When the mills evidence says that the problem is not in my back yard is codified as not in my black yard or place in blacks’ back yards, our advocacy says no to that. When Mills says blacks ust refuse their status to refuse the racialization of waste disposal that’s what the counterplan does.

Other than their arguments about black music, or about starting from a politics of addressing blackness – there’s really no reason why our advocacy is wrong.

The type of externalitie s of nuclear power

Nuclear provides more energy addresses – a lot of the issues with coal

Hook and Aleklett 09 (Mikael Höök\*, Kjell Aleklett. Uppsala University, Global Energy Systems, Department of physics and astronomy)

(Published in International Journal of Coal Geology Volume 78, Issue 3, 1 May 2009, Pages 201-216 http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.coal.2009.03.002 “Historical trends in American coal production and a possible future outlook” http://www.piacenza361.it/doc/USA\_Coal.pdf)

Future coal production will not be entirely determined by what is geologically available, but rather by the fraction of that amount that is practically recoverable. Society demands energy, not energy from coal. This means if this energy can be obtained less costly and more practically from other energy sources, potentially nuclear power or wind, those will be favored. Increased coal prices do not necessarily lead to increased production, increased reserves, and the transformation of resources into reserves. The price development and feasibility of other energy sources must also be considered, since it is the energy that is demanded. Increased coal prices might therefore also be a burden for the industry as investors may move towards cheaper energy sources. Increased concern around CO2 emissions from coal is likely to decrease coal's price competitiveness, because of the potential from CO2-taxes and increased costs of carbon-capture and storage (CCS). A closer discussion of this is beyond the scope of this study, but has been performed by others (Kavouridis and Koukouzas, 2008). There is a common belief in some form of self-regulating coal supply cycle (Thielemann et al., 2007), where increased prices and human ingenuity will automatically lead to reserve growth and higher production. Our results suggest that this theory should be reevaluated

#### Temporary storage solves nuclear waste

Cadenas 12 (Juan José Gómez Cadenas – Spanish National Research Council and University of Valencia.)

(“Nuclear Power, No Thanks?” The Nuclear Environmentalist. Pg. 103-124 http://www.springerlink.com/content/r17kwp1415285034/)

Temporary Storage

We have already seen that the spent fuel is kept in the pools of the nuclear plants for 10–30 years, where its radioactivity diminishes by a factor of at least 100. One of the exaggerated complaints that is often voiced is the ‘‘serious problem’’ of waste being stored in the power plants. In fact the only problem is space, because the storage pools eventually fill up and part of the fuel has to be taken out. But the longer it remains in the pools, the lower its radioactivity, and the easier it is to handle. Keeping the waste in temporary storage also means that it may be possible to reprocess it at some moment.

Temporary waste stores are designed to withstand all kind of disasters, including floods, tornadoes, missiles and extreme temperature changes. When the waste is put in dry barrels after ten or more years in the pool, the double layer shielding of the container stops gamma radiation completely; only heat (equivalent to household heating) is released to the outside.

Coal Impacts

Saves lives by trading off with coal air pollutants

Jessica Lovering, Ted Nordhaus, and Michael Shellenberger are policy analyst, chairman, and president of the Breakthrough Institute, a public policy think tank and research organization, 9/7/2012 (http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/09/07/out\_of\_the\_nuclear\_closet?page=full)

About 100,000 people die every year due to exposure to air pollutants from the burning of coal. By contrast, about 4,000 people have died from nuclear energy – ever

Coal is causing global warming

Roberts 12 (David Roberts is a staff writer for Grist writes on energy politics and policy. MA in philosophy @ UMT)

(“The only good coal is coal left in the ground” http://grist.org/coal/the-only-good-coal-is-coal-left-in-the-ground/)

Coal disproportionately hurts the disadvantaged

Patterson 11 (These comments were submitted by Jacqueline Patterson, environmental and climate director for NAACP.)

