# Keystone XL – Negative Starter Pack – SDI 2012

## Notes

* Railways are arguably better for spills, habitat loss – probably not warming
* The China/Venezuela adv’s has huge holes – mainly – keystone allows Canadia oil producers access to open market, not only does this mean Keystone wouldn’t offset U.S. purchasing Venezuelan oil, but by relieving the bottleneck – it probably makes it worse.

## \*\*\*Inherency

## Shells

### 1NC

A. Interpretation – the affirmative must prove an explicit and quantifiable advantage from status quo action.

B. Violation – there’s no comparative advantage from enacting keystone now vs after election.

C. Propensity -- Obama just postponed until after election – question not if keystone, just when – SQ preferred.

Bowen 12

Robert Bowen Robert Bowen served in the Colorado legislature in the 1980s as a moderate Democrat. He was also appointed by three different governors to serve on various boards and commissions. Keystone won’t go away; what’s next? March 10, 2012 http://www.examiner.com/article/keystone-won-t-go-away-what-s-next

Once again, a House in Congress has voted to force the Administration to build the Keystone XL pipeline before the environmental assessment is done. First, Congress attached an amendment to the payroll tax extension forcing Obama to make a decision on the pipeline within 60 days. He called their bluff and vetoed it. This time 56 Senators voted to attach an amendment by Sen. Hoeven (R-ND) to the stalled Highway Bill which would force the pipeline to be built over White House objections. Eleven Democrats broke ranks and voted with Republicans for the pipeline. This vote, however, was a vote to close debate on the amendment. It takes 60 votes in the Senate to allow a vote on a bill, so the amendment was not enacted. With gas prices skyrocketing, Republicans have decided to ditch contraception and jump on Keystone as their issue for the fall elections. Democrats who are up for re-election this year are siding with them because they fear voters will buy the argument that if Keystone is approved today, gas prices will drop tomorrow. Of course, that is utter nonsense. But little in politics is not nonsense. The Republicans advocated building the pipeline in their weekly radio address again today. Governor Jack Dalrymple (R-ND) said “Congress should step in and pass legislation that would authorize the Keystone project”. He blasted Obama saying he is “killing energy development.” Governor's pipeline arguments not consistent with facts Dalrymple said that gas prices are rising because we are growing “increasingly more dependent on foreign oil.” This does not square with facts. In recent years, the United States has decreased its imports of foreign oil to less than 50%. Last month, we imported the smallest amount of foreign in 13 years. The Governor also said Obama’s veto of the Keystone pipeline meant North Dakota could not bring its newly discovered tar sand shale oil to market. The Keystone XL pipeline would run from the Canadian Province of Alberta to the Gulf of Mexico to carry mostly Canadian oil. It seems logical that if Canadian oil is cheaper and more abundant, the pipeline would only increase our dependence on “foreign” oil. The truth is that the bottleneck that may prevent North Dakota from marketing its shale oil is in Oklahoma, not in North Dakota. Right now, there is so much domestic oil being produced it is backing up in Cushing, Oklahoma where the nations pipelines intersect. That oil is being stored because the pipelines are full and the refineries can’t process it fast enough. Logic would dictate solving that problem before building a new pipeline to bring in Canadian oil. White House signaled it would approve a portion of Keystone now White House Economic Council Chairman, Gene Sperling, said in an interview on MSNBC Friday that the administration would approve building the portion of the pipeline from Cushing to the Gulf right now. He said, however, there was no permit application for them to approve. It seems that someone should submit that application and start constructing that portion right away to eliminate the bottleneck. What good would it do to bring in Canadian oil when ours is being stored in tank farms in Oklahoma? Pipeline argument is being misrepresented The issue of Keystone is totally being misrepresented. The reason for the permit being denied is that Congress tried to embarrass the President by demanding that the normal environmental assessment be trashed and the pipeline be built immediately. Nebraska has expressed strong concerns about the pipeline being built on top of the largest aquifer in the country. They suggested a safer route be found. GOP legislation would force it to be built regardless on that route. In Michigan, there was a spill of tar sand oil in the Kalamazoo River a year ago. The clean up is still no where near to being complete since tar sand oil sinks to the bottom and can not be skimmed like regular crude. A spill in the aquifer could ruin the water supply for agriculture and humans in several states for decades if not permanently. The issue is not whether it should ever be built; rather, it is how and where it can be built without endangering our most precious resource. This issue will not go away until after the November elections.

Standards

A) Ground loss – the difference between passage in July vs. passage in November is arbitrary – they must prove an explicit advantage from quick action or we don’t have ground for offense.

B) Presumption – there’s only an inherent risk in change – let the SQ play out

### 2NC SQ Best

ExtendBowen 12 – no advantage from immediate implementation -- calls for action based on election politics – refinery capacity means new oil will just be stored, not sold for years. And Obama moving forward with Southern Keystone route.Legitimate environmental concerns outweigh a 6 month head start.

Rushed Keystone bad

**Burwell**12

David Burwell – director of the Energy and Climate Program at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Keystone XL pipeline, a post child for political posturing, CNN May 3 2012 <http://www.cnn.com/2012/05/30/opinion/burwell-keystone-pipeline/index.html>)

If the project can't be resolved soon, U.S.-Canadian relations could also be compromised. Canada is not only our largest trading partner but also a great friend. Today, Canada supplies the largest share of U.S. oil imports and buys our products with the money we pay them for it. Yet the Canadian government risks becoming a pawn in our domestic political catfight. Keystone XL is being egged on by the fossil fuel lobbyists on both sides of the border who have urged Canada to double down against the initial permit denial and "turn up the political heat." In a recent meeting with representatives of the Canadian government, a U.S. oil industry representative argued that Canada should have pulled its ambassador when the Keystone XL permit was initially denied. That's crazy talk. Yet the Canadians have pushed hard for Keystone approval, bringing in both Prime Minister Stephen Harper and Alberta Premier Alison Redford to praise the pipeline and hosting the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers while in town to brief Congress on the merits of the pipeline. All the pressures aside, the United States needs to pause and think carefully about its national interest. Our future energy balance and supply chain should not be short-stopped by attaching Keystone XL as a nongermane rider to a transportation bill for temporary political gain. Politicians come and go; nations generally do not. The long-term strategic interests of both Canada and the United States are better served if all parties involved heed the analysis under way in the State Department rather than resort to legislative fiat or a presidential veto. Calmer heads are already working on the details of a better proposal: a new route, improved technology and perhaps cleaner oil. The Canadian government should vigorously and publicly embrace the existing State Department analysis and strongly oppose attaching Keystone XL as a rider to the transportation bill. Canada should not be complicit in rushed, political decisions -- it should play by the rules. Congress should resist the temptation to use Keystone XL as an opportunity for political brinkmanship. Both Democrats and Republicans need to make sure that the real issues aren't lost in the partisan noise of Washington and that we do our best to avoid all the collateral damage.

## Extensions

### It’s already being built

TransCanada proceeding with construction this summer.

Mira 6-26

Leslie Mira. Journalist. 6/26/12. Platts. “Keystone XL is on track for initial construction this summer: TransCanada. June 26, 2012 <http://www.platts.com/RSSFeedDetailedNews/RSSFeed/Oil/6421340>

TransCanada has one of three required permits from the US Army Corps of Engineers to build the southern portion of its controversial Keystone XL crude pipeline,and the company is still eyeing a start of construction this summer, the company said Tuesday. "TransCanada still requires approvals from the Tulsa and Fort Worth Districts" of the US Army Corps of Engineers, TransCanada spokesman Shawn Howard said in an email. "We continue to believe that we will be in a position to begin construction later this summer and are working with the Corps and others to secure the approvals and permits we require," Howard said. The overall Keystone XL pipeline project would ship Canadian crude oil from Hardisty, Alberta, to the US Gulf Coast. TransCanada plans to build the $2.3 billion, 485-mile southern segment, dubbed the Gulf Coast Project, from Cushing, Oklahoma, to Nederland, Texas, while it waits for a State Department permit for the section that crosses the US-Canada border. It expects to have oil flowing on the southern segment in the second half of 2013. The Corps on Monday gave TransCanada an NWP 12 permit for the Galveston District, a Corps spokesman said Monday. "The Galveston District made a decision on June 25, 2012 that the work associated with the proposed GCPP in waters of the United States meets the terms and conditions... and could proceed," spokeswoman LaDonna Davis said in an email. Davis said the Fort Worth, Texas, and Tulsa, Oklahoma, districts "have performed or are in the process of performing a thorough review" of water crossing and wetlands to ensure that "impacts to these areas are avoided and minimized where possible." If the Corps "does not notify an applicant of its permit decision within 45 days from receipt of a complete preconstruction notification package, under the conditions of the NWPs, approval is assumed and the applicant can begin construction," Davis said in her email. "However, the applicant does so at their own risk. They must still adhere to the numerous conditions of the NWPs. Non-compliance with any of the general or regional conditions may result in an enforcement action," she said. Environmentalists reiterated previous criticism that President Barack Obama was allowing the Corps to "rubber-stamp" the pipeline project. "President Obama abandoned Texans and Oklahomans to the whims of Big Oil and an Army Corps that appears only too willing to serve them," Kim Huynh of Friends of the Earth said Tuesday in a statement. "The Army Corps has shown a willful disregard for the concerns of residents whose health, land and livelihoods are at stake if Keystone XL is rubber-stamped, which is why we're urging Administrator Lisa Jackson to step in and call for a full environmental review." Asked to comment about the EPA's role in oversight of the pipeline, EPA spokesman David Bloomgren on Monday referred a reporter to the Corps.

## \*\*\*Econ Advantage

## Jobs

#### Job claims exaggerated (also answers VenAdv)

**Turner12**(Ted Turner is the founder and chairman of the United Nations Foundation and the founder of CNN and Turner Broadcasting. Co-chairman of the Nuclear Threat Initiative, which seeks to reduce the threat of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons. “Stop Keystone pipeline before it’s too late” CNN February 24, 2012 (http://www.cnn.com/2012/02/22/opinion/turner-keystone-pipeline/index.html)

Meanwhile, the pro-pipeline lobby is pushing the public to accept Keystone XL with fuzzy promises about jobs and security. ButTransCanada's jobs claims have been widely discredited, andthere is no guarantee the oil transported by the pipeline would remain in the United Statesfor sale. An attempt in Congress to require the oil to be consumed in the United States was rejected just last week, and it has been widely detailedthat Gulf Coast refineries plan to export the finished product to Europe and Latin America. How do we become more energy secure under that scenario? Now Congress, by means of an amendment to the highway bill, is pushing to wrest decision-making control over the project from the administration, bypass final environmental review, and force approval of the pipeline before the final route has even been determined. Congress should not be in the business of skirting the rules and ramming through a polluting project like the Keystone XL pipeline. Instead of supporting the transport of dirty tar sands oil, its focus should be on harnessing truly clean, renewable energy sources like solar, wind and biofuels, which will create thousands of long-lasting jobs in the United States, protect our natural resources and provide true energy and water security today and for many years to come.

