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## Case

### Blackouts

#### They says MATS standard bad has a faulty methodology – no warrant at all extended in the 2AC. Have a high threshold for 1AR extension. There’s no reason for bias. This is an EPA funded study, no external motivations. We also indict their motivations. All of their supporters are paid off by the coal lobby. That’s Kraft. This outweighs all of their cost arguments Kraft says “the agency values these benefits at between $150 billion and $380 billion a year; they clearly exceed the estimated $10 billion annual costs of compliance for the industry.”. Additionally, they drop hidden solvency deficit. MATS affects nothing in the SQUO. Kraft says, “most plants can meet the standards using available technology, and that these changes are likely to create tens of thousands of jobs in the construction and pollution-control industries”

#### Extend Weiss below it. $80 billion in benefits annually.

#### MATS saves millions of dollars and lives

McCarthy 11, Specialist in Environmental Policy, and Copeland, Specialist in Resources and Environmental Policy, 11

(James E. and Claudia, EPA’s Regulation of Coal-Fired Power: Is a “Train Wreck” Coming? Congressional Research Service, 8 August 2011, http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R41914.pdf, da 8-4-2012) PC

EPA projected the annualized cost of compliance with the proposed rule at $10.9 billion in 2015, ¶ and remaining at $10 billion - 11 billion annually through 2030.¶ 25¶ The average consumer would ¶ see an increase of $3-$4 per month in the cost of electricity due to the rule, according to the ¶ agency.¶ 26¶ These costs will go largely to the installation of scrubbers and fabric filters. As a result¶ of the rule, 26 GW of coal-fired units, about 9% of total coal-fired capacity, are expected to install ¶ scrubbers. (EPA estimated that by the time the rule requires compliance, 203 GW will already ¶ have installed scrubbers anyway, as a result of other regulations.)¶ 27¶ More than half of the coal-fired EGU capacity (166 GW) are expected to add fabric filters ¶ because of the rule, while 77 GW would have them whether or not there were a rule. In most ¶ cases, the fabric filters will be coupled with activated carbon injection or dry sorbent injection.¶ 28¶ Mercury and other HAPs become attached to the carbon or sorbent after it is injected into the flue ¶ gas, and the fabric filter collects the particles, removing them from the plant’s emissions. EPA ¶ estimates that 62 GW of coal-fired capacity (about one-fifth of the U.S. total) would have either ¶ activated carbon or dry sorbent injection in 2015 without the rule. The rule adds another 149 GW ¶ of carbon/sorbent installations. ¶ This is not complicated or new technology. Other types of facilities (notably solid waste ¶ incinerators) have used this technology for the past 15 years to reduce their mercury and other ¶ HAP emissions by 95% or more. As a result of state-level pollution control regulations, a growing ¶ percentage of coal-fired power plants do the same. ¶ The benefits of the rule are estimated by EPA at $59 billion to $140 billion annually—5 to 13 ¶ times as great as the costs—due primarily to the avoidance of 6,800 to 17,000 premature deaths ¶ each year.¶ 29¶ Other benefits, only some of which were given dollar values, include the annual ¶ avoidance of 11,000 nonfatal heart attacks, 120,000 cases of aggravated asthma, and ¶ developmental effects on children, including effects on IQ, learning, and memory.¶ 30

#### Not enough work on blackouts key to the economy. They drop the fact that economy has back up systems that shield it from actual economic harms. No extrapolation That’s Uchitelle.

#### No chance of a recession – we’re in the clear.

Roubini, doctorate in international economics at Harvard University, ‘12

[Nouriel, receiving a BA in political economics at Bocconi University, he became an academic at Yale and a practicing economist at the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the Federal Reserve, World Bank, and Bank of Israel. Much of his early research focused on emerging markets. During the administration of President Bill Clinton, he was a senior economist for the Council of Economic Advisers, later moving to the United States Treasury Department as a senior adviser to Timothy Geithner, who in 2009 became Treasury Secretary, and Ian Bremmer, “$200 Oil and the Moscow-Beijing Alliance,” 3/7/12, Foreign Policy,

ttp://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/03/09/200\_oil\_roubini\_bremmer?page=0,0, RSR]

Really, since 2008, if it's not been one thing, it's been something else. We no longer believe that there's meaningful likelihood that a shock is going to send the world back into recession. That's in part true because of the strengthening of American numbers. Nouriel's right, these are not exciting growth numbers -- this isn't the robust bounce-back that we think is going to power a global economy with the kind of figures you saw before the crisis, but it's a very different environment from the last four years. That's very important in terms of getting consumer confidence back, but it's also very important in terms of the orientation of CEOs to start spending some of the major cash that they've left off the table. I think the answer that they'll start doing it -- and not just in the United States. I don't want to say they're getting ebullient, but they're less fearful about medium and long-term trajectory.

