



Speaking truth to power in all forms

As an “advocate” organization, we continually seek to educate the public about the most important issues affecting coastal Georgia’s sustainability and the actions needed to move forward. The people we seek to educate have greatly varying power over decisions, ranging from the obvious influence of elected officials to the shared power of those who vote.

As we educate, it is helpful to remember that learning isn’t simply a set of things we know, but rather a world view that carries a continuing obligation to remain as informed, open-minded, and judicious as possible.

Unfortunately, significant portions of our audience cling to obsolete ‘facts’ that are known to be no longer true, creating firm resistance to accepting change and forming new positions. And thus those groups have not adopted an educated viewpoint, to the extent they do not accept new information or objectively consider fresh policy alternatives.

Of course, conventional views are frequently held in place by the power of money. Established sources of wealth are defended as cash cows, no matter how unfair or wasteful they may be. And those who defend them pay dearly to lobby against change, while often working contrary to their own long-term interests without realizing it.

Another, less evident but equally troubling obstacle to the Center’s mission of sustainability is the dominance of fragmented thinking. Our positions reflect the reality that issues are most often interconnected, meaning that individual problems cannot be solved independently. A prime example is the connection between water management and energy policy. As Georgia faces daunting water management problems made worse by drought, the state’s energy policy encourages wasteful use of water for power production.

Similarly, state officials tout the economic benefits of fishing and other forms of tourism that depend on healthy natural resources while they weaken environmental safeguards such as marsh buffers and other water-quality regulations. Until economic and environmental goals are integrated through more enlightened policies, Georgia’s quality of life will suffer.

Thus, the Center’s mission must be advanced by both persuasion and coercion. We must persuade by continuing to publish opinion columns and newsletters as well as reports on coastal conditions and trends. We will persist in voicing our views and citing supporting facts at public forums, including hearings, meetings of advisory groups, and special conferences.

In coordination with this program of education, we will also persevere by taking selective legal actions to compel public agencies to properly enforce environmental laws, eliminate practices that ignore long-term consequences of permitting decisions, and to improve field surveillance that can help stop environmentally destructive activities before they go too far.

Harbor project more dubious than ever

A combination of federal and state budget cut-backs and well-justified complaints about the project’s incomplete evaluation by the Corps of Engineers has raised further doubt about the prospects of deepening the Savannah Harbor. In January of this year, the Center and other groups actively involved in the project’s Stakeholder Evaluation Group over the past ten years filed several major objections to the harbor deepening in their comments responding to the draft Environmental Impact Statement. (more...)

Among the major points of objections are:

- Although the project may have been studied extensively over the past decade, the broadly-representative stakeholder evaluation group guiding this review has never sanctioned the accuracy or completeness of Corps’ impact studies and findings. In fact, some long-time members of that stakeholder group, including the Center for a Sustainable Coast, have lodged serious objections about analytical assumptions, mitigation, and administrative controls. These concerns remain unresolved.
- Of paramount importance in the midst of our national financial crisis, there has been no comprehensive analysis of port development alternatives in the Southeast – that is, a strategy for coordinating the improvement of ports and inter-connecting land transportation systems. Such a strategy is essential to assuring taxpayers that government funds in the billions of dollars will be wisely spent to achieve maximum public benefit.
- South Carolina’s objections to the project are primarily based on unanswered questions about the Corps’ plan for mitigation – how they propose to compensate for, prevent, or control adverse environmental impacts. Perhaps the most dubious of many shaky mitigation proposals is the injection of oxygen into the Savannah River in an effort to prevent seasonal fish-killing dead zones. The U.S. Geological Survey reviewed the testing results for this mitigation approach and found them inconclusive, yet the Corps claims those same tests justify confidence in the approach.

In this issue

- ✓ ***More about harbor deepening***
- ✓ ***Nick Williams environmental awards***
- ✓ ***Regulations actually help the economy***
- ✓ ***Water coalition names “Dirty Dozen”***
- ✓ ***Wind energy advances despite U.S.***
- ✓ ***Our voice is heard – often, throughout Georgia***

Center hosts public forum on harbor project

In May 2011, the Center hosted a public forum on the harbor deepening project in Savannah, attended by nearly 100 concerned citizens and business owners. A lively question and answer period followed presentations by six speakers.

