**CCS Wave 4—AFF**

\*Advantage CPs\*

Reforestation

 Fails—General

**Traditional policies fail – only reducing demand while employing indigenous strategies can solve for deforestation**

**GCF** 12/1/20**10** – Global Forest Coalition (“Forest Policy Fails to Address the Underlying Causes of Deforestation and Degradation,” People Forests Rights, Blog from the Global Forest Coalition, http://peopleforestsrights.wordpress.com/2010/12/01/forest-policy-fails-to-address-the-underlying-causes-of-deforestation-and-degradation/)

Cancun, Mexico, 1 December 2010 – A report released by the Global Forest Coalition today at the UN Climate Talks in Cancun, Mexico reveals that measures to address deforestation, like REDD (Reduction of Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation) are likely to fail because they do not address the underlying causes of forest loss, such as excessive global demand for wood, plantation agriculture, expanding agrofuel production, and a rapid shift toward a bioenergy economy. High demand for wood is a prominent and persistent driver of deforestation. International demand is primarily generated by industrialized countries, but domestic demand can also be high, especially in countries where wood is easily accessed. Yet there are no international policies to reduce demand for timber as a means of reducing deforestation. To the contrary, EU and US renewable energy policies currently provide massive incentives to increase wood-based bio-energy production, triggering a steep rise in demand for woodand land. “Contrary to popular thinking, forests are dependent on the availability of land, not money,” said Simone Lovera, Executive Director of the Global Forest Coalition. “The most effective policies to conserve and restore forests are those that reduce demand for land.” Another major underlying cause of forest loss is the spiraling demand for land for plantations and other forms of industrial agriculture. In the Mymensingh area of Bangladesh for example, plantations of rubber, acacia, eucalyptus, pineapple, and banana cause forest degradation, and adversely affect the livelihoods of the forest-dwelling Garo and Koch peoples. Cultivation of crops traded in large volumes, such as soy (for foods, animal feed, and agrofuels) require increasingly large tracts of land, leading to the destruction of large tracts of forest in places such as the Amazon. The Global Forest Coalition’s new report, Getting to the Roots: Underlying Causes of Deforestation and Forest Degradation, and Drivers of Forest Restoration, also tells an important tale about the integral part that forests play for Indigenous and land-based peoples, both as a foundation of traditions and culture, and as a source of food, medicines and building materials. Thus Indigenous Peoples across the world are highly motivated to conserve forests and restore those damaged by others. As Geodisio Castillo from Panama observed, “Indigenous People have always considered that land is sacred and that the health of the planet depends on its health and conservation.” The new report from Global Forest Coalition gathers case studies from around the world to show that the vision professed by many indigenous cultures can provide important forest conservation strategies that run counter to the tendencies promoted by the United Nations, the development banks and other key policy-setting institutions. Fiu Mataese Elisara, Chair of the Global Forest Coalition said, “There is a pressing need to completely transform the way in which efforts supposed to reduce deforestation, such as REDD, are being developed. A more effective alternative would be to stop commodifying and monetizing forests, and to look to Indigenous Peoples to lead the way on restoring forests, on the basis of their knowledge and enduring commitment to them, providing them with appropriate financial and other support as required.”

**Counterplan fails – can’t be effectively implemented**

**Chiono in 12** – Policy Analyst at Pacific Forest Trust (Anton. “New Federal Report Spotlights Global Deforestation, Importance of Domestic Action” January 18, 2012. http://pacificforest.org/news\_story10205.html)/CS

The considerable carbon storage capacity of forests and the emissions associated with their loss make forests a central concern in addressing global climate change. In its assessment, the CBO recognizes the great potential of forests in climate change, but identifies several challenges that first must be overcome before this potential can be more fully realized. For instance, unlike many other emissions sources—where GHGs can be tracked at the end of a smokestack—quantifying emissions and sequestration from forests is much more challenging. Generally, this requires monitoring changes in forest carbon storage from year to year, and converting gains and losses in wood volumes to GHG equivalents. However, with 95% of forest-based emissions arising from only 25 countries, most of which are developing nations in the tropics, existing forest inventory data are often inaccurate at best—or nonexistent at worst. Further, the CBO notes that designing policies to reduce emissions through avoided deforestation can pose substantial challenges. For instance, when deforestation is halted in one location, demand for the goods that would have been produced may simply displace deforestation to another location. As a result, unless policies can find ways to prevent this demand-driven “leakage,” avoiding deforestation in one location may, in actuality, do little to reduce atmospheric GHG concentrations. Finally, even if these challenges can be overcome, governance issues in developing countries may complicate the implementation of policies to reduce forest loss.

 Fails—Empirics

**Reforestation legislation fails – empirically proven**

**VOA** 6/8/20**11** – Voice of America (“Indonesian Development Ban Fails to Curb Deforestation,” Voice of America, http://www.voanews.com/content/indonesian-development-ban-minimal-immediate-effect-on-deforestation-123534369/140488.html)

Environmental organizations say Indonesia's recently announced moratorium on developing new forest land is not slowing the rate of deforestation nor reducing the emission of greenhouse gases. Environmentalists are calling for more restrictions and oversight of logging, mining and palm oil companies if the country is going to reach its goal of reducing carbon dioxide emissions 26 percent by 2020. Developers ignore ban Environmental groups say the two-year ban on new development in 45 million hectares of designated forest area is not deterring logging companies from cutting down trees for timber and paper products, and is not stopping developers from burning and converting large forest areas for palm oil plantations. Nor has it changed Greenpeace's strategy to confront companies like Asia Pulp and Paper, one of the world's largest producers of wood products, for what it says are the company's illegal and destructive environmental practices. Greenpeace has been successful in the past in convincing international companies like Burger King Nestle to stop doing business with APP Indonesian Greenpeace Campaigner Bustar Maitar is now calling upon toy companies Mattel and Hasbro to follow suit. “They are using the packaging; the paper packaging produced by APP which we know is APP [and] is destroying forest in Sumatra. So what we are asking Mattel to do is, to asking their supplier to stop using natural forest for their products,” said Maitar. APP declined VOA's request for an interview. But the company issued a statement disputing Greenpeace's allegations, saying it follows legal guidelines, uses 95 percent recycled paper in packaging, and is working towards 100 percent sustainable plantations by 2015. Moratoriums ineffective Lou Verchot, a climate change scientist with the Center for International Forestry Research says confronting businesses that may exploit the environment will not stop development in forest lands. He says the moratorium also by itself will have little effect. Some companies were able to gain vast concession rights before the ban was put in place and others are able to operate because there is little monitoring and enforcement in rural areas. “Forests tend to be in remote areas of Indonesia. The access is not easy. The government is not particularly present. Law enforcement is a problem. Zoning enforcement is a problem,” Verchot explained. The moratorium is part of the country's $1 billion deal with Norway to reduce Indonesia’s carbon dioxide emissions, which primarily come from burning forests and peat lands for farming and other development. Indonesia is the world's third biggest emitter of greenhouse gases, which many scientists say contributes to global warming.

 Fails—Corruption

**The CP can’t solve - neglects the role of corruption in deforestation**

**Koyunen and Yilmaz** 200**9** – Cuneyt Koynen is a professor at Dumlupinar University in Turkey. Rasim Yilmaz is a professor at Namik Kemal University in Turkey. (“The Impact of Corruption on Deforestation: a Cross-Country Evidence,” The Journal of Developing Ideas, Spring 2009, <http://pod-208.positive-internet.com/uploads/TheImpactofCorruptiononDeforestation.pdf>)

In addition to other determinants of deforestation, this study examines the explanatory power of corruption on deforestation. We identified a positive correlation between corruption and deforestation. This finding is statistically significant and valid in both univariate and multivariate analyses for all periods and corruption indices. The Results indicate that corruption, except one model, has more explanatory power than rural population growth variable, which is the most prominent determinant of deforestation in the literature. Hence, its adverse effect should be taken into consideration as serious as the other major causal factors in combating against depletion of forests. 6 Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) sees the corruption as one of the major threats to world's forest resources. Policies and measures taken towards reducing corruption, therefore, will help to decrease illegal forest activities (e.g. illegal logging and timbering, smuggling of forest products etc.) and in turn depletion of forests.

 Fails—No Profit

**Agricultural companies won’t respond to intervention, want to make a profit**

**Mendaz 10** <Steven. “Why Can’t We Stop Deforestation?” September 10, 2010. http://globalwarming-articles.org/deforestation/stop-deforestation/>

Beyond humanity’s unfortunate sense of entitlement over nature, there’s also the profit motive, which makes things much more complicated. In Brazil, for example, **despite widespread efforts** to check the destruction of the rainforests, major logging and agricultural companies continue to clear out large expanses of formerly virgin forest merely because it means profit for them. And while it’s good for governments to have a business-friendly attitude, some businesses go too far, which is why regulations need to be in place. As long as we allow companies to pursue profits at the expense of all else, nothing is going to stop them from destroying our natural world, and if we’re not careful this destruction is going to be the suicide of the human race. It’s not too late to save ourselves, but time is running out. To save our planet from global warming, we have to stop deforestation within years, not decades.

 Fails—Drugs

**US can’t stop deforestation – driven by drug demand, government intervention now is failing**

**Peters 11** <Joey. “Illegal Drug Drives Deforestation in Colombia” April 29, 2011. Scientific American. http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=illegal-drug-drives-deforestation-columbia>

A recent study published in Environmental Science & Technology shows the linkage between the illegal production of coca and the continuing destruction of Colombia's rainforest. New plots of coca between 2002 and 2007 accounted for the direct destruction of 890 square kilometers of rainforest. That's roughly 6 percent of total rainforest lost in that period, which totaled to 14,000 square kilometers, or an area slightly larger than Jamaica. Most of the loss is linked to agriculture. But the study, led by Liliana Dávalos, an assistant professor of evolution and ecology at the State University of New York, Stony Brook, concludes that the closer the jungle is to newly developed coca plots, the more susceptible it is to destruction. It also found that the more land is protected by the government, the less likely it is that coca growers will use it. It wasn't exactly what the researchers were expecting they would find. With coca may come troublesome neighbors "We were expecting the more coca you had, the more migration you had, and the more migration you had, the more deforestation you had," Dávalos said. "But having new coca didn't necessarily lead to a gain in the number of people." What's going on is more complex and has to do with lack of development on land near new coca production, Dávalos said. "When you take into account the people there, it's not just the coca itself." The coca plots are located in remote areas that attract other entrepreneurs. An example could be a person setting up a beer stand close to where a new coca plot is, Dávalos said. She speculates that activities like these, along with the region's ongoing armed conflicts, could be indirectly leading to a larger pattern of deforestation. Dávalos said the most encouraging part of the findings was the level of protection that government can provide on land to curb deforestation. The research also suggests land that should be protected. The study analyzed land cover change in Colombia's rainforests in the northern Andes, Chocó and the Amazon. Colombia, Bolivia and Peru are the three commercial producers of coca. World market for cocaine grows While cocaine use has declined minimally in the United States in recent years, it's on a global rise, particularly in places like Argentina, Brazil, Eastern Europe and the United Kingdom, Dávalos said. "People wouldn't be going out of their way to plant this if there wasn't an eager market," she added. The three big producing countries have been making efforts to stop coca production. In a separate 2009 study, Dávalos measured the effectiveness of the strategies governments followed to curb coca production. The study found spraying herbicide to kill the coca bushes, a path that Colombia followed, to be very ineffective. The amount of hectares sprayed outnumbered the amount of coca eradicated by a 30-to-1 ratio, she said. Bolivia and Peru responded to the crisis differently through measures like attempting to provide alternative work to coca farmers. U.N. data from 2010 show Peru leading the world in global coca production, with 45 percent of the market. Colombia accounted for almost 40 percent, while Bolivia produced just over 15 percent.

