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### AFF Answers Keystone: No Solvency - Economy

#### Keystone can’t solve the economy – transportation infrastructure is a prerequisite

David Burwell. Director of the Energy and Climate Program at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. “The Tea Party Faction’s Keystone XL Mistake.” June 27, 2012.

<http://carnegieendowment.org/2012/06/27/tea-party-faction-s-keystone-xl-mistake/cc48>

The House leadership and its rambunctious tea party wing have bolted mandatory approval of the Keystone XL oil pipeline to the transportation bill. Whatever one thinks of the tea partyers’ politics, this is a strategic mistake from their own point of view because it contradicts one of their core policy goals — a permanent ban on earmarks — and hurts other objectives such as ensuring energy independence, creating more jobs, ending wasteful spending and maintaining America’s global exceptionalism. The tea party is effectively killing a transportation bill without gaining anything in return. It should be pushing for the bill instead. Here’s why: Energy independence. The reality of the 21st century is that there are a lot more fossil fuels stored in the earth than we ever realized. While no country is truly energy independent in a globalized world, the newly discovered stores of oil and natural gas here in the United States give us new leeway to think hard about how dependent we want to be on Canadian tar sands. Regardless of whether one is for or against Keystone XL or believes sourcing 100 percent of the oil we consume within North America is actually possible, it is certainly true that passage of the transportation bill would advance energy independence. Transportation represents 70 percent of U.S. oil consumption, and much of that consumption is wasted through congestion, travel delays and too few trip choices. The transportation bill addresses all of these inefficiencies. Jeopardizing the bill by forcing immediate approval of this pipeline risks losing the benefit of an improved transportation system. Jobs. **Sure, Keystone XL will provide some new jobs, but the number is highly uncertain. And oil jobs are not something the United States is lacking right now. Unemployment in North Dakota, home of the Bakken shale oil field, is 3 percent. In Oklahoma, another shale oil producer, it is 4.8 percent. In contrast, the unemployment rate in the construction industry is more than 14 percent and weighs down economies in virtually every state in the nation**. Plus, transportation infrastructure is crumbling. America, according to the World Economic Forum, has fallen from fifth to 24th place in the quality of its infrastructure. Latching Keystone XL to the transportation bill as a “non-negotiable” demand to gain a few thousand oil-sector jobs risks hundreds of thousands of ready-to-go construction jobs in the middle of the construction season. There’s no sense in that¶

#### CP doesn’t create jobs, can’t solve the Economy

Laurie Johnson. Chief economist at the Climate Center of the Natural Resources Defense Council. “Keystone XL pipeline: Good for Big Oil, bad for the economy” Feb 1, 2012. <http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/ljohnson/keystone_xl_pipeline_good_for.html>

Interesting quote. TransCanada and its allies can’t seem to keep their numbers straight for the proposed tar sands Keystone XL pipeline. Just the day before, the company released a press statement predicting 20,000 pipeline and 118,000 “spin-off” jobs. In September of 2010, they claimed 13,000 jobs. Two months prior to that, a “study” they commissioned was released predicting 250,000 to over half a million jobs (p. 33). The Republican Party claims over 100,000. All of these estimates contradict the statement by the company’s own Vice President, even those at the lower end. Analysts who aren’t trying to make money off the pipeline conclude that it would create far fewer jobs. Researchers at Cornell University project as few as 2,500 jobs**, and the State Department up to 6,000** (p.ES-22). Notably, most projections are for short-term jobs associated with construction—something proponents don’t always make clear. (There’s nothing wrong with short-term jobs, any would be welcome, but their temporary nature shouldn’t be in the fine print). According to the State Department, as few as 20 jobs will be permanent (p. 3.10-80) (excluding “induced” jobs created from wages spent by these workers). (Click here for a good summary explaining the differences across industry and independent analyses, by the Columbia Journalism Review). So what is going on here? After failing to convince their own country’s citizens that the pipeline would be good for them, Big Oil and its Congressional protectors have launched what can only be characterized as an aggressive disinformation campaign to build the pipeline. Preying on the fears of America’s unemployed and economically insecure, they are trying to sell it as a national jobs plan and a way to increase national security by reducing dependence on foreign oil. It’s a cruel hoax. Canadians didn’t fall for it, and neither should we. The proposed project would construct a 1,700 mile conduit from Alberta, Canada for the world’s dirtiest and most corrosive form of oil (tar sands) right through the heart of America’s farmland —threatening not only the bread basket of the US, but also the world. It promises little to potentially negative economic returns for Americans. Maybe that’s why President Obama made the bold decision to reject TransCanada’s permit application. With Citizens United giving the oil industry (even more) unlimited influence, and the American Petroleum Institute’s blatant threat to the President to approve Keystone XL or face “huge political consequences,” Obama’s courage shouldn’t be underestimated.

