#### **Huge solar investment by military bases now---**

Lewis 9-7-12

[Jamie, <http://www.opednews.com/articles/Military-s-Alternative-Ene-by-James-Lewis-120904-755.html>, mg]

For reasons of national security, the federal government has mandated the military services pull a quarter of their energy from renewable sources. ¶ The Army plans to meet this goal with heavy investment in solar power for its bases. The Army plans to develop 1 gigawatt of solar power and Fort Bliss is slated to receive a 20-megawatt plant.

#### **Marine bases are increasing solar investment now**

Wilcox 12

[Amanda, <http://www.jdnews.com/articles/solar-107386-base-lejeune.html>, mg]

Camp Lejeune is in the process of building multiple photovoltaic farms that will give the base the ability to generate up to 10 MW of instant solar energy at any time.¶ The solar farms are popping up all over the base, as Thomas Burton, Facilities Engineer Manager for Camp Lejeune and the surrounding bases, said they plan to install the energy alternatives “anywhere we can put them” — on building rooftops, in fields that are not being used for training or other purposes and in canopy-form over parking areas to double as shaded parking.¶ The most visible farm, by the Camp Lejeune main gate, can be seen right off Lejeune Boulevard; it has the ability to produce .852 MW of instant power, or the capacity to generate enough electricity to power 100 homes over the course of a year.¶ “The Marine Corps is trying to do a lot of things with clean energy,” Burton told The Daily News in a phone interview, adding that the construction of solar farms will lower the Corps’ reliance on outside energy sources.

#### Net zero trades off with smart grid

Sater 11

(Daniel, Research Fellow at Global Green USA’s Security and Sustainability Office in ¶ Washington, DC in the summer of 2011. He is a graduate student at the Frank Batten School of ¶ Leadership and Public Policy at the University of Virginia. Daniel holds a BA in Foreign Affairs ¶ from UVA and will receive his Master of Public Policy degree in May 2012. “Military Energy Security: Current Efforts and Future Solutions” <http://www.globalgreen.org/docs/publication-185-1.pdf>, SEH)

Despite the benefits of microgrids, the DOD, as well as legislation and executive orders, has ¶ focused on less efficient energy alternatives. The Environmental Conservation Investment ¶ Program, one of the principle funding mechanisms to fund conservation efforts in the DOD, ¶ rarely invests in microgrids and focuses too much on less cost efficient projects. Further, the ¶ DOD’s Net Zero Energy Installation Initiative does little to increase energy assurance at military ¶ installations. By focusing too much on renewable energy generation, legislation and executive ¶ orders have decreased the available funds for microgrids, which if installed before a renewable ¶ energy project, can increase its viability.

#### Military bases going off grid now

Pacific Business News 10

(Sophie Cocke, “Barking Sands Going Off Grid” <http://islandbreath.blogspot.com/2010/09/barking-sands-going-off-grid.html>, SEH)

The Pacific Missile Range Facility in Barking Sands, Kauai, aims to generate all its electricity off-grid by 2015.¶ The goal is part of a clean-energy initiative under way at the Naval facility that employs between 900 and 1,300 workers.¶ The more than 200 lights that line the missile range’s 6,000-foot runway are now powered by the sun, as are the street lights. The base is seeking bids on a contract to install photovoltaics on 10 rooftops and is collaborating with Kauai County to capture methane gas from a landfill to generate power.¶ Its renewable-energy strides are coupled with efforts to retrofit the base with energy-efficient lighting and appliances and install advanced meters that allow personnel to monitor energy usage. The base reduced electricity usage by almost 15 percent between 2008 and 2009.¶ “I’m quite proud of the efforts that have been made out here,” said base spokesman Tom Clements.