Startup 2.0

 Fails—General

**CP fails – Startup neglects STEM education here in the US**

Marvin **Ammori 6/21**/12 - Marvin Ammori is a First Amendment lawyer with his own law firm and a legal fellow at the New America Foundation's Open Technology Initiative, (“How America Can Get More Start-Up Talent,” The Atlantic, http://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2012/06/how-america-can-get-more-start-up-talent/258764/)

But the Startup Act should give all Americans, not just immigrants, a better shot at being tomorrow's engineers and entrepreneurs. And that opportunity could begin at a young age with education in computer programming. Students and parents expect a tax-supported education to provide. In a 2010 poll, [almost 80 percent](http://www.technet.org/pr23march2010/) of Americans said our public schools are not preparing children for high-skilled jobs of the future. American schools have been criticized for teaching kids how to follow orders and to be good employees, rather than to think independently, [creatively](http://www.thedailybeast.com/newsweek/2010/07/10/the-creativity-crisis.html), and with an entrepreneurial mindset. But, even if our schools were merely aiming low and training "employees" and not "leaders," they'd be failing at that task, too. In [international rankings](http://www.oecd.org/document/7/0%2C3746%2Cen_21571361_44315115_46635719_1_1_1_1%2C00.html) of the OECD countries, American public schools rank 14th in reading, 17th in science, and 25th in math. The Startup Act can help tackle this problem by incentivizing and funding public schools to bring computer programming -- or coding -- into classrooms. The goal would not be to mold every child into the next Mark Zuckerberg, but to ensure everyone in our society can better understand the code that affects their lives. Thinking like a programmer is not only helpful to succeed in any technical career, it will also become integral to simply navigating our increasingly digital world. Code consists of languages that can be taught just as we already teach the "language" of math, the language of music, and the language of Spanish vocabulary and grammar. Students could decide whether or not they want to pursue greater fluency and expertise in coding (or Spanish), and (if nothing else) students would benefit from the distinct problem-solving framework of a coding mentality -- which may be a more entrepreneurial mentality than memorizing the dates of famous battles in the Thirty Years War. It would help students to think critically -- to analyze and solve problems. In the post-industrial economy, ideas and great minds often provide far greater return on investment than any other resources or capital investments. As a [writer on TechCrunch observed](http://techcrunch.com/2012/05/10/dev-boot-camp-is-a-ruby-success/) about technology startups: "It's well worth finding a new approach to not only courting that talent, but producing it." The same is true about nations. **The United States should not just court talent. We must also produce more of it**. The congressional champions for our nation's startups and innovators should go one step further than immigration reform and include a strong pillar for ensuring that we produce talent in America over the long-term.

**Can’t solve – only addresses skilled workers and crowds out employment for others**

Erwin de **Leon** 3/24/20**12** - a Research Associate at Urban Institute’s Center on Nonprofits and Philanthropy completing a doctorate in Public and Urban Policy from the New School (“The Important Work Low-Skilled Immigrants Do,” OP –e, http://erwindeleon.wordpress.com/2012/03/24/the-important-work-low-skilled-immigrants-do/)

It’s far easier to argue for immigration policies that favor high-skilled immigrants over those that prioritize low-skilled immigrants. After all, who wouldn’t want the best and the brightest? In a rapidly changing world, we are anxious about our country’s economic viability so we nod in agreement when politicians call for more scientists and engineers from overseas—lest we are left in the dust by China and India. The reality is that we need both high and low-skilled workers. The [rotting crops in states](http://news.feetintwoworlds.org/2011/07/07/georgias-immigration-law-hurts-farms-and-the-state-economy/) that scared off immigrant farmworkers with their draconian immigration laws highlights the fact that most Americans could not survive back-breaking agricultural labor. Others won’t deign to perform what they consider menial work. The Brookings Institution recently released a [report](http://www.brookings.edu/papers/2012/0315_immigrant_workers_singer.aspx) that articulates the need for immigrant workers of varied skill sets. “The U.S. population is aging rapidly as the baby boom cohort enters old age and retirement. As a result, the labor force will increasingly depend upon immigrants and their children to replace current workers and fill new jobs.” The place of low-skilled immigrants in our economic system is laid out plain and simple in the report. As Americans become more educated, immigrants meet the subsequent demand for lower-skilled workers. These newcomers tend to work in certain industries, namely, private households, the accommodation sector, agriculture, food services, and construction. They are also over-represented in the fastest growing occupations, which include specialized construction workers and home health and personal care aides. As politicians and other policy makers weigh whatever little action they could make to address the country’s dilapidated, sputtering, and patched-up immigration system, they should acknowledge that **we need immigrants both in our research labs and in our fields. Legislation that solely addresses our desire for high-skilled foreign workers will not meet the needs of the American economy.** Of course it would be great if they could enact comprehensive immigration reform, but we all know that’s not going to happen.

**Can’t solve - immigration reform for skilled workers hurts other immigrant demographics who are key to the economy**

Mahwish **Khan** 4/5/20**12** – America’s Voice (“IMMIGRATION SYSTEM NEEDS SOLUTIONS TO PROTECT HIGH AND LOW-SKILLED WORKERS,” America’s Voice, http://americasvoiceonline.org/blog/immigration\_needs\_solution\_to\_protect\_high\_and\_low-skilled\_workers/)

Recently, the President said that he wants to deal with changes to high-skilled immigration, including the Kerry-Lugar Startup Visa bill, as part of comprehensive immigration reform. That position garnered criticism from Vivek Wadhwa in TechCrunch: I debated this with [United States Chief Technology Officer] Aneesh Chopra, at the Economist Innovation Summit in Berkeley, last week. The day before that event, Aneesh had invited me to a meeting with the director of the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, Alejandro Mayorkas, at Stanford Law School. We had had a very productive discussion with leading academics, lawyers, and entrepreneurs about how the government can interpret existing laws in a more favorable way for immigrant entrepreneurs. I was pleasantly surprised at how open Mayorkas was to criticism and at how he listened to the ideas presented to him. Both he and Chopra acknowledged the deficiencies of the current system and pledged to do all they could to have them fixed. But Chopra dropped a bombshell at the Economist event. He said that the President would only support the Startup Visa in the context of “comprehensive immigration reform.” What this means is that the legislation will be lumped in with toxic debates about illegal immigration and will be held hostage to other interests. If Wadhwa is concerned about the “toxicity” of the immigration debate, he should direct his criticism at Lamar Smith, Steve King, and Elton Gallegly—along with Sens. Jeff Sessions, David Vitter, and others. They are the ones who try to use every immigration issue—however important—as a vehicle for anti-immigration amendments and increased enforcement against undocumented workers. Yes, our country needs immigrant entrepreneurs and their contributions. But we also need busboys, farm workers, and landscapers. Helping one group while hurting another is not acceptable. Our entire economy – and especially the economy of California (from Silicon Valley to the Central Valley and beyond) — is dependent on immigrants from across the spectrum. With Smith, Gallegly, and King at the helm in the House, it’s clear that **any bill expanding access to America for high-skilled workers will also be a magnet for punitive enforcement targeting low-skilled workers**. It’s time for the adults in the Republican Party to step up, set aside the Smith-Gallegly-King agenda, and work with Democrats on real, comprehensive immigration reform.

 Links to politics

**Links to politics – election politics means no leadership will support the bill**

David **Grant** 6/7/20**12** – staff writer for Christian Science Monitor (Startup Act 2.0: Could it be an immigration breakthrough?,” The Christian Science Monitor, <http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Politics/2012/0607/Startup-Act-2.0-Could-it-be-an-immigration-breakthrough>)

And in a debate about economics, the Startup 2.0 Act's bipartisan contingent of supporters in both houses of Congress believes it has got the data to lay low all doubters. Immigration, the group contends, is a jobs issue. But they're running up against a record of failed attempts at immigration reform since at least 2005 – **and no sign that leadership is willing to take up this fight in an election year.**

**Empirically unpopular – unemployment concerns**

JD **Harrison** 6/6/20**12** – staff writer for the Washington Post (Startup Act 2.0: House lawmakers introduce Senators’ immigration reform bill, The Washington Post, http://www.washingtonpost.com/business/on-small-business/startup-act-20-house-lawmakers-introduce-senators-immigration-reform-bill/2012/06/05/gJQAAVHnGV\_story.html)

“US immigration policy should help, not hurt, the ability of US companies to attract top talent,” Sanchez said in a statement. “As our economy continues to recover, we must further enable our entrepreneurs to grow and to create jobs.” **A similar bill failed earlier this year amid concerns that such reform would allow foreign-born graduates to flood the job market and exacerbate the country’s unemployment woes.**

**Startup will cost capital – election year politics**

**Mayeux in 12** - management team of CBV, PhD in biomedical science <Jacques. “STARTUP ACT 2.0: MOVING BEYOND THE JOBS ACT” June 6, 2012. http://beventureso.me/2012/06/06/startup-act-2-0-moving-beyond-the-jobs-act/>

The Startup Act 2.0 provides benefits in addition to those resulting from immigration reform. The Act also looks to encourage investors into placing capital in startup companies by offering investment incentives. If investors make a five year or longer commitment to a startup company, the act provides an incentive that lowers the investors’ effective tax rate. This is great news for the entrepreneurs in America as this policy will provide them with resources to hire, expand, innovate, and grow. It will not be easy for a bipartisan act to be passed, especially in a high-stakes election year. It is my hope that congress can see the importance of this Act, and that it sees the same support that helped the JOBS act succeed. After all, acts such as these help new businesses, and new businesses help America. In fact, over the last three decades new businesses (less than five years old) accounted for more than 40 million jobs (4). So get out there and show your support for the Startup Act 2.0!

**CP Links to politics, immigration reform is controversial**

**US News 12** <US News. “Immigration Reform” June 2012. http://www.usnews.com/topics/subjects/immigration-reform>

Congress remains deadlocked over immigration. Many Republicans and border state legislators emphasize securing the U.S. border with Mexico as the critical first step toward reform. Arizona Sens. John McCain and Jon Kyl in April 2010 called for 3,000 National Guard troops to help close the border and stem cross-border violence. A bill sponsored by Democratic Sens. Claire McCaskill and Chuck Schumer became law in August 2010, sending about 1,000 additional enforcement personnel to the border and providing increased funding for unmanned surveillance drones. Republicans have also called for an expansion of guest worker programs and for an end to birthright citizenship, which, under the 14th Amendment, means anyone born on U.S. soil is a citizen. Democrats, led by Sen. Harry Reid, argue for a “comprehensive” approach--which critics derisively characterize as “amnesty”--including not only border security but also a path to citizenship for illegal immigrants who are already in the country.

Add On—Wildfires

**Growing emissions will increase the chance for wildfires – we need act now to stop the threat**

**Climate Choices 6** (A project of the Union of Concerned Scientists (UCUSA), “Impacts – Wildfires”, [http://www.climatechoices.org/impacts\_wildfires/)//AMV](http://www.climatechoices.org/impacts_wildfires/%29//AMV)

Wildfires are a major environmental hazard that have historically cost California more than $800 million each year and contribute to "bad air days" throughout the state. **As global warming accelerates, so will these wildfires, and the damage to health and property that they cause**. By century's end, we may see as many as 55 percent more large wildfires if we fail to make significant cuts in global warming emissions. More Wildfires Expected If average statewide temperatures rise to the medium warming range (5.5 to 8°F), the risk of large wildfires in California is expected to increase about 20 percent my mid-century and 50 percent by the end of the century. This is almost twice the wildfire increase expected if temperatures are kept within the lower warming range. Along with temperature, wildfires are determined by a variety of factors, including precipitation. Because of this, future wildfire risk throughout the state will not be uniform. For example, a hotter, drier climate could increase the flammability of vegetation in northern California and promote up to a 90 percent increase in large wildfires by the end of the century. A hotter, wetter climate would also lead to an increase of wildfires in northern California, but to a lesser extent—about a 40 percent increase in wildfires by century's end. More "Bad Air Days" Wildfire smoke produces small soot particles, which can cause or aggravate cardiovascular and respiratory illness and lead to premature death. For example, the wildfires that burned nearly three-quarters of a million acres in southern California in 2003 caused particulate matter (soot) to increase four to five times above normal levels throughout the southern part of the state. Five million people were exposed to dangerous levels of air pollution for at least two days during the fires, and nearly two million were exposed for five days in a row. Wildfire Costs Expected to Increase If global warming emissions continue unabated and temperatures rise into the higher warming range, property damage costs from California wildfires could increase as much as 30 percent toward the end of the century. This estimate is conservative because it assumes population and land-use patterns are held constant at 2000 levels, even though the state's population is expected to grow from 36 million today to more than 55 million by 2050. Furthermore, other fire-related costs such as fire prevention and suppression, health effects of fire-related pollution, flooding, mudslides, altered recreation opportunities, and loss of timber were not included**. Because most global warming emissions remain in the atmosphere for decades or centuries, the energy choices we make today greatly influence the climate our children and grandchildren inherit. We have the technology to increase energy efficiency, significantly reduce these emissions from our energy and land use, and secure a high quality of life for future generations. We must act now to avoid dangerous consequences.**

