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### 1AC

#### The United States federal government should establish a tax credit for the construction of carbon dioxide pipelines.

**Zarraby**, April **2012** (Cyrus – J.D. at George Washington University Law School, Note: Regulating Carbon Capture and Sequestration: A Federal Regulatory Regime to Promote the Construction of a National Carbon Dioxide Pipeline Network, The George Washington Law Review, p. Lexis-Nexis)

Market-based rates for transportation services create an incentive to build a CO<2> pipeline infrastructure that is necessary for the development of CCS projects. This is particularly true as pipeline infrastructure first begins to be built because market-based rates ensure an adequate return on investment. For example, when the first CO<2> pipelines are built for CCS, it would be unlikely that the entire capacity of the pipelines would be utilized right at the start. This is because pipelines are "overbuilt" to allow for future expansion as new sources of supply come online. n245 Rather, as more CCS projects are developed, the pipeline would "fill up" over time until it reached its maximum capacity. If pipelines were only allowed to charge a cost-based [\*982] rate - a fixed rate based on their cost of service and available capacity - the underutilization in the early operations of the project would result in either a low rate of return or an outright loss. Therefore, it is important that the pipeline be allowed to negotiate with each customer to determine a rate that ensures that the pipeline would receive an adequate return on investment in both the short and long term. Market-based rates would essentially allow the pipeline and customers to negotiate rates and terms that benefit both parties.

Congress passed similar legislation regarding needed energy infrastructure in the EPAct 2005. n246 In the EPAct, Congress added section 4(f) to the NGA to promote the construction of new natural gas storage infrastructure. n247 Section 4(f) provides FERC with the ability to grant a storage company authority to charge market-based rates even in instances where the company has monopoly power. n248 FERC, however, must find that the project's customers are adequately protected. n249 Section 4(f) has been very successful at promoting the construction of new storage infrastructure. Between January 2008 and May 2011, FERC has approved the construction of 59.6 billion cubic feet ("Bcf") of new natural gas storage to companies that possess market power. n250 Of this, forty-five percent was approved using market- [\*983] based rates under section 4(f). n251 Further, when including natural gas storage projects from providers that do not possess monopoly power, over ninety percent of all natural gas storage approved by FERC since 2008 has been granted authority to charge market-based rates. n252 This experience shows that providing companies with the opportunity to charge market-based rates would promote the construction of new projects and quickly develop the needed pipeline infrastructure. n253

Additionally, market-based rates authority addresses a key problem with the current regulatory system. As discussed previously, CO<2> pipelines are currently subject to multiple regulation regimes from each state, making it more difficult to determine what the overall rate would be for a transportation service that crosses multiple states. n254 Congressional establishment of market-based rates for all CO<2> pipelines would preempt state regulation and allow the pipelines and customers to negotiate transportation rates across the entire pipeline.

## Topicality

### T – Pipelines 2AC

#### Transportation infrastructure includes pipelines.

**US Chamber of Commerce**, 4/6/**2010** (Infrastructure Index: Let’s Rebuild America, p. 46)

Transportation indicators serve as the building blocks for the Transportation Index. The objective is to identify a set of indicators that reflects the performance of the transportation infrastructure and its relationship to economic health and growth. The indicators are selected based on the following definitions of transportation infrastructure: General Definition: Moving people and goods by air, water, road and rail Technical Definition: The fixed facilities (roadway segments, railway tracks, transit terminals, harbors, and airports), flow entities (people, vehicles, container units, railroad cars) and control systems that permit people and goods to traverse geographical space efficiently and in a timely manner and for the intended purpose. Transportation modes include highway, rail, air, waterway, and pipeline.

### T – Tax Credits 2AC

#### 1. We meet – tax credits are a form of government spending.

#### 2. Destroys aff flexibility – forces the aff to only use direct spending --- this makes the aff mechanism stagnant and allows the neg to win off of various alternative spending CPs.

#### 3. Not exclusive – their ev does not say that tax credits are excluded from investments.

#### 4. Counter-interpretation – infrastructure investments include tax incentives.

Congressional Budget Office/Joint Committee on Taxation, October **2009** (Subsidizing Infrastructure Investment with Tax-Preferred Bonds, p. <http://www.cbo.gov/sites/default/files/cbofiles/ftpdocs/106xx/doc10667/10-26-taxpreferredbonds.pdf>)

The federal government supports infrastructure investment in a variety of ways. It spends money directly, makes grants to state and local governments for their capital spending and, through the tax system, subsidizes the borrowing of both of those levels of government as well as certain private entities to finance infrastructure projects. However, the most common means of providing a tax subsidy for infrastructure investment—by offering a tax exemption for interest on state and local bonds—is generally viewed to be an inefficient way to subsidize state and local borrowing, largely because the revenue cost to the federal government may exceed the interest-cost subsidy provided to state and local governments by a substantial amount.

#### 5. Our definition is the most precise – our definition is from the CBO and defines how the government views infrastructure investment. This provides predictable ground and reflects the literature.

#### 6. Err on aff – competing interpretations detracts from topic education by encouraging a race for the most limiting interpretation.

### 1AR Investments = Tax Incentives

#### Infrastructure investment covers constructing and renovating by using direct expenditures and tax incentives.

Congressional Budget Office/Joint Committee on Taxation, October **2009** (Subsidizing Infrastructure Investment with Tax-Preferred Bonds, p. [1](http://www.cbo.gov/sites/default/files/cbofiles/ftpdocs/106xx/doc10667/10-26-taxpreferredbonds.pdf))

Investment in the nation’s infrastructure each year amounts to roughly a half-trillion dollars. Both government and the private sector fund that investment, which covers the costs of constructing and renovating such facilities as highways and airports, water and energy utilities, dams, waste-disposal and other environmental sites, schools, and hospitals. The federal government makes a significant contribution to that investment through its direct expenditures and the subsidies it provides indirectly through the tax system. Direct expenditures comprise what the federal government spends on infrastructure (for example, by funding construction of dams and other water resources by the Army Corps of Engineers) and what it provides as grants and loan subsidies to states and localities (primarily for transportation projects). Because infrastructure facilities typically provide a stream of benefits (and revenues for repayment) well into the future, their construction is often financed by borrowing. States and localities issue debt to finance projects undertaken by government and, in some cases, by the private sector (bonds issued by states and localities to finance either government operations or certain private-sector activities are known as municipal bonds). The federal government subsidizes the issuance of municipal bonds by offering tax preferences that lower the cost of debt incurred for those projects.

## Kritik Answers

### Climate K Answers – Policymaking Good

#### Policymaking and scenario planning is essential to agenda setting and social change

**Pralle**, September **2009** (Sarah - Department of Political Science at Syracuse University, Agenda-setting and climate change, Environmental Politics, p. http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/section?content=a915055759&fulltext=713240928)

While Kingdon is primarily concerned with how issues rise on agendas, the decline of issues is a similarly important question. As suggested above, a key challenge in climate policy politics will be to keep the issue high on public, governmental, and decision agendas, as it must weather any economic storms or other developments that might weaken the commitment of the public and policymakers to solving it. Decades ago Downs (1972) predicted that attention to environmental issues would gradually decline after an initial period of enthusiasm and high salience. While Downs' predictions did not bear out - some environmental issues have faded, but new ones have taken their place - he did identify important dynamics that may help explain cycles of shifting issue attention. Downs identifies the public and the media as driving forces behind issue emergence and decline. Public enthusiasm for solving problems helps to get issues on agendas initially, but subsequent cynicism, unwillingness to sacrifice, or lack of understanding may lead to a decline in attention and agenda status. As the costs and difficulty of solving a problem become more evident, the public tends to lose interest. Similarly, if the public believes that large sacrifices are required (in behaviour, for example), then attention to a problem may wane. A rather different cause of issue decline is when the public (mistakenly or not) believes that the government has solved a problem, and therefore feels free to turn their attention elsewhere. Kingdon (1995, p. 103) adds that even people in government may feel that they have solved a problem and thus redirect their efforts elsewhere. Actual failure to solve the problem can have a similar effect, as policymakers grow tired of trying to pass or amend legislation and let the problem move to the back-burner (Kingdon 1995, p. 103). The media, Downs suggests, can exacerbate cyclical patterns of attention, as it is under pressure continually to find new problems and new solutions, or at least new angles on old ones. As a result, media attention to problems is likely to rise and fall over time; the pattern will depend in part on the nature of the issue and real world events related to it. In the environmental policy area, the most important 'real world' events affecting the place of environmental issues on the agenda are economic events. Put simply, economic problems often move environmental problems and solutions down the list of priorities. Public opinion data from the United States suggests that the state of the economy is frequently a priority concern and that citizens' willingness to sacrifice economic growth for environmental protection decreases as the strength of the economy declines (Guber 2003). Political strategies for keeping climate change on the agenda What can agenda-setting theories teach us about the most effective strategies for putting (and keeping) climate change high on the agendas of affluent democracies? Three sets of strategies are examined here, mirroring the categories (problems, policies, and politics) used in Kingdon's streams model. It is assumed that the actors pursuing these strategies would comprise a range of groups and individuals, including environmental advocacy groups, scientists, journalists, agency personnel, legislators, cabinet members, and perhaps even leaders in renewable energy technologies. Together they constitute the 'climate change advocacy coalition' - the sum total of actors who are active in this policy area and have an interest in getting and keeping the issue high on public, governmental and decision agendas (Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith 1993). The climate change problem: saliency and strategic framing To keep the problem of climate change on governmental and decision agendas, it must be salient to policymakers. Public interest in an issue is not the only way to generate salience for politicians in a democracy, but it is an important one. Some politicians will prioritise climate change in their campaigns and when in office based simply on their personal concern for the problem. But policies are not enacted by individuals; therefore, we must consider strategies for increasing its salience more generally so that the average policymaker - someone with limited time and many potential problems to address - is willing to pay serious and frequent attention to the problem.

### Climate K Answers – Perm Solvency

#### The alternative alone fails --- concrete political action on climate is key to change

**Foust and Murphy**, July **2009** (Christina - assistant professor in the Department of Human Communication Studies at the University of Denver, and William - , Revealing and reframing apocalyptic tragedy in global warming discourse, Environmental Communication, p. http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/section?content=a912388367&fulltext=713240928#references)

Reframing the tragic apocalypse cannot end with vaguely interpretive or individualized agency. While becoming educated and expressing one's support for the growing coalition are important, in order to reduce emissions, such agency must be joined by concrete changes in our daily routines. Furthermore, while small behavioral changes (such as installing compact fluorescent light bulbs) are important to prepare individuals for the major changes to come, they must be connected to collective efforts and structural changes. To positively influence the global warming narrative, rhetors should, for instance, stress human agency in a number of sites, from altering heating and cooling practices; advocating for and using mass transit, bicycling, walking, and tele-commuting; to public support for funding alternative energy infrastructure.