Highlights of Speakers' Comments at the Forum
(in order of presentation)

- **David Kyler (Center for a Sustainable Coast)**
Due to the risky impacts of the project and vulnerability of the environment affected, "adaptive management" must be used – and is now required under federal law. However, neither the EIS nor the Corps' record substantiates confidence in the responsiveness needed for effective adaptive management. Procedures proposed by the Corps to manage the project are far too vague to protect public interest.
- **Bill Sapp (Southern Environmental Law Center)**
Despite having 13 years to do so, the Corps of Engineers still has not prepared a complete environmental impact statement that would comply with federal law.
- **Tonya Bonitatibus (Savannah Riverkeeper)**
Over 1.4 million people depend on the Savannah River to provide them with their drinking water and to serve as a receptacle for treated sewage. It is the economic driver supplying the water needed to manufacture and transport goods and for recreation. The current plan to deepen the harbor does not adequately predict or resolve critical conflicts, both existing and projected. Failure to mitigate properly will not only harm the health of the river, but will also impair the economic resilience of the communities that rely upon it.
- **Jane Griess (U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service)**
The Savannah National Wildlife Refuge has been adversely impacted by repeated past harbor deepening projects, by conversion of rare and ecologically vital tidal freshwater marsh into far more common brackish marsh. The proposed deepening will cause additional conversion of these marshes from fresh to brackish. There is a great deal of uncertainty regarding how well impacts are predicted and how the proposed mitigation features will perform. The U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service prefers limiting the deepening of Savannah Harbor to 45 feet because, of all deepening alternatives, that would minimize the loss of already diminished freshwater tidal wetlands. If the project is done, it should be to a depth of no more than three additional feet so as to minimize harm to the refuge, thereby reducing added threats on fish and other wildlife resources.
- **Steve Willis (Sierra Club)**
The details, contradictions and complexities of the Corps study only hide the real issues: what will dramatic port growth do to the health, safety, and quality of life in Savannah? And, since America's competitiveness in the

21st Century will be based on the capacity to rapidly and economically move products between our markets and markets worldwide, America's economic future is dependent upon state-of-the-art container shipping – the Corps' analysis does not seriously consider factors or alternatives outside the Lower Savannah River in Georgia. This is tragic for both Savannah and American taxpayers.

- **Andrea Malloy (South Carolina Coastal Conservation League)**
This Draft EIS proposes mitigation that just does not mitigate – "replacement" of a really important and rare freshwater wetland with a very common brackish wetland, fish ladders for a fish that doesn't use them, "iron lungs" that are entirely experimental, and zero money for replacement of a water pipe needed for Savannah drinking water.



Meet the Center's Board

- Steve Willis, President – Systems consultant (retired)
- Charles Seabrook – Renowned environmental journalist
- Mindy Egan, Secretary/Treasurer – Academic counselor (retired)
- Charlie Belin - Professor of marine science
- Les Davenport - Professor of ecology (retired)
- Pete Krull - Socially responsible investment advisor
- Ellen Schoolar – Attorney practicing law in Savannah

**PLEASE SUPPORT OUR WORK TO
IMPROVE THE FUTURE OF COASTAL GEORGIA**

Go to www.sustainablecoast.org for more information, including tax-deductible donations and membership.

Center honors environmental achievers

The Center officially recognized two young women in the Savannah area by presenting them with the prestigious **Nick Williams Coastal Sustainability Award**. The awards were given for the recipients' outstanding contributions to the conservation and sustainable use of coastal Georgia's natural environment.

The tributes were presented by president of the board of the Center for a Sustainable Coast, Steve Willis at a luncheon ceremony held in Savannah on August 22. The event was attended by several Center board members and general donor-members.

The first recipient is Elizabeth Bates, an undergraduate student at Armstrong Atlantic State University. Ms. Bates already holds a Bachelor of Arts degree in English literature from the College of William and Mary and is currently working toward a Bachelor's degree in chemistry at AASU.