**\*China CP\***

**Little 7/12**/12 (Morgan, “Capitol Hill joins criticism of 'Made in China' U.S. Olympic uniforms” LA Times, July 12 2012, http://www.latimes.com/news/politics/la-pn-capitol-hill-joins-criticism-of-made-in-china-us-olympic-uniforms-20120712,0,1586224.story)//MR

**Questions over whether overseas companies should be assembling the U.S. team's uniforms made their way to Congress** on Thursday, with **House Speaker John Boehner and Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi responding to the revelation** first reported by ABC News. “We take great pride in **our Olympic athletes** and try to watch them through as many of the trials as possible. I can’t wait to stay up all night to see as much as possible of them. We take such pride and they work so hard. They represent the very best and they’re so excellent, it’s all so beautiful,” Pelosi said. “And they **should be wearing uniforms made in America,” she concluded. Boehner**, when asked about the issue, **tersely said of the U.S. Olympic Committee: “You’d think they’d know better.”** But **the most heated remarks on the uniforms were delivered by Senate Majority Leader** Harry **Reid. "I am so upset. I think the Olympic committee should be ashamed of themselves**.... I think **they should take all the uniforms, put them in a big pile and burn them. And start all over again," Reid said** during a news conference. **"I hope they wear nothing but a singlet that says 'USA' on it painted by hand. We have people in America working in the textile industry who are desperate for jobs**," he concluded. “The U.S. Olympic team is privately funded and we’re grateful for the support of our sponsors. We’re proud of our partnership with Ralph Lauren, an iconic American company,” the U.S. Olympic Committee told ABC News in response to criticism. A similar controversy arose in 2008, when Reuters reported Team USA’s uniforms, again designed by Ralph Lauren, were made in China. **The** current uniform **controversy comes amid this week’s declaration of a “Make it in America” initiative**, unveiled by Minority Whip Rep. Steny Hoyer on Wednesday, a combination of **legislation on building up infrastructure,** simplifying Internet regulation, adjusting tariffs and more.

**The Examiner 7/18**/12 (“China investment in U.S. sought despite anti-Beijing sentiment” Washington Examiner, July 18 2012, http://washingtonexaminer.com/china-investment-in-u.s.-sought-despite-anti-beijing-sentiment/article/2502457)//MR

**Forget the furor over China trade and Ralph Lauren's outsourcing of U.S. Olympic uniforms** to the Asian nation. **A former top** Bush **official wants the U.S. to put out the welcome mat to the world's second-largest economy.**

**Despite** heated **anti-China rhetoric in** the **Washington and on the campaign trail, policy leaders** led by ex-Treasury Secretary Hank Paulson **are building a campaign to let Beijing invest in the U**nited **S**tates just like Japan has done. The reason: **They're going to take their money someplace and** "**it's in our best interests to capture our share**," according to Paulson.

The former Bush-era Treasury boss said **Washington should "welcome" Chinese investments because it would expand jobs and ease growing suspicions between the two nations.** In an address to the Atlantic Council Tuesday, he said that **Chinese investments overseas have produced 5.6 million jobs, but the U.S. has grabbed only 4,000 of them.**

His call is part of a broader Atlantic Council effort to draw up a new international agenda for President Obama's second term or Mitt Romney's first. Several other policy leaders have offered their plans to Atlantic.

But Paulson's **call to open the floodgates to Chinese investment comes at a time when anti-China sentiment is high in the U.S., as evidenced by Senate Majority Leader** Harry **Reid's angry call last week to burn U.S. Olympic uniforms because they were made in China.**

In fact, two Chinese reporters quizzed Paulson on **the anti-Chinese rhetoric in Washington** and he said that **it was an unfortunate issue that plays well with voters. "People respond positively to it,"** he said. **But** he added that **once the campaign is over, the nationalism should end.**

**\*Coal Mining DA\***

**No Impact to Mining**

**MTR results in restoration 95% of the time**

**Kuykendall 10** – Reporter, The Register-Herald (Taylor, “What's In a name? ‘Mountaintop Removal’ vs. ‘Mountaintop Development’” Friends of Coal, December 27 2010, [http://www.friendsofcoal.org/20101227332/latest-news/whats-in-a-name-qmountaintop-removalq-vs-qmountaintop-developmentq.html)//MR](http://www.friendsofcoal.org/20101227332/latest-news/whats-in-a-name-qmountaintop-removalq-vs-qmountaintop-developmentq.html%29//MR)

“In my mind, **mountaintop ‘removal’ implies the site is mined and then left barren, lifeless and flattened. This couldn’t be further from the truth**,” said Chris Hamilton of the West Virginia Coal Association. He points to the **mining permit requirement** that **forces miners to restore the mines to their approximate original contour or to configure the land for an “alternate use.” Restoring the land occurs in** about **90 percent to 95 percent of former surface mines**, Hamilton said. “**We rebuild the mountain peak, resculpting it** toapproximately **as close as possible to the original premining topography of the land, then we reseed it with grasses and trees**,” Hamilton said. “**We also rebuild the drainage channels, putting in sediment and erosion-control structures to prevent potential downstream impacts**.” **One example of land that was developed for alternative use**, Hamilton said, **is a 900-acre plot in Mingo County donated for use as a regional airport. Cooperation of local officials**, he said, **has allowed coal companies to be a part of community development, postmining.** “Mingo County is doing some marvelous things through their **Mingo County Redevelopment Authority**,” Hamilton said. “This organization **is partnering with the coal industry to include surface mining in its county master land use plan and to enlist the coal industry as an active partner in the process of building a new, diversified, sustainable economy for the region**. This should be the model for the entire state, and we believe it is becoming so.”

**No impact – mountains are resoiled and reseeded**

**Holton 9**

[Chuck, CBN News Reporter, "Mountaintop Mining: The Good, Bad & Ugly," 6/29/9, http://www.cbn.com/cbnnews/us/2009/April/Mountaintop-Mining-The-Good-Bad--Ugly-/]//SH

Jimmy Cook is with Massey Energy, the fourth largest coal company in the U.S. He points out that mountaintop removal is rarely practiced anymore. "Basically **one of the things the public doesn't know is that mountaintop mining basically doesn't exist now**," Cook explained. "**All these permits are what we call AOC permits** - Approximate Original Contour. **Which means when we mine out here, we have to put the mountain back within 50 feet."** His **miners scrape away the soil to get at seams of coal underneath. But once that's done, the mountain must be painstakingly rebuilt, then re-seeded with grass and trees**. But **sometimes, land owners have other plans.** "Whether it's a flume, a ditch or a pond, **when you go back to the landowner and say 'I'll put this back the way it was,' and they'll tell you, 'no, I want that road there**, I want that pond, because me and my grandkids go fishing in that pond now,'" **he said. "Nine times out of ten, they want you to leave it there, because at the end of the day it's left better than it was to start with**." Cook continued.

**Mountains recover and improve resource quality**

**Holton 9**

[Chuck, CBN News Reporter, "Mountaintop Mining: The Good, Bad & Ugly," 6/29/9, http://www.cbn.com/cbnnews/us/2009/April/Mountaintop-Mining-The-Good-Bad--Ugly-/]//SH

**One mountain** top **was strip mined in the 1980's, and back then, there were far fewer regulations as to the kind of reclamation that had to be done once the coal had been extracted.** And **yet the land has recovered remarkably well, and the farmers** who grow hay and cattle **on this mountain are pretty happy** with how it turned out. Dave **Hutchison farms this mountain. "The environmentalists get all bent out of shape saying they're burying our streams," Hutchinson said**. "Well, I'm not the smartest fella, but even I know **you can't stop water - and when they reclaimed this mountain, it actually improved the quality of the runoff because they put in these ponds and controlled the drainage**."

**New programs solve the impact**

**American Bird Conservancy 12**

[non-profit membership organization with the mission of conserving native birds and their habitats, "Reforestation planned for former coal mines," 6/22/12, http://www.birdwatchingdaily.com/en/Getting%20Started/Eye%20on%20Conservation/2012/06/Reforestation%20planned%20for%20former%20coal%20mines.aspx]//SH

The new program, known as the **Appalachian Regional Reforestation Initiative**, set out to reforest the former mines and **change how** future **reclamation is conducted. It has planted more than 70 million trees** on over 100,000 acres of mined land to date. **Organizers focus on restoring native hardwood forests where surface coal mining has occurred or is currently ongoing, including the Appalachian breeding ranges of many neotropical migratory songbirds**. Most notable among them is Cerulean Warbler, which depends on large blocks of intact interior forest. Its population has been declining steadily for 40 years. **Reforestation Initiative partners include federal and local government agencies, non-profit organizations, private companies, and individual citizens. They work together to target efforts and resources at sites that will help** Cerulean Warbler, Acadian Flycatcher, Wood Thrush, Worm-eating Warbler, Kentucky Warbler, and other priority bird **species**. High-priority shrubland birds such as Golden-winged Warbler should also benefit as young seedlings begin growing. **The work is groundbreaking** both literally — the heavily compacted soil must be ripped up with special equipment before the planted saplings can take root — and figuratively. In fact, the Reforestation Initiative was honored last year with the first Presidential Migratory Bird Stewardship Award, designed to promote partnerships that lead to better migratory-bird conservation. Contributors include the Appalachian Mountains Joint Venture, American Bird Conservancy, the Cerulean Warbler Technical Group, the Golden-Winged Warbler Working Group, the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, the Trust for Wildlife, and many other groups.

**Their authors are biased – they ignore what happens after the mining is done**

**Pyle 12**

[Thomas, President of the Institute for Energy Research, not-for-profit organization that conducts intensive research and analysis on the functions, operations, and government regulation of global energy markets, "Anti-Coal Lobby Overlooks Many Benefits of Surface Mining," 6/8/12, http://www.usnews.com/opinion/blogs/on-energy/2012/06/08/anti-coal-lobby-overlooks-many-benefits-of-surface-mining]//SH

Of course, **those who oppose surface mining** categorically **reject the notion that there can be any benefit to developing coal resources** in Appalachia, **even if the lands are restored or used for development projects thereafter.** The ultimate disingenuousness of the anti-coal campaign is seen in the many websites set up about "mountaintop removal" that show pictures of active surface mine sites, holding them out as if they were the final, permanent result of mining. **Reclamation is a part of mining as much as the extraction of coal.** These **anti-mining campaigns not only misrepresent the environmental impacts of surface mining, they wholly disregard the importance of it to the places they claim to want to protect.** Far from destroying communities, **surface mining is a centuries-old practice that has provided jobs and economic opportunity for generations of coal country inhabitants**. In West Virginia, the average wage for coal miners in 2010 was $79,409, compared to an average of $36,990 for all other industries in the state. Furthermore, coal provided 12 percent of West Virginia's gross state product in 2010, and 98 percent of West Virginia's electricity (the sixth-cheapest of all the states) was provided by its own coal. And more than half the United States's electricity was generated using West Virginia coal that year, much of which comes from productive surface mines. **As surface mining practices become more efficient with technological innovations, our ability to balance energy production with environmental conservation improves as well. And** indeed, **the ability to use our natural resources in a manner that also conserves the land will bode well for our nation's energy future. According to the North American Energy Inventory, the 461.1 billion short tons of coal that can be recovered with today's technology is enough for 464 years of use at our current rate of consumption.** The United States has the largest **coal** resources in the world. They **should be regarded as an asset, rather than a burden, especially because the law requires reclamation after mining has occurred. In addition to enhancing our ability to provide reliable, affordable electricity for generations to come, domestic energy production has provided jobs and economic growth through the best and worst of times in this country**. Just don't count on the anti-coal lobby to highlight that fact anytime soon.