### Climate K Answers – Policy Debate Key

#### A central question and specific problems are critical to effective climate engagement

**Jamieson**, May **1996** (Dale - professor of philosophy at the University of Colorado, Boulder, 545 Annals 35, p. lexis)

First, greater attention can be paid to problem definition at the beginning of a decision-making process. When policy problems are not clearly defined and characterized, it is quite [\*42] unclear what scientific information is relevant to bringing them to closure. Better problem definition involves being clear not only about what questions are being asked but also about the context in which they are asked and the purposes that answers to these questions are supposed to serve. The debate over climate change policy is an example of how things can go wrong when there is little agreement about what question is being asked. Some people claim that it is uncertain whether emitting greenhouse gases will change climate; others seem to deny this. In some cases, they are not really disagreeing. Both parties to the dispute may agree that, for the purposes of counting as scientific knowledge, the proposition is uncertain. More research needs to be done, data collected, and so forth. But those who seem to deny that there is significant uncertainty are often claiming not that there is no scientific uncertainty but that there is no uncertainty for the purposes of public decision making. In their view, the risk of climate change is known to be great enough, and the costs of mitigation and prevention are low enough, that some "no regrets" strategies ought to be pursued. This is an example of a case in which it is clear that the scientific data may rightfully be regarded as uncertain for some purposes but not for others. 13

### Climate K Answers – Nietzsche/Value to Life

#### The plan reorients our political approach to climate change --- the search for solutions empowers agency and human becoming

**Foust and Murphy**, July **2009** (Christina - assistant professor in the Department of Human Communication Studies at the University of Denver, and William - , Revealing and reframing apocalyptic tragedy in global warming discourse, Environmental Communication, p. http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/section?content=a912388367&fulltext=713240928#references)

A comic apocalyptic frame suggests that human beings have agency at different points within the global warming narrative. Comically framed discourse posits that humans may mitigate the worst effects of climate change, or that they may adapt to the unchangeable telos. For instance, Kristof (2005) identifies relatively inexpensive "initial steps we can take to reduce carbon emissions ... like encouraging mass transit, hybrid vehicles, better insulation and energy-efficient light bulbs," which "could reduce global emissions by one-third" (p. A25). At the same time it leaves open the possibility that humans may influence the future, apocalyptic rhetoric from a comic frame casts global warming as a material reality, (more or less) ordained and thus constraining human choices. Empowerment within the comic variation of apocalypse is not a trivial matter, however. It requires humans to make the right decisions from a limited set of choices: "Nature commands humans to adapt or die. The natural world keeps erupting, shifting, storming, collapsing, whirling. It refuses, despite our entreaties, to become something dependable and constrained and rational" (Achenbach, 2004, p. C1). In other words, a comic apocalypse does not suggest that events are controllable through any or all human actions. Using the comic frame permits humans to miss the fully tragic telos (which would, presumably, end all time and humanity): In [climatologist Roger Pulwaty's] view, a crisis is a point in a story, a moment in a narrative that presents an opportunity for characters to think their way through a problem. A catastrophe ... is one of several possible outcomes that follows from a crisis. "We're at the point of crisis ... " Pulwaty concluded. (Gertner, 2007, p. 68) By distinguishing between "crisis" and "catastrophe," the comic variation suggests that the tragic telos is only one potential ending to the climate change narrative, contingent upon whether humans alter their behavior in an appropriate manner. Human beings can assume responsibility within a comically constructed apocalypse, even if the narrative begins tragically. Eilperin (2007) reports that "the warming of the climate system is unequivocal ... even in the best-case scenario, temperatures are on track to cross a threshold to an unsustainable level" which "could" produce effects "irreversible within a human lifetime" (p. A1). What begins as a tragically ordained story takes a comedic turn, as humans have an opportunity to realize that they are mistaken. Eilperin interviews climate scientist Gerald Meehl, who concludes "that a sharp cut in greenhouse gas emissions could still keep catastrophic consequences from occurring: 'The message is, it does make a difference what we do'" (p. A1). Comically, the telos does not overshadow the significance of human choice, which may stave off total catastrophe. While mitigation is one potential source for human agency, another is adaptation. As Revkin (2007) quotes Dr. Mike Hulme: "Climate change is not a problem waiting for a solution ... but a powerful idea that will transform the way we develop" (p. A16). The emphasis on transformation suggests that humans can adapt to the apocalyptic telos of global warming, even though the telos is, implicitly, foretold. The comic telos thus requires humans to rethink their choices, sometimes after the worst effects of global warming have taken place. Such effects may be forecast as though they will (most likely) occur, maintaining the apocalyptic structure (even in the comic variation): If the scientists are right about an apocalyptic future of floods, droughts, dead coral reefs, rising sea levels and advancing deserts, global warming is an existential threat that should affect our approach to just about every issue. To take it seriously, we would have to change the way we think about transportation, agriculture, development, water resources, natural disasters, foreign relations, and more. (Grunwald, 2006, p. B1) Though the ending of global warming is foretold, climate change provides a comic challenge from which people may learn, grow, and adapt. While the tragic variation would end the narrative with humans and all other species as victims of the catastrophic effects of global warming, the comic version is more open-ended. Furthermore, comic variations often present the apocalyptic telos in a non-totalizing way, again with the effect of amplifying human agency. Comic versions of the global warming narrative posit localized effects, as Clynes (2007) suggests: "A one-meter rise in sea levels over the next 93 years would have enormous consequences, flooding low-lying coastal areas and megadeltas, such as the Nile and Brahmaputra in Bangladesh, where millions of people live" (p. 52). Though Northern industrialized nations could adapt to flooding, developing coastal countries likely could not: "the dramatic effects of climate change could push the number of displaced people globally to at least one billion" (Clynes, 2007, p. 52). Discourse such as this takes seriously global warming's threat, while emphasizing a non-total telos. As exemplary of the comic variation, it reinforces responsibility for making ethical choices, rather than resigning oneself to the foretold, total catastrophe. In addition, comic discourse indicates a time frame (93 years in the previous example) over which global warming will occur, rendering the temporality comic. While a tragic temporality might predict an exact date after which human agency is impossible; or, leave time to be experienced as rapid through its portrayal of catastrophic events; a comic framing allows readers to experience a more manageable time period across which effects may occur. In comic temporality, the effects of global warming do not happen all at once: "while widespread permanent inundation ... is possible, it isn't likely to occur in [New York City] in our grandchildren's lifetimes, or even their grandchildren's. And an extra 5 to 10 inches of water over the next few decades," Rogers (2007) concludes, is manageable for residents (p. 1). While such temporality may make the issue of climate change appear less pressing to crass readers unconcerned with their families' or communities' futures, it permits human action on climate change, rather than limiting possible expressions of human agency to total resignation. Conclusions: Understanding and Reframing Apocalyptic Despair Framing global warming as an apocalyptic event has several implications. Tragic apocalyptic framing in particular posits the issue of global warming as extra-human, driven by cosmic forces, and, as such, Fated. Oddly, this makes it difficult to hold humans accountable for pumping greenhouse gases into the atmosphere. We are dismayed by tragic discourse that attributes global warming to a simple "rise in temperatures" (Bacon & Watson, 1998, p. 3A), which alleviates humans of responsibility for creating, or at least contributing to, climate change; and decreases the sense of human responsibility for combating global warming. Furthermore, apocalyptic framing diminishes the range of human agency possible in influencing the inevitable march of global warming. As Brummett (1991) explains, believers who have "lost control over events" are "reassured, not by regaining control, but by knowing that history is nevertheless controlled by an underlying order" (p. 37). Apocalyptic framing limits believers' agency to acting in accordance with prophetic directives, which typically involves intrapersonal activity (e.g., repentance) in the face of cosmic forces beyond individual control. Rather than encouraging material action or behavioral change, being a true believer resigns the community to inaction. A second implication of the tragic apocalyptic frame is that it invites naysayers to discredit scientists as false prophets and label environmentalists as alarmists. As Gleiberman (2006) notes: "The right-wing strategy, which has been to paint global warming as a lofty hypothetical-an alarmist scenario pushed by pesky Chicken Littles-is a way of relegating it back to the era of '60s paranoia" (p. 65). Apocalyptic framing serves as fodder for naysayers to continue portraying global warming as "overblown" or arguing "that it may not exist" (Stevens, 1997, p. F1). Ultimately, such a discourse polarizes readers, who are forced to choose sides because they were not given more nuanced options for addressing the issue. But if not through a tragic apocalypse, how might the narrative of global warming be framed to promote political action? Participants in a recent Environmental Communication forum speak to this question, in light of Schwarze's discussion of melodrama (Kinsella, 2008). As Schwarze (2006) argues, the polarizing structure of melodrama may inspire action: "Promoting division and drawing sharp moral distinctions can be a fitting response to situations in which identification and consensus have obscured recognition of damaging material conditions and social injustices" (p. 242). Though melodrama and apocalyptic tragedy differ, they share a tendency to divide audiences, for instance, into heroes against villains (Schwarze, 2006) or believers against non-believers (Brummett, 1991). Perhaps the polarizing rhetoric of melodrama may shift the ground of the climate change debate away from economic costs and benefits, to the moral stakes of decimating the earth, as Peterson suggests (Kinsella, 2008). Drawing clear distinctions between heroes and villains could motivate identifications to mitigate emissions. As Check counters, the complex issue of climate change may not lend itself to divisive, melodramatic structure, for it does not have a single clear "rhetorical devil that is powerful, ubiquitous, deceitful, and identifiable" (Kinsella, 2008, p. 98). We, too, worry that divisive rhetoric, particularly in the form of tragic apocalypse, has precluded and will continue to suffocate opportunities for a widespread collective will to form. If we accept the view advocated by a number of experts-that global warming represents a challenge to every aspect of modern development-it is imperative for as many different sectors of society as possible to contribute to positive change. Polarizing the community while denying the potential for action, as in apocalyptic tragedy, seems an untenable rhetorical strategy for encouraging the public to become active participants in climate change mitigation. As a frame, apocalyptic comedy may promote agency on the issue of global warming more than tragic polarization. The comic frame promotes humanity as mistaken, rather than evil. As such, comic discourse allows some space for bringing ideologically disparate communities together. To the extent that humanity is mistaken, it has agency for making different choices which may lead to different outcomes. Time is open-ended, with human intervention possible. Humanity is less likely to be resigned to its fate, and, as such, may be inspired to take steps to change.

### AT: Root Cause

#### Focusing on root cause fails --- it oversimplifies and does not reflect reality

**Hutchison**, 3/22/**2004** (Fred, American innovation and the culture of war, p. <http://www.renewamerica.us/columns/hutchison/040322>)

Reductionist ideas reduce (hu)man(s) to a simplistic caricature. When man looks in the mirror and sees something less than what is there, it has a depressing effect on his spirit and his mind. Deterministic ideas are the most powerfully compressing of the reductionist ideas. When man believes he is but a cog in a great machine, he feels crushed in a brutal and inhuman wine press. The most pitiless and repressive states are based on deterministic ideas — such as the Soviet regime under Stalin. When man is told that he is not created according to a design but was haphazardly evolved he is reduced to a subhuman status — an animal of no designed species but a beast-monstrosity of accidental origins. In some ways this is worse than being a cog in a machine. At least a cog has a design and an understandable purpose as an integral part of the great machine. Determinism is based upon the inflation of the principle of causation. Causation can be decisively established only for extremely simplified situations. In modern science, an experiment must be reduced to its simplest essentials before proof of causation is possible. But human nature and society is exceedingly complicated and contradictory. Reductionism in the pursuit of proof of causation is illusive because human nature is irreducibly complex. This goes through my mind whenever I hear a liberal speak of "root causes." The illusion that we can ferret out the root causes indicates a liberal who has never read the classics — and is profoundly ignorant about human nature. Our history of trying to manipulate root causes through social programs is a discouraging one — filled with the surprises of unintended consequences. Three Fatal Determinisms The three fatal determinisms of our age are economic determinism, cultural determinism, and biological determinism. Economic determinism is the belief that what we are and what we do is shaped by economic forces. This is an extremely radical reductionism if ever there was one. All the incredibly complicated things that combine in mysterious synergies to make up human nature are all to be explained by one single cause — economics. If ever their was a myth grounded in false confidence and the radical ignorance of tunnel vision — this is it. When liberals speak of the "root causes" of social problems, they typically are borrowing ideas from economic determinism. Root cause arguments obscure rather than enlighten. The poor are not responsible for their poverty because of root causes — we are told. Criminals are not responsible for crime because of root causes. Terrorists are not responsible for murder because of root causes. Such thinking rules out the idea of human conscience, and moral responsibility. When the belief in root causes relieves us of responsibility for our actions it also weakens the belief in the existence of free will. Nothing will destroy a golden age of innovation faster than a paralysis of the will. If we doubt we have a will because of a belief in the myth of root causes, the will becomes either paralyzed or undisciplined. We become ether zombies or maniacs — and return to adolescence.