### Aff Answers Keystone – No Solvency – Oil

#### Keystone reduces oil transportation efficiency – increases risk of spills

Anthony Swift. Attorney, International Program, NRDC. “Pipeline Regulators cite two dozen safety violations by Enbridge in Kalamazoo tar sands spill.” July 5, 2012. <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/anthony-swift/kalamazoo-oil-spill_b_1647473.html>

Federal pipeline safety regulators have [announced](http://www.dot.gov/affairs/2012/phmsa1512.html) that **Enbridge, the Canadian pipeline company responsible for spilling over a million gallons of tar sands into Michigan’s Kalamazoo River watershed in 2010, likely violated two dozen regulations in connection with that spill**. In [a letter](http://www.phmsa.dot.gov/staticfiles/PHMSA/DownloadableFiles/Press%20Releases/NOPV.pdf) to Enbridge, regulators at the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) outlined each of the 24 violations and **proposed a $3.7 million civil penalty**, the largest fine ever proposed by the agency. Of course, **this penalty is dwarfed by the costs of the tar sands spill, which has become the most costly pipeline accident in U.S. history**, with damage and cleanup costs approaching a billion dollars. These findings come after Enbridge [applied](http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-05-11/enbridge-seeking-to-expand-crude-oil-pipeline-6b-in-michigan.html) with regulators to double the capacity of the same pipeline to accommodate more tar sands**. It's notable that Enbridge is attempting to expand its tar sands pipeline system before getting the report back from the National Transportation Safety Board** which will highlight the causes of the accident and issues that should be handled differently, or the National Academy of Science report detailing whether tar sands oil can be safely moved in these types of pipelines. Clearly, Enbridge’s failure to adhere to minimum federal safety standards provides a poor reference for its application, as does their unwillingness to wait for all of the information necessary to ensure public safety. But more broadly, PHMSA’s investigation demonstrates the folly of relying on pipeline operators to self regulate. Unfortunately, due diligence and regulatory oversight often happens after a preventable spill has occurred. The U.S. needs strong pipeline regulations focused on the prevention of spills and a pipeline agency with the authority to enforce those regulations. In addition, the Kalamazoo spill highlights the need to understand the risks of tar sands pipelines and tar sands spills before embarking on projects by companies like Enbridge to expand tar sands pipeline infrastructure. **The federal investigation of the Kalamazoo tar sands spills clearly shows that the most expensive pipeline accident in U.S. history could have and should have been prevented. PHMSA identified 24 probable violations of minimum federal safety regulations.** These violations can be placed in four major categories: Enbridge was aware of corrosion on its line for years and did nothing to fix it. **Enbridge identified corrosion on its pipeline in a 2004 in-line inspection. One year later, the company found crack-like anomalies on the same pipe segment**. Despite knowing of a threat to the integrity of its pipelines, **Enbridge did not attempt any remediation of the corrosion or cracks, and the pipeline ultimately ruptured** on July 25, 2010, **spilling over a million gallons of tar sands into the Kalamazoo River watershed.**

#### CP can’t solve oil dependency

Laurie Johnson. Chief economist at the Climate Center of the Natural Resources Defense Council. “Keystone XL pipeline: Good for Big Oil, bad for the economy” Feb 1, 2012. <http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/ljohnson/keystone_xl_pipeline_good_for.html>

