# Icebreakers Negative

## Case Answers

### Shipping 1NC

#### Alt cause—shipping lanes in the Arctic will be avoided because of the weather conditions

**Madred 11** (Craig Madred, staff writer, Arctic 'Strait of Gibraltar' unlikely, 6/21/11, Alaskan Dispatch)

The unpredictability of polar ice today makes the Arctic too big a gamble for large shippers, he said, and that doesn't look likely to change. The Maersk Line is a subsidiary of the Danish conglomerate A.P. Moller-Maersk Group, one of the world's 150 largest companies. Carmel himself is based in Norfolk, Va., but his view is global. What stands in the way of Arctic shipping today, he said in an interview with Alaska Dispatch, is the structure of the "global supply chain." Manufacturers and businesses of all sorts have streamlined to hold down costs by reducing inventories. As a result, on-time shipping has become a paramount concern. "Time always matters," Carmel said, "but predictability these days is more important." Shippers can't afford to be knocked off schedule by shifting ice or fog in the Arctic, he said, and both are potential problems. Shipping lanes in the region are opening, but there is still a lot of ice even in the summer. "When we say 'ice free,' we mean no ice," Carmel said.

### Oil Spills 1NC

#### Alaskan oil spill spurs economic growth – empirically proven

**Levine 10** (Thomas Levine, staff writer, Economics of an Oil Spill Cleanup, 6/27/10, Alaskan Dispatch)

While fishermen and shrimpers in the Gulf of Mexico worry about losing their livelihoods, others may be on the verge of a windfall. Experts talk about how the ocean and the oil and gas industry will be impacted by BP's spill, but little attention has been paid to the economics of a spill cleanup. Some jobs will no doubt be lost because of the spill, but others will be created. Workers are now being hired all over the Gulf region to lay down boom, clean up oil, provide security, and prepare for further damages. Many of these workers are finding jobs in economies that were weak. Alaska was in a similar situation when the Exxon Valdez oil tanker hit Bligh Reef in 1989. Oils prices had slumped, and the Alaska economy was suffering. More than 20,000 jobs had been lost in 1986 and 1987. The economy was sputtering back to life by 1988, but it took off with the oil spill. No year since the spill has seen a larger growth rate in the Alaska economy than occurred in 1989, according to Neal Fried at the Alaska Department of Labor. The Gulf could see a similar boost. Florida Gov. Charlie Crist on June 17 unveiled a [website](http://gulfrecoveryjobs.employflorida.com/portals/gulfrecoveryjobs/) directing Floridians to more than 3,500 jobs associated with the cleanup, although to this point the tens of thousands of gallons gushing from BP's undersea crude oil volcano have largely missed the Sunshine State. The Deepwater site has now gushed at least 42 million gallons, almost four times the 11 million gallons with which Exxon smeared Prince William Sound. Immediately after that accident, the call went out across Alaska for workers to help clean up and contain the spill. According to the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustee Council [website](http://www.evostc.state.ak.us/facts/qanda.cfm), 10,000 workers and 1,000 boats were mobilized at a cost of $2.1 billion. Spill cleanup workers made $16.69 an hour ($29.34 today, adjusted for inflation). Spill jobs helped pull Alaska's unemployment rate down from 7.2 percent in May 1989 to 6.9 percent in September 1989, when cleanup operations ended, according to the Alaska Department of Labor. And the amount of money spent to equip the cleanup operation created an economic wave that rippled through Alaska as fishing boats were leased, pilots hired, workers fed, equipment maintained and lawyers retained. Some lawyers had to hire additional staff to handle compensatory claims eventually totaling over $900 million. Most of those claims were paid off over the next 10 years. The spill jobs, while temporary, gave many people the means to put a down payment on a house or purchase a car. Fried said the increase in purchasing power helped pull the economy out of what had been the worst recession in 20 years. Some economic benefits have continued for decades. Scientific grants to study the damage to Prince William Sound have continued to this day, making the spill one of the most researched in history, according to the EVOSTC. And in 2008 Exxon settled punitive claims in the case Baker vs. Exxon Valdez Shipping Co. The company was required to pay fishermen and others another $995 million over 10 years.

#### Long-term effects of oil spills are minor

**Gillis and Kaufman 10** (Justin Gillis and Leslie Kaufman, Environmentalists and Contributors, After Oil Spills, Hidden Damage Can Last for Years, 7/17/10, New York Times)

Every oil spill is different, but the thread that unites these disparate scenes is a growing scientific awareness of the persistent damage that spills can do — and of just how long oil can linger in the environment, hidden in out-of-the-way spots. At the same time, scientists who have worked to survey and counteract the damage from spills say the picture in the gulf is far from hopeless. “Thoughts that this is going to kill the Gulf of Mexico are just wild overreactions,” said Jeffrey W. Short, a scientist who led some of the most important research after the Exxon Valdez spill and now works for an environmental advocacy group called [Oceana](http://na.oceana.org/). “It’s going to go away, the oil is. It’s not going to last forever.” But how long will it last? Only 20 years ago, the conventional wisdom was that oil spills did almost all their damage in the first weeks, as fresh oil loaded with toxic substances hit wildlife and marsh grasses, washed onto beaches and killed fish and turtles in the deep sea. But disasters like the Valdez in 1989, the Ixtoc 1 in Mexico in 1979, the Amoco Cadiz in France in 1978 and two Cape Cod spills, including the Bouchard 65 barge in 1974 — all studied over decades with the improved techniques of modern chemistry and biology — have allowed scientists to paint a more complex portrait of what happens after a spill. It is still clear that the bulk of the damage happens quickly, and that nature then begins to recuperate. After a few years, a casual observer visiting a hard-hit location might see nothing amiss. Birds and fish are likely to have rebounded, and the oil will seem to be gone. But often, as Dr. Short and his team found in Alaska, some of it has merely gone underground, hiding in pockets where it can still do low-level damage to wildlife over many years.

### Science 1NC

#### Their evidence only says that one of the key factors for science is icebreakers, it doesn’t say that would solve the problem

#### Icebreakers can’t solve—still need other facilities like deep water ports

(CROSS APPLY THIS TO ARCTIC SHIPPING AS A REASON WHY ARCTIC SHIPPING IS INEVITABLE)

**Campbell 5/8** (Mike Campbell, staff writer, Remembering Healy and its vital role delivering fuel to Nome, 5/8/12, Alaskan Dispatch)

"It is crucially important to remember America is not only a maritime nation -- we are an Arctic nation," Young said. "As the sea ice continues to thaw and the amount of vessel traffic in the Arctic increases, the Coast Guard's role will continue to grow. Our investment must not and cannot stop at just icebreakers. Continued investments such as a deep-water port, additional shore infrastructure and communications facilities must be priorities of Congress."

#### Food scarcity inevitable.

**Economist 10** [Climate change How to live with climate change Nov 25th 2010 | from PRINT EDITION http://www.economist.com/node/17575027/print]

Food security will become a crucial issue. Drought-resistant seeds are needed; and, given that the farmers least able to pay will require the hardiest varieties, seed companies’ efforts should be supplemented by state-funded research. Since genetic modification would help with this, it would be handy if people abandoned their prejudice against it. Even with better crops, better soil conservation, better planting patterns and better weather forecasts, **all of which are needed**, **there will still be regional calamities**. To ensure that food is always available, the global food market will have to be deeper and more resilient than it is now. That means abandoning the protectionism that bedevils agriculture today.