### AT: Truth Claims

#### The burden of “truth claims” is to disprove the factual claims of the 1AC --- no amount of theory can replace expertise

**Yudkowsky 2008** (Eliezer – research fellow at Singularity Institute for Artificial Intelligence, Cognitive Biases Potentially Affecting Judgment of Global Risks, Global Catastrophic Risks, p. 111-112)

Every true idea which discomforts you will seem to match the pattern of at least one psychological error. Robert Pirsig said: "The world's biggest fool can say the sun is shining, but that doesn't make it dark out." If you believe someone is guilty of a psychological error, then demonstrate your competence by first demolishing their consequential factual errors. If there are no factual errors, then what matters the psychology? The temptation of psychology is that, knowing a little psychology, we can meddle in arguments where we have no technical expertise - instead sagely analyzing the psychology of the disputants. If someone wrote a novel about an asteroid strike destroying modern civilization, then someone might criticize that novel as extreme, dystopian, apocalyptic; symptomatic of the author's naive inability to deal with a complex technological society. We should recognize this as a literary criticism, not a scientific one; it is about good or bad novels, not good or bad hypotheses. To quantify the annual probability of an asteroid strike in real life, one must study astronomy and the historical record: no amount of literary criticism can put a number on it. Garreau (2005) seems to hold that a scenario of a mind slowly increasing in capability, is more mature and sophisticated than a scenario of extremely rapid intelligence increase. But that's a technical question, not a matter of taste; no amount of psychologizing can tell you the exact slope of that curve. It's harder to abuse heuristics and biases than psychoanalysis. Accusing someone of conjunction fallacy leads naturally into listing the specific details that you think are burdensome and drive down the joint probability. Even so, do not lose track of the realworld facts of primary interest; do not let the argument become about psychology. Despite all dangers and temptations, it is better to know about psychological biases than to not know. Otherwise we will walk directly into the whirling helicopter blades of life. But be very careful not to have too much fun accusing others of biases. That is the road that leads to becoming a sophisticated arguer - someone who, faced with any discomforting argument, finds at once a bias in it. The one whom you must watch above all is yourself. Jerry Cleaver said: "What does you in is not failure to apply some high-level, intricate, complicated technique. It's overlooking the basics. Not keeping your eye on the ball." Analyses should finally center on testable real-world assertions. Do not take your eye off the ball.

## Enhanced Oil Recovery Advantage

### EOR 1AC

#### Contention Two: Enhanced Oil Recovery

#### Current supplies of CO2 are insufficient to sustain enhanced oil recovery --- only access to anthropogenic CO2 can alleviate oil dependency.

**NEORI**, February **2012** (National Enhanced Oil Recovery Initiative, Carbon Dioxide Enhanced Oil Recovery: A Critical Domestic Energy, Economic, and Environmental Opportunity, p. 8-9)

Reliance on oil imports directly affects the security and stability of the U.S. energy system. The United States consumed 19.1 million barrels of oil per day in 2010 (almost 7 billion barrels per year) primarily to fuel the transportation sector. Yet the United States produced only 5.5 million barrels per day – importing the remaining two-thirds, in some case from hostile regions (Energy Information Administration (EIA), 2011). Today, EOR quietly accounts for 281,000 barrels per day, or six percent of U.S. oil production (ARI, 2011). However, EOR has the potential to significantly increase domestic oil supplies. Over the past 40 years the EOR industry has grown to include over twenty companies that deploy new technologies and practices to improve understanding of the subsurface and to locate hard-tofind oil pockets, as well as boost oil production efficiency (NETL, 2010). Using existing state-of-the-art practices, EOR has the potential to deliver to the U.S economy 26-61 billion barrels of additional oil (ARI, 2011). This supply potential significantly expands oil resources above current levels. Companies in the EOR business currently book around 1 billion barrels as proven reserves; and over the past 25 years EOR has produced a total of 1.5 billion barrels of oil (NETL, 2010). Moreover, “next generation” EOR technology could yield substantially greater gains, potentially increasing recoverable domestic oil to 67-137 billion barrels (ARI, 2011). With a supply potential of almost 10-14 years of annual consumption, a fully developed national EOR program could dramatically alleviate our dependence on foreign oil. However, EOR development is constrained by insufficient supply of CO2. Without significantly expanding the volume of CO2 available for use in EOR, the production of vital domestic oil will fall short of its potential. Natural sources of CO2 do not have the capacity to satisfy all the demand from EOR (ARI, 2010). Therefore, the only way to increase oil production from EOR is to boost supplies of CO2 from ~~man-made~~ sources in a manner suitably calibrated to the full potential of EOR.

#### Pipelines are necessary for continued EOR --- they link CO2 sources with oil recovery.

**MIT Energy Initiative**, 7/23/**2010** (Role of Enhanced Oil Recovery in Accelerating the Deployment of Carbon Capture and Sequestration, p. 4-5)

Federal CCS programs have paid relatively little attention to the CO2 transportation infrastructure, but this is a key enabler for building both EOR and DSF sequestration. Looking well into the future, a CO2 -EOR program utilizing hundreds of millions of tons of CO2 annually will likely require tens of thousands of miles of CO2 pipeline. A “giant horseshoe” configuration was discussed at the symposium, linking the major CO2 sources of the Midwest with the producing regions of the Gulf Coast, West Texas, and the Rockies. Clearly, such an ambitious undertaking should occur with public support only with evidence that large-scale CO2 -EOR using anthropogenic sources will materialize as an opportunity for both climate risk mitigation and enhanced oil production. Satisfying these needs will probably require sustained “high” (i.e., current) oil price levels and a price (or cap) on CO2 emissions. However, even the initial steps to implement anthropogenic CO2 -EOR should be taken with a view toward beginning to build the physical infrastructure in a way that would be needed for a future major scale-up.

#### CCS is critical to providing industry-based CO2 to enhancement operations. This process will cut U.S. oil imports in half.

**Howell**, 3/11/**2010** (Katie, Pairing Oil Recovery With Carbon Capture a Win-Win for U.S. – Report, The New York Times, p. http://www.nytimes.com/gwire/2010/03/11/11greenwire-pairing-oil-recovery-with-carbon-capture-a-win-52359.html)

The Natural Resources Defense Council backed the report (pdf) that says combining CCS with enhanced oil recovery could boost U.S. production by 3 million to 3.6 million barrels a day. "Significant growth is dependent on sourcing affordable carbon dioxide," said Mike Godec, vice president of Advanced Resources International, which prepared the report. "Climate legislation obviously would give enhanced oil recovery a kick start and allow the technology to grow most rapidly." Oil companies for years have wrung as much oil as they could from maturing wells. And for the past 35 years or so, they have been pumping CO2 into aging reservoirs to displace oil and enhance production. Those efforts have produced about 1.5 billion barrels of domestic oil since 1986, or more than 250,000 barrels per day. But companies using the technique rely on natural sources of CO2, and that has posed a problem. "The real limiting factor historically has been the availability of CO2 supplies, not the availability of reservoirs," said Tracy Evans, president of Denbury Resources Inc., which uses enhanced oil recovery with CCS. A House-passed climate bill and pending Senate legislation could spur the technology's use, the report says. If a price on CO2 emissions pushed industrial emitters to develop capture technology, the greenhouse gas could easily be transported to oil recovery sites, Evans said. And by pumping captured CO2 underground and sequestering it, the United States could cut its carbon emissions by 530 million tons by 2030, the report says. Interest in enhanced oil recovery with CCS has grown recently. In response to a separate report this month that mentioned combining oil production and CCS, NRDC's Wesley Warren said such an effort "could cut U.S. oil imports in half, helping the economy and enhancing national security without raising new environmental concerns."

#### Oil dependency hamstrings the U.S. military and foreign policy goals --- that escalates to great power conflict

**Crawford** 2010/**2011** (Colin – J.D. Wake Forest University School of Law, Green Warfare: An American Grand Strategy for the 21st Century, Wake Forest Journal of Business and Intellectual Property Law, p. Lexis)

[\*248] In addition to the potential for economic growth, even the most ardent climate change skeptics will concede that the United States' dependence on fossil fuels has implications for national security and foreign policy. Security analysts have made the case for framing this debate in terms of "natural security," as the scarcity of natural resources will inevitably affect the United States' foreign policy calculus for years to come. n24 Despite the fact that the U.S. imports most of its oil from Canada and Latin America n25 - not the Middle East - many emerging markets are just beginning their love affair with the sticky, black hydrocarbon. n26 The corresponding increase in demand from emerging economies will continue to drive up energy prices, necessitating importation of oil from countries with less friendly dispositions toward the United States. n27 It is important to note how energy policy intersects with virtually all other aspects of governance. Not only will increased prices constrain U.S. fiscal policy and make it more expensive to project American power around the globe, they create pressures that will heavily influence American foreign policy in the coming decades, whether through resource wars or climate-induced humanitarian crises. n28 International trade and maritime policy in particular will be [\*249] greatly affected. Because "90 percent of global commerce and two thirds of all petroleum supplies travel by sea," and global energy demand will continue its inexorable rise, the Indian Ocean - already heavily used by "nuclearized" powers such as Pakistan, India, China, and Israel - will dramatically increase in strategic importance to the world's great powers. n29 The proximity of nuclear states in the Asia-Pacific region, along with increased pressures commensurate with rising energy demand, are already heightening military tensions among the major players in the region, including China and Russia in particular. n30 Geopolitical constraints will become increasingly difficult to manage as fuel prices continue to rise, and intervention will be needed to combat piracy and protect merchant shipping. n31 Make no mistake, the United States' continued dependence on fossil fuels poses significant problems for the national interest. The strategic implications are clear as U.S. foreign policy throughout entire regions is framed in the context of energy. n32

#### Expanding EOR significantly reduces emissions.

**Biello**, 4/9/**2009** (David – Associate Editor of Environment and Energy at Scientific American, Enhanced Oil Recovery: How to Make Money from Carbon Capture and Storage Today, Scientific American, p. http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=enhanced-oil-recovery)

In all of these projects, the CO2 basically scours more hydrocarbons out of the oil field. When injected into the oil reservoir, it mixes with the oil and mobilizes more of it—like turpentine cleaning paint—and then allows it to be pumped to the surface. Using carbon dioxide to churn out more fossil fuels—and permanently storing some of the CO2 in the process—might sound counterproductive to limiting climate change because those fuels, when burned, put more CO2 into the atmosphere. But it does reduce overall emissions by at least 24 percent, calculates petroleum engineer Ronald Evans, Denbury's senior vice president of reservoir engineering: every recovered barrel of oil eventually puts 0.42 metric ton of CO2 into the atmosphere, but 0.52 to 0.64 metric ton are injected underground recovering it. In fact, Kinder Morgan's Bradley estimates that enhanced oil recovery in the U.S. could reduce CO2 emissions by 4 percent, if done correctly.

#### Financial incentives for CO2 pipelines can piggy back off of existing EOR infrastructure. Connecting the source to the sink will incentivize further development of CCS technology.

**MIT Energy Initiative**, 7/23/**2010** (Role of Enhanced Oil Recovery in Accelerating the Deployment of Carbon Capture and Sequestration, p. 40-41)

Continental-Scale CO2 Pipeline Network Requirements The analyses of the scale of the CO2 -EOR opportunity that would be created by the ACES legislation would require new, continental-scale pipeline infrastructure to connect the CO2 sources to the sinks. Some participants advocated direct public intervention in the development of the necessary infrastructure and proposed a type of hybrid model for funding. The model would combine some of the lessons learned in building the transcontinental railroad system and the development of the unconventional natural gas pipeline system. Leadership was deemed essential, a characteristic that was critical to the building of the transcontinental railroad, which offers parallels in scale of the project, risk levels, and the involvement of the private markets. The development of unconventional natural gas “piggy backed” on the infrastructure built for conventional gas; the overlap of resource locations for conventional and unconventional gas resources is somewhat analogous to the current co-location of MPZs and ROZs. According to several of the participants, the exploitation of ROZs is only a matter of technology and investment. Participants discussed a hybrid of both models as a possible avenue for developing a national CO2 -EOR sequestration program. Some components of such a program would have to be built from scratch such as the measurement and verification procedures as well as the new pipelines, analogous to the ground-level development of the railroad system. The experience with the development of unconventional natural gas offers an analogy in terms of leveraging the existing EOR infrastructure and tapping into the subsurface fluid flow expertise of the oil and gas industry. These new pipelines and distribution networks could be financed through a quasi-governmental agency by the issuance of climate change bonds. Significant CO2 pipeline networks already exist in West Texas and these segments can provide the foundation for the further expansion of the network that will connect the anthropogenic sources of CO2 to the geologically well-characterized EOR oil basins, both MPZs and ROZs. At later stages, the network could be used to transport the captured CO2 into the depleted natural CO2 domes. The resulting infrastructure was described as “the Horseshoe” pipeline concept, as seen in Figure 12. The national pipeline would be constructed by filling in the gaps as shown by the dotted lines; according to the participants, the most important piece in this network would be the connection between East and West Texas. The shaded areas in Figure 12 represent the areas of large CO2 -EOR projects. Finally, it was argued that establishing the pipeline connection between the source and the sink would expand demand for captured anthropogenic CO2 and would incentivize the research needed to achieve a multifold reduction in the cost of capture. Thus, the availability of pipeline capacity could facilitate the breakthrough of the “chicken and egg” problem.