Finally, the pipeline will not reduce our oil dependence or increase national security. The price of TransCanada’s oil will be determined by surging global demand for oil, and OPEC’s monopolistic production decisions that limit the world’s oil supply and increase its price (the cartel (OPEC) has almost 80 percent of the world’s known oil reserves). For all the rhetoric about energy independence and controlling the price of oil, Keystone XL’s marginal contribution to global production won’t amount to a hill of beans. There is one source of potential long-term job creation about which oil industry has remained silent: jobs created to clean up inevitable spills and leaks. So far, TransCanada has experienced major problems with the section of the Keystone project already completed. In its first year of operation, its so-called safe “state-of-the-art” pipeline has already leaked 35 times, (21 times in Canada, 14 in the U.S--p. 3.13-11). According to the University of Nebraska, approximately 91 major spills can be expected over the 50-year lifetime of the pipeline. Clean up jobs will last longer than that… There is also the potential for a major disaster. In 2010, the largest tar sands spill in U.S. history devastated the Kalamazoo River with over 800,000 gallons of oil at a price tag of over $700 million. We’re still cleaning it up, a year and a half later.

### Aff Answers Keystone – Links to Politics

#### Keystone is politically unpopular – transportation bill proves

David Lawder and Roberta Rampton. “Lawmakers fail to break US Transport bill deadlock.” Chicago Tribune. June 19, 2012.

<http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2012-06-19/news/sns-rt-us-usa-congress-transportationbre85i105-20120619_1_oil-pipeline-short-term-extension-keystone-pipeline>

U.S. **congressional leaders failed** on Tuesday **to break a deadlock on a long-stalled** [**transportation**](http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2012-06-19/news/sns-rt-us-usa-congress-transportationbre85i105-20120619_1_oil-pipeline-short-term-extension-keystone-pipeline) **funding measure, and Republicans now may need to find a new legislative vehicle to carry their plan to approve the controversial Keystone XL oil pipeline**. With a June 30 deadline for new transportation funds looming, many lawmakers and aides now see it as inevitable that the controversial Canada-to-Texas pipeline provision be removed to make way for a short-term extension of current transportation law. House of Representatives Speaker John Boehner and Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid could not resolve differences in a late afternoon meeting over the road, bridge and rail bill that could create or save millions of jobs and give a lift to the struggling U.S. economy. "Hope springs eternal," Boehner, the top Republican in Congress, quipped as he left his office in the Capitol. Failure to reach a deal in Congress could trigger layoffs of nearly 3 million U.S. construction workers and increase [unemployment](http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2012-06-19/news/sns-rt-us-usa-congress-transportationbre85i105-20120619_1_oil-pipeline-short-term-extension-keystone-pipeline) less than six months before the November elections. HOPES DIM FOR FULL BILL, KEYSTONE **Republican Representative Ed Whitfield**, one of the negotiators trying to iron out House-Senate, **said** he feels that **a short-term extension of current transportation funding is unavoidable at this point, and neither the Keystone pipeline nor a Republican provision aimed at ensuring that coal ash can continue to be used in cement for road projects would be included.** Whitfield said **both provisions have been rejected by Democrats**, adding, "It's really disappointing that we couldn't get this resolved." But Republican House Transportation Committee Chairman John Mica said Boehner and Reid instructed negotiators "to redouble our efforts," and the Democratic-led Senate had offered a new proposal. He declined to comment on any discussions of a temporary extension, which would be the 11th since the most recent transportation bill expired in 2009. "We're going to take it hour by hour, see if we can get the job done," Mica said. Michael Steel, a spokesman for Boehner, said House negotiators were still working towards a joint bill. "We believe it is crucial that we have real reforms in how we spend taxpayers' highway dollars, and we continue to support bipartisan jobs initiatives like Keystone," Steel said. **President Barack Obama has opposed fast-tracking approval for TransCanada Corp's Keystone XL oil pipeline project until an** [**environmental**](http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2012-06-19/news/sns-rt-us-usa-congress-transportationbre85i105-20120619_1_oil-pipeline-short-term-extension-keystone-pipeline) **review of its new route is completed. The House lawmaker who authored the pipeline provision, Nebraska Republican Lee Terry, also said it is now unlikely to be part of a short-term, stopgap funding extension.** "He doesn't see it happening at this point," a Terry aide told Reuters, noting Terry continued to work with Boehner to see what other legislative vehicles could be used to advance approval for the oil pipeline. A Senate Democratic aide said the Keystone provision might have another chance if lawmakers complete a highway bill this summer or autumn. Republicans would "explore every option," for Keystone, said Whitfield, including attaching it to spending needed to keep the [government](http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2012-06-19/news/sns-rt-us-usa-congress-transportationbre85i105-20120619_1_oil-pipeline-short-term-extension-keystone-pipeline) running in the new fiscal year that starts on October 1.