Liz has demonstrated dedicated effort as an environmental volunteer and leader of AASU's biology club, which serves as thriving interest group for students concerned about conservation issues. Under her leadership as president, the biology club achieved impressive expansion of student members and involved its members in coastal issues as volunteers working with conservation groups – including Savannah Riverkeeper, the Georgia Dolphin Project, and Savannah Tree Foundation.

"Cultivating student awareness of environmental issues is extremely important in advancing the next generation's comprehension of profoundly important problems that must be resolved in the years ahead," said Center board president, Steve Willis.



Liz Bates,
one of two Nick Williams Award winners.

"Hands-on experience as volunteers, through opportunities made possible by Liz Bates', have given students at AASU invaluable understanding, not only about important public issues, but also about the environmental ethic and our shared responsibilities to conserve the natural heritage of Georgia's coast," noted Center board member and AASU faculty member, Charlie Belin.

The second recipient of the Nick Williams award is Carrie Smith, a graduate student in Planning and Urban Studies at Savannah State University. She already holds a Bachelor of Arts degree in political science from Middle Tennessee State University.

While at SSU, Ms. Smith has served as the first president for the Graduate Student Advisory Council and the Graduate Coastal Planning Association. Smith also played a vital role in working with a diverse group of Savannah State students and staff in implementing a recycling program on campus. Smith also interned with the Chatham County-Savannah Metropolitan Planning Commission (MPC).

In that internship, Smith worked in Environmental Services Division to research and evaluates the internal (office) recycling program, as a segment of the Georgia Environmental Protection Division's pollution prevention certification program. Smith also helped with various wind and non-point pollution seminars hosted by the MPC and the U.S. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA).

In 2008 the Center created this award in the memory of the Center's board member, Nick Williams of Chatham County, who was board president at the time of his death. Previous recipients include David and Mindy Egan of the Initiative to Protect Jekyll Island and the late Dr. Peter Verity, coastal research scientist and educator who was affiliated with the Skidaway Institute of Oceanography.



Carrie Smith receives her award from
Steve Willis, President of the Center's Board

That Dogma Won't Hunt

The following editorial by David Kyler, the Center's executive director, was posted in Atlanta-based Saporta Report on August 2, 2011.

In recent years we've witnessed increasing failures in political institutions brought by a reckless trend in the irrational commitment to ideological positions that have little if any factual basis for support.

Moreover, these positions often work to undermine the well-being of some of the same people who promote them. Voters elect candidates who serve the special interests of groups that few belong to, and long-disproven claims about economic remedies continue to motivate political decisions, with disastrous results.

Consider some ironic and self-defeating examples of these irrational trends:

- Government regulations are opposed on principle by conservative voters, but when regulations are weakened or removed, the "free market" runs recklessly rampant – as it did on Wall Street, culminating in the crash of 2007 - 2008 and bringing related bank failures. Note that Georgia had some of the nation's highest failure rates, largely caused by the pro-speculation, anti-regulation mind-set of state leadership.
- Public services supporting the environment, elderly, disabled, impoverished, and children are routinely condemned by many of the same voters and politicians who directly benefit from government programs such as Social Security, Medicare, small business loans, corporate tax credits, and farm subsidies.
- Many leading politicians persist in claiming that government spending is ruining the economy and that it has no role in U.S. job creation, yet the most recent employment data clearly shows that loss of jobs in the public sector caused by government budget cut-backs is the only reason why new employment fell short of projections. Anyone having doubt that government can play an essential role in job creation should ask those who live in the many southern communities benefitting from military, research, and other federal facilities. Limited success of past stimulus spending in creating jobs was primarily due to expenditures being cut short by those who are prejudiced against government economic programs – producing self-prophesized failure by limiting action.

It is clear that we don't need smaller government, but rather better-managed public programs and agencies, based on objective assessment of needs, impacts, and performance. To compete successfully in the global economy of the 21st century, America needs smart government, not small government.