#### CO2-EOR overcomes barriers to a transition to CCS technology.

**Kemp**, 7/30/**2012** (John – Reuters market analyst, U.S. bets on producing oil with captured CO2, Reuters, p. <http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/07/30/column-kemp-oil-co-idUSL6E8IUGHM20120730>)

For policymakers, the real significance of CO2-EOR is its potential to act as a catalyst or "early action pathway" to overcome barriers to a wider roll out of CCS infrastructure. CO2 capture and storage is capital intensive and immensely costly at every stage: technology for stripping it out of the combustion exhaust; pipelines for transport; wells for injection; and an appropriate monitoring, compliance, legal and regularly framework. In practice the costs are often prohibitive. But if the captured CO2 that is a by-product of combustion can be given a value as an input into EOR, the effective costs are reduced. Crucially, there are significant scale and network economies. Once pipelines have been built to transport CO2 to EOR projects, it is much cheaper to build out the network to store additional volumes in other non-oil bearing formations.

### Who is NEORI?

ABOUT THE NATIONAL ENHANCED OIL RECOVERY INITIATIVE

The National Enhanced Oil Recovery Initiative (NEORI) was formed to help realize CO2 -EOR’s full potential as a national energy security, economic, and environmental strategy. Organized and staffed by the Center for Climate and Energy Solutions (C2ES) and the Great Plains Institute (GPI), the Initiative brought together a broad and unusual coalition of executives from the electric power, coal, ethanol, chemical, and oil and gas industries; state officials, legislators, and regulators; and environmental and labor representatives. (See Project Participant List on the NEORI website.)

NEORI was launched on July 17, 2011 in Washington, D.C., with bipartisan support from four U.S. Senators and a member of Congress. Project participants met on three occasions to define the scope and expectations of the project, provide feedback on technical matters, and provide policy guidance. They gathered in Washington, D.C., with the launch of the project on July 17, 2011; in Traverse City, MI on September 21-22; and in Houston, TX, on November 1-2. The latter two meetings included field visits to commercial EOR operations and to a CO2 capture facility

### Pipelines Key to EOR

#### Pipelines are a pre-requisite for EOR.

**MIT Energy Initiative**, 7/23/**2010** (Role of Enhanced Oil Recovery in Accelerating the Deployment of Carbon Capture and Sequestration, p. 25)

National CO2 Pipeline Network? In view of the geographical differences between the location of anthropogenic sources of CO2 emissions and the location of EOR opportunities, a national pipeline network (greatly expanding the one in West Texas) is essential to enable deployment of EOR-CCS on a large scale. Estimates of total pipeline length needed for a large-scale national system range from 66,000 to 73,000 miles.

### EOR Good – Economy

#### EOR stimulates the economy --- multiple factors

**NEORI**, February **2012** (National Enhanced Oil Recovery Initiative, Carbon Dioxide Enhanced Oil Recovery: A Critical Domestic Energy, Economic, and Environmental Opportunity, p. 9-10)

Increasing domestic oil supplies through EOR will not only improve energy security, it will reduce trade deficits, strengthen the overall health of our economy and help reduce CO2 emissions. It will also benefit local and regional economies and creates thousands of jobs. Workers will be needed across the full CO2 -EOR value chain: from building and operating new CO2 capture systems at power plants and other industrial facilities, to constructing new pipeline networks to transport CO2 , to retrofitting and giving new life to existing oil fields. For example, the Kemper Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle (IGCC) plant in Mississippi, a cutting edge demonstration plant jointly funded by the U.S. Department of Energy’s Clean Coal Power Initiative and Mississippi Power (a subsidiary of Southern Company), will create approximately 300 permanent jobs from power plant and supply chain operations. Employment during construction is expected to peak at 1,150 and average 500 jobs over a 3.5-year construction period (DOE, 2010). In another example, the Wyoming Grieve Field project, a small-scale CO2 -EOR project that has been approved for construction, will generate more than 50 construction jobs to revitalize and return an aging oil field to service. It will also add five to ten operations jobs and produce 12 to 24 million barrels of additional oil that will inject millions of dollars into Wyoming’s economy through taxes, royalties, and local purchasing (Casper Journal, 2011). Increasing CO2 -EOR also stimulates the economy more broadly. Recent estimates show that expanded CO2 -EOR could provide up to $12 trillion in economic benefits to the U.S. over the next three decades, based on the “multiplier effects” of oil production on economic activities (Carter, 2011). In fact, a report by the University of Texas Bureau of Economic Geology’s (TBEG) Gulf Coast Carbon Center quantifies the total economic activity of oil production for Texas to be 2.9 times the value of the oil produced. In other words, almost two dollars of additional economic activity is created for every dollar of oil produced. Moreover, TBEG estimates 19 jobs for every $1 million of oil produced annually (TBEG, 2004). An increase in oil production from EOR has the potential to reduce net crude oil imports by half and provide up to $210 billion in increased state and federal revenues by 2030. Under a robust policy, EOR could reduce the U.S. foreign trade deficit by $11-$15 billion dollars (2007 dollars) in 2020 and $120-$150 billion by 2030. Cumulatively, this reduction in oil imports would keep $600 billion here at home, generating additional economic activity, jobs and revenues, rather than flowing out of the U.S. economy to other countries (ARI, 2010).

### EOR Good – CO2 Emissions

#### EOR reduces emissions with next generation technology.

**NEORI**, February **2012** (National Enhanced Oil Recovery Initiative, Carbon Dioxide Enhanced Oil Recovery: A Critical Domestic Energy, Economic, and Environmental Opportunity, p. 10)

Regarding the benefits of EOR for reducing CO2 emissions, using CO2 captured from industrial sources to produce oil has the potential to help the United States reduce the CO2 intensity of the industrial and power generation sectors. Over the life of a project, for every 2.5 barrels of oil produced, it is estimated that EOR can safely prevent one metric ton of CO2 from entering the atmosphere. 1 Current CO2 use for EOR ranges between 65 million tonnes per year (Melzer, 2012) to 72 million tonnes per year (ARI, 2011). ARI states that 55 million tonnes of CO2 come from natural sources and 17 million tonnes come from anthropogenic sources. But the potential for EOR to contribute to CO2 reduction goals is great. The volume of CO2 that could be captured and sequestered from industrial facilities and power plants to support “next generation” EOR could be 20- 45 billion metric tons (ARI, 2011).This is equal to the total U.S. CO2 production from fossil fuel electricity generation for 10 to 20 years (EPA, 2011). Figure 5 illustrates the oil production potential and CO2 demand — i.e., CO2 stored through EOR — from “next generation” EOR technologies. Properly managed EOR projects have demonstrated that injecting CO2 into producing oil fields can safely store CO2 in geologic formations without leaking to groundwater resources or escaping to the atmosphere. EOR is governed by federal regulations that require the protection of underground sources of drinking water, under the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA’s) Underground Injection Control (UIC) program. Many states have obtained authority from EPA to administer the UIC program and have laws that meet or go further than EPA’s requirements. Permits issued by the EPA or states require that EOR operators manage their site in a manner that will prevent CO2 (and other formation fluids) from migrating out of the subsurface confining formation and into drinking water aquifers (Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 40 CFR §144).

### EOR Good – Spills Over to CCS

#### CO2-EOR overcomes barriers to a transition to CCS technology.

**Kemp**, 7/30/**2012** (John – Reuters market analyst, U.S. bets on producing oil with captured CO2, Reuters, p. <http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/07/30/column-kemp-oil-co-idUSL6E8IUGHM20120730>)

For policymakers, the real significance of CO2-EOR is its potential to act as a catalyst or "early action pathway" to overcome barriers to a wider roll out of CCS infrastructure. CO2 capture and storage is capital intensive and immensely costly at every stage: technology for stripping it out of the combustion exhaust; pipelines for transport; wells for injection; and an appropriate monitoring, compliance, legal and regularly framework. In practice the costs are often prohibitive. But if the captured CO2 that is a by-product of combustion can be given a value as an input into EOR, the effective costs are reduced. Crucially, there are significant scale and network economies. Once pipelines have been built to transport CO2 to EOR projects, it is much cheaper to build out the network to store additional volumes in other non-oil bearing formations.

#### Expanding EOR revitalizes the carbon capture industry.

**Gardner**, 12/11/**2011** (Timothy – Reuters correspondent, Using Oil to Reduce Carbon Emissions, The New York Times, p. http://www.nytimes.com/2011/12/12/business/global/12iht-green12.html)

Companies including Denbury Resources and Kinder Morgan have piped carbon dioxide from naturally occurring sources into aging oil fields to push out crude that traditional drilling is unable to reach. As natural sources of carbon dioxide run dry, many of these companies are looking to industrial sources. Power utilities and other coal-burning companies may find it wiser to link up with this mature industry than to plunge ahead with their own versions of carbon capture and storage. Originally, enhanced oil recovery specialists thought aging oil fields could store about 100 billion tons of carbon dioxide, or about 5 percent of what would be needed to reduce the threat of climate change. But as researchers learn more about the storage potential of old oil zones, in both China and the United States, they say much more carbon could potentially be stored in these places. If enhanced oil recovery is going to be a bridge to steep carbon reductions, “that bridge is both wider and longer than originally realized,” said Julio Friedmann, the technical program manager at the U.S.-China Clean Energy Research Center, formed in 2009 by President Barack Obama of the United States and President Hu Jintao of China. Experts say success with enhanced oil recovery could give new life to the entire field of carbon capture by enlarging the market for man-made carbon. That could contribute to the construction of a pipeline network to move the carbon to market and help the business become more efficient in shooting the natural gas underground. “Without commercial transactions, no one knows the price,” said Deborah Seligsohn, an energy specialist in Beijing with the World Resources Institute, a research group. Enhanced oil recovery “would cause the price discovery and all the other commercial relationships that would need to get developed,” she said.

#### CO2-EOR spills over to CCS infrastructure.

**Carbon Capture Journal**, 7/12/**2011** (Members of Congress support US National Enhanced Oil Recovery Initiative, p. <http://www.carboncapturejournal.com/displaynews.php?NewsID=816&PHPSESSID=fm51adk67cio1gdc0a3i2umef4>)

Reasonable policies to advance CO2-EOR could produce significant amounts of new American oil and advance the development of infrastructure needed for long-term carbon capture and storage. An estimated 35-50 billion barrels of economically recoverable oil could be produced in the United States using currently available CO2-EOR technologies and practices, or potentially more than twice the country’s proved reserves.

### AT: EOR Tanks Solvency

#### EOR reduces emissions.

**Biello**, 4/9/**2009** (David – Associate Editor of Environment and Energy at Scientific American, Enhanced Oil Recovery: How to Make Money from Carbon Capture and Storage Today, Scientific American, p. http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=enhanced-oil-recovery)

In all of these projects, the CO2 basically scours more hydrocarbons out of the oil field. When injected into the oil reservoir, it mixes with the oil and mobilizes more of it—like turpentine cleaning paint—and then allows it to be pumped to the surface. Using carbon dioxide to churn out more fossil fuels—and permanently storing some of the CO2 in the process—might sound counterproductive to limiting climate change because those fuels, when burned, put more CO2 into the atmosphere. But it does reduce overall emissions by at least 24 percent, calculates petroleum engineer Ronald Evans, Denbury's senior vice president of reservoir engineering: every recovered barrel of oil eventually puts 0.42 metric ton of CO2 into the atmosphere, but 0.52 to 0.64 metric ton are injected underground recovering it. In fact, Kinder Morgan's Bradley estimates that enhanced oil recovery in the U.S. could reduce CO2 emissions by 4 percent, if done correctly.