#### TransCanada’s 15,000 job claims are for temporary jobs only, and most jobs are not even involved with Americans.

**Schoen 2/29/12**(Schoen, John W., senior producer for MSNBC, “Keystone Pipeline Claims Just Don’t Add Up”, <http://bottomline.msnbc.msn.com/_news/2012/02/29/10541404-keystone-pipeline-claims-just-dont-add-up?lite>, Published February 29th, 2012)

ANALYSIS:Proponents of the Keystone oil pipeline argue the $7 billion project will create hundreds of thousands of jobs,give the economy a shot in the arm, lower gasoline prices and wean the U.S. from foreign imports. Too bad the claims don’t hold up.  House Speaker John Boehner renewed his attack on the White House this week for postponing approval of the project pending a State Department review of the [environmental impact](http://bottomline.msnbc.msn.com/_news/2012/02/29/10541404-keystone-pipeline-claims-just-dont-add-up?lite) of the proposed 1,661-mile pipeline, which would cross six Midwest states to deliver Canadian crude to the Gulf Coast. Republicans have intensified their attacks on Democratic President Barack Obama's energy policies in recent days, blaming them for higher pump prices that could hurt his re-election prospects in the Nov. 6 face-off against the eventual GOP  nominee. On Wednesday, Boehner stepped up the pressure in a letter to the White House urging approval of the project "to provide greater energy security." Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell blamed the White House for rising pump prices. "Make no mistake: the rising price of gasoline isn't simply the result of forces we can't control," he said in a Senate speech. There's no doubt that rising North American oil production has created pipeline bottlenecks for companies trying to get their product to market. One major chokepoint at a central storage hub in Cushing, Okla., has created such a glut of oil that it's forced prices lower, providing consumers in the middle of the country with a significant discount at the [gas](http://bottomline.msnbc.msn.com/_news/2012/02/29/10541404-keystone-pipeline-claims-just-dont-add-up?lite) pump. But proponents' case that the Keystone XL pipeline will bring major economic benefits to the U.S. is much harder to make. Short-term, the construction phase of the project will "create more than 15,000 high-wage manufacturing jobs and construction jobs in 2011-2012 across the U.S., stimulating significant additional economic activity," [according to TransCanada, the Canadian company that is seeking approval to build it](http://www.transcanada.com/docs/Key_Projects/Keystone_Benefits_US_July_2010.pdf). (The company said this week it plans to go ahead with construction of a 450-mile segment linking the Gulf Coast and a major pipeline and storage hub in Cushing. That segment with U.S. borders does not require State Department approval.)That 15,000-job claim is based on [a report the company commissioned](http://www.perrymangroup.com/reports/TransCanada.pdf) which assumesroughly$5 billion of the total will be spent on building the U.S. portion of the pipeline. "The fallacy I see witha lot of the argumentsthatare going back and forthnow is totry to say you can somehow spend $5 billion and not create some economic activity," said Robert Perryman, author of the report. "You can't do that." But critics saythe jobs created will be a drop in the bucket of the U.S. labor force, which totaled more than 153 million peoplein January. Even if those jobs were added in a single month, they would reduce the unemployment rate by just 0.01 percent. When measured against just the construction and manufacturing workforces, the impact would be 0.07 percent. Critics of the company's claims, including a group of Cornell University researchers, also note that the employment impact would amount to the equivalent of 15,000 jobs that last only a year. "We're not looking down our nose here at temporary jobs. A six-month job is better than no work," said Sean Sweeney, one of the authors of [a report on the pipeline's economic impact](http://www.ilr.cornell.edu/globallaborinstitute/research/upload/GLI_KeystoneXL_012312_FIN.pdf). "Butthe actual effect of the project is finite. It's not going to create jobs permanently." The Cornell report also notes that a significant portion of the economic impact will be felt outside the U.S. Some 50 percent or more of the steel pipe used for Keystone XL, the report said, will be manufactured outside of the U.S. "A lot of the steel for Keystone XL is already stockpiled in the U.S. and sourced from India and Canada," said Sweeney. "Those are not U.S. jobs, those are Indian and Canadian jobs." TransCanada also argues that the six states crossed by the pipeline's route "are expected to receive an additional $5.2 billion in property taxes during the estimated operating life of the pipeline." But that analysis fails to account for the likely damage caused by oil spills along the pipeline route. In the past five years, more than half a million barrels of oil and other hazardous liquids have been spilled from U.S. pipelines, killing 76 people and causing some $2.4 billion in property damage,[according to the U.S. Department of Transportation](http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comm/reports/safety/AllPSI.html?nocache=4740).

## Comparative – Net Worse

#### Economically net worse

**Frosch 12**( **DanFrosch is a writer in the research environmental field** Study Warns of Economic Damage in a Keystone Pipeline Spil **http://green.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/03/13/study-warns-of-economic-damage-in-a-keystone-spill/)**

A report released on Tuesday by Cornell University’s Global Labor Institute concludes that the economic damage caused by potential spills from the Keystone XL pipeline could far outweigh the benefits of jobs created by the project. The institute, which advocates the creation of union jobs in renewable energy and analyzes sustainability issues, said that more than a million people work in agricultural or tourism jobs in the six states along Keystone XL’s route and that the economic costs could be considerable if a major spill occurred. The risks of an economically damaging accident are higher than those for conventional crude, the report said, because pipelines carrying oil sands crude are more prone to spills, an argument long made by opponents of the Keystone XL project. The report cited a spill from an Enbridge Energy pipeline in July 2010 that dumped about 843,000 gallons of oil sands crude near Marshall, Mich., and has been especially difficult and expensive to clean.“Given where the pipeline is scheduled to go, it’s not inconceivable that a spill like the Enbridge pipeline spill could occur,” said Sean Sweeney, the institute’s director and a co-author of the study. “And if it contaminated a major waterway in a remote area, it could take a long time to deal with.” TransCanada, whose application to build Keystone XL was rejected by President Obama in January, dismissed the report and cited an initial review by the State Department that found the pipeline would have little adverse environmental impact if operated properly. Terry Cunha, a spokesman for TransCanada, said the company stood by its projections that Keystone XL would create thousands of jobs. “Common sense will tell you that you can’t build the largest infrastructure on the books in the U.S. right now without a significant number of people,” he said. In turning away TransCanada’s application in January, President Obama said a deadline imposed by Congress for deciding Keystone XL’s fate did not allow sufficient time to complete environmental reviews. But he left open the door for the company to reapply for a fresh permit, and last month TransCanada announced its intention to do just that. TransCanada is also in the process of seeking permission to move forward with a southern portion of the 1,700-mile pipeline, from Cushing, Okla., to the Gulf Coast, which would not require the State Department’s approval. With that in mind, and with a decision on Keystone XL still likely to play a major role during the general election, foes of the pipeline were quick to hail Tuesday’s report as the latest evidence that the project was unsafe. “This report turns the political discussions around job creation on its head,” said Danielle Droitsch, an attorney with the Natural Resources Defense Council. “The pipeline will be an economic liability.”

#### TransCanada exaggerates the number of jobs that will be created, ultimately getting rid of even more jobs than it would create.

**Bookman 12/14/11**(Bookman, Jay, columnist and blogger at The Atlanta Journal-Constitution, specializing in foreign relations, environmental and technology-related issues and state and local politics. He has won two national awards for outstanding editorial writing, the National Headliner Award and the Scripps-Howard National Journalism Award, “The Keystone Pipeline Will NOT Create 20,000 New Jobs”, Published December 14th, 2011, MS)

And that, of course, is false, and Lugar and McConnell have good reason to know it is false.The Keystone XL Pipeline,the centerpiece of the latest standoff in Washington,will not produce 20,000 shovel-ready jobs. Even TransCanada, the company pushing the pipeline’s construction, now acknowledges that it is false. The number that the company likes to throw around is now 13,000 direct construction jobs, but that too is misleading. When challenged, the company acknowledges that it is counting what you might call “job years.”In other words,TransCanada believes the project will produce 6,500 jobs that last for two years.Six thousand five hundred jobs is a far cry from 20,000.And even the 6,500-job estimate is much too high. According to an [independent assessment by Cornell University’s School of Industrial and Labor Relations](http://www.ilr.cornell.edu/globallaborinstitute/research/upload/GLI_KeystoneXL_Reportpdf.pdf),the project would produce between 2,500 and 4,650 construction jobs, and could even end up costing the country jobs, for reasons that we’ll get to below. TransCanada is basing its job estimates on a report that it commissioned from [the Perryman Group](http://www.transcanada.com/docs/Key_Projects/TransCanada_US_Report_06-10-10.pdf). However, the Perryman Group has refused to release important data behind its estimate, claiming it to be proprietary information. The folks at Cornell nevertheless took what data Perryman did make available and found several major, fundamental flaws in its approach. For example, a$1 billion portion of the Keystone XL pipeline has already been built and is up and operating. The Perryman study nonetheless pretends that section of the project is still on the drawing boards and, when built, will provide thousands of new jobs.In addition, Keystone supporters ignore the fact that large quantities of Canadian tar-sands oil are already being imported into the United States and are being refined and used in the American Midwest. As the Cornell study points out: “According to TransCanada,KXL will increase the price of heavy crude oil in the Midwest by almost $2 to $4 billion annually, and escalating for several years. It will do this by diverting major volumes of tar sands oil now supplying the Midwest refineries, so it can be sold at higher prices to the Gulf Coast and export markets. As a result, consumers in the Midwest could be paying 10 to 20 cents more per gallon for gasoline and diesel fuel,adding up to $5 billion to the annual US fuel bill.” As the Cornell study concludes, those higher fuel prices for the Midwest could cost that region thousands of jobs.So while the pipeline construction would certainly help the Canadian tar-sands investors — many of them Chinese — get a higher price for their product by moving it to the Gulf, it could prove to be a wash or even a net negative in terms of jobs for American workers.

## \*\*\*Oil Dependence/Venezuela Advantages

## Status Quo Solves-

#### Current Pipelines can transport oil to the U.S.

**Swift 12**

Anthony Swift- Energy Analyst at the National Resource Defense Council, BA in political science and biology “Keystone XL: A Tar Sands Pipeline to Increase Oil Prices” 2012 http://www.nrdc.org/energy/keystone-pipeline/files/Keystone-Oil-Prices-Report.pdf

Keystone XL isnot a pipeline to the United States, but one through it. Existing pipelines from Canada to the United States provide enough capacity to move all the oil that Canada produces. In fact, Canada’s current oil production uses only approximately half of its export pipeline capacity. In 2010, Canada exported less than 2 million bpd of crude oil. The vast majority of these exports were produced in western Canada and transported to the United States. Canada already hasan excess of crude oil export pipelines—enough to export nearly 4.1 million bpd (see table 2: Total Capacity of Canada’s Existing Export Pipelines). Tar sands oil production in Canada is at approximately 1.6 million bpd. Tar sands production would have to reach nearly 4.1 million bpd for Keystone XL to begin to transport additional crude into the United States. 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.

## Won’t remain in U.S.

#### Won’t remain in U.S.

Turner 12

Ted Turner is the founder and chairman of the United Nations Foundation and the founder of CNN and Turner Broadcasting. Co-chairman of the Nuclear Threat Initiative, which seeks to reduce the threat of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons. “Stop Keystone pipeline before it’s too late” CNN February 24, 2012

(http://www.cnn.com/2012/02/22/opinion/turner-keystone-pipeline/index.html)

Meanwhile, the pro-pipeline lobby is pushing the public to accept Keystone XL with fuzzy promises about jobs and security. But TransCanada's jobs claims have been widely discredited, and there is no guarantee the oil transported by the pipeline would remain in the United States for sale.An attempt in Congress to require the oil to be consumed in the United States was rejected just last week, and it has been widely detailed that Gulf Coast refineries plan to export the finished product to Europe and Latin America. How do we become more energy secure under that scenario?

