# \*\*\*GN KEYSTONE NEG\*\*\*

### Notes

Other materials for the warming DA can be found in the original Keystone Neg.

## \*\*CASE\*\*

### A/T “Oil Export Inevitable (China)”\*

#### Canada can’t take the oil anywhere else- no Keystone means no tar sands, public opposition to other pipelines ensures

Shope 7/20/2012 (Elizabeth, staff at the Natural Resources Defense Council, degree in Environmental Science and Public Policy from Harvard, Scientists to State Department: Climate Change Must Be Considered in New Keystone XL Tar Sands Pipeline Review, http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/eshope/scientists\_to\_state\_department.html)

Some say that tar sands would just go to Canada’s two coasts for export if Keystone XL is not built. But Canadians don’t want tar sands pipelines and these options are looking less likely than ever. Opposition to building or expanding tar sands pipelines such as Enbridge’s Northern Gateway Pipeline to Northern British Columbia, Kinder Morgan’s Trans Mountain Pipeline to Vancouver, and Enbridge’s Trailbreaker Pipeline to Portland, Maine has continued to grow. Northern Gateway opposition has grown to the point that analysts in Canada after a scathing report from the National Transportation Safety Board on the massive and costly spill of tar sands oil into Michigan’s Kalamazoo River are calling the project dead. In fact, next week, for the 2-year anniversary of this million gallon Michigan tar sands spill, there will be approximately two dozen actions around North America of people opposing tar sands pipelines in their communities.¶ If Canada can’t send tar sands to the Gulf Coast via Keystone XL, there is not a sure and certain way for it to get to market otherwise – meaning that Keystone XL would certainly have an impact on how much tar sands it made sense for industry to extract, even in the short to medium term.

#### Other pipelines through Canada are dead- Northern Gate proves

Vancouver Sun 7/13/2012 (U.S. report sounds death knell for pipeline, http://www.vancouversun.com/news/report%20sounds%20death%20knell%20pipeline/6928443/story.html)

If Enbridge has not yet got the message, it needs to be told: Its proposal to build the Northern Gateway pipeline through B.C. is dead.¶ The company, in the best interests of its shareholders, should withdraw its proposal and go back to the drawing board.¶ That, thanks to a four page preliminary report released Tuesday by the U.S. National Transportation Safety Board into Enbridge's record in dealing with a nasty oil spill in Michigan's Kalamazoo River two summers back.¶ The report has done what B.C. environmentalists and aboriginals could not: convince even the most disinterested British Columbian that an Enbridge pipeline through B.C's midsection is too risky.¶ The Northern Gateway pipe-line proposal at the moment is under review by federal regulators, who are to report next year.¶ But this formal review was never going to be as important as a review that for the past year or so has been taking place in living rooms throughout the province.¶ British Columbians have been weighing in their minds whether the jobs, industrial spinoffs and government revenues to flow from the $5.5 billion megaproject are worth it.¶ Environmental concerns loom large in a green-minded province like B.C., where tourism and the fishery are economic drivers.¶ Taxpayers are also aware of how costly likely court battles with aboriginal groups opposed to the project could be.¶ Following this week's safety board report, even the jobs-minded Liberal Premier Christy Clark stepped forward to criticize Enbridge.¶ Only federal Conservatives seem gung-ho on the project at this point.¶ Bob Rae's Liberals sensibly are arguing for an alternative plan, pointing to a recent application by Kinder Morgan to expand its existing pipe-line capacity through B.C. The Kinder Morgan pipeline carries oil to a Burnaby refinery and oil tankers using the Port of Vancouver.¶ Another alternative would be rail transport of petroleum products through the province.¶ But as for Northern Gateway, it's dead.¶ Here are some key points made in the safety board report into the spill that dumped 120 tanker trucks worth of black sludge into the Michigan wet-lands and waterways, with 320 people reporting harm to their health from benzene exposure:¶ . Enbridge "employees performed like Keystone Kops" in addressing the spill, demonstrating "a culture of deviance," whereby staff felt they could freely ignore company procedures and protocols.¶ . So lame was Enbridge's response plan that staff allowed the spill to continue unabated for 17 hours, through three employee shifts. This, despite multiple alarms and a loss of pressure in the pipeline.¶ . Staff attempted two startups of the line after the oil spill had begun, pumping in yet more oil. This, of course, resulted in greater spill damage.¶ . The cause of the pipeline's rupture was identified as corrosion. The company had detected the relevant pipeline cracks back in 2005, but never repaired them.¶ The safety board's full report is due out in "several weeks."¶ Between now and then, Enbridge doubtless will be strategizing, plotting a comprehensive public relations posture for British Columbians who, quite legitimately, will view the Kalamazoo spill, and response, as a canary in the mine shaft.¶ The company took an initial stab at defending itself immediately following release of the damning report, stating the Michigan personnel addressing the spill "were trying to do the right thing."¶ Further, "our intent from the beginning of this incident has been to learn from it so we can prevent it from happening again."¶ The big problem for Enbridge is that British Columbians, too, will be taking a lesson from this spill, so they can prevent it from happening again - in B.C.