#### No impact disease- Self-interest means no extinction.

**MacPhee and Marx 98** [Ross, American Museum of Natural History and Preston, Aaron, Diamond AIDS Research Facility, http://www.amnh.org/science/biodiversity/extinction/Day1/disease/Bit1.html]

It is well known that lethal diseases can have a profound effect on species' population size and structure. However, it is generally accepted that the principal populational effects of disease are acute--that is, short-term. In other words, although a species many suffer substantial loss from the effects of a given highly infectious disease at a given time, the facts indicate that natural populations tend to bounce back after the period of high losses. Thus, **disease as a primary cause of extinction seems implausible**. However, this is the normal case, where the disease-provoking pathogen and its host have had a long relationship. Ordinarily, it is not in the pathogens interest to rapidly kill off large numbers of individuals in its host species, because that might imperil its own survival. Disease theorists long ago expressed the idea that pathogens tend to evolve toward a "benign" state of affairs with their hosts, which means in practice that they continue to infect, but tend not to kill (or at least not rapidly). A very good reason for suspecting this to be an accurate view of pathogen-host relationships is that individuals with few or no genetic defenses against a particular pathogen will be maintained within the host population, thus ensuring the pathogen's ultimate survival.

### Law of the Sea Turn

#### Failure to ratify the Law of the Sea undermines U.S. claims to Arctic resources.

**Bert**, 2/16/**2012** (Captain Melissa – United States Coast Guard and military fellow at the U.S.C.G., A Strategy to Advance the Arctic Economy, http://www.cfr.org/arctic/strategy-advance-arctic-economy/p27258)

Governance in the Arctic requires leadership. The United States is uniquely positioned to provide such leadership, but it is hampered by its reliance on the eight-nation Arctic Council. However, more than 160 countries view the LSOC as the critical instrument defining conduct at sea and maritime obligations. The convention also addresses resource division, maritime traffic, and pollution regulation, and is relied upon for dispute resolution. The LOSC is particularly important in the Arctic, because it stipulates that the region beyond each country's exclusive economic zone (EEZ) be divided between bordering nations that can prove their underwater continental shelves extend directly from their land borders. Nations will have exclusive economic rights to the oil, gas, and mineral resources extracted from those outer continental shelves, making the convention's determinations substantial. According to geologists, the U.S. portion is projected to be the world's largest underwater extension of land—over 3.3 million square miles—bigger than the lower forty-eight states combined. In addition to global credibility and protection of Arctic shelf claims, the convention is important because it sets international pollution standards and requires signatories to protect the marine environment. Critics argue that the LOSC cedes American sovereignty to the United Nations. But the failure to ratify it has the opposite effect: it leaves the United States less able to protect its interests in the Arctic and elsewhere. The diminished influence is particularly evident at the International Maritime Organization (IMO), the international body that "operationalizes" the LOSC through its international port and shipping rules. By remaining a nonparty, the United States lacks the credibility to promote U.S. interests in the Arctic, such as by transforming U.S. recommendations into binding international laws.

### Artic Conflict 1NC

#### No risk of conflict—U.S. is cooperating with Arctic Nations now

**O’Rourke 6/15** (Ronald O’Rourke, specialist in naval affairs, Changes in the Arctic: Background and Issues

for Congress, 6/15/12, Congressional Research Service

Of the other Arctic coastal nations, the United States enjoys strong political and commercial ties with Canada, Norway, and Denmark; all four countries are members of NATO. Although the United States views Russia as an important partner in developing policies to cope with changing conditions in the Arctic, relations with Moscow have been somewhat problematic in recent years, particularly in the wake of Russia’s August 2008 incursion into South Ossetia and Georgia, and its cutoff of natural gas to Ukraine and Europe. 165 The two nations have also been at odds over Washington’s plans to install in Europe missile defense facilities intended to guard against missiles launched from Iran. In February 2009, Vice President Joseph Biden stated the Obama Administration’s intention “to press the reset button and to revisit the many areas where we can and should work together.” 166 Washington has sought to engage Russian cooperation in negotiations with North Korea. Also, in support of U.N. sanctions, Moscow has cancelled the proposed sale of its S-300 anti-aircraft missiles to Iran. In addition, Russia is permitting nonlethal supplies to be transported across its territory to NATO forces in Afghanistan. In April 2010, the two countries signed the New Start Treaty; the accord was ratified by the U.S. Senate in December 2010. Finally, at the NATO-Russia Council meeting, held in conjunction with the alliance’s November 2010 summit in Lisbon, NATO and Moscow endorsed cooperation in the area of missile defense.

#### Diplomatic Cooperation in the arctic increasing--previous Arctic Council meeting proves

**McBride 11**(Blake McBride, Commander and part of U.S. Navy Task Force Climate Change, Climate Skepticism & Ways Forward, 2011, Center for a better life)

All evidence suggests that differences over sovereignty claims by the Arctic nations will be adjudicated through diplomatic means under the United Nations Convention of the Law of the Sea. While the United States has not formally acceded to the Convention, it does comply with provisions governing traditional uses of oceans. In addition, the U.S. is a member of the Arctic Council, an intergovernmental forum for the eight Arctic nations. Last May the Arctic Council completed a search and rescue agreement that focuses on coordination, cooperation and defined areas of responsibility. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton signed the agreement for the U.S., an indicator of its diplomatic importance to the Obama Administration.

#### No risk of arctic conflict

**DOD 11**(Report to congress on arctic operations and the northwest passage, 5/11/11, DOD)

Relationships among the Arctic nations will remain generally stable and cooperative. All five littoral nations (United States, Russian Federation, Canada, Norway, and Denmark on behalf of Greenland) have already established the groundwork of common approaches to managing the region within the framework of the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea, the International Maritime Organization (IMO), the Arctic Council, andother international forums. All of the Arctic states (the five littoral nations plus Iceland, Sweden, and Finland) have shown through their participation in the Arctic Council, the Barents Euro-Arctic Council, the IMO, and other international organizations a willingness and ability to manage and resolve disputes through established international diplomatic mechanisms. This provides a sound basis to anticipate that the security environment in the Arctic will be defined by cooperation rather than conflict in the future.Should military security issues arise, they will be addressed with the appropriate stakeholders through the network of relevant bilateral and multilateral relationships

#### **Arctic conflicts will remain purely diplomatic**

Byron 12 (Ruby Byron, John Gardner Fellow at the U.S. Department of State in the Office of Global Change working on adaptation measures to climate change, Conflict or Cooperation? Arctic0 Geopolitics and Climate Change, 2012, Berkeley Undergraduate Journal, Office of Undergraduate Research, UC Berkeley**)**