#### CP is unpopular – failed multiple times

Darren Goode and Andrew Restuccia. “Backers vow to keep Keystone in pipeline.” June 28, 2012.

<http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0612/77990.html>

Don’t think for a moment that congressional supporters of the Keystone XL pipeline are through pushing their cause on Capitol Hill. “This is not the last you’ve heard of this issue,” one senior Senate GOP aide said. “Not by a long shot.” **The pipeline [didn’t make the cut](https://www.politicopro.com/story/energy/?id=12367" \t "_blank) for the House-Senate transportation deal.** But Republicans have reveled in using every chance to portray President Barack Obama’s rejection of TransCanada’s pipeline project as a symbol of what they view as his failed energy record — and they’re not ready to stop. **Rep. Lee Terry (R-Neb.)** said Wednesday that he **is “poised and ready to pounce” on the next bill to which he can attach authorization of the pipeline**. [A mix-up](https://www.politicopro.com/story/energy/?id=12240" \t "_blank) over amendment language robbed Terry and other House Republicans of an opportunity last week to attach language approving the pipeline to a broader House energy strategy. **House lawmakers have voted to approve the pipeline multiple times already this Congress. But dropping Keystone from the transportation bill means the pipeline won’t be part of one of the few remaining must-pass measures this year — at least before the November election**. Casting aside Keystone — as well as an effort to trump EPA coal ash regulations — was necessary “so those political issues will not hold up approval of this major transportation bill,” House Transportation and Infrastructure ranking member Nick Rahall (D-W.Va.) said Wednesday. “That was, for the senators, especially very important.” Rahall supports the pipeline and coal ash provisions. “But I made it very clear from the get-go that was not going to hold me up from approving a transportation bill,” he said. “Let’s fight that on another day, on another bill. Or as a standalone.” **The conventional wisdom during the latter part of the conference talks was that Republicans were willing to give up the Keystone and coal ash provisions in lieu of language they wanted elsewhere, including measures to expedite environmental reviews of transportation projects. They are expected to get that in the final deal.** “My understanding is for some give on enhancements, cycling, pedestrian, for some give on streamlining, Republicans are willing to postpone the fight on Keystone to another day since it’s just a talking point anyway,” said Rep. Peter DeFazio (D-Ore.), a senior Democrat on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and member of the transportation conference. “That’s just as well. This is a real bill. It’s not a talking point.”

### AFF AT: Disaster Relief CP

#### It trades off with private efforts: Efforts to incorporate the private sector into disaster relief traditionally fail and exacerbate the costs of disasters by impeding an efficient response.

Jena Baker McNeill, Policy Analyst for Homeland Security in the Douglas and Sarah Allison Center for Foreign Policy Studies, a division of the Kathryn and Shelby Cullom Davis Institute for International Studies, at The Heritage Foundation. August 25, 2010. “More Than Lip Service: Why Private Sector Engagement Is Essential,” The Heritage Foundation. [http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports /2010/08/More-Than-Lip-Service-Why-Private-Sector-Engagement-Is-Essential](http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports%20/2010/08/More-Than-Lip-Service-Why-Private-Sector-Engagement-Is-Essential).

