Democrats Lead Fight Against West Virginia Wind Farms

by James Hoare

U.S. Reps. Alan Mollohan and Nick Rahall, both West Virginia Democrats, are leading a high-profile fight against industrial wind farms on the state’s mountaintop ridges.

At issue is an existing industrial wind farm complex in Tucker County atop the West Virginia Allegheny Plateau—the largest wind farm east of the Mississippi River—and four even larger industrial wind farms proposed for nearby mountain ridges. The proposed wind farms in Grant, Greenbrier, and Pendleton counties would result in a 10-fold increase in giant wind turbines in West Virginia’s mountain country.

Congressman Addresses Citizens

Mollohan voiced his opposition to the proposed wind farms in a letter read at a public meeting of concerned citizens December 15 at the Charleston Civic Center.

Mollohan wrote, “Because of the huge physical size of these projects, their starkly industrial appearance, and the fact that they dominate the view of the entire area in which they are located, these projects naturally raise concerns when they are proposed to be sited in areas that people enjoy for their scenic, natural beauty.”

Beyond the negative effect industrial wind farms have on West Virginia’s scenic ridgelines, Mollohan pointed out the projects make little economic sense. Mollohan’s letter noted wind power depends on “major tax preferences” from state and federal governments and yet still has...
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Pennsylvania Senate Passes Eminent Domain Reform

by James Hoare

The Pennsylvania Senate on December 7 passed eminent domain reform legislation significantly curtailing the ability of state and local government to condemn private property for non-public uses. The bill, S.B. 881, the Property Rights Protection Act, responds to the U.S. Supreme Court’s June 2005 decision in Kelo v. City of New London and the widespread abuse of eminent domain throughout the state.

Limits ‘Blight’ Designations

S.B. 881, introduced by state Sen. Jeffrey Piccola (R-Dauphin/Northern York) and approved by the Senate in an unanimous vote, prohibits the use of eminent domain for commercial development and considerably tightens the definition of blight. Tightening that definition was particularly important because defining a property as blighted is a prerequisite for condemning it and transferring it to another private party.

Exceptions were inserted to exclude from the bill’s reach property in Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, and Delaware County that has already been designated as blighted. The exceptions, however, will expire after seven years.

Explaining the need for his bill, Piccola said the Kelo ruling “made people sit up and take notice and start to realize that in the face of activist courts and local government, private property rights might very well be threatened,” according to the November 14, 2005 Greenwire.

Limited to Public Uses

“For too long, some local governments have threatened property owners in Pennsylvania with eminent domain for private profit,” Piccola said in a December 7 news release. “My legislation will help end these abuses but not touch local governments’ ability to acquire property to build everything traditionally considered a public use, such as roads, bridges, schools, and courthouses.

“The idea that a citizen’s property can be taken by the government and turned over to another citizen for non-governmental use is simply an outrageous proposition and something that was never intended by our founding fathers. The Property Rights Protection Act makes certain that home and small business owners in Pennsylvania know that they can keep what they have worked so hard to own,” Piccola added.

Far-Reaching Effects

“Pennsylvania law was in dire need of reform,” said Dana Berliner, a senior attorney at the Washington, DC-based Institute for Justice. “It allowed government condemnation of property merely for being ‘economically or socially undesirable.’ This definition put literally all property at risk.

“This bill places unprecedented limits on eminent domain abuse,” Berliner added. “The one glaring exception is the case of blight, but even that does not dampen the outrage proposition and some will take away a person’s property merely to give it to another person for economic development, it shouldn’t be a surprise that legislators from both parties are responding to the overwhelming will of the voters.”

“Take away the exceptions for Philadelphia and Pittsburgh and S.B. 881 stands as a model for other states looking to prohibit eminent domain for the benefit of private businesses and developers,” added Institute for Justice staff attorney Bert Gall in a December 7 news release. “Both cities have abused eminent domain in the past and certainly need no exception now, particularly since citizens that live in the excepted areas receive much less protection than everyone else. Fortunately, the exceptions will expire in seven years and all cities will then play by the same rules.”

Broad Coalition for Reform

The bill received support from a broad range of organizations, including the Pennsylvania State Conference of NAACP Branches, the League of United Latin American Citizens, the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund, the Farm Bureau, and the National Federation of Independent Business.

“The bill now heads to the state’s House of Representatives, which overwhelmingly passed a similar and slightly more stringent eminent domain reform bill in November 2005 and is expected to approve the Senate bill.”

“The unanimous nature of the Senate vote speaks volumes to the bipartisan support for property rights and eminent domain reform,” said Scott Bullock, another senior attorney for the Institute for Justice. Republicans and Democrats should both be applauded for passing this bill.

“Now that the Pennsylvania legislature illustrates, the tide is turning against state and local governments that engage in eminent domain abuse,” Bullock added.

James Hoare (jhoare@mckinneyan dkluger.com) is managing attorney at the Syracuse, New York office of McKinney, Kluger & Gannon.
California Utilities Commission Approves Costly Solar Plan

by James M. Taylor

California citizens will pay at least $3.2 billion over the next 11 years to finance a costly solar energy initiative rejected by the state's legislature in fall 2005 but implemented by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) on December 13.

Observers quickly derided CPUC's decision, the California Solar Initiative, as demonstrating deliberate disregard for the state's democratic processes.

Initiative Mirrors Failed Bill

CPUC's California Solar Initiative is virtually identical to S.B. 1, the Million Solar Roofs proposal that was supported by Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger (R) but died in the state assembly in September 2005.

S.B. 1 aimed to place solar power systems on the roofs of half of all new homes built in the state. In a bid to boost the appeal of solar power, the bill contained a patchwork of electricity price hikes, subsidies, and installation mandates designed to increase solar power, despite its prohibitive cost, to a 5 percent share of electric power generation in the state.

The program's costs sealed its doom in the California assembly. Each rooftop solar power system would have cost approximately $27,000 and would have provided only about half of a home's power needs.

Rebuffed by the state legislature, Schwarzenegger took the plan directly to CPUC, a regulatory body under the state's executive branch. CPUC adopted the Million Solar Roofs proposal virtually intact, leaving out minor portions of the bill that it did not have the power to implement.

Cost May Climb Further

Even the estimated $3.2 billion price tag for the California Solar Initiative may be overly optimistic. CPUC provided the estimate based in part on the assumption that the cost of solar equipment will decline significantly over the next decade. San Francisco voters were promised the same thing prior to a 2001 ballot initiative seeking $100 million to finance solar power equipment on city buildings. After voters approved the initiative, the price of solar equipment has not declined as promised. The city is stuck with a solar power proposal it cannot afford.

Economists are not expecting a solar power price turnaround. According to the September 20, 2005 Greenwire, solar power is "three or four times more expensive than [electricity] from gas-fired plants." He said, "The problem is solar panels are very sexy, and it's much easier to get people excited about them than energy efficiency or wind power."

"[CPUCs] proposed Solar Initiative is striking in its ambitions," noted the December 14 Greenwire, "adding nearly $1 billion in utility ratepayer funding to what Schwarzenegger had envisioned for the cost of his legislation. S.B. 1. Critics had doubted that the governor's initially proposed 'Million Dollar Roofs' budget would be enough."

Markets Shun Solar

Admitting solar power is more costly than other forms of energy production, CPUC defended its Solar Initiative as the only way to force Californians to build and utilize solar power equipment. "We are convinced that a cost-effective and sustainable solar market is unlikely to develop without a commitment for market support," stated CPUC's interim order on the initiative.

"Many of the parties to this proceeding observe that solar technologies are not yet cost-effective," CPUC added. "We share this concern and adopt the CSI with the objective of supporting the development of an industry that can compete with more conventional technologies and that is robust without government subsidies. We have not addressed here a specific strategy to effect that objective but intend to pursue it in the near future."

"Solar power is substantially more expensive than other sources of power," said Tom Tanton, senior fellow at the Institute for Energy Research. "This is why solar power accounts for less than 1 percent of power generation in the U.S. If solar power made any economic sense, governments would not have to mandate or heavily subsidize its use."

"Renewable power mandates, including solar power mandates, are big winners for government bureaucrats' budgets, but big losers for consumers' wallets," Tanton said.

James M. Taylor (taylor@heartland.org) is managing editor of Environment & Climate News.
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Relying on that promise, San Francisco voters approved a $100 million bond initiative to pay for solar equipment on city-owned buildings.

The initiative, however, held solar advocates to their promise that solar technology costs would soon fall dramatically. It mandated the $100 million could be spent only when solar power could be generated for the same or less money than electricity from the regional power grid.

Costs Remain High

Despite assertions from advocates that solar power is cost effective, and despite promises that solar power costs would soon drop, the city has yet to devise a plausible scenario where solar power can be generated for the same cost as traditional electricity. The $100 million in bond funds cannot be spent.

"We’ve got a $100 million bond sitting there," Mayor Gavin Newsom (D), a strong solar power advocate, lamented to the San Francisco Chronicle for a November 16, 2005 story. "The city's inability to launch its solar power initiative has not stalled for a lack of creativity, however. "We are working every single day ... trying to be creative to figure out how the heck we can use those dollars," Newson told the Chronicle.

"The simple fact is that despite all the solar power industry propaganda, solar power is tremendously expensive and will remain tremendously expensive for the foreseeable future.”

TOM TANTON

INSTITUTE FOR ENERGY RESEARCH

Existing Projects Costly

The city's newest solar power installation, purchased with other city revenues, illustrates the difficulties in finding an economic justification for new solar power generation. The new installation cost $1 million to build, will cost additional money to operate and keep in good repair, and will provide barely enough power for the equivalent of 200 homes.