#### SMRs ensure meltdowns

Smith 11

(Gar, Journal’s Editor Emeritus, “Don’t Mini-mize the Dangers of Nuclear Power” Earth Island Journal, <http://www.earthisland.org/journal/index.php/eij/article/dont_mini-mize_the_dangers_of_nuclear_power/>, SEH)

The Fukushima disaster has severely hobbled the atomic industry’s hopes for a big-ticket nuclear renaissance. So the American Nuclear Society has proposed a mini-renaissance based on “Small Modular Reactors,” or SMRs. Cheaper, quicker to build, and small enough to fit in a garage, SMRs could power homes, factories, and military bases. South Carolina’s Savannah River National Laboratory hopes to start building SMRs at a New Mexico plant and is taking a lead role in a GE-Hitachi demonstration project.¶ Even as Japanese engineers were working to contain the radiation risks at Fukushima, an international SMR conference in South Carolina in April attracted representatives from Westinghouse, AREVA, GE, the International Atomic Energy Agency, China National Nuclear Corp., Iraq Energy Institute, the US Army, and many US utilities.¶ But SMRs still depend on designs that generate intense heat, employ dangerous materials (highly reactive sodium coolant), and generate nuclear waste. SMRs also retain all the risks associated with supplying, maintaining, safeguarding, and dismantling large nuclear reactors – only now those risks would be multiplied and decentralized.¶ The planet can’t afford nuclear energy – be it mega or mini. As Dave Brower observed 30 years ago: “Is the minor convenience of allowing the present generation the luxury of doubling its energy consumption every 10 years worth the major hazard of exposing the next 20,000 generations to this lethal waste?¶ “We are at the edge of an abyss and we’re close to being irrevocably lost,” Dave warned. “As the Welshman Allen Reese puts it: ‘At the edge of the abyss, the only progressive move you can make is to step back.’”

#### Neg- 9 to 10 years to solve

King et al 11

(Marcus King, Associate Director of Research at The George Washington University's Elliott School of International Affairs LaVar Huntzinger, Thoi Nguyen, “Feasibility of Nuclear Power on U.S.

Military Installations” <http://www.cna.org/sites/default/files/research/Nuclear%20Power%20on%20Military%20Installations%20D0023932%20A5.pdf>, SEH)

The time required to obtain design certification, license, and build¶ the next generation of nuclear plants is about 9 to 10 years. After the¶ first plants are built it may be possible to reduce the time required for¶ licensing and construction to approximately 6 years [45].

#### Al Qaeda has massive money problems. They’re unable to attack or train new operatives.

**Daily Telegraph, ‘09** (David Blair, Diplomatic Editor, “Al-Qaeda in retreat as cash stops flowing”, 2009, L/N)

AL-QAEDA has been forced into retreat as the flow of funds to the terrorist network is steadily choked off, a senior American official said on Tuesday. In the first half of this year, al-Qaeda's core leadership was compelled to make four public appeals for cash, complaining in one case of a "weakness in operations because of lack of money''. Part of the reason for this is that some funding is believed to have gone to the Taliban instead. This financial squeeze has compounded the problems faced by "core al-Qaeda''. Highly effective attacks launched by American Predator drones have eliminated a raft of its most able leaders. Experts believe that Osama bin Laden's network is under immense pressure inside its last redoubts in the Tribal Areas lining Pakistan's north-west frontier. David Cohen, the assistant secretary at the US Treasury responsible for countering terrorist finance, said that al-Qaeda's recent appeal for funds showed its "financial predicament''. He added: "We assess that al-Qaeda is in its weakest financial condition in several years, and that, as a result, its influence is waning. This success is important. It is a sign that we are moving in the right direction.'' America and its allies have taken increasingly sophisticated steps to choke the movement of funds to all terrorist groups, principally by freezing assets belonging to "designated'' individuals, banks and companies. Traditionally, al-Qaeda's money has tended to come from the Gulf kingdoms, but there is evidence that this flow is being blocked. Carrying out terrorist attacks is relatively cheap - the bombing of the London Underground on 7 July 2005 probably cost only pounds 8,000 - but al-Qaeda also needs cash to train new operatives and buy the safety of its leading figures in the Tribal Areas. **Without these funds, its ability to operate is severely constrained**. Meanwhile, the drone strikes are taking a steady toll of "core al-Qaeda''. Pakistani authorities calculate that 14 al-Qaeda figures died in 60 American drone attacks in the Tribal Areas between January, 2006, and April this year. Those left are forced to concentrate on securing their own safety and hunting down informers, rather than planning attacks. "Operationally, it does look increasingly difficult for them to hold together as a coherent, disciplined terrorist group,'' said Paul Cornish, the head of international security at the Chatham House think tank. Al-Qaeda probably isn't the great demon that it once used to be, although there's still a serious threat. They keep getting punched again and again and they can't go on like this.'' A British official said that al-Qaeda's capabilities had been reduced. "AQ seem less able to plan and implement an overseas attack in Europe, partly to do with funding and partly to do with the impact of Predator drone strikes,'' he said. The elimination of key leaders was having an impact. The loss of "credible go-betweens'' who liaised between core al-Qaeda and new recruits or affiliated terrorist groups had imposed "severe operational difficulties''.