#### Sold overseas

Kohn12

Sally Kohn , political Commentator, Six reasons Keystone XL was a bad deal all along, p. Jan 18, 12 www.foxnews.com/opinion/2012/01/18/six-reasons-keystone-xl-was-bad-deal-all-along/

The oil to be sent through Keystone XL pipeline was never destined for US markets. In its own presentation to investors about the proposed pipeline extension, TransCanada (the company behind Keystone XL) boasted that most if not all of the extracted and refined oil would be exported --- sold in overseas markets where oil fetches a higher price (and thus turns a higher profit for the company).

## \*\*\*US-Canada Relations Advantage

## Solvency

### No Solvency

#### Doesn’t solve relations

Barry 7-5 (Donald, professor of political science at the University of Calgary, “Has decision on Keystone XL poisoned Canada-U.S. relations?,” iPolitics, 2012, http://www.ipolitics.ca/2012/07/05/donald-barry-has-obamas-decision-on-keystone-pipeline-poisoned-canada-u-s-relations/)¶ Is the Canada-U.S. relationship at its “lowest point in decades?”¶ Writing in the online edition of Foreign Affairs Derek Burney and Fen Hampson say it is, and for that they hold President Barack Obama responsible. At the head of their list of complaints is his decision to reject TransCanada Corp’s initial application for the Keystone XL pipeline that would bring oil sands crude from Alberta to Texas Gulf Coast refineries. Ignoring the domestic controversy the issue has created in the United States, Burney and Hampson contend that approval “should have been an easy diplomatic and economic decision,” to enhance energy security and create jobs, and possibly dissuade Canada from diverting oil exports to Asia. But Keystone may not do much to achieve those goals, and the environmental costs could be substantial.¶ The pipeline could help lower U.S. dependence on interruptible foreign oil supplies from “Venezuela or countries in the Middle East,” though the case becomes less compelling as the United States moves closer to self-sufficiency. But with most of Alberta’s oil exported to the American market, Canada would continue to import more than 50 percent of the oil it uses for domestic consumption from the same offshore sources the United States depends upon.¶ As President Richard Nixon’s Task Force on Oil Import Control pointed out more than 40 years ago, if Canada’s foreign supplies were interrupted Canada would have to turn to the United States, thereby reducing the “security value” of imports from Alberta.¶ Would Keystone create “tens of thousands of jobs?”¶ Using a one person-one year formula, TransCanada claims it would employ 13,000 in construction and 7,000 in supply manufacturing (depending on how much of the pipe would be fabricated in the United States), and provide permanent jobs in the hundreds. The U.S. State Department puts the number of construction jobs at 5,000-6,000, and as few as 20 permanent positions. The Cornell Global Labor Institute School of Industrial and Labor Relations estimates the construction workforce even lower at 2,500-4,650, with a permanent complement of 127. Even accepting TransCanada’s optimistic numbers, Keystone’s job creation potential would be more limited than Burney and Hampson suggest.¶ Has Obama’s Keystone decision prompted Canada to turn to Asia “for more reliable economic partners?”¶ The Canadian government encourages such thinking to pressure President Obama to approve the project. But a proposed Northern Gateway pipeline to bring oil sands crude to a marine terminal in British Columbia for shipment to China and other Asian countries has been under consideration since 2006. It has always been seen as a complement to Keystone. Access to the U.S. market remains the prime goal for Canadian producers.¶ The Gateway project, moreover, faces determined opposition and legal challenges from environmental groups and First Nations communities along the route. There is also stiff resistance to increased oil tanker traffic in British Columbia’s coastal waters. Neither issue will be settled any time soon.¶ Has President Obama “caved to environmental activists?”¶ Burney and Hampson challenge President Obama’s decision to reject Keystone pending a review of a new route around Nebraska’s ecologically fragile Sand Hills and Ogallala aquifer on the basis that the pipeline “posed little risk to the landscape it traversed.” But outside experts argue that TransCanada did not adequately evaluate the environmental effects of possible pipeline leaks. The State Department’s Inspector General agrees that information supplied to the department was insufficient to allow it to respond to criticisms of Keystone by the Department of Energy and the Environmental Protection Agency, including those involving the exclusion of 14 alternative routes, five of which “were specific to concerns raised by the public regarding the Ogallala Aquifer in the Sand Hills region.”¶ Heavy oil spills are especially difficult to clean. A 35 mile stretch of Michigan’s Kalamazoo River has only recently been re-opened following the July 2010 rupture of an Enbridge Inc. pipeline, which leaked 20,000 barrels of oil sands crude. The cleanup has cost more than $700 million.President Obama’s Keystone decision is not the game changer in Canada-U.S. relations that Burney and Hampson claim. An astute politician, President Obama knows he would be blamed if Keystone went wrong. He is right to withhold approval until the facts are in.

#### Keystone’s a drop-in-the-bucket – other issues overwhelm relations

Blanchfield 6-25 (Mike, Reporter – Canadian Press, “Obama jilting Canada, plunging relations to new low, says U.S. policy journal ,” Canadian Press, 2012, Online)

Is Barack Obama squandering Canada's love?¶The answer is a resounding yes, according to an essay in a leading U.S. foreign policy journal.¶ "How Obama Lost Canada," is the headline in the online edition of Foreign Affairs, published by the influential Washington think tank, The Council On Foreign Relations.¶ The article cites a litany of wrongs that its authors pin on the current U.S. president, including the delay in the Keystone XL pipeline, protectionist Buy American provisions, even disrespect for Canadian military contributions in Libya and Afghanistan.¶ As a result, the U.S. has jilted Canada, leaving relations at "their lowest point in decades."¶The article is by Derek Burney, a former Canadian diplomatic heavyweight and one-time ambassador to the U.S., and Fen Hampson, a Carleton University foreign policy expert.¶ Theirs is not the first analysis to note this pattern. But its publication in a respected U.S. policy journal months before the presidential election offers a ready-made slogan for further Republican attacks on Obama's leadership during an economic downturn. Canada and the U.S. are each other's top trading partners.¶Obama's decision to delay the Keystone decision until 2013 \_ after the election and following intense lobbying by environmentalists \_ was a point of attack for Republicans during their protracted primaries.¶But Burney and Hampson cite that as only the latest in long series of blunders, not all of them economic.¶ The article offers a sobering counterpoint to the polls that consistently show Obama to be more popular in Canada than his own country, not to mention his outburst of "I love this country" when he first visited Ottawa a month after his 2009 inauguration.¶ "Whether on trade, the environment, or Canada's shared contribution in places such as Afghanistan, time and again the United States has jilted its northern neighbour," the essay says.¶ "If the pattern of neglect continues, Ottawa will get less interested in co-operating with Washington."¶The article notes how Prime Minister Stephen Harper has declared it an economic imperative to bolster trade with China, India, South Korea and other Asian countries. It highlights Harper's pledge \_ while in China \_ to "sell our energy to people who want to buy our energy."¶ Harper spoke after the delay of the Keystone pipeline project, which would have carried crude from the Alberta oilsands to U.S. refineries on the Gulf of Mexico.¶ Two-way trade between Canada and the U.S. totalled $681 billion last year, and supports eight million U.S. jobs.¶ "Yet the Obama administration has recently jeopardized this relationship," the essay says, through the Buy American provision in its stimulus bill that prevented Canadian companies from bidding on infrastructure projects in the U.S.¶ The U.S. recession and the rise of Asia have led to a decline of Canadian exports south in the last decade. About 85 per cent of Canadian exports went to the U.S. in 2000, compared with 68 per cent in 2010, the essay says.¶The slights don't stop there.¶The essay criticizes the U.S. for demanding concessions from Canada on agricultural subsidies as the price of entry into negotiations over the Trans-Pacific Partnership, "while preserving massive agricultural subsidies of its own."¶It accuses the U.S. of sticking Canadian taxpayers with the bill for a new bridge between Detroit and Windsor, the choked crossing point for one-quarter of the trade between the two countries.¶ "The U.S. share is to be repaid over time by the tolls collected, but any shortfalls will rest with the Canadian taxpayer."¶Beyond economics, "Washington has also failed to trust and respect its loyal ally," the essay argues.¶ "To name one small, but telling, example, when Canada ran for a non-permanent seat on the UN Security Council in 2010, the United States offered little support. For whatever reason, Portugal was a more compelling choice."¶ Burney and Hampson argue that the Canadian military sacrifices in Afghanistan \_ including more than 150 lives lost and billions spent \_ as well as its major contribution to last year's NATO-led Libya air campaign have simply not won any enduring respect with U.S. leadership.¶ "Canada has no tangible interests of any kind in Afghanistan or Libya," their essay says. "Its participation in those countries, proportionately larger than any other ally, was intended primarily to strengthen the partnership with the United States on the theory that solid, multilateral commitments would engender more productive bilateral relations. That proved not to be the case."¶ U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton is criticized for how she "went out of her way to rake Canada over the coals" during the March 2010 summit of Arctic coastal states in Gatineau, Que. Clinton was voicing her objections to the exclusion of other countries with "legitimate interests" in the region.¶The Obama administration is cited for showing no interest in Canadian overtures for common North American fuel standards to reduce carbon emissions. The so-called "clean energy dialogue" \_ the major deliverable of 2009 Ottawa visit \_ has become a "monologue," says the essay.

## Arctic

### Cooper Inevitable

#### Every country's policy defines that they want cooperation and multilateral agreement – Prefer our evidence analyzing every policy specifically

**Brosnan, Leschine and Miles '11**[Ian, Thomas, Edwards.School of Marine Affairs University of Washington Seattle, Washington, USA. “Cooperation or Conﬂict in a Changing Arctic?” [http://web.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.uwc.edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=40c969c4-6fe8-4c63-95d0-98d48b833759%40sessionmgr11&vid=2&hid=19](http://web.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.uwc.edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=40c969c4-6fe8-4c63-95d0-98d48b833759@sessionmgr11&vid=2&hid=19). Pg. 4-8. JCook.]