A similar solar installation, involving 60,000 square feet of solar panels at the Moscone Convention Center, cost $7.4 million to build, will cost additional money to operate and keep in good repair, and provides the equivalent of the power needs of only 675 homes.

Newsom said the city will either forfeit the bond money or ask voters to pass an initiative that does not require the city to justify solar power generation economically. "If we can’t use [the $100 million bond funds], we go back to the voters," Newsom told the Chronicle.

"It is quite telling that even with significant subsidies and creative mathematics, San Francisco officials could not economically justify solar power to voters," said Tom Tanton, senior fellow at the Institute for Energy Research. "The simple fact is that despite all the solar power industry propaganda, solar power is tremendously expensive and will remain tremendously expensive for the foreseeable future.”

James M. Taylor (taylor@heartland.org) is managing editor of Environment & Climate News.

California Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger, shown here at an August 25, 2005 news conference on energy issues, is a strong proponent of solar energy mandates.
California Voters Defy Activist Groups, Approve New Home Construction

Support of Democratic legislators is key to victory

by James M. Taylor

Voters in the San Francisco suburbs of Pittsburg and Antioch, reflecting support from key Democratic elected officials, defied the Sierra Club and other activist groups by approving on November 8 two proposed housing developments. The activist groups have vowed to challenge the new communities in every venue possible, including zoning boards, planning commissions, and the courts.

Democrats Turn Pittsburg Tide

In the town of Pittsburg, an East Bay community of 60,000 residents roughly 40 miles east of San Francisco, citizens approved plans for 1,700 new homes on open land above the Concord Naval Weapons Station. Opponents had argued open land should not be taken for a new housing development. Supporters pointed out the area is already largely developed and population growth demands new home construction.

The tide turned against the Sierra Club and other activist groups when Democratic state Sen. Tom Torlakson (D-Antioch) and Democratic U.S. Rep. George Miller (D-Martinez) gave their support to the new community.

The Sierra Club refuses to concede defeat. “The fight is not over in Pittsburg,” said John Rizzo, chairman of the San Francisco chapter of the Sierra Club, as reported in the November 16, 2005 issue of the Contra Costa Times. “We will fight this development proposal at every step.”

Antioch Democrats Key

In a similar initiative also on the November 8 ballot, voters in Antioch, an East Bay community of 100,000 residents just south of Pittsburg, approved a new home community opposed by the Sierra Club and other environmental activist groups.

The new Antioch subdivision, known as Roddy Ranch, will host 700 homes on 850 acres of land. The Roddy Ranch victory was a landslide, with 60 percent of voters, including the city’s Democratic mayor and city council, approving the proposal.

The activist group Greenbelt Alliance pledged to do everything in its power to obstruct the new community. “It’s not over,” said David Reid, East Bay field representative for the Greenbelt Alliance. “The houses still have to go through a lengthy review process and a normal regulatory review process, including an EIR [Environmental Impact Report] and permits from the city and the natural resource agencies,” Reid pointed out.

Housing Becoming Unaffordable

“The median price of a home in the San Francisco Bay area … is over $700,000 at the moment. This is roughly 10 times median household income.”

WENDELL COX

THE PUBLIC PURPOSE

Despite voters’ overwhelming support for the Antioch community, Reid justified Greenbelt Alliance’s opposition by asserting area citizens “don’t want to see more cars on the road or more houses on the hillsides.”

Ronald Brown, executive director of Save Mount Diablo, said the Antioch developers had deceived voters. “The developers crafted the title and language of the bill to make it sound like they were a growth control measure, yet they were the ones proposing sprawl. It was very cleverly crafted and very misleading,” said Brown.

Sam Singer, spokesman for the initiative, chastised the Sierra Club and the Greenbelt Alliance for continuing to obstruct the will of voters. “The election was won fair and square,” Singer told the San Francisco Chronicle for a November 16 story. “We are sorry that they are, I would say, ungracious losers in this election.”

The median price of a home in the San Francisco Bay area is over $700,000 at the moment. This is roughly 10 times median household income.”

WENDELL COX

THE PUBLIC PURPOSE

Support of Democratic legislators is key to victory

by James M. Taylor

Even the Sierra Club admitted it might not be wise to keep fighting such a popular project as the proposed Antioch community.

“I hate to say it,” said Mike Daley, conservation director for the Sierra Club, in a December 5 article in the East Bay Business Times, “but with 60 percent of the vote, you have to start wondering if the public has spoken. When it gets up to 60 percent, some strong percentage knew it was Roddy Ranch development.”

The Antioch proposal succeeded, explained Joseph Perkins, president of the Home Builders Association of Northern California, in the East Bay Business Times article, because it “enjoyed the good will of the electorate. The support of the mayor [Democrat Don Freitas] and the council was a huge factor.”

“It is an incredible thing that Antioch and Pittsburg voters have shown foresight and done the right thing here,” said Cox. “It is a vote in favor of families, in favor of affordable housing, and in favor of community vitality. By contrast, the Sierra Club and the Greenbelt Alliance are against people, period.”

“It is encouraging that support has it is managing editor of Environment & Climate News.
Lake County, Ohio Scraps Flagship Recycling Program

Spiraling costs, paucity of environmental benefits doom curbside recycling

by James M. Taylor

Lake County, Ohio, which has long subsidized the state’s flagship recycling program, has decided to scrap curbside recycling. County commissioners announced the decision December 1, blaming escalating and unjustified costs for the program.

Instead of providing curbside pickup of materials placed in recycling bins, the county has designated 30 locations where residents can drop off their paper, plastic, aluminum, and glass. The dropoff locations began accepting recyclable waste on January 1.

Rising Costs Doomed Program

Lake County, which covers Cleveland’s far northeast suburbs, launched its curbside recycling program in 1993. At that time, the county imposed new fees on landfill deposits, which in turn subsidized curbside recycling. The county subsidized recycling at the rate of $1 per month per household.

As recycling costs rose over time, the recycling program began running a deficit even with the county subsidies. In 2003 the county mandated that each city, village, and township in the county provide an additional $.69 per month recycling subsidy per household.

By the end of 2005, county commissioners realized local authorities would have to double their subsidy for the program to break even, and there was no guarantee the subsidies would not continue to rise in the future. Numerous local officials told the county the recycling subsidies would break their budgets, so the county decided to end its curbside recycling experiment.

Activists Disappointed

While taxpayers will benefit from the end of ever-increasing recycling subsidies, some recycling activists expressed disappointment at the demise of the program.

“I’m shocked, heartbroken, really,” Andrew Booker, solid waste planning supervisor for the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency, told the Cleveland Plain Dealer for a December 1, 2005 story. “Lake County was always the leader, the one county we could point to that was doing a comprehensive plan.”

“Some of the hard-liners aren’t happy about this, because we were always the poster child for recycling,” admitted Lake County Solid Waste Coordinator Chris Hodges for the Plain Dealer article. “Everyone wants to be an environmentalist, but it eventually becomes a cost-benefit ratio thing, too,” added County Commissioner Dan Troy.

Recycling’s Benefits Questioned

While Lake County has discovered recycling programs are costly, the benefits are few, Property and Environment Research Center (PERC) Senior Associate Daniel Benjamin said. “Contrary to what the activists claim, we are not running out of landfill space,” said Benjamin. “The number of landfills in the United States is falling, but the landfills are getting bigger, and the total capacity is increasing. Today we have 18 years’ worth of landfill capacity nationwide—even if no other landfills are built.

“Moreover, recycling is a manufacturing process, so it has environmental impacts,” Benjamin added. “An EPA study found more toxic materials in recycling paper processes than in virgin paper manufacturing.

“Still further,” Benjamin observed, “curbside recycling requires another round of collection trucks stopping at every household in the county. This means more trucks driving more miles, wasting more fuel, and adding more air pollution to our skies.”

Costs Outweighed Benefits

“When state government mandates recycling programs, people felt good about helping the environment,” reported a November 27 Cleveland News-Herald house editorial. “But feeling good about helping the environment only goes so far as one’s wallet.

“But like any change, this eventually will become the norm,” the News-Herald explained. “County leaders aren’t faulted for making a wise business decision. The cost-benefit analysis of curbside recycling made it untenable.”

“This decision is extremely disappointing,” local high school teacher Scott McLaughlin said. “I don’t know why they can’t ask the public if they would be willing to pay for it. I think that if the trash pick-up in Lake County went to a pay-as-you-throw program, it could help cut down the trash fee and further support the recycling program.”

“If recycling made economic sense, government would not have to mandate it or subsidize it,” countered Jerry Taylor, director of natural resource studies at the Cato Institute. “Recycling companies would willingly pay people for their recyclable waste or charge governments less to reprocess waste than landfills charge to store it.”

James M. Taylor (taylor@heartland.org) is managing editor of Environment & Climate News.
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EPA Proposes Cut in Airborne Particulate Matter Levels

by Joel Schwartz

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) on December 21, 2005 proposed reducing allowable measured daily levels of fine particulate matter (PM2.5) in the atmosphere by nearly half, from 65 micrograms per cubic meter (ug/m3) down to 35 ug/m3.

By making clean air attainment standards more stringent, the new standard would change designations in many pollution monitoring locations from “attainment” to “non-compliance” with federal standards, and thus would require additional measures to reduce particulate matter.

EPA estimates the change would nearly double the number of pollution monitoring locations in violation of federal PM2.5 standards.

“The air is constantly getting cleaner, and has been doing so for decades. That is a point that activist groups conveniently omit and the media consistently fails to report.”