Within the existing literature on Arctic geopolitics and climate change, few authors explicitly define what they mean by "conflict." In fact, the term is often thrown around loosely, sometimes referring to a state of armed warfare or at other times to conflict of the political or diplomatic kind**.** While these uses are certainly legitimate and within the established meaning of the word, it makes for fuzzy boundaries and ambiguous projections: the chance or likelihood of future diplomatic "conflict," whatever that is intended to mean, most certainly differs—and probably differs starkly—from the chances of total war between two Arctic nations. Thus, for the purposes of this research, unless otherwise specified, conflict is defined as a militarized confrontation between at least two countries. No shots need be fired, nor do casualties need to be suffered. A formal declaration of war would also be too high of a standard for "conflict," as that would exclude such prominent wars like those in Korea, Vietnam, and the Persian Gulf on the basis of what has become in many respects a dispensable procedural formality. Rather, the mere formal invocation of some form of coercive force is sufficient to qualify an event as a form of conflict (e.g. ordering a ship to fire across the bow of another ship belonging to another nation). A baseline example of what would constitute a conflict, then, is the Turbot War of 1995 between Canada and Spain, where the Canadian Navy boarded a Spanish fishing vessel and arrested its crew for fishing in Canada’s Exclusive Economic Zone off the coast of Newfoundland (Nordås & Gleditsch 2007, 631). In this respect, this definition of conflict differs slightly from the typical notion of "war," which tends to connote much greater military mobilization and the number of causalities being greater than zero (Bremer 1992, 310). The logic for narrowing the scope of conflict in this respect is twofold. First, while there has certainly been a history of diplomatic dispute in the Arctic, there has yet to be any form of armed brinksmanship or militarized conflict to date—at least not since the fall of the Soviet Union in 1991. This leaves such future-facing projections on armed conflict—such as this research— still a relevant exercise. Second, it creates a clear distinction between what does constitute "conflict" and what does not. Definitions of conflict seeking to make qualitative judgments on the degree, size, or escalation of conflict inevitably invite criticism in terms of the arbitrariness of the line that renders some conflicts authentic and others as something else altogether

#### Current Arctic ports are enough for deterrence – DoD agrees.

**DOD 11**(Report to congress on arctic operations and the northwest passage, 5/11/11, DOD)

In summary, with the low potential for armed conflict in the region in the foreseeable future, the existing defense infrastructure (e.g., bases, ports, and airfields) is adequate to meet near- to mid-term U.S. national security needs. Therefore, DoD does not currently anticipate a need for the construction of additional bases or a deep draft port in Alaska between now and 2020. Given the long lead times for basing infrastructure in the region, DoD will periodically re-evaluate this assessment as activity in the region gradually increases and the CCDRs review and update their regional plans as the security environment evolves.

### Solvency 1NC

#### No solvency –

#### A) Current icebreaking power is insufficient to solve.

**Restino**, 1/13/**2012** (Carey, Icebreaker fleet in U.S. lags behind, The Arctic Sounder, p. http://www.thearcticsounder.com/article/1202icebreaker\_fleet\_in\_us\_lags\_behind)

News of the unprecedented attempt by U.S. Coast Guard and the Russian tanker Renda to break through hundreds of miles of ice and bring fuel to Nome has enthralled Alaskans, and even caught the attention of the nation and the world. If successful, this would be the first time Western Alaska received a shipment of petroleum via the sea in the winter. But the spotlight illuminates another issue as well — the United States' insufficient icebreaker capacity. During a time when traffic to and from the Arctic Alaska waters is higher than ever and only expected to increase exponentially, the U.S. Coast Guard is down to one polar icebreaker, the Healy, which is due to spend several months out of commission this winter for repairs. "This is on our radar for sure, and it's on the radar of everyone all the way up to the commandant," said Coast Guard Lt. Commander Maeve Keogh. "We have to get prepared. The Coast Guard is aware of that and working to remedy it." Fleet attention long time coming Those in the know have been banging the drum for more icebreakers in the Arctic for years now, but funding has been slow in coming. In a 2010 congressional report, the increase in activity in the north was highlighted, as was the fact that the United States lags far behind other Arctic countries in icebreaker capacity. According to one source, as of January 2009, Russia had a fleet of 25 polar icebreakers, including six heavy icebreakers rated at more than 45,000 break horsepower, all of which are nuclear-powered. Finland and Sweden each had seven and more recent reports have Canada down for 13. The report, as well as Alaska's congressional delegates, say that changes to the Arctic, brought by warming temperatures, will increase exploration for oil, gas and minerals. At the same time, tourism ships traveling through the region are likely to also increase, though Keogh said for now, the sagging economy has kept those to a minimum. Last year, the Coast Guard visited Barrow to train and met with local officials. When asked how ready they were to respond if a tourist ship went down, for example, the answer was a resounding "not very." "The Coast Guard doesn't have any publicly assigned assets (in the Arctic). None. Zero," Rear Admiral Thomas Ostebo told those gathered. U.S. fleet atrophies Two of the three polar icebreakers owned by the U.S. Coast Guard have exceeded their intended 30-year service lives. The Polar Sea has been essentially decommissioned while its sister ship, the Polar Star, is currently being refurbished thanks in part to a $32.5 million senate appropriation. That ship is not expected to come online until next year, Keogh said. That leaves the Healy, which is a smaller icebreaker designed to support scientific missions. At 420 feet, it does not have the **capacity of the larger icebreakers**. "U.S. polar ice-breaking capacity is now at risk of being unable to support national interests in the north and the south," Admiral Thad Allen, then the Commandant of the Coast Guard, testified in 2008. "Today, our nation is at a crossroads with Coast Guard domestic and international ice-breaking capabilities. We have important decisions to make. And I believe we need to address our ice-breaking needs now."

#### B) New icebreakers will not be ready for decades.

**Restino**, 1/13/**2012** (Carey, Icebreaker fleet in U.S. lags behind, The Arctic Sounder, p. http://www.thearcticsounder.com/article/1202icebreaker\_fleet\_in\_us\_lags\_behind)

Fast forward four years, and those decisions have yet to be made. It's estimated that once commissioned, an icebreaker might enter service in eight to 10 years and at a cost of $900 million. Refurbishing the Polar Sea to last another 25 years might cost $400 million, the congressional report said.

#### Conditions of the Arctic are unpredictable—kills solvency even icebreakers are vulnerable

**US Coast Guard 8** (Report to Congress: U.S. Coast Guard Polar Operations, 2008, US Coast Guard)

In the Arctic, there is now water part of the year where there used to be ice; however, more open water does not equate to a safer

operating environment. Indeed, it may mean more hazardous conditions for vessels and their crews and passengers if greater access is accompanied by larger, more numerous ice floes, limited navigation information, and harsh and unpredictable weather patterns. If more vessels operate in the nascent “open water” of the Arctic Ocean, the risk of a vessel becoming beset by an ice ridge or unexpectedly impacting thicker multi-year ice increases. This brings a corresponding increase in risk to their crews and the environment as well. Even icebreakers and ice-strengthened vessels may encounter unexpected conditions that could cause vessel damage or loss. If changes in summer Arctic conditions continue the trend observed in the past six years, we may expect incidents and casualties to occur with greater frequency and/or farther from U.S. shores. The USCG’s ability to respond to these incidents, provide access to support other agencies and governments, and enforce laws and treaties in the region will be driven by the availability of icebreakers, ice-strengthened vessels and cold-weather air support. The logistics and basing infrastructure in the region must be enhanced to provide extended operational presence.

#### Icebreakers can’t solve—still need other facilities like deep water ports

**Campbell 5/8** (Mike Campbell, staff writer, Remembering Healy and its vital role delivering fuel to Nome, 5/8/12, Alaskan Dispatch)

"It is crucially important to remember America is not only a maritime nation -- we are an Arctic nation," Young said. "As the sea ice continues to thaw and the amount of vessel traffic in the Arctic increases, the Coast Guard's role will continue to grow. Our investment must not and cannot stop at just icebreakers. Continued investments such as a deep-water port, additional shore infrastructure and communications facilities must be priorities of Congress."