**No impact to MTM – Studies prove**

**NMA 9** - the national trade organization that represents the interests of mining before Congress, the Administration, federal agencies, the judiciary and the media (National Mining Association, “Mountaintop Mining Fact Book”, March 2009, www.nma.org/pdf/fact\_sheets/mtm.pdf)//CH

**There have been several reports and environmental impact statements on the practice of mountaintop mining** over the past 30 years. **The most comprehensive** of those **was** a programmatic environmental impact statement **co-sponsored by the Environmental Protection Agency, the Fish & Wildlife Service, the Office of Surface Mining, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the State of West Virginia.** This 5,000 page report includes 30 studies on all different aspects of mountaintop mining. Mountaintop Mining/Valley Fills in Appalachia, Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (June 2003). **According to this study, surface mining has disturbed only about 3 percent of the land in the study area over the past 10 years. The** EIS **study area** (which includes parts of Virginia, West Virginia, Kentucky and Tennessee) **accounts for** about **25 percent of the nation’s coal production**. Mountaintop Mining and Streams: **During the ten-year period** examined in the June 2003 study, **mountaintop mining was viewed as impacting only 2 percent of the streams in the study area**, **which does not take into account avoidance, minimization and mitigation requirements imposed under regulations of the Clean Water Act.** The statistics on impacts to streams include not only bodies of flowing water, but also on intermittent streams that contain flowing water for only part of the year and ephemeral streams which contain no water at all except as a result of rain or runoff events.

Mining Good

 Adaptability

**Moutaintop mining is net good – people and animals can adapt to environmental changes, and legal provisions check damages**

**Muncy 12** (Brandon, journalist for daonline, February 27th, 2012, “Column – Mountaintop removal mining is beneficial”, http://www.thedaonline.com/opinion/column-mountaintop-removal-mining-is-efficient-beneficial-1.2797525#.UAhy3fXmnW4)//AMV

Mountaintop removal mining is a very divisive item in this state and across Appalachia. After all, West Virginia is the Mountain State and has been dubbed "Mountain Momma." So, how can someone whose heritage is linked with these titans of the Earth turn his back on them? I'll answer. Frankly, mountaintop removal mining is more efficient and safer than underground mining, and I care more about the positive effects this has on people than mountains. More often than not, I'm accused of being a heartless, social-Darwinian because of my fondness of free market economics. "What about the poor?" they inquire. "What if someone can't afford the basic necessities?" Of course, my answers to these questions will never satisfy them. To these individuals, it is unacceptable under almost every circumstance that any person can go without what they deem as a basic necessity. It's not really a stretch to suggest that, oftentimes, the aforementioned kind-hearted souls are also quite fond of the environment and seek to protect it. What they don't realize is their goal of making available basic necessities is inextricably tied to the free market and taking advantage of our nature-given resources. I'll absolutely concede mountaintop removal mining is hazardous to the ecosystem of the mountain. Removing the top of a mountain and filling the valley next to it would absolutely change the local ecosystem. But, still, I argue "So, what?" **Animals as well as people, adapt to changing environments all the time and when compared to the actual benefits of this form of mining, the impacts are worth taking**. Moreover, in a free market setting, most, if not all, externalities created by these disturbances in the local ecosystem could be handled through litigation and the court system. People whose property is damaged by the act would be justly compensated. Again, I'll concede there are problems with what I just said. West Virginia's government is notoriously in bed with big coal companies. This is something of which I do not, and will not ever approve. To counter this, West Virginians need to put pressure on the state government to pass a no-tolerance law that states that any and all damages to property or health that can be proved to be the result of actions of another party or parties will be completely covered by the damager of said property or health. Many times, a coal company's liability is limited and they are protected by legislation. I will side every single time with environmentalists and argue that approach is a travesty and is unacceptable. Environmentalists would have you believe there is no actual benefit to mountaintop removal mining, or, if there are, they are marginal at best. This statement, both logically, and empirically, is untrue. A coal company would only invest in a mining venture if both the expected marginal benefits of doing so exceeded the expected marginal costs of any other potential mining operation. This is what's known as opportunity cost. All else equal, any wise entrepreneur weighs the expected profits for any investment against all other opportunities and will choose the most profitable. Empirically speaking, mountaintop removal mining is often more efficient than underground mining and safer. Whereas environmentalists are concerned about losing mountains and the environmental cost, I look at the fact that **cheaper energy, steel and safer mining conditions are the result of mountaintop removal mining**. However, if you're and environmentalist, you're likely not convinced by my argument,. So, I've concocted a solution for you of which I approve. Pool together your money and start purchasing up the mineral rights to mountains from underneath coal companies. By doing this, you protect the mountains you love and are actually doing something productive and meaningful. The private property rights system advocated by free marketers like myself can actually be used to your advantage. The system in place is imperfect and free marketers and environmentalists can come together to make improvements. Eliminating imminent domain – an action of the state to seize private property – would curb some of the mining that takes place, and it's something free marketers could support. Moreover, having a legal system where companies are held accountable for the damage they cause to people's health and property is something both groups could get behind. However, banning the practice in totality would be detrimental to the economy at large.

**Their evidence assumes deforestation – clearcutting is distinct and better for the environment**

**Belt & Campbell 99** (Kevin, Sr. Financial Analyst at Forest City Enterprises, and Robert, R.F., consulting forester, Appalachian Forestry,

 “The Clearcutting Controversy – Myths and Facts”, http://www.wvu.edu/~agexten/forestry/clrcut.htm)//AMV

MYTH: Clearcutting is the same as deforestation. Deforestation is the removal of a forest with no intention of establishing a future stand of trees. In the 1700s and 1800s, eastern America was being deforested though, at the time, "deforestation" was not even a word. Furthermore, who today can complain about a rolling pasture in the Greenbrier Valley or the productive cropland of an Ohio or Indiana farm? Deforestation is occurring today in Brazil and other tropical areas in the form of agricultural conversion. Silvicultural clearcutting is both a harvest and a regeneration of the forest, and is done to improve future stand quality, growth, genetics, and species composition. MYTH: Clearcuts are the end and death of a forest. **In West Virginia, after any clearcut the forest immediately springs back with ample regeneration**. In a clearcut stand of hardwoods, that regeneration is of excellent quality and species composition. The natural regeneration from clearcuts in West Virginia eventually ends up as some of the nation's finest quality hardwood timber. In both the Deep South and the Great Lakes region, pines are normally planted after clearcutting because those areas are particularly well suited to growing high-quality, fast-growing pines (unlike Appalachian hardwoods, pines do not dependably spring back from advance regeneration, root stock, and seed stock). **Clearcuts can actually be a part of sustainable forest management.** MYTH: Clearcuts cause immensely more erosion than partial cuts. Actually, erosion has almost nothing to do with how much wood is removed, but has almost everything to do with how it is removed. Erosion from logging comes through road building efforts. If a logger is good at staying away from streamsides, good at building roads with as little slope as possible, good at placing water-bars on those roads, and good at using culverts at stream crossings, then that harvesting operation causes very little sediment movement and precious little sedimentation of streams, regardless of cutting method. If a logger builds roads in or near streams, builds other roads straight up slopes, and practices nothing in the way of Best Management Practices, then we can expect a great deal of mud, regardless of cutting method. Common sense and ample research have shown that cutting trees causes no erosion whatsoever-- removing the logs by way of roads is the source of sediment from logging. Non-road areas of clearcuts are comprised of the root mass and humus of a forest soil. This root mass is the world's best sponge for rainfall and runoff, regardless of the presence of stems. The forest industry must control erosion by controlling the quality of its road building and road lay-by efforts. (Best Management Practices--Soil & Water Conservation) MYTH: Clearcuts are biological deserts with no potential for wildlife habitat. A clearcut in Appalachian hardwoods is anything but a biological desert. Because a clearcut receives full sunlight, it actually provides a site for a huge number of sun-loving species to grow and thrive. As a clearcut grows, shrub and herb species more adapted to a shaded forest floor will slowly replace the sun-lovers. As common sense might indicate, a patchwork of uncut stands, clearcuts, and partial cuts provides the most biologically diverse situation. As any ambitious deer hunter will tell you, a clearcut is an excellent place for wildlife to thrive. However, in all truth, the sum total of wildlife is neither decreased nor enormously increased by a clearcut. To be more accurate, clearcuts rearrange habitat and wildlife population according to its age. A new clearcut is not a particularly good place for a squirrel, a possum, an adult turkey, or a raccoon. A new clearcut is an excellent place for bear, deer, grouse, young turkey, or quail. As a clearcut ages and grows, it provides different structure and different browse and mast species suitable for different animals' habitat and food needs. Fisheries need not even be affected by clearcutting so long as the proper buffer zones and soil and water conservation practices are implemented. (Best Management Practices--Soil & Water Conservation) Westvaco land is an excellent example of combined and coexisting uses: heavy forest industry, a patchwork of clearcutting, excellent BMP usage, fine hunting, and a rewarding place to fish for trout.

**Turn – MTM fixes environmental and BioD problems from alt causes**

**NMA 9** - the national trade organization that represents the interests of mining before Congress, the Administration, federal agencies, the judiciary and the media (National Mining Association, “Mountaintop Mining Fact Book”, March 2009, www.nma.org/pdf/fact\_sheets/mtm.pdf)//CH

**SMCRA not only regulates the mining process, it also requires that before mining** ever **begins the mine operator must submit and regulators must approve a comprehensive mine land restoration and reclamation plan**. To develop the plan the mining company, in consultation with landowners and regulators, will design a plan for the mine site that requires the company to restore the land to sup- port an approved “post-mining land use,” that will restore the land to a valuable use or purpose after mining**.** Examples of this could include reclaiming the land to support forests, pastureland, cropland, or an economic use for the public such as a golf course, an airport or industrial park, or a wind farm. In addition to the legal requirements to restore the land, **financial bonds are required by federal law as an insurance policy to ensure the land will be fully reclaimed** according to the reclamation plan, **regardless of the financial condition of the company after mining operations** are complete. **Wildlife Habitat and Reforestation Mining companies have a unique opportunity to tailor their post mining land uses to accomplish a variety of environmental and economic objectives** through the reclamation process. For example, **mining operations**, in conjunction with state government partners and the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation, **reintroduced a total of 1,500 elk in eastern Kentucky** between 1997 and 2002. According to the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation, **when mines are properly reclaimed according to government standards, the elk actually prefer such sites to other areas**. In 90 percent of the cases where the animals are radio tracked, the elk are living in and around reclaimed surface mines**. The elk herd in Kentucky has flourished and now numbers over 10,000 animals**, which represents more than a 600 percent increase in the size of the herd. **In addition, research conducted** by Virginia Polytechnic and State University and the University of Kentucky **has demonstrated that forest communities can be successfully re-established on reclaimed mine sites**. This success is promoted through efforts such as the Appalachian Regional Reforestation Initiative (ARRI), a partnership of federal and state regulators, private industry and conservation groups dedicated to promoting and encouraging the restoration of high-value, hardwood forests on coal mined lands in Appalachia using the forestry reclamation approach. The forestry reclamation approach requires using advanced techniques to ensure availability and depth of proper topsoil, avoiding compaction of the soil, using the appropriate groundcover and tree species selections, and applying the correct tree planting techniques. **Using this approach, mountaintop mining operations can successfully replant and restore the forest after mining operations are complete. Mountaintop mines also can improve the environment through reintroduction of plant species. For example, the American chestnut tree was largely eliminated from eastern forests** of the United States several decades ago **by a blight** that destroyed almost the entire species. **Through a partnership with the American Chestnut Foundation** (TACF), **mining companies are planting a blight-resistant version of the chestnut across 1.2 million acres in Kentucky.** These plantings are part of the Appalachian Regional Reforestation Initiative mentioned above, which promotes the reforestation of coal-mined lands using high-value, native hardwood trees, including the American chestnut. In addition the ARRI has joined with the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) Seven Billion Tree Campaign and has pledged to plant 38 million trees over three years. **Reforesting this land with trees**, especially fast-growing hardwoods like the American chestnut, on reclaimed mines **will also benefit landowners by providing them with a tree crop that can be periodically harvested.**

 Economic Development

**MTR is contained in small areas—facilitates community development**

**Kuykendall 10** – Reporter, The Register-Herald (Taylor, “What's In a name? ‘Mountaintop Removal’ vs. ‘Mountaintop Development’” Friends of Coal, December 27 2010, [http://www.friendsofcoal.org/20101227332/latest-news/whats-in-a-name-qmountaintop-removalq-vs-qmountaintop-developmentq.html)//MR](http://www.friendsofcoal.org/20101227332/latest-news/whats-in-a-name-qmountaintop-removalq-vs-qmountaintop-developmentq.html%29//MR)

While many cite grim imagery in the southern coalfields, Hamilton says **surface mining is not as prevalent as a lot of numbers would suggest on first glance.** “I love mountains as well,” Hamilton said. “And I would point out that **only 1 percent of the surface area of** our **state has been touched by surface mining.** Some **opponents of coal are prone to exaggeration**...” Hamilton acknowledges that **not every site is located in an area where population is dense enough to sustain long-term development.** However, there are some valuable uses for the land, he said. “Is it feasible to expect Toyota or Ford to build an auto plant on top of every mountain in southern West Virginia? Can we put an industrial park on each one and expect it to thrive? Of course not,” Hamilton said. “No one is suggesting that.” He said **he** would **suggest that the sites be developed into things like recreational facilities** such as the YMCA Soccer Complex in Beckley or in Morgantown at Mylan Park. He said homes and communities could be built outside floodplains to provide **safe, modern housing, schools and hospitals, shopping centers, airports and industrial parks. A survey of the West Virginia Department of Commerce found that 13,000 jobs were created on 43 former surface mining sites in 12 counties.** “**With some areas of our state having little flat land for development, the use of surface-mined lands has been critically important to providing land for new industry and facilities for use by the general public**,” Division of Energy Director Jeff Herholdt said. “In addition to the flat land, **many projects are able to take advantage of infrastructure, roads, and electric service used during coal mining**.”