(7/22/11 “We Need to Wean Ourselves Off Coal” http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2011/07/whither-coalfired-power.php

Warming causes poverty.

Caney 08 [Simon, Department of Politics and International Relations, Oxford University, UK Human rights, climate change, and discounting Environmental Politics, Volume 17, Issue 4 August 2008 , pages 536 - 555]

Coal might be the worst case of environmental racism – it doesn’t make rational or economic sense for the government – yet they continue to support it and hurt the disenfranchised.

Fieldstone 11 (Josh Fieldstone is a J.D. candidate, May 2013, at American University Washington

College of Law.)

(A Case for the United States’ Opposition of International and Domestic Coal Subsidies. Sustainable Development Law & Policy. Fall 2011)

Even though the United States’ short term interests favor coal subsidies, its long term interest are against them. Some of the downsides of coal use are immediately tangible such as harm to the environment25 and health hazards to those working at coal facilities.26 Still, perhaps the most pressing concern is its effect on climate change.27 A recent study of Harvard’s Center for Health and the Global Environment found that the total external cost—the negative effect of an economic activity on a third party—of United States’ coal-use28 could amount to $523 billion annually.29 The National Resource Council found the external costs to be $120 billion even without generally taking coal’s effect on climate change into account.30 In light of these long-term realities, the United Sates should oppose coal subsidies domestically by terminating the tax credit for production of nonconventional fuels and internationally by pressuring the IBRD to refrain from giving any further loans to coal projects. By subsidizing coal now and leaving the greater cost of externalities for the future, the United States is supporting an economically and socially irresponsible position. Ending the existing tax credit and pressuring the IBRD would help mitigate coal’s effect on climate change, catapult the United States as a credible leader on the climate change debate, and protect the United States from the predicted economic losses that far outweigh its current problems.

Plant hurting Navajo is just an example

Physicians for social responsibility 09 (Barb Gottlieb and Julia Pflaum, intern)

(Coal Poses Environmental Justice Issues http://www.psr.org/environment-and-health/code-black/blog/coal-poses-ej-issues.html)

PSR recently joined environmental and Native American groups in raising a legal challenge to a proposed coal-fired power plant slated for construction on a Navajo reservation in northwest New Mexico. The Desert Rock plant, a huge facility with a planned capacity of 1,500 Megawatts, would pose serious threats to the health of the area’s largely Navajo population.

In response, PRS filed an amicus curiae (“friend of the court”) brief objecting to the plant’s likely health impacts from coal pollution. We also filed separate comments addressing the plant’s carbon dioxide emissions, their contribution to global warming, and the resulting threats to health. More on that in a future post.

The Desert Rock plant raises important issues of environmental justice. The noxious health effects of pollutants like those from coal often inflict disproportionate impacts on low-income communities of color. Sensitive subgroups — like children, the elderly, and people with certain preexisting health problems — are at even greater risk of harm.

For example, people with diabetes have been found to be particularly susceptible to cardiovascular disease. Since 22.9 percent of American Indian adults 20 years or older have diabetes,i,ii this is a particular concern for the Navajo Nation. A study conducted specifically about the proposed Desert Rock plant reported that

The rate of cardiovascular complications for individuals with diabetes ranges from 35-38%, and these types of complications are more likely to occur with exposure to many of the pollutants from coal-burning facilities. …Given the high rate of diabetes in the Navajo population, the risk pool of persons likely to be at high risk for cardiovascular and pulmonary complications from coal-fired electricity plants will be 2.5-3 times higher than the general population.iii

Construction of the plant also raises concern in regard to Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD), a condition in which the lung’s airway passages are permanently narrowed. Exposure to air pollutants plays an important role in the development of COPD, and the Desert Rock plant would expose Navajo people living in the area to increased pollutants and particulate matter. COPD is already the sixth leading cause of death from chronic disease for Native American men and the seventh leading cause of death for Native American women,iv so the increased exposure would be cause for alarm.