## First the Plan

#### The United States federal government should reduce restrictions on the production of offshore wind power in the United States imposed by entities other than the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management.

## Second Solvency

#### The 2005 Energy Policy Act failed to create uniform permitting jurisdiction federally- multiple federal agencies are still responsible

Vann 12

[Adam, Legislative Attorney, CRS Reports, “Wind Energy: Offshore Permitting”, 10.17, p. online//wyo-tjc]

Prior to enactment of EPAct in 2005, the Army Corp of Engineers (Corps) took the lead role in the federal offshore wind energy permitting process, claiming jurisdiction pursuant to Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act (RHA),28 as amended by the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (OCSLA).29 The Corps has jurisdiction under these laws to permit obstructions to navigation within the “navigable waters of the United States” and on the OCS.30 The Corps’ jurisdiction over potential offshore wind projects had never been made explicit, however. Section 388 of EPAct sought to address some of the uncertainty related to federal jurisdiction over offshore wind energy development by amending the OCSLA to specifically establish legal authority for federal review and approval of various offshore energy-related projects. The provision amended the OCSLA by adding a new subsection that authorizes the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with other federal agencies, to grant leases, easements, or rights-of-way on the OCS for certain activities—wind energy development among them—not authorized by other OCSLA provisions, the Deepwater Port Act, the Ocean Thermal Energy Conversion Act, or “other applicable law.”31 A memorandum of understanding between the Department of the Interior and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) signed in April of 2009 confirmed the exclusive jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, exercised through the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation, and Enforcement (BOEM),32 an agency within DOI, over “the production, transportation, or transmission of energy from non-hydrokinetic renewable energy projects on the OCS.” EPAct also makes clear that federal agencies with permitting authority under other federal laws retain their jurisdiction, despite enactment of this subsection.33 Thus, the Corps continues to permit offshore development pursuant to the RHA, and other federal agencies with jurisdiction over issues related to energy development, such as species impacts, are similarly unaffected. The legislative language does not clearly dictate which agency should take the lead role in coordinating federal permitting and responsibility for preparing analysis under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).34 However, several provisions within Section 388 suggest that DOI is charged with primary responsibility. The law directs the Secretary of the Interior to consult with other agencies as a part of its leasing, easement, and right-of way granting process.35 DOI is also responsible for ensuring that activities carried out pursuant to its new authority provide for “coordination with relevant federal agencies.”36 The law also directs the Secretary to establish a system of “royalties, fees, rentals, bonuses, or other payments” that will ensure a fair return to the United States for any property interest granted under this provision.37

#### Lack of clarity and multiple authorities denies OSW the momentum it needs to scale up and commercialize in both state and federal waters

Fleischauer 11

[Patricia, Vice President of TRC Companies, a national environmental engineering and consulting firm based in Lowell, Massachusetts, “Regulatory uncertainty hindering offshore wind development”, 2.23, p. <http://ebookbrowse.com/offshore-wind-pat-fleischauer-pdf-d73772552> //wyo-tjc]

Energy infrastructure development inherently has elements of uncertainty. The challenge is to reduce the level of ambiguity and manage the residual risk in order to expedite the siting and permitting process. Offshore wind development in the United States, not quite in its infancy but certainly not as mature as onshore projects, faces a host of uncertainties that continue to hinder its full potential as a useful renewable resource for power generation. The changes and evolution in the U.S. environmental review process for offshore projects have helped, but more progress is needed for offshore wind projects to develop needed momentum. Just as a clearly defined regulatory path is imperative for onshore wind development -- i.e., a clear statement of requirements that, if achieved, will result in project approval -- offshore development needs the same certainty if it is to help meet near-term Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) requirements and long-term goals for energy independence. The promulgation of rules specifying the role and responsibility of the U.S. Minerals Management Service (MMS) has helped clarify development in federal waters. However, development in state waters is not exempt from federal environmental permitting requirements, which could stall state efforts to advance offshore development.

#### Federal permitting consolidation is critical to circumvent opposition to OSW and create the certainty necessary- state action is insufficient

Kimmell and Stalenhoef 11

[Kenneth, general counsel to the Massachusetts Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs, was responsible for overseeing the state permitting of the Cape Wind project, and now serves as the Commissioner of the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection, and Dawn, environmental law attorney and Counsel for the Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities, Golden Gate University Environmental Law Journal, “The Cape Wind Offshore Wind Energy Project: A Case Study of the Difficult Transition to Renewable Energy”, p. asp//wyo-tjc]

The Cape Wind saga reveals that the current permitting process for offshore wind energy projects is broken. If the nation is serious about developing offshore wind energy projects along its coasts, Congress must advance reform. One place to look for inspiration, ironically, is Massachusetts. Despite its reputation for long and protracted siting battles, Massachusetts has instituted two major reforms that could serve as models for federal reform of offshore wind-project permitting. The first model reform is a “one-stop permitting” law that enables the State Energy Facilities Siting Board to issue a single permit and eliminates the need for any additional state or local permits.85 Enacted during the energy crisis of the early 1970’s, this law ensures that state and local agencies do not block power plants and infrastructure needed for a reliable energy supply. The law allows the Siting Board to step in when an energy project proponent is denied a necessary permit or experiences significant delays, including those caused by litigation.86 The Siting Board has broad representation: it is composed of the Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs, the Department of Environmental Protection, the Department of Energy Resources, the Department of Public Utilities, and three citizen members representing labor, environmental, and consumer interests.87 It has wide jurisdiction and can review all of the various impacts of energy facilities that would be examined by state or local permitting agencies. It may also receive the input of all state and local agencies that would otherwise be called upon to grant permits.88 This authority ensures that all issues and all possible objections are heard once, rather than multiple times by multiple agencies. And unlike with most permits issued by state agencies, the appeals process is streamlined. Indeed, there is but one appeal of a Siting Board approval, which goes directly to the state Supreme Judicial Court.89 As noted above, this law was crucial to the success of Cape Wind’s permitting on the state level, because it ensured that the permitting of the electric cables would not get bogged down in other state and local level permitting, or be delayed by judicial appeals of such permit decisions. Had this law not been in place, it is likely that Cape Wind would still be in litigation with the Cape Cod Commission over its denial of the electric cables and would be defending the license issued by the Department of Environmental Protection allowing the cables to be placed in Massachusetts’ tidelands. There is no comparable “one-stop permitting” option for offshore wind projects available at the federal level. While the EPACT established that the MMS (now referred to as the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation, and Enforcement, or BOEMRE) plays the leading-agency role for issuance of an offshore lease, numerous other federal agencies such as the Army Corps of Engineers, Environmental Protection Agency, Federal Aviation Administration, and the Coast Guard will still need to issue separate approvals for the project. Federal agencies, including the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Park Service, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, will also play significant “consultative” roles. Rather than having the appeals of the permits lodged in one court, federal law provides for multiple appeals in various federal courts that will have to be resolved before the project can finally proceed. This multiplicity of permitting and consultative agencies, and numerous potential judicial appeals, is a formula for delay, confusion, redundancy, and inconsistency. In short, it is a boon for the forces of inertia.

