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# Inherency

#### The Energy Policy Act of 2005 only designated the DOI as the lead federal agency for OSW development- other federal agencies retained permitting authority and jurisdiction

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]

While several issues regarding the sufficiency of a Corps permit for offshore wind energy development along the OCS were being litigated60, the Energy Policy Act of 2005 was enacted. Section 388 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 eliminates the regulatory uncertainty surrounding offshore wind energy development by establishing explicit authority for permitting renewable energy and related uses of the OCS.62 Section 388 amends the OCSLA by adding subsection 43 U.S.C. § 1337(p)(1), which authorizes the Secretary of the Interior (Secretary), in consultation with other relevant agencies, to grant leases, easements, or rights-of-way on the OCS for specific activities, including wind energy development.63 In essence, it entrusts the Department of the Interior (Department) with the authority to grant offshore property interests for the purpose of renewable energy development on the OCS and the authority to regulate activities resulting from such development.

The Act creates a framework that shifts authority to the Department without completely striping all other agencies of their authority. It is careful to make clear that federal agencies with permitting authority under other federal laws still retain their jurisdiction, notwithstanding the enactment of section 388.64 Thus, the offshore developments will be subject to multiple permitting requirements.65 Despite the care taken to preserve other agencies’ permitting authority, the Act fails to designate a lead agency to coordinate federal permitting and prepare NEPA analyses. The Department, however, infers from several of section 388’s provisions that it is to serve as the lead agency. For example, the Secretary is directed to consult with other agencies during the process of awarding leases, easements, or rights-of-way.66 Also, the Department must ensure that activities carried out under this new authority provide for coordination with relevant federal agencies.67 Therefore, federal agencies may retain their permitting authority over offshore renewable energy development but the Department serves as the lead agency.

# Plan

#### The United States federal government should give exclusive permitting authority to the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management for the production of offshore wind power in the United States.

# Solvency

#### Federal permitting consolidation is key to circumvent opposition to OSW and create certainty - state action is insufficient- opponents will just challenge at the federal level

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 regulatory certainty and timeframe necessary for OSW investment decisions- placing authority under the department of the interior’s lead agency is essential

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 cost drops are inevitable, but the US market is frozen because it lacks clarity- the plan breaks the impasse by lowering risk and creating certainty

Navigant Group 12

[private market consulting group awarded DOE grant for preparing an analysis on OSW manufacturing and supply chains in the US, Dec 12, 2012, accessed from:

<http://www.thebioenergysite.com/articles/1349/us-offshore-wind-manufacturing-and-supply-chain-development> //wyo-tjc]

The supply chain is evolving in a number of areas. Larger rotors allow for increased energy capture and production. Next-generation drivetrains will result in increasing turbine efficiency and reliability. Offshore wind towers in the future may employ concrete, composites, or other alternative materials to help combat corrosion and reduce steel content while simultaneously enabling taller hub heights. Shifting to High-Voltage Direct Current (HVDC) interconnection lines will reduce electrical losses, and higher voltage array cabling and larger turbines will allow for project layouts that minimize array cabling needs. Such advancements will help to reverse the recent trend of increasing offshore wind power prices, which are driven largely by a movement toward deeper-water sites located farther offshore; increased siting complexity; and higher contingency reserves that result from greater uncertainty when working in the offshore environment. As the industry matures and uncertainties are reduced, both capital costs and the levelized cost of electricity (LCOE) from offshore wind facilities are expected to plateau and trend downward. The potential exists for significant domestic supply of a future US offshore wind market. A lack of current US offshore demand means no domestic manufacturing facilities are currently serving the offshore wind market. However, strong domestic supply capacity for the US land-based wind market suggests that potential also exists to supply significant portions of the future offshore market domestically. The magnitude of US-based offshore wind manufacturing capacity will depend on turbine suppliers perceiving stable, long-term policy support and subsequent demand for offshore wind in the US market. Three major barriers combine to have a dampening effect on the development of the US offshore wind supply chain: the high cost of offshore wind energy; infrastructure challenges such as transmission and purpose-built ports and vessels; and regulatory challenges such as new and uncertain leasing and permitting processes. The result is that European and Asian suppliers who are currently supplying offshore wind turbines and components have a competitive advantage over their US counterparts. The US offshore wind industry faces a “chicken-and-egg” problem where plants will not be built unless the cost is reduced, and local factories (which will help bring down the cost) will not be built until there is a proven domestic market. In deciding whether to enter the US offshore wind market, potential suppliers will assess the supply and demand dynamics. Suppliers will assess whether the market will be large enough to warrant dedicating manufacturing capacity to offshore wind-related products.

European-based suppliers will use demand forecasts to determine whether it is financially attractive to build manufacturing plants in the US On the supply side, potential suppliers will assess the competitive rivalry, the barriers to entry, and the risk for each component. Market entry will be more attractive with higher fragmentation, lower barriers to entry, and lower overall risk.

# Ports

**Changes to port infrastructure NOT coming now**

**Paul Davidson,12**

“USA's creaking infrastructure holds back economy” <http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/money/economy/story/2012-05-20/creaking-infrastructure/55096396/1>, accessed 10/28/12,WY/JF

**The shortcomings were** partly **masked during the recession as fewer Americans worked and less freight was shipped, easing traffic on transportation corridors**. **But interviews with shippers and logistics companies show delays are starting to lengthen along with the moderately growing economy**. "I call this a stealth attack on our economy," says Janet Kavinoky, executive director of transportation and infrastructure for the [U.S. Chamber of Commerce](http://content.usatoday.com/topics/topic/Organizations/Political%2BBodies/United%2BStates%2BChamber%2Bof%2BCommerce). "It's not like an immediate crisis. It's something that's sneaking up on us." **Freight bottlenecks and other congestion cost about $200 billion a year, or 1.6% of U.S. economic output**, according to a report last year by Building America's Future Educational Fund, a bipartisan coalition of elected officials. **The chamber of commerce estimates such costs are as high as $1 trillion annually, or 7% of the economy**. **Yet, there's little prospect for more infrastructure investment as a divided Congress battles about how to cut the $1.3 trillion federal deficit, and state and local governments face their own budget shortfalls**. Government investment in highways, bridges, water systems, schools and other projects has fallen each year since 2008. [IHS Global Insight](http://content.usatoday.com/topics/topic/IHS%2BGlobal%2BInsight)expects such outlays to drop 4.4% this year and 3% in 2013.

**Offshore wind key to port revitalization and manufacturing**

**LEED ‘12**

[Lake Erie Energy Development Corporation, “Ports and Maritime” 8.8.2012. <http://www.leedco.org/why-offshore/ports>//wyo-hdm]

**The scale and magnitude of offshore** [**wind energy**](http://www.leedco.org/why-offshore/ports) **requires a significant amount of maritime capabilities, capacity, and onshore land availability. As the industry launch pad and staging area for all installation and assembly activity, port revitalization is an essential backbone to a thriving offshore industry. This includes a number of vessels and shipbuilding activity required to service the industry**. To this end, Ohio's ports could sustain its own industry in addition to projects in other states and Canada. Here's a look at the landscape of Ohio's existing ports. In 1999, Germany’s ports became involved in offshore wind for the same reasons Ohio is seeking out today. Offshore wind is a plays a role in reversing the rapid decline of its ports' productivity**. Similarly, with decline of the manufacturing and steel presence** in Northeast Ohio, the region can benefit from an industry with a variety of maritime activities, raw material needs, and port facilities; all to the benefit of the local economy. According to TeamNEO, Ohio has six deepwater ports. **Offshore wind is one of the few industries of current relevance which offers the scale of development to bring about significant revitalization while employing thousands.** Multiple German ports are involved at various levels ([see report, page 2](http://www.gtai.de/GTAI/Content/EN/Invest/_SharedDocs/Downloads/GTAI/Fact-sheets/Energy-environmental/fact-sheet-wind-energy-in-germany%2Cproperty%3Dpdf%2Cbereich%3Dgtai%2Csprache%3Den%2Crwb%3Dtrue.pdf)). **A similar model for Ohio is realistic as no single port can support an entire industry simply based on space constraints. This, in effect, guarantees** (what is already a multi-county regional economic development project**) a more efficient build out**, across Ohio's North shore. Commercial scale farms will require [a network](http://www.leedco.org/why-offshore/ports) of supporting facilities. While location drives logistics, outfitting one port for a particular use may not be economically feasible for the same purpose at an adjacent county. Therefore it is likely one port may specialize in foundation construction and another in turbine assembly. Beyond Ohio, the entire Great Lakes is outfitted with suitable ports for offshore wind. Check out an inventory of all the ports in a report called [The Role of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway Ports in the Advancement of the Wind Energy Industry](http://www.glc.org/energy/wind/pdf/GLWC-PortSurvey-2010-web.pdf) by the Great Lakes Wind Collaborative. A similar infrastructural inventory was completed in [Massachusetts.](http://masscec.com/masscec/file/MA%20Port%20Study%20Final%20Report_4-20-10.pdf)

**The U.S. can’t compete without ports, increasing domestic energy production is also key**

**Peter Marber, 11/9**

is an adjunct associate professor of International and Public Affairs at Columbia University “How the United States Can Maintain Its Global Edge” <http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2012/11/how-the-united-states-can-maintain-its-global-edge/265011/>, accessed 11/15/12,WYO/JF

**New infrastructure** and energy production: **We can't compete using** [**crumbling** bridges, roads, and **ports**](http://www.infrastructurereportcard.org/)**. American infrastructure is ranked 25th globally**, according to the Global Competitiveness Report. **Equally important is expanding our domestic energy production** capabilities -- from fracking to **renewables -- which would reduce imports, lower electricity costs, reshore lost manufacturing, and boost employment**. **Combined,** **these could be game-changers and reverse America's 30-year decline in trade.** Michael Lind and Sherle Schwenninger of the New America Foundation have called for a federal Works Progress Administration-style infrastructure bank to help finance more than $2 trillion over five years. **With interest rates low, and returns on infrastructure high, there may never be a better time.**

**Ports are key to exports – they are the biggest internal link to the global supply chain, and current infrastructure vulnerable to a terrorist attack**

**Giermanski and Hains ‘12**

[JIM and Laura, Homeland Security Today.us, “Supply Chain Security And DHS Oversight,” 6.5.2012. <[http://www.hstoday.us/blogs/guest-commentaries/blog/supply-chain-security-and-dhs oversight/55079ca7058f8f48ad6ba50411635596.html](http://www.hstoday.us/blogs/guest-commentaries/blog/supply-chain-security-and-dhs%20oversight/55079ca7058f8f48ad6ba50411635596.html)>//wyo-hdm]