#### No global economic collapse and it wouldn’t cause conflict.

Drezner, Professor of International Politics at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University, ‘11

[Daniel, 8-12-11, “Please come down off the ledge, dear readers”, Foreign Policy,

http://drezner.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2011/08/12/please\_come\_down\_off\_the\_ledge\_dear\_readers, RSR, (Charts Not Included)]

So, when we last left off this debate, things were looking grim. My concern in the last post was that the persistence of hard times would cause governments to take actions that would lead to a collapse of the open global economy, a spike in general riots and disturbances, and eerie echoes of the Great Depression. Let's assume that the global economy persists in sputtering for a while, because that's what happens after major financial shocks. Why won't these other bad things happen? Why isn't it 1931? Let's start with the obvious -- it's not gonna be 1931 because there's some passing familiarity with how 1931 played out. The Chairman of the Federal Reserve has devoted much of his academic career to studying the Great Depression. I'm gonna go out on a limb therefore and assert that if the world plunges into a another severe downturn, it's not gonna be because central bank heads replay the same set of mistakes. The legacy of the Great Depression has also affected public attitudes and institutions that provide much stronger cement for the current system. In terms of public attitudes, compare the results of this mid-2007 poll with this mid-2010 poll about which economic system is best. I'll just reproduce the key charts below: The headline of the 2010 results is that there's eroding U.S. support for the global economy, but a few other things stand out. U.S. support has declined, but it's declined from a very high level. In contrast, support for free markets has increased in other major powers, such as Germany and China. On the whole, despite the worst global economic crisis since the Great Depression, public attitudes have not changed all that much. While there might be populist demands to "do something," that something is not a return to autarky or anything so drastc. Another big difference is that multilateral economic institutions are much more robust now than they were in 1931. On trade matters, even if the Doha round is dead, the rest of the World Trade Organization's corpus of trade-liberalizing measures are still working quite well. Even beyond the WTO, the complaint about trade is not the deficit of free-trade agreements but the surfeit of them. The IMF's resources have been strengthened as a result of the 2008 financial crisis. The Basle Committee on Banking Supervision has already promulgated a plan to strengthen capital requirements for banks. True, it's a slow, weak-assed plan, but it would be an improvement over the status quo. As for the G-20, I've been pretty skeptical about that group's abilities to collectively address serious macroeconomic problems. That is setting the bar rather high, however. One could argue that the G-20's most useful function is reassurance. Even if there are disagreements, communication can prevent them from growing into anything worse. Finally, a note about the possibility of riots and other general social unrest. The working paper cited in my previous post noted the links between austerity measures and increases in disturbances. However, that paper contains the following important paragraph on page 19: [I]n countries with better institutions, the responsiveness of unrest to budget cuts is generally lower. Where constraints on the executive are minimal, the coefficient on expenditure changes is strongly negative -- more spending buys a lot of social peace. In countries with Polity-2 scores above zero, the coefficient is about half in size, and less significant. As we limit the sample to ever more democratic countries, the size of the coefficient declines. For full democracies with a complete range of civil rights, the coefficient is still negative, but no longer significant. This is good news!! The world has a hell of a lot more democratic governments now than it did in 1931. What happened in London, in other words, might prove to be the exception more than the rule. So yes, the recent economic news might seem grim. Unless political institutions and public attitudes buckle, however, we're unlikely to repeat the mistakes of the 1930's. And, based on the data we've got, that's not going to happen.