#### Healy and a new icebreaker still wouldn’t be able to solve

**O’Rourke 6/14** (Ronald O’Rourke, specialist in naval affairs. Coast Guard Polar Icebreaker Modernization: Background and Issues for Congress, 6/14/12, Congressional Research Service

One new polar icebreaker is insufficient for several logical reasons. First, a single ship cannot be in more than one location at one time. No matter how technologically advanced or efficiently operated, a single polar icebreaker can be operational (on station) in the polar regions for only a portion of any year. An icebreaker requires regular maintenance and technical support from shipyards and industrial facilities, must reprovision regularly, and needs to effect periodic crew change-outs. These functions cannot be conducted practically or economically “in the ice” and therefore require transit time to and from polar operating areas. A single icebreaker, therefore, could not meet any reasonable standard of active and influential presence and reliable, at-will access throughout the polar regions. A second consideration supporting the need for more than a single polar icebreaker is the potential risk of failure in the harsh conditions of polar operations. Icebreakers are the only ships designed to collide regularly with hard objects and to go independently where no other surface vessels can survive. Despite their intrinsic robustness, damage and system failure are always a risk and the U.S. fleet must have enough depth to provide backup assistance. Being forced to operate with only a single icebreaker would necessarily require the ship to accept a more conservative operating profile, avoiding more challenging ice conditions because reliable assistance would not be available. A second capable icebreaker, either operating elsewhere or in homeport, would provide assured backup assistance and would allow for more robust operations by the other ship.

#### Healy can’t solve—it’s meant to complement other icebreakers

**National Research Council 7** (Polar Icebreakers in a Changing World: An Assessment of U.S. Needs, 2007, Washington, DC: The National Academies Press)

Only polar icebreakers can ensure this vital access, reliably and at will. Since the Second World War, the United States has possessed a capable, world class icebreaker fleet that afforded wide access to the polar regions. The current seagoing U.S. fleet of four ships includes three multimission ships operated by the U.S. Coast Guard and one ship, the PALMER, dedicated to scientific research and appropriately operated by the National Science Foundation. One of the three multimission ships, the HEALY, was commissioned in

1999 and its performance has exceeded design specifications. The HEALY’s operating time is dedicated to the support of Arctic research. While capable of performing many additional U.S. Coast Guard missions including search and rescue, sovereignty, presence, and law enforcement, HEALY cannot operate independently in the ice conditions of the central Arctic and McMurdo Sound. The HEALY was built to complement the Polar class ships.

#### Healy can’t solve—can’t break through thick ice

**Klimas 4/28**(Jacqueline Klimas, staff writer, Officials: Coast Guard behind in Arctic race, 4/28/12, The Navy Times)

The Coast Guard, meanwhile, lacks a functioning heavy-duty icebreaker. The Polar Star is awaiting a $57 million upgrade set to be finished in December. Its sister ship, Polar Sea, has been docked in Seattle since 2010 with engine issues. The Coast Guard’s only remaining icebreaker, Healy, cannot cut through the thickest ice. “One could make the case that there’s a greater need for icebreakers now than when we had more of them in the past because more things are going on in the Arctic,” Goward said.

### Delay 2NC

#### Construction will take years

**Polar Research Board 2011** (Future Science Opportunities in Antarctica and the Southern Ocean, p. 178)

Icebreakers that can navigate in multiyear ice of Antarctica represent one of the most expensive infrastructures for Southern Ocean oceanographic and biological research and for access to coastal regions of East Antarctica as well as stations in West Antarctica and the vital resupply route to McMurdo. There are several options if the United States wishes to pursue its own national icebreaking capability. The range of heavy icebreaking capabilities appropriate for Antarctica year-round operations is PC 1 to PC 3 (classifications of icebreakers by icebreaking capabilities are shown in Table D.1). Ships, such as the Varandey (Figure D.1[a]), that can break ice, tow small icebergs, and clear harbors have construction costs of about $100 million, but they cannot adequately support research missions, act as helicopter platforms, or perform the McMurdo break-in. Replacement costs for each of the currently disabled U.S. Coast Guard heavy icebreakers, the Polar Sea and Polar Star, could be more than $700 million each with a construction time over 3 years after the funds are authorized. Less ex- pensive modern research vessels strengthened for the ice such as the Sikuliaq (Figure D.1[b]), which is currently under construction for Arctic research, cost about $150 mil- lion and have capabilities to support research in unconsolidated seasonally light sea ice conditions and with limited endurance because of their smaller size. Specifications for NSF’s new icebreaking Polar Research Vessel are currently under consideration by the University–National Oceanographic Laboratory System (UNOLS). The United States should explore options of various-sized icebreakers within a holistic fleet plan. The daily costs for research ship operations as evaluated by UNOLS in 2010 and 2011 is approximately $31,000, and the expected daily costs for a polar class (PC1-PC3) heavy icebreaker will be greater than $40,000.

#### Ships are over a decade away.

**Klimas**, 4/28/**2012** (Jacqueline – staff writer for the Navy Times, Officials: Coast Guard behind in Arctic race, Navy Times, p. http://www.navytimes.com/news/2012/04/navy-coast-guard-arctic-deployments-042812/)

The Coast Guard, meanwhile, lacks a functioning heavy-duty icebreaker. The Polar Star is awaiting a $57 million upgrade set to be finished in December. Its sister ship, Polar Sea, has been docked in Seattle since 2010 with engine issues. The Coast Guard’s only remaining icebreaker, Healy, cannot cut through the thickest ice. “One could make the case that there’s a greater need for icebreakers now than when we had more of them in the past because more things are going on in the Arctic,” Goward said. The Coast Guard has asked for $8 million for initial design of a new icebreaker in its fiscal 2013 budget request; the ship could cost $1 billion. If the Coast Guard goes forward with the purchase, Goward said, it’s going to take 10 to 12 years to put a ship in the water. Until then, the U.S. must rely on other countries with available icebreakers, such as Russia and Sweden.

### US Won’t Fund Icebreakers 2NC

#### U.S. won’t fund icebreakers --- it will still be underfunded.

**Bloomberg**, 7/26/**2012** (As the Arctic Opens for Oil, the Coast Guard Scrambles, p. http://www.businessweek.com/articles/2012-07-26/as-the-arctic-opens-for-oil-the-coast-guard-scrambles)

Commandant Papp says the Coast Guard eventually will need three medium-duty and three heavy-duty icebreakers to operate in the polar regions. It now has one medium-duty icebreaker and two heavy-duty ones dating from the 1970s, neither of which is operable. (The service plans to repair one of them.) To meet Papp’s goal of six icebreakers, the government would have to spend about $3.2 billion, according to a Congressional Research Service report. Neither Congress nor the Obama administration has proposed spending that kind of money. The Obama fiscal 2013 budget calls for $8 million to study building one. The Coast Guard’s five-year plan has called for $852 million for a ship’s construction, although Congress has yet to address the funding. It can take as long as 10 years to build an icebreaker.

