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## \*\*\*AT Environment Advantage

### AT Oil Spills – No Impact

#### Creation of vessel routing system decreases potential for collisions, oil spills, and threats to marine environment.

Federal Register, 2010

<http://www.dot.state.ak.us/stwddes/desports/assets/pdf/regionalports_finalreport0111.pdf>

The U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) is currently conducting a study to assess whether the creation of a vessel routing system is advisable in the Bering Strait area. Establishing predictable and charted routing may address some of the issues and impediments listed above by reducing congestion and making vessel movements more predictable, thereby decreasing potential for collisions, oil spills, and other threats to the marine environment. The study will take a minimum of two years to complete and results may validate the status quo (no routing measures) or may conclude that changes are needed to enhance the navigational safety and efficiency of vessels.

### Chemical Cleaning Turn

#### The Coast Guard uses toxic chemicals to clean up oil spills, which could cause even more damage to environment than oil

Roosevelt ‘10

Margot Roosevelt, staff writer for LA Times. “Gulf oil spill: Did Coast Guard allow excessive toxic dispersants?” The Los Angeles Times. July 31, 2010. <http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/greenspace/2010/07/gulf-oil-spill-chemical-dispersants-coast-guard.html>.

“BP carpet-bombed the ocean with these chemicals, and the Coast Guard allowed them to do it,” said Rep. Edward J. Markey (D-Mass.), chairman of the House energy and environment subcommittee. "After we discovered how toxic these chemicals really are, they had no business being spread across the gulf in this manner." Dispersants were authorized by federal officials despite their toxicity because the ecological damage from oil was deemed to be worse. But scientists say that the chemicals, which break up the oil into tiny droplets, have contributed to large plumes of hydrocarbons below the ocean's surface. And it is unclear whether the danger to marine organisms may be higher from toxic dispersants or from oil. The documents also reveal contradictions in accounts of how much chemical dispersant was being used. According to DeepwaterHorizonResponse.com, the government’s official website, 1.8 million gallons of dispersants have been sprayed on the surface of the gulf and beneath the water since the April 20 rig explosion. ” The validity of those numbers are now in question,” Markey said, citing “huge discrepancies” that raise questions as to whether the Coast Guard “exercised appropriate oversight.”

### No Solvency – Need New Tech

#### Even with the port, technologies are not up to date.

Nuka Research and Planning Group 10 Nuka Research and Planning Group, LLC, November 2010 “OIL SPILL PREVENTION and RESPONSE IN THE U.S. ARCTIC OCEAN: Unexamined Risks, Unacceptable Consequences” <http://www.pewtrusts.org/uploadedFiles/wwwpewtrustsorg/Reports/Protecting_ocean_life/PEW-1010_ARTIC_Report.pdf>

Oil spill cleanup technologies have been slow to improve, and the basic tools used to contain and remove oil spills today are very similar to those in place decades ago. The Deepwater Horizon incident led to a number of innovations, forced by the imminent pressure of an exploding oil well. Moving forward, a more comprehensive and proactive research-and-development regime should be designed to expand the limits of existing spill response technologies, particularly mechanical recovery, the only technique that removes oil from the environment. Programs such as the JIP are a first step in this process, though the JIP had many flaws, including a lack of peer review and a lack of transparency during the research. Spill response technologies have not kept pace with advances in drilling technologies. New technologies for subsea containment, such as the one developed and used during the Deepwater Horizon spill, should be developed for the Arctic Ocean.

### No Solvency – Weather

#### Weather prevents response teams from acting and slow the movement of oil in the Arctic

Leaton 7 James Leaton is project director of Carbon Tracker and previously worked as a sustainability advisor at PricewaterhouseCoopers and World Wildlife Fund (WWF). 2007. Oil Spill Response Challenges in Arctic Waters. http://www.worldwildlife.org/what/wherewework/arctic/WWFBinaryitem24363.pdf

Response limits may also be driven by a combination of factors that, singly, would not affect the response. The cumulative effect of two or more environmental factors is not necessarily equal to the sum of the two factors individually: the interaction of the factors may cause more extreme impacts. For example, the combination of wind and cold can cause the wind chill factor to make air temperatures dangerous to responders, or cause ice to form on vessels and equipment, making them unsafe or unstable. Waves of a certain height or period present a greater obstacle to response operations when there is a strong wind or low visibility. All spill response requires effective planning, tracking, and surveillance. Visual methods of tracking an oil slick on water can be hampered by poor visibility due to darkness (which can lasts for months) or fog (which can last for several days). Oil that moves under ice is more difficult to track than oil on open water (Brandvik et al. 2006). Any aircraft-based surveillance efforts will be subject to safety limitations in wind or poor visibility. Remote sensing technologies may be impervious to some of these challenges; however, the technology and expertise necessary to operate these systems is not readily available in many arctic regions. While arctic conditions may reduce the effectiveness of spill response methods, there may be times when these same conditions provide opportunities that may not exist in open water. For example, sea ice can act as a natural containment barrier to facilitate mechanical recovery or burning of the oil contained by ice floes (Brandvik et al., 2006), if it can be accessed safely. Solid ice pack can serve as a platform to support heavy equipment and vehicles in areas that might otherwise be inaccessible (ACS, 2006). Extended daylight during summer months could increase operational periods, if sufficient staffing is available and other conditions allow safe access and operations. Colder temperatures may cause the oil to be more viscous and slow spreading (Brandvik et al., 2006).

### No Spills – Prevention

#### Oil Companies are already taking preventive actions

Broder, John M. 27 June 2012 "Interior Department Will Likely Allow Shell to Drill in Arctic." *The New York Times*. The New York Times,. Web. 29 June 2012. <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/06/27/science/earth/interior-department-will-likely-allow-shell-to-drill-in-arctic.html?\_r=2>.

WASHINGTON — Interior Secretary [Ken Salazar](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/s/ken_salazar/index.html?inline=nyt-per) said Tuesday that it was “highly likely” that the agency would grant Shell permits to begin drilling exploratory wells off the North Slope of Alaska as early as next month. Mr. Salazar, while acknowledging that the Arctic presented unique environmental and safety challenges for [oil](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/business/energy-environment/oil-petroleum-and-gasoline/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier) and gas operations, said he was confident that Shell would meet the [Interior Department](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/i/interior_department/index.html?inline=nyt-org)’s new standards for [offshore drilling](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/o/offshore_drilling_and_exploration/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier). He noted that Shell had successfully tested a new [oil spill](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/o/oil_spills/gulf_of_mexico_2010/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier) containment device in Washington State’s Puget Sound in recent days and said he believed the company’s claims that it could collect at least 90 percent of any oil spilled in the event of a well blowout. “I believe there will not be an oil spill,” Mr. Salazar said in a telephone briefing from [Trondheim, Norway](http://www.trondheim.com/engelsk/), where he is participating in an international conference on Arctic drilling safety. “If there is, I think the response capability is there to arrest the problem very quickly and minimize damage. If I were not confident that would happen, I would not let the permits go forward.

#### The Status quo solves for oil spill response

Kim Murphy 3/28/12 (reporter at the Los Angeles times) Arctic drilling: Beaufort Sea oil spill response plan approved, http://articles.latimes.com/2012/mar/28/nation/la-na-nn-arctic-drilling-20120328

Reporting from Seattle — Federal authorities have approved an oil spill response plan that could allow drilling to commence this summer in the Beaufort Sea, the first major offshore drilling in the Arctic since the early 1990s. Though Shell Alaska still needs several final permits, the oil spill plan has been the most debated aspect of the upcoming drilling program, with fears that cleaning up an offshore blowout in the turbulent, often icy seas of the Arctic could be a formidable challenge.

### No Pipeline Spills

#### New pipes stop oil spills from even happening

Laskow ‘11  
Sarah Laskow, staff writer for Good magazine. “Environment Improved Pipelines Could Stop Oil Spills Before They Start.” Good magazine- Environment. August 15, 2011. <http://www.good.is/post/improving-pipelines-could-stop-oil-spills-before-they-start/>.

One of the ways to stop spills is to improve pipelines so they don't break. The North Sea spill began when a pipeline called a “flow line” broke. The oil that spilled this past summer in Montana came from a ruptured transport pipeline buried (perhaps not deep enough) beneath the overflowing Yellowstone River. And although the disaster at Deepwater Horizon began when the rig caught fire and started sinking, the oil that contaminated the Gulf of Mexico and its coast came from the broken pipeline deep below the surface. With financial support from Royal Dutch Shell, researchers at the Massachusetts Institute for Technology have begun working to predict how pipelines like the one that broke in the Deepwater Horizon spill will perform under stress. Their work, the team reported back in June, fits into a slew of recent projects exploring the cause and effects of warped pipelines. The MIT team, led by Tomasz Wierzbicki, used a modeling system developed to predict how cars built of different materials would perform in crashes, conducting tests to determine a particular material’s characteristics and later using those results to create computer simulations of particular structures. In a preliminary exercise to prove their model could improve our understanding pipelines, the team simulated the sinking of the Deepwater Horizon rig. Their model showed cracks appearing in the pipeline in the same places that the pipe had fractured. Now that the team has some confidence that they can apply their model to pipelines, different materials can be tested, and the team can one day recommend materials that have a better chance of standing up to strains the pressures of deep waters, the dangers of ice in Arctic climates, and even accidents like the fire that started the Deepwater Horizon spill.