Securing the global supply chain system is integral to securing both the lives of people around the world and to maintaining the stability of the global economy. **We must work to strengthen the security, efficiency and resilience of this critical system. Supply chains must be able to operate effectively in a secure and efficient fashion in a time of crisis,** be able to recover quickly from disruptions, and continue to facilitate international trade and travel. In her April 25, 2012 testimony before a Senate Committee on the Judiciary hearing on oversight of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), DHS Secretary Janet Napolitano structured her testimony to cover: Preventing terrorism and enhancing security; Securing and managing our borders; Enforcing and administering our immigration laws; and Safeguarding and securing cyberspace. Assuming that “securing the global supply chain system is integral to securing both the lives of people around the world, an maintaining the stability of the global economy,” Napolitano said little on global supply chain security that reflected accurate or complete information in view of its enormity and importance. **In 2010 (**the latest year of data available), **the statistics of waterborne container trade by customs ports revealed that almost 28 million twenty-foot equivalent units (TEUs) passed through our water ports**. By weight measurement in thousands of short tons, one can see that 76 percent of international trade for the United States passes through water ports, alone. Truck and rail constitute 21 percent, while air cargo constitutes only one-half of one percent. Government agencies, research entities and consultants confirm the role and importance of seaports and their value to our economy. Their value may have best been expressed by Bethann Rooney, the manager of ports security for the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, in 2005. **Rooney said 95 percent of the international goods that come into the country come in through our nation’s 361 ports**. Twelve percent of that volume is handled in the Port of New York and New Jersey alone, the third largest port in the country. The port generates 229,000 jobs and $10 billion in wages throughout the region. Additionally, the port contributes $2.1 billion to state and local tax revenues and $24.4 billion to the US gross domestic product. Cargo handled at the port serves 80 million people -- or 35 percent of the entire US population. In 2004, the port handled over 5,200 ship calls, 4.478 million TEUs (which is approximately 7,300 containers each day), 728,720 autos and 80.6 million tons of general cargo. **Today, international trade accounts for 30 percent of the US economy.** Consequently, it’s easy to see how a terrorist incident in our nation’s ports or along the cargo supply chain would have a devastating effect on our country and its economy. **Indeed, given the size and magnitude of use of containers and trailers to carry weapons of mass destruction (WMD) through our sensitive and vulnerable port system, the supply chain is the single most important and potentially devastating vulnerability to a terrorist attack**. Meanwhile, the vulnerability is increased by the lack of appropriate training that’s given to Customs and Border Protection (CBP) in the supply chain arena. In 2012, CBP admitted that there could be a serious vulnerability within the US in-bond cargo program regarding the contents, access and whereabouts of in-bond cargo shipments.

**Economic decline causes protectionism and war – their defense doesn’t assume accompanying shifts in global power.**

**Royal 10** – Jedediah Royal, Director of Cooperative Threat Reduction at the U.S. Department of Defense, 2010, “Economic Integration, Economic Signaling and the Problem of Economic Crises,” in Economics of War and Peace: Economic, Legal and Political Perspectives, ed. Goldsmith and Brauer, p. 213-215

Less intuitive is how periods of economic decline may increase the likelihood of external conflict. Political science literature has contributed a moderate degree of attention to the impact of economic decline and the security and defense behavior of interdependent states. Research in this vein has been considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow. First, on the systemic level, Pollins (2008) advances Modelski and Thompson’s (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, finding that rhythms in the global economy are associated with the rise and fall of a pre-eminent power and the often bloody transition from one pre-eminent leader to the next. As such, exogenous shocks such as economic crisis could usher in a redistribution of relative power (see also Gilpin, 1981) that leads to uncertainty about power balances, increasing the risk of miscalculation (Fearon, 1995). Alternatively, even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflict as a rising power may seek to challenge a declining power (Werner, 1999). Seperately, Pollins (1996) also shows that global economic cycles combined with parallel leadership cycles impact the likelihood of conflict among major, medium and small powers, although he suggests that the causes and connections between global economic conditions and security conditions remain unknown. Second, on a dyadic level, Copeland’s (1996, 2000) theory of trade expectations suggests that ‘future expectation of trade’ is a significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behavious of states. He argues that interdependent states are likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations, However, if the expectations of future trade decline, particularly for difficult to replace items such as energy resources, the likelihood for conflict increases, as states will be inclined to use force to gain access to those resources. Crisis could potentially be the trigger for decreased trade expectations either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states. Third, others have considered the link between economic decline and external armed conflict at a national level. Blomberg and Hess (2002) find a strong correlation between internal conflict and external conflict, particularly during periods of economic downturn. They write, The linkages between internal and external conflict and prosperity are strong and mutually reinforcing. Economic conflict tends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn returns the favor. Moreover, the presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which international and external conflict self-reinforce each other. (Blomberg & Hess, 2002. P. 89) Economic decline has been linked with an increase in the likelihood of terrorism (Blomberg, Hess, & Weerapana, 2004), which has the capacity to spill across borders and lead to external tensions. Furthermore, crises generally reduce the popularity of a sitting government. ‘Diversionary theory’ suggests that, when facing unpopularity arising from economic decline, sitting governments have increase incentives to fabricate external military conflicts to create a ‘rally around the flag’ effect. Wang (1996), DeRouen (1995), and Blomberg, Hess, and Thacker (2006) find supporting evidence showing that economic decline and use of force are at least indirectly correlated. Gelpi (1997), Miller (1999), and Kisangani and Pickering (2009) suggest that the tendency towards diversionary tactics are greater for democratic states than autocratic states, due to the fact that democratic leaders are generally more susceptible to being removed from office due to lack of domestic support. DeRouen (2000) has provided evidence showing that periods of weak economic performance in the United States, and thus weak Presidential popularity, are statistically linked to an increase in the use of force. In summary, recent economic scholarship positively correlated economic integration with an increase in the frequency of economic crises, whereas political science scholarship links economic decline with external conflict at systemic, dyadic and national levels. This implied connection between integration, crisis and armed conflict has not featured prominently in the economic-security debate and deserves more attention.

**Trade prevents war: economic stakes give reasons to avoid conflict**

**Kleinberg et al 12**

(Katja, Binghampton University, Gregory Robinson, Binghampton University, Stewart French, Saginaw Valley State University, Journal of Politics, “Trade Concentration and Interstate Conflict, April 1, 2012, accessed via Academic Search Premiere//wyo-mm)

In the most commonly cited formulation of the liberal peace, the argument begins with the notion that **trade between states is (mutually) beneﬁcial**. In general, **specialization due to trade is** thought **to allow for greater consumption and to facilitate economic growth at the national level**. Within states, **ﬁrms and individuals involved in international trade realize welfare gains. These actors** in turn **develop a stake in the** continuation and **expansion of trade**. **To the extent** that **armed conﬂict with a particular trading partner would jeopardize welfare gains, governments and societal actors have incentives to avoid conﬂict**. In part through concerns about welfare losses and, depending on regime type, through concerns about the political repercussions associated with such losses, **trade** thus **paciﬁes interstate relations**. Arguments derived from this general proposition often center on the salience of the particular dyadic trade relation, suggesting that more intensive trade is associated with greater prospective losses from conﬂict. Larger opportunity costs in turn generate greater constraints on the foreign policy of trading states.

**Offshore wind would revitalize weak US ports and shipyards and create millions of sustainable jobs**

**DOE ‘11**

[U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Wind & Water Power Program U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation, and Enforcement, “A National Offshore Wind Strategy Creating an Offshore Wind Energy Industry in the United States” 2.7.2011 <http://www1.eere.energy.gov/wind/pdfs/national\_offshore\_wind\_strategy.pdf>//wyo-hdm]

**Deployment of wind energy along U.S. coasts would** also **trigger direct and indirect economic benefits. According to NREL analysis and extrapolation of European studies, offshore wind would create approximately 20.7 direct jobs per annual megawatt installed in U.S. waters** (W. Musial 2010). Installing 54 GW of offshore wind capacity in U.S. waters would create more than 43,000 permanent operations and maintenance (O&M) jobs and would require more than 1.1 million job‐years to manufacture and install the turbines (W. Musial 2010). **Many of these jobs would be located in economically depressed ports and shipyards, which could be revitalized as fabrication and staging areas for the manufacture, installation, and maintenance of offshore wind turbines. Offshore wind provides an opportunity for revitalization of U.S. ports and heavy industry facilities.** Due to the large scale of offshore wind turbine components, towers and foundation structures, it is generally advantageous to limit or eliminate overland transport from assembly and installation scenarios in order to maximize process efficiency and minimize logistics time and costs. In addition, **European experience has clearly indicated that it will be necessary to create a purpose‐built installation, operations, and maintenance** (IO&M**) infrastructure for offshore wind, including specialized vessels and port facilities**. To assist industry and regional port facilities in making informed decisions regarding design requirements for IO&M infrastructure, DOE will participate in collaborative studies of infrastructure needs and capabilities for the benefit of all national regions. A significant portion of the cost differential between land‐based and offshore wind energy systems lies in transport and installation requirements. European experience indicates that specialized wind system installation vessels, rather than adapted oil and gas vessels, will be required for cost‐effective, high‐ volume installation.

# Warming

**American clean energy markets are on the verge of collapse- incentives and declining export opportunities will gut renewables absent fast policy action**

**Jenkins et al 12**

[Jesse, Director of Energy and Climate Policy, Breakthrough Institute, Mark Muro, Senior Fellow, Metropolitan Policy Program, Brookings Institution, Ted Nordhaus and Michael Shellenberger, Cofounders, Breakthrough Institute, Letha Tawney, Senior Associate, World Resources Institute, Alex Trembath, Policy Associate, Breakthrough Institute, Beyond Boom and Bust: Putting Clean Tech on a Path to Subsidy Independence, April 2012, p. online//wyo-tjc]

**In the absence of significant and timely energy policy reform, the recent boom in US clean tech sectors could falter**. **Driven by** private innovation and entrepreneurship as well as **critical public sector support in the form of tax credits, grants, and loan guarantees, several clean energy technology (or “clean tech”) segments have grown robustly in recent years while making progress on cost and performance**. Renewable electricity generation doubled from 2006 to 2011, construction is under way on the nation's first new nuclear power plants in decades, and American manufacturers have regained market share in advanced batteries and vehicles. Prices for solar, wind, and other clean energy technologies fell, while employment in clean tech sectors expanded by almost 12 percent from 2007 to 2010, adding more than 70,000 jobs even during the height of the recession.1 **Despite this recent success**, however, **nearly all clean tech segments in the United States remain reliant on production and deployment subsidies** or other supportive policies to gain an expanding foothold in today’s energy markets. **Now, many of these subsidies and policies are poised to expire—with substantial implications for the clean tech industry**. This report aims to take stock of the coming changes to federal clean tech subsidies and programs (Part 1); examine their likely impact on key clean tech market segments (Part 2); and chart a course of policy reform that can advance the US clean tech industry beyond today’s policy-induced cycle of boom and bust (Part 3). Along the way, this report provides a comprehensive analysis of the spending trajectory of 92 distinct federal policies and programs supporting clean tech sectors over the 2009 to 2014 period. As this analysis illustrates, **an era of heightened clean energy spending supported by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009** (ARRA) **is now coming to an end, coinciding with the expiration of several additional time-delimited tax credits and programs. As a result, key portions of the clean tech industry can now anticipate substantially reduced federal support** (see Figure ES1). **At the same time, market subsidies are being cut in several European markets,2 reducing export oppor tunities for US clean tech manufacturers and leading to oversupply and declining margins**,3 even as pressure mounts from both low-cost natural gas at home4 and foreign clean tech manufacturers abroad.5 **US clean tech sectors therefore face a combination of new challenges, despite the growth and progress achieved in recent years**. The specific market impacts will vary by sector (see Part 2). But **without timely and targeted policy reform, several sectors are likely to experience more bankruptcies, consolidations, and market contraction ahead**.