### Status Quo Solves

#### Status quo solves, icebreakers being funded now

**Cavas 2/24**(Christopher Cavas, staff writer, U.S. Coast Guard Budget Request Eliminates 2 Cutters, 2/24/12, Defense News)

The budget contained another surprise not widely anticipated — funding for a new polar icebreaker. The service is asking for $8 million in 2013 to begin the program, and a total of $860 million through 2017 for research, design and development and construction. The icebreaker funding plan will ask for $120 million in 2014; $380 million in 2015; $270 million in 2016; and $82 million in 2017. It is not clear if more money will be requested in 2018 and beyond, or if more icebreaker construction is being contemplated. The Coast Guard has a requirement for three polar icebreakers and three medium breakers. The budget also is asking for $54 million to operate and maintain the medium icebreaker Healy and reactivate the 1970s-era Polar Star, one of two Polar-class ships laid up for repairs. Overall, the Coast Guard’s 2013 request for acquisition, construction and improvements totals $1.19 billion, down $272 million from last year’s $1.46 billion.

### Ext – Current Solves

#### Cutters will be funded now

**ASMC 3/20** (American Society of Military Competitors, Coast Guard Commandant tells Congress FY2013 budget balances current operations and future investment needs, 3/20/12)

FY2013 Coast Guard budget request “strikes the optimal balance between current operations and investment in future capability,” the Commandant testified. He highlighted four priorities: Responsibly rebuild the Coast Guard; preserve front-line operations; strengthen resource and operational stewardship; and prepare for the future. The FY2013 budget request funds the sixth National Security Cutter as part of the long-term plan to replace the aging High Endurance Cutter Fleet. The budget also funds two Fast Response Cutters (FRC) to replace retiring 110-ft patrol boats.To balance front-line operational requirements and recapitalization needs, Papp said the FY2013 budget includes “funding to operate and maintain Coast Guard assets and sustain essential front-line operations.” This includes funds to operate new assets and as well as “investment in military workforce pay and benefits,” he said.

#### **Cutters will be funded**

McCarter 5/10 (Mickey McCarter, staff writer, US Coast GuardCongress Poised To Give Coast Guard More Money Than Requested For FY 2013, 5/10/12, HS Today)

But the admiral said he was optimistic that the seventh and eighth NSCs would indeed be built. The US Coast Guard program of record calls for eight NSCs and after discussions with the US Navy, the two services have concluded that the Coast Guard requires its own unique assets to interoperate with Navy ships instead of possibly enabling the Navy to fill in the gaps for the Coast Guard. Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano ordered a review with the Navy to ensure the Coast Guard would not be duplicating existing capacity; the review concluded the Coast Guard would not be. The FY 2013 Coast Guard budget proposes funding for building a sixth NSC. The House Republican budget would also build the sixth NSC and provide money to start building the seventh.

### Current Icebreakers Fail

#### U.S. needs to double icebreaker capacity to solve.

Anchorage Daily News, 11/10/**2011** (Lawmakers confront reality of need for expensive icebreakers, p. http://www.adn.com/2011/10/10/v-printer/2113279/lawmakers-confront-cold-reality.html)

A National Research Council panel in 2006 concluded the nation's icebreaking capabilities were inadequate to support its polar missions and urged immediate construction of two ships. Another independent study by ABS Consulting in 2010 said the Coast Guard would need three each of heavy and medium icebreakers -- double its current fleet, assuming the current fleet is all operational, which it isn't. Add in military requirements and even more icebreakers are needed, the report said.

## Off Case

### Icebreakers 1NC

#### A. Interpretation – transportation infrastructure refers to fixed physical assets.

**Orr and Keever**, January **2008** (Ryan – executive director at the Collaboratory for Research on Global Projects and teaches Global Project Finance, and Gregory – private attorney, Collaboratory’s Executive Committee, Enabling User-Fee Backed Transportation Finance in California, Working Paper #41, p. http://crgp.stanford.edu/publications/working\_papers/Orr\_Keever\_Enabling\_User\_Fee\_Backed\_Transportation\_Finance\_wp0041.pdf)

Here transportation infrastructure is defined as “**any fixed physical asset designed for transporting people and goods including highways, arterial streets, bridges, tunnels, and mass transportation systems**.” 1 An often overlooked aspect of transportation infrastructure, even of the most well constructed type, is that it is a consumable asset: it has a finite life, wears out with use, and needs periodic replacement. This paper is intended for a wide audience: state assembly members who approve major freeway and mass-transportation projects, public officials at Caltrans and local governments who are involved in project implementation, and other participants in the decision making process, including but not limited to local government agencies (such as local transit authorities), state agencies (such as Business, Transportation and Housing), regional councils (such as the Bay Area Council), nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) (such as environmental and neighborhood groups), infrastructure operators and funds, labor groups, the Treasurer’s Office, the Governor’s office, and taxpayers and users.

#### B. Violation – the plan invests in vehicles --- that is distinct from infrastructure.

Research and Innovative Technology Administration **2004** (Introduction, Bureau of Transportation Statistics, p. http://www.bts.gov/publications/research\_papers/transportation\_investment\_and\_gdp/2004/html/introduction.html)

Transportation investment is defined as additions to transportation fixed assets. Transportation fixed assets refers to structures, motor vehicles, and other machinery and equipment, which are used in the provision of transportation services for more than one year. Due to data limitations, we exclude other machinery and equipment that are used in transportation by non-transportation-entities. Our definition thus reflects a combination of asset type and business characteristics of investors. Therefore, our list of transportation fixed assets includes all fixed assets within transportation industries and fixed assets that are transportation-specific and acquired by entities outside transportation industries. A fixed asset is transportation-specific when its only use is in transportation. For example, a pickup truck is transportation-specific whether or not it is used by a transportation entity, while a computer is not transportation-specific even if it is used by a trucking company. Therefore, our list includes all pickup trucks but only the computers used by transportation industries. Our extended definition of transportation assets and the related investment measures better serve transportation analysis purposes than measures of investment on a pure asset basis or industry basis. Many public policy questions focus on infrastructure, and there is interest in the levels and patterns of investment in infrastructure. The data in this paper address infrastructure, but they also cover the transportation equipment (aircraft, railroad cars, trucks) that use the infrastructure. Many issues relating to the impact of transportation investment on the economy, such as impact on aggregate demand and employment, relate just as much to equipment as to infrastructure. Infrastructure investment can leverage equipment investment, by improving equipment turn times, and can impact directly on equipment maintenance costs. On the other hand inadequate equipment investment can constrain the transportation system even if infrastructure is adequate. By providing total investment data, but breaking out infrastructure investment, we provide data that can be used to address these issues. In this way we also provide data that is comparable to investment data in national account statistics and in the Government Transportation Financial Statistics reports.

#### C. Standards –

#### 1. Limits – our interpretation prevents an explosion of aff’s that solely deal with modes of transportation like cars, railcars, planes, and boats. Their interpretation doubles the topic by including not only assets but the vehicles that drive on them.

#### 2. Ground – the neg thrives off of a core mechanism --- by shifting the focus away from physical assets to vehicles, it splits the neg’s research focus and eliminates strategic topic planning.