#### Lack of one-stop permitting destroys the certainty and timeframe necessary for investment decisions- plan’s consolidation is key

Weber 7

[Lucas, no qualifications available, published on WindPower.net- the North American Offshore Wind Power Information Project, “Offshore Wind Energy Permitting”, May 10, p. online//wyo-tjc]

As the above description of the various permitting authorities illustrates, the regulatory process for offshore wind energy development can be overwhelming. In order to combat this problem, there must be some form of centralized management. In Europe, the common practice is to use a “one-stop shop office” approach.136 Under this approach, the developers communicate with one official contact office to handle everything from administrative to legal matters. A recent study by the International Energy Agency concluded that the use of “one stop shop offices” has been a success from the point of view of both agencies and developers.137 The MMS, as the lead agency, would be perfect for this “one-stop shop” position. As the one-stop shop agency for wind energy permitting on the OCS, the MMS could streamline the approval process by coordinating with all of the other relevant agencies. In fact, the Energy Policy Act of 2005 mandates such coordination.138 Therefore, the MMS should coordinate efforts with the other relevant agencies to form a one-stop shop permitting office for wind energy development on the OCS. IV. CONCLUSION In sum, developing the United States’ potential for using offshore wind energy will contribute to security of energy supply, reduce dependency on fuel imports, reduce emissions of greenhouse gases and other pollutants, and improve environmental protection. Despite a vast potential for offshore wind energy along the OCS, the MMS is holding potential development hostage through regulatory delay and time-consuming replications of environmental reviews. It is vital that the MMS reduce the regulatory confusion and establish a unified coordinated approach to ensure the expeditious, yet responsible, development of offshore wind energy.

#### OSW is feasible and can solve energy demand within current limits of the technology- shallow federal waters, proximity to load centers, and sufficiency of supply

Roek 11

[Katherine, a partner at Lindquist & Vennum, PLLP, Minneapolis, “Offshore wind energy in the United States: a legal and policy patchwork”, Natural Resources & Environment, Spring, p. asp//wyo-tjc]

Given the relatively high development cost of offshore wind in comparison to land-based alternative energy sources, a logical threshold question is why pursue offshore wind in the first place? Part of the answer may be long-term energy policy. A 2008 study by the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), "20% Wind Energy by 2030," concluded that a national goal of deriving 20 percent of U.S. electrical supply from wind energy is possible, even economically feasible, and that offshore wind could play a large role in that supply, possibly more than 50 gigawatts. DOE, 20% WIND ENERGY BY 2030: INCREASING WIND ENERGY'S CONTRIBUTION TO U.S. ELECTRICITY SUPPLY. [section] 1.2.1 (July 2008). The National Renewable Energy Laboratory has estimated that several states, including Michigan, Ohio, New Jersey, both Carolinas, Maine, and Massachusetts, may be able to supply more than 100 percent of their 2004 state electricity consumption through offshore wind facilities sited in water less than 30 meters deep at locations within 50 nautical miles of shore. Id. [section] 2.5 (citations omitted). Some of these states lack significant onshore wind resources, making offshore wind an alternative means by which these states' utilities may satisfy their obligation to purchase electricity from renewable resources. Offshore wind resources are also frequently located close to large load centers, e.g., the New York City metropolitan area and the state of New Jersey, among the most densely populated U.S. cities and states. DOE's Energy Information Administration also notes that of the contiguous forty-eight states twenty-eight have a coastal boundary and that coastal states consume approximately 78 percent of the nation's electricity. Id. (citations omitted). Building offshore wind resources close to these load centers may mitigate the need for long and costly transmission lines. (This article does not discuss issues related to siting and permitting of transmission lines for offshore wind projects.)

## Third, Advantage One

**The power grid is fragile and collapse is inevitable
Heyes 8-15-12**
J.D. Heyes is a writer for Natural News.com August 15, 2012
Overloaded US power grid stretched to capacity; Will America follow in India's footsteps?
<http://www.naturalnews.com/036808_power_grid_collapse_outages.html#ixzz23glXL83u>, accessed 11/7/12,WYO/JF

#### Could the U.S. really suffer the kinds of widespread power outages that struck two-thirds of India's billion-plus population recently? Absolutely, say experts, and fixing the problem won't be cheap. While the nation's power infrastructure is referred to as a "grid," suggesting seamless interconnectivity, "the network more closely resembles a patchwork quilt stitched together to cover a rapidly expanding nation," the Washington Post reported. Experts note that the U.S. really doesn't yet face the kind of issues with its electrical infrastructure that left about 670 million Indians without power in what became the largest outage in history. But, at the same time, industry analysts say the nation's grid is definitely showing signs of aging. And, they say, it's stretched to capacity. More often than not, the grid falls victim to decrepitude rather than, say, the forces of nature, as in tornadoes and powerful storms. Nonetheless the grid is beginning to fail, say experts, who fear that such failures that caused blackouts in New York, San Diego and Boston could become ever more common as the country's demand for power grows exponentially. To fix the problem, industry analysts say it will take a multi-billion, multi-year investment if we're to avoid more frequent large-scale outages in the future. More plants needed, but the delivery system is weak "I like to think of our grid much like a water system, and basically all of our pipes are at full pressure now, and if one of our pipes bursts and we have to shut off that line, that just increases the pressure on our remaining pipes until another one bursts, and next thing you know, we're in a catastrophic run and we have to shut the whole water system down," Otto J. Lynch, vice president of Wisconsin-based Power Line Systems, told the Post. The problem in India and similar developing nations with growing pains is one of power generation. The country is stuck with old and aging coal-fired power plants and is meeting resistance internally to atomic plants. Recently, a number of plants shuttered suddenly, leaving customers without power once more. In the U.S., the problem is somewhat different. Though more plants will be needed in the future, to be sure, the larger problem is that the system of delivery is beginning to fail more frequently. The network of steel towers and power lines that span the country, along with the power transmission stations those lines feed, are the "pipes" of the system that Lynch spoke of. Electricity storage is difficult and besides, most [electricity](http://www.naturalnews.com/electricity.html), the Post said, is used within a second of it being produced. The system is designed to shunt power to regions where it is most needed, at the push of a button or, in a growing number of systems, when a computer managing the grid senses the need to shift power. The system is further designed to go around bottlenecks or other interruptions that could slow down the electrical flow. Tens of billions needed to update, upgrade power grids Towers themselves are designed to withstand large gusts of wind but increasingly, towers are collapsing when they shouldn't, and that's a symptom of the aging electrical infrastructure, analysts note. "The aging of equipment explains some of the equipment failures that lead to intermittent failures in power quality and availability," says a report by the American Society of Civil Engineers, released earlier this year. "The capacity of equipment explains why there are some bottlenecks in the grid that can also lead to brownouts and occasional blackouts." To keep the country's [power grid](http://www.naturalnews.com/power_grid.html) operational - and reliable - an additional investment of about $107 billion would be needed by 2020, the ASCE said. Once considered an indulgence, electricity is now a necessity for modern life. "Electricity was primarily a luxury when the majority of our grid was built 50, 60 years ago," Lynch told the Post. "Most people didn't require computers to do their jobs every day. They didn't need the Internet access. iPhones didn't need to be charged, and communication was all hard-wired, so you could still make a phone call when the electricity was out."Meltdowns are likely after a black-out: an outage will take days to recover- the best plants in the US can last 16 hours without external power