### A/T “US Oil (Venezuela)”

#### Keystone doesn’t bring oil to the US- it’s *only* an export pipeline

Droitsch 6/18/2012 (Danielle, staff of the Natural Resources Defense Council, Here we go again: TransCanada applies again for Keystone XL tar sands pipeline, http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/ddroitsch/state\_department\_announces\_pro.html)

There is no need for this pipeline which is being built to export tar sands oil outside the United States. What the tar sands industry doesn’t want Americans to know is that Keystone XL will not bring additional oil into the United States. Keystone XL is an export pipeline through the United States, not to it. Existing crude pipelines from Canada are half empty right now meaning another tar sands pipeline isn’t needed. Even if Canadian tar sands oil production increases at the highly aggressive pace that its oil industry predicts—reaching 3.7 million bpd by 2025—it would take more than 15 years to fill the existing pipelines to the United States. The real story is Keystone XL would skip over refineries and U.S. consumers in the Midwest, allowing tar sands producers to send Canadian crude to Gulf Coast refineries from where it can be exported anywhere in the world.

#### Keystone Oil Will Be Exported

Swift ’11 (Attorney, International Program, Washington, DC)

“Keystone XL is a tar sands pipeline to export oil out of the United States” http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/aswift/keystone\_xl\_is\_a\_tar\_sands\_pip.html

¶ One of the most important facts that is missing in the national debate surrounding the proposed Keystone XL tar sands pipeline is this – Keystone XL will not bring any more oil into the United State for decades to come. Canada doesn’t have nearly enough oil to fill existing pipelines going to the United States. However, existing Canadian oil pipelines all go to the Midwest, where the only buyer for their crude is the United States. Keystone XL would divert Canadian oil from refineries in the Midwest to the Gulf Coast where it can be refined and exported. Many of these refineries are in Foriegn Trade Zones where oil may be exported to international buyers without paying U.S. taxes. And that is exactly what Valero, one of the largest potential buyers of Keystone XL's oil, has told its investors it will do. The idea that Keystone XL will improve U.S. oil supply is a documented scam being played on the American people by Big Oil and its friends in Washington DC. ¶ ¶ The fact that Canada has excess pipeline capacity is well known. In a Department of Energy report evaluating Keystone XL's impacts on U.S. energy supply over the next twenty years, the agency found that it will take decades for Canada to produce enough oil to fill existing pipelines. On page 90, the report concludes that the United States will import the same amount of crude from Canada through 2030 whether or not Keystone XL is built.

#### Keystone Oil Will Raise Prices and Be Exported

Clayton ’12 (CS Monitor Staff Writer) “Inside the Keystone pipeline: How much would it really help US consumers?” http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Politics/2012/0309/Inside-the-Keystone-pipeline-How-much-would-it-really-help-US-consumers