#### D. Voting issue – for fairness and education.

### Violations 2NC

#### Government definitions provides a good list

**Trimbath 2011** (Susanne, Ph.D., former Senior Research Economist in Capital Market Studies at Milken Institute, Transportation Infrastructure: Paving the Way, STP Advisory Services, LLC, p. 9)

The strategy applied by the US Chamber of Commerce for the infrastructure performance index project presents a model for developing the way forward. A stakeholder-centric approach allows you to measure the right things, communicate to the people in a language they understand and get to ACTION faster. The process, detailed in the Technical Report last summer (US Chamber 2010), is basically this:

1. Clearly define “transportation infrastructure” as the underlying structures that support the

delivery of inputs to places of production, goods and services to customers, and customers to

marketplaces. The structures are:

• Transit

• Highways

• Airports

• Railways

• Waterways (Ports)

• Intermodal Links

#### Including shipping lanes as “infrastructure” explodes the topic.

**Sheinberg**, 10/22/**2008** (Barbara – Public Infrastructure Technical Work Group facilitator, Catalog of Policy Options – Public Infrastructure, p. http://www.climatechange.alaska.gov/aag/docs/PI3\_DraftOptionsCatalog\_102208.pdf)

PUBLIC INFRASTUCTURE ‐ Public infrastructure includes publicly‐owned or maintained highways, roads, bridges, ice‐roads, sidewalks, railroads and tracks, non‐road ground transportation, airports, landing strips, seawalls, river shoreline protection, harbors, barge landings, fuel facilities and pipelines, power generation, water and sewer systems, dumps and landfills, storm water systems, river and ocean shipping lanes, and buildings. A broader definition that reflects the reality of Alaskan communities is buildings and infrastructure that is community owned, used by the community, been built for community use, or that is privately owned but community residents depend upon.

#### Transportation infrastructure consists of roads, bridges, airports, ports and rail lines

**Alshawi**, 11/20/**2009** (Mustafa – chairman of the Iraq Institute for Economic Reforms, and Associate Dean of Research at the University of Salford, Concept and Background to Public Private Partnership (PPP)/Private Finance Initiative (PFI): UK Experience, p. 1)

1 Infrastructure is defined as transportation infrastructure (roads, bridges, airports, ports, rail lines); communications infrastructure; housing; and electricity generation and distribution. Infrastructure projects can be “mega projects” (dams, coast-to‐coast highways, mega‐ports, large power plants) or much smaller projects that can include communication franchises or limited highway spurs.

### Solvency 2NC

#### The aff cannot build new icebreakers --- their O’Rourke 2008 ev says “a single icebreaker could not meet any reasonable standard of active and influential presence…”

### Coast Guard DA 1NC

#### Icebreakers trade off with the Coast Guard budget.

**New York Times**, 7/16/**2008** (A Push to Increase Icebreakers in the Arctic, p. <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/08/17/world/europe/17arctic.html>)

The cost of building icebreakers and keeping the older vessels operating until the new ones have been launched could easily top $1.5 billion, according to several estimates. Arguments for new ships include the strategic, like maintaining a four-seasons ability to patrol northern waters, and the practical, like being able to quickly reach a disabled cruise ship or an oil spill in ice-clogged waters, Admiral Allen said. Even with the increasing summer retreats of sea ice, which many polar scientists say probably are being driven in part by global warming caused by humans, there will always be enough ice in certain parts of the Arctic to require icebreakers. Admiral Allen and members of the presidential U.S. Arctic Research Commission have been pressing lawmakers for support and urging the White House to issue a presidential directive that emphasizes the need for increased oversight of the Arctic and for new ships. Shipping traffic in the far north is not tracked precisely. But experts provided telling snapshots of maritime activity to legislators and other officials from Arctic countries at an international conference last week in Fairbanks, Alaska. For example, Mead Treadwell, who attended the conference and is an Alaskan businessman and the chairman of the research commission, said officials were told that more than 200 cruise ships circled Greenland in 2007, up from 27 in 2004. Lawson W. Brigham, chairman of the three-year Arctic Marine Shipping Assessment that is scheduled to finish work this year, told the gathering that more than 5,400 vessels of 100 tons or larger operated in Arctic waters in the summer of 2004. During that summer there were 102 trips in the Northwest Passage and five complete transits of that legendary route, he said. The growing Pentagon support for the Coast Guard, which is within the Department of Homeland Security, followed several highly publicized maneuvers by Russia aimed at cementing its position as the Arctic’s powerhouse, including sending a pair of small submarines to the seabed at the North Pole a year ago. White House officials said they have been reviewing Arctic policies for several years and were nearly finished with a new security policy on the region — the first since 1994. Bush administration officials said last week that it could be issued within a few weeks, but they declined to discuss what it would say. The enduring question is where the money would come from for rehabilitating the older ships and building new ones. The Department of Homeland Security is still mainly focused on preventing terrorist attacks. The Coast Guard is stretched thin, Admiral Allen said, protecting facilities in the Persian Gulf, seeking drug smugglers and patrolling coastal waters elsewhere.

### Coast Guard Link 2NC

#### Funding icebreakers trades off with other Coast Guard operations.

**Laster**, 10/15/**2011** (Jill – staff writer for the Navy Times, CG must balance cuts with Arctic mission, Navy Times, p. http://www.navytimes.com/news/2011/10/coast-guard-arctic-mission-balance-cuts-101511w/)

Congress is ramping up demands for the U.S. to build its icebreaker fleet — although how the Coast Guard will acquire icebreakers while maintaining frontline operations under a tight budget remains in question. Sen. Mark Begich, D-Alaska, proposed an $8.7-billion discretionary budget earlier this month for fiscal 2012, in line with the service’s request and about $115 million below fiscal 2011 levels. The Senate version of the authorization bill sets similar funding levels as the House bill, which authorizes $8.5 billion. “Senator Begich strongly supports the Coast Guard and thinks its budget needs to be plussed up to account for increased missions in the Arctic,” Begich spokeswoman Julie Hasquet said. “But we also have to respond to demand from the administration and the public to cut spending.” The Senate’s Coast Guard authorization bill, S 1665, requires the service to operate at least two heavy polar icebreakers at any one time and authorizes it to study building a deep-water sea port in the Arctic. “With increased energy development and maritime activity, our nation must ensure that the Coast Guard has the capabilities to operate in the Arctic waters,” Begich said during a Senate subcommittee hearing this summer on the Arctic. “That includes icebreakers, which we are sorely lacking.” The Coast Guard estimates it will need at least three heavy and three medium icebreakers to meet minimum mission requirements as the polar ice cap melts. The service has three polar icebreakers — one is inactive, and another isn’t expected to return to operations until 2013. The Senate authorization bill cuts $200 million from acquisitions, to about $1.4 billion. Hasquet said cutting acquisitions is “not ideal as the Coast Guard has major needs for vessels and aircraft.”

### Security Link – Artic Conflict

#### Arctic conflict and competition claims are framed through security politics

**ISN 11** (International Relations and Security Network, Colliding Geopolitics and the Arctic, 12/8/11, ISN)

Borgerson’s highly geopolitical tale is illustrative of a common narrative about the Arctic. It invariably stresses climate change, increasing competition for resources, and the potential for conflict. Last week’s discussion of critical geopolitics , however, should remind us that this narrative is far from the only one that can tell us about the Arctic today. Today’s second article, “Have you heard the one about the disappearing ice? Recasting Arctic Geopolitics,” challenges this conventional narrative. Far from accepting it as an inevitable reflection of global warming or climate change, it argues that the prospect of military conflict in the Arctic is largely a manufactured one. According to the authors, this orthodox construction of Arctic geopolitics has two main elements, neither of which are legitimate – 1) the construction of Arctic space in general as open, indeterminate and therefore dangerous, and 2) the political construction of Arctic space in the neo-realist terms of structural anarchy and territorial competition associated with a ‘great game.’ Together these two groups of representational choices conspire to misread Arctic geography – and the recent events of Arctic history. In particular, they contribute to an almost complete misunderstanding of the 2007 Russian Polar expedition as a geopolitically motivated Arctic resource grab, instead of a routine scientific endeavor that was only retroactively (and self-consciously) exploited by Moscow.