Here are a few examples of how to improve the use of public programs to help the state and nation:

- Instead of subsidizing businesses that are already thriving, shift government expenditures to emerging markets where innovations will benefit both investors and the general public. Foremost among such markets are green technologies in solar, wind, and tidal energy that can, over time, replace polluting and high-risk conventional forms of power generation (coal, oil, gas, and nuclear), which have been lavishly subsidized by the U.S. government over most of the past century. Highly qualified energy planners have set forth a detailed program for completely replacing fossil-fuel based power with renewable energy by 2030, if reasonable reforms of government programs are adopted to support this transition.
- Rather than denying climate change that's been incontrovertibly documented, while continuing subsidies for polluting industries, use government spending to induce both consumers and businesses to make smarter choices. Energy users are burdened by higher cooling costs over the longer and hotter periods brought by climate change, yet Georgians and other Americans continue promoting facilities using coal and oil – which compounds the trend in higher temperatures by adding to greenhouse gas emissions. Adopting aggressive government incentives for installing energy-efficient equipment, converting to fuel-efficient vehicles, and building or upgrading to better-insulated, energy-efficient structures (commercial, residential and industrial) would be far wiser than subsidizing exploration for oil and gas.
- As we struggle for economic recovery and a more secure future, government programs should be used to shape and coordinate policies to consistently achieve desired outcomes. For instance, despite Georgia's long-established and widely publicized disputes over water supply to meet the unrelenting demands of Atlanta's growth, state energy policies continue supporting construction and expansion of power plants that are among the worst water wasters — by using cooling towers that evaporate about 40 percent of the water they take from Georgia water supplies, not returning it to the source. Combined, existing Georgia power plants evaporate several hundred million gallons of water daily, which could be conserved to support millions of new residents.

Why not reform public policies to promote the use of water-wise energy equipment and renewable power sources? Programs for diverting some of Atlanta's growth to other parts of Georgia would also improve water management, reduce pollution, and advance a host of quality-of-life factors.

The interests of our state and nation cannot be served unless we use rational approaches to solving these problems instead of allowing political dogma to dictate.

Environmental regulation good for economy, studies conclude

In heated disputes over the best path to national economic recovery, some politicians argue that environmental regulations are blocking business growth needed to create new jobs. Some even call for shutting down EPA due to its “job-killing” practices.

According to many past studies, some quite recent, this assertion is utterly untrue – **regulations actually improve the economy by making businesses more competitive and efficient, while enhancing the quality of life for society at large by reducing health risks.**

Moreover, business activity in states with better environmental safeguards consistently outperforms those having weaker, poorly enforced regulations.

...Neither national nor state economic performance has been significantly or systematically affected by environmental regulation.

An interesting and revealing counter-argument was reported in a recent study by researchers at Yale and Middlebury College, using data from a variety of sources. They put a dollar value on environmental damage caused by polluting industries and compared it with the value of the jobs and products being created.

Even though researchers did not include any longer term adverse impacts like climate change, when all factors were considered, the most polluting industries actually imposed a net burden on society.

“ It turns out that there are a number of industries inflicting environmental damage that's worth more than the sum of the wages they pay and the profits they earn - which means, in effect, that they destroy value rather than create it.”

Source: *Relaxing pollution laws won't create more jobs*, column by Paul Krugman, **New York Times**, October 21, 2011.

The all-out assault on federal and state environmental statutes now underway is unwarranted and unwise. There is no environment-economy crisis – real environmental gains [would] be lost without accruing any enduring economic benefits.

The valid concerns of business and industry will not be addressed in a meat-ax approach to reforming environmental policies.

Gutting environmental statutes merely prolongs public subsidization of inefficient uncompetitive businesses.

Source: “The Economic Impact of Environmental Regulation”
by Stephen M. Meyer
MIT professor of political science

Economic benefits of environmental regulation in Coastal Georgia

As the Center for a Sustainable Coast has long argued – based on one of our founding principles – **economic prosperity depends on a healthy environment.**

Perhaps the most enlightening examples of this truth in coastal Georgia are the region’s tourism and housing industries – together supporting about half of the area’s jobs and hundreds of millions in annual income.

Central to tourism in our area is recreational fishing, which generates hundreds of millions of dollars annually in business income. Healthy marshes are essential habitat vital to diverse and abundant coastal sport fish such as red drum, striped bass, and grouper.