**MTR is vital to the economy—facilitates diverse development**

**Kuykendall 10** – Reporter, The Register-Herald (Taylor, “What's In a name? ‘Mountaintop Removal’ vs. ‘Mountaintop Development’” Friends of Coal, December 27 2010, [http://www.friendsofcoal.org/20101227332/latest-news/whats-in-a-name-qmountaintop-removalq-vs-qmountaintop-developmentq.html)//MR](http://www.friendsofcoal.org/20101227332/latest-news/whats-in-a-name-qmountaintop-removalq-vs-qmountaintop-developmentq.html%29//MR)

Hamilton said **surface mining is often pictured in black-and-white, but the reality is much more complex**. “Look, again, let’s go to the math — **the coal industry provides 60,000 jobs today at an average salary of $68,500 per year. The industry pays more than $3.4 billion each year in payroll and pumps some $26 billion into the state’s economy. That is no small contribution. It is the** very **bedrock of our state’s economy.** “About **45 percent of that impact comes from surface mining**, and it is important to note that **often the existence of a surface mine provides the economic support that allows affiliated underground mines to exist in an area.** If you remove the surface mine component, you will likely make some underground mining facilities un-economic to operate.” Due to early regulation and enforcement standards, Hamilton said, West Virginia is one of the most forested states in the nation. He said **the need for greater diversity and development is** now **in demand** and the future of West Virginia depends on development. “**I** actually **see these sites, with a properly developed mechanism to identify and market them, as one of our most important resources** for building this new West Virginia,” Hamilton said. “With proper planning and coordination, I see these sites leading the way in the effort. And I see the coal industry as one of the most important resources our state has — both **for today and for the future**.”

Mining Inevitable

**Regulations check and surface mining is inevitable in the status quo**

**Sipes 10** (Thomas, undergraduate, Environmental Policy and Management “The Polluting of a Nation: Surface Coal Mining in America”, July 25th, 2010, http://apus.academia.edu/ThomasSipes/Papers/234581/The\_Polluting\_of\_a\_Nation\_Surface\_Coal\_Mining\_In\_America)//AMV

Things may be about to improve for the environment in regards to surface mining. On April 1stof this year the EPA issued new guidelines for obtaining coal mining permits. These guidelines, reversing legislation of 2002, are aimed to stop the toxic metal pollution from valley fills which are common in MTR mining in Appalachia. Testing local streams for conductivity is the measure by which the level of toxic solids will be determined. In order for a company to acquire a mining permit they will have to demonstrate good environmental mining practice by keeping the local streams within the tolerable conductivity limits set by the EPA. Even though the tolerable limits are five times the natural level of conductivity, few companies are expected to be able to meet the new guidelines. This level of toxicity will still damage 5% of the aquatic life in affected areas. This is not an end to coal mining, but it will certainly limit if not end the days of MTR and strip mining (Block).The EPA is not the only effective tool to curtail this aggravated pollution of our natural resources. On April 27th**,** 2010, The Sierra Club, Ohio Valley Environmental Coalition, Coal River Mountain Watch, and the West Virginia Highlands Conservancy filed a citizen enforcement action under the Clean Water Act and Surface Mining Reclamation Act to force five coal companies to comply with their permits and stop polluting West Virginia waterways. The groups are seeking fines against the mines of up to $32,500 per day for each violation that occurred on or before January 12, 2009, and$37,500 per day for each violation that occurred thereafter - penalties that could, hopefully, rise into the millions of dollars (Environment News Service). If these companies are hit hard enough in their pockets it may become less expensive for them to practice environmentally sustainable mining than to pay the necessary fines imposed from contaminating the environment with unethical operations. **Coal mining is currently a necessary practice for the production of energy**. Until alternative energy methods are able to meet the energy requirements of our nation**, coalmining will continue to be practiced.** Strict regulations and enforcement are necessary to protect our current and future water supplies as well as aquatic ecosystems from unethical and unsustainable mining practices. It is less costly to prevent contamination from surface mining than it is to attempt to correct the contamination through remediation and reclamation. **The recovery of local wildlife from these contaminants may never be fully realized**

Natural Gas --> Warming

**Natural gas is net worse for climate change**

**Bloomberg 12**

[premier site for business and financial market news, " The Gas Is Always Greener When It Leaks Less," 6/13/12, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-06-13/the-gas-is-always-greener-when-it-leaks-less.html]//SH

**The** great **promise of natural gas**, we’re often told, **is that it will be better for the climate than other fossil fuels.** In fact, **this can come true only if very little of the fuel is allowed to escape**, unburned, into the air. **The trouble is, we don’t know how much natural gas leaks** -- as it is extracted, processed, transported and used -- **and** some **evidence suggests the amount may be more than we have assumed**. As the U.S. gears up to use more of the fuel, not only for electricity and home heating but also to power cars and trucks and for export, the need to find out how much is getting away is urgent. This is exactly what experts convened by the Department of Energy recommended last August. So far, their call has gone unanswered. **The reason natural gas has a reputation for being gentle on the climate is that burning it emits almost a third less carbon dioxide** than burning oil does, and almost 45 percent less than burning coal does**. But when methane, the principal component of natural gas, floats directly into the air, it has a much stronger greenhouse effect** than carbon dioxide has -- 25 times stronger over the course of a century and, over 20 years, **72 times stronger**. (The time span makes a difference because methane breaks down in the atmosphere faster than carbon dioxide does.) **The maximum leakage we can afford is 3.2 percent** of the total amount of natural gas used, scientists from the Environmental Defense Fund and three universities recently figured out. Any more than that, and using natural gas leads to more heat being trapped in the atmosphere for some time than using coal does. The best guess so far on how much is leaking is just 2.4 percent. However, this number, from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, is based not on direct measurements but on limited data collected 20 years ago. **Recent measurements** taken near a natural-gas field north of Denver **indicate that the actual amount of methane escaping** there **is** higher -- **about 4 percent**. This study determined leakage by sampling the air in the vicinity of natural-gas facilities, which is a more accurate way of assessing leakage. Yet it would be better to monitor methane directly at the points where it is escaping. Environmental Defense Fund scientists are taking such measurements now at select drilling sites in four big natural- gas-producing regions in the U.S. Eventually, they plan to take similar readings on leaks from transmission pipes and storage facilities. **Careful measurements are also needed where compressed or liquefied natural gas is being provided for cars and trucks. A certain amount of methane leaks during fueling and use of these vehicles. Because methane is especially potent in the short term, converting a fleet of cars from gasoline to compressed natural gas will, for many years, make climate change worse**, according to the same scientists who calculated the 3.2 percent limit for total methane leakage. **In order for such a fleet conversion to produce net climate benefits immediately, well-to-wheels leakage must be reduced to at least 1.6 percent, from the current estimated 3 percent. For heavy trucks, the leak rate would need to come down to 1 percent. A new escape route for methane will be opened as the U.S. begins exporting some of its natural-gas bounty.** (With natural- gas prices at $9 per million BTU and higher in Europe and $17 in Asia, a new facility in Louisiana to liquefy gas for export is on the drawing board.) **Methane can escape during liquefaction, shipping and regasification** at the receiving end. **All these leaks, too, have to be measured**. What’s ultimately needed is a full accounting of all methane escaping from the natural-gas supply chain. Such an effort is expected to cost many millions of dollars and require cooperation by federal agencies involved in energy, the environment, transportation and trade. In calling for the effort last August, the Energy secretary’s Shale Gas Production Subcommittee wisely recommended that the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy coordinate the job and make sure it gets funded and started immediately. In the meantime, as the subcommittee also said, natural-gas producers should begin their own voluntary efforts to directly measure leaks, even as they work to reduce them.

**Fracking is worse - turns water into poison and has the same effects as MTM**

**Steingraber 11**

[Sandra, PhD in Biology from University of Michigan, Distinguished Visiting Scholar at the Division of Interdisciplinary and International Studies at Ithaca College, "Fracking Democracy," January/February 2011, Orion Magazine, http://www.orionmagazine.org/index.php/articles/article/6055/]//SH

Over the course of two days, a panel of **EPA officials heard** four hundred two-minute **presentations** by members of the public who had come to advise the agency, at its own invitation, **on how it should design a scientific study**. As ordered by Congress, **this study will investigate the risks** to drinking water **posed by** the Johnny-come-lately technology known as high-volume slick water horizontal **hydrofracturing, which does to shale bedrock what mountaintop removal does to an Appalachian mountaintop: blows it up to get at a carbon-rich fossil fuel trapped inside.**  **In the case of fracking,** the quarry is methane bubbles trapped inside impermeable layers of shale thousands of feet below the earth’s surface. To liberate the gas, **millions of gallons of fresh water** (high-volume) **are mixed with sand and chemicals — some of which are carcinogens — and this** slippery **mixture** (slick water) **is forced, under immense pressure, into mile-long tunnels drilled sideways** (horizontal) **through bedrock. With the assistance of explosives, this poisonous solution shatters the shale** (hydrofracturing) **and releases a vaporous froth of petroleum, euphemistically known as natural gas, which floats up the borehole — along with brine, radioactive materials, and heavy metals.**  So, last September in Binghamton, some four hundred members of New York State’s citizenry signed up to express their particular views on the question of how one might go about studying the environmental impacts of this sort of energy extraction. The EPA panelists sat in chairs on the commodious stage of this tattered-but-grand former vaudeville house, while, one by one, each preregistered citizen advisor approached a podium in the orchestra pit and offered up opinions. After 120 seconds, the microphone turned off automatically, ending the presentation of a sometimes still-talking, still-gesticulating petitioner. Then the next person on the roster was called to the mike. And then the next. And then the next. For four solid hours. And then the panelists took an intermission and came back for another four-hour round of two-minute testimonies. And then there was a second day of speeches. For members of the audience, who could see only the back of the speaker as he or she addressed the onstage panel, the sole visual element was a giant digital timer projected onto a screen behind the panelists that ticked backwards, second by second, from two minutes to zero, making the parade of speeches a cross between speed dating and a NASA countdown. After my own 120 seconds of counsel — during which time I (rapidly) advised the EPA to consider revisiting its own prior investigation of PCBs in the Hudson River, at least some molecules of which seeped into the water through naturally occurring fissures and hairline cracks (seventy-nine seconds; talk faster) in the shale bedrock beneath General Electric’s factory floor, migratory pathways not previously known or even thought possible — I had plenty of time to listen to the other presentations. Because the EPA had signaled a possible willingness to expand the scope of its study to consider cumulative impacts, the pro-drilling contingent was on the defensive. One after the other, the self-identified “landowners” — which seemed to be code for “people who believe that the federal government should not get between a man and his gas lease” — urged the EPA to “restrict inquiry” and “resist the temptation” of more deliberation. Back in the cheap seats, I practiced sympathy for this position. What would it be like, I asked myself, to view scientific inquiry as meddlesome dithering? As someone who, in other circumstances, has argued that the time for action had arrived, I could almost understand the impatience of those who viewed fracking as a bold enterprise rather than complete lunacy. But, soon, the repeated calls for expediency were followed by dismissive comments about water, and whatever empathy I might have felt for the opposition vanished. One man intoned rhapsodically, “Energy is Life,” and then added with a smirk, “Water is a Resource.” I thought that maybe I had heard it backwards, but then he repeated his assertion again, with even more sanctimony: “Energy is Life; Water is a Resource.” It felt like a Monty Python Drop-the-Cow kind of moment, but, alas, no cows fell. And then came the untruths. The millions of gallons of fresh water used by gas wells during fracking operations are exceeded, claimed one petitioner, by the leaks in the New York City water system. They are exceeded by the water used to irrigate golf courses claimed another. Huge amounts of water are wasted doing all kinds of things. A geologist friend and I looked at each other in wonderment, and in my head, I began to imagine a 120-second rebuttal. It would go like this: **Fracking constitutes consumptive water use, which is different from what happens to water when underground pipes leak and water re-enters the aquifer, or when irrigation leads to evaporation and cloud formation. When water is entombed in deep geological strata, a mile or more below the water table, it’s permanently removed from the water cycle.** As in, **forever. It will never again ascend into the clouds, freeze into snowflakes, melt into rivulets, cascade over rocks, turn with the tide, soak into soil, rise through roots, or pour from your tap. It will never again become blood, tears, sweat, urine, milk, sap, nectar, yolk, honey, or the juice of a fruit. It will never again float a leaf boat, swell a bud, quench a thirst, fill a swamp, spill over an edge, slosh, dribble, spray, trickle, splash, drip, or glisten. Never again fog, mist, frost, ice, dew, or rain. It’s gone.** To conclude: **fracking turns fresh water into poison and makes the water disappear. That’s something we’ve not done before on a large scale.** And by the way, water is life. It’s energy that’s a resource.