## Random Case

### Solvency – Financing Key

#### Financing pipelines is key to establishing infrastructure.

International Energy Agency **2008** (CO2 Capture and Storage: A Key Carbon Abatement Option, p. 115)

Financing CO2 Transport

Another important challenge to the wide-scale utilisation of CCS is the need to finance the infrastructure required to transport large volumes of CO2 from capture sites to storage sites. The nature and extent of the network of CO2 pipelines that will be needed will depend on many factors, including the distance between capture and storage sites, the costs of acquiring pipeline right-of-ways and associated permits, the cost of constructing pipelines, and the costs of operating the pipelines and complying with operations and maintenance regulations. The IEA estimates that in the first round of CCS demonstration projects, CO2 transport and storage costs are likely to be in excess of USD 20/t CO2 (IEA, 2008). The development of shared CO2 transport networks will generate efficiency benefits on a system level (ACCSEPT, 2007). But the costs and benefits of such networks will go well beyond the interests and budgets of individual CCS projects. As a result, governments may need to play a role in fostering the development of CO2 transport pipelines, e.g. by taking ownership of existing pipelines and requiring users to pay a fee and/or by subsidising the construction of pipelines. In the European Union, a partnership for CO2 transport pipelines could be modelled on the existing Trans-European Energy Networks.16 Under this programme, the EU finances electricity and gas transmission infrastructure feasibility studies that are of European interest. Projects typically cross national boundaries and have an impact on several member states. More detailed analysis is needed to identify the best ways forward for financing CO2 transport networks worldwide.

### Solvency – Pipelines Key (1AC)

#### CO2 transportation infrastructure investment reduces the barriers and spills over to the development of CCS technology.

**Bohm**, 3/4/**2010** (Mark – Climate Change Engineering Specialist with Suncor Energy, The Economics of Transportation of CO2 in Common Carrier Network Pipeline Systems, Carbon Capture Journal, p. http://www.carboncapturejournal.com/displaynews.php?NewsID=523)

Establishing a widespread CO2 transportation infrastructure requires a strategic approach that takes into account the magnitude of potential deployment scenarios for CCS with hundreds of megatonnes (Mt) of CO2 transported every year through pipeline systems. Transporting CO2 by pipeline is not a new technology; in the US almost 4,000 miles of CO2 pipeline for enhanced oil recovery (EOR) are in operation. However, the infrastructure for mass CCS could be on the scale of the current gas transmission infrastructure for Europe or North America, and will require significant investment to construct and operate. The CO2 Capture Project (a partnership of seven oil and gas majors to advance CCS) has been looking at the issues surrounding the economics of transportation of CO2 in common carrier network pipeline systems. The CCP commissioned a study to examine different approaches to infrastructure development. In the study two approaches have been evaluated. The first would see the development of a point-to-point system, the second the development of common carrier pipeline networks, including backbone pipeline systems. This study has helped our understanding of the challenges involved; shedding light on what would be the best scenario and how in practical terms CO2 infrastructure might evolve. The results of this study were presented in a paper - Assessing issues of financing a CO2 transportation pipeline infrastructure commissioned by the CCP, and completed by Environmental Resources Management (ERM). Results of the Study The study confirmed that an integrated backbone pipeline network is likely to be the most efficient long-term option. It offers the lowest average cost on a per tonne basis for operators over the life of the projects if sufficient capacity utilization is achieved relatively early in the life of the pipeline. Crucially, integrated pipelines reduce the barriers to entry and are more likely to lead to the faster development and deployment of carbon capture and storage. Particularly in situations where government money is being used to finance CO2 transportation it makes sense to pursue an integrated approach that provides equitable, open access to other large final emitters. This will reduce the barriers to entry and will encourage faster adoption of CCS. However, point-topoint pipelines offer lower costs for the first movers and do not have the same capacity utilization risk. It is clear that without government incentives for the development of optimized networks, project developers are likely to build point-to-point pipelines. Other forms of financial support may be needed which overcome commercial barriers and ensure optimized development of CO2 pipeline networks So what is the way forward? Guaranteed capacity utilization is essential for integrated backbone pipeline networks to become economically viable. Public policy is needed that provides some guarantees as to capacity utilization. Government incentives or loan guarantees are also needed to support a backbone infrastructure and encourage the development of optimized networks. Government support in the first years, when capacity is ramping up, will be essential for eventual commercial viability.

### AT: Eminent Domain

### AT: Liability

#### 1. Their evidence assumes the status quo – the plan changes the economic equation behind the cost of pipelines. Reducing pipeline cost outweighs all other factors. That’s Roddy 2012.

#### 2.

### AT: Burping DA

**Biello**, 4/9/**2009** (David – Associate Editor of Environment and Energy at Scientific American, Enhanced Oil Recovery: How to Make Money from Carbon Capture and Storage Today, Scientific American, p. http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=enhanced-oil-recovery)

The great fear commonly associated with carbon sequestration is that trapped CO2 might suddenly escape to the surface with deadly consequences, as happened in 1986 at Lake Nyos in Cameroon. That volcanic lake had naturally accumulated two million metric tons of carbon dioxide in its cold depths; one night it spontaneously vented, displacing the oxygenated air, and suffocated more than 1,000 nearby villagers. Yet in all three decades of commercial use of CO2 for EOR, there have been no dangerous leaks. CO2 from leaks and ruptured injection wells has always dispersed too quickly to pose a threat. For example, prospectors in Utah drilling for natural gas in 1936 accidentally created a CO2 geyser. It still erupts a few times a day as pressure builds but is "so unhazardous that it's a tourist attraction, not a risk," says hydrologist Sally Benson, director of the global climate and energy project at Stanford University. In fact, air concentrations of carbon dioxide have to build up to more than 10 percent to be hazardous, which is difficult to achieve, according to modeling from Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL). The reason is that CO2 belching from a volcanic lake creates conditions very different from those of the gas escaping from a wellhead or seeping into a basement, explains Julio Friedmann, leader of the carbon management program at LLNL. At Lake Nyos, an abrupt release of the CO2 allowed dangerous concentrations to pool in low-lying surrounding areas. Pressurized gas escaping from a wellhead or crack simply mixes rapidly with the atmosphere, presenting no danger, much as the use of a fire extinguisher is not hazardous. In situations where atmospheric mixing is minimal, such as for a slow leak into a basement, the problem can be eliminated by simply installing a sensor and a fan, as in apartment buildings today near natural CO2 seepages in Italy and Hungary.

### AT: Leaks

#### Japan earthquake empirically denies.

**Biello**, 4/9/**2009** (David – Associate Editor of Environment and Energy at Scientific American, Enhanced Oil Recovery: How to Make Money from Carbon Capture and Storage Today, Scientific American, p. http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=enhanced-oil-recovery)

At a demonstration project in Japan, even a magnitude 6.8 earthquake didn't shake injected CO2 loose from a deep saline aquifer; the wellheads did not so much as leak. Big earthquakes might cause leakage, but in many cases, they will not, Friedmann says.

### Earthquakes 1AC Pre-Empt

#### No risk of earthquakes or leaks --- best studies and analysis are on our side.

**Peridas**, 6/26/**2012** (George – scientist at the Natural Resources Defense Council Climate Center, CCS and Earthquakes – Anything to Worry About?, p. http://www.globalccsinstitute.com/community/blogs/authors/gperidas/2012/06/26/ccs-and-earthquakes-anything-worry-about-0)

Zoback and Gorelick however appear to have been causing undue alarm in the media. They state (p. 2) that their “principal concern is not that injection associated with CCS projects is likely to trigger large earthquakes; the problem is that even small to moderate earthquakes threaten the seal integrity of a CO2 repository”. They acknowledge that only slip on large faults can result in earthquakes large enough to cause damage to human environments, and that such faults are easily identified and avoided. No objections on that last point. The potential for slip on existing faults/fractures and seismicity can and should be taken into account during site selection. This is routinely done as part of a proper geomechanical assessment, and Federal Underground Injection Control Program regulations for geologic sequestration operations require “[i]nformation on the seismic history including the presence and depth of seismic sources and a determination that the seismicity would not interfere with containment”.1 Large seismic events can be avoided in a straightforward way through proper siting and operations. Zoback’s and Gorelick’s arguments against CCS hinge on the assertion that “[b]ecause laboratory studies show that just a few millimeters of shear displacement are capable of enhancing fracture and joint permeability, several centimeters of slip would be capable of creating a permeable hydraulic pathway that could compromise the seal integrity of the CO2 reservoir and potentially reach the near surface.” In plain English, the authors are saying that even a small earthquake can cause CO2 to escape all the way to the surface, without investigating the circumstances under which this might happen or their applicability to broad scale CCS. This creates the impression that it will happen in every case, and is a big logical leap and a gross simplification, for several reasons. First, the laboratory studies they cite were performed on granite, which is extremely unlikely to be used as a sealing layer, or “caprock” in a real-life sequestration project. Almost certainly, the caprock will be shale or another low permeability sedimentary rock. The way that a strong but brittle rock like granite deforms in response to stress is very different from the way that softer and more ductile shales and other sedimentary rocks deform, and is therefore not a good analogue.2 Second, concluding de facto that joint and fracture permeability in the caprock(s) would increase in all cases, and that a pathway would be created that would result in the migration of CO2 to the surface, is wrong. The degree to which joint and fracture permeability is increased, if at all, depends on many factors, including rock type, stress state, and in-filling materials. This is well documented in a large body of literature on shear-induced behavior of fractures and faults (if you want a flavor, take a look here3 for example). In fact, situations abound where many large faults that exhibit large slip act as seals and have no effect on permeability. Such is the case in California and Iran, where trapped oil and gas exists despite frequent large natural earthquakes. In these areas, in fact, faults themselves have acted as seals as opposed to pathways for fluid migration, and trapped hydrocarbons over geologic time. Another well-documented event is the magnitude 6.8 earthquake in Chuetsu, which did not result in any leaks in the nearby Nagaoka CO2 injection project. Despite frequent and large natural earthquakes therefore, CO2 and other fluids have remained trapped in the subsurface. Additionally, assuming that CO2 will reach the surface implies that the fault in question extends from the injection zone to the surface. As the authors themselves note, such a large fault would be easy to identify and avoid. Even if a fault allows CO2 to migrate out of the injection zone, many sites also have multiple sealing layers that impede the motion of fluids to the surface as well as multiple permeable layers that can act as secondary containers. In fact, studies show that such layered systems can help prevent fluids from reaching the surface.4 Assuming that a pathway will be created all the way to the surface is a huge leap of logic. Fluids can and do move along faults and fractures – but this does not mean that the containment “box” has been breached – fluids can simply move within the “box”, leaving the caprocks intact. In other words, jumping to the conclusion that a small induced earthquake would result in surface leakage is wrong. That’s not to say that it cannot happen, but the problem with the authors’ assertion is that they then postulate that not enough sites for sequestration can be found that avoid this scenario to meaningfully deploy CCS at scale. Although they acknowledge that certain geological settings are ideally suited to secure sequestration of CO2, such as in the case of the Sleipner project in Norway (which features a highly porous and permeable reservoir consisting of weak, poorly cemented sandstone that is laterally extensive), they then extrapolate that not enough sites like Sleipner can be found around the U.S. to house the necessary volumes of CO2 to mitigate climate change. This extrapolation is based on speculation and comes with no scientific justification. The authors do not study the potential for sites like Sleipner – i.e. with sufficient porosity and permeability to accommodate injected CO2 without giving rise to unacceptable stresses – to be found around the country. This can only be done with a rigorous geologic assessment, and there is no evidence to suggest that such sites cannot be found in sufficient numbers. Not all sequestration sites need to be slam-dunk cases with porosity and permeability like Sleipner’s in order to safely accommodate CO2. Of course – wouldn’t it be nice if things were ideal everywhere, but a wide range of geological settings can also accommodate CO2 safely without causing unacceptable seismicity risk. The regulation of maximum allowable pressure, evaluation of seismic risk, and of the conditions in which transmissive faults would threaten groundwater is central to Federal regulations under the Underground Injection Control Program. Industry and regulators should take note, however: even though smaller earthquakes caused by injection may cause no physical damage or human harm, the public may reject the idea of CO2 injection if these quakes and perceptible. Zoback and Gorelick’s assertions were met with skepticism by expert scientists. Sally Benson (Stanford professor of Energy Resources Engineering and Director of Stanford's Global Climate and Energy Project, and Lead Coordinating Author of the Underground Geological Storage Chapter in the IPCC Special Report on CCS) said “of course, you need to pick sites carefully, but finding these kinds of locations does not seem infeasible”. I think Rob Finley hit the nail on the head when he compared Zoback and Gorelick's analysis to early criticisms of the Wright brothers and the notion at the time that airplanes would never work at scale. Rob is the principal investigator of the Midwest Geological Sequestration Consortium, which is now operating a large CO2 injection project in Decatur, Illinois, and has spent considerable time and money investigating the geology of the Illinois Basin. Julio Friedmann at Lawrence Livermore National Lab points out that “[b]y 2020, we're going to have somewhere between 15 and 20 projects around the world. That will be a good time to assess what we've learned and whether [CCS] can be scaled up more.” The last in the series of international conferences on the subject attracted 1,500 people. None of them appear to have voiced the seeming impossibilities for CCS that Zoback and Gorelick describe in their “Perspective”. Should we therefore be alarmed by the prospect of CO2 injection in terms of earthquakes? My view is “no” – we should however be vigilant. Improperly conducted CCS does have the potential to cause earthquakes, due to the volumes of CO2 injected. But preventing and predicting these is within our capabilities. Avoiding the large ones is straightforward. It is worth noting that large natural earthquakes have not compromised the storage security in natural and man-made sites that trap CO2 and hydrocarbons. This does not mean, of course, that we should tolerate CCS projects that could cause earthquakes. Avoiding smaller quakes that may not cause harm but may alarm the public and local communities will require will careful site operation and regulation. And that can and must be done. Regulators and prospective injectors, do your homework.