### No Impact – Spills On Spills

#### Spills happen all the time with no real impact and safeguards prevent escalation

Drew Thornley 2009 independent public-policy analyst, adjunct and part-time university lecturer, and licensed attorney (Alabama). A native of Jasper, Alabama, I'm a 2002 graduate of The University of Alabama (B.A., economics, summa cum laude) and a 2005 graduate of Harvard Law School (J.D.). “Energy and the Environment: Myths and Facts” April 2009 <http://www.manhattan-institute.org/energymyths/myth8.htm>

Research published in 2000 by the U.S. Minerals Management Service (MMS)[106] documents the decreasing occurrence of crude-oil spills in the OCS. Revising previous estimates first published in 1994, the authors analyzed data through 1999 and concluded that oil-spill rates for OCS platforms, tankers, and barges continued to decline.[107] Additionally, the number of oil spills from platforms, tankers, and pipelines is small, relative to the amount of oil extracted and transported. Even so, oil spills remain an unpleasant reality of offshore oil drilling. Certainly, any amount of oil spilled into the ocean is undesirable, but offshore oil operations contribute relatively little of the oil that enters ocean waters each year. For example, ocean floors naturally seep more oil into the ocean than do oil-drilling accidents and oil-tanker spills combined. (However, such seepage generally does not rise to the surface or reach the coastlines and, thus, is not as apparent as oil-drilling spills.) According to the National Academies’ National Research Council, natural processes are responsible for over 60 percent of the petroleum that enters North American ocean waters and over 45 percent of the petroleum that enters ocean waters worldwide.[108] Thus, in percentage terms, **North America’s oil-drilling activities spill less oil into the ocean than the global average, suggesting that our drilling is comparatively safe for the environment. Ironically, research shows that drilling can actually reduce natural seepage, as it relieves the pressure that drives oil and gas up from ocean floors and into ocean waters**. In 1999, two peer-reviewed studies found that natural seepage in the northern Santa Barbara Channel was significantly reduced by oil production. The researchers documented that natural seepage declined 50 percent around Platform Holly over a twenty-two-year period, concluding that, as oil was pumped from the reservoir, the pressure that drives natural seepage dropped.[109] Offshore oil drilling is carefully monitored for environmental safety. Using state-of-the-art technology and employing a range of procedural safeguards, U.S. offshore drilling has a track record of minimal environmental impact. Modern oil drilling is even designed to withstand hurricanes and tropical storms. According to the MMS, 3,050 of the Gulf of Mexico’s 4,000 platforms and 22,000 of the 33,000 miles of the Gulf’s pipelines were in the direct path of either Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita. The hurricanes destroyed 115 drilling platforms, damaged 52 others, and damaged 535 pipeline segments, yet “there was no loss of life and no major oil spills attributed to either storm.”[110]

### No Impact – Spills On Spills

#### Oil spills are frequent in Alaska

Patti Epler 06/25/11 (Alaskan news reporter with the Alaska Dispatch) Third North Slope oil spill in a week, 2http://www.alaskadispatch.com/article/third-north-slope-oil-spill-week

Small oil spills on the North Slope are continuing to keep BP Alaska crews and state environmental officials busy this summer. The company has had to deal with three small spills in just the last week, events that appear to be related to maintenance and testing activities. BP Exploration Alaska spokesman Steve Rinehart said Monday all three are still under investigation by company experts so it's not clear whether corrosion -- a major issue for the aging oil field -- is to blame. On July 16, an underground section of pipe ruptured at the Lisburne field, dumping as many as 100 barrels of fluid -- mostly methanol and water and a small amount of crude -- onto a gravel pad and into a nearly tundra pond. The leak occurred while work crews were testing newly installed valves in that area. Then on Thursday, July 21, BP discovered a new spill, this one in a flare pit at Flow Station 2 in the Prudhoe Bay unit. BP and state Department of Environmental Conservation officials said about 200 gallons of fluid -- a mix of briny water, gas and crude oil -- spilled into the flare pit at the production facility, creating an oil ring around the pit.ing oil field -- is to blame.

### No Impact to Spills

#### Oil spill impacts are exagerated

David **Crocker** April 30 **2011** Oil Spills Are Not “Environmental Catastrophes” ( [Attorney](http://www.davidcrocker.com) , carrying on an international practice in the areas of Information Technology, Licensing, Intellectual Property and Business law; negotiated licenses and commercial agreements in all places, including Russia, the UK, Europe, Japan and South Korea)

http://www.behindbluelines.com/2011/04/30/oil-spills-are-not-enviromental-catastrophes/

Obviously, oil spills are messy and unpleasant – and to be avoided. But are they “catastrophes” in the perfervid language of contemporary environmentalism – events causing irreparable or even persistent damage? Clearly not. First, consider some facts. During World War II, thousands of ships were sunk and millions of gallons of oil spilled. In merchant tonnage alone, [the US lost over 1,500 ships](http://www.usmm.org/shipsunkdamaged.html) with hundreds more damaged. The Germans [sank 42 oil tankers off the US east coast](http://science.jrank.org/pages/4848/Oil-Spills-Oil-pollution.html) and oil fouling the seascape was a fact of life during the war years. Since the war, we’ve seen numerous oil spills large and small – with what result? In fact, [the oceans seep oil](http://geology.com/nasa/oil-seeps/). People growing up on the US Gulf coast live with tar balls washing up on the beach. Each year, the equivalent of [two Exxon Valdezes seep into the Gulf](http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2000/01/000127082228.htm) – to no effect other than feeding adapted bacteria. So, what’s the big deal with the BP spill last year? Apparently, not much. From [the Globe and Mail:](http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/opinions/opinion/can-you-handle-the-truth/article1998171/) Here’s some news you may not have heard: One year after the worst oil spill in history, the Gulf of Mexico is nearly back to normal. That’s right: Armageddon didn’t happen. Instead of terrible harm to the biosphere, the Deepwater Horizon spill has caused only mild problems. In fact, because of the fishing bans imposed after the spill, there are more fish than ever. Shark and mackerel populations have exploded. “Red snapper are unbelievable right now,” one fisherman said. “You could put a rock on the end a string and they’d bite it.” Apparently, the truth is difficult to acknowledge: Yet, despite the good news, the coverage of the blowout’s anniversary last week was almost unrelievedly grim. Not one story I read bothered to chronicle the Gulf’s astonishing recovery. The lone exception was a brave CBC reporter who dared to say that things were looking pretty good. A wire story in the Toronto Star was far more typical. “You can’t see or smell the oil, but scientists fear problems are hidden in marshes and the food web,” the headline said. In fact, most scientists believe the Gulf is in surprisingly good shape. When three dozen of them were asked to rate the current health of the Gulf’s ecosystem on a 1-to-100 scale, they gave it an average grade of 68 – not bad, considering that, before the spill, they gave it a 71. “People are having a hard time accepting it. Me, too,” says Ed Overton, a chemist at Louisiana State University. “There are things that are wrong. There is still oil out there. But it is not nearly as bad as I expected it would be a year later.” But will this change the dominant narrative? Doubtful at best. After all, if you’re invested in flat-earth, no-growth [Luddism](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Neo-Luddism) and believe that humans are a scourge on Mother Gaia, then you’ll stop your ears and stamp your feet. But if you’re an adult, you’ll relax, do your best to avoid oil spills wherever possible, but not faint with fright if one does occur. After all, nature does it anyway, regardless of what we do.

### No Impact – Exaggerated

#### Environmentalists Hate Anything In The Arctic

Osthagen, Andreas. 27 Mar. 2012."The Arctic Institute - Center for Circumpolar Security Studies." *The Arctic Institute - Center for Circumpolar Security Studies*. (Analyst - Norway/EU Arctic Policy, Offshore Arctic Oil and Gas), Web. 29 June 2012. <http://www.thearcticinstitute.org/2012/03/to-drill-or-not-to-drill-arctic.html>

Taking this to the extreme, **non-governmental environmental organizations like Greenpeace and Bellona have actively promoted an Arctic region free of petroleum activity. Political engagement and legal and illegal protests, have highlighted what they perceive to be exploitation of a pristine environment by oil companies only seeking profits.** As Scottish Cairn Energy conducted exploratory drillings off the coast of Greenland in 2010 and 2011, **Greenpeace staged extensive illegal protests and occupied an oil rig to emphasize the dangers of drilling in Arctic waters [8]. These actions have caused great resentment** amongst the Greenlandic population at large, as Greenpeace is perceived to interfere with Greenland’s recently acquired right to self-government. **Different environmental organizations and private individuals have also used litigation as a way to halt the oil and gas development in Alaska.** In Norway **the proposal to open up the southern Arctic regions** of Lofoten and Vesterålen **caused internal conflict in the current coalition government, while at the same time triggering a national oil and gas debate. Ultimately the topic of when and how to allow offshore Arctic drilling has caused heated debate in most of the Arctic nations.**

### Port Hurts Environment

#### Arctic port harms environment

Bob Weber 2011

“Promised Arctic naval port lags”

<http://www.winnipegfreepress.com/canada/promised-arctic-naval-port-lags-122816134.html?device=mobile>

In 2008, the navy was informed the project would be subject to an environmental review by the Nunavut Impact Review Board. That board required information on the facility's potential environmental impact before it would grant a construction. The navy missed a series of deadlines for information on those impacts and didn't file its assessment until April 29 this year. Even then, the board found the submission incomplete, listing 16 areas requiring more information. In addition, the environmental consultants hired by the navy found a series of problems with the site. In documents posted earlier this month, the consultants reported soil in the area exceeded guidelines for contamination by hydrocarbons and the potentially toxic metals copper, lead, zinc, arsenic and cadmium. Similar problems exist in surface water. A spokeswoman from Breakwater Resources, the last company to operate the mine, confirms the environmental cleanup is ongoing. "Reclamation of that facility is under way," said Ann Wilkinson.