#### Al-Qaeda can’t pull off an attack – misunderstood strength

Lobe ‘12

Lobe, 2/9/ 2012, [James R. Lobe is an American journalist and the Washington Bureau Chief of the international news agency Inter Press Service, “Muslim 'terror threat' belied by numbers,” < http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/features/2012/02/20122912326479430.html>

Coincidentally, the new report was released as a senior Pentagon official suggested that Washington may also have exaggerated the threat posed by al-Qaeda in the aftermath of 9/11. "Al-Qaeda wasn't as good as we thought they were on 9/11," Michael Sheehan, the assistant secretary of defence for special operations and low-intensity conflict, told a conference here Tuesday. FBI halts anti-Muslim training "Quite frankly, we … were asleep at the switch, the US government, prior to 9/11. So an organisation that wasn't that good looked really great on 9/11. Everyone looked to the skies every day after 9/11 and said, 'When is the next attack?' And it didn't come, partly because al-Qaeda wasn't that capable," he was reported as saying by the Army Times. "They didn't have other units here in the US …Really, they didn't have the capability to conduct a second attack," he added.

### 2NC Solves

#### Cyber Security Act solves- 1NC Outlook series says we provide critical intel sharing, training, and threat preparedness- that solves all the aff’s reasons a cyber-attack is coming.

#### Bill gives the DHS enforcement powers that’s key to solve

Weitz 11

(Richard, Senior Fellow and Director of the Center for Political-Military Analysis at the Hudson Institute; 4/27 “DHS Grapples with Cyber Threats” http://www.sldinfo.com/dhs-grapples-with-cyber-threats/

**The fundamental problem is that, at present, DHS has responsibility to protect all non-defense, public sector and private sector networks from cyber attack but lacks sufficient authority** to accomplish this mission. The department has broad authority within the civilian government space to set requirements for other agencies. **But DHS does not have direct enforcement authority over those departments and agencies**, which has raised issued in particular cases. For example, DHS experienced difficulty in obtaining responses regarding the scope of the Conficker worm attack from different departments and agencies. In addition, **the U.S.-CERT program which is charged with monitoring the security of civilian cyber networks does not have the enforcement authority that it needs to ensure that agencies comply with its recommendations** and mitigation guidance. U.S.-CERT also does not have the authority to compel agencies to deploy technology for determining in real time if a cyber attack is taking place. Sometimes the other agencies cannot meet DHS requirements for valid reasons, such as when they are constrained by their limited resources. But **sometimes the other agencies just ignore DHS since it is a relatively weak department that lacks a means to punish them—such as by withholding funds—for non-compliance**. According to media reports, **the White House has drafted legislation to significantly enhance DHS oversight over all civilian agency computer networks**. the 100-page document is going through interagency review. It reportedly would give DHS many, if not all, of the same authorities for the .gov networks that the Defense Department has for the .mil networks. For example, **DHS would enjoy the same broad hiring authorities as the Defense Department, including the right to make direct hires**, establish compensation rates, and pay additional benefits and incentives. Furthermore, **the draft legislation would give DHS a major role in cybersecurity-related procurements. Given the large volume of cybersecurity software purchased by the federal government, DHS could use this market power to establish and raise de facto standards in the software industry**. **The bill would also authorize the Secretary of DHS to determine what is critical infrastructure, assess audit systems for cyber resilience, and empower third-party accreditors and evaluators to assess the cybersecurity requirements of private sector owners and operators of critical information systems**. A senior accountable official would have to sign and attest that owners and operators of critical infrastructure have developed and implemented effective cybersecurity measures. Third-party evaluators would then review and cross-check these measures.

