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## CP Text

### The United States Federal Government should grant tax credits to private companies that build nationwide wind turbines.

## Solvency – Tax Credit

### United States Federal Government Tax credits have worked before specifically in wind energy – empirics.

Herb Sargent, Staff writer, 2-7-12 Bang or daily news “Keep priming the wind energy pump” http://bangordailynews.com/2012/02/07/opinion/contributors/keep-priming-the-wind-energy-pump/

Unfortunately, despite a record demonstrating progress in creating American jobs and cutting our dependence on foreign oil, Congress is poised to allow the highly successful production tax credit to expire, a move that will stop cold tens of thousands of wind energy manufacturing and engineering jobs in the United States. Sparked by targeted federal incentives and private sector investments, the wind energy sector is a success story in Maine and around the country. Wind energy provides unlimited renewable energy, tens of thousands of manufacturing jobs, technological innovation, lower energy costs and a reduced dependence on foreign oil. Today, more than 400 manufacturing facilities across the U.S. supply some of the 8,000 components in a wind turbine, and 75,000 Americans work in wind manufacturing and development. That forward progress is not guaranteed and is now at risk due to Congress’ inaction.

## Solvency – Wind Solves Econ

### Wind solves for any economic benefit – historical evidence proves

David Loom is Professor of Economics at Illinois State University where he teaches in the Master’s Degree program in electricity, natural gas and telecommunications economics. Dr. Loomis is Director of the Center for Renewable Energy and Executive Director of the Institute for Regulatory Policy Studies. As part of his duties, he leads the Illinois Wind Working Group under the U.S. Department of Energy. Dr. Loomis is part of a team of faculty that has designed a new undergraduate curriculum in renewable energy at Illinois State University. Dr. Loomis earned his Ph.D. in economics at Temple University. Prior to joining the faculty at Illinois State University, Dr. Loomis worked at Bell Atlantic (Verizon) for 11 years.

6-2011 “economic impact wind energy development in Illinois” http://renewableenergy.illinoisstate.edu/wind/publications/2011%20FINAL%20Economic%20Impact%20Report.pdf

According to this economic analysis (see Figure 1), the 17 largest wind farms in Illinois: Created approximately 13,323 full-time equivalent jobs during construction periods with a total payroll of over $762 million Supports approximately 598 permanent jobs in rural Illinois areas with a total annual payroll of over $35 million Supports local economies by generating $22 million in annual property taxes Generates $10 million annually in extra income for Illinois landowners who lease their land to the wind farm developer Will generate a total economic benefit of $4.1 billion over the life of the projects

### Wind solves for any econ- creates “indirect impacts”

David Loom is Professor of Economics at Illinois State University where he teaches in the Master’s Degree program in electricity, natural gas and telecommunications economics. Dr. Loomis is Director of the Center for Renewable Energy and Executive Director of the Institute for Regulatory Policy Studies. As part of his duties, he leads the Illinois Wind Working Group under the U.S. Department of Energy. Dr. Loomis is part of a team of faculty that has designed a new undergraduate curriculum in renewable energy at Illinois State University. Dr. Loomis earned his Ph.D. in economics at Temple University. Prior to joining the faculty at Illinois State University, Dr. Loomis worked at Bell Atlantic (Verizon) for 11 years.

6-2011 “economic impact wind energy development in Illinois” http://renewableenergy.illinoisstate.edu/wind/publications/2011%20FINAL%20Economic%20Impact%20Report.pdf

The initial spending on the construction and operation of the wind farm creates a second layer of impacts, referred to as “turbine and supply chain impacts” or “indirect impacts.” Indirect impacts during construction period consist of the changes in inter-industry purchases resulting from the direct final demand changes, and include construction spending on materials and wind farm equipment and other purchases of goods and offsite services. Essentially, these impacts result from “spending related to project development and on-site labor such as equipment costs (turbines, blades, towers, transportation), manufacturing of components and supply chain inputs, materials (transformer, electrical, HV line extension, HV sub-interconnection materials), and the supply chain of inputs required to produce these materials” (JEDI Support Team, 2009, 2). Concrete that is used in turbine foundations, increases the demand for gravel, sand, and cement. As a result of an expenditure for concrete there is increased economic activity at quarries and cement factories and these changes are indirect impacts. The accountant for the construction firm and the banker who finances the contractor are both considered indirect impacts. All supply chain component impacts/manufacturing-related activities are included under indirect impacts; therefore, the late stage turbine assembly process, which includes gearbox assembly, blade production, and steel rolling are all included under the construction period indirect impacts category

## Solvency – HSR Aff

### CP not only solves comparatively better than High Speed Rail by avoiding fossil fuel dependency, but also is a prerequisite to the affs oil dependency advantage as the electricity for the train in the SQ will be made by fossil fules not alt energy like the CP.