## Off Case Answers

### No Link – Tax Credit

#### Tax credits are uncontroversial and do not trigger perceptions of spending.

**Rigby**, 1/5/**2009** (Elizabeth – Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Houston, Research Affiliate at the National Center for Children and Families at Columbia University, Tax Credits vs. Spending: Why Progressives Should Care How the Stimulus is Delivered, Huffington Post, p. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/elizabeth-rigby/tax-credits-vs-spending-w\_b\_155389.html)

Described as a move to placate wary Republicans who shudder at an ungodly price tag nearing $800 billion, Obama has indicated that nearly half of the package will take the form of tax credits to individuals and businesses. As a political strategy, this tax-cut-heavy proposal seems smart, as evidenced by Republican leader Mitch McConnell's assessment of the proposal as "the sort of thing we could have bipartisan agreement on." But, from a progressive perspective, does the use of tax credit represent a political compromise that will limit the potential for the stimulus to seed more substantial policy change? Or is this truly a policy design that everyone should embrace? To answer these questions, I identify the key differences between tax credit and direct spending policy designs. These differences illustrate what is gained and what is lost by taking a tax-focused approach, as well as the details that progressives should attend to in order to make full use of this political opportunity. Before highlighting differences, I should note that tax credits operate like spending programs in many ways. Most importantly, they must be paid for through higher taxes elsewhere or equivalent cuts in spending to make up for forgone tax revenue. For this reason, I prefer the term "tax expenditures," which better captures the (albeit indirect) spending resulting from policy. Of course we know that, despite their budgetary similarity to direct spending programs, tax expenditures remain more political popular, easier to enact, and more sustainable over time. This is the result of a set of key differences, described below. #1: Tax Expenditures have Hidden Costs As described by Christopher Howard in his book, The Hidden Welfare State, the forgone taxes from tax expenditures do not show up in the normal government budgeting and policy review process. As a result, tax expenditures can provide governmental benefits without increasing the measure of government spending and by (ironically) seeming to reduce the total size of government. Not surprisingly, this slight of hand is popular with policymakers from both political parties who enjoy distributing benefits with little attention to their costs, making them much easier to enact and protecting the benefits from later cuts. #2: Tax Expenditures have Hidden Beneficiaries Since tax expenditures are distributed through the tax system, citizens can claim a benefit without needing to apply for or enroll in a government program. As a result, these benefits typically come with little stigma of the sort attached to Food Stamp or unemployment insurance receipt. This feature explains the paradox of wealthy conservatives who express disdain for those accepting welfare while happily claiming their mortgage and employer health insurance tax deductions each year. And it also helps explain why calls to cut government largess rarely focus on eliminating benefits delivered through the tax system and focus instead on cuts to programs that can be more easily attacked as handouts for the undeserving. #3: Tax Expenditures Bypass the Appropriations Process Unlike spending programs which must be first authorized and then go through appropriations to receive actual funding, tax expenditures are created and funded by the same committee in each chamber of Congress. This cuts in half the number of veto points (times that an organized opposition can kill a proposed bill) and makes tax expenditures easier to pass. Further, the absence of an annual appropriations requirement produces a virtual entitlement program in which all eligible tax filers who claim the credit receive the benefit without the waiting lists or capped spending seen in most spending programs. And finally, by avoiding the appropriations stage, tax expenditure proposals pass through the Congressional process avoiding most of the earmarking that produces the "legislative pork" abhorred by most Americans. Since tax expenditures are typically legislated by formula rather than earmark, they remain "cleaner" with less waste. #4: Tax Expenditures are Automatic Policy Tools As defined by Lester Salamon in his tome, The Tools of Government, automatic policy tools use an existing administrative structure rather than requiring a new administrative agency or infrastructure. As a result, a new tax expenditure policy can more quickly reach their designated target -- in this case the American economy. In fact, Obama's advisors have expressed a desire to get the stimulus into Americans' pockets quickly and noted a potential strategy in which they will make the individual-level credit retroactive to the 2008 tax year and adjust withholding formulas so that our paychecks will start reflecting the decrease in payroll taxes right away. That quick turnout-around is not possible for a new spending program that requires a more complex implementation structure. #5: Tax Expenditures are Indirect Policy Tools Again as defined by Salamon, indirect policy tools are characterized by the separation between the entity authorizing and financing the tax expenditure (in this case the federal government) and the entity that will actually carry out the services the expenditures provide. As a result, government has little control over how, when, and where government funds are spent. This is seen as an advantage by those wary of government intervention and trusting of the market, but as a disadvantage by those wanting to target the stimulus package to particular ends (such as spending rather than saving or to food assistance versus more fungible aid). In the longer term, reliance on indirect policy tools can also decrease public support for governmental solutions to social problems. This effect is illustrated in Jacob Hacker's The Divided Welfare State, which illustrates how our nation's heavy reliance on private pension and health benefits creates incentives for private actors to block significant public expansions in these areas. He notes how indirect support in the form of tax expenditures (and subsidies) from the government to private businesses and actors can facilitate the organization and advocacy of these groups who stand in the way of later public service expansion. Implications for the Stimulus and Beyond Considering these features, it is likely that Obama's use of tax expenditures for nearly half of the stimulus package is likely to ease enactment of the program by making bipartisan agreement easier due to the hidden costs (#1), the potential for quick and efficient implementation due to the automatic nature of program (#4), the lack of government administration (#5), and the ability to enact a tax expenditure package without opening up the door to earmarks and pork that would raise the overall price tag (#3). In essence, this is as "small" as "big government" can be. As a result, the part of the stimulus delivered this way is likely to be less controversial and more efficiently administered. Yet, these key differences between tax expenditures and spending programs highlight two other factors of importance to those concerned about progressive policy priorities. First, the use of tax expenditures makes the distributional consequences of the policy (i.e. who gets what) all the more important since the hidden nature of the costs (#1) and beneficiaries (#2), as well as lack of annual appropriation requirements (#3) will likely allow for any benefits to be sustained over time unlike many welfare, health, and social service programs that are being cut as we speak. This creates a real possibility for policy benefiting low-income and middle-class Americans; but, the degree to which the opportunity is seized depends on the details of the tax expenditures package (rather than the use of tax expenditures themselves). And secondly, the pairing of tax expenditures with spending programs can overcome most progressive concerns of the tax expenditure approach -- as long as the spending is really done right! For example, although the indirect nature of a tax-focused approach (#5) will dilute the governmental investment throughout our (still) large economy, the other half of the stimulus package comprised of direct spending programs can focus on those areas of aid and investment that we do not want the market alone to determine. For example, investments in already established spending programs that provide unemployment insurance, food stamps, and health care to those in financial crisis can assure that basic needs are met in ways that the more indirect nature of the tax expenditures just can not. Similarly, since even successful tax expenditures are rarely perceived as governmental assistance, it is the spending programs in the stimulus that will determine public perceptions regarding the capability of government to address a crisis and put us back on the right track. The bureaucratic bungling of a billion dollar package could damn our hopes of large-scale reform for decades, while a careful and competent set of spending priorities enacted without waste and corruption could help rebuild support for public programs that will pay dividends later on. The use of tax expenditures to distribute nearly half of the aid, can actually make it easier for the federal government to spend enough money to stimulate our economy while also cutting in half the size of spending programs that must be carefully administered devoid of waste, fraud, and abuse that would limit later efforts to build on the initial investment.

### States Counterplan 2AC

#### Uncertainty undermines financing.

**Nordhaus and Pitlick 2009** (Robert – member of Van Ness Feldman, P.C., adjunct faculty at George Washington University Law School, former General Counsel of the Department of Energy and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, and Emily – Associate at Van Ness Feldman, Carbon Dioxide Pipeline Regulation, Energy Law Journal, p. Lexis)

In addition, existing law governing access and rate regulation of CO<2> pipelines is unclear at best. Greater certainty as to the extent of that regulation will help facilitate project financing. In order to obtain financing project developers (and their debt and equity investors) need to know what regulatory requirements-if any-will apply to the pipeline during its operational phase, so they evaluate potential regulatory risks. n115 Moreover, if Congress is asked to grant federal siting and eminent domain authority to such pipelines, it is likely to impose some form of "common carrier" requirements, such as nondiscriminatory access and rate regulation-among other reasons, to avoid a multiplicity of small high unit-cost facilities.

### Obama Good 2AC – Clean Coal Turn

#### Plan is perceived as a clean coal initiative.

**Robinson**, 6/5/**2009** (Eugene – Op-Ed Columnist for the Washington Post, Questions about Clean Coal and Carbon Capture and Storage, Washington Post, p. http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/06/04/AR2009060402991.html)

I mean that literally. The plan is to meet ambitious targets for limiting emissions of carbon dioxide and other "greenhouse" gases through development and widespread use of an unproven technology known as -- prepare for your eyes to glaze over -- carbon capture and storage. That clunky phrase has a simple meaning: Siphon off the carbon dioxide from the smokestacks of power plants, before the stuff has a chance to warm the atmosphere, and pump it deep underground where it can be entombed forever. Theoretically. This idea is fundamental to the "clean coal" initiative that Obama and many in Congress tout so enthusiastically. About half the electricity consumed in this country is produced in coal-fired power plants -- which is not surprising, given that the supply is so abundant that the United States has been called "the Saudi Arabia of coal."

#### Clean coal is key to multiple swing states.

**The Washington Times**, 3/5/**2012** (Coal heats up as campaign issue for Obama, p. http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2012/mar/5/coal-heats-up-as-campaign-issue-for-obama/?page=all)

The top coal-dependent states include eight 2012 battlegrounds or must-win states for Mr. Obama’s re-election campaign: Colorado, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Missouri, Ohio, New Mexico and Wisconsin. In addition, Pennsylvania, a big coal-producing state and another key swing state, depends on coal for 48 percent of its electricity needs. Rhetorical shift As a former senator from Illinois, where coal accounts for 47 percent of the electricity supply, Mr. Obama has been a proponent of the coal industry and a strong supporter of clean-coal technologies. Even as Mr. Obama has embraced the idea that burning fossil fuels threatens major climate change and has backed efforts to reduce global warming, he had not supported a ban on new coal development. Instead, he backed policies that discouraged the further use of inefficient facilities while encouraging plants to be retrofitted with coal-capture and sequestration technology. In the first three years of his presidency, Mr. Obama consistently included coal whenever speaking about the need to harness all of America’s multiple energy resources. But as environmental regulations have ramped up against the coal industry this year, the president has not mentioned coal in remarks or speeches. In some cases, the shift is stark. In 2010, he touted the U.S. as the “Saudi Arabia of coal.” In mid-January, he altered the statement to say the country is the “Saudi Arabia of natural gas.” He also omitted the word “coal” from his State of the Union address for the first time this year. Most recently, during a speech devoted to energy policy Thursday in New Hampshire, Mr. Obama advocated “an all-of-the-above strategy that develops every single source of American energy,” but he made no mention of coal. The White House did not respond to an inquiry about whether the omission of coal and clean-coal technology in recent speeches marks a policy shift. Green opposition Coal industry leaders closely watching the election-year energy debate have suspicions about the silence and worry that Mr. Obama has dropped his support for cleaner coal in response to pressure from environmentalists who call the very idea of “clean coal” a myth.