**Warming is human caused, shifting the amount of emissions produced is key to stop rapid warming, it’s try or die**

**Muller 12**

 (Richard A., professor of physics at the University of California, Berkeley, and a former MacArthur Foundation fellow, “The Conversion of a Climate-Change Skeptic,” 7-28-12, <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/07/30/opinion/the-conversion-of-a-climate-change-skeptic.html?_r=2andpagewanted=all>), accessed 9/22/12,WYO/JF

**How definite is the attribution to humans**? The carbon dioxide curve gives a better match than anything else we’ve tried. **Its magnitude is consistent with the calculated greenhouse effect — extra warming from trapped heat radiation**. **These facts don’t prove causality** and they shouldn’t end skepticism, **but they raise the bar:** to be considered seriously, **an alternative explanation must match the data at least as well as carbon dioxide does**. **Adding methane**, a second greenhouse gas, **to our analysis doesn’t change the results.** Moreover, **our analysis does not depend on large, complex global climate models, the huge computer programs that are notorious for their hidden assumptions and adjustable parameters. Our result is based simply on the close agreement between the shape of the observed temperature rise and the known greenhouse gas increase**.

**The environment is at the tipping point- Collapse will be fast and catastrophic**

**AFP, 12**

(Agence France-Presse, citing UN study, “Environmental collapse now a serious threat: scientists,” Raw Story, http://www.rawstory.com/rs/2012/06/06/environmental-collapse-now-a-serious-threat-scientists/)

**The paper by 22 top researchers said a “tipping point” by which** the biosphere goes into swift and irreversible change, **with** potentially **cataclysmic impacts for humans, could occur as early as this century.**¶ The warning contrasts with a mainstream view among scientists that environmental collapse would be gradual and take centuries.¶ **The study appears ahead of the June 20-22 UN Conference on Sustainable Development,** the 20-year followup to the Earth Summit that set down priorities for protecting the environment.¶ The Nature paper, written by biologists, ecologists, geologists and palaeontologists from three continents, compared the biological impact of past episodes of global change with what is happening today.¶ **The factors in today’s equation include a world population that is set to rise from seven billion to around 9.3 billion by mid-century and global warming that will outstrip the UN target of two degrees Celsius** (3.6 degrees Fahrenheit).¶ **The team determined that once** 50-90 percent of small-scale ecosystems become altered**, the entire eco-web tips over into a new state, characterised especially by species extinction**s.¶ **Once the shift happens, it cannot be reversed.**¶ To support today’s population, about 43 percent of Earth’s ice-free land surface is being used for farming or habitation, according to the study.

#### Inevitable gas-price contraction will trigger coal-switching and further emissions from gas production—now is key time to lock-in renewable energy deployments to avoid the worst impacts of warming

Rotman 12

[David, editor of Technology Review, Technology Review, “King Natural Gas”, October, p. asp//wyo-tjc]

But optimism about the environmental benefits should be tempered. For one thing, utilities might return to using more coal as increased demand makes natural gas more expensive. Another concern is that extracting and transporting natural gas itself generates greenhouse gases. Dueling studies have published varied and sometimes contradictory estimates of the total emissions associated with natural-gas production, but the contributing factors include the energy used in the extraction process and the fact that methane -- an extremely potent greenhouse gas-is released during drilling and leaks from pipelines during transport. In fact, there are no reliable measurements of how much energy drilling for shale gas consumes or how much methane actually escapes.

In any case, it's clear that switching from coal to natural gas will not come close to delivering the huge reductions in greenhouse-gas emissions that most scientists contend are needed by midcentury to ward off the worst effects of climate change. According to estimates by economist Henry Jacoby and his colleagues at MIT, the increased use of shale gas might lower carbon emissions somewhat in the next five to 10 years, but at best it will keep them flat through 2050. In other words, there is a short window of opportunity to begin inventing and deploying cleaner technologies. Jacoby predicts that natural-gas prices will stay relatively low over the next decade, climbing slowly to around $5 to $6 per million BTUs -- still making it hard for renewables to compete.

#### Climate change results in multiple scenarios for extinction

Sawin 8/12

Senior Director of the Energy and Climate Change Program at the WorldWatch Institute Aug. ’12

(Janet, “Climate Change Poses Greater Security Threat than Terrorism,” <http://www.worldwatch.org/node/77>, accessed 9/30/12,WYO/JF

As early as 1988, scientists cautioned that human tinkering with the Earth's climate amounted to "an unintended, uncontrolled globally pervasive experiment whose ultimate consequences could be second only to a global nuclear war." Since then, hundreds of scientific studies have documented ever-mounting evidence that human activities are altering the climate around the world. A growing number of international leaders now warn that climate change is, in the words of U.K. Chief Scientific Advisor David King, "the most severe problem that we are facing today—more serious even than the threat of terrorism." Climate change will likely trigger severe disruptions with ever-widening consequences for local, regional, and global security. Droughts, famines, and weather-related disasters could claim thousands or even millions of lives and exacerbate existing tensions within and among nations, fomenting diplomatic and trade disputes. In the worst case, further warming will reduce the capacities of Earth's natural systems and elevate already-rising sea levels, which could threaten the very survival of low-lying island nations, destabilize the global economy and geopolitical balance, and incite violent conflict. Already, there is growing evidence that climate change is affecting the life-support systems on which humans and other species depend. And these impacts are arriving faster than many climate scientists predicted. Recent studies have revealed changes in the breeding and migratory patterns of animals worldwide, from sea turtles to polar bears. Mountain glaciers are shrinking at ever-faster rates, threatening water supplies for millions of people and plant and animal species. Average global sea level has risen 20-25 centimeters (8-10 inches) since 1901, due mainly to thermal expansion; more than 2.5 centimeters (one inch) of this rise occurred over the past decade. A recent report by the International Climate Change Taskforce, co-chaired by Republican U.S. Senator Olympia Snowe, concludes that climate change is the "single most important long term issue that the planet faces." It warns that if average global temperatures increase more than two degrees Celsius—which will likely occur in a matter of decades if we continue with business-as-usual—the world will reach the "point of no return," where societies may be unable to cope with the accelerating rates of change. Existing threats to security will be amplified as climate change has increasing impacts on regional water supplies, agricultural productivity, human and ecosystem health, infrastructure, financial flows and economies, and patterns of international migration. Specific threats to human welfare and global security include: ► Climate change will undermine efforts to mitigate world poverty, directly threatening people's homes and livelihoods through increased storms, droughts, disease, and other stressors. Not only could this impede development, it might also increase national and regional instability and intensify income disparities between rich and poor. This, in turn, could lead to military confrontations over distribution of the world's wealth, or could feed terrorism or transnational crime. ► Rising temperatures, droughts, and floods, and the increasing acidity of ocean waters, coupled with an expanding human population, could further stress an already limited global food supply, dramatically increasing food prices and potentially triggering internal unrest or the use of food as a weapon. Even the modest warming experienced to date has affected fisheries and agricultural productivity, with a 10 percent decrease in corn yields across the U.S. Midwest seen per degree of warming. ► Altered rainfall patterns could heighten tensions over the use of shared water bodies and increase the likelihood of violent conflict over water resources. It is estimated that about 1.4 billion people already live in areas that are water-stressed. Up to 5 billion people (most of the world's current population) could be living in such regions by 2025. ► Widespread impacts of climate change could lead to waves of migration, threatening international stability. One study estimates that by 2050, as many as 150 million people may have fled coastlines vulnerable to rising sea levels, storms or floods, or agricultural land too arid to cultivate. Historically, migration to urban areas has stressed limited services and infrastructure, inciting crime or insurgency movements, while migration across borders has frequently led to violent clashes over land and resources. The parallels with terrorism are compelling. Traditional responses to security threats cannot address the root of such problems, and related impacts could persist even if global emissions are cut dramatically over coming decades because of the significant lag time between cause and effect. As with terrorism, we know that changes will occur, but not when or where they will strike, nor how damaging and costly they will be. Climate change already claims more lives than does terrorism: according to the World Health Organization, global climate change now accounts for more than 160,000 deaths annually. By the time the world experiences the climate equivalent of September 11th, or the 2004 Madrid bombings, it could be too late to respond.