[Cappiello](http://search.boston.com/local/Search.do?s.sm.query=Dina+Cappiello&camp=localsearch:on:byline:art), 11

Dina, staff writer, “NRC casts doubt on US reactors’ blackout plans” <http://www.boston.com/news/nation/washington/articles/2011/04/29/nrc_casts_doubt_on_us_reactors_blackout_plans/?camp=pm>, accessed 10/24/12,WYO/JF

The nation’s top nuclear regulator cast doubt yesterday on whether reactors in the United States are prepared for the type of days-long power outage that struck a nuclear power plant in Japan. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has required reactors to cope without power from either the electrical grid or emergency diesel generators for four to eight hours. After that time, it assumes some electrical power will be restored. Chairman Gregory Jaczko of the NRC questioned whether four hours is enough time, even though it is unlikely a nuclear power plant would lose power from both the grid and generators as the Japan plant did. Requirements put in place after the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks are expected to lengthen plants’ ability to withstand a blackout. “Four hours doesn’t seem to be a reasonable time to restore offsite power if you lost the diesels immediately,’’ Jaczko said at a commission meeting at the NRC’s Rockville, Md., headquarters. “In the event there is a station blackout that is externally driven, I’m not convinced that in that situation four hours’’ is enough time to restore power. An Associated Press investigation last month examined the risk to the nation’s 104 nuclear reactors to a complete loss of electrical power. In the United States, such a “station blackout’’ has happened only once, at the Vogtle Electric Generating Plant in eastern Georgia in 1990. There, power was restored in 55 minutes. The Japan disaster showed that it could be days before the electricity needed to pump water and keep the radioactive core from melting can be turned back on. The Fukushima Daiichi plant had capacity for eight hours of emergency battery power. When that elapsed, the plant operator struggled to find other ways to cool the cores without onsite or offsite power. “It wasn’t the earthquake or the tsunami that caused the Fukushima nuclear catastrophe — it was an electricity outage. A blackout shouldn’t cause a meltdown,’’ Representative Edward Markey, Democrat of Malden, said in a statement. He has filed legislation that includes expanding the time reactors are required to cope without power. Of the 104 nuclear reactors in the United States, 87 can cope for four hours without power or emergency generators. Another 14, including the Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station in Plymouth, Mass., can cope for eight hours, and three can last for 16 hours. Most reactors rely on batteries for this power source. Markey’s bill calls for a comprehensive approach to improving the safety of the nation’s nuclear plants. It would include requiring reactors to have at least 72 hours of capacity for battery generators. The bill also calls for 14 days of power from backup diesel generators to be available. Currently, plants are required to have seven days of such power available. As part of a review initiated after the Japan disaster, the nuclear commission is looking at whether the blackout rule needs to be updated. At the time the rule was written in the 1980s, the commission assumed electrical power could be restored in 50 minutes to two hours. The NRC added an additional two hours to that time as a safety buffer. Since then, plants have lost offsite power for longer periods of time. In every case, diesel generators kicked on and supplied electrical power, sometimes for days. There also are agreements with power grid operators that nuclear power plants get first priority as power is restored. “We have a high expectation you will restore offsite power, restore emergency diesels or use alternate sources,’’ said Pat Hiland, director of the NRC’s reactor regulation engineering division. But Jaczko, the NRC chairman, pointed out that the blackout regulation is designed to deal with a situation where even diesel generators do not work, as in the case of the Fukushima Daiichi plant in Japan. A top staffer told NRC commissioners yesterday that the Japan situation “has definitely improved’’ in recent weeks. Bill Borchardt, NRC’s executive director for operations, said that while there are still many unanswered questions about equipment failures and other problems at the facility, the situation is “certainly not as highly dynamic’’ as it was. Overall, Japan is “making progress,’’ he said

#### Meltdowns cause extinction

Lendman, 2011

(Stephen, Research Associate of the Centre for Research on Globalization, 03/ 13, “Nuclear Meltdown in Japan,”, The People’s Voice <http://www.thepeoplesvoice.org/TPV3/Voices.php/2011/03/13/nuclear-meltdown-in-japan>, accessed 10/12/12,WYO/JF