¶ But others, including environmentalists who oppose the pipeline mainly because extracting oil from tar sands releases more greenhouse gases than other methods of harvesting oil, also argue the pipeline will do little or nothing to boost US energy security and will actually lead to higher oil prices in the Midwest.¶ ¶ “Rather than providing the US with more Canadian oil, Keystone XL will simply shift oil from the Midwest to the Gulf Coast, where much of it can be exported to international buyers – decreasing US energy supply and increasing the cost of oil in the American Midwest,” concludes a new study by the Natural Resources Defense Council, a New York-based environmental advocacy non-profit group, citing numerous TransCanada studies and the transcripts of Canadian federal hearings.¶ “The firms involved have asked the US State Department to approve this project, even as they’ve told Canadian government officials how the pipeline can be used to add at least $4 billion to the US fuel bill,” Philip K. Verleger, president of PKVerleger LLC, a Colorado consulting firm that specializes in research on oil market economics, wrote in a Minneapolis Star-Tribune commentary last March.¶ ¶ US farmers who spent $12.4 billion on fuel in 2009 could see those costs rise to $15 billion or higher if the pipeline goes through, he projects. At least $500 million of the added cost “would come from the Canadian market manipulation,” he wrote.¶ ¶ “Millions of Americans will spend 10 to 20 cents more per gallon for gasoline and diesel fuel as tribute to our ‘friendly’ neighbors to the north,” the highly respected Dr. Verleger wrote. “The Keystone XL pipeline will move production from Canadian oil sands to a deepwater port from where it can be exported.”

#### Keystone is an Export Pipeline

Kretzmann ’11 “Report: Exporting Energy Security: Keystone XL Exposed” http://priceofoil.org/2011/08/31/report-exporting-energy-security-keystone-xl-exposed/

In pushing for the Obama Administration’s approval of TransCanada’s proposed Keystone XL tar sands pipeline, the North American oil industry and its political patrons argue that the pipeline is necessary for American energy security and its construction will help wean America of dependence on Mideast oil. But a closer look at the new realities of the global oil market and at the companies who will profit from the pipeline reveals a completely different story: Keystone XL will not lessen U.S. dependence on foreign oil, but rather transport Canadian oil to American refineries for export to overseas markets.¶ A new report from Oil Change International lays out the case, based on data and documents from the U.S. Energy Information Administration and the Canadian National Energy Board, corporate disclosures to regulators and investors, and analysis of the rapidly shifting oil market.¶ The facts:¶ Keystone XL is an export pipeline*.* The Port Arthur, Texas, refiners at the end of its route are focused on expanding exports to Europe, and Latin America. Much of the fuel refined from the pipeline’s heavy crude oil will never reach U.S. drivers’ tanks.¶ Valero, the key customer for crude oil from Keystone XL, has explicitly detailed an export strategy to its investors. Because Valero’s Port Arthur refinery is in a Foreign Trade Zone, the company can carry out its strategy *tax-free*.¶ *In a shrinking U.S. market, Keystone XL is not needed.* Since the project was announced, the oil industry acknowledges that higher fuel economy standards and slow economic growth mean declining U.S. oil demand, even as domestic production is booming. Oil from Keystone XL will therefore displace American crude from new, “unconventional” domestic fields in Texas or North Dakota.¶ “To issue a presidential permit for the Keystone XL, the Administration must find that the pipeline serves the national interest,” said Stephen Kretzmann, executive director of Oil Change International. “An honest assessment shows that rather than serving U.S. interests, Keystone XL serves only the interests of tar sands producers and shippers, and a few Gulf Coast refiners aiming to export the oil.”¶ Valero has contracted to take at least 100,000 barrels of tar sands crude a day from Keystone XL until 2030. It’s publicly disclosed business model relies on refining heavy sour crude for export. It is upgrading its Port Arthur refinery to process heavy sour into diesel fuel. Its investor presentations clearly show it plans to ship diesel to Latin America and Europe.¶ Valero – the Texas independent behind last year’s attempt to overturn California’s clean fuel standards – is the only U.S. company among the six customers who have jointly committed to purchase 76 percent of Keystone XL’s initial capacity. The other refiners are Shell, which is part of Motiva, a joint venture between Royal Dutch Shell and the Saudi government, and Total of France, both of which have newly upgraded facilities in Port Arthur tax-free trade zones. There are also two Canadian producers and one international oil-trading firm in the group of six customers.¶ “Oil is a fundamentally global market – the idea that the pipeline enhances our energy security is a scam.” said Kretzmann. “Let’s hope the Obama Administration doesn’t fall for it. In fact, the only way to truly reduce our dependence on foreign oil is to reduce our dependence on all oil. Let’s not fool ourselves that we will achieve ‘energy independence’ by serving as a middleman for access to overseas markets.”