### Politics Links – Congress Hates Icebreakers

#### **GOP doesn’t want to spend on icebreakers**

Ahlers 11(Mike Ahlers, reporter, Polar icebreaker dispute ties up Coast Guard appropriations, 11/3/11, CNN)

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 appropriations 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."

#### Icebreakers are publically unpopular

**Laster 11** (Jill Laster, staff writer, CG must balance cuts with Arctic mission, 10/15/11, Navy Times)

Congress is ramping up demands for the U.S. to build its icebreaker fleet — although how the Coast Guard will acquire icebreakers while maintaining frontline operations under a tight budget remains in question. Sen. Mark Begich, D-Alaska, proposed an $8.7-billion discretionary budget earlier this month for fiscal 2012, in line with the service’s request and about $115 million below fiscal 2011 levels. The Senate version of the authorization bill sets similar funding levels as the House bill, which authorizes $8.5 billion. “Senator Begich strongly supports the Coast Guard and thinks its budget needs to be plussed up to account for increased missions in the Arctic,” Begich spokeswoman Julie Hasquet said. “But we also have to respond to demand from the administration and the public to cut spending.”

#### **Icebreakers are strongly opposed**

Song 11(Kyung M. Song , staff writer, 2 parties' icebreaker plans on collision course , 11/8/11, Seattle Times Washington bureau)

WASHINGTON — For a pair of battered ships that in recent years have mostly sat docked in Seattle, the Coast Guard's heavy-duty icebreakers are facing roiling waters in Congress. The Coast Guard wants to mothball the hobbled Polar Sea and scavenge the 33-year-old vessel for parts for its sister ship, the Polar Star. Sen. Maria Cantwell, D-Wash., opposes the move. Last week, the Senate Commerce, Science and Transportation Committee passed a two-year Coast Guard authorization bill that included an amendment co-sponsored by Cantwell barring the service from decommissioning the Polar Sea. But over in the House, Republicans are pushing for the exact opposite: They want the Coast Guard to permanently mothball the Polar Sea in six months, and to decommission the Polar Star — now undergoing a $57 million overhaul near West Seattle — in three years. That measure passed a House committee in September and was scheduled for consideration by the full House on Friday before being postponed. And on Thursday, the White House issued a statement that it "strongly opposes" the House version of the reauthorization bill on grounds that it would prematurely yank the Polar Star from service and "create a significant gap in the nation's icebreaking capability."

### Alaska Counterplan 1NC

#### The Alaska Industrial Development and Export Authority should authorize the funding for icebreaker capacity for the United States Coast Guard on the condition that the U.S. Coast Guard create shipping lanes through its icebound territorial waters off the coast of Alaska.

#### The CP solves --- can finance.

**DeMarban**, 4/13/**2012** (Alex – staff writer for the Alaska Dispatch, Parnell: AIDEA could help finance icebreaker if Feds drop ball, Alaska Dispatch, p. http://www.alaskadispatch.com/article/parnell-aidea-could-help-finance-icebreaker-if-feds-drop-ball)

Earlier this week, Alaska Dispatch published a story shining light on an exchange of letters between Gov. Sean Parnell and Rep. Don Young about how the state can help the US government beef up its Arctic icebreaking capacity. Icebreaker fans know the federal government is hobbled in the Arctic as other countries boost their presence in the resource rich -- and increasingly accessible -- Far North. But the nation's two heavy-duty icebreakers are out of commission, leaving just the medium-duty ship, Healy. Parnell's March 15 reply to Young, who had tossed out ideas on how the state could help, was succinct. Parnell lamented the federal government's shirking of its ice-breaking role in the Arctic, and said the state should not subsidize that US duty. However, he said Alaska could consider helping, including financing. He didn't provide more detail on the financing idea, and the Dispatch did not receive an immediate reply to a request seeking more detail. However Sharon Leighow, the governor’s spokeswoman, emailed a response the day after the story published on Thursday. "Before looking to the state of Alaska to fund federal infrastructure, we would suggest the president revisit his FY 12 proposed budget for the US Coast Guard, which contains $8.68 billion of discretionary funding. We think protecting the nation’s interests and the state’s interests in the Alaska offshore area is critical. The president proposes funding six fast-response cutters, 40 response boat medium-endurance cutters, and other vessels and air assets. While those are important, and we support the USCG, we think a new icebreaker is critical and should be funded by the administration. It is clearly the administration’s job to make sure the Coast Guard has the assets it needs, and an important asset is a new heavy icebreaker. "If the federal government fails to provide for this need, there may be options for a state agency like Alaska Industrial Development and Export Authority to participate in some sort of arrangement, but that will be up to the AIDEA board, and the Coast Guard would have to come to AIDEA with a project proposal that met all due-diligence requirements. What exactly such an arrangement could look like would be up to the AIDEA board."

### Alaska 2NC

#### Only Alaska can fund icebreakers --- fiscal constrains means the federal government says no.

**DeMarban**, 4/11/**2012** (Alex – staff writer for the Alaska Dispatch, Should Alaska take the lead in financing new icebreakers?, p. http://www.alaskadispatch.com/article/should-alaska-take-lead-financing-new-icebreakers)

Gov. Sean Parnell says the state might be interested in helping finance a new icebreaker so the U.S. can make up lost ground in the race for Arctic dominance. That's the gist of the governor's response to a lengthy letter from Rep. Don Young offering ideas on how Alaska can help the cash-strapped federal government put costly new icebreakers off Alaska's increasingly busy northern coasts. With the nation's icebreaking fleet reduced to a single working ship -- its two large icebreakers are undergoing repairs or being decommissioned -- the state and U.S. government should consider sharing costs to make new icebreakers a reality, Young suggested in a Feb. 7 letter to Parnell. New or refurbished icebreakers will cost hundreds of millions of dollars. More ships are plowing through the Bering Strait as sailing seasons lengthen in the warming but often ice-choked Arctic. The U.S. Coast Guard predicts traffic will continue growing as shipping, resource development and tourism expands. But the Healy, a "medium duty" icebreaker that escorted a Russian fuel tanker to Nome this winter, is the Coast Guard's lone functioning icebreaker. 'Creative financing' "Without access to heavy icebreakers, we will be unable to adapt to historic changes in the Arctic," Young wrote. "Icebreakers are critical for ensuring safe shipping and resource operations and providing for field research opportunities." He continues: "Given the current fiscal climate in D.C., funding the acquisition of new vessels presents a significant challenge. It is clear that we must consider **creative financing and ownership options to move forward**." In addition to helping bankroll the project, the state should also think about owning an icebreaker with private firms. The state could refurbish the Polar Sea or the Polar Star. It could then lease its icebreakers to the Coast Guard and National Science Foundation, wrote Young.

