## AT: Don’t increase incentive

#### 1. We meet- we increase an incentive by increasing the availability of rolled in pricing

#### **Rolled in pricing is an incentive**

Spulber 94 (Daniel [Thomas G. Ayers prof of Energy Resource Management and Professor of Management Strategy, Kellogg Graduate School of Management, Northwestern University]; PRICING AND THE INCENTIVE TO INVEST IN PIPELINES AFTER GREAT LAKES; 15 Energy L. J. 377; kdf)

Natural gas pipeline companies invest heavily in expansion of the United States pipeline system. System expansion projects totaled $ 5.7 billion in 1992. In 1993-94 there was more than $ 3.8 billion of construction projects completed or under construction, and an additional $ 5.2 billion proposed and pending, totaling over $ 9 billion. n1 Over 8,000 miles of new pipelines were installed or under construction in 1993. n2 Much of the new investment involves expanding capacity of existing pipelines by constructing parallel pipes that use existing compressors and follow the same right-of-way, a process also known as "looping." Under traditional regulation by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission or FERC), the pipelines have been able to average or "roll in" the costs of expansion, generally raising costs to existing customers. The Great Lakes Gas Transmission Ltd. Partnership (Great Lakes) n3 decision reversed this long-standing policy by requiring new customers to bear the costs of expansion. This article will demonstrate that these alternative regulatory policies have significant consequences for pricing and the incentives to invest in new pipeline construction, and argues that the Great Lakes decision, which is currently under review, should be upheld and extended.To understand the importance of the rolled-in versus incremental pricing debate, it is useful to observe that the existing transmission network with more than 284,000 miles of pipeline has a book value of $ 54 billion. n4 Therefore, expansion of existing facilities represents only a small fraction of total installed capacity in terms of pipeline miles but a much larger fraction of book value. For individual pipelines, expansion costs can far outweigh the book value of capacity. Regulated pricing provides pipelines with an incentive to expand since the costs of construction can be averaged with the existing rate base. The size of the installed base suggests that there are substantial opportunities available to average capacity expansions with existing facilities.

#### 2. Counter-interpretation- The affirmative can reduce restrictions and/or increase incentives

#### The plan removes a barrier

World Bank 5 Gas Flaring Reduction ¶ Projects ¶ Framework for Clean Development ¶ Mechanism (CDM) Baseline Methodologies Revised Printing April 2005 http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTGGFR/Resources/gfrmethodologyno6revised.pdf

Barrier analysis can be thought of as those factors that are outside the direct ¶ control of the project developer and yet impact the project’s likelihood of ¶ implementation. Some of these factors can be economic, such as when the ¶ domestic gas price is controlled by the host government at a level below that ¶ needed to justify the investment in gas recovery. The fiscal regime may be ¶ designed for oil and thus provide de facto disincentives for gas recovery or even ¶ assign the ownership of the gas to a different entity than the operators of the field. ¶ A lack of access to capital may prevent project implementation (regardless of the ¶ project’s economic attractiveness). ¶ • A proposed new technology may have higher technological and ¶ implementation risk, higher operating cost, less experience, and ¶ greater performance uncertainty than the baseline technology. ¶ • Local market conditions, institutional weaknesses, or structural ¶ issues (for example, lack of open access to the gas transmission ¶ lines) could prevent implementation of certain projects. ¶ • Limited information, managerial resources, organizational ¶ capacity, and so on could affect project implementation. ¶ Barrier analysis can be a critical factor in justifying many CDM GFR projects but ¶ are, by nature, specific to the area, regime, or type of project. Thus, a ¶ methodology needs to identify and provide a general means to analyze and ¶ measure the impact of such barriers in determining the baseline scenario.

#### Reasons to prefer

#### A. Literature Checks- our evidence is from energy specialist at Northwestern and MIT

#### B. Ground- the affirmative allows for affs to discuss the pricing mechanisms in relation to energy production—no reason this under limits the topic

#### C. Their interpretation over-limits the topic by only allowing the removal of a barrier OR an increase of incentives---not both

#### Evaluate topicality through reasonability and don’t vote on potential abuse

## CASE

#### A lack of pipeline infrastructure has made it more cost effective to flare natural gas than to capture it. According to Rueters 12 this increases the emissions of natural gas by 350 percent. Our Nigerian Compass evidence indicates the flaring releases chemicals, destroys vegetation, and causes acid rain.