### A/T “US-Canada Relations”

#### Keystone’s not key to relations

Hamilton, 7/18/2012, [Charles, “In Spite of Keystone XL, U.S.-Canada Relations on track”,

http://www.thestarphoenix.com/news/Spite+Keystone+Canada+Relations+track/6955190/story.html#ixzz21SdLjG2k

After last year’s PNWER conference in Portland, Doer said he had a checklist of things related to U.S.-Canada relations that he wanted to see done before this year’s conference. Doer said Keystone was the only thing on his list that didn’t get done.¶ Doer said he has seen progress on Beyond the Border, an agreement aimed at aligning Canadian and U.S. regulations in order to facilitate the flow of cross-border goods and services.¶ Wednesday’s ruling that Canada did not circumvent the softwood lumber agreement by shipping large quantities of pine beetle-infested lumber to the U.S. was also a victory, Doer said.¶ Canada’s entrance into negotiations on the trans-Pacific Trade Partnership — a massive free-trade partnership that includes the United States, Australia, Brunei, Chile, Malaysia, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore and Vietnam — was another, he said.¶ Giving these issues, the ambassador said is not too disappointing Keystone didn’t make the list.¶ “Obviously we would have liked to see all six items completed. But I learned a long time ago that when you have a to-do list it doesn’t happen as fast you sometimes want,” Doer said.

### Venezuela Impact Takeouts

#### No threat from Chavez, it’s just rhetoric

Miami Herald, 2012, [Citing Riordan Roett, the director of Latin American Studies Program at the School of Advanced International Studies at The Johns Hopkins University, Mitt Romney, GOP howl over President Barack Obama’s remark about Hugo Chávez, July 11th,

<http://www.miamiherald.com/2012/07/11/v-fullstory/2891728/republicans-attack-obama-for-chavez.html#storylink=cpy>

Experts in the region, though, called Obama’s comments reasonable. Chávez is “certifiable,” with a tremendous ego fueled by the power that comes from sitting on vast oil reserves — but he’s not as dangerous as the leaders of other less friendly regimes, said Riordan Roett, the director of Latin American Studies Program at the School of Advanced International Studies at The Johns Hopkins University.¶ The Republican criticism is “just pure electoral politics,” Roett said.¶ “He poses no security threat to the United States or anyone else,” Roett said. “Hugo Chávez is not going to attack us, he’s not going to occupy our embassy, he’s not going to bomb U.S. planes arriving in Caracas at Maiquetía Airport. He is a loudmouth who enjoys listening to himself, and has built up on the basis of oil revenue, a very, very populist, dependent regime that can’t deliver on basic services, on goods and commodities to his own people.”

#### No Threat of Cyber War

Jackson GCN, 2012, [William Jackson: reporter for Government Computer News, “Fuss over cyber war distracts from real threats, security pioneer says”, Feb. 28th, http://gcn.com/Articles/2012/02/28/RSA-3-cyberwar-distracts-real-threats.aspx?Page=1]

The threat of cyber war has been exaggerated, and given the nation’s inadequate defenses our preparations for offensive cyber actions could be counterproductive, he said. It’s like a man in a glass house stockpiling stones. “It’s not a good idea to initiate a response in kind by doing it to someone else.”¶ Ranum, a self-described “lefty-pacifist anti-statist” and an early innovator in firewalls and other IT security technology, is chief of security at Tenable Security. He is presenting his views on cyber war this week at the RSA Conference.¶ His primary points are that cyber crime, espionage and hacktivism are carelessly lumped together into cyber war, which us distracts from the real nature of these threats, and that real cyber war — an attack by a nation to destroy or degrade the military capabilities of anther nation — is a lot less likely than it often is portrayed.¶ “In terms of cyber war, you have to look at the geopolitical situation and see’s what makes sense,” he said.¶ A real cyberattack makes no sense unless it is part of, or is backed up by, a military attack, because the attacker risks a military response. Right now, no nation appears ready to attack us militarily or to take that risk with a cyberattack, Ranum said. “The truth is, China doesn’t want to do this.”¶ This does not mean that the nation is not facing real threats, both in the physical world and in cyberspace. But defenses should be focused on the real threats, which include terrorism, crime and espionage, Ranum said. If we protect our systems against hackers, this will protect us against some spies and most terrorists.¶ “This isn’t going to protect you against nation-state spies, because they are going to look like your network manager,” he said. Real spying by other nations is not a cyber threat, he said. “If I’m a country and I want to get into your system, I’m not going to worry about hackers. One of your employees is going to be my agent.”¶