BEN LIEBERMAN
THE HERITAGE FOUNDATION

The current daily standard of 65 ug/m3 was promulgated by the Clinton EPA in 1997. The standard has already significantly reduced particulate matter, with average PM2.5 levels dropping 15 percent from 1999 to 2004. Since the early 1980s, annual average PM2.5 levels have declined about 45 percent.

With his current proposal to cut allowable daily particulate matter levels by nearly half, EPA Administrator Stephen Johnson chose a slightly more relaxed standard than was recommend ed by EPA’s Clean Air Science Advisory Committee (CASAC), a group of outside scientists and health experts. CASAC recommended a 30 ug/m3 daily limit and a 13-14 ug/m3 annual limit. Johnson’s proposal would not reduce the Clinton EPA’s annual limit of 15 ug/m3.

“Our nation’s air is the cleanest it has been in over a generation, and today’s proposal begins our next step in the steady march toward cleaner air and healthier lives by addressing particle pollution,” said Johnson.

Activists Attack New Reductions

Environmental activist groups were unimpressed. Clean Air Watch complained, “President Bush Gives Early Christmas Present to Smokestack Industries.” The American Lung Association called the cuts “Status Quo Revisions to PM” standards.

Many newspapers mirrored the eco-activists’ assertions. The Atlanta Journal-Constitution’s December 21, 2005 front-page headline claimed, “EPA barely budges on soot; Health advice disregarded.” According to the New York Times, EPA “modestly” reduced allowable PM2.5 and “largely ignored recommendations for tighter controls from its own scientists and from an independent panel of outside experts.”

Ben Lieberman, senior policy analyst at The Heritage Foundation, put the activist claims in perspective, saying, “The air is constantly getting cleaner, and has been doing so for decades. That is a point that activist groups conveniently omit and the media consistently fails to report.

“Activists tend to take things out of context and assert that any action short of their ‘most restrictive possible’ goals is a rollback in environmental standards. However, by virtually every measure of the Clean Air Act, the air is cleaner now than it was, for example, just five years ago. EPA’s newly proposed standards will accelerate this trend, although it is easy to make the argument that the substantial additional costs are not worth the very minor additional benefit.”

“Further tightening particulate matter standards provides very little, if any, health benefits at significant economic cost to society. We could do far better directing our economic resources toward more real and pressing ... issues.”

BEN LIEBERMAN
THE HERITAGE FOUNDATION
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Compliance Expected to Decline

Most of the nation’s PM2.5 monitoring stations are in compliance with the current daily standard. While 14 percent of the monitoring locations violate the annual standard, only 0.3 percent violate the daily standard.

Under EPA’s new proposal, the more stringent daily standard would require a substantial new round of pollution abatement measures, nearly doubling the combined annual and daily PM2.5 violation rate to 27 percent of all monitoring sites. Virtually all monitoring stations that violate the annual standard would violate the daily standard as well.

The new standard will add approximately 75 additional counties to EPA’s list of PM 2.5 “non-attainment” areas.

With current standards and existing technologies already resulting in a steady decline in airborne particulate matter, however, it is possible EPA’s tougher PM2.5 standard won’t require any new emission-reduction requirements in some metropolitan areas.

“Further tightening particulate matter standards provides very little, if any, health benefits at significant economic cost to society. We could do far better directing our economic resources toward more real and pressing ... issues.”

BEN LIEBERMAN
THE HERITAGE FOUNDATION
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The Heartland Institute

Merits Unclear

“The Clean Air Act requires EPA to protect public health with an adequate margin of safety, which these proposed standards simply do not do,” said Janice Nolen, director of national policy for the American Lung Association.

“In this case, thousands of people can die and millions of people can have asthma attacks and can die or end up in the hospital as a result of airborne particulate matter,” Nolen added. “More than 2,000 studies have consistently found adverse health effects at or even below the EPA’s proposed standard.”

“The adverse health effects claimed by activists are based on very weak epidemiological associations,” responded Lieberman. “Further tightening particulate matter standards provides very little, if any, health benefits at significant economic cost to society. We could do far better directing our economic resources toward more real and pressing health and welfare issues.

“The existing standard is already too stringent,” Lieberman added. “We’re already in the realm of excessive and unjustified regulation.”

EPA is accepting public comment on its proposed new standard through March 20. Johnson said EPA encourages comments and will take them into consideration prior to finalizing its decision.

“We are hoping to have a robust public comment period,” Johnson said.

Joel Schwartz (joel@joelschwartz.com) is a visiting fellow at the American Enterprise Institute.
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**Penn. Legislators Seek to Block California Emissions Standards**

by Michael Coulter

Leaders in the Pennsylvania House and Senate have introduced legislation to keep state residents from being subject to California auto emissions standards, preferring instead to use federal standards for auto emissions.

**States Can Choose**

Under the federal Clean Air Act, states have a choice to meet either federal standards or stricter California standards for emissions from vehicles and other mobile sources.

The Pennsylvania Clean Vehicle Program, enacted in 1996, adopted a third set of standards: the National Low Emissions Vehicle (NLEV) standards. The NLEV standards were voluntary ones stricter than the federal standards in place at the time, yet more lenient than the California standards enacted by California Air Resources Board (CARB) regulators. Between 1998 and 2005, the Pennsylvania Environmental Quality Board allowed automakers and auto dealers to opt for either the California or NLEV standards.

According to a December 13, 2005 statement issued by state Sen. Mary Jo White (R-Venango), “to encourage automakers not to withdraw from NLEV—thus falling back on the weaker [federal] Tier 1 standard—states adopted the California rules as a legal backstop. Automakers would be less likely to withdraw from NLEV if they faced the possibility of implementing California rules.” The NLEV rules also were considered a backstop should the federal government fail to finalize a stricter, Tier 2 rule.

**Option Expiring**

With the NLEV option expiring in the state with the 2006 model year, environmental activists and the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) assert only the California option remains, and therefore Pennsylvania is now governed by the California standards. Others, including White, say the federal Tier 2 rule, now finalized, applies.

As White explained, “the California rules were adopted in our regulations, and submitted to EPA, only as a legal backstop—in essence a paperwork exercise. We did so only because, back in 1998, the NLEV was a voluntary emission standard and states (with EPA’s blessing) needed an incentive to encourage automakers not to withdraw from it.

Consumer Group Rejects California Auto Standards

In a commentary published in the December 9 State College Centre Daily and other Pennsylvania newspapers, AAA, the nation’s oldest organization of automobile owners, has come out in staunch opposition to the effort to impose California automobile emission standards on Pennsylvania. The group notes:

- Higher prices. California cars cost substantially more, from $1,000 to $3,000 or more per comparable model, because of required manufacturing changes and limited production.
- Limited choices. Pennsylvania consumers could no longer buy new diesel vehicles. Even advanced ‘clean diesel’ vehicles would not be allowed under California requirements.
- Fuel availability. The Commonwealth’s current fuel production, distribution and retailing infrastructure would require significant and costly changes. When a Pennsylvania/California car gases up outside the Commonwealth, the special blend of fuel will likely not be available.
- Limited choices. Pennsylvania consumers would face fewer choices when buying a new car; they would be limited to CA LEV-certified vehicles.

Pennsylvania dealers would not be able to trade or bring into Pennsylvania vehicles from border states that do not participate in the CA LEV program.

“With a Tier 2 vehicle,” AAA points out, “a car trip from Harrisburg to Pittsburgh would produce fewer emissions than mowing your lawn.” — Michael Coulter

This became moot when the federal government finalized Tier 2 in 2000.

DEP Secretary Kathleen McGinty, former environmental official in the Clinton administration, argues that by using California standards “as a backstop,” the Pennsylvania Clean Vehicle Program adopts the California standards, known as Cal LEV II, by reference. Accordingly, DEP, through its Environmental Quality Board, is now proposing to make Cal LEV II the legal auto emission standards in Pennsylvania.

Those standards, according to the DEP regulation, would take effect in 2008.

Legislators Oppose DEP

White, who is chair of the Environmental Resources and Energy Committee, and Sen. Roger Madigan (R-Bradford), chair of the Transportation Committee, have introduced a bill that would prohibit DEP from adopting the Cal LEV II standards. Under the bill, which has 18 additional co-sponsors from both political parties, DEP would be required to incorporate federal Tier 2 as part of the State Implementation Plan for meeting clean air goals under the Clean Air Act.

In a joint statement, Madigan and White said, “We are very concerned over the prospect of subjecting Pennsylvanians to regulations crafted by CARB. CARB is obligated to impose air quality standards for California—not Pennsylvania—to meet its air quality attainment.”

In the state House, the ranking Republican, Rick Geist (R-Altoona), and ranking Democrat Keith McCall (D-Carbon) have introduced a bill that would have the same effect as the Madigan-White Senate bill.

Geist asserts the primary nature of his bill is “a matter of sovereignty.” “I don’t want a board from California setting policy for Pennsylvania,” said Geist.

In a letter published by the Tribune-Democrat, Geist observed, “The choice here is not between a clean car and a dirty car, but between the two very clean cars.”

Further Improvements Minuscule

In December 1999, as the federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) adopted the Tier 2 standards, then-president Bill Clinton called the Tier 2 standards “the boldest steps in a generation to clean the air we breathe.” Clinton observed the standards “will reduce tailpipe emissions by as much as 95 percent.”

According to Joel Schwartz, visiting fellow at the American Enterprise Institute and an expert on auto and air regulation, “under Tier 2 standards the average car will have an 80 percent reduction in auto emissions compared to model-year 2000 automobiles. By comparison, the California standards will lead to only an 82 percent improvement,” said Schwartz.