Given that future terrorist attacks, natural disasters, and accidents are inevitable, it is important that society be able to bounce back quickly. Such resiliency, however, requires that strong relationships are established with the private sector beforehand. Yet despite significant emphasis on the need to foster strong relationships with the private sector, such efforts have largely floundered. There are several reasons for this problem, including: The need for the federal government to understand the competitive realities of the marketplace and how these realities affect the way that businesses interact with government. The need for a framework to protect the competitive advantage of industry partners while allowing them to share valuable counterterrorism and other information with authorities. The lack of such a workable framework has led to significantly less information sharing with government. Partnerships, where invoked, tend to be government-dictated; private sector organizations are treated as an afterthought or essentially commandeered by government rather than respected as invaluable partners. When disaster does strike, the politics of the moment have driven the White House to adopt an exceedingly adversarial tone toward industry—a scenario illustrated by the recent BP spill. Indeed, disaster responses are sometimes politicized to the point where the government jeopardizes its chances of receiving or benefiting from offers to help from other companies. The focus on culpability issues of the spill and condemnation of BP leadership also creates a real risk of chilling future relationships between the federal government and the private sector.

#### Federal relief programs establish perverse incentives to undervalue insurance premiums, shifting the ultimate burden to the federal government and risking a resort to a federal bailout when disasters eventually occur.

Matt A. Mayer, et al. Visiting Fellow at The Heritage Foundation, President and Chief Executive Officer of Provisum Strategies LLC, and an Adjunct Professor at Ohio State University. He has served as Counselor to the Deputy Secretary and Acting Executive Director for the Office of Grants and Training in the U.S. Department of Homeland Security. He is author of Homeland Security and Federalism: Protecting America from Outside the Beltway (June 2009). David C. John is Senior Research Fellow in Retirement Security and Financial Institutions in the Thomas A. Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies at The Heritage Foundation. James Jay Carafano, Ph.D., is Assistant Director of the Kathryn and Shelby Cullom Davis Institute for International Studies and Senior Research Fellow for National Security and Homeland Security in the Douglas and Sarah Allison Center for Foreign Policy Studies at The Heritage Foundation. April 8, 2009. “Principles for Reform of Catastrophic Natural Disaster Insurance,” The Heritage Foundation. Backgrounder #2256. <http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2009/04/Principles-for-Reform-of-Catastrophic-Natural-Disaster-Insurance>.]

As with many federal proposals, a CAT fund started small as a hurricane-centric idea, but California's congressional delegation would likely seek to add earthquakes to any proposed legislation. Yet no matter what is covered, a CAT fund would federalize even more of America's natural disaster response and spread the risks willingly accepted by a minority of taxpayers to a majority of taxpayers who live far away from routine hurricane and earthquake activity. Common sense demands a different approach. In 2007, one CAT fund proposal, The Home­owners Defense Act (H.R. 3355), embodied many of the worst characteristics of CAT funds. It would have made it easier to create a federal government subsidy of P&C coverage for natural disasters. The bill would also have made it easier for individual states to create unrealistic disaster insurance pro­grams, with underpriced policies, by creating a fed­eral loan fund to cover losses suffered by those programs. Although states are already empowered to create such consortiums, H.R. 3355 would have granted this consortium a federal charter that would appear to extend a federal guarantee to the bonds issued by the group, when in fact no such guarantee would have existed. This false federal imprimatur could have increased pressure for a federal bailout following the inevitable disaster.

### AFF AT: Airline Infrastructure CPs

#### No Impact – SQUO solves airline emissions and congestion, voluntary efforts and government programs are already effective

Federal Aviation Administration Office of Environment and Energy (FAA). “Aviation and Emissions: A Primer.” January 2005. <http://www.faa.gov/regulations_policies/policy_guidance/envir_policy/media/aeprimer.pdf>.