#### Alaska should build its own polar icebreaker

**Epler 12** (Patti Epler, staff writer, Should Alaska build its own Arctic icebreaker?, 6/21/11, Alaska Dispatch)

Anchorage Sen. Lesil McGuire thinks the state should build its own Polar-class icebreaker, much like the U.S. Coast Guard uses for Arctic patrols. The Coast Guard's two "heavy" icebreakers are out of commission right now, and the service is relying on one "medium" icebreaker -- primarily a scientific research vessel -- for anything that's needed in the Arctic. The problem? Repairing or retrofitting an icebreaker costs hundreds of millions of dollars. Building a new one? Even more. Congress has been reluctant to commission a new ship due to the high cost. An April report by the Congressional Research Service put the pricetag of a new icebreaker at about $1 billion, $500 million to fix up one of the existing ships enough to last another 25 years. The heavy icebreakers have been in service more than 30 years. McGuire, addressing the Arctic Imperative Conference that ended Tuesday night, called the icebreaker a "key part of the Arctic," saying the Alaska Legislature should pay for one itself, using some of the billions of dollars the state has socked away in various budget reserve accounts. The ship could be used for search and rescue operations and help in oil spill response, among other things. It's one of those big Alaska dreams, the kind Wally Hickel used to propose. McGuire didn’t address who would operate the ship or what exactly it would do when it wasn't needed to save a tour boat trapped in the ice.

### Alaska – AT: Spending

#### Alaska can afford the project—their economy is strong

**Forgey 10** (Pat Forgey, staff writer, Alaska’s economy powers through recession, 8/24/10, Juneau empire)

With the nation still struggling to pull itself out of recession, Alaska is in the welcome - but decidedly unusual - position of having one of the nation's strongest economies. "We're a place of envy right now," said Neal Fried, a state labor economist who has watched the state's economy for decades. The state's unemployment rate in July dropped to 7.7 percent, down from 7.9 percent in June and from 8.1 percent in July of 2009. The national unemployment rate is at 9.5 percent, where it has hovered for more than a year. Alaska's boom-and-bust economy typically posts much higher unemployment rates than the national economy, Fried said. "This is the first time we've ever seen a [year] of the unemployment rate coming in below the national average," he said. Many of Alaska's industries have shown to be largely immune to the ongoing national recession, which has hit the manufacturing and construction sectors hardest. Fishing, oil, government and mining are all important Alaska industries that are evading the impacts of the recession. "When you look at what makes our economy tick, its largely different than the national average," Fried said. Some parts of the economy, such as manufacturing and real estate, faltered elsewhere but not in Alaska. Alaska's tiny manufacturing sector is holding up well, mostly due to the thriving seafood industry, Fried said. The continued strength of seafood prices, even in the face of a recession, is somewhat remarkable, said Eric Norman, vice-president and general manager at Taku Fisheries/Smokeries in Juneau. "It's a little bit of a surprise to us the levels that fish prices have gone to, especially halibut and black cod," Norman said. Despite the higher prices, they can still move what they can bring in, even with the recession. "We've gotten some comments out the market but they're still playing ball," he said. That's meant full employment for a big crew, as many as 100 workers. A solid salmon season has helped, as well. And Alaska's real estate industry never soared to the heights of some others, and therefore had less room to fall. "Our real estate market was better in 2007 or 2008 than it is today, but while ours slowed, we haven't had the balloon pop that others have had," Fried said. High oil prices have also benefited the state in a big way, providing strong employment in the industry, though they are down. ANS West Coast crude enjoyed an average spot price of $133.78 a barrel in June 2008, according to information on the Alaska Deartment of Revenue's website. The averge spot price in July of this year was $76.53. In addition to jobs, oil revenues fund state and local government operations, which further stabilize the economy. Other states where oil is an important economic driver, such as North Dakota and Texas, are also doing at least somewhat better than the national average, Fried said. The federal government also provides much employment in Alaska, another source of stability. "Government jobs tend not to have the volatility of other sectors of the economy," Fried said. "The mining industry has been booming too, Kensington Mine opened with a price of gold at $1,200 an ounce. In some ways, that's an industry that's thriving because of uncertainty in the world economy." While Alaska has an unemployment rate lower than the nation's, the state's rate was even lower a few years ago. There are more people working in both Juneau and Alaska than there were a few years ago, Fried said. The most recent numbers for the first quarter of 2010 show 17,035 employed in the capital city, compared to 16,722 in the same quarter of 2009. Juneau's unemployment rate, not seasonally adjusted, dropped in July to 5.2 percent, one of the lowest in the state, and down from 5.5 percent in July 2009. The national recession is likely keeping the unemployment rate from falling even lower. Alaskans who lose jobs are less likely to leave the state, while other may move here looking for work. Not all Alaska industries have been as lucky as oil, fishing and mining, and some have been suffering along with the nation. "The visitor industry is very strongly correlated to the health of the national economy, as is the air cargo industry," Fried said.

#### Alaskan economy is strong now

**Schok 3/1** (Richard Schok, staff writer, Record weather tests the unflappables up North., 3/1/12, High Beam)

While chilly economic winds are blowing through the Lower 48, Alaska is enjoying bright economic weather, created in large part by strong oil prices currently around $25 per barrel that translate into higher state revenue, higher employment and overall higher hopes. ``My gut feeling is that we're on the front end of a boom that's going to last four, five, six years,'' said Chris Johansen, engineering manager at Flowline Alaska, a Fairbanks-based company that makes and insulates pipelines. ``We are more optimistic than we've been in a long time,'' agreed Neal Fried, a state labor economist. ``We have high oil prices, the oil industry is in good shape.'' Each year Alaska's economy is less and less dependent on oil, but when the industry is cruising, as it is now, the state also gets a nice ride. Oil taxes and royalties accounted for more than 75 percent of the state government's $2 billion operating budget in the latest fiscal year. Upswings are also felt strongly in real estate, retail and construction. Times are so good that some Alaska companies are beginning to worry about their ability to attract enough skilled employees to keep up with an increasingly ambitious work load in the North Slope oil region.

### Privatization Counterplan 1NC

#### Privatizing the icebreaker industry solves for capabilities while avoiding spending.

**Davis**, 12/9/**2011** (Tyler – current member of the Young Leaders Program at the Heritage Foundation, The Lone Icebreaker: U.S. Sovereignty in the Arctic, p. http://blog.heritage.org/2011/12/09/the-lone-icebreaker-u-s-sovereignty-in-the-arctic/)

Complicating matters even further, ice in the Arctic is melting, producing more ocean area for the transportation of goods and services in the region. Essentially, whoever best utilizes this route will control trade and transportation of goods and materials in the upper hemisphere. With all other nations around the Arctic building their icebreaker fleets and exploiting the key transportation route that connects the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, the United States is falling behind. In order to create an icebreaking fleet to maintain U.S. presence in the region, the Administration should look toward privatizing the fleet. Allowing private companies to own and operate the U.S. icebreaking fleet and perform national security functions would not only allow for crucial modernization but also save federal dollars and expand U.S. capabilities in the Arctic. This is particularly important at a time when the government is looking to **cut corners in federal spending**. Ultimately, something must be done. If the U.S. does not act fast, it will come in last in the race for the Arctic.