Fracking Turn

**Fracking is worse than MTM**

**Howarth et al 11** – Howarth is a David R. Atkinson Professor of Ecology

& Environmental Biology at Cornell University, Santoro is a Research Aide at Cornell University, and Ingraffia is a Professor in the Civil and Environmental Engineering department of Cornell University (Robert Howarth, Renee Santoro, and Anthony Ingraffia, “Methane and the Greenhouse-Gas Footprint of Natural Gas from Shale Formations”, 2011, [www.notforshale.com/PDF/Howarth-EtAl-2011.pdf)//CH](http://www.notforshale.com/PDF/Howarth-EtAl-2011.pdf%29//CH)

We evaluate the greenhouse gas footprint of natural gas obtained by high-volume hydraulic fracturing from shale formations, focusing on methane emissions. **Natural gas is composed largely of methane,** **and** 3.6% to **7.9% of the methane from** shale-gas **production escapes to the atmosphere** in venting and leaks **over the life-time of a well.** These methane emissions are at least 30% more than and perhaps more than twice as great as those from conventional gas. The higher emissions from shale gas occur at the time wells are hydraulically fractured -- as methane escapes from flow-back return fluids -- and during drill out following the fracturing. **Methane is a powerful greenhouse gas, with a global warming potential that is far greater than that of carbon dioxide, particularly over the time horizon of the first few decades following emission**. Methane contributes substantially to the greenhouse gas footprint of shale gas on shorter time scales, dominating it on a 20-year time horizon. The footprint for shale gas is greater than that for conventional gas or oil when viewed on any time horizon, but particularly so over 20 years. **Compared to coal, the footprint of shale gas is at least 20% greater and perhaps more than twice as great on the 20-year horizon and is comparable when compared over 100 years.**

**Fracking turns their impacts and isn’t regulated**

**Radford 11** – Executive Director of Greenpeace USA (Phil, “‘Natural’ Gas Fails the Sniff Test”, June 27, 2011, [http://www.greenpeace.org/usa/en/news-and-blogs/campaign-blog/natural-gas-fails-the-sniff-test/blog/35470/)//CH](http://www.greenpeace.org/usa/en/news-and-blogs/campaign-blog/natural-gas-fails-the-sniff-test/blog/35470/%29//CH)

Top **decisionmakers** in Washington **seem to have forgotten that "natural" gas is a fossil fuel**, **with** some of **the same** damning **negatives as coal** and oil. For instance, unlike renewables, "natural" gas is an energy source we will exhaust – possibly sooner than previously thought. Let's not forget that the recent rise of hydraulic fracturing (fracking) couldn't have happened if we hadn't nearly exhausted easily extracted gas supplies already. And now it turns out that this fracking boon may be partly a matter of industry hype. The **extraction of natural gas – especially via fracking – is incredibly harmful to the environment and people's health.** If you aren't alarmed by increasing instances **of flammable tapwater from methane leaks** caused by drillers messing with geology, then maybe **diesel and cancerous chemicals in the w**ater will sound a few bells. Unfortunately, **Congress exempted the "natural" gas industry from practically every** type of **pollution law**, and there are no plans to remove this special treatment. Now, the EPA and DOE want to study the damages of fracking, a little after the fact. But one thing they aren't studying is whether fracked gas can legitimately be called a transition fuel from coal to renewables. **Burning gas creates half the CO2 of coal combustion, but a recent study shows that fracked gas may release so much of a worse global warming pollutant (methane) into the air that it cancels out any benefit to the climate.**

**Fracking is just as bad for the environment**

**Altmann et al 11** – Report requested by the European Parliament's Committee on Environment, Public Health and Food Safety, Altmann, Capito, Matra, Weindrorf, and Zittel are consultants at Ludwig-Bölkow-Systemtechnik GmbH, a professional environment consultation company, Lechtenböhmer is part of the Wuppertal Institute for Climate, Environment and Energy. (Matthias Altmann, Sofia Capito, Zsolt Matra, Werner Weindrorf, Werner Zittel, Stefan Lechtenböhmer, “Impacts of shale gas and shale oil extraction on the environment and on human health”, European Parliament Policy Department A: Economic and Scientific Policy, June 2011, http://europeecologie.eu/IMG/pdf/shale-gas-pe-464-425-final.pdf)//CH

Figure 1 might be used to identify the **possible impacts on the environment** along this way. These **are Consumption of landscape** as the rig pads need space for technical equipment, **fluid storage and road access** for their delivery. **Air and noise pollution** as the machinery is operated by combustion engines, **the fluids (also waste water) might allow harmful substances to evaporate into the air,** the **trucks** with frequent transport activity **might emit volatile organic compounds, other air pollutants and noise. The water might be contaminated with chemicals from the fracturing process, but also with waste water from the deposit that contains heavy metals** (e.g. arsenic or mercury) **or radioactive particles.** Possible migration paths to ground and surface waters could be accidents by truck transport, **leaks of gathering lines, waste water ponds, compressors** etc**., spills from accidents** (e.g. blow out with a fountain of fracturing fluid or waste water), damages to the cementation and casing or simply uncontrolled subsurface flows through artificial or natural cracks of formations. **Earthquakes induced by the hydraulic fracturing process or waste water injection. The mobilization of radioactive particles from the underground**. Finally, the **huge natural and technical resources consumption** with respect to the recoverable gas or oil must be assessed in a cost/benefit analysis of such operations**. Impacts on biodiversity** could be possible, though at present none are documented.

**Fracking is exempt from regulations**

**Sierra Club 12**- Largest US grassroots environmental organization (“Close Industry Loopholes”, 2012, [http://content.sierraclub.org/naturalgas/close-industry-loopholes)//CH](http://content.sierraclub.org/naturalgas/close-industry-loopholes%29//CH)

**The natural gas industry exploits loopholes and disregards** common sense **environmental and health standards.** The industry **tears up entire landscapes and contaminates water** without anyone holding it accountable. **Reckless drilling is** turning neighborhoods upside down, **making our children sick, polluting our air, and contaminating our drinking water**. How did this happen? **In 2005, Congress gave** the method of **hydraulic fracturing a free pass. Dubbed “the Halliburton loophole**,” former Halliburton CEO Dick Cheney gave his friends in the drilling business special treatment, despite the damaging effect it would have on our water, air, and communities. **Alarmingly, the loophole exempts fracking from: Clean Water Act:** Prevents chemicals and toxic wastewater from polluting surface water sources like lakes and streams. **Safe Drinking Water Act**: Protects drinking water and requires disclosure of toxic underground injections. **Clean Air Act:** Protects the health of nearby families from dangerous air pollution. **National Environmental Policy Act**: Requires full environmental reviews on public lands. **Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act**: Requires reporting of the handling of toxic substances to the EPA. **Resource Conservation and Recovery Act**: Sets standards for handling hazardous waste. Now it is up to us to work together and demand Federal agencies like the Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of Energy work to close these dangerous loopholes. The industry is exempt from major sections of these landmark protections.

AT Birth Defects

**Alt causes to infant mortality**

**CDC 6** (Center for Disease Control and Prevention, “Birth Defects: Leading Cause of Infant Death”, http://www.cdc.gov/Features/dsInfantDeaths/)//AMV

The top 10 causes of infant deaths in 2006 were birth defects (5,819); low birth weight and prematurity (4,841); SIDS [Sudden Infant Death Syndrome] (2,323); maternal complications (1,683); accidents/unintentional injuries (1,147); complications of placenta, cord, and membranes (1,140); respiratory distress of newborn (825); bacterial sepsis of newborn (807); neonatal hemorrhage (618); and diseases of the circulatory system (543) (1).

**Mountaintop mining not main cause of birth defects - multiple alt causes**

**Georgia Department of Public Health no date** (reference: March of Dimes Perinatal Data Center. Maternal, Infant, and Child Health in the United States, “Birth Defects”, http://health.state.ga.us/epi/mch/birthdefects/)//AMV

Both genetic and environmental factors can cause birth defects. However, the causes of about 60 to 70 percent of birth defects currently are unknown.A single abnormal gene can cause birth defects. Every human being has at least 30,000 to 35,000 genes that determine traits like eye and hair color, as well as direct the growth and development of every part of our physical and biochemical systems. Genes are packaged into each of the 46 chromosomes inside our cells.Each child gets half its genes from each parent. A person can inherit a genetic disease when one parent (who may or may not have the disease) passes along a single faulty gene. This is called dominant inheritance. Examples include achondroplasia (a form of dwarfism) and Marfan syndrome (a connective tissue disease). Many other genetic diseases are inherited only when both parents (who do not have those diseases) happen to carry the same abnormal gene and pass it on to a child. This is called recessive inheritance. Examples include Tay-Sachs disease (a fatal disorder seen mainly in people of European Jewish heritage) and cystic fibrosis (a fatal disorder of lungs and other organs, affecting mainly Caucasians). There also is a form of inheritance (X-linked) where sons can inherit a genetic disease from a mother who carries the gene (usually with no effect on her own health). Examples include hemophilia (a blood-clotting disorder) and Duchenne muscular dystrophy (progressive muscle weakness). **Abnormalities in the number or structure of chromosomes can cause numerous birth defects**. Due to an error that occurred when an egg or sperm cell was developing, a baby can be born with too many or too few chromosomes, or with one or more chromosomes that are broken or rearranged. Down syndrome, in which a baby is born with an extra chromosome 21, is one of the most common chromosomal abnormalities. Affected children have varying degrees of mental retardation, characteristic facial features and, often, heart defects and other problems. Babies born with extra copies of chromosome 18 or 13 have multiple birth defects and usually die in the first months of life.Missing or extra sex chromosomes (X and Y) affect sexual development and may cause infertility, growth abnormalities, and behavioral and learning problems. However, most affected individuals have essentially normal lives.Birth defects also may result from environmental factors such as drug or alcohol abuse, infections, or exposure to certain medications (such as the acne drug Accutane) or other chemicals. Many birth defects appear to be caused by a combination of one or more genes and environmental factors (called multifactorial inheritance). Some examples include cleft lip/palate, clubfoot and some heart defects.