First, there are voluntary programs underway at airports to reduce emissions from ground support equipment and other airport vehicles. For example, FAA developed a pilot program, with EPA and DOE, to demonstrate air quality improvements with alternative fuel ground support equipment. The program is called the Inherently Low-Emissions Airport Vehicle (ILEAV) Pilot Program. To reduce emissions from these vehicle fleets, airlines have engaged in voluntary emission reduction programs. For example, California and Texas have agreements with the major airlines to reduce emissions from their ground support equipment. These new agreements will reduce emissions by converting gasoline and diesel equipment to electricity and alternative fuels. A national stakeholders group made up of representatives of FAA, EPA, major airlines, state and local environmental regulators, airports, and environmental interest groups is currently working to establish a national agreement to reduce ground support equipment emissions at other airports in air quality nonattainment areas. This has proved challenging, and it is still unclear whether it will be successful. In addition, many airports have independently taken action to reduce emissions from buses, trucks, taxicabs, and other on-road vehicles that operate in and around the airport. Hybrid-electric vehicles are being used for staff transportation and customer service vehicles. Airport police departments are using compressed natural gas automobiles and maintenance departments are using alternative fuel trucks. Airport shuttle buses in particular have been converted to compressed natural gas at a number of airports. Also, new clean diesel trucks are being used in heavy maintenance and construction. Based on their experience with the ILEAV Program, FAA and EPA have expanded the initiative to reduce ground emissions at commercial service airports in all air quality nonattainment areas. The new Voluntary Airport Low Emission (VALE) program expands eligibility for airport low emission projects under the Airport Improvement Program (AIP) and the Passenger Facility Charges (PFC) program. Through the use of funding and emission credit incentives, the voluntary program includes the conversion of airport vehicles and ground support equipment to low emission technologies, modification of airport infrastructure for alternative fuels, provision of terminal gate electricity and air for parked aircraft, a pilot program to explore retrofit technology for airport ground support equipment, and other related emissions improvements.

#### Technological advances solve airline emissions and overall traffic efficiency

Federal Aviation Administration Office of Environment and Energy (FAA). “Aviation and Emissions: A Primer.” January 2005. <http://www.faa.gov/regulations_policies/policy_guidance/envir_policy/media/aeprimer.pdf>.

Second, it is also worth noting that many strategies for reducing the environmental impact of aviation are inherent to the intended design and operation of the air transport infrastructure. With airports for example, access roadways are often limited access, high-speed and free flowing and parking facilities are readily available. These features minimize motor vehicle emissions and keep them contained in areas away from the public. Third, looking at aviation more broadly, many recent changes have improved the system efficiency and reduced environmental impact. In the past few years, better meteorological information, available in the cockpit in real time, has allowed for optimized flight planning with shorter routing. Yield management tools have allowed airlines to increase load factors, which moves more people on every flight. The hub and spoke system, combined with the growth of low cost point-to-point carriers and a significant increase in the number and reach of regional airlines, has improved the efficiency of the entire aviation network.

#### No Solvency – airport infrastructure planning and completion typically takes over a decade

U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO). “Aviation Infrastructure: Challenges related to building runways and actions to address them.” Report to the Subcommittee on Aviation, House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. January 2003.

The amount of time that airports spend planning and building their runways can vary because of a number of factors. For example, although it is relatively straightforward to determine the beginning and ending of the environmental and the design and construction phases of the runway development process, there is no consensus among stakeholders about what constitutes the beginning of the planning phase of the process. Consequently, the length of time and the number of activities considered by some airports to be part of the planning phase vary. In light of these circumstances, we decided to use a median time rather than the average time because it would minimize the impact of outlying airports that may have taken a very long or very short time. For the airports we surveyed, the median time spent from planning to completion of their runway projects was about 10 years, and the median time that airports estimated they would spend on projects not yet completed was about 14 years. Several of the airports with unfinished runway projects stated that significant challenges had delayed their projects’ completion. Although the level of challenges faced by airports varied depending on such factors as proximity of the airport to a major city, amount of community opposition to the runway, and specific environmental issues, some common themes emerged. For example, several airports described challenges related to reaching stakeholder agreement on the purpose and need for the new runway. Another theme was the challenge of completing required environmental reviews; specifically, airports described challenges related to complying with extensive and duplicative federal and state requirements and obtaining the necessary permits. Some airports also described challenges related to reaching agreement on how to mitigate the impact of noise and other issues. Several airports commented that they faced challenges during the design and construction of their runways such as dealing with weather and site preparation issues.