**The U**nited **S**tates **updated its Arctic Region Policy**(U.S. ARP) **on** 9 January 20**09**.14 It was released during the final days of President George W. Bush’s administration, which has raised questions about its merit as a guide to present U.S. policy. However, **the contents seem to have been carefully crafted to serve as a flexible, long-term policy for the U**nited **S**tates **rather than a partisan move** to influence long-term U.S. Arctic conduct. Furthermore, there have been no suggestions that the administration of President Barack Obama desires to make any changes to the document.15 **The U.S.ARP identifies U.S. interests in seven topical areas and lays out steps for implementing the policy. These interests include:**Arctic nationaland homeland security; international governance; extended continental shelf and boundary issues; **international scientific cooperation; maritime transportation; economic and energy issues; and environmental protection and conservation of living marine resources. Canada’s “Northern Strategy:** OurNorth,Our Heritage, Our Future”was**released on** 26 July 20**08** as a document and aWeb site.16**The strategy is built on four pillars:** (1) **exercising Arctic sovereignty,** which includes establishing and maintaining a physical presence in the Arctic and mapping of the continental margin to substantiate claims to an extended continental shelf; **(2) protecting environmental heritage, including conducting scientific research and environmental protection; (3) promoting social and economic development** through resource exploration, development, and infrastructure improvements; **and (4) improving and devolving Northern governance**, which involves streamlining regulatory processes in the three northern territories and transferring authorities over land and resources to territorial and indigenous governments. **There is also a foreign policy component of Canada’s “Northern Strategy” that identifies Canada’s bilateral projects with its Arctic partners and describes the Arctic Council and other international fora in which Canada participates. Norway’s “High North Strategy” was signed on** 1December 20**06**.17 **It clearly identifies Norway’s interest in the sustainable development of Arctic energy and fisheries resources, but is also notable for balancing development with environmental management concerns and a strong focus on regional and international cooperation.** It is also the oldest of the Arctic state strategy documents. However, despite its vintage, it remains relevant. The government that authored the report remained in power through the 2009 elections and the new government has not replaced or updated the strategy. In a 2010 address to the Norwegian parliament, the Norwegian foreign minister affirmed many of its policies.18 Norway’s “High North Strategy” is divided into nine subject areas: (1) foreign policy, including focus on energy and the environment, regional forums, and presence of Norwegian armed forces in the Arctic; (2) knowledge generation and competence building in marine, climate, and polar research, petroleum research and development, and environmental monitoring and emergency response; (3) indigenous peoples’ issues; (4) people-to-people cooperation in the North through cultural exchange; (5) environmental issues related to climate change, long-range transboundary air pollution, and integrated management of Northern seas; (6) management and utilization of marine resources; (7) petroleum activities; (8) marine transportation; and (9) business development. **The Russian Federation’s “Arctic Strategy” was approved on** 18 September 20**08**.19 **It is built on five central objectives**: (1) social and economic development, particularly natural resource development and expanded use of the Northern Sea Route; (2) military security and protection of the state borders; (3) environmental protection, including protection and preservation of the Arctic and management of anthropogenic development impacts; (4) scientific and technological research and development in areas of climate change, resource exploitation, and social issues; **and** (5) **foreign affairs, including establishing or maintaining positive bilateral relationships and determining limits of the Russian continental shelf beyond 200 nautical miles. The strategy also describes the measures and mechanisms for achieving these objectives and three stages of implementation that are to be completed by 2020**. The statement makes it clear that Russia’s priority is to secure its Arctic territory for use as a strategic resource pool. **Denmark’s** May 20**08 “Arctic Strategy”**20 **has two foci, fostering Greenlandic independence through economic development and Denmark’s role as an Arctic nation.**21 The former receives greater emphasis throughout the statement. **The strategy discusses** 11 key issue areas: (1) home rule; (2) asserting sovereignty, including physical presence and continental shelf mapping; (3) Arctic and Nordic cooperation; (4) indigenous peoples; (5) energy andminerals development; (6) protection and sustainable use of living natural resources; (7) the environment, including addressing climate change and pollution; (8) research, particularly into climate change and pollutant impacts; (9) shipping and aviation infrastructure development; (10) encouraging commerce and industry; and (11) **cultural cooperation.**

#### Arguments for Arctic wars are over simplifications. Logically, states will create cooperation instead.

**Brosnan, Leschine and Miles '11**[Ian, Thomas, Edwards.School of Marine Affairs University of Washington Seattle, Washington, USA.“Cooperation or Conﬂict in a Changing Arctic?” [http://web.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.uwc.edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=40c969c4-6fe8-4c63-95d0-98d48b833759%40sessionmgr11&vid=2&hid=19](http://web.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.uwc.edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=40c969c4-6fe8-4c63-95d0-98d48b833759@sessionmgr11&vid=2&hid=19). Pg. 1-3. JCook.]

**Although many of the arguments for Arctic conﬂict found in the popular press are built on oversimpliﬁcations of complex multidimensional issues, conﬂict in the region seems possible. But a possibility of conﬂict is also a possibility of cooperation. The lively debates about the future of the Arctic have been dominated by conflict; examination of the opportunities for cooperation** among the five coastal Arctic states **is needed.** This article addresses this need by using the Arctic strategies of the United States, Canada, Norway, Russia, and Denmark to identify where important common issues and circumstances suggest that **cooperation among the five states can lead to mutually desirable outcomes**. These opportunities are categorized as dilemmas of “common interest” and “common aversion,” a framework described by Arthur Stein in *Why Nations Cooperate: Circumstance and Choice in International Relations*.3 This approach cannot predict cooperation; whether states cooperate or conflict is a function both of circumstances and the criteria states use as they make policy choices. However, **by examining the circumstances and incentives to cooperate in the Arctic, avenues for cooperation can be illuminated.** Cooperation in International Relations **In circumstances where states, acting alone, can realize their desired outcomes, there is no need for cooperation; no conflicts exist or such conflicts as there are can be overcome by the assertion of state power.**4 **Although actors may prefer unilateral action, they may find that they need cooperate to attain outcomes protecting or advancing their interests** as well as to avoid outcomes to which they are averse.5 **These positions may be categorized as dilemmas of common interest** or dilemmas of common aversion. Dilemmas of common interest arise when actors have a common interest in ensuring some optimal outcome, one that all actors prefer to suboptimal outcomes that may arise from unilateral action. A dilemma of common aversion arises when actors either do not share a preferred outcome or face several equally acceptable outcomes, but are unified in seeking to avoid a particular outcome.6 **Dilemmas of common interestmay give rise to regimes inwhichactorsmust collaborate to attain an optimal outcome that is not the outcome that would result if each state pursuedits own interests.**7 **Because they must both constrain the behavior of the actors involved and prevent defections, collaborative regimes will tend to be more formalized and involve international organizations that service the needs of the regime.**8 Dilemmas of common aversion can be addressed through coordination.**Where regimes are created to facilitate coordination, they tend to be less formal (although international organizations may still be involved) because they do not need to bind the behavior of the actors to ensure a particular outcome nor ensure that actors comply with the directives of the regime.9 They need only to ensure that one outcome is avoided. As a result, these regimes tend to be self-policing; defectors often do not benefit at the expense of the others and instead harm themselves. The five major players in the Arctic**—the United States, Canada, Russia, Norway, and Denmark—**have recently published new or updated Arctic strategies and policies** (henceforth referred to collectively as strategy statements). **These statements reveal where the five states have common concerns and associated desired outcomes with respect to the Arctic. Where the states have incentives to cooperate, their desired outcomes can be used to identify dilemmas of common interest and common aversion in the most pressing Arctic issues—presumed to be those selected for inclusion in national strategies. Opportunities for cooperation are thus revealed, as dilemmas of common interests and common aversions may be resolved through formal and informal international regimes.**10

#### Cooperation will stop conflict and solve arctic war – Illegal fishing and mapping prove.

Brosnan, Leschine and Miles '11**[Ian, Thomas, Edwards.School of Marine Affairs University of Washington Seattle, Washington, USA.“Cooperation or Conﬂict in a Changing Arctic?”** [http://web.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.uwc.edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=40c969c4-6fe8-4c63-95d0-98d48b833759%40sessionmgr11&vid=2&hid=19](http://web.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.uwc.edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=40c969c4-6fe8-4c63-95d0-98d48b833759@sessionmgr11&vid=2&hid=19)**. Pg. 13-19. JCook.]**

**Under the theme of sovereignty,** the coastal Arctic states are interested in determining the extentof their extended continental shelves and projecting sovereign presence. There areincentives for the five coastal states to cooperate on both issues. Cooperation will allowthem to realize increasingly optimal outcomes. **In some cases,** cooperation among the states isalready occurring.***Extended Continental Shelves.*Article 76 of UNCLOS permits a coastal state whose continental margin extends beyond its 200-nautical-mile EEZ to establish the outer edge of its continental margin up to, but no further than, 350 nautical miles beyond the baselines used to delimit the territorial sea or not more than 100 nautical miles from the 2,500-meter isobath. The coastal state is accorded sovereign rights to the mineral and nonliving resources of the seabed and subsoil and sedentary living marine resources out to the extent of its continental margin and has 10 years from the national date of entry into force ofthe convention to submit to the Convention on the Limits of the Continental Shelf (CLCS) the particulars of the limits of its extended continental shelf.29 Mapping the continental shelf to determine marginal extent and preparing the necessary information is a technically challenging and expensive task. It typically requires the use of multiple techniques to map seafloor topography and sediment characteristics and can involve the employment of two ships, one to perform mapping activities and the other to provide icebreaking services.30 *Cooperation and Extended Continental Shelf Issues.*** Is there room for cooperation on the first issue, mapping the continental margins? The United States, Russia, Canada, and Denmark are clear that delimiting their continental shelves is a national priority. The U.S. State Department describes why: certainty and international recognition **[of the limits of the continental shelves]** are important in establishing the necessary stability for development, conservation and protection of these areas [that are] likely rich in resources.**31 However, this is insufficient to suggest that an avenue for cooperation exists.** The answer may lie in comparing thepotential outcomes of unilateral action against cooperation. **Consider the first case,** a state engaging in unilateral mapping of its Arctic continental margins. The state will bear the full financial costs of mapping its extended continental margin; two ice-capable ships **carrying costly mapping equipment and technically competent personnel may be required, one to break ice, the other to map the seafloor.32 The ships and their availability may be particularly important as the national icebreaker fleets of the Arctic nations are aging and are prone to mission-limiting casualties.33 As developed, relatively wealthy nations, the Arctic states seem likely to have the resources to complete mapping efforts by their 10-year timetable (Norway succeeded and Russia submitted information34)but**, while the shelves are being mapped, shelf-related decisions and activities such as resource development and bilateral boundary resolutions must bedeferred and the legal and technical personnel to prepare and evaluate claims at the national and international level must be maintained**.35 The same holds true if submission timetables are not met.** Collaborative efforts can conceivably result in better outcomes. Nations may have access to more ship-time, comparative advantages in mapping equipment and ship capabilities may be realized, duplication of effort may be avoided, and mapping, submission, and approval may proceed more quickly, leading to cost savings and political stability that companies investing in resource exploitation value.**36 Submissions to the CLCS need not be for the whole of a nation’s extended continental shelf: Norway’s 2006 submission was for three distinct and important regions, with the possibility of additional future submissions.37 Thus,**collaboration need not encompass the entire mapping efforts of the states, but could focus on priority areas such as the regions where there may be overlapping claims**. Continental shelf mapping appears to represent a dilemma of common interest.** Collaboration would likely permit the states to realize a more optimal outcome: geopolitical stability supportive of development, conservation, and protection of a potentially resourcerich shelf, in a more timely and perhaps less costly manner**. The United States and Canada appear to prefer the outcomes from cooperation; they have conducted two cooperative mapping missions in the Beaufort Sea since 2008.38 *Sovereign Presence.* Sovereign presence in this analysis refers to efforts to deter, detect, and interdict illegal activities such as smuggling, terrorism, and illegal fishing. These are activities that, generally speaking, require combinations of enforcement vessels (aircraft and ships), trained personnel, and monitoring and surveillance capabilities. The capability of the states in these areas varies. In the U.S. Arctic, these sorts of activities are generally under the purview of the Coast Guard, whose Arctic assets include three icebreakers. Two, the most powerful, are well past their service lives and neither ship, at the time of writing, is operational.39 Other U.S. Coast Guard assets, including small boats and aircraft, were not designed for Arctic operations and summer tests in Barrow suggest they are not wellsuited to Arctic use.40 Canada’s icebreaker fleet is also aging and the country has long had plans to build a powerful Arctic icebreaker and, more recently, a small fleet of Arctic patrol ships. The icebreaker project has been slow and the Arctic patrol ship plans were recently placed on hold.41 Canada’s satellite-based Arctic surveillance project, Polar Epsilon, does appear to be proceeding.42Norway operates a dozen patrol ships, including several ice-strengthened vessels that operate in the Barents Sea and a program named i-Nord has been proposed to implement and operate a comprehensive monitoring system for the Norwegian Arctic.43 Denmark operates seven ice-strengthened ships that conduct fisheries and sovereignty patrols in Greenland and teams of specially trained dogsled forces patrol northern Greenland.44 A recent defense position paper released by the Danish government proposes a new Arctic command and military group with air, land, and sea components and new surveillance capabilities.45 Russia’s capabilities are less evident, but the country previously announced creation of a new Arctic security group under the Russian Federal Security Service and has reportedly awarded a contract for a fleet of coastal patrol ships.46 The Russian Federal Security Service operates a large, but aged, fleet of coastal patrol ships, several of which are strengthened for Arctic operations.47 *Cooperation and Sovereign Presence.*** Norway devotes the most attention in its strategy statement to sovereign presence. Three pages of its strategy are devoted to **illegal, unreported, and unregulated (**IUU) fishing. Norway, Canada, and the United States describe interest in bilateral cooperation to stem illegal activities**. Similar** interest in bilateral cooperation on such issues is not explicit in the Danish and Russian strategies, but may be inferred from their stated interest in Arctic cooperation generally. There are benefits to joint action that suggest that cooperation will result in outcomes that are otherwise not attainable and may represent the outcomes sought by the states, even if they are not explicitly stated in the strategy statements. Bilateral and multilateral efforts to deter, detect, and interdict illegal activities can serve as force multipliers, maximizing the use of limited resources**. For example, when the police force of one party participates in a ride-along of another state’s maritime patrol, the authority and jurisdiction of two states can be projected at once from one vessel rather than two. Comparative advantages in equipment and capability can also be realized if nations have invested in unique platforms for enforcement or surveillance, including satellite deployments.48 Such advantages need not be identified post hoc; the Arctic states are reviewing their surveillance and operational capabilities. Bilateral and multilateral efforts to stem illegal activity can also mean that international borders no longer serve as a means of escaping authorities.**