#### Port facilities are likely to cause transboundary impacts

Eeva Furman, Mikael Hildén 1997

GUIDELINES FOR ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA) IN THE ARCTIC

<http://www.unece.org.unecedev.colo.iway.ch/fileadmin/DAM/env/eia/documents/EIAguides/Arctic_EIA_guide.pdf>

In the Arctic, the development of oil and gas resources, large-scale hydroelectric projects, and extensive mining and smelter works are activities that have already led to transboundary impacts. For these activities the scale of operation is often so large that transboundary impacts can occur even though the border is far away. In addition several smaller activities, such as forestry development, land drainage and road building have caused transboundary impacts, when these activities have occurred close to borders. Planned activities, for example, the opening of new sea routes in the high Arctic and their required port facilities are also likely to cause transboundary impacts. In many countries, detailed lists of activities that may cause adverse environmental impacts have been compiled. In the border areas in the Arctic, these lists should be compared and harmonised through bi- or multilateral agreements.

### Port Hurts Environment

#### Ports pose a significant threat to water quality.

United Nations Transport Division. [ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF PORT DEVELOPMENT] 1992. <http://www.unescap.org/ttdw/Publications/TFS_pubs/Pub_1234/pub_1234_ch2.pdf>

Breakwaters and landfills may change current patterns and cause stagnation of water behind the structures. If municipal or industrial effluent flows into a port, stagnant port water may deteriorate through a dramatic increase of phytoplankton and a decrease of dissolved oxygen, resulting from eutrophication of water, caused by effluents containing nutrient salts (Chemical compounds including Nandi P). Anaerobic water leads to the generation of hydrogen supplied (H2S) and can be identified by its odor. It has serious effects on Organisms. Municipal sewage also brings coli form bacteria into the port and may cause Unacceptable contamination of the harbor.

#### Ports create contaminated ocean floors.

United Nations Transport Division. [ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF PORT DEVELOPMENT] 1992. <http://www.unescap.org/ttdw/Publications/TFS_pubs/Pub_1234/pub_1234_ch2.pdf>

The location of a port may accelerate sediment deposition in stagnant water behind Structures and cause contamination of the sea bottom. Sediment deposition covers bottom Biota and physical habitat. Pile structures shade the bottom and affect habitat. Eutrophication of water induces sedimentation of dead plankton and changes chemical characteristics of bottom sediments, resulting in an increase of organic matter, hydrogen sulphide, and Mobilization of harmful substances.

#### Creation of ports disrupts the ecosystem and biodiversity found in ocean.

United Nations Transport Division. [ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF PORT DEVELOPMENT] 1992. <http://www.unescap.org/ttdw/Publications/TFS_pubs/Pub_1234/pub_1234_ch2.pdf>

The location of a port affects aquatic fauna and flora through changes of water quality, Coastal hydrology and bottom contamination. Land reclamation from the sea destroys bottom Habitat and displaces fishery resources. Terrestrial fauna and flora may also be altered by the Location of a port. Diminution of bottom biota is usually linked to a reduction of fishery resources, and Occasionally to an increase of undesirable species. Deterioration of water quality usually gives rise to changes in aquatic biota: a decrease in the number of species; and an increase in the Quantity of one or two specific species. Further deterioration may lead to the destruction of All kinds of aquatic biota. Diminution of plants in a shore zone within enclosed water may degrade its aeration Capability and worsen water pollution. Mangroves in wetlands play an important role in providing habitat for terrestrial and aquatic biota and indirectly recovering water quality.

### Port Construction Hurts Environment

#### Construction of ports pollutes waters.

United Nations Transport Division. [ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF PORT DEVELOPMENT] 1992. <http://www.unescap.org/ttdw/Publications/TFS_pubs/Pub_1234/pub_1234_ch2.pdf>

Pile driving, deposition of rubble, dredging, sand compaction and other construction work In water will cause the resuspension of sediments and turbid water. Resuspension of sediments in water leads to an increase in the level of suspended solids (88) and in the concentration of Organic matter, possibly to toxic or harmful levels. It also reduces sunlight penetration. Work vessels are a possible cause of oil spills, garbage discharge, and leakage of other Substances into water. Diffusion from concrete work in water and overflows from landfills may Be possible sources of water pollution.

#### Port construction causes damage to ocean floors.

United Nations Transport Division. [ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF PORT DEVELOPMENT] 1992. <http://www.unescap.org/ttdw/Publications/TFS_pubs/Pub_1234/pub_1234_ch2.pdf>

Construction work and dredging disturb bottom sediments and induce resuspension, Dispersal and settlement of such sediments. Dumping of dredged material directly alters bottom configuration and biota and may disperse toxic or harmful chemicals around the Disposal site. Dredging removes bottom habitat and may lead to a loss of fishery resources.

#### Port construction disrupts the ocean’s natural ecological system.

United Nations Transport Division. [ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF PORT DEVELOPMENT] 1992. <http://www.unescap.org/ttdw/Publications/TFS_pubs/Pub_1234/pub_1234_ch2.pdf>

Disturbance from construction activities may cause displacement of fishery resources And other mobile bottom biota. Dredging removes bottom biota and dumping of dredged material covers bottom habitat, both of which may reduce fishery resources. Settlement of Resuspended sediments on fragile marine fauna and flora damages the ecosystem particularly coral reefs, which are formed by the extracellular product of symbiotic plants. The great number of coral polyps attached need dissolved oxygen for respiration and the plants need Sunlight for photosynthesis. Piles, concrete surfaces, rubble mounds and other similar structures in water could form New habitats, which may introduce undesirable species. If toxic substances and other Contaminants are resuspended through

### Port Construction Hurts Environment

#### Ports not only harm the ocean, but also pollute the air.

United Nations Transport Division. [ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF PORT DEVELOPMENT] 1992. <http://www.unescap.org/ttdw/Publications/TFS_pubs/Pub_1234/pub_1234_ch2.pdf>

Emissions from construction equipment, work vessels, trucks and other vehicles used In construction work could be a source of air pollution. Dust from construction activities is also Possible source of air pollution.

#### Port construction causes an incredible amount of polluted water.

United Nations Transport Division. [ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF PORT DEVELOPMENT] 1992. <http://www.unescap.org/ttdw/Publications/TFS_pubs/Pub_1234/pub_1234_ch2.pdf>

Wastes from construction activities are mainly spoils generated by dredging. Disposal of dredged material on land may cause destruction of plants, loss of vegetation, leakage of contaminated materials and salt, odor, an unsightly view and other nuisances to the local community.

### Port Cargo Hurts Environment

#### Handling cargo will result in water pollution.

United Nations Transport Division. [ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF PORT DEVELOPMENT] 1992. <http://www.unescap.org/ttdw/Publications/TFS_pubs/Pub_1234/pub_1234_ch2.pdf>

Runoff from raw material storage, spills from bulk cargo handling, and wind-blown dust Are possible sources of contamination of port water. Toxic or harmful substances may be included in runoff from sulfur, bauxite, phosphates, nitrogenous manure, coal, metal ores and Other raw materials. Organic materials in runoff are decomposed to the inorganic form, Spending dissolved oxygen and increasing the nutrient level in water. Accidental spills of toxic, harmful materials, oils or oily compounds, and other raw materials are also possible sources Of contamination of water.

#### Loading/Transporting cargo will result in contamination of ocean floors.

United Nations Transport Division. [ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF PORT DEVELOPMENT] 1992. <http://www.unescap.org/ttdw/Publications/TFS_pubs/Pub_1234/pub_1234_ch2.pdf>

Bottom contamination may result from runoff from quay and storage area, spills from bulk Cargo operations and windblown dust. Discharge from waterfront industries is a major source Of contamination of bottom sediments.

#### Cargo handling harms the marine and coastal ecology immensely.

United Nations Transport Division. [ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF PORT DEVELOPMENT] 1992. <http://www.unescap.org/ttdw/Publications/TFS_pubs/Pub_1234/pub_1234_ch2.pdf>

Cargo handling and storage may cause runoff, spills or leakage of ingredients, which Possibly include toxic or harmful materials, organic matter, or oily compounds. Water pollution and bottom contamination resulting from these effluents lead to deterioration of aquatic biota And fishery resources. Dust dispersion on land may cover plants and change terrestrial habitat. If toxic or harmful substances are included in dust emissions, the health of port workers And local people are endangered. Discharge from waterfront industries is a major source of water pollution which induces deterioration of aquatic biota due to toxic and harmful materials, poor oxygen dissolution and Eutrophication of water.

### Port Cargo Hurts Environment

#### Handling Cargo will pollute the air as well.

United Nations Transport Division. [ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF PORT DEVELOPMENT] 1992. <http://www.unescap.org/ttdw/Publications/TFS_pubs/Pub_1234/pub_1234_ch2.pdf>

Emissions of dust from bulk cargo handling and gasses from cargo handling equipment Can be sources of air pollution. Liquid cargo handling may result in the release of vapor during the cleaning of storage tanks and by the breather system for ambient temperature changes. Accidental leakage of gasses may cause problems such as toxic material emission, explosions, Fumes, odors and hazardous airborne emissions. Waterfront industries may release various kinds of gasses and can be major sources of air pollution and odor.

#### An excessive amount of noise will cause stress among both people, AND animals.

United Nations Transport Division. [ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF PORT DEVELOPMENT] 1992. <http://www.unescap.org/ttdw/Publications/TFS_pubs/Pub_1234/pub_1234_ch2.pdf>

Cargo handling equipment and road traffic are two major sources of noise and vibration, which may cause unacceptable levels of stress among local people, or marine life.