The California standards, however, will lead to substantial extra costs, Schwartz said, because the closer automobiles get to zero emissions, the more difficult and more costly the remaining reductions become.

“CARB estimates that its regulations will add $1,000 to the cost of cars, but auto industry research puts the figure closer to $3,000,” Schwartz said. “Misleadingly, these regulatory costs will be largely hidden from consumers because the costs won’t be seen on the invoice.”

Activists Vow Lawsuits

The Clean Air Council, an environmental activist group based in Philadelphia, has indicated it will file suit in federal court if the state does not abide by the California standards.

“Our position is that Pennsylvania should adopt the California standards because it’s important to have the cleanest, air possible,” said Eric Cheung, an attorney with the council.

“Tier 2 is not a dirty-car standard,” countered Gene Barr, vice president for political and regulatory affairs at the Pennsylvania Chamber of Business and Industry. Barr said adopting Tier 2 would keep the state safely in compliance with federal clean air standards and existing state rules, including the Pennsylvania Clean Vehicle Program.

Michael Coulter (mcoulter@gcc.edu) teaches political science at Grove City College in Grove City, Pennsylvania.
Six Suspects Arrested for String of Eco-Terrorist Attacks

Fire-bombings show increasing threat of domestic eco-terrorism

by James M. Taylor

Federal officials on December 7, 2005, arrested and indicted six suspected eco-terrorists for crimes dating back to 1998. The suspects, some of whom are college students in their late 20s, are believed to have acted together in planning and carrying out some of the attacks.

Terrorists Coordinated Attacks

From 1998 to 2001, terrorists in Oregon and Washington launched a series of very similar attacks on tree farms and botanical research centers. In what officials have described as sophisticated fire-bombing techniques, the terrorists constructed fire bombs out of gasoline, road flares, batteries, and digital timers. Some of the attacks occurred simultaneously at different locations, indicating collaboration.

In most of the attacks, the terrorists left graffiti announcing Earth Liberation Front (ELF) or Animal Liberation Front (ALF) involvement, or the ELF or ALF Web sites claimed responsibility.

Targets included a government animal and plant health inspection site in Olympia, Washington, set ablaze on June 21, 1998; a U.S. Forest Industries facility in Medford, Oregon, torched on December 27, 1998; and an electricity transmission tower near Bend, Oregon, destroyed on December 31, 1999, the date the U.S. public feared Al Qaeda strikes coinciding with the millennium celebrations.

“I’m gratified that the FBI has been diligent in their pursuit of these people.”

STEVE SWANSON
SUPERIOR LUMBER

Other targets were a family-owned timber company in Glendale, Oregon, where terrorists set a veneer and plywood plant on fire on January 2, 2001; a University of Washington horticultural facility, set afire on May 21, 2001; and the University of Washington botanical research facility, destroyed by a fire bomb on May 21, 2001.

Victims Relieved by Arrests

“I’m gratified that the FBI has been diligent in their pursuit of these people,” Steve Swanson, president of the family-owned timber company Superior Lumber in Glendale, Oregon, told the New York Times for a December 9, 2005 article. The attack caused $500,000 in damage and left him wondering when the terrorists might return. “If left unchecked these are the kind of crimes that could really hurt someone,” Swanson said.

Although terrorist attacks in Oregon and Washington have become less frequent in the past few years, attacks are becoming more common in California and in Rocky Mountain states. Terrorists have targeted ski facilities, homes, and condominiums.

“It certainly took them long enough to make these arrests, which is both a good thing and a bad thing,” said Ron Arnold, author of the 1997 book Eco-Terror: The Violent Agenda to Save Nature. “It is discouraging that it took federal law enforcement officials so long to apprehend the suspects. Yet it is encouraging that they took these crimes seriously enough to never give up ...”

RON ARNOLD
AUTHOR - ECO-TERROR: THE VIOLENT AGENDA TO SAVE NATURE

“Web sites continue to recruit hate-filled, disgruntled people and instruct them on how to engage in terrorist acts. Ringleaders continue to travel from state to state like traveling evangelists, recruiting local activists for local attacks, then moving on to the next community to do the same, while the prior attackers melt back into the community. There is still a long way to go in reining in these hate-filled acts of violence.”

In 2005 testimony before the U.S. Senate, FBI officials stressed the clear and present danger posed by eco-terrorist groups such as ELF and ALF. Branding such groups the number one domestic terrorism threat, the FBI reported 1,200 crimes from 1990 to 2004 in which eco-terrorists had voluntarily asserted responsibility. The agency still has 150 open investigations of eco-terrorist crimes committed since 1990.

Misguided Aggression

The attack at the University of Washington botanical research facility was the most severe and perhaps most misguided. The firebomb destroyed the facility, caused $7 million in damage, and killed numerous endangered native plants the university was cultivating with the intention of eventually reintroducing them into the wild. With the loss of the research facility and its botanical specimens, endangered native plants suffered an untimely and devastating setback.

“If they’re guilty, I hope they lock them up and throw away the key,” University of Washington botanical researcher Toby Bradshaw told the Seattle Post-Intelligencer for a December 9, 2005 story.

The attack focused attention on the benefits of the botanical research center and led to construction of a more comprehensive, and more protected, research facility.

“If it had worked out any better for me, I would have been a leading suspect,” Bradshaw quipped.

Groups Are Top Threat

“Terrorism is terrorism, regardless of motivations,” explained Sterling Burnett, senior fellow of the National Center for Policy Analysis. “When terrorist groups start firebombing targets, and especially places where people come and go, they need to be severely punished.”

“These arrests are good news, but the government still has a long way to go in reducing this terrorist threat,” Burnett said.

“When the FBI lists a particular group or groups as the nation’s number one domestic terrorist threat, we are clearly dealing with something far more serious and far more pernicious than small groups of misguided pranksters.”

James M. Taylor (taylor@heartland.org) is managing editor of Environment & Climate News.
NOAA: Hurricane Upsurge Is Natural, Not Linked to Global Warming

by Kerry Jackson

Atlantic Ocean is in peak of 20- to 30-year natural pattern

Natural Cycle Is Peaking

According to NOAA, the U.S. has been in a cycle of heightened Atlantic Ocean hurricane activity since 1995. This cycle is expected to continue for at least another decade. Importantly, the cycle is part of a naturally occurring pattern and is not in any way related to global warming activity, concluded NOAA.

“NOAA attributes this increased activity to natural occurring cycles in tropical climate patterns near the equator,” states the NOAA study. “These cycles, called ‘the tropical multi-decadal signal,’ typically last several decades (20 to 30 years or even longer). As a result, the North Atlantic experiences alternating decades long (20 to 30 year periods or even longer) of above normal or below normal hurricane seasons. NOAA research shows that the tropical multi-decadal signal is causing the increased Atlantic hurricane activity since 1995, and is not related to greenhouse warming.”

The current upsurge in hurricane activity is similar to the previous cycle of heightened hurricane activity lasting from the late 1920s to the late 1960s. An intervening cycle of below-normal hurricane activity occurred from 1970 to 1994, the NOAA study concludes.

“Since 1995, the tropical multi-decadal signal has produced lower wind shear (changing winds with height) and warmer waters across the tropical Atlantic, along with conducive winds coming off the west coast of Africa. This key combination of conditions produces active hurricane seasons,” explains NOAA.

“With an active hurricane era comes many more landfalling tropical storms, hurricanes and major hurricanes in the United States. ... The United States can expect ongoing high levels of landfalling tropical storms and hurricanes while we remain in this active era.”

CO2 Not to Blame

Regarding the warmer Atlantic, the lower wind shear, and the conducive winds coming off the west coast of Africa, NOAA observes, “Research by NOAA scientists Jerry Bell and Muthuvel Chelliah, currently in press with the Journal of Climate, describes the tropical multi-decadal signal and shows that it accounts for the entire inter-related set of conditions that controls hurricane activity for decades at a time.”

The NOAA study affirms the findings of most hurricane researchers. “There is consensus among NOAA hurricane researchers and forecasters that recent increases in hurricane activity are primarily the result of natural fluctuations,” reports NOAA.

In interviews for this article, three of the nation’s leading hurricane experts agreed with the NOAA assessment.

Chris Landsea, science and operations

CONTINUED on right
Global Warming Simultaneously Baking, Freezing Europe, Activist Alarmists Claim

by James Hoare

Europe is simultaneously baking and freezing, and will continue to do so as a result of global warming, alarmists asserted in global media reports in November 2005. The two theories upon which the claims were made were promptly debunked by climate scientists.

Media Fanned Fears

Measurements taken during 2005 and reported in November show the rate of movement of the Atlantic Ocean’s Gulf Stream, which carries warm Caribbean waters to the west coast of northern Europe, has slowed by 30 percent relative to measurements taken in 1992. Alarmists quickly claimed those findings as evidence of large-scale global warming.

According to the predictions of some alarmists, warmer temperatures will cause more glacial melt from Greenland and the North Atlantic, which will impede the operation of the Gulf Stream. Some alarmists claim the entire Gulf Stream could shut down, leading to another ice age, if warming continues on its current course.

The media were quick to spreadalarm. In anticipation of the findings, the London Guardian ran a November 13 article titled “Will global warming trigger a new ice age?” Following the study’s release, the Guardian published a December 1 article claiming “Alarm over dramatic weakening of Gulf Stream.”


The Times article was typical, claiming, “The findings give the strongest indication yet that ... Europe’s central heating system is breaking down under the impact of global warming.”