#### Meltdown impacts won’t happen – empirics

WNA ’11

[World Nuclear Association, “Safety of Nuclear Power Reactors”, (updated December 2011), <http://www.world-nuclear.org/info/inf06.html>]

From the outset, there has been a strong awareness of the potential hazard of both nuclear criticality and release of radioactive materials from generating electricity with nuclear power. As in other industries, the design and operation of nuclear power plants aims to minimise the likelihood of accidents, and avoid major human consequences when they occur. There have been three major reactor accidents in the history of civil nuclear power - Three Mile Island, Chernobyl and Fukushima. One was contained without harm to anyone, the next involved an intense fire without provision for containment, and the third severely tested the containment, allowing some release of radioactivity. These are the only major accidents to have occurred in over 14,500 cumulative reactor-years of commercial nuclear power operation in 32 countries. The risks from western nuclear power plants, in terms of the consequences of an accident or terrorist attack, are minimal compared with other commonly accepted risks. Nuclear power plants are very robust.

#### Nuclear power plants cannot possibly explode – best science agrees.

Hargreaves ‘9

[Steve Hargreaves, CNNMoney.com staff writer, The threat of nuclear meltdown, November 12, 2009, <http://money.cnn.com/2009/11/12/news/economy/nuclear_security/index.htm>]

A nuclear power plant would not blow up like a bomb. Even in a worst-case scenario, a meltdown at a nuclear power plant involves the core or the spent fuel getting too hot and literally melting, with the toxic gas escaping into the atmosphere. But that process would take several hours, if not days. Officials say they could safely shelter or evacuate people within the most dangerous area -- generally 50 miles or so from the plant.

### Rails

#### They say that coal is not clean. This is the biggest concession at the top of the 2AC. Stick them to it. Coal has horrific environmental impacts. Coal threatens keystone species – killing biodiversity. **Coal Train Facts 12.**

#### They say that the impact is inevitable but 1.) We control the UQ to this question. Our evidence is that China is shifting to nat gas now is not old. It’s from February this year. It’s talking about future strategy.

#### 2.) Also, this is too risky to take a chance on. Any loss of biodiversity can collapse the entire system. They read no evidence on why it’s empirically denied or why it’s inevitable. No new 1AR ev. Chen says that any loss of species poses a risk.

#### Biodiversity is the biggest internal link to extinction – newest studies prove.

Science Daily, ‘11

["Biodiversity Critical for Maintaining Multiple 'Ecosystem Services'" Cites McGill University, August 19, [www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2011/08/110819155422.htm](http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2011/08/110819155422.htm)]

By combining data from 17 of the largest and longest-running biodiversity experiments, scientists from universities across North America and Europe have found that previous studies have underestimated the importance of biodiversity for maintaining multiple ecosystem services across many years and places. "Most previous studies considered only the number of species needed to provide one service under one set of environmental conditions," says Prof. Michel Loreau from McGill University's biology department who supervised the study. "These studies found that many species appeared redundant. That is, it appeared that the extinction of many species would not affect the functioning of the ecosystem because other species could compensate for their loss." Now, by looking at grassland plant species, investigators have found that most of the studied species were important at least once for the maintenance of ecosystem services, because different sets of species were important during different years, at different places, for different services, and under different global change (e.g., climate or land-use change) scenarios. Furthermore, the species needed to provide one service during multiple years were not the same as those needed to provide multiple services during one year. "This means that biodiversity is even more important for maintaining ecosystem services than was previously thought," says Dr. Forest Isbell, the lead author and investigator of this study. "Our results indicate that many species are needed to maintain ecosystem services at multiple times and places in a changing world, and that species are less redundant than was previously thought." The scientists involved in the study also offer recommendations for using these results to prioritize conservation efforts and predict consequences of species extinctions. "It is nice to know which groups of species promoted ecosystem functioning under hundreds of sets of environmental conditions," says Isbell, "because this will allow us to determine whether some species often provide ecosystem services under environmental conditions that are currently common, or under conditions that will become increasingly common in the future." But Michel Loreau, of McGill, adds au cautionary note: "We should be careful when making predictions. The uncertainty over future environmental changes means that conserving as much biodiversity as possible could be a good precautionary approach."