#### Transition to OSW in the US is crucial to emission reductions and adaptation against climate change. Regulatory requirements and uncertainty derails investment decisions

Thaler 12

[Jeffrey, University of Maine's first Visiting Professor of Energy Policy, Law & Ethics, and Assistant University Counsel for environmental, energy and sustainability projects, “Fiddling as the world burns: How climate change urgently requires a paradigm shift in the permitting of renewable energy projects”, Environmental Law, Volume 42, Issue 4, Forthcoming, p. <http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2148122> //wyo-tjc]

As noted in the Introduction, offshore wind energy projects have the potential to generate large quantities of pollutant-free electricity near many of the world’s major population centers, and thus to help reduce the ongoing and projected economic, health, and environmental damages from climate change.99 Wind speeds over water are stronger and more consistent than over land, and “have a gross potential generating capacity four times greater than the nation’s present electric capacity.”100 The net capacity factor101 for offshore turbines is greater than standard land-based turbines, and their blade-tip speeds are higher than their land-based counterparts.102 Offshore wind turbine substructure designs mainly fall into three depth categories: shallow (30 m or less), transitional (>30 m to 60 m), and deep water (>60 m).103 All of the grid-scale offshore wind farms in Europe have monopole foundations embedded into the seabed in water depths ranging from 5m to 30m; the proposed American projects such as Cape Wind in Massachusetts and Block Island in Rhode Island would likewise be shallow-water installations. In deeper water, it is not economically feasible to affix a rigid structure to the sea floor, and floating platforms are envisioned. Three concepts shown below have been developed for floating platform designs, each of which is tethered but not built into the seabed. Each design uses a different method for achieving static stability, and some small pilot efforts are underway to demonstrate the performance of different turbines. 105 Greater wind speeds and thus available energy capture are found further from shore, particularly at ocean depths greater than 60m.106 These attributes, combined with proximity to major coastal cities and energy consumers,107 are why offshore wind—in our carbon-stressed world—requires serious consideration and prompt implementation. As demonstrated in the following pages, however, the maze of federal and state regulatory requirements facing renewable energy projects in general and offshore wind in particular, is especially burdensome.108 These requirements undermine the fundamental goal of significantly increasing reliance on emission-free renewable energy sources109 and, unless substantially revised, will effectively preclude any meaningful efforts to mitigate the many damaging human and economic impacts of climate change. B. Federal and State Jurisdiction U.S. jurisdiction over the ocean and seafloor extends from the coast 200 nautical miles seaward.110 Within the umbrella of U.S. jurisdiction, ocean governance is divided between the federal government and individual states.111 Individual state governments retain title to submerged land within three nautical miles from shore,112 and may regulate activities within that area, subject to federal law;113 the federal government retains title and authority over all remaining waters out to 200 nautical miles from shore (Outer Continental Shelf, or OCS).114 The federal government also retains some jurisdiction within state coastal waters, thus numerous federal laws impact offshore wind development occurring solely within state waters. Likewise, several statutes, most notably the Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA),115 allow for state review of certain federal activities occurring solely federal waters. These instances will be discussed in greater detail below.

#### Failure to move forward on OSW guts American credibility on climate leadership

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]

If completed, the Cape Wind offshore wind energy project would be one of the largest offshore wind farms in the world. The project is also one of the most significant greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction measures in our nation. It would reduce GHG emissions by an estimated 730,000 tons per year, which is the equivalent of taking 175,000 cars off the road each year.2 Due to its size, novelty, and colorful permitting history, the project has become a symbol of the United States’ resolve to take action to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions and its dependence on fossil fuels. However, if the project is not constructed, either because of the aesthetic concerns of tenacious beachfront property owners who oppose the project or because of its large up-front costs, the world may well begin to question the United States’ commitment to doing its part to avert climate change.

#### Offshore wind is key to electricity production in the U.S

DOE,11

“A National Offshore Wind Strategy: Creating an Offshore Wind Energy Industry in the United States.” <http://usoffshorewind.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/national_offshore_wind_strategy2.pdf>, accessed 11/1/12,WYO/JF

On average, one gigawatt of installed offshore wind power capacity can generate 3.4 million megawatt‐hours (MWh) of electricity annually. Generating the same amount of electricity with fossil fuels would consume 1.7 million tons of coal or 27.6 billion cubic feet of natural gas and would emit 2.7 million tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2e) annually (S. Dolan 2010). Because offshore winds generally blow more strongly and consistently than onshore winds, offshore wind turbines operate at higher capacity factors2 than wind turbines installed on land.
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#### First, we meet- plan in a vacuum is topical.

#### Second, counter-interpretation- a restriction is a regulatory constraint

Farlex, ’12 (Farlex collection, Princeton University, 2012, WordNet 3.0, Print)//CC

restriction - an act of limiting or restricting (as by regulation)

#### Third, we meet- restrictions on leasing range from out-right bans to stipulations- NEPA review is right in the middle

USDI, USDA, DOE 2008

[“Inventory of Onshore Federal Oil and Natural Gas Resources and Restrictions to Their Development”, <http://www.blm.gov/pgdata/etc/medialib/blm/wo/MINERALS__REALTY__AND_RESOURCE_PROTECTION_/energy/0.Par.68195.File.dat/EPCA2008lo_1.pdf> //wyo-tjc]

2.3.1 Categorization of Oil and Gas Access Constraints The main factors that affect access to oil and gas resources on Federal lands are land availability (Section 2.1.1) and leasing and drilling restrictions (Sections 2.1.2 and 2.1.3). To simplify the analysis and present meaningful results, these factors were categorized into a hierarchy that represents varying levels of access as shown in Table 2-9. This categorization was necessary to enable a reasonable quantitative analysis, given the fact that approximately 3,125 individual stipulations from 128 Federal land use plans (LUPs) exist for the study areas within the Inventory. The hierarchy of categories was formulated to ensure that the constraints on oil and gas development could be appropriately assessed (especially for areas of multiple, overlapping stipulations), and to ensure that the cumulative impacts on access would be examined. In addition, the hierarchy was formulated based upon the accessibility of the lands for leasing, and for areas where leasing is permitted, the impacts relative to the difficulty for conducting drilling operations. The Federal lands categorization hierarchy is ordered from “No Leasing” (most constrained) to “Leasing with Standard Lease Terms” (least constrained) as follows: 1. No Leasing (Statutory/Executive Order) (NLS) are lands that cannot be leased due to Congressional or Presidential action. Examples include national parks, national monuments, and wilderness areas. 2. No Leasing (Administrative) (NLA) are lands that are withheld from leasing based on discretionary decisions made by the Federal land management agency. The NLA areas can include endangered species habitat and historical sites. 3. No Leasing (Administrative), Pending Land Use Planning or NEPA Compliance (NLA/LUP) are lands that have not yet undergone or are currently undergoing land use planning or NEPA analysis, and that are generally not available for leasing. In the cases where there is no land use plan in effect, non-Federal mineral estate underlying Federal land is categorized as NLA/LUP to reflect the fact that access to mineral estate can be allowed through the NEPA process. 4. Leasing, No Surface Occupancy (NSO) (Net NSO for Oil & Gas Resources) are lands that can be leased but ground-disturbing oil and natural gas exploration and development activities are prohibited. These stipulations protect identified resources such as special status plant species habitat. Their surface areas are mapped as described by the LUPs. However, at least some of the resources can be accessed by directional drilling from nearby lands where surface occupancy is allowed. This is accounted for by creating an extended drilling zone (EDZ, as described in Appendix 9) that reduces the size of the NSO area. The area removed is then placed in the next most restrictive resource access category (5 through 9, below) that would otherwise apply in the absence of the NSO stipulation. Within the EDZ area the underlying resource is considered accessible even though the surface above it cannot be occupied by drilling equipment. After the EDZ is removed, the NSO area that remains is referred to as “Net NSO” (NNSO) and the resources under it are therefore considered inaccessible. 5. Leasing, Cumulative Timing Limitations (TLs) on drilling of >9 Months are lands that can be leased, but stipulations and/or COAs limit the time of the year when oil and gas exploration and drilling can take place to less than 3 months. Timing limitations prohibit surface use during specified time intervals to protect identified resources such as sage grouse habitat or elk calving areas. 6. Leasing, Cumulative Timing Limitations (TLs) on drilling of >6 to ≤9 Months are lands that can be leased, but stipulations and/or COAs limit the time of the year when oil and gas exploration and drilling can take place from 3 to 6 months. 7. Leasing, Cumulative Timing Limitations (TLs) on drilling of >3 to ≤6 Months are lands that can be leased, but stipulations and/or COAs limit the time of the year when oil and gas exploration and drilling can take place from 6 to 9 months. 8. Leasing, Controlled Surface Use (CSU) are lands where stipulations and/or COAs control the surface location of natural gas and oil exploration and development activities by excluding them from portions of the lease. For example, a CSU stipulation could require an operator to develop a specialized mitigation plan based on the presence of moderately steep slopes. This category also includes the minimal areas that have timing limitations of less than three months. 9. Leasing, Standard Lease Terms (SLTs) areas are lands that can be leased and where no additional stipulations are added to the standard lease form. Standard lease terms, however, still dictate that the lessee must comply with many environmental standards and other requirements (see Section 2.1.2, above). Categorizations were made on the basis of LUPs and discussions with Federal land management agencies. In most cases categorization is relatively straightforward; in other cases judgments were made based upon experience with stipulation datasets. For the FS, FPs standards and guidelines are both included in the definition of “Management Direction” at 36 CFR 219.3 (Forest Planning), and were used synonymously without distinction in evaluating FS stipulations. All categorizations were made available to field offices for review and comment.

#### Fourth, prefer our interp:

#### There is no difference between a legal prohibition and an environmental review

Hagerty 10

[Curry L. Hagerty, Specialist in Energy and Natural Resources Policy Outer Continental Shelf Moratoria on Oil and Gas Development, CRS Reports, June 15, 2010, p. <http://crs.ncseonline.org/nle/crsreports/10Jul/R41132.pdf> //wyo-tjc]

Policy makers seeking to reach a compromise to resolve environmental concerns have focused on a range of proposals, including proposals to substitute a combination of other measures as a replacement for moratoria. Such efforts have tended to reach an impasse, however, as advocates remain largely divided on what environmental precautions would constitute adequate protection for the marine and coastal environments. Advocates opposed to OCS oil and gas development often associate oil and gas consumption with harmful greenhouse gas emissions and other global climate change concerns. From this perspective, only permanently restricting the offshore development of conventional energy sources would protect against these risks to the domestic and global environment. This perception complicates efforts to reach a compromise involving a combination of possible restrictions designed to tailor OCS development activities. Advocates in support of conventional OCS development view environmental risk on a different scale and largely reject global climate change as a basis for defining the risk. These advocates claim that compliance with current environmental laws and regulations can be an adequate substitute for moratoria, and that new technologies are emerging to manage harmful greenhouse gas emissions and other global climate change concerns. Improvements in offshore technology are broadly viewed by the Obama Administration as potential measures to bridge the impasse over environmental risk in shaping OCS policy.17

#### Education and predictability- the NEPA process is the most direct and significant statutory restriction on production

USDI, USDA, DOE 2008

[“Inventory of Onshore Federal Oil and Natural Gas Resources and Restrictions to Their Development”, <http://www.blm.gov/pgdata/etc/medialib/blm/wo/MINERALS__REALTY__AND_RESOURCE_PROTECTION_/energy/0.Par.68195.File.dat/EPCA2008lo_1.pdf> //wyo-tjc]

Additional statutory and discretionary requirements beyond lease stipulations impact Federal land access for oil and gas development. Many of these impacts were not quantified because GIS data do not exist, or they are issues that are not amenable to quantitative analysis. Many of these requirements can be considered restrictions on drilling because they have effects similar to stipulations on oil and gas development activities. These issues can directly or indirectly impact Federal land accessibility for oil and gas development. Tables 4-1 through 4-16 present office-specific issues that were recorded from discussions with BLM and FS staff during field visits. Average APD processing time was calculated for each office using input from the offices supplemented by an analysis of BLM’s Automated Fluid Minerals Support System (AFMSS).47