#### Handling cargo produces waste.

United Nations Transport Division. [ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF PORT DEVELOPMENT] 1992. <http://www.unescap.org/ttdw/Publications/TFS_pubs/Pub_1234/pub_1234_ch2.pdf>

Cargo operations produce wastes such as the remains of bulk cargo storage, rubbish from unpacking, wood bark from log handling, floating garbage and other wastes from daily activities. Waterfront industries generate various kinds of wastes and some of them are Disposed of in the port area or at sea. Landfills in a port area could be deposition sites of Such industrial wastes.

#### Operation of cargo is not attractive, and will annoy residents/visitors nearby.

United Nations Transport Division. [ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF PORT DEVELOPMENT] 1992. <http://www.unescap.org/ttdw/Publications/TFS_pubs/Pub_1234/pub_1234_ch2.pdf>

Lighting for night operations may cause nuisances to the nearby community. Wastes from port-activities, smoke from ships, bulk cargo piles, and ugly materials stacked in a port May give an unpleasant impression.

## \*\*\*AT Oil Advantage

### AT Solves Oil Dependence

#### Our economy is not dependent on oil in the Arctic Ocean. The region is too fragile and our technology is not advanced enough to try and continue drilling there

**Beinecke June 27, 2012**

Plan for Arctic Drilling a Bad Move When No Proven Way to Stop an Arctic Spill Posted June 27, 2012 http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/fbeinecke/plan\_for\_arctic\_drilling\_a\_bad.html Frances Beinecke

**We can keep our economy moving without oil from the Arctic Ocean.** Fuel efficient cars, sustainable biofuels, public transit options, and **other solutions can get us where we need to go without sacrificing the Arctic Ocean or climate stability.** The Obama administration’s new clean car standards, for instance, will save drivers more than $80 billion a year at the pump within 20 years, while cutting our oil use by more than we imported from Saudi Arabia and Iraq in 2010. **But the oil industry is using its extraordinary influence to persuade** **leaders we need more oil and we need to despoil our last wild ocean to get it.** **Oil companies** are so eager to get into the Arctic that they **don’t even want to wait until experts can establish what is safe or create plans for protecting the most sensitive parts of the region.** Nor do they want to wait until America has acted on the lessons of the BP oil disaster. While the Obama administration has taken some steps, **Congress has failed to pass one piece of legislation to make drilling safer since the Deepwater Horizon pumped approximately 170 million gallons of oil into the Gulf of Mexico.** **The only responsible course is to put the brakes on risky drilling in the Arctic Ocean, while we gather the facts we need to understand this fragile and vital region.** Until and **unless we have the knowledge**, technology and ability **to prevent** all **spills,** or ensure that they are swiftly contained and cleaned up, **any drilling in Arctic waters risks unthinkable disaster. The stakes are too high here to roll the dice and hope for the best.**

### Alaska Doesn’t Have Oil

#### Alaska only might have oil

Tim Bradner 03/01/12(reporter from the Alaska Journal of Commerce) USGS estimates on Slope shale oil, gas puts Alaska near top, <http://www.alaskajournal.com/Alaska-Journal-of-Commerce/AJOC-March-4-2012/USGS-estimates-on-Slope-shale-oil-gas-puts-Alaska-near-top/>

The U.S. Geological Survey has estimated the potential of undiscovered, technically recoverable onshore shale oil and gas resources on the North Slope, with estimates ranging from zero to 2 billion barrels of oil and from zero to 80 trillion cubic feet of gas. The starting point is zero because shale oil and gas have not actually been produced on the Slope and it is not known whether hydrocarbons can actually be produced, much less whether the production can be profitable.

### Russia Has The Resources

#### Resources aren’t accessible-they lie within clear boundaries, not on our side

**OTTAWA** May **2011**

“Now it’s their turn, the Inuit prepare to defend their rights”

http://www.economist.com/node/18277141

In fact, countries surrounding the Arctic do not have much to argue over. The resources on land lie within clearly delineated borders and those under the sea—which include an estimated 83 billion barrels of oil, more than Russia’s proven reserves today—are largely in shallow waters within the uncontested jurisdiction of coastal states. “There is no race for Arctic resources, and no appetite for conflict,” says Michael Byers, author of the book “Who Owns the Arctic?” Instead of getting into a fight, he points out, Norway and Russia last year ended a decades-long dispute.

#### The majority of useful and obtainable resources are located in Russia’s Arctic region

**Lindholt 2011**

Lars Lindholt The Economy of the North http://www.ssb.no/english/subjects/00/00/30/sa\_economy\_north/sa84\_en/kap3.pdf November 20, 2011 **With respect to proven petroleum reserves, gas is much more important than oil. Of the total global proven reserves of oil and gas, 5.3 and 21.7 per cent, respectively, are located in the Arctic (**see Figure 3.2). **Almost all of the Arctic proven gas reserves are found in Russia. Also regarding the Arctic oil reserves, we find around 90 per cent in Russia.** The oil price is ex- pected to remain high over the next two decades, thus Arctic resources are attracting considerable at- tention, in spite of the relatively high extraction costs in these areas. Consequently, **the Arctic is under vig- orous pressure to lift production.** In Siberia and **Alaska, operations have historically mainly been pursued on land in response to the focus on land-based exploration. Beyond that, the Arctic and its waters represent virgin territory**. In Alaska, ar- eas along the northern coast (east of Prudhoe Bay) are regarded as promising for oil and gas discoveries. **To US authorities, this represents an opportunity to reduce dependence on oil and gas imports from polit- ically unstable areas. However, these plans have met strong opposition from environmental groups who argue that petroleum production might damage the vulnerable Arctic ecosystem**. Russia will also intensify exploration in its Arctic regions, and production is ex- pected from offshore fields on the Russian continental shelf in the Barents Sea and the Petchora Sea3. The best-known discovery is Schtokmanovskoye in the Barents Sea, with estimated reserves of around 3200 billion cubic metres of gas. **Production of oil and gas for the US market is seen as an important option for development of petroleum resources in North-western Russia. However, Europe will remain a core market for oil and gas exported from this area.** Explorations in the Norwegian sector of the Barents Sea (outside Hammerfest in Northern Norway) have yielded sever- al discoveries, including the Snøhvit gas field now un- der development.

### UQ – Development Now

#### North Slope is already being developed

Patti **Eppler,** writer for the Alaska Dispatch, April 8, **2011**

Heavy oil production begins on North Slope, <http://www.alaskadispatch.com/article/heavy-oil-production-begins-north-slope>

A new project that could herald the future for Alaska's maturing oil industry has begun pumping oil from one of the North Slope's most difficult reservoirs. BP Alaska's "heavy oil" pilot project is now up and running and drawing what its director calls an "awesome" 350 barrels a day from the shallow Ugnu reservoir. Eric West, the heavy oil project's director, says the company has started up the first of four wells in a pilot project that is aimed at determining the "technical viability" of producing the molasses-like crude from a prospect that could hold billions of barrels of oil.

### Solvency – Not Cost Effective

#### Oil Production in the arctic Circle is Expensive

Hobart **King,** writer and holds degrees in Geology, **2011**

Oil and Natural Gas Resources of the Arctic, <http://geology.com/articles/arctic-oil-and-gas/>

A short list of reasons why oil and gas exploration in the Arctic is so expensive... [3]Harsh winter weather requires that the equipment be specially designed to withstand the frigid temperatures. On Arctic lands, poor soil conditions can require additional site preparation to prevent equipment and structures from sinking. The marshy Arctic tundra can also preclude exploration activities during the warm months of the year. In Arctic seas, the icepack can damage offshore facilities, while also hindering the shipment of personnel, materials, equipment, and oil for long time periods. Long supply lines from the world's manufacturing centers require equipment redundancy and a larger inventory of spare parts to insure reliability. Limited transportation access and long supply lines reduce the transportation options and increase transportation costs. Higher wages and salaries are required to induce personnel to work in the isolated and inhospitable Arctic

### Solvency – Knowledge Gap

#### Lack Knowledge that the Arctic drilling will work

Dan **Joling,** writer for the associated press, June 26, **2012**

Salazar announces 'targeted leasing' in Arctic, <http://www.live5news.com/story/18885309/salazar-announces-targeted-leasing-in-arctic>

"We lack the basic science to make good decisions in the Arctic," he said. "There is no reason to schedule lease sales in the Beaufort and the Chukchi and the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management should not have done that." Likewise, the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement should not have approved Shell's response plan, he said. "There has been no demonstration that the response technologies that Shell proposes might work in Arctic conditions, especially in the presence of ice," he said.

### Don’t Solve Growth

#### Natural Resources do not affect growth

Beatriz **Gaitan**, economist, **2005**

Natural resource abundance and economic growth in a two country model, http://www.eea-esem.com/papers/EEA/2005/1636/GaitanRoe.pdf

Ding and Field (2004) distinguish between natural resource endowments and natural resource dependence and find that across countries natural resources do not affect growth. After this puzzling empirical evidence one wonders if there is a theory that can help explaining how resource abundance affects economic growth. Rodríguez and Sachs (1999) have studied the issue of why resource abundance can be a detriment for growth

## \*\*\*AT Russia Advantage

### Cooperation Not Conflict

#### No impact – Russia is cooperating on resource issues

Gorenburg ’11 (Senior Analyst at CNA, a non-profit think tank, where he conducts research on Russian security and military issues) Dmitry, Russian Analytical Digest, No. 96, May p. 12

The Russian government has recently focused on reaching agreements with neighboring Arctic states to delimit maritime boundaries. The goal is to ensure control of the maximum amount of seabed natural resources, while creating conditions that will allow for international cooperation in the development of these resources. In order to achieve this goal, the government believes it must resolve all remaining maritime territorial disputes with the four other states that claim sectors in the Arctic: Norway, Denmark, Canada, and the United States.