#### Ecosystems are on the brink now, and are key to sustaining life

Black 10 (Richard Black, environment correspondent for BBC, October 18, 2010, “'Ten years' to solve nature crisis, UN meeting hears,” http://goo.gl/4l6c)

The two-week gathering aims to set new targets for conserving life on Earth. Japan's Environment Minister Ryo Matsumoto said biodiversity loss would become irreversible unless curbed soon. Much hope is being pinned on economic analyses showing the loss of species and ecosystems is costing the global economy trillions of dollars each year. Ahmed Djoghlaf, executive secretary of the UN Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), described the meeting in Nagoya, Japan, as a "defining moment" in the history of mankind. "[Buddhist scholar] Daisetsu Teitaro Suzuki said 'the problem of nature is the problem of human life'. Today, unfortunately, human life is a problem for nature," he told delegates in his opening speech. Referring to the target set at the UN World Summit in 2002, he said: "Let's have the courage to look in the eyes of our children and admit that we have failed, individually and collectively, to fulfil the Johannesburg promise made by 110 heads of state to substantially reduce the rate of loss of biodiversity by 2010. "Let us look in the eyes of our children and admit that we continue to lose biodiversity at an unprecedented rate, thus mortgaging their future." Earlier this year, the UN published a major assessment - the Global Biodiversity Outlook - indicating that virtually all trends spanning the state of the natural world were heading downwards, despite conservation successes in some regions. “ Start Quote We are about to reach a threshold beyond which biodiversity loss will become irreversible” Ryo Matsumoto Japanese environment minister It showed that loss and degradation of forests, coral reefs, rivers and other elements of the natural world was having an impact on living standards in some parts of the world - an obvious example being the extent to which loss of coral affects fish stocks. In his opening speech, Mr Matsumoto suggested impacts could be much broader in future. "All life on Earth exists thanks to the benefits from biodiversity in the forms of fertile soil, clear water and clean air," he said. "We are now close to a 'tipping point' - that is, we are about to reach a threshold beyond which biodiversity loss will become irreversible, and may cross that threshold in the next 10 years if we do not make proactive efforts for conserving biodiversity." Climate clouds In recent years, climate change has dominated the agenda of environmental politics. And Achim Steiner, executive director of the UN Environment Programme, suggested there is a lack of understanding at political levels of why tackling biodiversity is just important. "This is the only planet in this Universe that is known to have this kind of life," he said. "This fact alone should give us food for thought, But more importantly, we are destroying the very foundations that sustain life on this planet; and yet when we meet in these intergovernmental fora, society somehow struggles to understand and appreciate what it is what we're trying to do here, and why it matters."

#### Coal is not key to the economy. Bad for econ. Trades off with other forms of energy that create longer, higher paying jobs. We control the magnitude of the link. That’s Serres.

### Asian Pivot

#### Alt causes – Iran/NK prolif, Arab Spring and Indo-Pak relations.

Bader, John C. Whitehead Senior Fellow in International Diplomacy, Foreign Policy, John L. Thornton China Center, ‘12

[Jeffrey, “China and the United States: Nixon's Legacy after 40 Years,” Brookings, 2-23,

<http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2012/0223_china_nixon_bader.aspx>, RSR]

The common interests on which Nixon and Mao sought to cooperate were international issues. In their day, the dominant ones were Vietnam and Indochina, Korea, south Asia, and resistance to Soviet expansionism. Since then, up to and including the Obama administration, American presidents have sought to work with the Chinese on the major international issues, either in the United Nations Security Council or elsewhere where the Chinese have influence. The record on such issues in recent years has been mixed. The United States and China have agreed on opposition to the Iranian and North Korean nuclear weapons programs, but have differed on tactics to reverse them. They have worked together to preserve peace in the Korean peninsula and in the Taiwan Strait. They see the Arab Spring, and more recently the Syrian uprising, through very different lenses, which will be a source of tension as the region remains in turmoil and the forces of change and status quo come into violent conflict. We have a common interest in preventing Pakistan from becoming a long-term source of instability and base for terrorism, but differing perspectives on Pakistan’s relationship with India. The good news is however deep our differences on some of these issues, none has led, or shows signs of leading, to conflict between us.