4.1 Issues Directly Impacting Access

The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. The NEPA is the nation’s central environmental statute. It requires Federal agencies to consider environmental impacts before an action is taken. The NEPA process is intended to help public officials make better decisions based on an understanding of their environmental consequences. The NEPA is embedded into the fabric of Federal land management decision-making and has become the most important procedural public land management statute because it requires agencies to comply with its processes in all situations where major actions are contemplated. When an activity or action is proposed on Federal lands, an interdisciplinary review of the environmental effects of the proposal is conducted and made available to citizens and public officials. The review can take one of four forms: • a categorical exclusion (CX) • documentation of NEPA adequacy (DNA) • an environmental assessment (EA) • an environmental impact statement (EIS) The NEPA process can impact oil and gas development in terms of cost and time delays. Typically an EIS or EA is drafted in consultation with the cooperating agencies, presented for public comment, and reviewed by multiple agencies. A simple EIS can take 24 to 36 months to complete, while those with more complex issues may require three to six years to complete. The land use planning process as a whole takes in excess of 36 months, particularly if there is oil and gas involved. The NEPA documents analyze alternatives to the proposed action and must include a “no action” alternative. Impacts are classified as direct, indirect, and cumulative, and include the evaluation of economic impacts to counties and states to be considered, as well as impacts on resources. When considering oil and gas leasing, the BLM has identified the need to obtain additional data on such issues as air quality and clean water as a part of the cumulative impact analysis required by the NEPA and land use planning processes. This has been cited as an overarching issue that affects oil and gas lease parcel nominations. This lack of data can result in leasing delays when existing documents are deemed inadequate. The net result is that potential applicants are often aware of the problem and make decisions not to develop in areas that will be or could be held up by the NEPA process. With respect to the NEPA process itself, concern was expressed by some government officials that individual documents provide “piecemeal” information and that better environmental decisions could be made based on larger scale studies that look at the “bigger picture.” For example, wildlife habitat fragmentation is better characterized when it is examined in the context of larger rather than smaller areas. Delays can increase costs for oil and gas operations because, rather than waiting for the Federal agency to complete the work, operators frequently pay a third-party contractor to perform the necessary work. Section 366 of Energy Policy Act of 2005 (EPAct 2005) sets a deadline for the consideration of applications for permits. The permit must be issued within 30 days (if NEPA and other legal requirements have been met), or defer the decision and provide a notice to the applicant.

#### Breadth outweighs- prefer ground that wasn’t explored on previous energy topics like leasing policy and environmental reviews because it is unique.

#### Fifth, their interp is bad:

#### It conflates restrictions and bans- those are distinct according to DOI

BLM 7

[Dept of Interior, “Energy Policy and Conservation Act Assessment Phase III”, <http://www.blm.gov/wo/st/en/prog/energy/oil_and_gas/EPCA_III/EPCA_III_faq.print.html> //wyo-tjc]

Q: What does “Accessible with Restrictions” mean?

 A: “Accessible with Restrictions” is a combination of Categories 5-8:

 5. Leasing, Cumulative Timing Limitations (TLs) on drilling of >9 Months

 6. Leasing, Cumulative Timing Limitations (TLs) on drilling of >6 to ≤9 Months

 7. Leasing, Cumulative Timing Limitations (TLs) on drilling of >3 to ≤6 Months are lands that can be leased, but stipulations and/or COAs limit the time of the year when oil and gas exploration and drilling can take place. Timing limitation stipulations prohibit surface use during specified time intervals to protect identified resources such as sage grouse habitat or elk calving areas.

 8. Leasing, Controlled Surface Use (CSU) are lands where stipulations and/or COAs control the surface location of natural gas and oil exploration and development activities by excluding them from portions of the lease. For example, a CSU stipulation could require an operator to develop a specialized mitigation plan based on the presence of moderately steep slopes. This category also includes the minimal areas that have timing limitations of less than three months.

Q: What do the “Inaccessible” categories include?

A: “Inaccessible” is a combination of Categories 1-4:

 1. No Leasing (Statutory/Executive Order) (NLS) are lands that cannot be leased due to Congressional or Presidential action. Examples include national parks, national monuments, and wilderness areas.

 2.No Leasing (Administrative) (NLA) are lands that are withheld from leasing based on discretionary decisions made by the Federal land management agency. NLA areas can include endangered species habitat and historical sites.

#### B- Sets a bad limit- eviscerates almost all restrictions aff because there are no real prohibitions on production because no topic energies are banned.

#### Sixh, Err affirmative—the topic is massively neg-biased because of a lack of fed-key warrants and the states counterplan, and breaking a regulation is just as illegal as breaking a prohibition so there is no difference that’s not semantic

#### Seventh, Competing interpretations is bad—comparisons are just as subjective as reasonability and their frame encourages a race to the bottom. We shouldn’t lose if our aff makes debate harder as long as it is still possible and educational.

# Warming

# Ports

#### Elites will backlash at the revolution, resulting in extinction

Dasmann, 89

Raymond F. Dasmann, PhD in Zoology, professor emeritus of ecology at UC-Santa Cruz, 1989, The Ends of the Earth, edited by Donald Worster and Alfred W. Crosby, p. 288

There is really little doubt that there is a growing awareness of the necessity for modifying human ways to ensure the survival of the natural world on which the future of the human race depends. There is a rapidly growing biosphere consciousness, which is reaching the higher levels of many governments and has often found its expression at the level of the United Nations. One regrets that it is less evident in the United States government than it has been in the past, but it is certainly expressed among many members of the Congress, and one can expect future changes in the national leadership which will reflect the growing public awareness. The real question is whether or not the human race can modify its ways of behavior rapidly enough, because the majority continues to pursue pathways that lead toward the ecological impoverishment of the planet. The increase in awareness does not keep pace with the rate of destruction of tropical forests, the spread of deserts, the erosion of agricultural soils, the depletion of wildlife, or the growing pollution of the atmosphere and hydrosphere. Those who exercise the greatest political and military power still threaten a war that can bring the whole edifice built by civilization crashing down into the wreckage of the biosphere, while in the meanwhile dozens of little wars forestall efforts to achieve sustainable ways of life. There is also a reasonable fear that if the power and influence of those who work for conservation of nature, sustainable development based on social justice and equity, and a more reasonable approach to human use of the biosphere, begins to reach a critical mass there will be attempts at massive repression by those who feel threatened by such changes. In other terms, if we begin to approach the hundredth monkey level, the “international power structure” will declare an open season on monkeys. If that happens then the real question will be whether anyone will be left to write the environmental history of our times.

#### Growth inevitable- hardwired in human psyche

Zey 1 (Dr. Michael G., 2001, “THE EXPANSIONARY THEORY OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT”, http://www.zey.com/perspective.htm, ) ET

The emerging picture of early Earth is one of a planet brimming with activity, virtually forcing life into existence. As soon as the molecules had the chance, they attempted to establish the conditions for life. This self-organization of molecules made life, and the evolution of life forms, possible. It is the contention here that the same inclination to self-organize, to intentionally evolve oneself from the simple to the complex, exists on the biological level as well as the molecular. And the human species is the finest example of this process. Alfred Russell Wallace, a contemporary of Darwin who concurrently developed a similar theory of natural selection, discussed a major mystery in human evolution. It seems that between Homo habilis and Homo erectus the human brain undergoes a gigantic jump in its size. The earlier hominid has a brain only slightly larger than that of an ape. Homo erectus, which existed for a million years starting around 1.5 million years ago, has a cortex as large as ours. Wallace contends that the human brain was overdesigned for its primitive uses and thus could not have been a production of natural selection. He said that natural selection could only have endowed savage man with a brain a few degrees superior to that of an ape, whereas he actually possesses one very little inferior to that of a philosopher. Robert Orenstein, a biologist specializing in brain research, is similarly curious about why Homo erectus possessed a brain that he ostensibly had little use for. Our brain expanded to a size for which there was little functional use at the time. According to Orenstein, (in his book The Evolution of Consciousness) Homo erectus' brain was complex enough to invent a microprocessor, even though all that was needed at the time was a brain that could figure out how to hammer out the first few stone tools. "Why be able to fly to the moon when no one has even understood how to make iron?", Orenstein asks.

#### Resource Shortages is just Pessimism, Solved by substitutes, technology and Human ingenuity

Energy policy 10

[Marian Radetzki, Luleå University of Technology, Sweden, Energy Policy, “Peak Oil and other threatening peaks—Chimeras without substance”, Volume 38, Issue 11, November 2010, Pages 6566-6569, accessed Science Direct, \\wyo-bb]

1. **Unwarranted resource pessimism** The commodity boom that emerged in 2004 and that still rages most commodity markets has stimulated high-pitched claims, the Peak Oil gospel being one among many, that resource depletion is now a painful reality. **Prophecies of impending catastrophes based on resource pessimism are as old as humanity** (Maurice and Smithson, 1984). In more recent times, the following ones can be noted: • **140 years ago a seriously worrying British “Peak Coal” was seen to be looming** (Jevons, 1865). In reality, production levels were maintained until the 1950s. **The subsequent sharp decline was not caused by a depleting resource base but by competition from other domestic and imported sources of energy.** Remaining British coal reserves have become worthless in consequence. • Until the early 20th century, South American guano was a valuable exhaustible material for the production of fertilizer. Its strategic importance caused diplomatic conflicts, even war, to obtain control over its supply (Skaggs, 1994). Scientific progress in chemistry early in the 20th century has made guano superfluous. • Perception of inadequate petroleum resources has repeatedly aroused widespread worries. In 1920, when the US produced 1 mbd, the US Geological Survey reported that the country’s oil would be depleted before the end of the decade (Lindstedt, 2005), but 80 years later, production had risen to 6.9 mbd. • Early in the 1970s, the Rome Club published a somber outlook about an impending depletion of the physical resource base (Meadows et al., 1972). **By the turn of the century, our materialist civilization was likely to collapse as an increasing number of critical natural resources were becoming unavailable**. A common characteristic of the doomsday prophecies listed above, and many others, is that none of them has actually occurred (Simon, 1996). **Resource scarcity has been successfully handled with the help of technical progress that has widened the resource base and/or by substitution. The 20th century has been referred to as “the age of substitutability”** (Goeller and Weinberger, 1976). **The 21st century will be even more so. Human inventiveness and flexible competitive markets are regularly sufficient to overcome emerging problems. The real prices (a measure of scarcity) of virtually all primary commodities traded in competitive markets exhibit a long-run downward trend (Radetzki, 2008).**

# Solvency

#### Hurricanes don’t affect wind farms in the northeast- probabilities of even one tower buckling are exceedingly low

Rose et al 12

[Stephen, aDepartment of Engineering and Public Policy at Carnegie Mellon, “Quantifying the hurricane risk to offshore wind turbines”, Jan 12 //wyo-tjc]

Galveston County is the riskiest location to build a wind farm of the four locations examined, followed by Dare County, NC. In contrast, Atlantic County, NJ and Dukes County, MA are significantly less risky. In Galveston County, there is a 60% probability that at least one tower will buckle in 20 y and a 30% probability that more than half will buckle if the turbines cannot yaw; if they are able to yaw, there is still a 25% probability that at least one tower will buckle and a 10% probability that more than half will. In Dare County, NC, there is a 60% probability that at least one tower will buckle in 20 y and a 9% probability that more than half will buckle if the turbines cannot yaw; if they are able to yaw, there is a 15% probability that at least one tower will buckle and much less than 1% probability that more than half will. In Atlantic County, NJ there is a 15% probability that at least one tower will buckle in 20 y and less than 1% probability that more than half will buckle. In Dukes County, MA, there is a 10% probability that at least one tower will buckle in 20 y and less than 1% probability that more than half will buckle. If the turbines in Atlantic and Dukes counties are able to quickly yaw even when grid power is out, there is approximately a 99% probability that none will buckle in 20 y.