Scientists Debunk Alarmism

Climate researchers quickly debunked the alarmists’ claims. “The only way computer models have managed to simulate an entire shutdown of the current is to magic into existence millions of tons of fresh water and dump it in the Atlantic,” observed Chris West, director of the UK climate impacts program at Oxford University, according to a December 1, 2005 article in the Guardian. “It’s not clear where that water could ever come from, even taking into account increased Greenland melting,” West said.

“The only way computer models have managed to simulate an entire shutdown of the current is to magic into existence millions of tons of fresh water and dump it in the Atlantic. It’s not clear where that water could ever come from.”

CHRIS WEST
UK CLIMATE IMPACTS PROGRAM
OXFORD UNIVERSITY

The European Environment Agency released a November 29 report claiming Europe is warming, not cooling. The report determined Europe had warmed by 1.71 degrees Fahrenheit during the twentieth century, well above the global average increase of 1.25 degrees Fahrenheit.

“Much of the difference in temperature between eastern North America and western Europe can be explained not by the Gulf Stream but by the simple and well-known fact that the ocean stores heat in the summer and gradually releases it in winter. When winds blow from west to east, as across the North Atlantic, the heat released in winter preferentially warms the land areas to the east of the ocean,” said Timo Hermanter, moderator of the Finland-based Climate Skeptics, a Web site for climate scientists interested in discussing current climate issues. “Actual measurements show that the Gulf Stream is too weak to warm Europe by itself.”

Humidity Alleged Problem

Another recent theory, reported by the BBC, is that global warming is causing higher humidity levels than expected, which will in turn make global warming more severe than expected. Europe, with the Atlantic Ocean and North Sea serving as substantial humidity sources, is warming faster than the rest of the globe, the program reported.

While regional effects will vary, the global effect will be higher temperatures than previously predicted, the BBC story reported. “This is potentially a positive feedback mechanism which could increase the impact of greenhouse gases such as CO2,” the article warns.

Here, too, climate scientists quickly debunked the alarmists’ claims.

“The news media almost always reports ‘new evidence shows global warming worse than previously thought,’” said Pat Michaels, senior fellow at the Cato Institute and former president of the American Association of State Climatologists. “However, if global warming were constantly becoming worse than previously thought, climate scientists would be revising their warming estimates upwards. In fact, the opposite is happening. Climate data continues to suggest a very modest warming in the decades ahead.”

Contradictions Cast Doubt

Regarding the apparent contradiction of studies predicting both a colder and hotter Europe in years ahead, “You can’t have it both ways,” Michaels said. “It cannot be both simultaneously warming and cooling in Europe. We cannot have a cold catastrophe and a heat catastrophe in Europe.”

Added Michaels, “When the temperature is warm, the alarmists blame it on global warming. When the temperature is cold, the alarmists blame it on global warming. When it rains, global warming is to blame. When it doesn’t rain, global warming is to blame. This is not science, this is the alarmists simply lobbying for attention and lobbying for large government research grants.”

James Hoare (jhoare@mcgivneyandluger.com) is managing attorney at the Syracuse, New York office of McGivney, Kluger & Gannon.
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officer at the NOAA National Hurricane Center in Miami, Florida, observed any impact global warming might have on hurricane activity is neither large nor immediate.

“We may be looking at stronger hurricanes by 5 percent,” Landsea said. “And even that is a very small change that is still way off in the future.”

Even the potential 5 percent change in hurricane strength may be too small to measure. According to Landsea, hurricane experts can estimate a storm’s winds “only to the nearest 5 mph.”

“We can’t even measure that [5 percent change], it’s so small,” Landsea said.

“NOAA research shows that the tropical multi-decadal signal is causing the increased Atlantic hurricane activity since 1995, and is not related to greenhouse warming.”

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

Current Activity Is Normal

Jeff Masters, director of meteorology for the popular Web site Weather Underground, confirmed global warming cannot be blamed for even the warmer Atlantic Ocean temperatures, let alone the other factors necessary for heightened hurricane conditions.

“Everyone agrees the tropical oceans have warmed a half-degree Fahrenheit over the last 100 years,” Masters said. However, he noted, multiple studies on the subject have reached conflicting conclusions on causation.

It is “way too early to say one way or the other” if global warming is responsible, Masters said.

William Gray, head of Colorado State University’s Tropical Meteorology Project, reported that despite media claims to the contrary, most hurricane researchers are skeptical of asserted connections between global warming and recent hurricane activity.

“There is no evidence of changes in tropical storms compared to what we would normally expect during this current cycle,” Gray said.

Kerry Jackson (kjak31@yahoo.com) is a freelance writer.

INTERNET INFO

Portland Not Complying with Kyoto, Despite State Claims to the Contrary

by Richard Page and John Charles

In June 2005, Portland, Oregon’s Office of Sustainable Development (OSD) released a report announcing 2004 emissions of carbon dioxide (CO2) in Multnomah County (MC) were lower than emissions in 1990. This is the same benchmark for CO2 reduction sought in the Kyoto Protocol, and according to the report’s authors, is an achievement “likely unequaled in any other major U.S. city.”

Jane Lubchenco, a professor at Oregon State University and co-chair of Governor Ted Kulongoski’s (D) Advisory Group on Global Warming, upped the ante a few days later by proclaiming to The Oregonian, “I know of no other city in the world [emphasis added] that has lowered greenhouse emissions at this level.”

This caught the attention of New York Times columnist Nicholas Kristof, who published an article on July 3, 2005 exalting Portland as “America’s environmental laboratory” for having “achieved stunning reductions in carbon emissions while booming economically.” Kristof concluded by implying that if President George W. Bush read Portland’s Global Warming Progress Report, his decision on how to deal with global warming would be a “no-brainer.”

CO2 Cuts Never Occurred

Portland’s claim of painlessly reducing carbon dioxide has been repeated over and over by journalists, bloggers, and even some scientists, without any attempt to verify the accuracy of the OSD’s report. In fact, actual carbon emissions have been well above the level claimed by Portland. Moreover, any regulatory program imposed by the government to lower emissions to pre-1990 levels is going to be costly to consumers, something elected officials apparently don’t understand.

As it turns out, “no-brainer” was an ironically apt description of the analytical effort most commentators had put into reviewing the Portland CO2 reductions because the assertions in CO2 never actually occurred. The OSD admitted this in response to inquiries from the Cascade Policy Institute. In response to a series of data requests regarding the report, Michael Armstrong of the OSD stated, “You’ll note that the total emissions for 2004 in the ‘Time Series Report’ differ from that in the Progress Report. In assembling the materials for your request, I noticed an error in one of the inputs to the Clean Air and Climate Protection Software, which has been corrected in the print outs enclosed.”

This error underestimated the 2004 CO2 emissions by 74,561 tons, just enough to put the reading below 1990 levels. Moreover, there are serious methodological flaws in the report, all of which suggest CO2 emissions have actually been growing in Portland, as they have been in most other major cities.

Transportation Data Flawed

For example, the city claims a decrease in transportation-related CO2 emissions since 1990. This is critical, since the transportation sector is the largest single source of CO2 emissions, both nationally and locally. To reach this conclusion, the OSD estimated transportation emissions primarily on the basis of gasoline sales in MC, even though page 46 of the software manual used to estimate local emissions explicitly advised researchers not to do so.

Since 1990, MC gasoline sales have increased by less than 1 percent, despite a huge increase in the number of vehicles registered in the county. The OSD used these fuel sales as a proxy for vehicle miles traveled and concluded that CO2 emissions from automobiles in MC have not increased much over this time period. However, as the software manual warns, “these records do not take into consideration fuel purchased outside the community and consumed within the community boundaries (e.g., if a portion of the population crosses jurisdictional lines to take advantage of cheaper gas prices).”

High Prices Skew Stats

All of the relevant data indicate that this is exactly what is taking place. In fact, there is reason to believe that since 1990 there has been a significant increase in the percentage of MC drivers purchasing their gas elsewhere.

For example, in neighboring Washington County (WC), gasoline sales have risen 37 percent since 1990. It’s reasonable to assume some of these WC gasoline customers ventured into MC on a regular basis, especially since roughly 12 percent of MC workers live in WC. This equates to more than 52,600 commuters each weekday traveling from WC to MC. In 1990, there were only 49,201 such commuters.

Also, the number of automobiles crossing the I-5 and I-205 bridges from Vancouver, Washington, just north of Portland, to MC on a daily basis has increased by 50 percent since 1990. In 2003, the average price of a gallon of gasoline was 10 cents cheaper in Vancouver than it was in Portland, which suggests many MC commuters would prefer to buy their gas in Washington state.

In total, the number of commuters traveling in and out of MC on a daily basis increased by 21 percent between 1990 and 2000. Why would these new commuters purchase their gas in MC, where prices are higher and all sales are subjected to a MC tax of three cents on the gallon?

Trends Refute Emissions Claims

Other related trends also cast doubt on the alleged drop in MC emissions. For instance, the total number of motor vehicles registered in MC rose from 493,693 in 1990 to 715,872 in 2004, a 45 percent increase. While motor vehicles were also becoming more efficient during this time, which somewhat minimizes the emissions effect of this increase, fuel economy for passenger vehicles rose only 9.4 percent nationally.

Also, the Oregon Department of Transportation estimates total travel on state-owned highways within MC during the 1990-2004 period increased from 7.0 to 11.0 billion vehicle miles traveled (VMT) annually, an 11 percent increase.