#### Single issues don’t spillover.

Clarke, Visiting Research Fellow at the East Asian Institute (EAI), National University of Singapore, ‘11

[Ryan, “Maintaining Baseline Stability in China-U.S. Relations: Alliance Structures, Rethinking Flashpoints, and Identifying New Shared Interests,” EAI Working Paper No. 158, 9-16, <http://www.eai.nus.edu.sg/EWP158.pdf>, RSR]

In recent years we have witnessed an explosion of analysis on both the future trajectories of China as well as the United States and the nature of the interactions between them with prognoses varying wildly. Some boldly predict a myopic, conflict free future in China-U.S. relations where America recognizes the inevitability of a rising China and adjusts its grand strategy, military deployments, and trade policy in order to clear the way for this predetermined geopolitical shift. For China, it obligingly adjusts its key institutions, market regulations, and foreign policy practices to be in line with the established norms of the heretofore largely undefined yet often cited “international community.” Others openly voice fears of a repeat of the events that rocked human civilization in the 19th and 20th centuries with terms such as security dilemma, security spiral, hard balancing, nationalism, and others returning into the everyday vernacular. Those who subscribe to the latter paradigm over-extrapolate from seemingly individual issues, such as Taiwan (which is actually an artifact of history), to make broad assessments of the overall direction of the China-U.S. relationship. “Test case”, “precedent”, and the like are now applied to what have previously been regarded as rather unitary issues. If defense-centric analysis becomes the dominant mode, then we had better prepare ourselves to see a constant stream of security dilemmas and escalations with no exit. No one actually desires such an outcome. This study seeks to make a humble contribution by providing a balanced, realistic, and policy-oriented analysis of the most pressing contemporary issues in the relationship between Washington and Beijing. Through this work, this study aims to highlight that while many ingrained, structural issues (Taiwan, Korean Peninsula, American alliance structures, etc…) continue to pose challenges to the relationship, there are still frontier areas in which shared interests can rationally be identified and expanded upon. There are indeed many challenges that China and America face in the future management of their relationship and there is ample space for miscalculation and escalation with unpredictable results. However, this study seeks to break out of the “wait-and-see” approaches which characterize so much analyses in Asia as well as the West.

#### Relations solve nothing – China doesn’t work with the US.

Blumenthal, Resident Fellow at AEI, ‘11

[Dan, Current commissioner and former vice chairman of the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission, where he directs efforts to monitor, investigate, and provide recommendations on the national security implications of the economic relationship between the two countries. Previously, he was senior director for China, Taiwan, and Mongolia in the Secretary of Defense's Office of International Security Affairs and practiced law in New York prior to his government service. At AEI, in addition to his work on the national security implications of U.S.-Sino relations, he coordinates the Tocqueville on China project, which examines the underlying civic culture of post-Mao China. Mr. Blumenthal also contributes to AEI's Asian Outlook series and is a research associate with the National Asia Research Program, 10-31-11, The top ten unicorns of China policy”, AEI

http://www.aei.org/article/foreign-and-defense-policy/regional/asia/the-top-ten-unicorns-of-china-policy/]

9) We need China's help to solve global problems. This is further down on my list because it is not really a fantastical unicorn. It is true. What is a fantasy is that China will be helpful. We do need China to disarm North Korea. They do not want to, and North Korea is now a nuclear power. The same may soon be true with Iran. The best we can get in our diplomacy with China is to stop Beijing from being less helpful. It is a fact that the global problems would be easier to manage with Chinese help. However, China actually contributing to global order is a unicorn.

#### US Chinese relations aren’t key to solve global problems.

Economy and Segal, ‘10

[Elizabeth (V. Starr senior fellow and director of Asia studies at the Council on Foreign Relations) and Adam (Ira A. Lipman senior fellow for counterterrorism and national security studies at the Council on Foreign Relations), “Time to Defriend China”, Foreign Policy, 5-24-10

http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/05/24/time\_to\_defriend\_china?page=0,1]