#### Cooperation will stop conflict and solve arctic resource scenarios – Prefer our evidence siting every scenario possible.

Brosnan, Leschine and Miles '11**[Ian, Thomas, Edwards.School of Marine Affairs University of Washington Seattle, Washington, USA.“Cooperation or Conﬂict in a Changing Arctic?”** [http://web.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.uwc.edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=40c969c4-6fe8-4c63-95d0-98d48b833759%40sessionmgr11&vid=2&hid=19](http://web.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.uwc.edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=40c969c4-6fe8-4c63-95d0-98d48b833759@sessionmgr11&vid=2&hid=19)**. Pg. 23-25. JCook.]**

***Cooperation and Resources.*Under the UNCLOS framework,** resource development outcomes **that may** require cooperation in order to be realized include transboundary fish stocks and resources in areas of overlappingclaims. These appear to be bilateral issues in the Arctic, **so it is useful to consider the potential dilemmas of the Arctic states in the context of four regions: a Norwegian/Russian region (the Barents Sea area); a Canadian/Danish region that includes the Lincoln Sea and two small areas of overlapping claims; a Canadian/U.S. region in the Beaufort Sea that also includes an overlapping territorial claim; and a U.S./Russian region north of the Bering Strait. *Norway/Russia (Barents Sea).* The case of Russia and Norway serves as a demonstration of two states forgoing unilateral action in order to attain a more optimal outcome. According to their strategy statements, the preferred resource development outcomes of Russia and Norway are similar; both seek to develop Arctic resources to sustain existing exports and domestic industries and support social and economic development. The fisheries and oil and gas resources they seek to develop are found in the Barents Sea, where fish stocks cross between the waters of both states (transboundary) and through a formerly disputed area known as the Grey Zone. The same** formerly disputed area is also believed to contain valuable energy resources.**70** Russia and Norway recognized early on that only cooperation in Barents Seafisheries would yield an optimal outcome, one of sustainable fisheries and exclusion of undesirable third parties**.71 A 1975 treaty established a joint Norwegian/Russian fisheries commission, an 1976 treaty established a framework for cooperation on joint stocks, and a 1978 Grey Zone Agreement that governs the harvest limits, catch allocations, fishing gear in use, and division of enforcement authority in the Grey Zone.72 Although outside the disputed Grey Zone, Norwegian state-owned StatoilHydro and Russia’s Gazprom have recently signed a 3-year memorandum of understanding to work jointly to develop Shtokman field.73 In late April 2010,** Russia and Norway jointly announced that they had resolved their dispute over the delimitation oftheir maritime boundary in the Barents Sea and, subsequently, signed a treaty on maritime delimitation and cooperation **in the Barents Sea and the Arctic Ocean, effectively** eliminating political uncertainty that has been one barrier to development of Barents Sea resources.**74 *Canada/Denmark (Lincoln Sea).*** TheCanada/Denmark case is similar to that of Russia and Norway. There exist overlapping claims in the Lincoln Sea.**75 However, the area of the claims is far smaller than the Grey Zone, perhaps to the point of being insignificant as far as resources are concerned.76** Denmark and Canada’s Arctic strategies reveal a preference for resource development to support economic development and, ultimately, economic independence of their Arctic territories. If the area of overlapping claims in the Lincoln Sea proves to contain energy **and fisheries resources (or fisheries resources develop as a result of changing oceanographic conditions) and climate and market conditions support exploitation,** industry investors will likely seek geopolitical stability beforeinvesting in energy development in the disputed areas. Canada and Denmark face a dilemma of common interest. The preferred optimum result for the states appears to be development of the resources in the disputed area. To realize this optimal outcome, Canada and Denmarkmust collaborate to realize the geopoliticalstability that may be a prerequisite to energy development **and to manage transboundaryfish stocks to prevent overfishing and ensure long-term stock conservation and utilization. The Russian/Norwegian management scheme in the Barents Sea, establishment of a joint fisheries commission to set catch limits and agreements on harvest allocation, enforcement, and cooperative development of energy resources, provides an model for a possible Canadian/Danish regime in the Lincoln Sea if the location of maritime borders cannot be agreed on. *Canada/United States (Beaufort Sea).***In contrast to Russia, Norway, Denmark, and Canada, the U**nited** S**tates** does not express a strong preference for resource development. **In keeping with the overall tone of its policy,** the U**nited** S**tates simply** notes that it has interests in Arctic resources. **At first glance, the Canadian development-oriented strategy and the more neutral U.S. policy seem at odds.** Canadian strategy and recent federal actions have given attentionto the area through commercial fisheries-related investments in Nunavut and the focus on the energy resources of Mackenzie Delta**.77 It seems that** the U**nited** S**tates** and Canada have thesame preferred outcome. **Specifically,** they wish to preserve their potential fisheries interests in the Beaufort Sea and energy interests where they have an overlapping territorial claim. This seems to be a case where the states may obtain their desired outcome withoutcooperation. However, consider the hypothetical case where one country finds a compelling reason to begin fishing Beaufort Sea stocks or drilling for oil where the states have overlapping claims. This hypothetical scenario would place the interests of the other stateat risk and suggests that the states actually have a dilemma of common interest. The optimal result, and incentive to collaborate, is a case where each state’s interests in energy resources in the disputed area and potential transboundary Arctic fish stocks are not placed at risk by the activities of the other state. An informal moratorium on oil and gas development in the disputed region of the Beaufort Sea already exists to preserve the interests of both states.**78 A joint moratorium on fishing throughout the Beaufort Sea would ensure the states their preferred outcome: preservation of their interests in the Beaufort Sea. At some future date, should there prove to be commercially viable fisheries in the Beaufort Sea or accessible energy resources in the area of overlapping claims that both states desire to exploit, a dilemma of common interest would still exist. Only the desired outcome would have changed, and Canada and the United States would have the same incentives to cooperate as Canada and Denmark. Again, the Norwegian/Russian agreements provide an example of a regime to address such issues. Both Canada and the United States appear amenable to the idea of new governance arrangements. The U.S. Arctic Policy explicitly states that new governance arrangements should be considered as human activities in the Arctic change. Canada’s strategy is not as explicit, but it does indicate that Canada intends to continue to deepen cooperation with the United States on emerging Arctic issues. *United States/Russia.***The case of the U**nited** S**tates** and Russia is similar to that of the U**nited** S**tates** and Canada. Their preferred outcomes, as stated in their strategy statements, seem at odds. But a regional view suggests that Russia’s maritime focus is largely on development in northwest Russia rather than the Far East.**79 This suggests that both countries may at present be interested in preserving their interests in their border region.** The U**nited** S**tates a**nd Russia do not have overlapping territorial claims in the Arctic, although Russia has not ratified the 1991 treaty delimiting the U.S./Russian maritime boundary**.80 Russia does, however, abide by its terms so, unlike the Canada/Denmark and Canada/U.S. cases, there does not appear to be any immediate concern over overlapping claims to energy resources.81** This leaves potential transboundary Arctic fish stocks as anavenue forcooperation between Russia and the United States as existing agreements do not extend north of the Bering Strait. As with Canada, a joint moratorium on new fishing could ensure the states their preferred outcome: preservation of their fisheries interests in the Arctic.

#### Cooperation will occur because of shipping

Brosnan, Leschine and Miles '11**[Ian, Thomas, Edwards.School of Marine Affairs University of Washington Seattle, Washington, USA.“Cooperation or Conﬂict in a Changing Arctic?”** [http://web.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.uwc.edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=40c969c4-6fe8-4c63-95d0-98d48b833759%40sessionmgr11&vid=2&hid=19](http://web.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.uwc.edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=40c969c4-6fe8-4c63-95d0-98d48b833759@sessionmgr11&vid=2&hid=19)**. Pg. 26-27. JCook.]**