Reuters said the 1995 Kobe quake caused $100 billion in damage, up to then the most costly ever natural disaster. This time, from quake and tsunami damage alone, that figure will be dwarfed. Moreover, under a worst case core meltdown, all bets are off as the entire region and beyond will be threatened with permanent contamination, making the most affected areas unsafe to live in. On March 12, Stratfor Global Intelligence issued a "Red Alert: Nuclear Meltdown at Quake-Damaged Japanese Plant," saying: Fukushima Daiichi "nuclear power plant in Okuma, Japan, appears to have caused a reactor meltdown." Stratfor downplayed its seriousness, adding that such an event "does not necessarily mean a nuclear disaster," that already may have happened - the ultimate nightmare short of nuclear winter. According to Stratfor, "(A)s long as the reactor core, which is specifically designed to contain high levels of heat, pressure and radiation, remains intact, the melted fuel can be dealt with. If the (core's) breached but the containment facility built around (it) remains intact, the melted fuel can be....entombed within specialized concrete" as at Chernobyl in 1986. In fact, that disaster killed nearly one million people worldwide from nuclear radiation exposure. In their book titled, "Chernobyl: Consequences of the Catastrophe for People and the Environment," Alexey Yablokov, Vassily Nesterenko and Alexey Nesterenko said: "For the past 23 years, it has been clear that there is a danger greater than nuclear weapons concealed within nuclear power. Emissions from this one reactor exceeded a hundred-fold the radioactive contamination of the bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki." "No citizen of any country can be assured that he or she can be protected from radioactive contamination. One nuclear reactor can pollute half the globe. Chernobyl fallout covers the entire Northern Hemisphere." Stratfor explained that if Fukushima's floor cracked, "it is highly likely that the melting fuel will burn through (its) containment system and enter the ground. This has never happened before," at least not reported. If now occurring, "containment goes from being merely dangerous, time consuming and expensive to nearly impossible," making the quake, aftershocks, and tsunamis seem mild by comparison. Potentially, millions of lives will be jeopardized. Japanese officials said Fukushima's reactor container wasn't breached. Stratfor and others said it was, making the potential calamity far worse than reported. Japan's Nuclear and Industrial Safety Agency (NISA) said the explosion at Fukushima's Saiichi No. 1 facility could only have been caused by a core meltdown. In fact, 3 or more reactors are affected or at risk. Events are fluid and developing, but remain very serious. The possibility of an extreme catastrophe can't be discounted. Moreover, independent nuclear safety analyst John Large told Al Jazeera that by venting radioactive steam from the inner reactor to the outer dome, a reaction may have occurred, causing the explosion. "When I look at the size of the explosion," he said, "it is my opinion that there could be a very large leak (because) fuel continues to generate heat." Already, Fukushima way exceeds Three Mile Island that experienced a partial core meltdown in Unit 2. Finally it was brought under control, but coverup and denial concealed full details until much later. According to anti-nuclear activist Harvey Wasserman, Japan's quake fallout may cause nuclear disaster, saying: "This is a very serious situation. If the cooling system fails (apparently it has at two or more plants), the super-heated radioactive fuel rods will melt, and (if so) you could conceivably have an explosion," that, in fact, occurred. As a result, massive radiation releases may follow, impacting the entire region. "It could be, literally, an apocalyptic event. The reactor could blow." If so, Russia, China, Korea and most parts of Western Asia will be affected. Many thousands will die, potentially millions under a worse case scenario, including far outside East Asia.

#### Grid failures cascade outward- the impact is worse than a nuclear explosion

Latynina, 03

[America in the Dark Yulia Latynina, Novaya Gazeta (liberal semi-weekly), Moscow, Russia, Aug. 18, 2003. http://www.worldpress.org/Americas/1579.cfm//uwyokb]

The scariest thing about the cascading power outages was not spoiled groceries in the fridge, or elevators getting stuck, or even, however cynical it may sound, sick patients left to their own devices without electricity-powered medical equipment. The scariest thing of all was chemical plants and refineries with 24-hour operations, which, if interrupted, can result in consequences even more disastrous and on a larger scale than those of an atomic bomb explosion. So it is safe to say that Americans got lucky this time. Several hours after the disaster, no one could know for certain whether the power outage was caused by an accident or someone’s evil design. In fact, the disaster on the East Coast illustrates just one thing: A modern city is in itself a bomb, regardless of whether someone sets off the detonator intentionally or by accident. As I recall, when I was writing my book Industrial Zone, in which business deals were bound to lead to a massive industrial catastrophe, at some point in time I was considering making a cascading power outage the cause of a catastrophe. Back then, I was amazed and shocked at the swiftness of the process. Shutting down at least one electric power plant is enough to cause a drop in power output throughout the entire power grid. This is followed by an automatic shutdown of nuclear power plants, a further catastrophic drop in power, and finally a cascading outage of the entire grid system. To start with, the electric power plant may burn out because of just about anything. In Ekibastuz [Kazakhstan] under the Soviet regime, a large hydroelectric power station was burned to the ground because of the negligence of one extremely smart worker, who used a wrench to unscrew the cap from a pressurized oil vessel. A stream of oil shot up to the ceiling; the worker got scared and dropped the wrench, which hit against the steel floor and created a spark that set the stream of oil on fire. Then the lights went off. Which brings us back to our main thesis. In order to destroy a modern city, one does not need to have nuclear weapons, because the modern city is in itself a weapon. The city infrastructure is an infrastructure with dual purpose. Why should terrorists need chemical weapons if their enemies already have chemical plants? Why should terrorists need nuclear weapons if their enemies already have skyscrapers and airplanes with tanks full of fuel, which can be hijacked with the help of a penknife? Why would they need sophisticated military technologies and stolen explosives if the KamAZ truck that blew up the hospital in Mozdok was carrying a load of, let us say, fertilizer? So-called dictatorship regimes and terrorists themselves have long since figured that out.

#### OSW solves the advantage:

#### And OSW solves East Coast electricity demand- drops prices and solves grid congestion that creates cascades

Marcacci 12

[Silvio, Principal at Marcacci Communications, a full-service clean energy public relations company based in Washington, D.C., Clean Technica, “Offshore Wind On The Atlantic Cost Could Create 300,000 Jobs And $200 Billion In Economic Activity”, p. online//wyo-tjc]

Beyond creating new jobs and economic activity building and operating all these new turbines, plugging offshore wind into our nation’s grid can increase reliability and lower utility prices. Offshore winds blow strongest during the day and in heat waves – precisely the points when demand for electricity is highest and the risk of power shortages most acute. In addition, the greatest potential wind power lies along some of the East Coast’s biggest cities. Grid congestion has constrained the ability of cheaper power to reach these demand pools and created some of the highest power prices in the country. But if these population centers could tap into steady electricity being generated just offshore, growing demand could be met cheaply. In fact, New York State’s grid operator recently found consumers save $300 million in wholesale electricity costs for every 1 GW of wind on the grid.