Metro has estimated total VMT for both the Portland-Vancouver region and the Portland-only region, and neither trend supports OSD’s conclusion. Between 1990 and 2003, daily VMT for the Portland-Vancouver region increased by 45 percent. For the Portland-only region (technically, parts of Multnomah, Washington, and Clackamas counties), the total increase in daily VMT was 38 percent.

In terms of per-person daily VMT, there was actually a larger increase on the Oregon side of the Columbia River (where the light rail lines have been built) than for the region as a whole. Between 1990 and 2003, per-person daily VMT for the Portland-Vancouver region rose by 3.2 percent, while it rose by 3.7 percent in the Portland area alone. Clearly, relying on MC fuel sales records has caused the OSD to underestimate this increase in driving.

Despite the fact that the OSD ultimately admitted committing a serious math error and despite the obvious methodological flaws of the report, the Web site for the sustainability program still claims Portland has reduced CO2 emissions to below-1990 levels. Portland officials should publicly retract the report and stop relying on MC fuel sales records for estimating local CO2 emissions.

Richard Page is a research associate with Cascade Policy Institute. A. Charles Jr. (john@casadepolicy.org) is president of the Institute. This article was first published in the Fall 2005 Cascade Update and is reprinted with permission.
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trouble competing with conventional power sources.

Mollohan also expressed concern that environmental effects, including excessive bird and bat kills in addition to the disruption of West Virginia’s scenic beauty, could “become exponentially worse as the industry, supported by those government subsidies, expands... in environmentally sensitive areas.”

Potential Effects Unknown
“We are trying to grapple with this new industry, which is unregulated,” said Judy Rodd, senior vice president of the Highlands Conservancy and director of Friends of Blackwater, as reported in the December 15, 2005 Charleston Gazette.

Regarding the proposed expansion of industrial wind farms in West Virginia, Rodd continued, “There is no public debate, no science on this issue, no knowledge of the cumulative impacts of wind farms and no concern to weed out bad projects before they are built.”

What has been documented, however, is the deadly impact the current Tucker County industrial wind farm has had on area wildlife. A recent study conducted by Bat Conservation International discovered approximately 2,000 bats were killed by the Tucker County wind farm during a six-week period in 2004. The number of bats killed during this period was likely substantially lower than would typically be the case, said Merlin Tuttle, president of Bat Conservation International, because record cold kept bat activity abnormally low.

Tuttle believes the proposed 10-fold increase in wind turbines would kill more than 50,000 bats per year, which would harm the local ecosystem.

“Bats are the slowest reproducing mammals on the planet for their size, and there is no way they can sustain those kill rates,” Tuttle said. “If we continue to build these giant killing machines and place them in places like West Virginia mountain ridges, we run a very strong risk of pushing a very beneficial and once abundant species into endangered species status.”

“Bats are just as important by night as birds are by day,” Tuttle explained. “They are absolutely instrumental in keeping harmful insect populations like mosquitoes and crop-destroying pests in check. Eliminate the bats, and the only other alternative is spraying substantially more pesticides on our food, on ourselves, and in our environment.”

Industry Rejects Compromise
“I can appreciate that we need other energy sources,” Jane Burch, a Grant County resident who lives near one of the proposed wind farms, told the Atlanta Journal-Constitution for a December 14, 2005 article, “but I don’t like the look of them, and I don’t want them behind my property, and I don’t like what they do with the bat kills.”

Wildlife advocates have proposed, at a minimum, that current and proposed wind turbines not operate on nights when wind speeds are low and bats are most active.

That proposal did not sit well with Steve Stengel, spokesman for the Florida Power & Light company that owns and operates many of the existing and proposed wind turbines. “We don’t think it makes a whole lot of sense to be focusing on a solution that potentially could reduce the amount of power that is generated and potentially put stress on the machines,” Stengel told the Atlanta Journal-Constitution.

Tuttle believes the farms are a danger to the environment. “As an environmentalist and as a conservationist heading a conservation agency, I certainly would like sustainable, environmentally friendly power,” he said. “I would like wind farms to succeed. But the more we study the issue, the more apparent it is that wind farms, and particularly wind farms along mountain ridges, are decimating bat populations. Wind power is not an environmentally friendly power source.”

—James Hoare

Wind Turbines Kill Raptors, Lead to Rat Infestations

Predictions by bat experts that expanded industrial wind farms in West Virginia will increase numbers of disease-carrying mosquitoes and crop-destroying grasshoppers, locusts, and moths are not the only expected ecological consequences of expanded wind farms. Giant wind turbines take an even greater toll on birds, including many endangered species and birds of prey instrumental in controlling rodent populations.

According to the December 18, 2005 Riverside, California Press-Enterprise, up to 1,300 birds of prey are killed each year at Northern California’s Altamont Pass wind farm alone.

Rat infestations
Residents near California’s smaller San Gorgonio Pass wind farm report that even in an area with far fewer wind turbines than Altamont Pass, the declining number of birds of prey associated with the wind farm is causing an ever-worsening rat infestation.

According to the Press-Enterprise, longtime residents Nancy and Peter Wright have witnessed a steady decline in golden eagles, red-tailed hawks, and barn owls near their San Gorgonio-area home. At the same time, residents report, the Wrights, rats have begun taking over.

“The only thing that’s changed out here is the presence of the windmills,” Nancy Wright told the Press-Enterprise.

Peter Wright reports he must engage in “rat wars” on daily basis. The rats nest in his palm trees and devour the backyard citrus he used to pick and eat.

“It’s a regular job, rat catcher,” Peter Wright told the Press-Enterprise.

Rats Invading Homes
Another San Gorgonio resident, Xandi Shaw, has brought three new cats to her yard citrus he used to pick and eat. According to the Press-Enterprise, up to 1,300 birds of prey are killed each year at Northern California’s Altamont Pass wind farm alone.

“Wind turbines are absolutely devastating to wildlife, and in particular to wildlife that greatly benefits humans.”

ALEX AVERY
CENTER FOR GLOBAL FOOD ISSUES
HUDSON INSTITUTE

Other Sources Greener
“All forms of power entail environmental trade-offs,” said Alex Avery, director of research and education for the Hudson Institute’s Center for Global Food Issues. “Wind power fares especially poorly in this equation.

“Wind turbines are absolutely devastating to wildlife,” Avery explained, “and in particular to wildlife that greatly benefits the farm. Small birds and bats control harmful insects such as disease-carrying mosquitoes and crop-destroying moths, while birds of prey control rat populations. For all this environmental damage, wind turbines produce only intermittent, undeependable, and quite expensive power.”

Other energy sources are much “greener,” Avery said. “Nuclear power, with zero emissions and a very small ecological footprint, is perhaps the most environmentally friendly power source,” Avery noted. “Beyond that, hydropower produces far more power, far more cheaply, and with a similar or reduced environmental impact as compared to wind turbines.”

—James Hoare


Education and Capitalism

How Overcoming Our Fear of Markets and Economics Can Improve America’s Schools

By Herbert J. Walberg and Joseph L. Bast

“Walberg and Bast have written a scholarly, readable, and timely book that cogently explains how market competition can promote school improvement. I recommend it as a college-level text in economics, education or public policy, and to anyone who cares about the education of our children.”

JOSEPH P. VITERITTI, NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

Send check or money order for $15 + $3 shipping and handling to The Heartland Institute at 19 South LaSalle Street #903, Chicago, IL 60603. This and other great books are also available for purchase on our Web site at www.heartland.org.

HAS YOUR STATE REDUCED ITS WELFARE ROLLS BY 86%?

Available for purchase through The Heartland Institute’s online store at www.heartland.org or call 312/377-4000.

A limited number of COMPLIMENTARY COPIES are also available to elected officials and their staff. Send your request by fax on office stationery to 312/377-5000.

Make a Difference is both a compelling memoir and convincing proof that we now know important answers to help solve America’s poverty problem—without spending any more of the taxpayers’ money.

Author Gary MacDougal spent years working in Illinois inner cities and rural communities—talking with “ladies in the backyard,” befriending community leaders, and working with local organizations in his quest to find solutions that have long eluded academic researchers and politicians. As chairman of the Governor’s Task Force on Human Services Reform, MacDougal was the catalyst for the complete overhaul of the state’s welfare system, which included the largest reorganization of state government since 1900.

Eight years after MacDougal’s suggestions were implemented, Illinois now stands well ahead of California, New York, and other big-city states, with a spectacular 86 percent reduction in the welfare rolls since reform implementation in 1996, second only to Wyoming among all fifty states. The welfare rolls in Chicago’s Cook County have been reduced an amazing 85 percent, with studies showing that most who left the rolls are working, and at pay above minimum wage.

MacDougal’s extraordinary journey shows the way for the rest of the nation and proves there are ways we can all help provide a ladder of opportunity for those in poverty. We each can Make a Difference in the ongoing effort to end America’s poverty problem.
Senate Approves $5 Billion in New Oil Company Taxes

Oil company profits expected to fall in 2006

by Marlo Lewis

The U.S. Senate on November 17, 2005 voted to impose nearly $5 billion in taxes on oil companies in response to record oil company profits. The Senate rejected three amendments that would explicitly assess “windfall profits’’ taxes on the oil industry, but nevertheless changed longstanding accounting rules in ways that are expected to add $5 billion to the oil companies’ tax burdens over the next two years.

Unlike all other U.S. firms since the 1930s, the major U.S. oil companies will no longer be able to use the Last-In, First-Out (LIFO) method to calculate business costs and taxable income. This would result in a new $5 billion tax penalty that critics of the move characterized as a windfall profits tax by another name.