#### Offshore wind will not affect fish populations

DOI, 11

“Commercial Wind Lease Issuance and Site Characterization Activities on the Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf Offshore New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia”, <http://www.boem.gov/uploadedFiles/BOEM/Renewable_Energy_Program/Smart_from_the_Start/MidAtlanticWEAs_DraftEA.pdf>, accessed 10/26/12,WYO/JF

The proposed action and the potential effects of HRG survey noise on marine fish are generally expected to be limited to avoidance around the HRG survey activities and short-term changes in behavior. Thus, potential population-level direct and indirect impacts on fish for HRG surveys is expected to be negligible. Meteorological tower construction noise could disturb normal behaviors. As discussed in the analysis of HRG surveys, behavioral reaction may include avoidance of, or flight from, the sound source. Fish that do not flee the immediate action area during pile driving procedure could be exposed to lethal sound pressure levels. Additionally, due to likelihood of mitigation measures required by NMFS for endangered species as evidenced by previous Section 7 consultations for similar activity and presented as proposed mitigation measures in Appendix C, this impact would be further minimized. Measures to protect endangered marine mammal and sea turtles will benefit fish and likely include the implementation of a “soft start” procedure and that no pile driving occur if any whales or sea turtles are present within 7 km of the pile to be driven. As a result of sub-bottom sampling small footprint, it is expected this activity would have negligible benthic effects that could impact federally-managed fish species that may occur in the Mid-Atlantic WEAs. Impacts related to meteorological towers/buoys installation, operation and decommissioning is expected to be minor and not expected to result in changes in local community assemblage and diversity. Fish could be exposed to operational discharges or accidental fuel releases from construction sites and construction vessels and to accidentally released solid debris. The entanglement in or ingestion of OCS-related trash and debris by fish would not be expected during normal operations. Impacts to fish and their habitat from the discharge of waste materials or the accidental release of fuels are expected to be minor due to the limited number of structures and vessels involved with their construction, operation, and decommissioning. There is a potential for natural and/or unanticipated events to cause impacts to the environment during site assessment activities. A natural event such as a severe storm may impact meteorological towers or buoys at some point during operation. If unanticipated collisions were to occur, and a vessel’s cargo was discharged, the impacts would depend upon that of the type and amount of cargo discharged at the time. Due to the limited number of structures anticipated in Chapter 3 of this EA and the considerations for their placement, the likelihood of natural and unanticipated events from occurring is rare.

# Politics

#### Obama is gauging interest in offshore wind now

Herndon 3 Jan

[Herndon, Andrew: reporter for Bloomberg News. " U.S. Gauges Interest in New York Offshore Wind Projects." *Bloomberg Sustainability*. Bloomberg, 3 Jan 2013. Web. 3 Jan 2013. <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-01-03/u-s-gauges-interest-in-new-york-offshore-wind-projects.html>. //Wyo-BF]

The Obama administration is gauging interest in wind power development off the coast of New York, after a state agency proposed an offshore project 11 nautical miles south of Long Beach. The Bureau of Ocean Energy Management issued a request today for any competing interests in the proposed lease area, which covers about 127 square miles (329 square kilometers), according to an e-mailed statement. If no other parties express interest, the New York Power Authority can get a lease on a non- competitive basis. The agency, part of the U.S. Interior Department, is also seeking comments on potential environmental effects of a wind farm in the area. The authority has proposed a project that would generate 350 to 700 megawatts of power for Long Island and New York City. There are no offshore wind farms currently operating in the U.S. The government has awarded two offshore wind-energy leases, in Massachusetts in 2010 and in Delaware in October, through non-competitive arrangements with Cape Wind Associates LLC and NRG Energy Inc. (NRG) The administration plans to conduct the first competitive lease auctions this year for projects off the coasts of Massachusetts, Rhode Island and Virginia.

#### Obama and Democrats support the ITC and offshore wind is popular with environmentalists, ports, and state officials on the Eastern Seaboard and in Texas

Kessler 12

[Kessler, Richard A.: U.S. Online Editor at Recharge Newspaper. "Winds are blowing in favour of American offshore sector as support for development grows." *Recharge Politics*. Recharge, 24 Sep 2012. Web. 3 Jan 2013. <http://www.rechargenews.com/business\_area/politics/article323347.ece>. //Wyo-BF]

The fledgling US offshore wind industry has had a good summer. Polls show President Barack Obama, a big supporter, has opened a narrow but steady lead in his bid for a second term over Republican challenger Mitt Romney, who opposes government support for renewable energy. Democrats are expected to retain control of the Senate and reduce the 49-seat Republican majority in the House of Representatives. If this plays out in 6 November elections, Obama will be in a stronger political position to pursue an agenda that Republicans in Congress have sought to obstruct. A strong showing by the Democrats would also improve chances that the outgoing Congress, which will continue to meet until mid-December, extends the renewable-energy investment tax credit (ITC) beyond this year. For offshore wind, this could include extending eligibility to projects that begin construction before the ITC expires. At present, they must have been “placed in service”. That key potential change would greatly improve chances of building Cape Wind, the only utility-scale project with a federal lease and required permits, plus pilot projects in state waters off New Jersey and Rhode Island. The ITC gives developers a credit equal to 30% of their project cost, worth about $750m for Cape Wind. It has been a long battle for Cape Wind developer Energy Management Inc (EMI), but it now sounds confident of success. Geotechnical work has begun and the detailed design engineering phase will follow soon. The Federal Aviation Administration recently concluded that the wind farm would not pose any danger to aircraft, a defeat for project opponents. With 77.5% of Cape Wind’s capacity under long-term purchase contracts, EMI’s ability to finance at least 101 of a planned 130 turbines has improved. EMI is confident it will find buyers for the balance of output. Elsewhere, support for offshore wind development continues to be strong among most environmental groups and ports, and from state officials along the eastern seaboard and off the Texas coast. They expect the industry to get a boost when the Department of Energy announces which of up to four demonstration project proposals it will support under a six-year $180m initiative. The focus is on achieving “large cost reductions over existing offshore wind technologies”, with the department aiming for $0.10 per kWh by 2020. It augurs well if that can be done.

#### Immigration reform won’t happen until June. Plan comes first.

Foley and Stein, 1-2

[“Obama's Immigration Reform Push To Begin This Month”, Elise Foley, Sam Stein. 01/02/2013 http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/02/obama-immigration-reform\_n\_2398507.html?//uwyokb]

It remains unclear what type of immigration policies the White House plans to push in January, but **turning them into law could be a long process.** Aides expect **it will take about two months to write a bipartisan bill**, **then another few months before it goes up for a vote, possibly in June.** A bipartisan group of senators [are already working](http://www.politico.com/story/2012/12/new-gang-of-eight-on-immigration-84772.html) on a deal, although they are still in the early stages. Rep. Zoe Lofgren (D-Calif.) will likely lead on the Democratic side in the House. While many Republicans have expressed interest in piecemeal reform, it's still unclear which of them plan to join the push.

#### Offshore wind is bi-partisan

NAW, 11

North American Wind “New Bipartisan Legislation Proposes Offshore Wind Energy Tax Credit” <http://www.nawindpower.com/e107_plugins/content/content.php?content.8790>, accessed 11/7/12,WYO/JF

U.S. Reps. Bill Pascrell Jr., D-N.J., and Frank LoBiondo, R-N.J., [have introduced](http://pascrell.house.gov/list/press/nj08_pascrell/pr101820112.shtml) bipartisan legislation to encourage offshore wind power investment off the coast of New Jersey. The Incentivizing Offshore Wind Power Act (H.R.3238) proposes to provide a 30%tax credit on investment in the first 3,000 MW of offshore wind. The secretary of the Treasury would have to consult with the secretaries of Energy and the Interior when establishing this credit.