#### OSW is uniquely key to solve electricity demand in the United States- it overcomes issues with transmission costs, intermittency, and load capacity factors all because it is on the water\*\*

Schroeder 10

[Erica, J.D. from University of California, Berkeley, School of Law, 2010. And Masters in Environmental Management from Yale School of Forestry & Environmental Studies, “Turning Offshore Wind On”, California Law Review, p. ln//wyo-tjc]

Many of the most compelling benefits of offshore wind are similar to those of onshore wind, though offshore wind has its own unique set of benefits. To start, wind power generation can help meet the growing energy demand in the United States. The U.S. Energy Information Administration predicts that the demand for electricity in the United States will grow to 5.8 billion MWh in 2030, a 39 percent increase from 2005.58 The more that wind power can help to meet this demand, the more diversified the United States’ energy portfolio will be, and the less susceptible the nation will be to dependency on foreign fuel sources and to price fluctuations in traditional fuels.59 In addition, wind power benefits the United States by creating a substantial number of jobs for building and operating the domestic wind energy facilities.60 In an April 2009 speech at the Trinity Structural Towers Manufacturing Plant in Iowa, President Obama predicted that if the United States ―fully pursue[s] our potential for wind energy on land and offshore,‖ wind power could create 250,000 jobs by 2030.61 Once a wind project is built, it involves only minimal environmental impacts compared to traditional electricity generation. Wind power emits negligible amounts of traditional air pollutants, such as sulfur dioxide and particulate matter, as well as carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases.62 Lower emissions of traditional air pollutants means fewer air quality-related illnesses locally and regionally.63 Lower greenhouse gas emissions will help to combat climate change, effects of which will be felt locally and around the world.64 According to the International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the effects of climate change will include melting snow, ice, and permafrost; significant effects on terrestrial, marine, and freshwater plant and animal species; forced changes to agricultural and forestry management; and adverse human health impacts, including increased heat-related mortality and infectious diseases.65 The U.S. Energy Information Administration estimates that the United States emits 6 billion metric tons of greenhouse gases annually, and it expects emissions to increase to 7.9 billion metric tons by 2030, with 40 percent of emissions coming from the electric power sector.66 Thus, if the United States can get more of its electricity from wind power, it will contribute less to climate change, and help to mitigate its negative impacts. Furthermore, wind power does not involve any of the additional environmental costs associated with nuclear power or fuel extraction for traditional electricity generation, such as coal mining and natural gas extraction.67 Wind power generation also does not require the water necessary to cool traditional coal, gas, and nuclear generation units.68 Moreover, offshore wind power has certain attributes that give it added benefits compared to onshore wind. Wind tends to be stronger and more consistent offshore—both benefits when it comes to wind power generation.69 This is largely due to reduced wind shear and roughness on the open ocean.70 Wind shear and roughness refer to effects of the landscape surrounding turbines on the quality of wind and thus the amount of electricity produced.71 While long grass, trees, and buildings will slow wind down significantly, water is generally very smooth and has much less of an effect on wind speeds.72 In addition, because offshore wind projects face fewer barriers—both natural and manmade—to their expansion, offshore developers can take advantage of economies of scale and build larger wind farms that generate more electricity.73 Importantly, offshore wind also could overcome the problems that onshore wind faces regarding the distance between wind power generation and electricity demand. That is, although the United States has considerable onshore wind resources in certain areas, mostly in the middle of the country, they are frequently distant from areas with high electricity demand, mostly on the coasts, resulting in transmission problems.74 By contrast, offshore resources are near coastal electricity demand centers.75 In fact, twenty-eight of the contiguous forty-eight states have coastal boundaries, and these same states use 78 percent of the United States’ electricity.76 Thus, offshore wind power generation can effectively serve major U.S. demand centers and avoid many of the transmission costs faced by remote onshore generation.77 If shallow water offshore potential (less than about 100 feet in depth) is met on the nation’s coasts, twenty-six of the twenty-eight coastal states would have sufficient wind resources to meet at least 20 percent of their electricity needs, and many states would have enough to meet their total electricity demand.78

## \*\*\*Advantage One

#### U.S. Shipbuilding industry is collapsing

Paulo Santos, 12

Paulo Santos is a Portuguese independent trader, analyst and algorithmic trading expert, having worked for both sell side (brokerage) and buy side (fund management) institutions. “Expecting A Bust In The Shipbuilding Industry” <http://seekingalpha.com/article/341301-expecting-a-bust-in-the-shipbuilding-industry>, accessed 12/20/12,WYO/JF

As the [Baltic Dry Index](http://www.bloomberg.com/apps/quote?ticker=BDIY:IND) plunges ever lower, [taking out the 2008 lows](http://seekingalpha.com/article/336001-baltic-dry-index-plumbs-new-lows), we've already concluded that many dry ship bulkers will [go under the bankruptcy waves](http://seekingalpha.com/article/318245-as-shipping-gets-no-relief-bankruptcies-are-to-be-expected) in this cycle. However, there are other obvious consequences of this pricing environment. We know that one of the clear reasons why freight rates are imploding is simply too many ships being delivered. And such an influx of ships was the result of the bubble in freight rates that took place during 2007 and early 2008, together with long delivery periods. Thus, today's incredibly low rates will lead to the opposite - precious few ships will be ordered and made in the next 2 years or so. So certainly, the shipbuilders are going to hit a dry spell here. Unfortunately, shipbuilding is something that's long gone from the U.S. economy and markets, and other than Huntington Ingalls Industries ([HII](http://seekingalpha.com/symbol/hii)), I can't even locate any other shipbuilder. Naturally, HII doesn't fit this thesis, since it does mostly military work. Certainly, we can follow the events through a [worldwide shipbuilding index](http://www.bloomberg.com/apps/quote?ticker=BWSHIP:IND) published by Bloomberg, but that won't cut it as far as trading goes, since the shipbuilding companies are mostly Korean, like Hyundai and Daewoo as well as Chinese, such as Yangzijiang Shipbuilding. There is, however, another consequence of a bust in shipbuilding. It's something that adds to other factors I've already [written about](http://seekingalpha.com/article/320883-steel-is-in-china-s-hands), regarding the Chinese Economy slowdown, namely the drop in auto production that's already occurring, and the predicted drop in residential construction, given that residential prices are already falling. What is this consequence? Well, those large ships take a lot of steel. If you don't make ships, you don't use steel. So this is one more reason why the steel sector will face substantial headwinds during 2012, with United States Steel ([X](http://seekingalpha.com/symbol/x)), AK Steel Holding Corporation Co ([AKS](http://seekingalpha.com/symbol/aks)), Arcelor Mittal ([MT](http://seekingalpha.com/symbol/mt)) and Nucor ([NUE](http://seekingalpha.com/symbol/nue)) being potentially exposed to these developments. Right now, these steel shares are being bought under the general theory that slightly better economic numbers in the U.S. will lead to higher steel consumption and prices, yet these effects I've been describing, from auto and residential production in China, to shipbuilding, are much more important than any increased demand on U.S. soil. It's thus not a surprise that, as I have written earlier, steel prices are already falling.