## \*\*Warming DA\*\*

### 1NC

#### US shifting to renewables now- solves heg- Keystone stops that

Orpiszewska 12

Marta Orpiszewska Keystone XL: Pipeline to Nowhere UNC Environmental Law Symposium Feb 2012 (http://www.law.unc.edu/documents/clear/orpiszewska.pdf)

The U.S. Government is the single largest consumer of energy in the country.71 The¶ Department of Defense (DOD) accounts for 93% of that energy use.72 The types of sources from¶ which it procures energy have an impact on how funding for research and infrastructure is¶ spent.73 There have been recent attempts in Congress to repeal Section 526.74 Doing so could¶ not only open the door for the rapid expansion of Canada’s tar sands, but would also stifle¶ important energy initiatives that this provision has enabled.75 Section 526 has facilitated the¶ DOD’s major investments into renewable energy innovation.76 The Navy and Air Force have¶ both pledged that 50% of their fuels will come from non-petroleum based sources by 2016 and¶ have launched major investments in advanced biofuels.77 Additionally, this provision sends a¶ signal to the private sector of where the federal government is headed: investment into renewable¶ energy, instead of expansion of fossil fuel use.78 This signaling provides security and incentive¶ for private investment.79 Keystone XL could compromise the security of investment in renewable¶ energy technologies.80 The DOD itself recently made statements advocating Section 526.81 The¶ DOD stated that repealing Section 526 would strengthen our dependence on fossil fuels, and this dependence “degrades our national security, negatively impacts our economy, and harms our¶ planet.”82The U.S. is quickly lagging behind countries like China and India in energy innovation.83¶ Section 526 is an important provision that allows the government to move forward in renewable¶ energy innovation. Repeal of this provision would have a major impact on how the U.S.¶ procures its energy. If Keystone XL is approved, Congress could be pressured to repeal this¶ provision. Doing so would have a significant impact on our energy and emissions.84 Keystone¶ XL could lock the U.S. into dependence on tar sands oil.85The Keystone XL pipeline has become a major topic of controversy because of its farreaching¶ impact. Proponents of the pipeline refer to Canada is a friendly neighbor, claim that¶ imports of Canada’s tar sands are a welcome alternative to imports of Middle Eastern oil, and¶ assert that the project will create jobs.86 Opponents to the project point to adverse environmental¶ impacts and to health and equity impacts to neighboring communities. If the State Department¶ approves the project, it will send a signal to oil companies that the U.S. is open to tar sands¶ development. This decision would impact the energy future of the country by calling into¶ question our commitments to renewable energy innovation and our emissions reductions goals.!

#### Keystone is the vital internal link to catastrophic warming

Shope 7/20/2012 (Elizabeth, staff at the Natural Resources Defense Council, degree in Environmental Science and Public Policy from Harvard, Scientists to State Department: Climate Change Must Be Considered in New Keystone XL Tar Sands Pipeline Review, http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/eshope/scientists\_to\_state\_department.html)