#### Your Russia will fight evidence is old – Russia has shifted to a cooperative strategy in the Arctic

Gorenburg ’11 (Senior Analyst at CNA, a non-profit think tank, where he conducts research on Russian security and military issues) Dmitry, Russian Analytical Digest, No. 96, May p. 12

Though Russia remains keenly interested in the Arctic, it will pursue its regional ambitions via negotiations and peaceful dispute resolution. Unilateral posturing and talk of building up a Russian military presence — which featured prominently in Russian Arctic policy just three or four years ago — have nowfallen by the wayside, in part because the authorities regard a cooperative approach as more conducive to exploration of and investment in Arctic natural resources. While disputes over fishing and navigation rights among the five Arctic maritime states remain unresolved, in recent years all sides have agreed to resolve competing claims through international institutions. The Arctic is thus unexpectedly becoming a venue for strengthening international cooperation, rather than the potential zone of military confrontation that it had been since the start of the Cold War.

#### No impact – Russia has abandoned its aggressive approach to the Arctic region

Baev ‘11 (Norwegian political scientist and security scholar. He is currently a research professor at the Peace Research Institute Oslo and a senior nonresident fellow at the Brookings Institution) Pavel, Carnegie Council Report, June 3 [https://www.carnegiecouncil.org/resources/articles\_papers\_reports/0104.html/\_res/id=sa\_File1/Russia's%20High%20Ambitions%20and%20Ambivalent%20Activities%20in%20the%20Arctic.pdf](https://www.carnegiecouncil.org/resources/articles_papers_reports/0104.html/_res/id=sa_File1/Russia's%20High%20Ambitions%20and%20Ambivalent%20Activities%20in%20the%20Arctic.pdf" \t "_blank)

It may appear puzzling that the theme of "conquering the Arctic," which was so prominent in Russian official discourse in 2008-2009, has practically disappeared from the accelerating political campaigning leading to the parliamentary elections in December 2011 and the presidential elections in spring 2012. Indeed, Arctic-related issues were practically absent in the lengthy report presented by Prime Minister Vladimir Putin to the State Duma in April 2011, where a wide range of priorities was outlined, and a great many promises were given. In fact, the last time that this theme was substantially addressed was Putin's speech at the International Arctic Forum in Moscow in September 2010, while President Dmitri Medvedev has not dwelt on it for more than a year.

### Cooperation Not Conflict

#### Russia will cooperate and not fight over the Arctic – it is in their Geopolitical interests

Baev ‘11 (Norwegian political scientist and security scholar. He is currently a research professor at the Peace Research Institute Oslo and a senior nonresident fellow at the Brookings Institution) Pavel, Carnegie Council Report, June 3 [https://www.carnegiecouncil.org/resources/articles\_papers\_reports/0104.html/\_res/id=sa\_File1/Russia's%20High%20Ambitions%20and%20Ambivalent%20Activities%20in%20the%20Arctic.pdf](https://www.carnegiecouncil.org/resources/articles_papers_reports/0104.html/_res/id=sa_File1/Russia's%20High%20Ambitions%20and%20Ambivalent%20Activities%20in%20the%20Arctic.pdf" \t "_blank)

The tentative shift to cooperation from geopolitical competition (which appeared real in the late-2000s, but was actually rather experimental) has been drivennot by Moscow's principled pro-Western choice, but rather by opportunism. It is not so much the immediate benefits from cooperation that prompted this shift,but rather the concern that a defiant stance could convince neighbors to overcome their differences and gang up against Russia. So Moscow demonstrates commitment to strengthening the Arctic Council, while at the same time indicating a preference for networking with the narrower format of the Arctic Five.

#### Russia won’t fight – too many structural barriers to aggression in the Arctic

Baev ‘11 (Norwegian political scientist and security scholar. He is currently a research professor at the Peace Research Institute Oslo and a senior nonresident fellow at the Brookings Institution) Pavel, Carnegie Council Report, June 3 [https://www.carnegiecouncil.org/resources/articles\_papers\_reports/0104.html/\_res/id=sa\_File1/Russia's%20High%20Ambitions%20and%20Ambivalent%20Activities%20in%20the%20Arctic.pdf](https://www.carnegiecouncil.org/resources/articles_papers_reports/0104.html/_res/id=sa_File1/Russia's%20High%20Ambitions%20and%20Ambivalent%20Activities%20in%20the%20Arctic.pdf" \t "_blank)

The inescapable problem with the desire to assert sovereignty over the largest part of the Arctic is the weakness of the Russian state, with its economic vulnerability and political backwardness. The needs of economic modernization, increasingly internalized by elites, prescribe massive investments in high-tech industries and techno-parks; these preclude a mobilization of resources and attention to developing the Arctic. A key precondition of an economic revival is modernization of the "enlightened authoritarian" political system, which has a particular interest in channeling budget funding towards Arctic programs, due to plentiful opportunities for misappropriation and graft. Russia's current trajectory of economic and political stagnation is unsustainable, and a modernization breakthrough is both necessary and feasible. But such a breakthrough would—somewhat paradoxically—cut down on ambitions for an Arctic "re-conquest."

### Cooperation Not Conflict

**US and Russia looking to improve relations and cooperation now**

**GMF 12**

The German Marshall Fund of the United States (GMF) is a non-partisan American public policy and grantmaking institution dedicated to promoting better understanding and cooperation between North America and Europe on transatlantic and global issues. Requiem to a Reset: Why Putin’s Russia Distrusts America Posted on 27 June 2012. Tags: Boris Yeltsin, G-20, Government of Russia, Politics of Russia, United States, Vladimir Putin

SOFIA — The meeting of U.S. President Barack Obama and his Russian counterpart Vladimir Putin at the G-20 summit in Mexico only underscored the chill in relations between Moscow and Washington. In fact, relations have deteriorated steadily since Putin replaced the ailing Boris Yeltsin in 1999 despite Obama’s ambitious program to improve – or “reset” – bilateral ties. Today the reset is over, and the two leaders no longer disguise their differences on most important international issues. For Obama, the interment of one of his administration’s signature foreign policy efforts at the outset of a re-election campaign is an unwelcome realization. With few triumphs in the international arena, Obama undoubtedly looked forward to citing improved relations with Russia as an unqualified asset. For their part, Russian leaders have also seemed contemptuous of American hopes for renewing their strained relationship. Under Putin, Moscow has steadfastly opposed Western efforts to halt civilian casualties in Syria and international efforts to block Iran’s nuclear program. Most pointedly, the new U.S. Ambassador to Russia Michael McFaul – a key author of the reset strategy – was publicly ostracized in a series of Russian media exposés.

#### No conflict over the Arctic, nations will work together

The Economist Newspaper, 16 June 2012. "Too Much to Fight over." *The Economist*. Web. 30 June 2012. <http://www.economist.com/node/21556797>\

Yet **the risks of Arctic conflict have been exaggerated. Most of the Arctic is clearly assigned to individual countries. According to a Danish estimate, 95% of Arctic mineral resources are within agreed national boundaries. The biggest of the half-dozen remaining territorial disputes is between the United States and Canada,** over whether the north-west passage is in international or Canadian waters, hardly a *casus belli*. **Far from violent, the development of the Arctic is likely to be uncommonly harmonious, for three related reasons. One is the profit motive. The five Arctic littoral countries, Russia, the United States, Canada, Denmark and Norway, would sooner develop the resources they have than argue over those they do not have**. A sign of this was an agreement between Russia and Norway last year to fix their maritime border in the Barents Sea, ending a decades-long dispute. The border area is probably rich in oil; both countries are now racing to get exploration started. **Another spur to Arctic co-operation is the high cost of operating in the region. This is behind the Arctic Council’s first binding agreement, signed last year, to co-ordinate search-and-rescue efforts. Rival oil companies are also working together, on scientific research and mapping as well as on formal joint ventures. The third reason for peace is equally important: a strong reluctance among Arctic countries to give outsiders any excuse to intervene in the region’s affairs.** An illustration is the stated willingness of all concerned to settle their biggest potential dispute, over their maritime frontiers, according to the international Law of the Sea (LOS). Even the United States accepts this, despite its dislike for treaties—though it has still not ratified the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, an anomaly many of its leaders are keen to end.

### Cooperation Not Conflict

#### Russia is not a threat to the arctic region

**Vasilyev 2010**

“Russia does not plan to deploy troops in Arctic”

http://www.rt.com/news/arctic-russia-no-militarisation/

Russia will not create an Arctic military force irrespective of any territorial disputes that may develop in the energy-rich region, said the Russian envoy to the eight-nation Arctic Council. “Forming special Arctic troops is not on the Russian agenda,” Anton Vasilyev told a news conference on Monday. “But we did indeed plan to strengthen the materiel of the forces responsible for security, primarily in ensuring the safety of navigation at sea.” The envoy added that any speculations about militarization of the Arctic region “have nothing to do with reality.” The statement follows last week's breakthrough maritime border [deal with Norway](http://www.rt.com/news/russia-norway-dispute-borders/). Scientists are also working to provide arguments about the length of the Arctic shelf for an international forum in Moscow. The event will be held on Wednesday and Thursday and focus on balancing interests in the region. As for Russia’s strategic presence in the Antarctic, the issue will be submitted for discussion to the Cabinet on Thursday, said the head of the Federal Hydrometeorology and Environmental Monitoring Service on Monday.