#### Lack of regulatory clarity and speed with federal permitting destroys investment decisions in OSW broadly and in ship-building specifically

Bondaref 12

[Joan, analyst with Blank Rome LLP, “Is the Time Right to Expedite Offshore Wind”, North American Wind Power, July, p. <http://www.nawindpower.com/digitaleditions/Main.php?MagID=2&MagNo=31> //wyo-tjc]

While well intentioned, the U.S. Department of the Interior’s (DOI) “Smart from the Start” program has not produced a lease since the program was announced in 2010. (Cape Wind, which was awarded the first commercial lease for wind energy development along the Outer Continental Shelf in October 2010, was grandfathered.) If the DOI waits too long to award leases, it will find itself in the middle of an election campaign and face the possibility that leases will be delayed even further should a new administration and new Congress come to Washington, D.C. It may also find itself faced with the loss of developers that lose heart in the slow but methodical leasing process. For example, in May, Gamesa – citing the U.S. market’s uncertain offshore future – pulled out of its joint arrangement with Virginia-based Newport News Shipbuilding. Gamesa’s actions should serve as a warning to federal and state agencies.

**Commercial shipbuilding’s key to naval power**

NLUS 12

Navy League of the United States, “America’s Maritime Industry The foundation of American seapower”, 2012, <http://www.navyleague.org/files/americas-maritime-industry.pdf>, Date Verification – http://gsship.org/industry-links/

**Defense Industrial Base: Shipbuilding The American Maritime Industry also contributes to our national defense by sustaining the shipbuilding and repair sector of our national defense industrial base upon which our standing as a seapower** is based**. History has proven that** **without a strong maritime infrastructure—shipyards, suppliers, and seafarers—no country can hope to build and support a Navy of sufficient size and capability to protect its interests on a global basis. Both our commercial and naval fleets** **rely on U.S. shipyards** **and their numerous industrial vendors for building** **and repairs**. The U.S. commercial shipbuilding and repair industry also impacts our national economy by adding billions of dollars to U.S. economic output annually. In 2004, there were 89 shipyards in the major shipbuilding and repair base of the United States, defined by the Maritime Administration as including those shipyards capable of building, repairing, or providing topside repairs for ships 122 meters (400 feet) in length and over. This includes six large shipyards that build large ships for the U.S. Navy. Based on U.S. Coast Guard vessel registration data for 2008, in that year U.S. shipyards delivered 13 large deep-draft vessels including naval ships, merchant ships, and drilling rigs; 58 offshore service vessels; 142 tugs and towboats, 51 passenger vessels greater than 50 feet in length; 9 commercial fishing vessels; 240 other self- propelled vessels; 23 mega-yachts; 10 oceangoing barges; and 224 tank barges under 5,000 GT. 11 Since the mid 1990’s, the industry has been experiencing a period of modernization and renewal that is largely market-driven, backed by long-term customer commitments. Over the six-year period from 2000-05, a total of $2.336 billion was invested in the industry, while in 2006, capital investments in the U.S. shipbuilding and repair industry amounted to $270 million.12 **The state of the industrial base that services this nation’s Sea Services is of great concern** **to the U.S. Navy.** **Even a modest increase** **in oceangoing commercial shipbuilding would give a substantial boost to our shipyards and marine vendors**. Shipyard facilities at the larger shipyards in the United States are capable of constructing merchant ships as well as warships, but often cannot match the output of shipyards in Europe and Asia. On the other hand, **U.S. yards** construct and equip the best warships, aircraft carriers and submarines in the world. They are unmatched in capability, but **must maintain that lead**. 13

**Naval power solves nuclear war**

**Conway et al 7** James – General, US Marine Corps, Commandant of the Marine Corps, Gary Roughead – Admiral, U.S. navy, Chief of Naval Operations, Thad Allen – Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Commandant of the Coast Guard, A Cooperative Strategy for 21st Century Seapower, p. http://www.navy.mil/maritime/MaritimeStrategy.pdf

No other disruption is as potentially disastrous to **global stability** as **war among major powers**. Maintenance and extension of this Nation’s comparative seapower advantage is a **key component** of **deterring major power war**. While war with another great power strikes many as improbable, the near-certainty of its ruinous effects demands that it be actively deterred using all elements of national power. The expeditionary character of maritime forces—our lethality, global reach, speed, endurance, ability to overcome barriers to access, and operational agility—provide the joint commander with a range of deterrent options. We will pursue an approach to deterrence that includes a credible and scalable ability to retaliate against aggressors conventionally, unconventionally, and with nuclear forces. Win our Nation’s wars. In times of war, our ability to **impose local sea control**, overcome challenges to access, force entry, and project and sustain power ashore, makes our maritime forces an **indispensable** element of the joint or combined force. This expeditionary advantage must be maintained because it provides joint and combined force commanders with freedom of maneuver. Reinforced by a robust sealift capability that can **concentrate and sustain forces, sea control and power projection** enable extended campaigns ashore.

#### Sea Power is key to keep Indo-Pak cooperation intact

Cropsey, 12

Dr. Seth Cropsey Hudson Institute “The U.S. Navy Shipbuilding Plan: Assumptions and Associated Risks to National Security” <http://www.hudson.org/files/publications/SethCropsey--USNavyShipbuildingPlan--Testimony041812.pdf>, accessed 12/20/12,WYO/JF

Finally there are the consequences if U.S. seapower continues to decrease and proves unable to meet even the reduced goals it has set for itself. History is a good guide. Nations in the middle like to side with the winner. During our Civil War British political leadership considered recognizing the Confederacy but was eventually dissuaded by Union military success. In World War II Sweden declared neutrality but grew increasingly amenable to Allied requests as Germany’s military position worsened. Romania initially sided with Germany in the same war but changed sides following U.S. attacks on their oil fields and a coup that deposed the pro German dictator, Antonescu. Bulgarians followed a similar path from siding with the Nazis to switching their allegiance to the Allies in 1944. Saudi Prince Bandar, acknowledging China’s increasing international prominence and power visited Beijing last year and met with President Hu. American weakness at sea, especially in the Indo-Pacific will change the current military, diplomatic, and commercial character of the region. Whether the U.S. fleet shrinks because of too little funding or because unreformed procurement practices have raised the price of ships or because ships have been called home to save on operational expense, the result is the same. While we were once present in strength, we would be no more.

#### Indo-Pak war causes extinction

Washington Times 1

July 8, LN.