Tax Proponents Cite Record Profits

In the third quarter of 2005, the major U.S. oil companies—Exxon Mobil, Chevron, ConocoPhillips, BP America, and Shell Oil Company—collectively earned almost $26 billion in profits, an all-time record. In September and October, gasoline prices also hit historic highs, exceeding $3.00 per gallon in many locations.

Many politicians, pundits, and activists accused oil companies of price gouging and urged Congress to impose windfall profits taxes on the majors. “To my constituents, today’s hearing is about shared sacrifices in tough times versus oil company greed,” said Sen. Barbara Boxer (D-CA). “Working people struggle with high gas prices and your sacrifices appear to be nothing.”

While the congressional hearings were timed to coincide with peak gasoline prices and peak energy profits, experts do not expect either prices or profits to maintain their autumn 2005 high. According to a November 2005 Standard & Poor’s analysis, “U.S. Oil and Gas Sector Hard Pressed to Repeat 2005’s Stellar Performance in 2006,” gas prices and oil company profits will likely decline in 2006.

Standard & Poor’s expects U.S. oil demand to flatten and even decline by 0.8 percent in 2006, which would be the first oil demand drop since 1990. This will work to soften U.S. gasoline prices and oil company profits. Even with potential supply and demand issues—U.S. refining capacity still is limited, Standard & Poor’s reports, and global demand is more unpredictable than U.S. demand—U.S. gasoline prices and oil company profits are expected to drop in 2006.

By January 2006, nationwide gasoline prices had already dropped approximately 25 percent from their fall 2005 highs.

Boom Brings Overreaction

Oil prices are very unpredictable, and oil companies that suffer bust cycles when prices are low must be allowed to make substantial profits when prices are high, said Jerry Taylor, director of natural resources studies at the Cato Institute. Taylor pointed out that oil companies posted substantial losses in the late 1990s when oil prices fell under $10 per gallon.

“When prices dropped under $10 per gallon, nobody was proposing a law to give oil companies windfall losses rebates. And neither should they have. Similarly, we should not seek to help ourselves to oil company profits during this current cycle of profits.”

JERRY TAYLOR
CATO INSTITUTE

“Oil company profits pale in comparison to other industries. Industries such as pharmaceuticals, software and services, and household and personal products earn substantially more,” said the November 9 testimony

Exxon Mobil Chairman Lee Raymond pointed out that in the second quarter of 2005, U.S. oil companies earned about 7.7 cents per gallon, and Shell Oil Company earned 16 cents per gallon. As a result, the November 9 paper citing Exxon Mobil’s annual average capital expenditures—$14 billion—slightly exceeded the company’s annual average profits of $13.8 billion.

“Oil Taxes Already High

Supporting the argument that oil companies should not be singled out for new and higher taxes, Jonathan Williams and Scott Hodge of the non-partisan Tax Foundation released a November 9 paper citing Exxon Mobil’s third-quarter financial statement reports that the company’s year-to-date tax payments total $72.9 billion—almost triple the $25.4 billion the company earned in year-to-date profits.

“The past year has clearly been a good year for oil companies,” Tax Foundation President Hodge said in an interview for this article. “However, these profits pale in comparison to the staggering amount of taxes the oil companies pay each year. In the oil industry, government is the largest profit-taker.”

Marlo Lewis (mlewis@ceil.org) is a senior fellow at the Competitive Enterprise Institute.

INTERNET INFO

Exxon Mobil Chairman/CEO Lee R. Raymond’s November 9 testimony to a joint hearing of the U.S. Senate_subcommittees on Energy and Natural Resources and Commerce, Science, and Transportation is available online at http://exxonmobil.com/corporate/files/corporate/lrr_testimony_11-09-05.pdf.

EPA Removes Solvent from Toxic Chemical List
by James M. Taylor
Manufacturers and users of the solvent methyl ethyl ketone (MEK) will no longer have to report to the federal government waste management information regarding the substance, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) announced on December 14.

The Clean Air Act (CAA) requires EPA to regulate toxic air pollutants. Currently, the agency regulates 188 compounds it considers to be toxic. EPA's announcement came after extensive scientific research showed MEK poses no threat to human health or the environment.

Not Toxic or Harmful
MEK is a clear solvent used for lacquer, adhesives, cleaning fluids, and perfumes. Since 1996, the American Chemistry Council has been petitioning EPA to remove MEK from its list of toxic air pollutants. In response to the petitions, EPA began gathering scientific data on MEK in 1999.

In May 2003, EPA proposed to remove MEK from its list of regulated toxic air pollutants. "After carefully considering the 57 comments received on the proposal and reviewing scientific data demonstrating MEK's low toxicity," EPA explained, "EPA has taken final action to delist MEK as a hazardous air pollutant."

According to an EPA fact sheet on MEK, "After extensive technical review and consideration of public comments, EPA has concluded that potential exposures to MEK that is emitted from certain industrial processes may not reasonably be anticipated to cause human health or environmental problems."

Other Chemicals Also Delisted
EPA's decision to cease regulating MEK under the Clean Air Act is not the first time the agency has delisted a chemical compound. EPA removed from its toxic list caprolactam in 1996, long chain glycol ethers in 2000, and ethylene glycol monobutyl ether in 2004.

In addition, EPA's decision to discontinue regulating MEK under the Clean Air Act is not the first time the agency has addressed a prior assertion of health hazards related to MEK. On June 30, 2005, EPA published a final rule allowing companies to stop reporting MEK emissions on EPA's Toxics Release Inventory (TRI). EPA had favored keeping MEK on the TRI, but it removed MEK from the list following a federal appellate court's determination that MEK was not toxic and posed no threat to human health or the environment.

"At a minimum, the chemical must cause harm via human exposure" to be listed in the TRI, wrote Senior Judge Stephen Williams of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit in a May 2005 decision. "Because EPA's own analysis demonstrates that MEK fails this test, EPA's denial of the [American Chemistry Council's] petition to delist was improper."

Re-Thinking Green: Alternatives to Environmental Bureaucracy
edited by Robert Higgs and Carl P. Close
Independent Institute, April 2004
480 pages, $22.95 paper, ISBN 0945999976

review by Jay Lehr
The American public has shown significant concern for environmental quality since the first Earth Day in 1970, yet the maze of environmental laws and regulations enacted since then has fostered huge government bureaucracies better known for waste and failure than for innovation and success.

In Re-Thinking Green, 22 economists and political scientists explain how environmental quality can be enhanced more effectively by relying less on government agencies, which are increasingly politicized and unaccountable, and more on environmental entrepreneurship and the strict enforcement of private property rights.

The environmental bureaucracy has grown in size and scope because of a misguided belief that unless mankind reduces consumption of natural resources, cataclysmic environmental disasters will occur. "Sustainable development" is the fashionable but fallacious idea that will no longer be a priority of the conservatives. This is a magnificent collection of essays by experts in free-market economics and related environmental issues. If you find yourself arguing, or yearning to argue intelligently, these issues with friends, colleagues, or opponents, no other book will give you better information and ammunition.

Jay Lehr (lehr@heartland.org) is science director for The Heartland Institute.

BOOK REVIEW

Property Rights Improve Environment, Book Says

Sterling Burnett National Center for Policy Analysis

Regulation Continues
Although MEK has been removed from the TRI and Clean Air Act regulation, EPA still will regulate MEK as a volatile organic compound because the agency asserts MEK, when mixed with other air particles, contributes to smog formation.

"The ongoing MEK saga illustrates how quick environmental activists—and often the federal government—are to errantly label a chemical as harmful to humans and the environment," said Sterling Burnett, senior fellow at the National Center for Policy Analysis. "The MEK saga also illustrates how difficult and arduous it is to set the record straight. This should not have been an 11-year process, nor should it have required judicial intervention. Unfortunately, it is rare for science to prevail over alarmist propaganda.... It is good to see that science triumphed over propaganda at least this once."

STERLING BURNETT
NATIONAL CENTER FOR POLICY ANALYSIS

INTERNET INFO
The EPA fact sheet on methyl ethyl ketone (MEK) is available online at http://epa.gov/ttn/oarpg/13/fact_sheets/mek_fs.html.
Fish Is Good for You
by Willie Soon

Why do the Japanese and the Inuits have some of the lowest risks for cardiovascular disease and heart-related death? Likewise, why are breast cancer rates unusually low in these same groups? Why are rates of postpartum depression relatively lower in Japan, Singapore, Malaysia, Hong Kong, and Chile than in most western nations? Why is the prevalence of Alzheimer’s disease so high in Arab populations in Israel while the risk is significantly lower for the Cree Indians of northeastern Canada?

The best explanation points to differing diets. The healthier populations listed above ingest high levels of nutritious omega-3 fatty acids through consumption of fish and shellfish.

“The further drop in American seafood consumption below an already deficient level is particularly bad news for our most sensitive populations, such as pregnant women, fetuses, and young children.”

Comparing national daily intakes of these essential fatty acids reveals average Americans consume between 2 to 10 times below rates in Japan, Singapore, Scandinavia, and Spain.

Mercury Scare Takes Toll

So, why are American diets deficient in fish and fish oil? Why aren’t Americans eating more fish?

Our self-imposed consumption restriction is at least partially derived from being confused and alarmed by the daily news barrage claiming available sources of seafood may be overly “contaminated” by the biologically toxic form of mercury, called methylmercury.

For example, recent evidence demonstrates that pregnant women from eastern Massachusetts are consuming less fish following the FDA’s confusing revision of its fish consumption advisory. Also, the latest sales figures for canned tuna report a drop of 10 percent nationwide, compared to 16 months ago. This represents an industry revenue loss of nearly $150 million. More worrisome than financial loss, a further drop in American seafood consumption below an already deficient level is particularly bad news for our most sensitive populations, such as pregnant women, fetuses, and young children.