#### This advantage outweighs their impacts on:

#### Timeframe- our Clayton and Reuters evidence indicate that there are thousands of new wells coming online in the coming years, at the same time the impacts of flaring are already being felt

#### Magnitude- flaring causes extinction through acid rain and warming. Acid rain destroys the food chain by raising the PH level of the ocean to an unsustainable point and destroying vegetation and soil. Temperature rise leads to feedbacks, causing sea level rise, crop loss, and the death of billions, ultimately leaving the earth uninhabitable.

#### Probability- science is on our side that climate change is anthropogenic and can be dramatically reduced with pipeline infrastructure, our Friedman evidence is the tie breaker—if there is a one percent chance we can reduce warming, we should do so because the magnitude is so large and certain

### AT: Other Countries

#### Flaring is decreasing in other countries- that’s our Clayton and Reuters evidence

#### Extend Friedman it’s try or die—any decrease in emissions is a good thing

1. **If the US doesn’t take the lead no one else will—guarantees extinction**

**Pascual and Zambetakis 2010** (Carlos [US Ambassador to Mexico, Served as VP of foreign policy @ Brookings] and Evie [Brookings]; The Geopolitics of Energy: From Security to Survival; Energy Security; 26-27; kdf)

Among these groups, **the United States has the capacity to play a pivotal**¶ **role**. **China and India will not move toward more proactive domestic**¶ **policies if the United States does not set the example**. Along with Europe¶ and Japan, the United States has the capacity to demonstrate that green¶ technology and conservation can be compatible with growth and a foreign¶ policy that is more independent of energy suppliers. T**he United States also stands to benefit from accelerated commercialization of green technologies**¶ **and the development of global markets in energy-efficient and**¶ **clean energy technologies**. **The ability of the United States to lead**, however,¶ **will depend on domestic action-on whether it will undertake on a**¶ **national basis a systematic strategy to price carbon and curb emissions**. If¶ it does the scale and importance of the U.S. market can be a driver for¶ global change. **If it fails to act, then the United States will find that over**¶ **time the opportunity for leadership to curb climate change will be replaced**¶ **by the need for crisis management as localized wars, migration, poverty,**¶ **and humanitarian catastrophes increasingly absorb international attention**¶ **and resources.** Eventually**, its failure to act will come back to U.S.**¶ **borders in a way that will make the Katrina disaster seem relatively tame.**

## CP

**Fiating the 50 states is bad and a voting issue for competitive equity:**

A. Not Predictable: They can’t prove a single instance where all 50 states acted together on the plan issue or subsidies.

B. Education: It avoids the substance of the aff to debate out agents. We only learn about the net-benefits, not the case or topic issues. Even if the “States CP” has been around forever doesn’t make it good.

C. Justifies Object Fiat: If you can fiat 50 states acting together, then there’s no reason they couldn’t fiat 10 countries and claim disarm. Allows them to functionally ban the plan so no Aff could win

D. It’s an agent pic: These are uniquely bad for competitive equity because we can never predict all the possible agents and it forces us to debate against the Aff to garner offense

Err aff on theory – the negative gets the block and more diverse strategic options

## DA

### Obama will lose- his supporters are jumping ship

**Medved 7/24** (Michael, a member of USA TODAY's Board of Contributors, “Column: Obama's uphill re-election bid”, ([http://www.usatoday.com/news/opinion/forum/story/2012-07-24/medved-obama-reelection-chances/56462732/1)CD](http://www.usatoday.com/news/opinion/forum/story/2012-07-24/medved-obama-reelection-chances/56462732/1%29CD))