In order to determine how opposition to unmanaged shipping may represent an avenue for Arctic cooperation, a number of component issues need to be considered. **Among the five states, 10 topics related to shipping are mentioned in their Arctic strategy statements. These include: aids to navigation; Vessel Traffic Services (VTS); ports; weather and navigation services; iceberg and sea-ice reports; shipping monitoring; standards for Arctic ships; environmental response; and search and rescue response. There are not clear incentives for cooperation on port development, aids to navigation, and weather or navigation services. These are traditionally national activities and, while there are international standards for the marking of aids to navigation, the states do not seem interested in new standards but rather development of infrastructure. These issues seem likely to remain targets of unilateral action.** There are**, however,** incentives for cooperation to address state concerns regarding unsupported shipping through the remaining infrastructures and services **mentioned above; vessel traffic and monitoring services, sea-ice and iceberg services, and environmental and search and rescue response.** These represent dilemmas of common interest as cooperation may result in increasing optimal outcomes that the states cannot necessarily attain acting alone**. VTS can assist vessel movements in restricted, crowded, or otherwise sensitive areas. Coordinated VTS may permit smooth transitions for mariners moving between national jurisdictions and permit states to monitor traffic bound for their waters. Coordination ofCanadian and U.S. VTS services in Puget Sound through the Co-operative Vessel Traffic System Agreement is a prime example.95** There are **also** potential incentives for cooperation on icebergand sea-ice reporting. Aircraft observations funneled through a secretariat for analysis and distribution could accomplish iceberg and sea-ice reporting services. By poolingresources and establishing one or several international centers to operate the service, states could avoid duplicate capital investments and operational costs. The currentInternational Ice Patrol that serves the North Atlantic is an example. Seventeen statescontribute financially to the service and their payments are based on each participating nation’s percentage of the total cargo tonnage transiting the patrol area during the ice season**.96**Environmental response and search and rescue cooperation can delineate clearresponsibilities of states for responding to mishaps**, improve response by establishing lines of communication and standardized procedures before events occur, eliminate gaps in geographic coverage, and pool resources to prevent unnecessary redundancies in service.** A search and rescue agreement is presentlybeing negotiated by the Arctic states.**97 As events such as the *Exxon Valdez* grounding and the Deepwater Horizon explosion suggest, a similar environmental response agreement could be equally valuable. Finally, there are incentives to cooperate on standards for Arctic ships.** States have historically cooperated on such issues because they gain the assurance that the standards they apply to their ships leaves them free to transit the waters of other states **and engage in trade as well as the knowledge that ships entering their waters meet the states’ desired standards for construction and operation. States are averse to their ships and crews needing to meet numerous similar or unique requirements as they ply the seas.98 The Arctic states concern regarding underregulated Arctic shipping therefore represents a dilemma of common aversion. The International Maritime Organization (IMO) has already issued guidelines for construction, equipping, and operation of ships intended for Arctic service.99 Guidelines often precede binding standards to determine that there is a need for such standards and, if the Arctic states are averse to substandard ships proceeding through their Arctic waters, codifying and making mandatory the current guidelines represents an opportunity for cooperation among the states.100**

### Turn – No War

#### 1. Turn – There will be no arctic war – It's your framing that makes it inevitable

**Brosnan, Leschine and Miles '11**[Ian, Thomas, Edwards.School of Marine Affairs University of Washington Seattle, Washington, USA. “Cooperation or Conﬂict in a Changing Arctic?” [http://web.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.uwc.edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=40c969c4-6fe8-4c63-95d0-98d48b833759%40sessionmgr11&vid=2&hid=19](http://web.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.uwc.edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=40c969c4-6fe8-4c63-95d0-98d48b833759@sessionmgr11&vid=2&hid=19). Pg. 31-.JCook.]

**Conclusion Arctic Ocean conflict is not inevitable. Numerous avenues for cooperation exist and categorizing these opportunities as common interests and common aversions suggests how these avenues may be pursued.Under this framework,** Stein has suggested that new options, **alternative conceptualizations, and different perspectives can influence policy decisions.**126 Thus,**in a dynamic, uncertain environment such as the Arctic, it is perhaps more useful to explore and illuminate the avenues for cooperation than to attempt to predict conflict.**

### Canadian Army Weak

#### Canada’s weak military is a problem for the United states- forcing them to protect all of upper North America

**Cooper02** (Barry Cooper, Professor of political science at the University of Calgary, Canada's Weak Military Is a Burden to U.S.”, Newsday, December 3, 2002, http://www.newsday.com/canada-s-weak-military-is-a-burden-to-u-s-1.250609)

'Every nation," said Winston Churchill, "must have an army,¶either its own or somebody else's." His words bear on the fundamental question¶ of Canadian security policy today: **Because of Canadian military weakness, the¶ upper half of the North American continent is increasingly going to be secured¶ not by Canadians and Americans working together, but by Americans alone**, acting¶ under American commanders and on behalf of American interests.¶ Canadians have lost a lot of sovereignty because of military weakness; we¶ are about to lose a lot more. Historically, Canadians took care of domestic¶ security well enough, and relied on the British army and the Royal Navy for¶ external defense. But, from the summer of 1940, when Britain appeared to be on¶ the verge of defeat by Germany, to the present, Canada has relied on the United¶ States for help to guard the approaches to the country and to the continent.¶ Until the past generation or so, Canada has been capable not of defending¶ itself, but of not being a burden to the United States. **Today, however, Canada¶ has provided Washington with an unnecessary problem: how to deal with a¶ friendly country that is rapidly running out of defense capability and doesn't¶ see its weakness as a problem.¶**Canada's current defense posture is not encouraging. Consider first the¶ country's best-equipped and most battle-ready service, the navy. Ottawa's¶ long-standing naval strategy is built around the concept of a flexible task¶ group that can operate in combination with other navies - or, rather, with the¶ only one that counts for Canada, the U.S. Navy. Canada has three 30-year-old¶ destroyers and a fourth tied up in British Columbia because there are not¶ enough sailors to put her to sea. In addition, four surplus submarines have¶ been purchased from the Royal Navy, but there have been problems making them¶ serviceable. Canada also owns two old and rusty support ships.¶ About the only blue-water vessels that are approximately equal to their¶ American equivalents are a dozen Halifax-class frigates. They are still¶ relatively up-to-date - except that they carry Sea King helicopters. At 40-plus¶ years of age, these dangerous helicopters are considerably senior to the¶ pilots who fly them.¶ **Worst of all, half of Canada's surface fleet and trained sailors are¶ committed to Operation Apollo, Canada's military contribution to the¶ international campaign against terrorism. But the current levels of commitment¶ are simply not sustainable. There are no plans to replace the old ships. There¶ is no slack to take the frigates out of service to upgrade them. By¶ conservative estimates, within five years, Canada will be unable to mount any¶ task group deployments**.¶ Matters are even worse in the other two services. The number of operational¶ CF-18 jet fighters has declined from 122 some 20 years ago to about 80. One¶ reason so many Air Canada pilots are so young is because they took early¶ retirement from the air force.¶ Worst of all is the army. It needs 24 new fire control support technicians¶ a year to operate certain wheeled armored vehicles. Over the past four years, a¶ total of four technicians have been recruited. Canada has no first-class tanks.¶ The reason for the sorry state of the Canadian Forces is obvious:¶Successive Canadian governments spent the "peace dividend" long before there¶ was a hint of peace. Currently, defense expenditures constitute 1.1 percent of¶ the gross domestic product, which places us just ahead of Luxembourg. The¶ United States spends Canada's defense budget in less than a week.¶ Moreover, the Americans have noticed. **For U.S. defense planners, the¶ Canadian Forces are past the point of no return: Canada may as well not have an¶ army**, the air force is minute and the navy will soon enough be rust.¶ In short, Americans today can no longer neglect Canada and trust Canadians¶ to do their duty. It is one reason why the animosity between official¶ Washington and official Ottawa is nearing an all-time high. For the United¶ States, Canadians have become weak freeloaders with a bad attitude.¶ Machiavelli explained what all this means for Canada-U.S. relations: "Among¶ the evils of being unarmed," he said, "it causes you to be despised."¶ Canadians are going to have to get used to being despised.

#### Canada’s army is weakening at a time of need – can’t defend homeland

**The Ottawa Citizen 09** (The Ottawa Citizen, Most trusted news source in the Ottawa-Gatineau, “Weak on defence”, The Ottawa Citizen, March 18, 2009, <http://www2.canada.com/vancouversun/news/editorial/story.html?id=0861bc9e-62c1-4b54-b136-9d26d72d9dbe>)

There are alarming indications that**the Canadian military is weakening during a time of growing demand.** Attrition rates in the army are steadily increasing.¶ Despite stepped-up recruitment drives, the army has repeatedly fallen short of expansion goals. No wonder the troops are showing signs of strain, both individually and as a collective.¶ **Things are so bad**, Leslie told the Senate's security and defence committee last week, that **the army will have to consider taking an operational break of at least one year after Canadian troops leave Afghanistan in 2011**. Just making it to that deadline is a challenge.¶ Meanwhile, Leslie testified that more than 80 tanks are still sitting in storage -- nearly two years after the federal government announced their purchase -- because no contractor has been hired to do necessary upgrades.¶ This is unacceptable. The Canadian government can't send soldiers to places like Afghanistan without holding up its part of the bargain. And this isn't just about fighting foreign wars.¶ **Canada's most pressing security interest is right here at home, as other countries try to erode our sovereignty in the North.The Russian surveillance plane that came up over the Arctic and tried to make mischief on the eve of U.S. President Barack Obama's visit to Ottawa won't be the last.**

## Canadian-China Worse

### Inevitable

#### It’s inevitable, booming markets, slow U.S. growth means diversification

**Mintz**12

JackMintz, the Palmer Chair of Public Policy at the School of Public Policy at the University of Calgary, Canada downgraded, relations with U.S. at lowest point in 25 years, Financial Post Jan 25 2012 <http://opinion.financialpost.com/2012/01/25/jack-mintz-canada-downgraded-relations-with-the-u-s-at-lowest-point-in-25-years/>)

With the U.S. economy growing slowly for many years to come and with booming emerging markets, Canada will naturally diversify trade. The role of Canadian federal and provincial governments is therefore to make sure policies are not inhibiting trade and capital flows. Seen in this light, the Canadian government is moving in the right direction to negotiate free-trade agreements with various Asian countries as well as Europe. It should make sure its infrastructure — ports, pipelines, and transport — is in place to take advantage of these new opportunities. Canada should develop more investment and tax treaties to remove the tax and regulatory barriers that inhibit the flow of capital in new markets.

## F-35s

### Not Key to military

#### The F-35 cannot improve the military – cost overruns cause drastic delays

**The Economist 2011** [7/14/11 [Print edition, “The last manned fighter,” http://www.economist.com/node/18958487?story\_id=18958487&fsrc=rss,]

Burning banknotes Above all, the F-35 was meant to be affordable. Development costs would be shared across the three versions and with eight foreign partners who were also buying and helping to build the F-35. Manufacturing scale economies were assured because more than 3,000 planes were to be sold—2,443 to Uncle Sam and the rest to his NATO allies. And because 80% of the parts were common to all three versions, maintenance and logistics would be simpler and cheaper. Deliveries of operational aircraft were to begin in 2010. That was the idea, anyway. The F-35’s critics have long argued that its performance is compromised by having to fulfil too many roles and that an over-complicated design lashed to an over-optimistic schedule was asking for trouble. In the past 18 months, as delays have mounted and costs escalated, even some of the plane’s ardent fans have become alarmed. In 2009 the Pentagon realised that a breach of the Nunn-McCurdy rules on over-budget defence-procurement programmes was inevitable, because costs would exceed the original baseline by more than 50%. An internal report declared: “Affordability is no longer embraced as a core pillar.”