That hope was short-lived. It has become painfully clear during the first year of Barack Obama's administration that mismatched interests, values, and capabilities make it difficult for Washington and Beijing to work together to address global challenges. China's unwillingness to sit down with the United States and its maneuverings with India, Brazil, and South Africa to undermine a larger agreement at Copenhagen were clear signs that building a special relationship would not be easy. America's approval of arms sales to Taiwan in January and the Dalai Lama's visit with Obama in February returned both sides to old suspicions and sensitivities. But while we now have a more realistic assessment of what the U.S.-China relationship is not, we still lack a positive formulation of what it is -or should realistically become. Next week's U.S.-China Strategic and Economic Dialogue (S&ED), the annual high-level dialogue on economic and political issues led by Clinton and Treasury Secretary Tim Geithner on the U. S side and Vice Premier Wang Qishan and State Councilor Dai Bingguo on the Chinese, is unlikely to address this lack of a larger framework. In fact it will compound the problem. In the run-up to next week's meetings, U.S. officials have been all over the map in framing the topics for discussion. State Department officials have identified at least 20 issues of strategic importance to discuss in Beijing. The Treasury Department has laid out an equally broad agenda that includes trade and investment barriers, balanced growth, financial reform, and strengthening the international economic and financial architecture. Meanwhile, some White House officials have mentioned specific goals, such as RMB revaluation; others have said the goal is the development of a larger framework to address strategic issues; still others have said they hope that by putting controversial issues like local content requirements on the agenda, they can get the most senior Chinese officials to make decisions on topics that would typically disappear within the bureaucracy. These are all worthy objectives and outcomes, but the lackluster history of similar dialogues suggests there are better ways to spend our time and effort. Past such dialogues have achieved only modest success delivering on specific goals. Yes, it's true that the last S&ED yielded agreements on EcoPartnerships, collaboration on electric vehicle standards, and development of smart grids. Yet such small-scale cooperation and capacity-building have been a staple of U.S. energy and environmental talks for decades. These narrow goals would hardly seem to merit flying more than a dozen U.S. cabinet members and agency heads crossing the Pacific. Let's be realistic: Progress on core U.S. strategic interests largely emanates from outside such talks. For instance, at Copenhagen, China reversed its stance on two core issues related to its climate change negotiation position, establishing voluntary emission reduction targets and offering to move to the back of the line for international funding assistance. Both of these moves, however, were a response to concerns in the developing world, not U.S. pressure. Similarly, Beijing's apparent willingness to rescind the most controversial portions of a proposed government procurement strategy that would have closed off a large portion of the Chinese market to foreign technologies arose from widescale global protest, not simply U.S. objections. And China's recent decision to support the U.S.-led sanctions against Iran depended largely on Russia folding first and leaving China without political cover to maintain its opposition.

#### Nat gas is crowding out. Addressed above.

### Solvency

#### Alt cause - non-permanence of refined coal tax credit creates investor uncertainty

#### Simpson 3/15/12

#### Low natural gas prices kill the coal industry

Lydersen 2012

(Kari, writer for Midwest Energy News, 4-13, “Is natural gas killing coal?”, <http://www.midwestenergynews.com/2012/04/17/is-natural-gas-killing-coal/>) PY

As an increasing number of older coal-fired power plants are shutting down, the reasons seem to vary depending on whom you ask.¶ In news releases, power company officials are quick to blame environmental regulations, while acknowledging that low demand for power and cheap natural gas prices are also major factors. Meanwhile, environmentalists point to grassroots opposition to coal power and say plant operators have failed to adequately prepare for new rules they knew were coming.¶ Ultimately, energy markets are complex, and defy simple explanations. All of these factors play a role in the closing of coal plants, with the unexpected boom in shale gas production exacerbating market and regulatory trends that were already underway.¶ Natural gas prices are hovering at a very cheap $2 per MMBtu this spring – and gas is so abundant and cheap that drillers are cutting back on production. Natural gas plants emit almost no harmful toxins, and because of their much lower carbon emissions can meet the recently-announced Environmental Protection Agency proposed greenhouse gas standards that – if adopted – would mean virtually no new conventional coal plants could be built.¶ The proposed EPA standards don’t affect existing power plants, but the past two years have also seen the closing or announced closing of more than 100 older coal-fired power plants.¶ In many cases the natural gas factor and low electricity demand hastened the demise of plants that were scheduled to close at later dates when environmental regulations kicked in. Many plants cannot comply with the new Mercury and Air Toxics Standards (MATS) and the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule (CSAPR) without expensive new pollution control equipment that would make them unprofitable to run.¶ For example, Dominion had originally planned to close its State Line Power Station just outside Chicago at the end of 2014 rather than comply with environmental regulations, but bumped up the date to this spring because it could no longer compete with natural gas.¶

#### Concede that CCS is not inevitable. This means that there is NO CHANCE AT CLEAN COAL. Crucial concession. Supercharges bioD args on rails.