The most dangerous place on the planet is Kashmir, a disputed territory convulsed and illegally occupied for more than 53 years and sandwiched between nuclear-capable India and Pakistan. It has ignited two wars between the estranged South Asian rivals in 1948 and 1965, and a third could trigger nuclear volleys and a nuclear winter threatening the entire globe. The United States would enjoy no sanctuary. This apocalyptic vision is no idiosyncratic view. The director of central intelligence, the Defense Department, and world experts generally place Kashmir at the peak of their nuclear worries. Both India and Pakistan are racing like thoroughbreds to bolster their nuclear arsenals and advanced delivery vehicles. Their defense budgets are climbing despite widespread misery amongst their populations. Neither country has initialed the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, or indicated an inclination to ratify an impending Fissile Material/Cut-off Convention.

#### Naval power is key to keep the Strait of Hormuz open and stops middle east wars

**Layne 9**

[Christopher, Professor of Political Science at Texas A&M, Review of International Studies, “America’s Middle East grand strategy after Iraq: the moment for offshore balancing has arrived”, 2009, p. asp]

Access to oil is an important US interest, and in some respects American military power plays an important role in keeping the oil flowing from the Gulf. **But there is no need for an on-the-ground American military presence in the Gulf and Middle East. Over-the-horizon deterrence can prevent the emergence of Gulf oil hegemon without triggering the kind of anti-American backlash that can occur when US forces visibly are present** in the region.20 Similarly, although its closure is a low-probability event, the US has an important interest in **making sure the Strait of Hormuz remains open.** But this **is a task that can be accomplished by American naval power**. Finally, **domestic instability in the Gulf oil producing states is a risk** – especially in Saudi Arabia. **Howeve**r, as Secretary of State Condoleeza Rice recently acknowledged, **the Gulf – and Middle East – are going to be unstable regardless of what the US does.**21 Certainly, **US military power, and America’s heavy-handed political influence, are not an antidote to domestic instability** in the region. **On the contrary, they contribute to it. This suggests that the wisest policies for the US are to reduce its footprint in the Gulf and Middle East**, and formulate a viable long-term energy strategy that minimises its vulnerability to the vicissitudes of that endemically turbulent region.22

#### Middle East War causes Extinction

**Steinbach in 2**

[John, DC Iraq Coalition, “Israeli Weapons of Mass Destruction: A Threat to Peace,” **[http://www.wagingpeace.org/articles/2002/03/00\_steinbach\_israeli-wmd.htm](https://www.wagingpeace.org/articles/2002/03/00_steinbach_israeli-wmd.htm)**, accessed 4/19/04]

Meanwhile, the existence of an arsenal of mass destruction in such an unstable region in turn has serious implications for future arms control and disarmament negotiations, and even the threat of nuclear war. Seymour Hersh warns, "**Should war break out in the Middle East again,**... or should any Arab nation fire missiles against Israel, as the Iraqis did, a **nuclear escalation**, once unthinkable except as a last resort, **would now be a strong probability**."(41) and Ezar Weissman, Israel's current President said "The nuclear issue is gaining momentum (and the) next war will not be conventional."(42) Russia and before it the Soviet Union has long been a major (if not the major) target of Israeli nukes. It is widely reported that the principal purpose of Jonathan Pollard's spying for Israel was to furnish satellite images of Soviet targets and other super sensitive data relating to U.S. nuclear targeting strategy. (43) (Since launching its own satellite in 1988, Israel no longer needs U.S. spy secrets.) Israeli nukes aimed at the Russian heartland seriously complicate disarmament and arms control negotiations and, at the very least, the unilateral possession of nuclear weapons by Israel is enormously destabilizing, and dramatically lowers the threshold for their actual use, if not for all out nuclear war. In the words of Mark Gaffney, "... if the familar pattern(Israel refining its weapons of mass destruction with U.S. complicity) is not reversed soon - for whatever reason **- the deepening Middle East conflict could trigger a world conflagration**." (44)

#### U.S. Sea Power is key to deter Chinese hegemony and war in the south china sea

Cropsey, 12

Dr. Seth Cropsey Hudson Institute “The U.S. Navy Shipbuilding Plan: Assumptions and Associated Risks to National Security” <http://www.hudson.org/files/publications/SethCropsey--USNavyShipbuildingPlan--Testimony041812.pdf>, accessed 12/20/12,WYO/JF

A nation burdened with massive debt whose ability to shape world events has been limited in tandem with its capacity to invest in research and technology will have more and more trouble finding markets. China’s potential hegemony would not only force its neighbors’ to reconsider whether the U.S. is a reliable ally. It would also become an increasingly powerful magnet for trade in the region—at the expense of U.S. commerce. Unlike the U.S. whose seapower has protected global sea lanes that other states have used to their benefit China has a different set of values. It views with suspicion a liberal trading system notwithstanding the benefits received from it. China’s friends include Iran and North Korea. Beijing is a poor candidate to support the international order that has been the keel of U.S. foreign and security policy for a century. Waning U.S. seapower is an invitation that China will regard as a complement to its rising military and navy in particular. It foreshadows a coercive resolution of territorial disputes in the South China Sea, the likelihood of an increased regional arms race, and the troubling international perception that the U.S. is—or has—abandoned its role as a great power. American seapower is the strategic keel of our foreign and security policy. Reducing it would be an exercise of history-making shortsightedness. Restoring it would be an act of statesmanship from which Americans and all who cherish political liberty would benefit for the remainder of this century. Thank you.

#### CONFLICT IN THE SCS ESCALATES TO FULL-SCALE NUCLEAR WAR

STRAITS TIMES 1995

[staff, “Choose Your Own Style of Democracy”, May 21, p. ln// wyo-tjc]

In his speech, Dr Mahathir also painted three scenarios for Asia.

In the first -the worst possible scenario -Asian countries would go to war against each other, he said. It might start with clashes between Asian countries over the Spratly Islands because of China's insistence that the South China Sea belonged to it along with all the islands, reefs and seabed minerals. In this scenario, the United States would offer to help and would be welcomed by Asean, he said. The Pacific Fleet begins to patrol the South China Sea. Clashes occur between the Chinese navy and the US Navy. China declares war on the US and a full-scale war breaks out with both sides resorting to nuclear weapons.