#### The F-35 fails – cost overruns, take off and landing difficulties, software problems and the plane hasn’t even been tested yet

**The Economist 2011** [7/14/11 [Print edition, “The last manned fighter,” http://www.economist.com/node/18958487?story\_id=18958487&fsrc=rss]

Anticipating the breach, in March 2010 MrGatesrestated his support for the F-35, but hit out at “unacceptable delays and cost overruns”. He said he was “fundamentally restructuring” the programme, adding more money and time for development. He also withheld $614m in performance payments to Lockheed Martin, tying its future earnings to specific criteria rather than the subjective ones that he believed had stiffed the taxpayer. In January this year Mr Gates made a series of further announcements which included spending another $4.6 billion on development, slowing down initial production to avoid building aircraft that would later have to be expensively upgraded and putting the marines’ STOVL version on two-year “probation” because of problems with the aircraft’s structure and propulsion system. Condemning the failure to get costs under control, which he blamed partly on the lack of financial discipline in the defence department during George Bush’s presidency and partly on execution failures by Lockheed Martin and its partners, Mr Gates said that “the culture of endless money that has taken hold must be replaced by a culture of restraint”. The latest cost estimates from the Government Accountability Office (GAO), published in May to coincide with a Senate Armed Services Committee hearing on the F-35 programme, were shocking. The average price of each plane in “then-year” dollars had risen from $69m in 2001 to $133m today. Adding in $56.4 billion of development costs, the price rises from $81m to $156m. The GAO report concluded that since 2007 development costs had risen by 26% and the timetable had slipped by five years. MrGates’s 2010 restructuring helped. But still, “after more than nine years in development and four in production, the JSF programme has not fully demonstrated that the aircraft design is stable, manufacturing processes are mature and the system is reliable”. Apart from the STOVL version’s problems, the biggest issue was integrating and testing the software that runs the aircraft’s electronics and sensors. At the hearing, Senator John McCain described it as “a train wreck” and accused Lockheed Martin of doing “an abysmal job”.

#### F-35s aren’t key to the military – limited range and drone replacements

**The Economist 2011** [7/14/11 [Print edition, “The last manned fighter,” http://www.economist.com/node/18958487?story\_id=18958487&fsrc=rs]

The future belongs to the drones. But the longer-term outlook for the F-35 is uncertain. Its costly capabilities are intended to make it effective against the air defences of a sophisticated enemy, such as China. But the growing vulnerability of American aircraft carriers to Chinese missiles will mean operating from well beyond the F-35’s 600-mile (1,000km) range. Some military strategists already think that the job the F-35 is meant to do can be better handled by cruise missiles and remotely piloted drones. In many roles, unmanned planes are more efficient: they carry neither a bulky pilot nor the kit that keeps him alive, which means they can both turn faster and be stealthier. And if they are shot down, no one dies. Even the F-35’s champions concede that it will probably be the last manned strike fighter aircraft the West will build.

#### F-35s not key to hegemony – no other nation is close to our current airpower

**Majumdar 2011 writer for Defense News** [ 6/30, Dave, Defense News, “China Nears Jet Engine Breakthrough: Report,” http://www.defensenews.com/story.php?i=6967956&c=ASI&s=AIR]

It will probably take a lot longer than five to 10 years before China can build fighter engines comparable to modern U.S. engines, said Richard Aboulafia, an analyst at the Teal Group, Fairfax, Va., "They're a very long way from an F119/F135/F136 level of technology," Aboulafia said. "They'd have to make huge strides in materials, design and manufacturing. And by the time they got there, the West will have made major strides, too." That being said, the Chinese have made major strides in advancing their engine technology, he said. "The Chinese are making aero engine improvements, and could get to a reasonable level of autonomy in five-10 years. That means copying Western or Russian capabilities from the 1980s," Aboulafia said.

### Not key to Aerospace

#### Cutting F-35’s won’t kill the industry – other nations will still buy them

**The Economist 2011** [7/14/11 [Print edition, “The last manned fighter,” http://www.economist.com/node/18958487?story\_id=18958487&fsrc=rss]

Even if Mr Burbage is too sanguine, the F-35 is in no imminent danger. Its position is strengthened by two inarguable propositions. The first is that many of the current generation of fighters are approaching 30 years in service and must soon be replaced. The second is that because the F-35 was designed to replace so many types of aircraft, it has, in effect, a monopolist’s grip on the future fighter market. Even if America and some of its NATO allies cut their orders, Lockheed Martin is confident that the numbers will be more than made up by countries such as Japan, South Korea, Singapore and Taiwan. All these nations are rich and nervous of Beijing.Mr Burbage draws comparison with the F-16, of which more than 4,500 will be built over its long life.

### No Expansion (Answers China BioD scenario)

#### No expansion

Turner 12

Ted Turner is the founder and chairman of the United Nations Foundation and the founder of CNN and Turner Broadcasting. Co-chairman of the Nuclear Threat Initiative, which seeks to reduce the threat of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons. “Stop Keystone pipeline before it’s too late” CNN February 24, 2012 (http://www.cnn.com/2012/02/22/opinion/turner-keystone-pipeline/index.html)

The purpose of Keystone XL is to bring tar sands crude oil through the United States to Gulf Coast refineries. The route through the United States is actually the oil industry's second choice: Transporting the oil west from Alberta to the Pacific Coast would be shorter and much cheaper, but Canadians concerned about environmental impacts and threats to native people's lands are challenging that route, and with good reason. The existing and potential environmental impacts along the 2,000-mile pipeline route are profound.

#### No Canadian pipeline expansion

Rosenthal 6-13

Elisabeth Rosenthal “Canada Seeks Alternatives to Transport Oil Reserves” NYT Published: June 13, 2012 http://www.nytimes.com/2012/06/14/science/earth/canada-seeks-new-ways-to-get-oil-reserves-to-market.html

Together, the new westward pipelines would carry more oil than Keystone XL would. But even with aggressive government backing, creating new pipelines may prove as difficultin Canada as it has been in the United States, though for different reasons. Indigenous groups must be consultedif new pipelines cross their land. To gain coastal access, pipeline companies must also navigate the politics of some of the most environmentally conscious Canadian provinces, British Columbia and Quebec, where public opinion tendsto be against both pipelines and further fossil fuel development. Vancouver’s City Council recently passed a motion requiring that pipeline companies take on 100 percent liability for the economic and environmental costs of a worst-case spill. Even though the federal government gives permissions for pipelines, such local maneuvering and lawsuits can cause severe delays. “It’s poetic justice that Vancouver, the birthplace of Greenpeace, stands between the last big oil deposit on Earth and the expanding markets in Asia,” said Ben West of the Wilderness Committee, a consortium of environmental groups. “I’d anticipate it won’t get built for years.”

**Stiff opposition to Canadian expansion.**

**Barry 7-5** (Donald, professor of political science at the University of Calgary, “Has decision on Keystone XL poisoned Canada-U.S. relations?,” iPolitics, 2012, <http://www.ipolitics.ca/2012/07/05/donald-barry-has-obamas-decision-on-keystone-pipeline-poisoned-canada-u-s-relations>

Has Obama’s Keystone decision prompted Canada to turn to Asia “for more reliable economic partners?”The Canadian government encourages such thinking to pressure President Obama to approve the project. But a proposed Northern Gateway pipeline to bring oil sands crude to a marine terminal in British Columbia for shipment to China and other Asian countries has been under consideration since 2006. It has always been seen as a **complement to Keystone**. Access to the U.S. market remains the prime goal for Canadian producers.The Gateway project, moreover, faces determined **opposition and legal challenges** from environmental groups and First Nations communities along the route. There is also **stiff resistance** to increased oil tanker traffic in British Columbia’s coastal waters. Neither issue will be settled any time soon.

## \*\*\*Case Turns

## Environmental Turns

### Generic

#### Keystone environmentally destructive

Turner 12

Ted Turner is the founder and chairman of the United Nations Foundation and the founder of CNN and Turner Broadcasting. Co-chairman of the Nuclear Threat Initiative, which seeks to reduce the threat of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons. “Stop Keystone pipeline before it’s too late” CNN February 24, 2012

(http://www.cnn.com/2012/02/22/opinion/turner-keystone-pipeline/index.html)

In Canada, extraction of tar sands crude requires clear-cutting thousands of acres of boreal forests, diverting rivers, strip-mining, and destroying critical habitat for some of the largest populations of woodland caribou left in the world. Thirty percent of North America's songbirds and 40% of its waterfowl rely on the wetlands and waterways of the boreal forest.Tar sands oil production has already created more than 50 square miles of toxic waste ponds so massive they are visible from space. Even more important, tar sands oil extraction produces three times more greenhouse gas emissions than conventional oil and gas, putting even greater strain on our atmosphere and oceans, which have little absorptive capacity left. Closer to home, the pipeline presents an immediate threat to drinking water for millions and to the livelihood of farmers and ranchers.To transport via pipeline, the thick tar sands crude must be mixedwith toxic chemicals and then pumped at extreme temperature and pressure.This sets the stage for more pipeline failures and spills that create a highly toxic mess.The existing Keystone 1 tar sands pipeline has spilled more than 12 times in its first 12 months of operation. In July 2010, a spill of more than 800,000 gallons of toxic tar sands crude from the Enbridge pipeline contaminated more than 30 miles of water and shoreline along the Kalamazoo River in Michigan. This created public health problems, threats to groundwater, widespread fish kills, and destruction of wildlife habitat, contamination that is still being cleaned up at a cost exceeding $700 million. Downstream landowners like me are thinking this is a preview of coming attractions if Keystone XL is built.

#### Destroys habitat, climate

Orpiszewska 12

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

Tar sands oil, or bitumen, is currently a hot topic among environmental groups and others¶ opposed to the Keystone XL project. The tar sands are found in an area approximately the size¶ of Florida under the Boreal Forest of Alberta, Canada.10 Extraction of tar sands oil is very¶ energy-intensive.11 The Boreal Forest must be clear cut in order to get at the oil underneath.12¶ The forest is an important carbon sink, as well as a fragile ecosystem home to caribou and¶ migratory birds.13 Tar sands extraction has an impact on the forest’s ability to absorb carbon out¶ of the atmosphere and its ability to sustain important species.14 Additionally, excavation requires¶ thousands of gallons of water to separate the bitumen (heavy crude oil) from the sand.15 This¶ mining process leaves behind toxic tailings ponds, the size of small lakes, that consist of the¶ water used to separate the oil contaminated with the toxic chemicals that are the byproducts of¶ the extraction process.16 Extraction of this oil is approximately three times more carbon intensive¶ per barrel than conventional oil.17

### A2 New Route Solves (Don’t read with Inh)

#### New Route still dangerous

**Clayton 4/19/12** (Clayton, Mark, Staff writer, “Keystone XL Pipeline: New Route, New Problems For Obama?”,<http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Politics/2012/0419/Keystone-XL-pipeline-New-route-new-problems-for-Obama>, Published April 19th, 2012, MS)

TransCanada's new proposed route would still cross the [Ogallala aquifer](http://www.csmonitor.com/tags/topic/Ogallala+Aquifer), which underlies much of the state, but would avoid the Sand Hills, where groundwater is very close to the surface. Critics of the plan say the new route still winds its way perilously close to, and across, sensitive aquifer areas and would receive only a cursory review under the new state law. What's needed, they contend, is a thorough environmental impact study in accord with federal law. "TransCanada hasn't even applied for a federal permit yet," says Jane Kleeb, executive director of Bold Nebraska, which opposes putting the pipeline through the aquifer area. "All they're trying to do is get Nebraska to get rubber stamp this route so they can then go to the State Department and say: 'We've solved Nebraska's problem, they've approved our route, so now give us our permit.'" TransCanada officials say the new pipeline route will meet requirements laid out by the state and solve the problem of future pipeline spills tainting vital groundwater. "This report ... identifies a proposed preferred corridor to advance the Keystone XL pipeline project while realigning the route around the Nebraska Sandhills," Shawn Howard, a spokesman for TransCanada said in a statement. "Once again, this process is back in the hands of Nebraskans, who overwhelmingly support the safe construction and operation of this critical North American energy infrastructure project." But other observers say the move by TransCanada and Heineman is designed to apply fresh pressure on Mr. Obama during an election year.