Tidal marshes are also extremely important to protecting coastal developed against storm-surge and flooding. Risks to property valued in the billions of dollars are substantially reduced by tidal marshes.

A study done by the late Dr. Eugene Odum, renowned UGA ecologist, estimated a dollar value of the services provided by Georgia’s tidal marshes. Updated to account for the changing value of the dollar, the services provided by our marshes, per acre, are worth over \$15,000 a year. At that rate, the total benefit of services offered by Georgia’s vast marsh area is worth more than \$5 billion a year.

The Center takes these issues seriously in our persistent efforts to help ensure that environmental protection laws are enforced. Sometimes that requires taking legal action aimed at strengthening the interpretation of law and improving the procedures used by regulatory agencies. These actions affect safeguards over shorelines, marshes, wildlife, and waterways – natural resources that provide a host of practical benefits to all Georgians, not just those of us living along the coast.

Our economy and quality of life depend on effective regulation.

Water coalition declares harbor deepening and docks among top threats

The Georgia Water Coalition is celebrating its tenth anniversary by issuing a list of the dozen biggest threats to state water quality and related ecosystems.

The Coalition's "Dirty Dozen" highlights the worst offenses to Georgia's water—offenses that are the consequences of an under-funded state environmental agency and a lack of political will to aggressively enforce laws that protect our water, land, air and people.

Too often in Georgia, the "fox is watching the hen-house," and the system gives polluters free passes while the rest of us end up with dirty water

and fish that are depleted by spoiled habitat.

What unites each of the Dirty Dozen examples is that in practically every case our waters are being abused in ways that benefit a few but harm many - including property owners, downstream communities, fish and wildlife, hunters and anglers, boaters and swimmers, and more. A broken system allows these problems to occur and continue without resolution, often with catastrophic consequences.

The Georgia Water Coalition publishes this list as a call to action for our state's leaders and its citizens to come together

to correct the pollution problems and threats to our water detailed in the Dirty Dozen.

The Georgia Water Coalition is a consortium of more than 180 conservation and environmental organizations, hunting and fishing groups, businesses, and faith-based organizations that has been working to protect Georgia's water since 2002. Collectively, these organizations represent more than 300,000 Georgians.

Two of the twelve nominations, summarized below, were submitted by the Center for a Sustainable Coast.

Costly Harbor Dredging Wrecks Savannah River Estuary

Harbor deepening projects on the Savannah during the past century have destroyed two-thirds of the 12,000 acres of freshwater wetlands contained in the Savannah River National Wildlife Refuge. Now, the Georgia Ports Authority and EPD are supporting a harbor deepening plan that will destroy another 20 percent of the remaining refuge wetlands, vastly increase the cost of clean drinking water in Savannah and place several fish species in further jeopardy. Meanwhile, the \$600 million taxpayer-funded project is not predicted to increase traffic to Savannah's port or create any new jobs. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers should conduct an analysis of all potential port expansions in the Southeast to determine what sites can be developed with the least harm and lowest cost to achieve the greatest benefit for taxpayers.

Docks in Georgia's Tidal Wetlands Spoil the "Marshes of Glynn"

Our coastal marshes that Sidney Lanier celebrated in one of Georgia's best known poems are now under attack by development that has been allowed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, CRD and the Governor-appointed Coastal Marshlands Protection Committee. These federal and state entities have permitted the construction of thousands of docks in Georgia's 450,000 acres of tidal marshes. Such docks can stretch for hundreds of yards into the marshes and often alter and kill marsh vegetation, turning these productive wetlands into barren mud flats. At stake is critical habitat for nearly 70 percent of marine species. Based on past studies, the value of Georgia's marshes is well over \$5 billion annually in ecosystem services. Georgia's permitting process for docks and marinas permitting should acknowledge these services and preserve their value.