Earlier this week, a group of ten of the nation’s top scientists including James Hansen, James McCarthy, and Raymond Pierrehumbert, sent a letter to the State Department calling for “a serious review of the effect of helping open Canada’s tar sands on the planet’s climate.” They are rightly asking that this happen as part of the environmental review of the proposed Keystone XL pipeline that would carry polluting tar sands into the United States from Canada. In a time that people across the United States are suffering from the climate chaos of high heat, wildfires, droughts and floods, the State Department should not be giving a permit to bring in a type of oil that will only make climate change worse. We have better solutions than expensive and dirty tar sands oil.¶ In February, President Obama rejected TransCanada’s earlier application for the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline. But the company is back again. Unwilling to take no for an answer, TransCanada has reapplied to the State Department to get tar sands into the United States so that they can get it down to the Gulf Coast to export markets. ¶ Through July 30, the State Department is accepting comments on what should be in the environmental review of the project. So far, the State Department has said that they plan to include a review of the impacts in Nebraska where the route has been changed slightly, and also information about “significant new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns bearing on the proposed action or its impacts.” But clearly, the climate impacts of strip-mining and melting the gooey tar sands from under Alberta’s Boreal forest need to weigh heavily in any evaluation of a new tar sands pipeline.¶ Of course, greenhouse gas emissions are just one of a number of important considerations for the new environmental review. In a May 2012 letter, NRDC and our partners asked the State Department to also assess the need for the pipeline; economic and employment factors; the impact of the pipeline on gas prices; oil supply, demand and export issues; refinery emissions; impacts on wildlife; pipeline safety; tribal consultation; alternative routes; and more. We are preparing comments along these lines for the State Department, but we’ve also asked for more time to pull these together: this is an important project and it is important to get this important first stage right. You can add your voice to the more than 50,000 NRDC members and activists who have commented here.¶ As the scientists write in the letter, “The vast volumes of carbon in the tar sands ensure that they will play an important role in whether or not climate change gets out of hand; understanding the role this largescale new pipeline will play in that process is clearly crucial.” In the environmental review of the original Keystone XL tar sands pipeline project back last August, the State Department acknowledged that tar sands cause as much as 17% more greenhouse gas emissions than conventional oil on a lifecycle basis – a number that expert research shows to even be on the low side. However, the State Department then didn’t take these greater greenhouse gas emissions into account. By their flawed reasoning, Keystone XL was not a driver of additional tar sands production. This was wrong then, and as our leading scientists have pointed out, it would be wrong not to consider the climate impacts of tar sands now.¶ Keystone XL would have an impact on tar sands production and greenhouse gas emissions. It is a major project for Big Oil in the tar sands and would drive expansion of tar sands strip mining and drilling.

#### Extinction

Tickell 08[Oliver, “On a planet 4C hotter, all we can prepare for is extinction]

We need to get prepared for four degrees of global warming**,** *Bob Watson told the Gurdian last week. At first sight this looks like wise counsel from the climate science adviser to Defra*. But the idea that we could adapt to a 4C rise is absurd and dangerous. Global warming on this scale would be a catastrophe that would mean*, in the immortal words that Chief Seattle probably never spoke*, "the end *of living and the beginning of survival"* for humankind. Or perhaps the beginning of ourextinction. The collapse of the polar ice caps would become inevitable, bringing long-term sea level rises of 70-80 metres. All the world's coastal plains would be lost, complete with ports, cities, transport and industrial infrastructure, and much of the world's most productive farmland.*The world's geography would be transformed much as it was at the end of the last ice age, when sea levels rose by about 120 metres to create the Channel, the North Sea and Cardigan Bay out of dry land*.Weather would become extreme and unpredictable, with more frequent and severe droughts, floods and hurricanes. The Earth's carrying capacity would be hugely reduced. Billions would undoubtedly die.

### Links

#### Keystone causes warming- locks US in to dirty energy and causes massive tar sands expansion

Droitsch 6/18/2012 (Danielle, staff of the Natural Resources Defense Council, Here we go again: TransCanada applies again for Keystone XL tar sands pipeline, http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/ddroitsch/state\_department\_announces\_pro.html)

Building this tar sands pipeline would hinder progress to combating global warming. According to a recent report by the Congressional Research Service, building Keystone XL would be the equivalent of adding at least 4 million new cars to the road. The EPA estimates that Keystone XL will increase carbon pollution by the equivalent of several coal-fired power plants operating continuously. Keystone XL would expand dirty tar sands mining practices and lure the U.S. into a long-term commitment to an energy infrastructure that relies on extra-dirty oil. For example, building Keystone XL would wipe out the benefits of new standards that would have cut greenhouse gas emissions from medium to heavy duty trucks announced by the Obama administration.

#### Tar sands cause significant harm to the environment and increase GHGs

Sierra Club 9 [“Background: Environmental Impacts of Tar Sands Development”, 1/16/09, http://www.sierraclub.org/energy/factsheets/tarsands.asp]