#### Russian forces are not a threat-they’re staying in their boundaries

David **Pugliese** June 23, **2012**

“Russia's move to protect Arctic interests no threat”

http://www.canada.com/news/Russia+move+protect+Arctic+interests+threat+Canada/6831454/story.html

Russia's creation of new military units for the Arctic and its decision to conduct a survey of its seabed in the region doesn't pose a threat to Canada, Defence Department analysts have concluded. Last year, Russian Defence Minister Anatoly Serdyukov announced his country's intention to create two new brigades, totalling nearly 10,000 troops, to protect its interests in the Arctic. The forces are to be used to secure Russian borders and, like Canada, the Russians are also beefing up their coast guard and looking to exploit natural resources in their northern territory, according to DND. "While many observers have commented in the media on Russia's perceived provocative actions in the Arctic, there has yet to be any serious cause for alarm," the analysts wrote in a July 2011 briefing for Defence Minister Peter MacKay and Associate Defence Minister Julian Fantino. "Russia has a right to station its troops wherever it wants on Russian territory," the briefing added. The analysts say the economic potential of the Arctic is a major driver behind Moscow's decisions. The analysis was released under the Access to Information law. The Defence Department could not comment on the analysis. The Conservative government has pointed to the military activities of Russia and other nations in the Arctic as a reason for a buildup of the Canadian Forces' presence in the North. Government officials have maintained that the F-35 stealth fighter the military wants to purchase is required so the Royal Canadian Air Force can intercept Russian military planes that may fly near Canada's northern borders. Prime Minister Stephen Harper has also announced the building of a new icebreaker, patrol vessels and an Arctic warfare training centre. He has spoken of the presence of oil, gas and minerals in the Arctic region, labelling the resources as critical to Canada's economic growth. The DND analysis points out that most of the known oil reserves in the region are within the 200-mile economic limits of countries such as Russia and Canada. The DND analysis also noted Russia's recent agreement with Norway on maritime borders in the Arctic is further evidence of "a willingness by Moscow to act in a co-operative manner on Arctic issues." "Russian surveying of the seabed is a continuation of the work it has been conducting to determine the extent of its continental shelf and is in no way threatening to Canadian interest," the analysts concluded. "Russia is following the same process prescribed by the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea to define its outer jurisdictional limits as other coastal states**,** including Canada."

### Link Turn – Russian Aggression

#### Russia would view America as intervering in the Arctic

**Frolov, Vladimir. July 2007 "**Russia Profile - International - The Coming Conflict in the Arctic."*Http://russiaprofile.org*. N.p., Web. 29 June 2012. <http://russiaprofile.org/international/a1184076124.html>

The United States has been jealous of Russia’s attempts to project its dominance in the energy sector and has sought to limit opportunities for Russia to control export routes and energy deposits outside Russia’s territory. But **the Arctic shelf is something that Russia has traditionally regarded as its own.** For decades, international powers have pressed no claims to Russia’s Arctic sector for obvious reasons of remoteness and inhospitability, but no longer. **Now, as the world’s major economic powers brace for the battle for the last barrel of oil, it is not surprising that the United States would seek to intrude on Russia’s home turf. It is obvious that Moscow would try to resist this U.S. intrusion and would view any U.S. efforts to block Russia’s claim to its Arctic sector as unfriendly and overtly provocative. Furthermore, such a policy would actually help the Kremlin justify its hardline position. It would certainly prove right Moscow’s assertion that U.S. policy towards Russia is really driven by the desire to get guaranteed and privileged access to Russia’s energy resources.**

### Link Turn – Relations/Sphere of Influence

#### Trying to block Russian expansion hurts relations and risks war

Eland 08

Ivan Eland, Sr. Fellow @ Independent Inst., former Defense Analyst for Congressional Budget Office. The Independent Institute. <<http://www.independent.org/newsroom/article.asp?id=2363>>.

But the bear is now coming out of a long hibernation a bit rejuvenated. Using increased petroleum revenues from the oil price spike, the Russians will hike defense spending 26 percent next year to about $50 billion— the highest level since the collapse of the Soviet Union. Yet as the oil price declines from this historic high, Russia will have fewer revenues to increase defense spending and rebuild its military. Even the $50 billion a year has to be put in perspective. The United States is spending about $700 billion per year on defense and starting from a much higher plain of capability. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, the Russian military fell apart and was equivalent to that of a developing country. Even the traditionally hawkish U.S. military and defense leaders and analysts are not worried about Russia’s plans to buy modern arms, improve military living standards to attract better senior enlisted personnel, enhance training, and cut back the size of the bloated forces and officer corps. For example, Eugene B. Rumer of the U.S. National Defense University was quoted in the Washington Post as saying that Russian actions are “not a sign, really, of the Russian military being reborn, but more of a Russia being able to flex what relatively little muscle it has on the global scale, and to show that it actually matters.”[1]In addition, the Russian military is very corrupt—with an estimated 40 percent of the money for some weapons and pay for personnel being stolen or wasted. This makes the amount of real defense spending far below the nominal $50 billion per year. U.S. analysts say, however, that increased military spending would allow Russia to have more influence over nations in its near abroad and Eastern Europe. Of course, throughout history, small countries living in the shadow of larger powers have had to make political, diplomatic, and economic adjustments to suit the larger power. Increased Russian influence in this sphere, however, should not necessarily threaten the security of the faraway United States. It does only because the United States has defined its security as requiring intrusions into Russia’s traditional sphere of influence. By expanding NATO into Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union, the United States has guaranteed the security of these allied countries against a nuclear-armed power, in the worst case, by sacrificing its cities in a nuclear war. Providing this kind of guarantee for these non-strategic countries is not in the U.S. vital interest. Denying Russia the sphere of influence in nearby areas traditionally enjoyed by great powers (for example, the U.S. uses the Monroe Doctrine to police the Western Hemisphere) will only lead to unnecessary U.S.-Russian tension and possibly even cataclysmic war.

### Relations High

#### Russian Foreign Minister Sees 'Improvement' in U.S.-Russian Relations

Margaret Warner, July 3, 2009 (PBS, Interview with the Russian Foreign Minister,http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/europe/july-dec09/lavrov\_07-03.html)

Putin told reporters his country stood on both feet and was always looking to the future. President Obama says he's seeking a new relationship with Russia and that he wants to reset it. Do you see the prospects for resetting this relationship in a major way, in a significant way? SERGEY LAVROV says: Well, I think the relations already took a new start. The two presidents met on April 1st in London; the atmosphere of the meeting was positive. We share the desire of President Obama to improve our relations, and President Medvedev recently stated this on his video blog. And the atmosphere is improving, no doubt about it. We feel more inclination to listen, to hear, and to look for common denominators on the issues which still divide us. And the issues which divide us are not very numerous compared to the issues on which we think alike and act together. So, hopefully, a Moscow meeting would strengthen this atmosphere, but would also be the place where the two presidents not only discuss all important things of our bilateral relations and the important issues on the international agenda, but we'd also take decisions on quite a number of things.

#### US/Russia Relations Improved under Obama

Philip H. Gordon, June 16, 2010 (Assistant Secretary, Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs, Remarks at the German Marshall Fund, Washington, D.C. http://www.state.gov/p/eur/rls/rm/2010/143275.htm)

This is a timely moment to take stock of U.S.-Russian relations -- eighteen months into the Obama Administration, eighteen months into the “reset” of relations between our two countries, and nearly one year since the Obama-Medvedev summit in Moscow. President Medvedev will soon be traveling to the United States, visiting Silicon Valley and holding a series of meetings in Washington as well. The trip in a sense caps a year and a half of hard work in reorienting our relationship and offers a chance to reflect on how far we’ve come.: The United States and Russia have significant common interests and where the United States and Russia have common interests, we should cooperate. Where we have differences, we will be honest about them, both in private and in public, and work to move the Russians to more reasonable positions. We will pursue a better relationship with Russia in our mutual interest and we will do so without sacrificing our principles or our friends. With these basic propositions as a guide, we have pursued a path of principled engagement.

### Relations High

#### Russia-US Relations Good

Voice of America, December 28, **2011 (**http://www.voanews.com/c0ontent/relations-between-us-russia-are-good-136389268/170976.html

Most experts agree relations between the United States and Russia are good. The two countries still have differences, but they increasingly work together on a wide range of issues. President Barack Obama has made better relations with Russia a cornerstone of his foreign policy. Experts say the so-called “reset” in relations that Obama launched shortly after coming into office almost three years ago has generated important achievements. Angela Stent, a Russia expert at Georgetown University, said the highlight was the ratification by both countries of the New START treaty reducing long-range nuclear weapons. “We can still destroy each other - it makes no sense to have all those warheads. The Cold War is over, so we’ve drastically cut down the number of warheads and we are going to cut them down further. So I think it was very important to accomplish that,” said Stent. Stent and others say another achievement was the agreement allowing U.S. military transports to transit through Russia into Afghanistan. Given the frayed relationship between the United States and Pakistan, Stent says that supply route is crucial for the conduct of the war. Moscow also has supported stronger United Nations sanctions against Iran and has canceled the delivery of S-300 anti-aircraft missiles to Tehran. In addition, the Russian government did not oppose a no-fly zone over Libya.