Science Contradicts Alarmists

Such mercury fears are unfounded in science. The wide variety of ocean fish available to Americans is almost surely safe, with no emerging health threats from the trace levels of mercury. There is nothing in these fish to warrant unnecessary consumption restrictions.

“The wide variety of ocean fish available to Americans is almost surely safe, with no emerging health threats from the trace levels of mercury. There is nothing in these fish to warrant unnecessary consumption restrictions.”

Studies Wildly Misinterpreted

The Faroese studies are inappropriate because the Faroe Island inhabitants are uniquely exposed to very high levels of mercury from consumption of pilot whale meat. Additionally, Faroese mothers and children are exposed to a cocktail of other toxic chemicals, including PCBs and DDT, by eating pilot whale blubber.

Limited suggestions of cardiac risk from consuming fish with trace levels of mercury is contradicted by numerous studies of documented cardiac health benefits, as noted by the American Heart Association. The Finnish study often referenced by alarmists is almost certainly too unique and poorly designed to suggest any direct relevance for Americans. For example, the rate of cardiac death in eastern Finland is among the highest in the world, likely due to high consumption of animal fat. The authors themselves identified at least eight other risk factors, including vodka and beer binging; low dietary intake of fruits, berries, and vegetables; and vitamin C deficiency. More important is a critical design flaw of the Finnish study: The time lapse for collection of the mercury data can be as long as 10 years before the documented death events, which raises serious questions about misclassification of exposure.

Thus, persistent, exaggerated, and unfounded mercury scares reported in the media could be seriously and irresponsibly endangering the health of all Americans.

Willie Soon (vanlien@earthlink.net) is chief science researcher at the Center for Science and Public Policy.

INTERNET INFO

More information on the science of mercury and public health is available online at http://www.scienceandpolicy.org.

In Other Words

“Aesop’s most famous fable is about a shepherd boy who cried ‘wolf’ so often when no wolf was around that when one did appear nobody took any notice of his warning. Some environmentalists risk falling into the same trap. They are so convinced of the righteousness of their cause that they will cry ‘wolf’ at any event that might plausibly be thought to support their view of the world.”

The Economist

“The sound of distant howling”

December 3, 2005
Green Leader Criticizes Negative Activist Rhetoric

by James M. Taylor

Jonathon Porritt is a man whose “green” credentials are the envy of any activist. He has served in high-proﬁle roles as head of the British Green Party and leader of the environmental activist group Friends of the Earth. Described by the London Observer as the “founding father of the British green movement,” Porritt has been a stalwart role model for radical activists on both sides of the Atlantic.

It is because of his success and inﬂuence that his new book, released November 7, 2005 by Stylus Publishing, is causing a stir in the environmental community.

Strong Criticism

In Capitalism: As If the World Matters, Porritt writes environmental activist groups have become exaggerative and overly negative—qualities that make them less credible and are causing them to lose their relevance in today’s society, he says.

“A lot of this is historical,” Porritt told the London Observer for a November 6 article. “Environmental organizations for many years were saying ‘no’ and protecting and stopping, because in a way that became part of the culture of the movement. There’s still a lot of criticizing and blame-laying and not enough saying what solutions are available.”

Porrirt told the Observer the movement must “emphasize the positive” about its core beliefs rather than attack capitalism, business, and technology out of little more than reactionary habit.

“If you consider the way the environmental movement portrays climate change, it’s the end of the world as we know it,” said Porritt. “In reality, climate change could provide a stimulus to an extraordinary shift in the economy [and] it could improve people’s quality of life. You never hear all that.”

Author Opposes Capitalism

Porritt’s attack on activist strategies, however, does not signal a break with such groups, but rather an attempt to make them politically and socially relevant again. He argues that while exaggerated, knee-jerk criticism of capitalism is self-defeating, capitalism can and should be criticized with real-world data and examples that show empirically it fails to protect the environment.

After listing in his book many alleged environmental failings of capitalism, Porritt contends, “We’ve wasted the best part of 20 years pursuing to the point of utter exhaustion a model of capitalism that can only succeed by liquidating the life-support systems that sustain us, and systematically widening the ‘inequity gaps’ upon which any kind of social cohesion depends in the long run.”

Just as importantly, however, Porritt thereafter concedes “capitalism is the only economic game in town.” What Porritt ultimately argues for is a form of “soft landing” for capitalism that embodies more of the activist groups’ ideals. But that soft landing is less likely to occur, and capitalist business will continue as usual, Porritt argues, unless environmental activist groups suggest practical solutions that can work within a capitalist structure rather than limit themselves to shrill attacks on capitalism itself.

If environmental activist groups fail to recognize this, he writes, “a continuing decline in [their] inﬂuence seems the most likely outcome.”

Fault Lines Evident

Porritt’s underlying criticisms of capitalism as it currently exists are not lost on his colleagues, including those who have fought about strategy and tactics for a long time. What they fail to understand, however, is that the reason for their declining inﬂuence is that they have lost their focus on sound science and common sense.

“One can only cry wolf so many times before people stop listening or at least take the warnings with a few hundred grains of salt,” explained Burnett. “Radical activists do not have exclusive ownership of the ‘environmentalist’ tag, although the media might like to believe so. A focus on negativity is not a prerequisite of being an environmentalist. Nor should the slightest concern, fear, or allegation derail all others concerns and issues.”

James M. Taylor (taylor@heartland.org) is managing editor of Environment & Climate News.
ANWR

Continued from page 1

Filibuster Defeated 57-43 Majority
Sixty senators must vote for cloture, a procedure that ends debate in the Senate. The final vote on cloture was officially 56-44, Senate Majority Leader Bill Frist (R-TN) originally voted to end debate, but changed his vote before the final recording of votes. That procedural move allows him to bring up the matter again in the Senate.

Voting against ending debate were 41 Democrats and two Republicans—Mike DeWine of Ohio and Lincoln Chafee of Rhode Island—along with Frist. Four Democrats voted with the 52 Republicans to end debate. Those Democrats were Daniel Akaka of Hawaii, Daniel Inouye of Hawaii, Ben Nelson of Nebraska, and Mary Landrieu of Louisiana.

Hurricane Aid Scuttled
Alaska Sen. Ted Stevens (R), who has long worked to open ANWR to oil and gas production, sought to attach an ANWR-drilling amendment to a $453 billion defense appropriations bill. The amendment provided that some revenues derived from ANWR would be used for reconstruction in areas damaged by Hurricane Katrina, for farmland preservation grants, for financial grants to train and prepare first responders in the event of terrorism, and for funds to help low-income Americans pay their heating bills.

When it became evident the ANWR provision would not be added to the bill, Stevens offered a 10-minute floor speech where he said, “This has been the saddest day of my life.”

“I worked three months of my life on this bill, primarily to find a way to help the people that I saw in New Orleans,” Stevens said.

Opponents Criticize Tactics
Some Democrats objected to Stevens adding the ANWR amendment to the defense appropriations bill so late in the budget-crafting process and just before the holiday recess. For Democrats such as Mark Pryor (D-AR), who were undecided about their support for ANWR natural resource recovery but ultimately voted against the amendment, the way the ANWR provision was attached to the defense bill may have been decisive.

The Senate later passed a version of the defense appropriation bill that did not include the ANWR amendment. A House-Senate conference committee will iron out differences between the two bills. The House version did contain a provision allowing natural resource recovery in ANWR.

ANWR Still in Play
Sen. Pete Domenici (R-NM), a strong supporter of ANWR production, said he hoped to add ANWR to a budget reconciliation because those bills are not subject to filibusters and thus do not require a supermajority.

“Clearly we consider ANWR to be important to our nation’s energy supply and our nation’s defense,” said Courtney Boone, spokesperson for Stevens.

Referring to promises made in 1980 by former U.S. Sens. Scoop Jackson (D-WA) and Paul Tsongas (D-MA) to allow natural resource recovery in ANWR in exchange for Stevens’ support for creating ANWR, Boone said, “We will continue to fight for the promise that was made to us 25 years ago.”

In a separate statement, Stevens noted some of the strongest opposition to ANWR comes from Senate seats in Jackson and Tsongas’ home states. “These people are filibustering the commitment of Senator Tsongas and Senator Jackson. Those two gentlemen left us prematurely and, as a consequence, we have fought now for 25 years to fulfill that commitment,” Stevens said, as reported in the December 23, 2005 Sacramento Bee.

Added Alaska’s junior senator, Lisa Murkowski, in a news conference following the vote, “It does not mean that we give up. Absolutely, positively not. We are working on the next chapter of ANWR.”

Public Supports Resource Recovery
Political pressure may build to open a portion of ANWR to natural resource recovery. A 2005 Harris poll indicated 53 percent of the American public support drilling in ANWR. Similarly, a 2005 Luntz Research Group poll found more than 67 percent of Americans who were aware that only 2,000 out of 19.6 million acres of ANWR would be developed favored drilling.

A Pew Research Center poll released in fall 2005 found 57 percent of Americans believe it is more important to develop new energy sources than to protect the environment, and Americans favor oil and gas production in ANWR by a margin of 50 to 42 percent.

Michael Coulter (mlcoult@gcc.edu) teaches political science at Grove City College in Grove City, Pennsylvania.
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“Every concerned citizen and policy maker should read this book…everyone will be challenged by it to reexamine their beliefs and the environmental establishment’s claims.”

— NGER PAINS, NATIONAL SPOKESMAN, CONGRESS OF RACIAL EQUALITY
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