THE DIRTY DOZEN – THE WORST OFFENSES TO GEORGIA'S WATERS

1. **Polluter Devastates Ogeechee for Five Years and Goes Undetected by EPD**
2. **Rayonier Pulp Mill Discharge Destroys Fisheries**
3. **Costly Harbor Dredging Wrecks Savannah River Estuary**
4. **Critical Chattahoochee Flow Neglected at Atlanta**
5. **Unnecessary Reservoirs Threaten Downstream Communities, Endangered Species and Public Coasters**
6. **Speculative Coal Plant Permitted Even Though it is Unneeded and Will Harm Water, Air and Fisheries**
7. **Flint River Sucked Dry as EPD Allows Too Many Withdrawals**
8. **Docks in Georgia's Tidal Wetlands Spoil the "Marshes of Glynn"**
9. **Four Decades of Ditches Dry Out South Georgia Wetlands**
10. **Land Disposal of Waste Fouls the Broad River**
11. **Discharges from Kaolin Mines Pollute Creeks, Kill Fish**
12. **Coal-fired Power Plant's Water Withdrawal and Heated Water Discharge Threaten Coosa**

Source: Georgia Water Coalition, 2011

Center board president reports on major wind conference: U.S. way behind Europe, our environment suffers

Conclusion: Instead of supporting coal and nuclear plants, Georgia officials should be promoting offshore wind.

It was hard to ignore the difference between the 2009 American Wind Energy Association Convention in Boston and its 2011 sequel, just held in Baltimore. In 2009 there were about 700 participants, and AWEA was glad to get that many. The vendors were almost all specialists in environmental assessment, bird watchers, and weather prediction. In 2011 there were 1,800 participants, and the vendors were almost entirely from European energy producers, and very well-heeled.

What happened? Within two years Europe's offshore wind industry went from start-up to full production. There was plenty of spare change available to pay for a serious exploratory mission to the USA, just in case. The UK has completed Round 1, or the start-up phase, of its offshore wind industry (first turbine in the water in 1991), and Round 2, massive, relatively close to shore wind farms, and has already contracted for much of its far-from-shore Round 3, which will include farms of over 100 kilometers from land.

Germany, which had no offshore wind at all in 2006, has surged ahead and is predicted to surpass the UK in 2012 in offshore wind power capacity. Denmark, an early pioneer, is already generating nearly 30% of its total electric power from offshore, and plans to produce more than 50% by 2020. Spain, Norway, Sweden, and France are all installing offshore wind. China has an offshore wind farm.

Although the investment has been large, and the EEU power production is now equal to about two Vogtle expansions, Europe has clearly established itself as the world leader in offshore power generation – a role which has already spawned more than 200,000 jobs in Europe alone, (not to mention suppliers in China, Korea, India and Japan), and will undoubtedly give the European producers an edge for decades into the 21st Century.

The United States still has no operating offshore wind turbines.

The wind energy executives agreed that the great challenge is explaining the multifaceted and complex benefits of offshore to the American public and their politicians. Offshore is expensive,

approaching the price of nuclear per kilowatt generated, but in terms of jobs, energy independence, production of power near demand centers, economic spin-offs, local manufacturing, boosting port profitability, minimizing the spread of transmission thoroughfares, not to mention positively altering climate change (or, if you prefer, avoiding a \$50 dollar per ton penalty for CO2 emissions in the future), offshore wind has a plethora of advantages. The conference attendees, including Secretary of Interior Salazar and many governors, firmly believe offshore is one of the top growth industries of the 21st Century.

Offshore wind projects make sense from a national perspective.

Not all of offshore wind's advantages are obvious. For instance, virtually all of the ports around the North Sea are booming due to the heavy shipping demands offshore installation generates. About ten different types of ships are involved in the installation of a single offshore turbine. The parts for turbines are so large that they are best fabricated near their point of use, and the blades must be assembled on shore. The blade span can exceed three football fields on the largest turbines – impossible to assemble in the water.

Remarkably, the largest new turbines are so huge that there are now no ships capable of installing them and the Europeans are hustling to build specialty ships which are scheduled to be completed and arrive about the same time the turbines are ready.

Interestingly, America is investing heavily in offshore wind, just not here – some of the biggest investors in the European wind farms are American banks. One big advantage to American offshore wind would be to invest money here, rather than build other nation's superior power infrastructures.