#### Clinton Optimistic over US/Russia Relations

HELSINKI June 27, 2012 (AP) (Clinton Optimistic Over US-Russian Relations, http://abcnews.go.com/International/wireStory/clinton-optimistic-us-russian-relations-16659553#.T-9hA473Dws)

U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton says she's optimistic that relations with Moscow will not suffer despite planned legislation in Congress that would impose tough sanctions on Russian human rights violators. She told reporters in Finland on Wednesday that the concerns could be expressed "without derailing the relationship (with Moscow) and that is what we are working with our Congress to do and we have every reason to believe we can accomplish that." "Now, we discussed this directly with President (Vladimir) Putin when I was with President Obama in Mexico. We made it very clear that, you know, we do have concerns about human rights in Russia," Clinton said. "But again, to go back to original question, we think there is a way of expressing those concerns without derailing the relationship," she said, "and that is what we are working with our Congress to do and we have every reason to believe we can accomplish that."

### Relations High

#### Relations Expected to Continue

Andre deNesnera May 25, 2012 (Voice of America, http://www.voanews.com/content/us-russia-relations-in-holding-pattern/1102914.html)

President Obama has made better relations with Moscow a cornerstone of his foreign policy. His so-called "reset" in relations with then-Russian President Medvedev and then-Prime Minister Putin, brought about a major arms control agreement and increased cooperation on such issues as Afghanistan and Iran.

But despite the harsh statements from Putin during Russia's presidential campaign, Colombia's Legvold says the Obama administration expects continuity in Moscow's foreign policy "because they believe that almost everything that they endorsed during the Medvedev period was blessed by Putin. "They were persuaded that Medvedev was not acting alone, let alone in opposition to Putin, anywhere along the line," Legvold said. Analysts say one thing is for sure: the U.S.-Russia relationship has grown over the years to such an extent that they say a return to the tension-filled Cold War days is virtually impossible.

## \*\*\*Solvency

### Kansas Debate 2NR

#### There are too many questions about deepwater ports for the plan to be implemented effectively

**DeMarban 2012**

Begich panel considers deepwater port to support Arctic shipping

Alex DeMarban | Apr 09, 2012 Alaska Dispatch http://www.alaskadispatch.com/article/begich-panel-considers-deepwater-port-support-arctic-shipping  
With ship traffic increasing in the warming Arctic Ocean**, many** in government and industry **contend that Alaska needs its first deepwater port** that can host everything from huge ice-breaking ships to small boats while supporting oil-spill responses, rescue missions and refueling operations. **But where to put the port, which could cost hundreds of millions of dollars? How deep should it be? Should government or industry pay for it? And what other services, such as an airport, ought to accompany it?** Those were among the questions considered Monday at a roundtable convened by US Sen. Mark Begich to jump-start talks about how to prepare for new shipping, tourism and resource development off Alaska's little-developed western and northern coasts. **The number of vessels crossing the Bering Strait -- 53 miles wide at its narrowest point -- has doubled in recent years with some 400 trips recorded in 2011**, the U.S. Coast Guard has said. **The Anchorage meeting was the first in a series dealing with how to prepare for increased ship traffic in the Arctic,** said Begich, chair of the Senate's Commerce subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries and Coast Guard.

### Advantage Thesis Timeframe

#### 30% less ice is melting than was thought—changes timeframe.

Koebler 12 Jason Koebler, Journalist for USNews “Earth’s Polar Ice Melting Less Than Thought” <http://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2012/02/08/earths-polar-ice-melting-less-than-thought>

While vast quantities of ice melting into the ocean is not exactly good news, Wahr says, according to his team's estimates, about 30 percent less ice is melting than previously thought. The team used data from the Gravity Recovery and Climate Experiment satellite, which was launched as a joint project between NASA and Germany in 2002. The GRACE satellite measures gravity, which is related to mass, in 20 distinct regions worldwide. Wahr says that gives the team more accurate estimates, because previous teams had to measure ice loss at "a few easily accessible glaciers" and then extrapolate it to the 200,000 glaciers worldwide. "It's tough to get an estimate [with previous methods]," he says. With GRACE, the team can measure wide swaths of the earth, giving them a more complete picture. "It was time to do a complete global inventory," he says. Although the team used eight years of GRACE's data, Wahr says it's important to realize that melting patterns are hard to predict. "Even with an eight-year estimate, it's not clear how far into the future you can project," he says. "A lot of people want to predict into the end of the century, but I think it's too dangerous to do that … We don't have enough info to know what'll happen. There's some ebb and flow to these things."

### Alt Cause – Land Infrastructure

#### The North Slope requires a massive improvement in transportation infrastructure

Kroh, Conothan, and Huvos ‘12

[Emily, Associate Director for Ocean Communications at the Center for American Progress, Michael, s the Director of Ocean Policy at the Center for American Progress, Putting a Freeze on Arctic Ocean Drilling, http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2012/02/pdf/arcticreport.pdf]

Despite its vast area, 663,268 square miles, the state of Alaska has only 4,857 miles of paved roads, an average of 0.007 miles of paved road per-square-mile. 47 Nearly all of these paved roads are concentrated in the southern part of the state. The 414-mile, partially paved Dalton Highway is the only overland route to the U.S. Arctic coast, connecting Deadhorse on the North Slope with Livengood in the interior region. 48 There are no roads whatsoever connecting communities along the North Slope of Alaska. As a result, residents of the North Slope rely primarily on snow machines or all terrain vehicles for overland transportation. While parts of southern and interior Alaska are served by the Alaska Railroad, which operates more than 500 miles of track extending as far north as Fairbanks, there is no rail service from there to the North Slope. 49

#### To have an effective port, you must have some sort of land-based infrastructure.

Margaret Kriz Hobson, E&E reporter. Tuesday, January 10, 2012

http://www.eenews.net/public/Greenwire/2012/01/10/1

**Building a port would be just one part of a wide-ranging commercial network that could potentially include shipping facilities, industrial services and housing. Depending on its location, the port might be connected to mining or drilling sites by a railroad or shoreline road. To attract the military, it would also require large airport facilities."A port is just that, it's a portal between the sea and the land," Metzger said. "You also have to have some kind of land-based infrastructure."**

#### Expansions of civil infrastructure are necessary to build a new port.

Margaret Kriz Hobson, E&E reporter. Tuesday, January 10, 2012

http://www.eenews.net/public/Greenwire/2012/01/10/1

**The port development would most certainly change the face of northern Alaska,** he said. "**Most of the communities that you see up there have water, wastewater and lodging adequate for the community and maybe a few extra visitors,"** he noted. "**A large influx of people is going to require expansion of shore-side civil infrastructure." The early port studies must also consider the environmental consequences of the proposed project, said Fore of the Army Corps. "I think the biggest unknowns are the environmental impacts," he said. "What critical habitats do we have up there? How does economic development interface with that? We know the polar bear is an issue and their habitat. How does that play in here? There are so many endangered species up here."**

### Alt Cause – Icebreakers

#### Infrastructure investment will not resolve icebreaker deficiencies – need additional spending that wont happen

Kroh, Conothan, and Huvos ‘12

[Emily, Associate Director for Ocean Communications at the Center for American Progress, Michael, s the Director of Ocean Policy at the Center for American Progress, Putting a Freeze on Arctic Ocean Drilling, http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2012/02/pdf/arcticreport.pdf]

In an era of budgetary woes, the cost of updating our icebreaking capabilities will be difficult to swallow. A recent GAO analysis found that, “Given the challenges that the Coast Guard already faces in funding its Deepwater acquisition program, it is unlikely that the agency’s budget could accommodate the level of additional funding (estimated by the High Latitude Study to range from $4.14 billion to $6.9 billion) needed to acquire new icebreakers or reconstruct existing ones.” 82 Even though Shell announced plans to construct its own customized icebreaking ship, icebreaking capacity in the Arctic would still be well below the amount recommended by the 2010 High Latitude Study, which projects that the Coast Guard needs three heavy and three medium icebreaking vessels in order to fulfill its statutory mission requirements in the Arctic. 83, 84

#### The U.S. Coast guard will not be able to expand it’s fleet of icebreakers.

Margaret Kriz Hobson, E&E reporter. Tuesday, January 10, 2012

http://www.eenews.net/public/Greenwire/2012/01/10/1

**a December report from the Government Accountability Office noted that the U.S. Coast Guard lacks maritime ships and on-shore resources needed to respond to emergency calls. The United States has one active heavy-duty icebreaker -- the U.S. Coast Guard vessel Healy, whose home port is in Kodiak, more than 1,200 miles from Barrow. The 1970s-era icebreaker Polar Star has been sidelined for repairs since 2006, and its sister ship, the Polar Sea, has been decommissioned. Due to budget constraints, the report said, "it is unlikely that the Coast Guard will be able to expand the U.S. icebreaker fleet to meet its statutory requirements, and it may be a significant challenge for it to just maintain its existing level of icebreaking capabilities due to its aging fleet."**

### Weather Prevents Solvency

#### Harsh conditions may hinder the feasibility of a seaport in Alaska.

Margaret Kriz Hobson, E&E reporter. Tuesday, January 10, 2012

http://www.eenews.net/public/Greenwire/2012/01/10/1

**The prospect of developing Alaska's massive coal reserves could also attract new support for building a shipping facility,** said Hemsath of the AIMEA. "Coal becomes an entirely different animal altogether," he said. "That's a big brass ring on this." **Alaska mining experts boast that the state has half of the nation's coal reserves. However, those resources are located in remote, environmentally sensitive regions of the state where the terrain is rough and shipping would be limited to the summer months. Construction of an offshore port or on-shore harbor face serious weather-related challenges,** according to Andrew Metzger, an engineering professor at the University of Alaska, Fairbanks. "**The rigors of the Arctic cannot be overstated,**" Metzger said at a Senate hearing in July. "**People and facilities in this environ must contend with extreme cold, permanently frozen soil [permafrost] and lack of daylight in winter. In addition, coastal communities and marine infrastructure must contend with intense wind and wave conditions, subsea permafrost, accelerating erosion and potentially catastrophic hazards from sea ice. These harsh conditions will significantly shape development of marine infrastructure in the Arctic as well as stakeholder activities."**