#### That’s the most likely scenario for US-China war

Glaser 12 Bonnie S., Senior Fellow – Center for Strategic and International Studies, “Armed Clash in the South China Sea,” CFR, April, http://www.cfr.org/east-asia/armed-clash-south-china-sea/p27883

The risk of conflict in the South China Sea is significant. China, Taiwan, Vietnam, Malaysia, Brunei, and the Philippines have competing territorial and jurisdictional claims, particularly over rights to exploit the region's possibly extensive reserves of oil and gas. Freedom of navigation in the region is also a contentious issue, especially between the United States and China over the right of U.S. military vessels to operate in China's two-hundred-mile exclusive economic zone (EEZ). These tensions are shaping—and being **shaped by—rising apprehensions about** the growth of China's military power and its regional intentions. China **has embarked on a substantial modernization of its maritime paramilitary forces as well as naval capabilities** to enforce its sovereignty and jurisdiction claims by force if necessary. At the same time, it is developing capabilities that would put U.S. forces in the region at risk in a conflict, thus potentially denying access to the U.S. Navy in the western Pacific. Given the growing importance of the U.S.-China relationship, and the Asia-Pacific region more generally, to the global economy, the United States has a major interest in preventing any one of the various disputes in the South China Sea from **escalating militarily**. The Contingencies Of the many conceivable contingencies involving an armed clash in the South China Sea, three especially threaten U.S. interests and could potentially prompt the United States to use force. The **most likely** and **dangerous contingency** is a clash stemming from U.S. military operations within China's EEZ that provokes an **armed Chinese response**. The United States holds that nothing in the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) or state practice negates the right of military forces of all nations to conduct military activities in EEZs without coastal state notice or consent. China insists that reconnaissance activities undertaken without prior notification and without permission of the coastal state violate Chinese domestic law and international law. China routinely intercepts U.S. reconnaissance flights conducted in its EEZ and periodically does so in **aggressive ways that increase the risk of an accident** similar to the April 2001 collision of a U.S. EP-3 reconnaissance plane and a Chinese F-8 fighter jet near Hainan Island. A comparable maritime incident could be triggered by Chinese vessels harassing a U.S. Navy surveillance ship operating in its EEZ, such as occurred in the 2009 incidents involving the USNS Impeccable and the USNS Victorious. The large growth of Chinese submarines has also **increased the danger of an incident**, such as when a Chinese submarine collided with a U.S. destroyer's towed sonar array in June 2009. Since neither U.S. reconnaissance aircraft nor ocean surveillance vessels are armed, the United States might respond to dangerous behavior by Chinese planes or ships by dispatching armed escorts. A **miscalculation** or misunderstanding could then result in a **deadly exchange of fire**, leading to further **military escalation** and precipitating a major political crisis. Rising U.S.-China mistrust and intensifying bilateral strategic competition would likely make managing such a crisis more difficult

#### Offshore wind would lead to massive investment of funds toward ship building

MCTC, 10

Massachusetts Clean Energy Center, “Port and Infrastructure Analysis for Offshore Wind Energy Development”online, accessed 10/26/12,WYO/JF

No purpose-built wind turbine installation vessels exist that are compliant with U.S. coastwise trade laws (i.e., "Jones Act"). These laws require vessels to be U.S.-built, U.S.-owned, and U.S.-operated. A small number of Jones Act-compliant vessels that are currently operating in the Gulf of Mexico could be used to construct the first-generation U.S. offshore wind farms. These vessels lack the efficiency associated with purpose-built wind turbine installation vessels, such as the ability to transport multiple sets of turbine components and the ability to rapidly jackup, pre-load the legs, erect the turbines, and jack-down. In order to economically and efficiently achieve GW-scale deployment of offshore wind in the United States, a fleet of purpose-built, Jones Act-compliant vessels will be needed. The industry recognizes this fact and is taking steps to develop the vessel infrastructure. NRG Bluewater Wind, for example, has teamed with the Aker Philadelphia shipyard to develop three purpose-built wind turbine installation vessels. (Bluewater Wind 2009b). Future wind turbine installation vessels are expected to focus on improving construction efficiency through faster transit speeds, larger payload capacity, and ability to erect turbines in higher wind speeds and larger sea states. Some firms are developing designs that accommodate the transport and installation of fully assembled turbines (see Figure 3-18).

#### Thriving OSW industry jumpstarts shipbuilding and port improvements throughout the United States- leadership now is crucial to avoid the US shipping industries and ports from being locked-out of global competition

Bondaref 12

[Joan, analyst with Blank Rome LLP, “Is the Time Right to Expedite Offshore Wind”, North American Wind Power, July, p. <http://www.nawindpower.com/digitaleditions/Main.php?MagID=2&MagNo=31> //wyo-tjc]

Europe has been at the forefront of renewable energy and, in particular, offshore wind. Like the DOD, Europe has made a commitment to renewable energy and set a more ambitious goal of having 20% of its energy consumption from renewable sources by 2020. Each member of the European Union (EU) has a national action plan to achieve this goal, and Europe is well on its way to meeting its objective. In 2009, wind constituted 7.7% of renewable energy sources in Europe. This has also resulted in the creation of over 1 million new jobs, according to a recent report by market research firm EurObserv’ER. One burgeoning market in Europe that the U.S. should emulate is the offshore supply and support vessel industry. Innovative designs for new support vessels, such as catamarans and crew-transfer vessels that can perform well in high-sea states, have come online and can be deployed rapidly to new and existing offshore wind farms. One U.K. company is building 25 crew-transfer vessels a year. Smart U.K. boat builders that are working in the offshore wind industry have also entered into licensing agreements with U.S. boat builders, which not only will bring jobs to a flagging industry, but also should enhance support for offshore wind. Similarly, European port owners and operators are reaping the benefits of offshore wind farm projects. How European ports have positioned themselves as “epicenters” of offshore wind operations and support bases is discussed at length in the September 2011 issue of North American Windpower (“U.S. Ports Model Themselves After European Counterparts,” page 50). Instead of working to stymie offshore wind farms for fear of interference with shipping traffic, U.S. ports should focus on the new jobs and financial opportunities that would be created by similar projects in the U.S. To ensure that these high-tech, high-paying jobs come to the U.S., it requires leadership at the federal and state levels. The U.S. should do what it can to bring about the development of this clean industry, and not sit by while other regions such as the EU, India and China take over what could be a strong manufacturing base and job market for years to come.

#### No one can fill in for US naval power

Daniel Whiteneck et al, Research Analyst for NATO, Michael Price, Neil Jenkins, Peter Swartz, 3-2010, CNA Analysis & Solutions, “The Navy at a Tipping Point: Maritime Dominance at Stake?”, <http://www.public.navy.mil/usff/documents/navy_at_tipping_point.pdf>

Second, no other country (or combination of countries) will create the forces required for a navy with global influence. America’s European allies, and its Asian allies as well, have created navies that are capable of sustained regional operations, or routine “cruising” by small squadrons of surface ships that show the flag, conduct engagement and exercises, and demonstrate national interest in economic ties with the visited nations and regions. These navies can also conduct short-term surges for uses of force against low end threats or act as supporters to USN-led naval operations; however persistent out-of-area operations (even by a low number of assets) would quickly deplete their resources and political support at home.