Both mining and processing of tar sands cause significant environmental impacts, including huge emissions of global warming gases, destruction of wildlife habitat, and impacts to air and water quality. In addition to producing greenhouse gas emitting fossil fuels, tar sands development is significantly more energy intensive than conventional oil and gas development.¶ Greenhouse gas emissions from tar sands production are three times those of conventional oil and gas production, and producing synthetic crude oil emits up to 20% more greenhouse gas emissions than low-sulfur, light crude oils. Tar sands development, which largely has been concentrated in Canada, is becoming the country's largest single emitter of greenhouse gases. In the United States growing interest in tar sands development, especially in the western states, could increase U.S. greenhouse gas emissions from new tar sands projects from 27 to 126 million tons by 2015.¶ In addition, large quantities of water are required for tar sands extraction operations and would draw down surface water flow, adversely impacting stream habitat for fish and other species dependant on local water resources. Drilling one well consumes 5.5 acre-feet of water each year, and the production of one gallon of oil requires thirty-five gallons.¶ Tar sands are composed of clay, sand, water, and bitumen, a heavy black viscous oil, which can be mined and processed. Extracted bitumen is then refined into synthetic oil and other petroleum products. Because the bitumen cannot be pumped from the ground in its natural state, deposits are mined using energy intensive extraction and separation techniques to separate bitumen from the sand, clay and water. Surface tar sand deposits can be recovered by open pit mining techniques, using large hydraulic and electrically powered shovels to dig up tar sands and transport them for extraction using a hot water separation process. Compressed air and steam injection methods are used to extract deep tar sand deposits, and those methods require large quantities of water and energy for heating and pumping. About two tons of tar sands are required to produce one barrel of oil.¶ Tar sands project activities, including grading, excavation and extraction, cause temporary and localized emissions of particulate matter, sulfur dioxide, carbon monoxide and nitrous oxide. In addition, localized emissions of hazardous air pollutants - including benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, xylene and formaldehyde - pose health risks to nearby residents and project employees. Tar sands processing, upgrading and transport would have long-term regional impacts on air quality from volatile organic carbon emissions, as well as sulfur and carbon dioxide.

#### Keystone both significantly increases GHGs and stops climate leadership

Nuccitelli 11 [Dana, environmental scientist at a private environmental consulting firm; “What tar sands and the Keystone XL pipeline mean for climate change”, Guardian, 8/23/11, http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2011/aug/23/tar-sands-keystone-xl-climate]

Making liquid fuels from bitumen requires energy for steam injection and refining. Currently the energy is produced from natural gas. This process generates more greenhouse gas emissions per barrel of final product than the production of conventional oil.¶ There is a slight challenge in quantifying the climate impact of tar sands oil as compared to conventional oil, because there are different ways to make this comparison. Approximately 80% of the carbon from any barrel of crude is emitted when it's burned. Therefore, evaluating well-to-wheel (extraction to combustion) emissions, tar sands emit approximately 10 to 45% more greenhouse gases than combustion of conventional oil. However, if we exclude combustion and evaluate well-to-tank emissions, tar sands emissions are approximately twice those of conventional oil. According to a recent US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) assessment, tar sands well-to-tank emissions are approximately 82% higher than conventional oil.¶ Keystone Pipeline Emissions¶ The EPA also evaluated the greenhouse gas emissions specifically associated with the proposed Keystone pipeline which McKibben's group is protesting.¶ "recognizing the proposed Project 's lifetime is expected to be at least fifty years, we believe it is important to be clear that under at least one scenario, the extra GHG emissions associated with this proposed Project may range from 600 million to 1.15 billion tons CO2-e, assuming the lifecycle analysis holds over time"¶ Over 1 billion tons of equivalent CO2 emissions is a substantial chunk of emissions. We recently discussed The Critical Decade report produced by the Climate Commission established by the Australian government. Their report concluded that humanity can emit not more than 1 trillion tonnes of CO2 between 2000 and 2050 to have a probability of about 75% of limiting temperature rise to 2°C or less. According to the latest data, between 2000 and 2010 we emitted approximately 300 billion tons of CO2, so after 20% of the allotted timeframe, we're already over 30% of the way through the allotted emissions.¶ Climate Concerns¶ In addition to being more emissions-intensive than conventional oil, the main concern is that exploiting the tar sands is conceptually backwards. As The Critical Decade report made clear, we need to be looking for ways to leave fossil fuels in the ground, not trying to find more unconventional sources of carbon for combustion. The USA in particular has taken very few concrete steps to minimize its greenhouse gas emissions to this point. Building the Keystone pipeline to exploit an unconventional source of fossil fuels is a step in the wrong direction, and will encourage other countries to follow suit. If we're to have any hope of achieving sufficient global greenhouse gas emissions cuts, the USA needs to start leading the way in finding ways to reduce fossil fuel consumption, not lead the way in finding ways to burn new unconventional sources, especially when they're more emissions-intensive than conventional sources.