#### Neg- Regulatory environment makes SMRs too expensive

Lordan 4/16

(Rebecca, asters student at the University of Chicago's Irving B. Harris School of Public Policy Studies where she is focusing on science and technology policy, BA in Chemistry, “Bite-Size Nuclear Reactors: More Than We Can Chew?” Chicago Policy Review, <http://chicagopolicyreview.org/2012/04/16/bite-size-nuclear-reactors-more-than-we-can-chew/>, SEH)

But can these SMRs compete economically with alternative green technologies and with low natural gas prices? Rosner and Goldberg assert that they can, but only under particular economic and regulatory conditions.¶ SMR plants have two major cost advantages over alternative energies: they can be built one module at a time, thereby reducing up-front capital costs, and they can take advantage of existing nuclear infrastructure such as component and equipment facilities.¶ Large-scale reactors are constructed on-site from scratch. As a result, each site requires expensive capital investments and is staffed by a novice local workforce that must learn by doing; costly delays are common due to small errors. In contrast, production of SMRs in a manufacturing facility would benefit from an experienced workforce and machine-controlled precision and could create economies of scale. Under these conditions, SMRs would not only be competitive with carbon-based energy, but would have lower unit-energy prices than other alternative energy options, such as wind, solar photovoltaic, solar thermal, and geothermal, which are less efficient and less reliable and suffer from high capital costs.¶ However, alternative energies do not face the same regulatory challenges as nuclear power. In order to further decrease the costs of SMRs to a competitive level, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) would have to rule in favor of changing license requirements. One such change would be a reduction in the number of onsite staff required at nuclear facilities, which would decrease operating and infrastructure costs.¶ Rosner and Goldberg also outline a variety of ways that the government should support the nascent SMR industry, including cost incentives and market transition strategies to help limit the uncertainty and risk that often deter private investors.¶ The authors map out a five-step business plan beginning with a first-of-a-kind pilot plant and ending with fully developed facilities that have achieved economies of scale. But there is much to do before their plan is realized. While the paper mainly examines SMRs based on economic and manufacturing factors, the regulatory challenges that small reactors face are significant. Despite the country’s history with SMRs, this difficult regulatory environment and anti-nuclear sentiment after the events at Fukushima Dai’ichi will make deploying small modular reactors on the scale the authors imagine a challenge.

#### SMRs being put into place now

PACE 11

(People’s Alliance for Clean Energy, “Smaller Size, Big Price Tag: Small modular reactors are risky” <http://pacevirginia.org/2011/01/12/smaller-size-big-price-tag-small-modular-reactors-are-risky/>, SEH)

Claim: New nuclear power technologies must be part of a future energy plan.¶ Reality: Safe, clean and affordable energy options exist TODAY that do not pose the serious risks that SMR’s or other forms of new nuclear energy technologies do. The United States can already implement energy efficiency measures and produce clean, renewable energy at a cheaper rate than building any type of new nuclear reactor. This can be done here in the Southeast too. Unfortunately, nuclear proponents in the Southeast have shown interest in constructing SMR’s. On November 5, 2010 the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) sent the Nuclear Regulatory Commission a key assumptions letter, which is an introductory step towards the federal licensing of a nuclear power plant. TVA stated that it will seek to construct up to six small 125MW Babcock & Wilcox mPower design modular reactors near Oak Ridge, Tennessee at its Clinch Valley site in Roane County. The NRC sent a reply and meeting with TVA and the NRC was then held on December 14, 2010. Furthermore, Hyperion Power Generation has signed a memorandum of understanding with Savannah River Nuclear Solutions to build a prototype SMR at the Department of Energy’s sprawling Savannah River Site nuclear weapons complex in South Carolina. Other states are also keeping a watchful eye as these “mini-nukes” go through the NRC certification process.