe: Protecting the environment is one of the trickiest problems we face as a society. We all want and need clean water and air. Restructuring the law is an absolute must. The Libertarian solution to these issues has always been advocating for strong protections of property rights and holding polluters responsible for the damage they do.

Steve A. Von Loor did not answer our survey.

[NC 5](#)

Virginia Foxx did not answer the survey.

DD Adams: The current administration is busy repealing protections to our water (air and soil, too) at a time when we need to be even more rigorous in protecting our natural resources. It is time to re-examine the Clean Water Act as we know much more about the dangers of pollution and how to protect our water.

I agree with Clean Water Action:

- We need better tools to find more of these chemicals in water and to know what drinking water sources, private drinking water wells, and other water is contaminated
- We need to know where these chemicals are made and used and in what products. We also need to identify how they are getting into the environment and to stop that contamination
- We need better information on effects on our health, on wildlife, and on overall environmental quality
- Costs of clean up should not be paid by taxpayers, but by those responsible for the contamination
- Producers of these chemicals need to be accountable for contamination, and for continuing to make and use these chemicals while withholding evidence of health risks
- Address the issue of unregulated chemicals, such as GenX. Approximately 180,000 chemicals are currently untested. States should be held responsible for allowing chemical discharges

[NC 6](#)

Mark Walker did not answer our survey.

Ryan Watts did not answer our survey.

[NC 7](#)

David Rouzer did not answer the survey.

Dr. Kyle Horton: Having graduated high school in Flint, Michigan and living in Wilmington, I'm both personally and professionally committed to using my

medical and public health expertise to clean our water. No kid should ever be a guinea pig at the hands of a Fortune 500 polluter. With chemicals like Gen X also in fire fighting foam and contaminating water around military bases, we need federal legislation to investigate health consequences of these emerging contaminants, and to regulate their clean up. It's time to re-examine the Clean Water Act to address growing challenges from climate change, failing infrastructure and to reflect the latest threats from big polluters. We should defend the Waters of the United States Rule to protect smaller streams, lakes, and creeks that are sources of our drinking water. I'll fight efforts to defund and dismantle the EPA that have been championed by my opponent who funds his campaigns with big polluter and fossil fuel money. I would support expanding participation in the Centers for Disease Control's Environmental Public Health Tracking Network which enables the public and county public health departments to track trends and figure out the burden of disease being caused by toxins in our environment.

[NC 8](#)

Richard Hudson did not answer our survey.

Frank McNeill did not answer our survey.

[NC 9](#)

Mark Harris: We need to educate all of our people, not only North Carolina, but throughout the nation, on these issues of our environment, and making sure that we're all being good stewards.

I'm not a fan of more regulations. I recycle and my family recycles, not because we're told to by any regulation or law but because we choose to. We want to be good stewards of our environment, this creation that God has created and given us. I think the answer [is] to educate and make sure that everybody knows and understands what's happening in terms of our drinking water and has the facts. That's the most important aspect of it.

So is there anything you'd say we should do about like DuPont and cameras, chemical contamination of air and drinking water in the Cape Fear River, or, you know, Guilford County Schools have lead in their water, Greensboro has a whole bunch of pls and their water, anything.

I believe when there are situations that show up like that, those local governments and our state government needs to look at those and put things in place. I believe that you need to set laws and set enforcements and govern the closest to home as you possibly can. And I think empowering state and local to do those things is perfectly fine.

I'm not a fan of Washington setting laws, oftentimes that have unintended consequences to other parts and other regions.

Dan McCready: I support the Clean Water Act because no North Carolina family should have unsafe drinking water. At the same time, we need to ensure that the Act is working. In Congress, I will be open to amending the legislation to ensure it's serving its purpose, but we must keep its vital protections.

Jeff Scott: The Federal Clean Water Rule is under review. The Supreme court has opined on the contentious issue of the scope of the EPA's power over the waters of the US. I favor limits on the agency's power to expand its own role, for the same reason I oppose mission creep by other agencies. Congress must deliberate in the open over standards before it can authorize powers over navigable waters. The most straightforward case is one where the actions of the polluter are clearly related to specific harms. Beyond that, the standards for pollution control are contentious, and Congress must to design laws around the forecasts of potential harm. Industry cannot promise that its processes won't have side effects and waste or that it can predict accurately the long-term harms.

There are two important examples for North Carolina. One is the possible negligence of hog farms where lack of preparation for a foreseeable event, such as a storm, can lead to animal waste in our rivers. Another is the degradation of the solar panel installations, which are also abundant in the state. Solar energy is an economic experiment built on subsidies for broad adoption. Panels will be decommissioned within 20 years. If the state wants to ward off future

contaminations, then the industry itself and the beneficiaries of the subsidies must be held accountable. In the long run, much of that land will need to be reclaimed. North Carolina citizens can demand higher standards of precaution, such as monitoring animal waste facilities and industrial chemical contamination, the cost of which can be paid from the general fund.

[NC 10](#)

Patrick McHenry did not answer our survey.

David Wilson Brown: We should revisit that. When regulation is put into place, and it sits there for as long as it does, and advancements in science have occurred[...], we absolutely need to have a review of that legislation to bring it up to modern standards. [...] We should hold these corporations accountable for the spills and for the damages that they do. If they can't produce energy or [their] products [with] a plan for their waste, then they need to not be pursuing those areas.

I would like to have a much stronger EPA that's not hobbled by lobbies. We have to recognize how much the regulations that protect our environment have added to our better health. So much of the cost in managing this health crisis could be dealt with by better handling of the environment ahead of time, before they become health crises. Look at what's going on in Flint [and] the costs that [families] have to deal with from the health results of their bad water decisions.

[NC 11](#)

Mark Meadows did not answer our survey.

Clifton B. Ingram did not answer our survey.

Phillip Price: My opponent [U.S. Rep. Mark Meadows] has voted to repeal the stream protection rule, he did that last year. He's also voted twice to undermine the EPA's power plant regulations. He tends to be on the side of fossil fuel and electricity that's produced by fossil fuels. We need better regulation not less regulation from those industries that pollute our water.

It's also chemical plants, the paper mills and so forth. They're doing a lot better than they have in the past but the current administration and my opponent would like to go backwards and under many if not all of the things we've accomplished in the last 30, if not 40 years, in cleaning up our water and air. I'm 100 percent for clean water and air over corporation's profits.

[NC 12](#)

Alma Adams: I have been a strong supporter of environmental issues. It's really about our future and about the children. We need to make sure that our drinking water is pure, that it's clean. All of this digging and fracking and all that kind of stuff that we're doing, I think is a detriment to the health of our citizens. We've got to have stricter regulations and we are deregulating the wrong things in my opinion. We deregulate those kinds of things that help our environment to stay pure and provide clean air and water for our children. Look at what happened in Flint, Michigan [...] because the government's not paying enough attention to what's going on. I think regulations in some instances are absolutely necessary. And I think instead of deregulating many of the things we need to continue the regulations and make them stronger, in some instances.

Paul Wright did not answer our survey, but he did provide a statement.

[NC 13](#)

Ted Budd did not answer our survey.

Kathy Manning did not answer our survey.

Tom Bailey did not answer our survey.