In contrast, several of Obama's hope-and-change boosters have deserted his cause and in some cases enlisted with the opposition. [Artur Davis](http://content.usatoday.com/communities/onpolitics/post/2012/05/artur-davis-party-switch-democrat-virginia-/1%22%20%5Cl%20%22.UAyFWaDmWnI%22%20%5Ct%20%22popup729), three-term Alabama congressman and [Congressional Black Caucus](http://content.usatoday.com/topics/topic/Congressional%2BBlack%2BCaucus) member, delivered a seconding speech for Obama in 2008, but he now backs Romney and has changed his registration to Republican. West Virginia Democratic Sen. [Joe Manchin](http://content.usatoday.com/topics/topic/People/Politicians%2C%2BGovernment%2BOfficials%2C%2BStrategists/Governors%2C%2BMayors/Joe%2BManchin), a former governor, says [he can't commit](http://content.usatoday.com/communities/onpolitics/post/2012/06/obama-manchin-rahall-west-virginia-convention-charlotte/1%22%20%5Cl%20%22.UA1yAqDmWnJ%22%20%5Ct%20%22popup729) to supporting Obama this time, and the state's incumbent governor, Earl Ray Tomblin, expressed similar sentiments. [Colin Powell](http://content.usatoday.com/topics/topic/People/Politicians%2C%2BGovernment%2BOfficials%2C%2BStrategists/Colin%2BPowell), who proudly joined the Obama's first historic campaign for the White House, insists he [remains uncommitted](http://content.usatoday.com/communities/theoval/post/2012/05/powell-declines-to-endorse-obama/1%22%20%5Cl%20%22.UA1zbqDmWnI%22%20%5Ct%20%22popup729) in 2012. Meanwhile, the tight national polling shows static or declining enthusiasm for Obama in the key constituent groups that made up 2008's victorious coalition. The president still commands big leads among young people, Jewish voters, union households and unmarried women — but his numbers are down from last time. Even among African-American voters, where candidate Obama drew 95% of the vote in 2008, his backing looks less unanimous and enthusiastic, indicating potentially reduced turnout. The president holds his own with Hispanics (thanks to his new emphasis on immigration) but can't expect significant improvement on the 67% he scored last time. Four years ago, Obama won Catholic voters, but recent polls show this key swing constituency either evenly divided or tilting toward Romney. If the president doesn't compensate for inevitable losses by adding new supporters, he's certain to lose the election: His vote total last time (nearly 52.9% against John McCain) doesn't provide a comfortable cushion against a more formidable opponent and more unified GOP. Democratic strategists must identify elements of the electorate where they can add new votes over 2008 rather than struggling on every front to limit their losses. That's why the president's own prediction of an election "even closer than the last" might have unwittingly revealed his underlying pessimism in approaching November. He broke tradition and made history in 2008 by becoming the first non-white candidate elected to national office. It's also conceivable that he could discredit Romney thoroughly enough to become the only president to win a second term with reduced rather than enhanced support. But the odds, and records of all past campaigns, show that accepting fewer votes in a bid for re-election amounts to a formula for sure defeat rather than a blue-print for narrow victory

### JOBS ARE KEY – IT’S THE LAST THING THE VOTERS WILL CONSIDER BEFORE THE ELECTION

**HUNT – June 11th 2012** (albert r. is the Washington Editor of Bloomberg News “Obama-Romney contest could be shaped by these milestones” <http://www.washingtonpost.com/business/obama-romney-contest-could-be-shaped-by-these-milestones/2012/06/10/gJQAviaVSV_story.html?tid=pm_business_pop> //k)

**Nov. 2: The unemployment data for October is released. Voters’ sense of economic security will be well formed by the eve of the election. Yet with dueling messages -- Obama claiming the economy is improving and Romney saying it isn’t -- a highly publicized jobs report four days before the election could be psychologically important.**

**The focus will be on whether the trend is generally positive, with unemployment moving down a little, or basically negative, with joblessness increasing.**

If the rate is in the neighborhood of the high sevens, or below 8 percent, “people will start saying maybe things are getting better,” Davis says. “If it’s going back up, it may be over.” Last month, the jobless rate rose to 8.2 percent from 8.1 percent.