#### Latin American relations are bad—the plan isn’t going to destabilize the region because it won’t be perceived

Weisbrot 19 Dec

[Weisbrot, Mark: economist and co-director of the Center for Economic and Policy Research. "Obama Signals Four More Years of Bad Relations with Latin America." *Venezuela Analysis*. Al Jazeera, 19 Dec 2012. Web. 3 Jan 2013. <http://venezuelanalysis.com/analysis/7566>. //Wyo-BF]

President Obama went too far in throwing gratuitous insults at President Hugo Chavez of Venezuela on Friday, in an interview in Miami. By doing so, he not only offended the majority of Venezuelans, who voted to re-elect their president on October 7, but even many who did not. Chavez is fighting for his life, recovering from a difficult cancer operation; in Latin America, as in most of the world, this wholly unnecessary vilification of Chavez by Obama is a breach not only of diplomatic protocol but also of ordinary standards of civility. Perhaps even more importantly, Obama's ill-timed aspersions sent an unpleasant message to the rest of the region. While Obama can get away with anything in the major media outlets, you can be sure that his remarks were noticed by the presidents and foreign ministries of Brazil, Argentina, Ecuador, Bolivia, and others. The message was clear: Expect four more years of the same failed, Cold War policies toward Latin America that President George W Bush championed and Obama continued in his first term. These presidents see Chavez as a close friend and ally, someone who has helped them and the region; like millions of Venezuelans they are praying for his recovery. They also see Washington as responsible for the bad relations between the US and Venezuela (as well as the hemisphere generally), and these unfortunate remarks are additional confirmation. At the 2012 Summit of the Americas, Obama found himself as isolated as George W Bush was at the notorious 2005 summit. It was a sea change from the 2009 Summit, where everyone - including Chavez - greeted Obama warmly and saw in him the potential for a new era of US-Latin American relations. To these governments, Obama's broadsides about Chavez's "authoritarian policies" and "suppression of dissent" have a bad smell, even ignoring the offensive timing. Venezuela just had an election in which the opposition, which has most of the income and wealth of the country, as well as most of the media, mobilised millions of voters. The turnout was 81 percent of registered voters, with about 97 percent of the voting-age population registered. The government did not "suppress dissent", nor has it done so in other elections; or even when the dissenters shut down the oil industry and crippled the economy in 2002-2003 - actions which would have been illegal and blocked by the force of the state in the United States. Peaceful protesters in Venezuela are far less likely to get beaten or tear-gassed or shot with rubber bullets by security forces than they are in Spain, and probably most other democracies. Yes, there have been abuses of authority in Venezuela, as in all of the hemisphere - as President Obama should know. It was Obama who defended the imprisonment without trial for more than two-and-a-half years, and abuse in custody, of Bradley Manning, which was condemned by the United Nations' Special Rapporteur on Torture. It is Obama who has refused to grant freedom to Native American activist Leonard Peltier, widely seen throughout the world as a political prisoner, now in a US prison for 37 years. It is Obama who claims the right, and has used it, to kill American citizens without arrest or trial.

# Eco K

#### Perm do both.

#### Those who are aware of ecological destruction are increasingly more likely to take personal action to avoid consequences- Several national surveys prove

Veldman ‘12

[Robin Globus, a doctoral candidate in the Religion and Nature program at the University of Florida. Her research focuses on the interplay between environmental attitudes, religious beliefs, and ethics. A National Science Foundation fellow in the University of Florida’s Integrative Graduate Education and Research Traineeship (IGERT) program in Adaptive Management, she is also Assistant Editor of the Journal for the Study of Religion, Nature and Culture, “Narrating the Environmental Apocalypse: How Imagining the End Facilitates Moral Reasoning Among Environmental Activists” Ethics & the Environment, Volume 17, Number 1, Spring 2012, pp. 1-23 (Article)//wyo-hdm]

Some of the strongest evidence of a connection between environmental apocalypticism and activism comes from a national survey that examined whether Americans perceived climate change to be dangerous. As part of his analysis, Anthony Leiserowitz identified several “interpretive communities,” which had consistent demographic characteristics but varied in their levels of risk perception. The group who perceived the risk to be the greatest, which he labeled “alarmists,” described climate change using apocalyptic language, such as “Bad…bad…bad…like after nuclear war…no vegetation,” “Heat waves, it’s gonna kill the world,” and “Death of the planet” (2005, 1440). Given such language, this would seem to be a reasonable way to operationalize environmental apocalypticism. If such apocalypticism encouraged fatalism, we would expect alarmists to be less likely to have engaged in environmental behavior compared to groups with moderate or low levels of concern. To the contrary, however, Leiserowitz found that alarmists “were significantly more likely to have taken personal action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions” (ibid.) than respondents who perceived climate change to pose less of a threat. Interestingly, while one might expect such radical views to appeal only to a tiny minority, Leiserowitz found that a respectable eleven percent of Americans fell into this group (ibid). Further supporting Leiserowitz’s findings, in a separate national survey conducted in 2008, Maibach, Roser-Renouf, and Leiserowitz found that a group they labeled “the Alarmed” (again, due to their high levels of concern about climate change) “are the segment most engaged in the issue of global warming. They are very convinced it is happening, humancaused, and a serious and urgent threat. The Alarmed are already making changes in their own lives and support an aggressive national response” (2009, 3, emphasis added). This group was far more likely than people with lower levels of concern over climate change to have engaged in consumer activism (by rewarding companies that support action to reduce global warming with their business, for example) or to have contacted elected officials to express their concern. Additionally, the authors found that “[w]hen asked which reason for action was most important to them personally, the Alarmed were most likely to select preventing the destruction of most life on the planet (31%)” (2009, 31)—a finding suggesting that for many in this group it is specifically the desire to avert catastrophe, rather than some other motivation, that encourages pro-environmental behavior. Taken together, these and other studies (cf. Semenza et al. 2008 and DerKarabetia, Stephenson, and Poggi 1996) provide important evidence that many of those who think environmental problems pose a severe threat practice some form of activism, rather than giving way to fatalistic resignation.

# 1ar

#### Warming is comparable to the scientific consensus behind gravity

AP 27 Nov

["AP Interview: UN climate scientist says Sandy no coincidence in warming world." *Washington Post*. Associated Press, 27 Nov 2012. Web. 1 Dec 2012. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/middle\_east/at-climate-conference-un-warns-that-thawing-permafrost-will-cause-increased-global-warming/2012/11/27/abdb72e0-3881-11e2-9258-ac7c78d5c680\_story.html>. //Wyo-BF]

Since 1990, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, or IPCC, has released four reports with projections on how global warming will melt glaciers and ice caps, raise sea levels and shift rainfall patterns with impacts on floods and droughts. The panel shared the 2007 Nobel Peace Prize with climate campaigner Al Gore, the former U.S. vice president. The IPCC is set to start releasing portions of its fifth report next year. Van Ypersele would not discuss the contents except to say the report will include new research on the melting of ice sheets in Greenland and Antarctica, boosting previous estimates on sea level rise. He said the scientific backing for man-made climate change is now so strong that it can be compared to the consensus behind the principles of gravity. “It’s a very, very broad consensus. There are a few individuals who don’t believe it, but we are talking about science and not beliefs,” Van Ypersele told AP. Climate change skeptics say IPCC scientists have in the past overestimated the effect of the accumulation of CO2 in the atmosphere and underplayed natural cycles of warming and cooling. Others have claimed the authors, who aren’t paid for their work, exaggerated the effects that climate change will have on the environment and on human life.

**Warming is real and human caused, skeptics are just hacks**

**Elizabeth Muller, 7/29**

co--‐Founder and Executive Director of Berkeley Earth “250 YEARS OF GLOBAL WARMING Berkeley Earth Releases New Analysis” <http://berkeleyearth.org/pdf/berkeley-earth-press-release-july-29.pdf>, accessed 9/22/12 WYO/JF

**According to a new Berkeley Earth study released today, the average temperature of the Earth’s land** **has risen by 1.5 °C over the past 250 years**. The good **match between the new** temperature r**ecord and historical carbon dioxide records suggests that the most straightforward explanation for this warming is human greenhouse gas emissions**. Together with their most recent results and papers, Berkeley Earth also released their raw data and analysis programs. They will be available online at BerkeleyEarth.org on July 30. **The new analysis** from Berkeley Earth **goes all the way back to 1753, about 100 years earlier than previous groups’ analyses**. **The limited land coverage prior to 1850 results in larger uncertainties in the behavior of the record; despite these, the behavior is significant.** Robert Rohde, Lead Scientist for Berkeley Earth and the person who carried out most of the analysis, noted that “**Sudden drops in the early temperature record (1753 to 1850) correspond to known volcanic events.”** Volcanoes spew particles into the air, which then reflect sunlight and cool the earth for a few years. **In the Berkeley Earth temperature plot** (see figure below), **sudden dips in temperature caused by large volcanic explosions are evident back to the late 1700s**. Berkeley Earth compared the shape of the gradual rise over 250 years to simple math functions (exponentials, polynomials) and to solar activity (known through historical records of sunspot numbers), and even to rising functions such as world population. Richard Muller, Founder and Scientific Director of Berkeley Earth, notes “**Much to my surprise, by far the best match was to the record of atmospheric carbon dioxide, measured from atmospheric samples and air trapped in polar ice.”**

MARKED

 He emphasizes that the match between the data and the theory doesn’t prove that carbon dioxide is responsible for the warming, but the good fit makes it the strongest contender. “**To be considered seriously, any alternative explanation must match the data at least as well as does carbon dioxide.” In its 2007 report the IPCC concluded only that “most” of the warming of the past 50 years could be attributed to humans.** It was possible, according to the IPCC, that increased solar activity could have contributed to warming prior to 1956. **Berkeley Earth analyzed about 5 times more station records than were used in previous analyses, and this expanded data base along with its new statistical approach allowed Berkeley Earth to go about 100 years farther back in time than previous studies**. **By doing so, the Berkeley Earth team was able to conclude that over 250 years, the contribution of solar activity to global warming is negligible**. Some of the scientists on the Berkeley Earth team admit surprise that the new analysis has shown such clear agreement between global land--‐temperature rise and human--‐caused greenhouse gases. “I was not expecting this,” says Richard Muller, “but as a scientist, I feel it is my duty to let the evidence change my mind.” Elizabeth Muller, co--‐Founder and Executive Director of Berkeley Earth, says that “**One of our goals at Berkeley Earth is complete transparency – we believe that everyone should be able to access raw climate data and do their own analysis. Scientists have a duty to be ‘properly skeptical’, and we are trying to lower the barriers to entry into the field.”** Robert Rohde created an online feature that allows people to look up temperature records by location. “If you want to know what the temperature change has been in your city, your state, or even your country, you can now find this online at BerkeleyEarth.org” says Rohde. He adds, “We hope people will have a lot of fun interacting with the data.” This feature should be available to the public by Monday July 30. **A previous Berkeley Earth study, released in October 2011, found that the land--‐surface temperature had risen by about 0.9 °C over the past 50 years (**which was consistent with previous analyses) **and directly addressed scientific concerns raised by skeptics,** **including the urban heat island effect, poor station quality, and the risk of data selection bias.** The Berkeley Earth team values the simplicity of its analysis, which does not depend on the large complex global climate models that have been criticized by climate skeptics for their hidden assumptions and adjustable parameters. **The conclusion that the warming is due to humans is based simply on the close agreement between the shape of the observed temperature rise and the known greenhouse gas increase.** Elizabeth adds, “The current data does not include ocean temperatures; these will be added in the next phase of the Berkeley Earth studies. Another next step for our team is to think about the implications of our findings.”