### Obama Good 2AC – Jobs

#### CO2 pipeline construction generates jobs.

Midwestern Governors Association **2009** (Midwestern Governors’ Carbon Capture and Storage Task Force Recommends Projects for Priority State and Federal Support, p. <http://www.midwesterngovernors.org/CCS/Projects_Recommendation.pdf>)

Through EOR, the Midwest can use CO2 emissions from a range of industrial sources— including ethanol production, natural gas processing, coal and biomass-based energy and chemicals production, fertilizer production and the manufacture of industrial commodities like cement and steel—into a domestic energy security solution that produces more domestic oil, while reducing total CO2 emissions and creating high-paying jobs. Accelerated commercial deployment of EOR is crucial to Midwestern leadership in a future CCS industry. The oil industry can help finance the build-out of a needed CO2 pipeline infrastructure and accelerate the development of a CCS industry to serve Midwestern coal, natural gas, utility, biofuels and other industries for decades to come. Once developed and in place for CO2-EOR, a commercial CCS infrastructure of CO2 capture, compression and pipeline transport can enable long-term storage of industrial CO2 in geologic formations other than oil and gas reservoirs, including deep saline formations. At a time when Midwestern states grapple with the fiscal aftermath of the worst recession since the Great Depression and seek to retool and revitalize the region’s traditional industrial base, CO2-EOR offers a range of important benefits: increase domestic petroleum production from the existing environmental footprint of depleted Midwestern oil fields, without incurring risks associated with new drilling in ever more challenging circumstances; enhance national security by reducing dangerous dependence on oil from unstable and/or hostile regimes; reduce our trade and current account deficits by keeping oil expenditures at home and at work revitalizing America’s heartland; attract private sector investment and new jobs to the Midwest; enable and accelerate commercial deployment of a regional CCS industry to the benefit of many established Midwestern industry sectors; and demonstrate Midwestern leadership in CCS-based carbon reductions in the absence of national agreement on broader federal climate policy.

#### Jobs key to the election.

**Johnson**, 2/17/**2012** (Fawn – correspondent for the National Journal, Infrastructure Becomes Campaign Fodder, Transportation Experts Blog at the National Journal, p. http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2012/02/infrastructure-becomes-campaig.php)

If you want proof that President Obama is distancing himself as far from Congress as he can, look no further than his proposed infrastructure budget. The White House proposed $476 billion over six years for surface transportation in the fiscal 2013 budget, which is at least $200 billion more than House Republicans are proposing. It's also at least $150 billion more than current infrastructure spending levels. Obama is aiming high, even though he knows he'll probably get much less. Infrastructure means jobs, and "jobs" are the name of the game for his reelection. It's an added bonus that infrastructure has been in the news, which gives politicians of all stripes the opportunity to exploit it for reelection purposes. Both the House and the Senate are attempting (and so far not succeeding) to pass surface transportation bills. Obama ideally wants to increase federal infrastructure investment, but he has also praised the Senate for its more modest bill that simply maintains the current spending levels over two years. Leaders say it could take a few weeks to get that measure completed.

### Ext – Plan = Clean Coal

#### Plan will be perceived as a clean coal initiative.

**Koch**, 3/16/**2010** (Wendy, Clean Coal? Obama funds research to capture carbon, USA Today, p. http://content.usatoday.com/communities/greenhouse/post/2010/03/clean-coal-energy-department-spends-154-million-on-texas-project-to-capture-coals-carbon/1#.UBwbDLRYt2A)

 Can coal really be clean? Environmentalists may be skeptical, but President Obama is moving ahead with efforts to create non-polluting coal. On Tuesday, the Department of Energy announced that it will give up to $154 million to NRG Energy, a Texas-based company, to create a facility that will capture coal's carbon and store it underground, thereby reducing its greenhouse gas emissions. It's one of several such federally funded coal projects. "Advancing our carbon capture and storage technology will create new jobs in America and reduce our carbon pollution output," Energy Secretary Steven Chu, who won the 1997 Nobel Prize for physics, said in a statement. In his State of the Union address, Obama called for a diverse mix of clean energy sources, including -- to the dismay of many environmentalists -- nuclear power plants and "clean coal technologies."

### Ext – War on Coal Internal

#### The perception of a war on coal will cost Obama critical votes in swing states.

Wall Street Journal, 5/11/**2012** (Trouble in Coal Country for Obama, p. http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304543904577396792995700910.html)

If Mr. Obama can't sustain those margins this year, he will have to draw additional votes from other parts of Ohio and Virginia. It won't help if the union sits out the election. Mr. Roberts says his members won't work against the president, but already his painting Mr. Obama as a coal killer has made its way into an anti-Obama radio advertisement produced by the conservative group American Crossroads. Mr. Obama isn't expected to contest West Virginia, which didn't back him in 2008. Still, the state has economic and cultural similarities to its politically competitive neighbors. In several of its coal counties, the federal inmate beat Mr. Obama outright. "A lot of folks here have real frustration with this administration's stance on coal and energy," said Larry Puccio, the Democratic Party chairman in West Virginia, explaining Tuesday's election results. "They are frustrated and they are upset, and they wanted to send Obama a message." Mr. Obama's campaign says it will get support from a number of labor leaders, such as Ed Good, president of the Upper Ohio Valley Central Labor Council. Mr. Good worked as an electrician at a coal-fired power plant before taking a full-time post at the union. He said he is worried that coal-plant operators, unwilling to spend money to meet the Obama administration's new rules, are smearing the president and hurting his standing among workers. "There's this perception that the president has this war on coal. Many of us, we hear that daily. But that's simply not the case,'' he said. Coal-mine operators have ramped up their campaign donations. According to the Center for Responsive Politics, coal companies and their employees have given more money so far in the current election cycle than in any election since 1990 besides 2010, adjusted for inflation. All but 13% has gone to Republicans. The National Mining Association, an industry group, has been focusing on supporting candidates in battleground states with heavy coal production or use, including Virginia, Ohio, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin.

### Ext – Coal Voters Key

#### Coal voters are key to Obama’s reelection.

**Politico**, 5/21/**2012** (Republicans look to bury Obama on coal issues, p. http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0512/76597.html)

Now Republicans hope Mitt Romney can squeeze an electoral diamond out of coal country in battleground states such as Ohio, Virginia and Pennsylvania. The GOP has stoked the fires by accusing Obama’s Environmental Protection Agency of making it more difficult to mine or burn coal, and Republicans made hay when a “clean coal” section quietly turned up on the president’s campaign website after the West Virginia drubbing. During Vice President Joe Biden’s visit to Ohio last week, Republicans made sure coal turned up seemingly everywhere in protests, GOP email blasts, Web videos and even a chance restaurant encounter with a Romney campaign flack. This isn’t a new playbook for Republicans: A similar strategy in 2010 torpedoed more than two dozen Hill lawmakers who had voted for the cap-and-trade climate bill, helping flip control of the House to the GOP. And coal country stretches across states that are crucial to Obama’s hopes for reelection. One of the fallen Democrats from 2010, former 14-term Virginia Rep. Rick Boucher, said the president’s campaign team has reason to worry about how coal-minded voters will react. “I think it is a perilous issue politically,” Boucher said, adding that Obama needs to present a “positive” response to concerns about lost mining jobs and rising energy costs resulting from EPA’s actions. “There is real concern in our coal-producing communities. The concern is well founded.” Boucher said Obama is no enemy of coal and, in fact, championed policies that would have helped fund a new generation of carbon-capturing “clean coal” power plants. Boucher played a big role in spreading a similar message to voters in 2008. The Obama camp also delights in pointing out Romney’s own vulnerabilities on the issue — for example, a 2003 speech in which he said an aging coal-burning plant in Massachusetts “kills people.” But the GOP is doing all it can to make the “war on coal” message stick against Obama.

#### Obama’s war on coal will cost him several pivotal swing states.

**Montopoli**, 7/16/**2012** (Brian – senior political report for CBS News, Has Obama declared a “war on coal?”, CBS News, p. http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-503544\_162-57472207-503544/has-obama-declared-a-war-on-coal/)

Can Mitt Romney win Ohio by convincing voters in this economically-depressed Appalachian town and those like it that President Obama has declared a "war on coal?" That's the message coming from Romney's Ohio campaign manager, Scott Jennings, who argued in an interview that Mr. Obama's "hostility to domestic oil production" - particularly when it comes to coal - will help put Romney over the top in this pivotal swing state. Mr. Obama is holding a campaign event in Cincinnati on Monday. Jennings pointed to the fact that six coal-burning power plants in Ohio - three in or around Cleveland and one each near Toledo, Dayton and Cincinnati - are slated to close or have closed, taking hundreds of jobs and much-needed tax revenue with them. Republicans and many in the coal industry attribute the closures in large part to Environmental Protection Agency regulations mandating reduced mercury and other emissions. Jennings said the losses will resonate across a state where the Ohio Coal Association, citing unnamed studies, says there are up to 11 "spin-off" jobs tied to each of the more than 3,000 jobs in the state in the coal industry. "The energy policies don't just affect a guy that's a coal miner," he said. The notion that Mr. Obama has declared "war on coal," as his detractors put it, could have ramifications beyond Ohio. Anger toward the Obama administration is boiling over in coal mining areas of West Virginia like Mingo County, where some residents blame the president for mine and plant closures and lost jobs - an apparent factor in the strong showing by a convicted felon against the president in the Democratic primary early this year. (Democratic West Virginia Sen. Joe Manchin has aggressively distanced himself from the president and his policies on coal.) And while Mr. Obama has little chance of taking West Virginia regardless of his position on coal, the industry is also significant in nearby Pennsylvania, where the president holds a single-digit lead in recent polls, as well as the crucial swing state of Virginia.

#### Clean coal attacks will hurt swing states like Ohio.

**Foster**, 6/15/**2012** (Joanna – freelance science journalist and regular contributor at the Energy and Environment blog at the New York Times, Obama’s ‘War on Coal’ Drives GOP to Take Up Arms, Take Part, p. http://www.takepart.com/article/2012/06/15/obamas-war-coal-drives-gop-take-arms)

But for Inhofe and like-minded Republicans, the new regulations are yet another example of EPA overreach, and President Obama's ongoing "war on coal." Back in 2008, Obama touted clean coal technologies as key to American energy independence, but since then it's hardly been a talking point. But with the election seeming to hinge on a few key swing states like Ohio, which is deep in coal country, Obama's commitment to clean coal has re-emerged on his campaign website as one of the seven pillars of his energy policy, alongside nuclear, oil, natural gas, biofuels, wind and solar.

### Ext – Coal K2 Voters

#### Clean coal resonates with voters.

**Politico**, 5/21/**2012** (Republicans look to bury Obama on coal issues, p. http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0512/76597\_Page2.html#ixzz22VjW6UIb)

Now, Boucher said, the administration would be wise to continue pushing for clean-coal funding, and to reconsider the EPA’s limits on coal plants’ mercury emissions to make sure companies can meet the standards using existing technology. The pro-coal barrage comes during a discouraging time for an energy source that humans have used for thousands of years. Coal has been losing market share to natural gas for electricity generation, and environmentalists have waged a campaign in the past decade to shut down coal-burning plants and prevent new ones from being built. “I’m surprised to see coal prominently featured in these early political ads,” said Sierra Club lobbyist Melinda Pierce. “I think they see this could be make or break for coal in this election.” Still, Pierce said she thinks Obama’s embrace of clean energy will resonate with more voters than the GOP’s embrace of old technologies like coal and incandescent light bulbs. “Our view is that the American electorate is much more forward thinking,” she said. “We’ve learned they truly do want all-of-the-above, but that all-of-the-above focuses on a clean energy future.”

### Obama Good – AT: Romney Turns Case

#### Romney won’t rollback EPA regs --- Congress checks.

**Politico**, 5/7/**2012** (Mitt Romney’s EPA would likely look familiar, p. http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0512/76022.html)

But what really happens at Romney’s Environmental Protection Agency? Romney may talk a big game, but the reality is he’ll face significant roadblocks in Congress and the courts that may make wholesale change difficult. Moving new environmental legislation — particularly to weaken current laws — would prove difficult at best in such a divided Congress, which struggles to coalesce on nearly anything. And the courts — tasked with interpreting the environmental legislation that is often deliberately vague, complicated and designed to rest on scientific information — can often order the EPA to take action or revise legislation.