**Face the ugly truth: infant mortality is the greatest injustice in our country**

**Walker 11** (Deborah Klein, Vice President, Principal Associate/Scientist, Pulbic Health and Epidemiology Practice Lead, U.S. Health, “Why is infant mortality still a U.S. problem?”, http://articles.cnn.com/2011-11-02/opinion/opinion\_walker-infant-mortality\_1\_infant-mortality-rate-of-white-babies-american-public-health-association?\_s=PM:OPINION)//AMV

If a measure of a successful society is its ability to prevent infant deaths, then there is an ugly truth in the United States today that public health officials know but the public largely does not: Too many of our babies are dying, and they don't have to. Public health officials, doctors and researchers from around the world are gathering in Washington this week for the 139th annual meeting of the American Public Health Association to address the pressing public health issues of the day, and it is imperative that they focus their attention on protecting the most vulnerable members of our society. The U.S. infant mortality rate is one of the highest among all developed countries. The disparity in rates within the United States is alarming as well, with black babies dying at more than twice the rate of white babies. The most recent statistics from 2007 show that the U.S. rate of almost seven deaths per 1,000 live births ranked the U.S. behind the majority of other developed countries. Thirty developed countries have lower infant mortality rates, according to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, all of them spending much less than we do on health care Within the United States, infant mortality ranges from a high of almost 10 deaths per 1,000 in Mississippi and Alabama to about five deaths per 1,000 in Washington and Massachusetts. Although the overall rates have been slowly declining since 2000, the huge gap between whites and blacks continues to exist. American women who are most likely to lose their babies are non-Hispanic black women, with a rate almost 2 1/2 greater than that for non-Hispanic white women. **This is one of the greatest injustices in our country**: that a baby's chance of having a healthy life is largely dependent on where he or she is born. States and local communities vary widely in what care their leaders choose to provide to women and children. But these higher rates can be lowered by implementing strong initiatives at the state and federal levels. And maternal and child health experts know what needs to happen, based on what's worked in places with lower rates. Preventing infant mortality is not just about prenatal care. There are four key periods in the lives of women and their children, each vital in determining whether an infant lives or dies: before pregnancy, during pregnancy, at birth and during the first year of life.

**The well-being on infants is vitals – determines the health of the next generation**

**HealthyPeople 12** (A Federal Government Web site managed by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, “Maternal, Infant, and Child Health”, May 29th, 2012, http://www.healthypeople.gov/2020/LHI/micHealth.aspx)//AMV

The well-being of mothers, infants, and children determines the health of the next generation and can help predict future public health challenges for families, communities, and the medical care system. Moreover, healthy birth outcomes and early identification and treatment of health conditions among infants can prevent death or disability and enable children to reach their full potential. Despite major advances in medical care, critical threats to maternal, infant, and child health exist in the United States. **Among the Nation’s most pressing challenges are reducing the rate of** preterm births, which has risen by more than 20% from 1990 to 2006,1 and reducing **the infant death rate**, which in 2011 remained higher than the infant death rate in 46 other countries.2

AT Mercury

**Alt Cause—Volcanoes**

**Hull 12** (Janet Starr, PhD, Alternative health and nutrition, “Mercury from Volcanoes”, July 2012, http://www.janethull.com/newsletter/0712/mercury\_from\_volcanoes.php)//AMV

Everyone is aware of how toxic mercury is to the human body, and over the past decade or two, we have become aware that mercury used in dental procedures is toxic, mercury used in vaccines is toxic, and mercury absorbed by fish is toxic. Now, let me make you aware of another, current source of mercury toxicity - volcanoes.There is a difference between man-made, inorganic elements that are toxic, and nature-made, organic elements, however. Typically, the molecules are different sizes, natural elements come in "groups" that provide a buffer, organic elements are rarely isolated like we find in man-made products, and natural elements are usually found in trace amounts, which makes exposure less-toxic. However, on occasion, natural elements can become toxic if they come to the Earth's surface in greater quantities. Hence, **mercury exposure is increasing because we are experiencing an increase in volcanic activity, worldwide**. I highly recommend having a hair analysis done if you are living in an area where volcanic ash may be circulating. Hopefully, exposure is merely extraneous and not internal. Any way you look at it, it is good to know if mercury is increasing within your living environment - for you, your family, and for your pets.There are approximately 1,500 known, active volcanoes worldwide. A volcano is considered active if it has erupted in the last 10,000 years, and over 75% of the world's volcanoes, and most active volcanoes, are located along the Pacific Ocean Rim. The number of active volcanoes can only be determined at the time they erupt, however - so, um hum, they're active!!No one has really counted all of the Earth's volcanoes because we can't see the tens of thousands on the sea floor. Around 1,511 volcanoes have erupted in the last 10,000 years, and these are still considered active. Today, there are about 60 volcanoes showing activity of some kind. On the average, 50 to 70 volcanoes activate every year, and about 160 volcanoes show activity every decade. All these volcanoes release mercury into the atmosphere.Mount Etna is the largest active volcano in Europe, which currently stands 3,329 meters (10,922 ft) high. Mount Etna is currently releasing mercury into the environment, and scientists are measuring the amount released as an average 2 tons per day. Mount Etna contributes about 20 tons of mercury per year into the air over the Mediterranean basin. Keep a watch on Mt Etna.With over 60 volcanoes erupting in some capacity today, the volcanic gases are now mixing within both the atmosphere and our water. The Iceland volcanoes are impacting four groundwater springs, which find their way into the oceans.Mercury from the underwater Mt. Sakurajima volcano in Japan is now within Kagoshima Bay. The water above the volcano in the inner bay registers large amounts of mercury compared to the water at the bay entrance, which is farther from the underwater volcano. Soil samples taken from around the bay show that the soil also contains a large amount of mercury from the volcano.Mercury levels in the air, ash, and lava around an erupting volcano impact the vegetation, soil, water, and the atmosphere. Mercury contents of pine and spruce needles, brooms, lichens, and the soil around Mt. Etna were determined to have mercury within them, but the levels are generally low at this time, but Mt. Etna is still the main source of mercury in the Mediterranean basin. Bottom-line, the mercury is there.Mercury is a toxic, trace metal that bioaccumulates with a long atmospheric life cycle. Volcanic mercury exists as gas, as well as particulate matter. Volcanoes are the only natural sources of direct mercury emission into the troposphere and stratosphere, and are the principal natural sources of reactive and particulate mercury in the soil and water.

Non-Unique/Coal Inev

**Non-unique - Coal use projected to increase worldwide**

**IBISWorld 12** – Largest US provider of industry information (“Coal Mining in the US: Market Research Report”, July 2012, <http://www.ibisworld.com/industry/default.aspx?indid=108&partnerid=prweb)//CH>

**The demand for coal is dominated by its use as a fuel for power generation;** in particular, metallurgical **coal is experiencing a surge in interest and companies are scrambling to meet demand** for steel overseas. **Emerging economies will increasingly demand metallurgical** **coal over the next five years to meet their insatiable demand for steel. Electricity consumption will also expand as consumers and businesses increase their energy use and, in turn, demand more energy**.

**US coal will increase in the status quo – EU**

**OilPrice 7/17**– energy news source (“Coal Consumption Increases in the EU: Is the Carbon Trading Scheme a Failure?”, July 17, 2012, [http://oilprice.com/Energy/Coal/Coal-Consumption-Increases-in-the-EU-Is-the-Carbon-Trading-Scheme-a-Failure.html)//CH](http://oilprice.com/Energy/Coal/Coal-Consumption-Increases-in-the-EU-Is-the-Carbon-Trading-Scheme-a-Failure.html%29//CH)

Unfortunately, despite having the most ambitious carbon reduction regulations in the world, **Europe** is now heading in the opposite direction as they **saw coal consumption increase by 3.3% compared to 2010. Germany’s coal consumption increased by 1.2%** compared to 2010, **despite its renewable energy intentions, and large capacity of photovoltaic installations. Spain, who has** also **been investing heavily in renewable sources such as solar and wind, saw their coal consumption increase by more than 50%. Over all EU coal imports from the US increased by 49%.** The reason is purely financial. Coal imported from the US is very cheap, and so are the carbon permits sold under the EU Emissions Trading Scheme, prices of which have fallen 17% this year already. **Energy utilities find it much more profitable to use coal power plants** and buy the permits for the extra emissions, than shift to renewable energy sources, or other low carbon fuels.

**US coal is increasing now**

**Platts 7/19** - leading global provider of energy, petrochemicals and metals information since 1909 (“US coal exports still on upswing: government data”, July 19, 2012, http://www.platts.com/RSSFeedDetailedNews/RSSFeed/Coal/6485069)//CH

Despite coalfield sources recently reporting a slowing of overseas demand for US coal, **government data shows the nation's coal exports for January through March largely increased** compared with the previous and year-ago quarters.¶ While US coal exports to Asia decreased 19.3%, from 8.7 million st in January-March 2011 to just over 7 million st in January-March 2012, **exports to Europe increased 28.7%** to 16.4 million st from 12.7 million st, **according to Energy Information Administration data, published in a report** Thursday **by Representative** Ed **Markey**, Democrat-Massachusetts, in his capacity **as ranking member of the House** of Representatives' **Natural Resources Committee**

\*Earthquakes DA\*

**Zoeback and Gorelick conclude aff**

**Casey 12** - Deputy Director of Public Affairs for the New York City Department of Environmental Protection (Tina, “Carbon Sequestration’s Got an Earthquake Problem, Too”, June 19, 2012, [http://cleantechnica.com/2012/06/19/stanford-researchers-link-carbon-sequestration-to-earthquakes/)//CH](http://cleantechnica.com/2012/06/19/stanford-researchers-link-carbon-sequestration-to-earthquakes/%29//CH)

Not the end for carbon sequestration **The report doesn’t rule out any underground storage, but it does suggest that appropriate sites are not** as **widespread** as previously supposed**. One avenue of exploration is the use of depleted gas reservoirs.** While not entirely risk-free, **these formations once stored gas, so they could be more likely to have the potential for holding a firm seal**. This past January, the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory reported that a demonstration gas reservoir project undertaken in Australia has been successful so far, but further study is needed before putting the practice into widespread use.

\*Regulations CP\*

Gov Investment Key

**Federal liability is key**

**Tady 7** – national political reporter (Megan, “Carbon Capture: Miracle Cure for Global Warming, or Deadly Liability?,” Alternet, http://www.alternet.org/environment/68490/?page=4)//MR

Benefits aside, the stored carbon dioxide is like a hot potato -- nobody wants to have the liability of ensuring hundreds of billions of tons of carbon dioxide that stays buried for hundreds of years. "Who pays for it if there's a leak?" asked Jackson of Duke University. Leonard thinks he knows. "[Industry has] been very upfront to Congress that there's **no way** that carbon sequestration will **move forward** unless the federal government assumes all liability for that project. It's very similar to what's happening to nuclear waste; industry is very happy to create it, but they themselves don't want to be stuck with the liability of what to do with that waste because they know it's dangerous."