### Need Airports

#### Need to dramatically increase airport infrastructure on the North Slope

Kroh, Conothan, and Huvos ‘12

[Emily, Associate Director for Ocean Communications at the Center for American Progress, Michael, s the Director of Ocean Policy at the Center for American Progress, Putting a Freeze on Arctic Ocean Drilling, http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2012/02/pdf/arcticreport.pdf]

With overland transportation infrastructure lacking, a large-scale response effort in the Beaufort or Chukchi Seas would have to rely heavily on aerial transport of people and equipment. Most airports in Northern Alaska have only small gravel airstrips and therefore are ill suited for many types of commercial and emergency response aircrafts. 65 In order to land a C-130, the military’s workhorse four-engine, turboprop transport aircraft, in favorable weather conditions, pilots require a runway of at least 5,000 feet. 66 Within a 500-mile radius of proposed drill sites, there are only 21 runways that meet this criterion (and only four with runways of 8,000 feet or longer—the ideal length to land a C-130 in bad weather). Of those, only 10 have year-round access to the Dalton Highway. Additionally, many of Alaska’s airports lack the electronic navigation support, field lighting, and on the ground facilities needed to facilitate a massive aerial mobilization. Given the limited daylight during the winter months and the inclement weather characteristic of the region, aircraft would have to rely on approach lighting and instrument landing systems rather than relying on visual navigation to ensure a safe landing. This equipment is not widely available on the North Slope. What’s more, with temperatures frequently dropping well below freezing, hangars would be needed to prevent aircraft icing. The North Slope lacks sufficient tarmac and hangar space to accommodate an aerial mobilization on the same scale as the Deepwater Horizon response effort.

## \*\*\*Politics Links

### Unpopular - Spending

#### Political opposition to funding Alaskan ports

**Hobson 12**, Margaret K. "Aging Infrastructure Adds to Woes of Alaska-bound Fuel Tanker."*Eenews*. EE Publishing, 10 Jan. 2012. Web. 25 June 2012. <http://www.eenews.net/public/Greenwire/2012/01/10/1>.

Speakersat the two-day meeting quickly concluded that the federal government won't be spearheading the port campaign. "At this point, federal interest is such that if you build itand they have a need to use it,they'll use it,"said Fore of the Army Corps. **"**But nobody [in Washington] is actually stepping up and providing funding or assistance." Alaska legislator Joule observed that change is in the air in Alaska**.** Some of it is being driven by global warming.Some is a product ofthe federal government, which **has encouraged commercial development and oil drilling off Alaska shores** and signed the Arctic Council treaty, but is not providing funding for a port or icebreakers. "We are ill-prepared for these things," Joule said. But, he added, "nobody is going to get in the way to stop anything."

### Unpopular - History

#### Funding for a deepwater port is unclear and the project would take too long to happen anyway

**Lowther 2012**

Arctic Deep Water Port BY PAULA LOWTHER Alaska Business Monthly http://www.akbizmag.com/Alaska-Business-Monthly/January-2012/Arctic-Deep-Water-Port/

**How a deep water Arctic port project will be funded is unclear**. The federal government appreciates the roll it must play in protecting the country’s interest in the Arctic in regard to national security and sovereignty; however, **the fragile state of the federal economy puts into question whether that will be enough to push the project forward**. **Nearly $1 million** in state funding from the 2012 fiscal budget **has been identified** by Governor Sean Parnell **to begin the process of** underwriting the studies necessary to **identify the feasibility for Arctic port development, but even that is about a third of the cost necessary** to complete the three-year study that will determine the best location for the nation’s only deep water Arctic port. **Findings** of the planning charrette **indicated Arctic deep water port development is a 20-plus year process** **and stressed that some issues need to be addressed now such as how the U.S. will fulfill its obligation to the Arctic Council Search and Rescue treaty.** Spill response was also listed as a concern as traffic continues to increase in the region; however, short-term solutions such as mooring buoys and lightering may be necessary until the full port project can be built.

### Unpopular – Coast Guard/Icebreakers

#### Increased funding for the coast guard causes a clash between Obama and the GOP

Ahlers '11

Mike Ahlers, Polar icebreaker dispute ties up Coast Guard bill

[http://www.cnn.com/2011/11/03/politics/congress-polar-icebreakers/index.html](http://www.cnn.com/2011/11/03/politics/congress-polar-icebreakers/index.html" \t "_blank)

With the nation's only two heavy-duty polar icebreakers broken and out of service, the Obama administration and congressional Republicans are clashing on how best to put the U.S. Coast Guard back into the ice-busting business.  House Republicans, who say they want to force the administration's hand, are pushing a Coast Guard authorization bill that would decommission the icebreaker Polar Star, which is now being repaired, in just three years, saying that keeping the 35-year-old ship afloat is "throwing good money after bad."

### Flip Flop Link

#### Obama slashing Coast Guard funding now – plan would be spun as flip flopping

**Helvarg 2012**

SOS from Coast Guard on Obama plan to cut budget David Helvarg Published 04:00 a.m., Friday, February 24, 2012 http://www.sfgate.com/opinion/openforum/article/SOS-from-Coast-Guard-on-Obama-plan-to-cut-budget-3357265.php

The crew of the Alameda-based National Security Cutter Bertholf recently seized $400 million worth of cocaine while on patrol. **As one of the Coast Guard's few modern ships**, the Bertholf **will spend this summer patrolling the Arctic.** Yet President **Obama is looking to reduce Coast Guard funding in 2013 even as rapid climate change and competition for resources in the Arctic has sparked urgent calls to expand the Coast Guard's polar icebreaking fleet - now down to one ship**. (A second, older icebreaker from the 1970s is being retrofitted for use next year.) Unlike the Pentagon-based armed services, whose historically hefty if not bloated budgets will go on a Jenny Craig diet to cut 10 percent over the next decade**, the Coast Guard**, part of the Department of Homeland Security, **will take a 4 percent hit next year alone under the Obama administration's budget plan**. Coast Guard Commandant Adm. Robert Papp, delivering his annual State of the Coast Guard address in Alameda on Thursday, noted that "**the decommissioning of (two) high-endurance cutters and patrol boats and the tightening of staffs in the 2013 budget will reduce our personnel strength by over 1,000 people** (out of an active duty force of 42,000). ... **On our current track line, we will likely see the Coast Guard get smaller."**

## \*\*\*K/CP Stuff

### Development K Link/Impact

#### Development of the region forces indigenous people to surrender to the global economic order and destroys native cultures

Kroh, Conothan, and Huvos ‘12

[Emily, Associate Director for Ocean Communications at the Center for American Progress, Michael, s the Director of Ocean Policy at the Center for American Progress, Putting a Freeze on Arctic Ocean Drilling, http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2012/02/pdf/arcticreport.pdf]

As the Arctic melts at an alarming rate and maritime industries from cruise lines and shipping companies to oil and gas developers and mining operations lick their chops at the opportunity to cash in on the previously-inaccessible Arctic, the Alaska Native communities that have populated the region for centuries are faced with a difficult decision: embrace development for the economic opportunity it may bring or protect their way of life from potentially devastating fallout. 86 Shell’s impending exploration off the North Slope has deeply divided the communities that stand to be impacted the most. In the Native Village of Point Hope, for example, residents are “torn apart between development and sustaining our lifestyle.” Those opposed fear the development threatens their culture and that an oil spill could destroy the already endangered bowhead whale population they depend on. But because the region has yet to discover a viable economic activity on par with oil, many others “think their continued survival will depend on trying to profit from oil.”

### Alaska CP

#### Alaska should do the plan

Rapp ‘11

[December 1, ADMIRAL ROBERT PAPP COMMANDANT, U.S. COAST GUARD ON COAST GUARD OPERATIONS IN THE ARCTIC, PROTECTING U.S. SOVEREIGNTY: COAST GUARD OPERATIONS IN THE ARCTIC]

With transformation in the Arctic calling for a broad spectrum of new facilities on such a large scale, the State of Alaska must take an active role in regional planning efforts with communities and their stakeholders. This will help communities develop local strategies and ensure that the State is getting the most return on investment for local projects. Some communities may not have the resources to adequately prepare for the future, and the State should take this opportunity to help increase local capacity for the benefit of all Alaskans.

### Icebreaker CP

#### Icebreakers resolve the need for a base

**DoD 2011**

Department of Defense May 2011 http://www.defense.gov/pubs/pdfs/Tab\_A\_Arctic\_Report\_Public.pdf

Report to Congress on Arctic Operations and the Northwest Passage

**Existing DoD** posture3 **in the region is adequate to meet near- to mid-term U.S. defense needs. DoD does not currently anticipate a need for the construction of a deep-draft port in Alaska between now and 2020**. Given the long lead times for construction of major infrastructure in the region, **DoD will periodically re-evaluate this assessment as the Combatant Commanders update their regional plans on a regular basis. The United States needs assured Arctic access to support national interests in the Arctic. This access can be provided by a variety of proven capabilities, including submarines and aircraft**, but only U.S.-flagged ice-capable ships provide visible U.S. sovereign maritime presence throughout the Arctic region**. This need could potentially be met by either icebreakers or ice-strengthened surface vessels**, none of which are in the U.S. Navy current surface combatant inventory, but **which do exist in U.S. Coast Guard’s inventory** in limited numbers.