Tony Bosworth. Campaigner for Friends of the Earth. 2011. .http://www.cnn.com/2011/11/18/world/how-green-is-hsr/index.html

Across the world governments are looking to high speed rail to provide fast, modern transport systems fit for the 21st century. By the end of 2012 China is expected to have more high speed rail lines than the rest of the world combined, while President Obama aims to give 80 per cent of Americans access to fast rail travel within 25 years. But if governments want high speed rail to spearhead the drive towards a cleaner transport system they must look further than simply providing faster trains. The UK is currently mulling over a high speed rail link between London and Birmingham, a city about 160 kilometers north-west of the capital. But according to official estimates, it's unlikely to lead to significant carbon dioxide cuts -- and may even increase climate-changing emissions. So what's stopping high speed rail being a major part of a greener transport future in Britain? Over two thirds of the world's electricity comes from fossil fuels so until (or unless) power stations are weaned off fossil fuels, electric trains will still have a significant climate impact. Tony Bosworth First there's the electricity to power the trains. Over two thirds of the world's electricity comes from fossil fuels so until (or unless) power stations are weaned off fossil fuels, electric trains will still have a significant climate impact -- although rail travel is still better than flying or driving. Secondly, will high speed rail entice people off the roads and short-haul flights? French TGVs and the Channel Tunnel rail link have succeeded, but official calculations estimate that only 16 per cent of anticipated passengers for the London to Birmingham line will have swapped from planes or cars. One of the main factors is cost. Despite soaring fuel prices, motoring and flying are still expected to be cheaper than high speed rail. If faster rail travel is to become a realistic alternative it must be affordable too. The UK's high speed rail link is expected to cost a whopping $54 billion. But living as we do in cash-strapped times there's surely a strong case for investing some of that that money in less grandiose, but more effective, projects.

## Current oil dependency is high and not enough in U.s.

### The United States of America still imports 400 million gallons of oil a day.

ASP has been working to protect communities, wild places, and the planet itself. The largest and most influential grassroots environmental organization in the United States. And our founder, John Muir, appears on the back of the California quarter. 2012 “Ending Our Dependence On Oil”

<http://action.sierraclub.org/site/PageNavigator/adv_eodo>

TRANSPORTATION:

The U.S. uses nearly 400 million gallons of oil every day moving people in automobiles, goods on freight truck, air travel, rail and transit. Cars and light trucks use nine million barrels of oil per day. Of all the oil used in the United States, 70% is consumed by transportation ECONOMIC SECURITY: Americans send over $1 billion abroad every day to pay for oil. The result is lost jobs and increasing dollars in the hands of foreigners who we increasingly rely upon to finance our deficits. The U.S. borrows money from the Chinese to buy oil from the Saudis, causing greater national debt and dependence on the goodwill of others to allow its economy to function .

### Absent a new counter-plan – U.S. oil dependency can rise up to 60 % in the low case scenario

 Anthony H. Cordesman he holds the Arleigh A. Burke Chair in Strategy at CSIS. He is a recipient of the Department of Defense Distinguished Service Medal. During his time at CSIS, he has completed a wide variety of studies on energy, U.S. strategy and defense plans,

2011 “US Oil and Gas Import Dependence: Department of Energy Projections in 2011” http://csis.org/expert/anthony-h-cordesman

At the same time, the reference case – which is based on very favorable assumptions about technology, alternative liquids, and future demand – still leaves the US dependent on imports equal to over 40% of its consumption in the far more likely reference case – rising to over 60% in the low price case. These are still critical levels of strategic dependence, and the fourth and fifth charts in this section show that President Obama’s goal of a 33% reduction in the US import level in 2008 is no more credible than President Nixon’s goal of 100% in 1980.