Long delay and dithering have placed the United States in an unenviable position. We have none of the specialty ships required to install turbines, and the Europeans have no spares. The US has a particular problem with the Jones Act, an anti-competition act which requires ships sailing from one US port to another to be built, owned, and crewed in America, by Americans. Because of this, we couldn't use the European ships if they were available. Also, because of the Jones Act, the

Germans, the world's foremost financiers of shipbuilding, will not invest in the US. Interstate rivalries, hostile monopolistic power companies, and conservative politicians wedded to coal and nuclear don't help. Developers are seriously exploring the possibility of developing ports in Mexico and the Caribbean Islands from which to fabricate, assemble and load turbines, blades and supports before installation in order to avoid ever entering US waters, and thus avoiding the dreaded Jones Act.

Despite all of this, the European wind farm executives and bankers at the conference unanimously agreed that the U.S. could break out of its self-imposed quagmire if only it would provide dependable, fair, long-term development incentives.

Certainly any price for electricity which includes even a small part of the real cost of damage done by fossil fuels would make offshore wind very competitive.

Over the years, fossil fuels and nukes have received trillions of dollars in government subsidies. Isn't it time we used our dollars to support safe and self-renewing power sources instead?

- Steve Willis, Center Board President

Wind Energy Potential
In the Southeast

(In Giga-Watts. A Giga-Watt = One Billion Watts)

State	Onshore Wind	Offshore Wind	Total Wind
Arkansas	7,256	-	7,256
Florida	86	2,069	2,155
Georgia	3,635	52,788	56,423
Kentucky	228	-	228
NC	11,882	262,557	274,440
SC	679	169,252	169,931
Tennessee	4,645	-	4,645
Virginia	4,753	158,236	162,989
Total	33,164	644,902	678,066

Source: Southern Alliance for Clean Energy

The Center often seen on the opinion page – have you noticed?

We're not sure if people are aware of this, but the Center has consistently won more publication space on the opinion pages of media outlets than any other advocacy group in Georgia. Sometimes our voice has been heard in publications that cover the entire east coast, such as *Atlantic CoastWatch*.

For the past decade, in dozens of "guest columns" from Brunswick and Darien to Savannah and Atlanta, we have spoken on behalf of coastal Georgia's environment and quality of life. The issues we've covered have ranged from offshore energy (against drilling, for wind), rampant development speculation and its harmful consequences (financial as well as environmental), water protection and conservation, coastal management, climate change, harbor deepening, and the urgent need for more responsible, accountable decision-making by public officials.

If there is one theme threading through all these Center statements, it is that conventional approaches are failing because they fragment problems as if they are unrelated to one another. Until our leaders understand that all major threats to the public interest are interconnected, progress will remain elusive.

A recurring example of this principle in Georgia is water management in relation to energy policy. As Georgia has struggled with water supply to serve rapid growth, at the

same time state officials have actively promoted the expansion of nuclear and coal power plants that are major water wasters. Similarly, the widely touted Georgia water conservation program imposes utterly no requirements for responsible practices on the two biggest water users – energy and agriculture.

It might be said that the heavy-handed and obsolete ways of Georgia's leadership make our job both harder and easier. Obviously, progress in putting sustainable policies into practice is severely hindered by short-sighted and narrow-minded thinking, so common in our state. But because the ill-advised decisions made by our leaders are so clearly wrong, not to mention unfair to our citizens, offering better alternatives is not all that hard.

We strongly believe that it is important to get our views heard by as many Georgians as possible. The change we are seeking can only be achieved through an educated electorate that has the opportunity to learn more about the issues that profoundly affect their daily lives.

The healthier and more sustainable future we strive for depends on a growing portion of our citizen grasping the interconnectedness of our world – from local to international. We are convinced that our efforts to speak out on opinion pages are making a significant difference. We hope you agree.



*"Conserving Coastal Georgia's Natural Heritage...
Investing in Our Children's Future"*

221 Mallory Street, Suite B
Saint Simons Island, Georgia 31522

Voice: 912.638.3612
Email: susdev@gate.net

www.sustainablecoast.org

Return Service Requested