#### Growth is sustainable, no resource shortages. All arguments are just pessimism, human ingenuity, technology and substitution solves all issues. That’s our Energy 10’

#### As the collapse happens, the elite will just kill off those not necessary. That’s Dasmann 89’

#### Elite Won’t be overthrown

Kassiola 90

(Joel, Prof of Poli-Sci @ Brooklyn College, “The death of industrial civilization,” p. 194)

Moreover, as a result of disappointment, Wildean tragedy, and value erosion, the postindustrial elite (the current members of the beneficiary class within the dominant, postindustrial social paradigm and structure) might come to a realization unique in history. The elite, postindustrial consciousness may be shocked into change by increasingly conspicuous limits to growth as well as by the profoundly challenging nature of the limits-to-growth literature: the futility, insecurity, and disaster looming in our foreseeable future (unlike the predicted long-range disaster of our sun burning up in several billion years), and a future filled with the preoccupation of seeking to maintain their relative advantages and ceaselessly fend off all of the others seeking to replace them. The enjoyment of the elite’s present success seems short-lived, unstable, and increasingly inadequate relative to both the concern and effort expended in attaining such “success” in the first place, and the rising costs of maintaining their celebrated position on top.

#### Economic growth is the only solution to famine

Mahder 8

(Ethiopian Development Website, “Addressing the root cause of famine and poverty in Ethiopia,” September 27, 2008,
http://mahder.com/pdf/Addressing\_the\_root\_cause\_of\_famine\_and\_poverty\_in\_Ethiopia..pdf, AD: 7-6-9)

It is well established that there is a strong correlation between famine and economic development or growth. Economic growth leads to development and reduction in poverty and famine. MAAAAARRRKKKKEEEDDD

Real economic growth embracing and benefiting all the citizens of a country produces safety mechanisms which are of vital importance in alleviating or avoiding displacements and live destruction emanating from famine. The suffering and significant loss of lives resulting from persistent famines which are hitting Ethiopia could not be avoided or even mitigated owing to the shrinking economy or increasing poverty in the country. On the other hand, one can can not avoid but face the irony of Ethiopia failing to be self sufficient and feed its population despite possessing all the potential to do so. Thus a critical examination of the major stumbling block or factor acting as a bottleneck and preventing the country from eradicating or even coping with famine is necessary.

#### Economic Crises Directly increase rate of disease transmission

Stuckler 11

[Marc Suhrcke Norwich School of Medicine, University of East Anglia, David Stuckler- Harvard School of Public Health, Jonathan E. Suk- Future Threats and Determinants Section, Scientific Advice Unit, European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control, Monica Desai- London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, Michaela Senek- Norwich School of Medicine, University of East Anglia, Martin McKee- London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, Svetla Tsolova- (ECDC), Sanjay Basu- Department of Medicine, University of California San Francisco, Ibrahim Abubakar- Norwich School of Medicine, University of East Anglia, Paul Hunter- Norwich School of Medicine, University of East Anglia, Boika Rechel- Norwich School of Medicine, University of East Anglia, Jan C. Semenza- (ECDC), (2011) The Impact of Economic Crises on Communicable Disease Transmission and Control: A Systematic Review of the Evidence. PLoS ONE data base, \\wyo-bb]

We found evidence that crises often increased direct and indirect contact rates among human hosts or common vehicles and between human hosts and disease vectors (Figure 1) [13], [34], [46], [47]. We also observed that crises can lead to changes in host behaviour that decrease host immunity [30], [48], [49], [50], [51], [52]. As concerns direct human-to-human transmission, economic downturns may lead to increased crime, especially against property (although this can be mitigated by effective policing [53] and by increased social welfare spending, as occurred in the Great Depression [54]), as well as to increased prison populations. Prisons, in turn, have been shown to act as incubators for tuberculosis, for example, with overcrowding playing a key role, and subsequent spill-overs to the general population

MMMMMAAAARRRRRKKKKKEEEEEDDDD

 [12], [13], [34], [55]. Indirect transmission through a common vehicle was documented in Uzbekistan subsequent to the breakup of the former Soviet Union [56]. High diarrheal disease rates during the summer months were recorded in Nukus, an administrative centre of a region in Uzbekistan. A randomized intervention trial using home chlorination pinpointed the source of these high disease rates: cross-connections between the municipal water distribution system and sewer lines were implicated as the common vehicle in disease transmission. Leaky pipes and lack of water pressure are manifestations of a failing infrastructure, mismanaged during times of economic hardship, which can cross-contaminate the drinking water supply. The political, social and economic upheaval at the time resulted in deterioration of water treatment and distribution systems in Uzbekistan, with serious implications for public health. Environmental changes in vector habitats may occur due to economic downturns, which could increase contact rates between humans and disease vectors. One study found that mortgage foreclosures in the Californian housing market in California in 2007 caused homes with swimming pools to be abandoned, increasing breeding habitats for mosquitoes. This was linked to an unexpectedly early seasonal increase in West Nile Virus cases [46]. A study of the economic crisis in Kosovo in 1999–2000 found that economic dislocation resulted in the abandonment of food stores. Subsequent rises in rodent populations led to the emergence of tularaemia [47]. An ecologic study suggested that people in Central and Eastern Europe who returned to subsistence agricultural productions, in particular mushroom harvesting, were at greater risk of tick-borne encephalitis [13]. Behavioural changes induced by economic downturns may lead to increased exposure to disease. Loss of income, involuntary unemployment and job insecurity appear to lead to increased tobacco consumption, substance abuse and hazardous drinking, all of which could impair immunity [52]. For example, tobacco use increases the immediate risk of TB mortality and longer-term risk of TB spread and reactivation [35], [51]. Alcohol can increase susceptibility to some infectious diseases, such as pneumonia and tuberculosis [38]. However, some research has suggested that risky behaviours associated with affluent lifestyles can decrease during recessions [27], [57], depending on the price and availability of the substances in question [30], [45]. The implications for infectious disease are not, however, known. Other factors may also reduce immunity during an economic downturn, but the links are indirect. There is some evidence linking stress to impaired immunological status, by virtue of the cortisol response, increasing susceptibility to certain infectious diseases, [49] [48] although responses to stress vary greatly between individuals [58]. Meanwhile, governments which do not provide food subsidies to indigent populations when faced with rising food prices risk impairing nutrition, a risk factor for several infectious diseases that appears to reflect weakening immunological defences against latent infections, for example, reactivation of tuberculosis [38].

Economic collapse leads to terrorism

Bremmer 9(Ian, - President of the Eurasia Group, sr. fellow @ World Policy Institute, , 3/4/09, *Foreign Policy,* http://eurasia.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2009/03/04/the\_global\_recession\_heightens\_terrorist\_risks) ET

But there's another reason why the financial crisis heightens the risk of global terrorism. Militants thrive in places where no one is fully in charge. The global recession threatens to create more such places. No matter how cohesive and determined a terrorist organization, it needs a supportive environment in which to flourish. That means a location that provides a steady stream of funds and recruits and the support (or at least acceptance) of the local population. Much of the counter-terrorist success we've seen in Iraq's al Anbar province over the past two years is a direct result of an increased willingness of local Iraqis to help the Iraqi army and US troops oust the militants operating there. In part, that's because the area's tribal leaders have their own incentives (including payment in cash and weaponry) for cooperating with occupation forces. But it's also because foreign militants have alienated the locals. The security deterioration of the past year in Pakistan and Afghanistan reflects exactly the opposite phenomenon. In the region along both sides of their shared border, local tribal leaders have yet to express much interest in helping Pakistani and NATO soldiers target local or foreign militants. For those with the power to either protect or betray the senior al-Qaeda leaders believed to be hiding in the region, NATO and Pakistani authorities have yet to find either sweet enough carrots or sharp enough sticks to shift allegiances. The slowdown threatens to slow the progress of a number of developing countries.

MMMMMAAAAARRRRRKKKKEEEEDDDD

Most states don't provide ground as fertile for militancy as places like Afghanistan, Somalia, and Yemen. But as more people lose their jobs, their homes, and opportunities for prosperity -- in emerging market countries or even within minority communities inside developed states -- it becomes easier for local militants to find volunteers. This is why the growing risk of attack from suicide bombers and well-trained gunmen in Pakistan creates risks that extend beyond South Asia. This is a country that is home to lawless regions where local and international militants thrive, nuclear weapons and material, a history of nuclear smuggling, a cash-starved government, and a deteriorating economy. Pakistan is far from the only country in which terrorism threatens to spill across borders.

#### 1) Biotech development creates a world of democracy, clean air and water while ending oppression and malnutrition

Glickman 99

(Dan Glickman Secretary of Agriculture “How Will Scientists, Farmers, And Consumers Learn to Love Biotechnology  And What Happens If They Don't?” http://www.usda.gov/news/releases/1999/07/0285 July 13, 1999)

"Public policy must lead in this area and not merely react.   Industry and government cannot engage in hedging or double talking as problems develop, which no doubt they will. "At the same time, science will march forward, and especially in agriculture, that science can help to create a world where no one needs to go hungry, where developing nations can become more food self-sufficient and thereby become freer and more democratic, where the environmental challenges and clean water, clean air, global warming and climate change, must be met with sound and modern science   and that will involve biotechnological solutions. "Notwithstanding my concerns raised here today, I would caution those who would be too cautious in pursuing the future.  As President Kennedy said, "We should not let our fears hold us back from pursuing our hopes."  "So let us continue to move forward thoughtfully with biotechnology in agriculture but with a measured sense of what it is and what it can be.  We will then avoid relegating this promising new technology to the pile of what- might-have-beens, and instead realize its potential as one of the tools that will help us feed the growing world population in a sustainable manner.

# eco

#### You shouldn’t throw the baby out with the bathwater- each question of security is different and should be judged on an individual and contextual basis.

Buzan, Professor of IR at the [London School of Economics](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/London_School_of_Economics), 1983

(Barry, honorary professor at the [University of Copenhagen](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/University_of_Copenhagen), *People, States, and Fear: The National Security Problem in International Relations*, pg. 65 p3)

Perhaps the most obvious conclusion refers back to one of the observations with which we began, namely that states are exceedingly dissimilar as objects of security. Each of the components we examined offers large numbers of options and, when added together, these results in a limitless array of combinations around which a state might be structured. Because of this diversity, the nature of security as a problem necessarily differs substantially from state to state. All states are to some degree vulnerable to military and economic threats, and many also suffer from a fundamental political insecurity. The different kinds of threat, which makes national security a problem in many dimensions rather than just a matter of military defense. The idea of the state, its institutions, and even its territory can all be threatened as much by the manipulation of ideas as by the wielding of military power. Since the ideas underpinning the state are themselves subject to evolution, the problem is not only difficult to solve, but may even be hard to identify. The multi-layered nature of the state opens it to threats on many levels, particular vulnerabilities depending on the diversity of states as referent objects for security underpins the argument in the Introduction about the impossibility of devising a useful general definition for national security. The concept of security can be mapped in a general sense, as we are doing here. But it can only be given specific substance in relation to concrete cases. Ideally, work at each of these levels, the general and the specific, should inform and complement one another.