### Obama Good Agenda 2AC

#### CCS is a bipartisan issue.

**DiPeso**, 4/8/**2011** (Jim – policy director for Republicans for Environmental Protection, The Devil in a Bipartisan Carbon Bill Details, The Daily Green, p. http://www.thedailygreen.com/environmental-news/blogs/republican/bipartisan-carbon-capture-bill)

An April Fool's joke, right? Actually, no. Senators Jay Rockefeller (D-West Virginia), Lisa Murkowski (R-Alaska), and John Barrasso (R-Wyoming) are three senators backing legislation to squelch the Environmental Protection Agency's regulatory authority over greenhouse gas emissions, temporarily in Rocky's case, permanently in the case of the other two. They've teamed up with Senate Energy Committee Chairman Jeff Bingaman (D-New Mexico) to sponsor a bill that would facilitate large-scale carbon sequestration demonstration projects. Sequestration is only one piece of the very large jigsaw puzzle that will have to be assembled for tamping down carbon pollution. There's only one way to find out, however, whether capturing and burying large quantities of carbon dioxide from coal plants would work in the real world - try it out, at scale, in a demonstration program that meets federal standards for protecting drinking water supplies, monitoring for leaks, fixing leaks, and putting up enough financial guarantees to ensure that sequestration site owners don't make like dodgy hardrock mining outfits and walk away from failing CO2 garbage cans, leaving a mess for the taxpayers to clean up. The bill would set up such a demonstration program, which follows the recommendation of a 2007 MIT report that assessed the future of coal. MIT's conclusion: coal is cheap and abundant, it will be used because it is cheap and abundant, carbon dioxide emissions would more than double under a business-as-usual scenario, so the only way to head off an extremely dangerous gamble with climate stability would be capturing and storing CO2 underground forever. Before gigatons of CO2 could be captured and stored, the technology must be demonstrated, at large enough scales to tell the technical experts and the politicians what works and what doesn't. So, it's good to have Republicans and Democrats coming together to push a bill that would create a regulatory framework for a large-scale demonstration program. Yet the legislation begs a very large question that was spotlighted clearly in MIT's report. Capturing and storing carbon dioxide would cost money - an estimated $30 per metric ton if you include the full range of capture, pressurization, transport, and storage costs. MIT says the costs might be higher or lower, depending on how the technology develops, but it certainly wouldn't be free.

#### Tax credits are uncontroversial and do not trigger perceptions of spending.

**Rigby**, 1/5/**2009** (Elizabeth – Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Houston, Research Affiliate at the National Center for Children and Families at Columbia University, Tax Credits vs. Spending: Why Progressives Should Care How the Stimulus is Delivered, Huffington Post, p. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/elizabeth-rigby/tax-credits-vs-spending-w\_b\_155389.html)

Described as a move to placate wary Republicans who shudder at an ungodly price tag nearing $800 billion, Obama has indicated that nearly half of the package will take the form of tax credits to individuals and businesses. As a political strategy, this tax-cut-heavy proposal seems smart, as evidenced by Republican leader Mitch McConnell's assessment of the proposal as "the sort of thing we could have bipartisan agreement on." But, from a progressive perspective, does the use of tax credit represent a political compromise that will limit the potential for the stimulus to seed more substantial policy change? Or is this truly a policy design that everyone should embrace? To answer these questions, I identify the key differences between tax credit and direct spending policy designs. These differences illustrate what is gained and what is lost by taking a tax-focused approach, as well as the details that progressives should attend to in order to make full use of this political opportunity. Before highlighting differences, I should note that tax credits operate like spending programs in many ways. Most importantly, they must be paid for through higher taxes elsewhere or equivalent cuts in spending to make up for forgone tax revenue. For this reason, I prefer the term "tax expenditures," which better captures the (albeit indirect) spending resulting from policy. Of course we know that, despite their budgetary similarity to direct spending programs, tax expenditures remain more political popular, easier to enact, and more sustainable over time. This is the result of a set of key differences, described below. #1: Tax Expenditures have Hidden Costs As described by Christopher Howard in his book, The Hidden Welfare State, the forgone taxes from tax expenditures do not show up in the normal government budgeting and policy review process. As a result, tax expenditures can provide governmental benefits without increasing the measure of government spending and by (ironically) seeming to reduce the total size of government. Not surprisingly, this slight of hand is popular with policymakers from both political parties who enjoy distributing benefits with little attention to their costs, making them much easier to enact and protecting the benefits from later cuts. #2: Tax Expenditures have Hidden Beneficiaries Since tax expenditures are distributed through the tax system, citizens can claim a benefit without needing to apply for or enroll in a government program. As a result, these benefits typically come with little stigma of the sort attached to Food Stamp or unemployment insurance receipt. This feature explains the paradox of wealthy conservatives who express disdain for those accepting welfare while happily claiming their mortgage and employer health insurance tax deductions each year. And it also helps explain why calls to cut government largess rarely focus on eliminating benefits delivered through the tax system and focus instead on cuts to programs that can be more easily attacked as handouts for the undeserving. #3: Tax Expenditures Bypass the Appropriations Process Unlike spending programs which must be first authorized and then go through appropriations to receive actual funding, tax expenditures are created and funded by the same committee in each chamber of Congress. This cuts in half the number of veto points (times that an organized opposition can kill a proposed bill) and makes tax expenditures easier to pass. Further, the absence of an annual appropriations requirement produces a virtual entitlement program in which all eligible tax filers who claim the credit receive the benefit without the waiting lists or capped spending seen in most spending programs. And finally, by avoiding the appropriations stage, tax expenditure proposals pass through the Congressional process avoiding most of the earmarking that produces the "legislative pork" abhorred by most Americans. Since tax expenditures are typically legislated by formula rather than earmark, they remain "cleaner" with less waste. #4: Tax Expenditures are Automatic Policy Tools As defined by Lester Salamon in his tome, The Tools of Government, automatic policy tools use an existing administrative structure rather than requiring a new administrative agency or infrastructure. As a result, a new tax expenditure policy can more quickly reach their designated target -- in this case the American economy. In fact, Obama's advisors have expressed a desire to get the stimulus into Americans' pockets quickly and noted a potential strategy in which they will make the individual-level credit retroactive to the 2008 tax year and adjust withholding formulas so that our paychecks will start reflecting the decrease in payroll taxes right away. That quick turnout-around is not possible for a new spending program that requires a more complex implementation structure. #5: Tax Expenditures are Indirect Policy Tools Again as defined by Salamon, indirect policy tools are characterized by the separation between the entity authorizing and financing the tax expenditure (in this case the federal government) and the entity that will actually carry out the services the expenditures provide. As a result, government has little control over how, when, and where government funds are spent. This is seen as an advantage by those wary of government intervention and trusting of the market, but as a disadvantage by those wanting to target the stimulus package to particular ends (such as spending rather than saving or to food assistance versus more fungible aid). In the longer term, reliance on indirect policy tools can also decrease public support for governmental solutions to social problems. This effect is illustrated in Jacob Hacker's The Divided Welfare State, which illustrates how our nation's heavy reliance on private pension and health benefits creates incentives for private actors to block significant public expansions in these areas. He notes how indirect support in the form of tax expenditures (and subsidies) from the government to private businesses and actors can facilitate the organization and advocacy of these groups who stand in the way of later public service expansion. Implications for the Stimulus and Beyond Considering these features, it is likely that Obama's use of tax expenditures for nearly half of the stimulus package is likely to ease enactment of the program by making bipartisan agreement easier due to the hidden costs (#1), the potential for quick and efficient implementation due to the automatic nature of program (#4), the lack of government administration (#5), and the ability to enact a tax expenditure package without opening up the door to earmarks and pork that would raise the overall price tag (#3). In essence, this is as "small" as "big government" can be. As a result, the part of the stimulus delivered this way is likely to be less controversial and more efficiently administered. Yet, these key differences between tax expenditures and spending programs highlight two other factors of importance to those concerned about progressive policy priorities. First, the use of tax expenditures makes the distributional consequences of the policy (i.e. who gets what) all the more important since the hidden nature of the costs (#1) and beneficiaries (#2), as well as lack of annual appropriation requirements (#3) will likely allow for any benefits to be sustained over time unlike many welfare, health, and social service programs that are being cut as we speak. This creates a real possibility for policy benefiting low-income and middle-class Americans; but, the degree to which the opportunity is seized depends on the details of the tax expenditures package (rather than the use of tax expenditures themselves). And secondly, the pairing of tax expenditures with spending programs can overcome most progressive concerns of the tax expenditure approach -- as long as the spending is really done right! For example, although the indirect nature of a tax-focused approach (#5) will dilute the governmental investment throughout our (still) large economy, the other half of the stimulus package comprised of direct spending programs can focus on those areas of aid and investment that we do not want the market alone to determine. For example, investments in already established spending programs that provide unemployment insurance, food stamps, and health care to those in financial crisis can assure that basic needs are met in ways that the more indirect nature of the tax expenditures just can not. Similarly, since even successful tax expenditures are rarely perceived as governmental assistance, it is the spending programs in the stimulus that will determine public perceptions regarding the capability of government to address a crisis and put us back on the right track. The bureaucratic bungling of a billion dollar package could damn our hopes of large-scale reform for decades, while a careful and competent set of spending priorities enacted without waste and corruption could help rebuild support for public programs that will pay dividends later on. The use of tax expenditures to distribute nearly half of the aid, can actually make it easier for the federal government to spend enough money to stimulate our economy while also cutting in half the size of spending programs that must be carefully administered devoid of waste, fraud, and abuse that would limit later efforts to build on the initial investment.

### Ext – EOR Popular

#### Broad support for CO2-EOR expansion.

**Carbon Capture Journal**, 7/12/**2011** (Members of Congress support US National Enhanced Oil Recovery Initiative, p. <http://www.carboncapturejournal.com/displaynews.php?NewsID=816&PHPSESSID=fm51adk67cio1gdc0a3i2umef4>)

Senator Kent Conrad (D-ND), Senator John Hoeven (R-ND), and Congressman Mike Conaway (R-TX) were on hand to help kick off the National Enhanced Oil Recovery Initiative (EOR Initiative). Senator John Barrasso (R-WY) and Senator Dick Lugar (R-IN) offered written statements in support of the initiative. The EOR Initiative includes executives from oil and gas, electric power, ethanol, pipeline and other industry sectors; state officials; technical experts; and environmental advocates. The group will develop recommendations for federal and state policymakers on how to ramp up CO2-EOR to improve U.S. energy security, create economic opportunities, support high-paying jobs, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The slate of recommendations is expected to be released in early 2012. "We know where the oil is, we just need the CO2 to help produce it,” said Robert Mannes, President and CEO of Michigan-based Core Energy, LLC. “We are the only company engaged in commercial CO2-EOR in the Great Lakes Region, and we have a limited amount of CO2. With additional supplies of sufficient volumes of CO2 we could produce a significant amount of oil, providing much needed jobs and revenue to local economies.” The EOR Initiative will marshal support from diverse constituencies for accelerated nationwide expansion of CO2-EOR projects. Commercially proven, safe, and environmentally sound, CO2-EOR stands out as a compelling and largely unheralded example of American private sector technological innovation that can support a wide range of urgent national priorities. “Carbon capture and sequestration technology combined with enhanced oil recovery addresses our growing demand for energy, the need for sound environmental policy, and provides the kind of economic and energy security that can only come from increased domestic production,” said Texas State Rep. Myra Crownover. “I look forward to working with the other members of this initiative on improving and expanding opportunities for EOR production throughout the United States.” Reasonable policies to advance CO2-EOR could produce significant amounts of new American oil and advance the development of infrastructure needed for long-term carbon capture and storage. An estimated 35-50 billion barrels of economically recoverable oil could be produced in the United States using currently available CO2-EOR technologies and practices, or potentially more than twice the country’s proved reserves. “The fiscal struggles facing federal and state governments combined with a challenging political climate demand new ideas for U.S. energy policy,” said Eileen Claussen, President of the Pew Center on Global Climate Change. “The diverse interests represented in this group offer a unique opportunity to secure broad support for sensible policies that increase domestic oil supply and limit emissions – a win for our nation’s economy, security, and the climate.”
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