#### Claims that tar sands aren’t worse than normal oil are based on cherry picking studies

Casey-Lefkowitz and Droitsch 12 [Susan, director of international program at NRDC, and Danielle, director of Canada Project; “The Keystone XL Tar Sands Pipeline Hinders Climate Change Progress”, NRDC, March, http://www.nrdc.org/energy/files/keystonexlmyths.pdf]

Contrary to claims that tar sands is similar to emissions from conventional oil, climate pollution emissions from tar sands are higher than emissions created by conventional crude oils and other heavy crude oils. FACT: Claims that tar sands greenhouse gas emissions are similar to conventional oil are not telling the full story and are cherry-picking how they make the comparison using the very dirtiest of conventional oil and the lowest emission of the tar sands production processes. 11 Multiple independent studies, including one by the U.S. Department of Energy, have shown that tar sands is significantly more greenhouse gas intensive than many other heavy oils, including conventional. 12

#### Keystone would undermine the effective efforts that are currently being taken to stop GHG and climate change

Casey-Lefkowitz and Droitsch 12 [Susan, director of international program at NRDC, and Danielle, director of Canada Project; “The Keystone XL Tar Sands Pipeline Hinders Climate Change Progress”, NRDC, March, http://www.nrdc.org/energy/files/keystonexlmyths.pdf]

Keystone XL Leads To More Greenhouse Gas emissions Construction of the pipeline would lead to greater demand for tar sands oil. As this demand increases, more energy intensive methods would be needed to extract the oil. According to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the Keystone XL pipeline has the potential to increase carbon pollution by 27 million metric tons of carbon dioxide. 1 This is the equivalent of seven coal-fired power plants operating continuously or having 6.2 million cars on the road for 50 years. 2 Compared to conventional oil, tar sands takes more energy to extract and refine, and therefore its production is three- to four-times more greenhouse gas intensive. 3 Tar sands oil ranks among the most carbon-intensive oils on the planet. Tar Sands Climate Pollution is on The Rise Approximately 20 percent of tar sands oil is extracted by open-pit mining. The remaining 80 percent, however, can be extracted only by using the even more energy-intensive insitu process of pumping steam under the ground. 4 Open-pit mining lays waste to millions of acres of carbon storing Boreal forest. The Canadian Boreal forest is one of the world’s largest storehouses of carbon. To produce just one barrel of oil, these trees are felled, and tons of earth are scooped up by massive backhoes. The oil-laden soil is then loaded into trucks the size of houses and carted off to an extraction plant for initial processing. While open-pit mining is dirty, in-situ extraction is even dirtier. Meaning “in place” in Latin, in-situ mining generates more than two and a half-times more greenhouse gases as does open-pit extraction. 5 The in-situ process involves burning natural gas above ground, generating steam, which then is forced into subterranean pipes. The heat emanating from the pipes melts the surrounding bitumen from the sands. The melted material is then pumped up to the surface for further processing. In-situ extraction is the future of tar sands. By 2017, in-situ extraction will be how most tar sands oil is recovered. 6 From then on, the gulf between the two extraction processes—from dirty to dirtier—will only widen. Keystone XL undermines clean energy and national Security The United States is getting serious about clean energy. Real strides have been made, notably with fuel efficiency standards, and forecasts show that demand for oil in the United States has peaked and will remain flat for the next two decades. Building Keystone XL, however, would eliminate the benefits that efficiency standards will bring to the climate. For example, the standards that would cut greenhouse gas emissions by up to 20 percent by 2018 from medium- to heavy-duty trucks would effectively be neutralized. 7 Instead of sending these mixed messages, the United States can choose to adopt policies that in 20 years would reduce our oil consumption by 5.7 million barrels per day—twice the oil currently imported from Canada. 8 Oil coming from a friendly neighbor does not translate into increased energy security. Keystone XL is a pathway for tar sands oil to be exported. TransCanada has confirmed that the purpose of Keystone XL is to enable tar sands to be exported as diesel from the Gulf to take advantage of higher international market prices. 9 Retired Brig. General Steven Anderson has noted that the “greatest threat to our security is our overreliance on oil.” 10 Only clean energy and reducing our demand for oil will detach the United States from the conflict ridden, oil producing areas of the world and help us address and reduce the threatening impacts of climate change. The proposed Keystone XL pipeline does not move our country in that direction.