\*Renewables DA\*

Coal Inev/Link Turn

**Coal use is increasing and key to transition to renewables**

**Slaughter 12** - Chief Investment Strategist of Market Advisor, Scarcity & Real Wealth, and Energy & Income (Nathan, “The World's Most Hated Energy Source Could Make You a Fortune”, 2/29/2012, [http://finance.townhall.com/columnists/nathanslaughter/2012/02/29/the\_worlds\_most\_hated\_energy\_source\_could\_make\_you\_a\_fortune/page/full/)//CH](http://finance.townhall.com/columnists/nathanslaughter/2012/02/29/the_worlds_most_hated_energy_source_could_make_you_a_fortune/page/full/%29//CH)

It's abundant, it's cheap, and it's found just about everywhere...¶ **It accounts for** about **40% of the planet's electricity** usage -- more than natural gas, nuclear, wind, solar and geothermal combined.¶ ¶ **It's the world's most preferred fuel** for electricity generation, **and people hate it**... Even children don't like it. They're told if they misbehave, they could find a "lump of this" on Christmas morning.¶ ¶ If you haven't figured it out yet, **I'm talking about coal**. But before you tell me how the black rocks are the biggest threat to the planet since the last great meteor strike, hear me out.¶ ¶ There's no denying that coal gives off unwelcome pollutants. But **plant efficiencies and technological advances have dramatically blunted the environmental impact** -- **and clean coal development continues to progress**.¶ Still, many **investors have been sold on the theory that coal is yesterday's energy source**, not that of tomorrow.¶ ¶ **We're constantly told** that **fossil fuels are** quickly **becoming obsolete**, and the future belongs to cleaner alternatives such as wind and solar power.¶ ¶ **Don't believe it**.¶ ¶ Don't get me wrong, I wholeheartedly support the pursuit of renewable energy sources (particularly those that are economically viable without taxpayer subsidies). But **coal is still the king of the energy hill -- and it won't be knocked off for a long**, long **time**.¶ ¶ **Will coal eventually give way to other fuel sources? Probably. But it won't happen in the next quarter-century.** In fact, **the Energy Information Administration** (EIA) **is expecting global coal consumption to actually rise by 50%** -- **from** less than seven billion tons in **2010, to** 10 billion tons in **2030**.¶ ¶ But before I get into the investment opportunity, let me briefly address the environmental aspect -- nobody likes the image of a factory belching pollutants into the sky.¶ ¶ I know **coal isn't going to win any green awards. But much of the bad reputation is undeserved. The industry has** actually **made great strides in response to** stringent air quality **standards** **imposed by the** U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (**EPA**) and other regulatory bodies.¶ ¶ Since 1980, **U.S. coal consumption has risen by almost 80%, yet sulfur emissions have been slashed by 40%. The development of** selective catalytic reduction (**SCR**) systems **has eliminated 90% of nitrogen oxides** (NOx). And there are all sorts of scrubbers to trap particulates and trace elements.¶ ¶ **These and other innovations have greatly reduced coal's effect on climate change. And that's important, because the global economy would quickly shut down without coal**.¶ ¶ Now, I've said before that affordable **natural gas is displacing some coal-fired generating capacity**. That's true in the United States, **but that's not the case overseas. On a global basis, coal has been the fastest-growing fuel** since 2000.¶ ¶ In China alone, coal is credited with providing power access to 450 million people in the past 15 years, according to the World Coal Association.¶ ¶ And **consumption is projected to rise, not fall. Thanks to** surging demand from **Asia** (which accounts for two-thirds of global usage), coal will meet 44% of the world's electricity needs by 2030, up from 40% today. And it's a thicker slice of a pie that grows bigger every year. **Europe is also becoming more reliant on coal** in response to high natural gas prices and a backlash in some quarters against nuclear power. In India, imports of thermal coal soared more than 30% last year. And China is planning to build 600 megawatts of coal-fired power generation over the next 25 years. This increase represents more than the current coal generating capacity in the United States, Europe and Japan, combined.¶ ¶ Even 100 megawatts of additional capacity would require an additional 330 million metric tons of coal. China already burns far more than it can produce. In fact, the country had to import 182 million tons last year to cover the deficit.¶ ¶ **And power generation is only half of the big picture**...¶ ¶ **Coal has several other important uses, most notably steel production**. The world's mills produced 1.4 billion metric tons of steel in 2010. That production used up 720 million tons of metallurgical coking coal, which is used to make steel.¶ ¶ This means 50 pounds of this key raw ingredient are needed to make every 100 pounds of steel. And you can't build much without steel. The World Steel Association is forecasting 5% production growth in 2012, which would mean an extra 50 million tons of coal usage.¶ ¶ **Add it all up, and you can see why the world is headed for a coal super-cycle over the next two decades. Global consumption reached a record** 7.5 billion tons **last year. And this number is headed higher**. In fact, the IEA says the increase in coal consumption in the next 25 years will be more than double that of crude oil.

Natural Gas Turn

**(only if reading natural gas advantage)**

**Alt cause – shale gas displacing renewables now**

**Deutsche Welle 6/21** – Germany’s international news broadcaster (“Coal and gas boom likely to increase CO2 emissions”, June 21, 2012, [http://www.dw.de/dw/article/0,,16042310,00.html)//CH](http://www.dw.de/dw/article/0%2C%2C16042310%2C00.html%29//CH)

US exploitation of shale gas is depressing prices **The gas revolution comes from shale: half the increase in global gas production in 2011 is the result of the exploitation of shale gas in North America. As supply exceeds demand, this environmentally controversial energy** source **is costing the Americans just one seventh of the world** gas market **price. Shale gas has also put a damper on the sale of** carbon-neutral, **renewable energy**. The **BP** World Energy Report **estimates** **the current proportion of wind power, solar energy and biofuel energy production to be 2 percent**. Regine Günther from the WWF only has one comment**: it's enough to make you cry.**

**Shale is dirty – releases methane**

**Tollefson 12** – Reporter for Nature, previously a Knight fellow in science journalism at MIT, Cites a study by the NOAA and University of Chicago (Jeff, “Air sampling reveals high emissions from gas field”, February 7, 2012, [http://www.nature.com/news/air-sampling-reveals-high-emissions-from-gas-field-1.9982)//CH](http://www.nature.com/news/air-sampling-reveals-high-emissions-from-gas-field-1.9982%29//CH)

When **US government scientists began sampling** the **air from** a tower **north of Denver**, Colorado, **they expected** urban **smog** — but **not** strong whiffs of what looked like **natural gas. They** eventually **linked** **the** mysterious **pollution to a nearby natural-gas field, and their investigation has** now **produced** the first hard **evidence that the** cleanest-burning **fossil fuel might not be much better than coal when it comes to climate change**. researchers at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and the University of Colorado, Boulder, **the study estimates that natural-gas producers** in an area known as the Denver-Julesburg Basin **are losing about 4% of their gas to the atmosphere — not including additional losses in the pipeline and distribution system. This is more than double the official inventory**, but roughly in line with estimates made in 2011 that have been challenged by industry. **And because methane is some 25 times more efficient than carbon dioxide at trapping heat in the atmosphere, releases of that magnitude** could **effectively offset the environmental edge** that natural gas is said to enjoy over other fossil fuels.

**Shale is worse than coal – it will push us over the tipping point**

**IPS 12** – Global news source, focuses on development, environment, human rights, and globalization (Inter Press Service, “Shale Gas a Bridge to More Global Warming”, January 24, 2012, [http://www.ipsnews.net/2012/01/shale-gas-a-bridge-to-more-global-warming/)//CH](http://www.ipsnews.net/2012/01/shale-gas-a-bridge-to-more-global-warming/%29//CH)

That research undercuts the logic of **energy sector claims that shale gas is a “bridge” to a low-carbon energy future. Those claims are based on the fact that natural gas (which is mainly methane) has half the carbon content of coal**, and when burned for electricity it is more energy efficient than coal.¶ **However, those climate gains are more than negated by methane leaks both at the well during the fracking process** (called flow-back), **and through the gas delivery and distribution system**. Howarth and colleagues estimate that between 3.6 and 7.9 percent of all shale gas produced leaks – called “fugitive emissions” – into the atmosphere, making it worse than burning coal or oil.¶ **Methane has 105 times the warming potential of CO2 over a 20-year time frame**, after which it rapidly loses its warming potential. If large amounts of methane are released through fracking – as seems likely with hundreds of thousands of new wells forecast in the next two decades – **Howarth says global temperatures could rocket upward from 0.8C currently to 1.8C in 15 to 35 years,** running the risk **of triggering a tipping point that could lead to catastrophic climate change.**¶ “Our primary concern is that methane emissions over the coming two decades will drive the entire climate system past a major tipping point,” he told IPS.

\*Topicality\*

Pipelines = TI

**Pipelines are infrastructure – different from vehicles and operations**

**Campaign for Sensible Transportation 06** (The CFST is a group of individuals and organizations focused on promoting a balanced and sustainable transportation system. http://www.cfst.org/transportation.html

**Transportation** can be **divided into three distinct fields:¶ 1. Infrastructure** - When we refer to infrastructure it **includes our transport networks such as roads, railways, airways, canals, and¶ pipeline.** This also includes theterminals or nodes such as airports, railway stations, bus stations, and seaports.¶ **2. Vehicle** – These comprises of the vehicles that we regularly ride in the networks for instance automobiles (buses, cars, taxis, and etc.), trains and airplanes**.¶ 3. Operations** – They are the control of the whole transport system including traffic lights/signals on roads, ramp meters, railroad switches, air traffic control, and etc.¶ As well as these, other policies such as how to fund and finance the system is also important. A good example is the use of tolls roads or gasoline taxes and duties.¶

**Pipelines are transportation infrastructure**

**Mica 12** (John L. Mica of Florida is the Chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee in the U.S. House of Representatives.. “Pipelines Safety Legislation” <http://republicans.transportation.house.gov/singlepages.aspx/1476>)

**Government and industry have taken steps** over the years **to improve pipeline safety**, and **in order to ensure that we continue** this commitment to making **this safe, efficient, and economical form of transportation even safer** in the 112th Congress, Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials Subcommittee Chairman Bill Shuster (R-PA) and **Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Chairman John L. Mica (R-FL) introduced the Pipeline Safety, Regulatory Certainty, and Job Creation Act of 2011** (H.R. 2845).

**Pipelines are transportation infrastructure**

**Department of Transportation 12** (USDOT 2013 Budget Overview <http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/budget/fy2013/assets/transportation.pdf>)

**A** well-functioning **transportation system** is ¶ critical to America’s economic future. Whether ¶ it **is** by **road, transit, aviation, rail, pipeline, or ¶ waterway**, we rely on our transportation system ¶ to move people and goods safely, facilitate commerce, attract and retain businesses, and support ¶ jobs. The President’s 2013 Budget provides a total of $74 billion in discretionary and mandatory ¶ funding plus an additional $50 billion above what ¶ has been provided to date in 2012 to jump-start ¶ economic growth and job creation. Recognizing ¶ the fiscal realities, the Budget again proposes ¶ significant reforms to surface transportation programs, including a consolidation of over 55 duplicative, often earmarked highway programs into ¶ five streamlined ones.

 Not Energy

**CO2 pipelines are not energy – the FERC has specifically disclaimed jurisdiction over the pipelines**

**Nordhaus & Pitlick 9** (JD, Faculty @ Georgetown Law, general council to FERC, \*\* Associate at Van Ness Feldman Robert and Emily, “CARBON DIOXIDE PIPELINE REGULATION,” Energy Law Journal, http://www.felj.org/docs/elj301/85\_-\_nordhaus\_and\_pitlick.pdf)//AMV

In addition to regulating natural gas pipelines, the FERC also regulates oil pipelines under the Interstate Commerce Act.22 The FERC’s responsibilities include: (1) regulation of rates and practices of oil pipeline companies engaged in interstate transportation; (2) establishment of nondiscriminatory conditions of service in order to provide shippers access to pipeline transportation; and (3) establishment of reasonable rates for transporting petroleum and petroleum products by pipeline.23 **The FERC has**, however, **specifically disclaimed jurisdiction over CO2 pipelines**, even where they transport small amounts of natural gas, such that the NGA requirements on rate regulation, access regulation, and certificate requirements otherwise applicable to interstate natural gas pipelines do not apply. In Cortez Pipeline Co. (Cortez), the FERC found that it did not have jurisdiction over CO2 pipelines under the NGA.24 Cortez sought to develop a pipeline connecting a CO2 reservoir in Colorado with oil fields in Texas for EOR.25 Cortez requested that the FERC issue a declaratory order stating that the FERC did not have jurisdiction over the proposed pipeline because the supercritical fluid being transported was not ”natural gas” within the meaning of the NGA.26 (The NGA defines natural gas as “natural gas” unmixed or any mixture of natural and artificial gases..)27 The pipeline company stated that the mixture transported in the pipeline project would be ninety-eight percent CO2, with the other two percent of mixed composition, including methane.28

 DOT Brightline

**CO2 pipelines are under DoT jurisdiction – the PHMSA regulates design, construction, operation, maintenance, and control of the pipelines**

**Fish & Martin 10** (Jerry R., and Eric L., “Carbon Dioxide Pipelines”, *California Carbon Capture and Storage Review Panel*, http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/carbon\_capture\_review\_panel/meetings/2010-08-18/white\_papers/Carbon\_Dioxide\_Pipelines.pdf)//AMV

CO2 pipelines have been operating in the United States for almost 40 years, and there are approximately 3,600 miles of CO2 pipelines in operation today.1 The Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (“PHMSA”), which is part of the Department of Transportation, regulates the safety of interstate CO2 pipelines under the Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Safety Act of 1979.2 CO2 is defined under PHMSA’s regulations as “a fluid consisting of more than 90 percent CO2 molecules compressed to a supercritical state.”3 Although CO2 is not considered a hazardous liquid under PHMSA’s regulations, it is effectively treated as if it were a hazardous liquid (i.e., subject to the same regulatory framework).**4 These regulations address design, construction, operation and maintenance, corrosion control, and reporting requirements**.5