### **Iran Strikes limits civilian casualties and eliminates the possibility of a nuclear Iran**

Kroening 2012 (Matthew [assistant professor of Government at Georgetown University and a Stanton Nuclear Security Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations]; Time to Attack Iran; <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/136917/matthew-kroenig/time-to-attack-iran?page=show>; kdf)

Even if the United States managed to identify all of Iran’s nuclear plants, however, actually destroying them could prove enormously difficult. Critics of a U.S. assault argue that Iran’s nuclear facilities are dispersed across the country, buried deep underground and hardened against attack, and ringed with air defenses, making a raid complex and dangerous. In addition, they claim that Iran has purposefully placed its nuclear facilities near civilian populations, which would almost certainly come under fire in a U.S. raid, potentially leading to hundreds, if not thousands, of deaths. These obstacles, however, would not prevent the United States from disabling or demolishing Iran’s known nuclear facilities. A preventive operation would need to target the uranium-conversion plant at Isfahan, the heavy-water reactor at Arak, and various centrifuge-manufacturing sites near Natanz and Tehran, all of which are located aboveground and are highly vulnerable to air strikes. It would also have to hit the Natanz facility, which, although it is buried under reinforced concrete and ringed by air defenses, would not survive an attack from the U.S. military’s new bunker-busting bomb, the 30,000-pound Massive Ordnance Penetrator, capable of penetrating up to 200 feet of reinforced concrete. The plant in Qom is built into the side of a mountain and thus represents a more challenging target. But the facility is not yet operational and still contains little nuclear equipment, so if the United States acted quickly, it would not need to destroy it. Attempting to manage a nuclear-armed Iran is not only a terrible option but the worst. Washington would also be able to limit civilian casualties in any campaign. Iran built its most critical nuclear plants, such as the one in Natanz, away from heavily populated areas. For those less important facilities that exist near civilian centers, such as the centrifuge-manufacturing sites, U.S. precision-guided missiles could pinpoint specific buildings while leaving their surroundings unscathed. The United States could reduce the collateral damage even further by striking at night or simply leaving those less important plants off its target list at little cost to the overall success of the mission. Although Iran would undoubtedly publicize any human suffering in the wake of a military action, the majority of the victims would be the military personnel, engineers, scientists, and technicians working at the facilities.

### Empirics prove no spillover

Drum 2007 (Kevin Drum, Staff Writer for the Washington Monthly, 9/9/’7 http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/archives/individual/2007\_09/012029.php)

Having admitted, however, that the odds of a military success in Iraq are almost impossibly long, Chaos Hawks nonetheless insist that the U.S. military needs to stay in Iraq for the foreseeable future. Why? Because if we leave the entire Middle East will become a bloodbath. Sunni and Shiite will engage in mutual genocide, oil fields will go up in flames, fundamentalist parties will take over, and al-Qaeda will have a safe haven bigger than the entire continent of Europe. Needless to say, this is nonsense. Israel has fought war after war in the Middle East. Result: no regional conflagration. Iran and Iraq fought one of the bloodiest wars of the second half the 20th century. Result: no regional conflagration. The Soviets fought in Afghanistan and then withdrew. No regional conflagration. The U.S. fought the Gulf War and then left. No regional conflagration. Algeria fought an internal civil war for a decade. No regional conflagration.

### Middle East war solves warming

CETRON AND DAVIES SEPTEMBER 1 2007 (Marvin, president of Forecasting International Ltd.; Owen, former senior editor at Omni magazine and freelance writer, The Futurist)

Coal gasification. In an effort to wean the United States off foreign oil, the Department of Energy has mounted a substantial R&D program for coal gasification. A gasification pilot plant is expected toenter operation in 2010, and the zero-emissions FutureGen power plant, based on an advanced gasifier, is scheduled to begin producing electricity and hydrogen a few years later. Nothing can make coal miningenvironmentally friendly, but these technologies at least reduce thegreenhouse and respiratory impact of burning coal for power. The gasification program will be one of the first alternative energy programs to be accelerated in time of Middle Eastern war. Coupled with consumer trends toward plug-in hybrid cars, real opportunities for energy efficiency exist through coal power. [ILLUSTRATION OMITTED] \* Renewables. We can expect a much stronger push for renewable energy as well. Given the proper incentives--and a world oil shortage seems likely to qualify--solar, wind, and other renewable power technologies already have proven useful.