### Water

### Link/Impacts

#### Destroys water supplies

Turner 12

Ted Turner is the founder and chairman of the United Nations Foundation and the founder of CNN and Turner Broadcasting. Co-chairman of the Nuclear Threat Initiative, which seeks to reduce the threat of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons. “Stop Keystone pipeline before it’s too late” CNN February 24, 2012 (http://www.cnn.com/2012/02/22/opinion/turner-keystone-pipeline/index.html)

The potential for pollution of vital groundwater from the Keystone XL pipeline is even more frightening. Depending on the final route of the pipeline, spills would threaten the Ogallala Aquifer, the largest aquifer in the western North American region, upon which millions of people and agricultural businesses depend for drinking water, irrigation and livestock watering. But spills anywhere along the route would threaten crucial drinking water supplies, from local and municipal drinking water wells to the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer in Texas, a critical water supply for drought-stricken East Texas and Houston. Anyone with even a passing familiarity with the water scarcity problems in that region should understand how a sizable pipeline failure could have catastrophic consequences.

#### Pipeline pollutes 27% of irrigation supplies.

**Bair** 11/30/**11** (Bair, Julene, Op-Ed Contributer for the New York Times, “Running Dry On The Great Plains”, [http://www.nytimes.com/2011/12/01/opinion/polluting-the-ogallala-aquifer.html, Published](http://www.nytimes.com/2011/12/01/opinion/polluting-the-ogallala-aquifer.html,%20Published) November 30th, 2011, MS)

Imagine you are a farmer in the center of the country, where it seldom rains enough.Now imagine that a well driller came to your farm and told you that he could bore a hole deep into the ground, and that forever after you could pump out as much water as you needed to grow your crops. That is exactly what happened on the Great Plains in the mid-20th century.The wondrous resource containing all that water was the Ogallala Aquifer. The Ogallala underlies portions of eight large states— 174,000 square miles of crop and range land all the way from South Dakota to Texas. Over the last several months, it became about as famous as a geologic formation can get. With the nation’s environmentalists at their side, Nebraska landowners battled ferociously against the Keystone XL pipeline, which would have carried oil extracted from Canadian tar sands through the environmentally sensitive Nebraska Sand Hills.If the pipeline leaked,they argued,chemicals and oil would seep down into the aquifer, contaminating a precious resource responsible for [27 percent](http://co.water.usgs.gov/nawqa/hpgw/factsheets/DENNEHYFS1.html) of the nation’s irrigated agriculture.They won — for now. President Obama agreed last month to reconsider the pipeline’s route. So is the Ogallala now safe? Not quite. Regardless of whether the pipeline was a good or bad idea, it was never the real danger. The true threat is posed by agriculture as it’s currently practiced on the Great Plains by the farmers themselves, many of whom opposed the pipeline vehemently.The aquifer is being wasted and polluted. Wasted, that is, on corn, a thirsty crop that requires over 20 inches of irrigation water in parts of the Plains. And polluted with pesticides and nitrogen fertilizers. It’s not that I don’t empathize with the Nebraska farmers. I grew up on a Kansas farm. Like them, we called our Ogallala water “precious” and bragged that it was the best in the world. But the aquifer’s only natural recharge comes from rain and snow. In our Kansas district, less than half an inch of that reached the aquifer in a given year. We were allowed to pump out over 30 times that amount. When I expressed concern, my father assured me that the government would step in to stop us someday. Until then, he liked to tease, “I got mine!” But the government has not stepped in. Controls imposed by local water districts — run by irrigators themselves — and by state legislators dependent on the farm vote have been minimal at best. As a result,in some areas of Kansas and Texas, farmers can no longer pump enough to water their crops. If current withdrawal rates continue, usable water in most areas will be gone by the end of this century. The aquifer in the Nebraska Sand Hills gets more recharge than elsewhere, because rain and snowmelt seep quickly through sand. Opponents of the Keystone XL pipeline argued that this characteristic made that part of the aquifer particularly susceptible to contamination. They were right. But contaminants are already there. According to a report by the United States Geological Survey in 2009, 90 percent of samples taken from shallow groundwater in Nebraska portions of the Ogallala contained nitrate from fertilizers. The Ogallala is a geologic formation, not an underground lake that can be widely contaminated by a localized spill. Water fills the spaces between sandstone, gravel, clay and other sediments, which slow the water’s lateral travel. A pipeline leak would have been minor compared to the damage that chemically dependent agriculture causes. Chemicals trickle inexorably downward with each rainfall or application of irrigation water, creating a situation that the Geological Survey has referred to as “creeping normalcy.” Over the coming decades, it warned, contaminants will continue to creep down into the aquifer, and more wells will exceed federal safety levels. Already, 14 percent of all Ogallala irrigation wells tested contained one pesticide or more. Most common was Atrazine. This herbicide, used ubiquitously in cornfields, is a known hormone disruptor and is suspected of, among other things, retarding fetal development. Five percent of the irrigation wells contained nitrate levels equal to or in excess of safety standards set by the Environmental Protection Agency. Excess nitrate levels in drinking water can impair the blood’s ability to deliver oxygen in infants, causing “blue baby syndrome.” Why haven’t viable environmental groups formed to protect the Ogallala? Because corn contributes so much to the economy that its reign is seldom questioned. Federal subsidy payments to corn growers and the federal mandate to produce ethanol underwrite the waste and pollution. These subsidies should end. When the farm bill comes up for reauthorization next year, Congress should instead pay farmers to reduce their dependence on irrigation and chemicals. The eastern Nebraska climate is moist enough to grow corn without irrigation. That is how the University of Nebraska football team came to be the Cornhuskers. And the more arid High Plains to the west are known as the nation’s breadbasket because wheat, a drought-tolerant crop, thrives there. The Keystone XL pipeline posed a potential threat to a limited region. But agricultural waste and pollution are damaging the entire Ogallala Aquifer right now. In an era of growing population and advancing drought, we cannot afford complacency in the face of “creeping normalcy.”

#### Pipeline = next dustbowl

**Pierce 10/27/11** (Pierce, Charles P., A working journalist since 1976, “Something We Should Be Worried About, But Aren’t: Water.”, <http://www.esquire.com/archives/blogs/politics/by_author/68/15;1>, Published October 27th, 2011, MS)Under the high plains of the midwest, there is a resource called the Ogallala Aquifer, which is a subsystem of a huge underground mega-system called the High Plains Aquifer. It is made of permeable layers of sand, sandstone, and gravel within which are contained billions and billions of gallons of water. The nature of the aquifer geology makes the water easy to pump. The system covers 174,000 square miles beneath eight different states, ranging north-south from North Dakota to Texas, and from Nebraska in the east all the way west to parts of New Mexico. Nebraska depends most vitally on the water found in the aquifer. And there are two concerns about the aquifer that ought to be serious concerns in our politics, but that aren't. One of them isn't being treated as a concern at all. The other is not being treated seriously, but instead as a slogan and one more litmus test by the Republican presidential candidates, and as some sort of nuisance complaint by a Democratic administration that appears to be falling down on the job. The first problem is that portions of the aquifer are [running dry](http://green.blogs.nytimes.com/2011/05/04/aquifers-depletion-poses-sweeping-threat/). The second is that Trans-Canada, the Canadian oil giant, wants to run a [pipeline](http://journalstar.com/news/state-and-regional/govt-and-politics/article_6b91f55d-0e58-5299-9bc7-1440021630f5.html) through a portion of the aquifer in Nebraska. How you feel about that depends entirely on how much you trust oil companies these days, because your State Department appears to be taking a dive on the question, and your Environmental Protection Agency is [dodging it entirely](http://www.politico.com/news/stories/1011/67001.html). Make no mistake. You screw with the Ogallala Aquifer and you screw with this nation's heartbeat. Twenty percent of the irrigated farmland in the United States depends upon it. Pumping the water from it is all that has kept the Dust Bowl from coming back, year after year. Any damage to it fundamentally changes the lives of the people who depend on it, their personal economies, the overall national economy, and what we can grow to feed ourselves. Absent the aquifer, and the nation's breadbasket goes back to being a prairie, vast grasslands that the people who first crossed them referred to as a desert. You end up with dry-land corn and some dry-land wheat. And the aquifer is far easier to empty than it is to fill. The technology to fully exploit it has existed only since the 1950's, and portions of it are already dangerously low. It won't be fully recharged until the next Ice Age. Water is the next big fight in this country. By now, we are used to the big fights over energy reserves, over coal and oil. There are even some new ones, over fracking for natural gas and over things like the XL pipeline, which we will get to shortly. But there haven't been serious fights over water for a while. Now, they seem to be coming [thick](http://waterwiki.net/index.php/Water_Conflict_Between_the_US_and_Mexico:_Lining_of_the_All-American_Canal) and fast. A [report](http://www.cbo.gov/doc.cfm?index=46&type=0&sequence=3) by the Congressional Budget Office as far back as 1997 said that, particularly in the West, conflicts over water would take many forms — farmers vs. cities, sportsmen vs. developers, environmentalists vs. practically everyone else. The report concluded: First and foremost, western rivers provide water to agriculture to grow crops. They also help cities meet municipal and industrial needs for water and generate electricity.Other benefits that rivers provide — such as habitat for fish and wildlife, recreation, and cultural values for Native Americans — were historically ignored in the water equation but increasingly are considered legitimate and valuable uses. Demand for water by existing agricultural and urban users outstrips available supplies in many cases, however, so demand for water for public purposes or for increased urban supplies necessarily conflicts with existing patterns of water use. The ongoing drought exacerbates all of these concerns, particularly in the most imperiled [portions](http://www.srh.noaa.gov/ama/?n=2011drought) of the Ogallala Aquifer, which are in Oklahoma and in the Texas Panhandle, were the drought has been the most severe. This has caused the demand for water to skyrocket as the available supply dwindles. Texas did put in place some water-conservation rules that restricted the amount of groundwater that farmers could pump, but they fairly well defined the concept of locked barns and escaped horses. Moreover, Governor Rick Perry, who is now running for president, after a fashion, anyway, did manage to [arrange](http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2011-08-31/perry-s-friends-in-texas-discover-donations-dovetail-with-state-contracts.html) for one of his billionaire campaign donors to get a contract to build a radioactive waste dump in an area that environmentalists say puts a portion of the aquifer in danger: Environmentalists raised concerns because the site was near the Ogallala Aquifer, which provides water for drinking and agriculture from Texas to Nebraska. The engineers and geologists reviewing the application for the commission said it didn’t address those water contamination concerns. Glenn Lewis, part of the TCEQ team that reviewed the permit, called the initial application "laughably deficient."Silly environmentalists. What could possibly go wrong there?

#### Impact is disastrous

Zellmer, 8

Sandra Zellmer – professor of law and co-director of the Water Resources Research Initiative at the University of Nebraska, Book Review: Boom and Bust on the Great Plains: Déjà vu All Over Again, Creighton Law Review, 41 Creighton L. Rev. 385, p. l/n

CONCLUSION "Water is life ... . Each drop is a benediction." 226 Reforms - especially agricultural reforms - are hard to come by. According to Jim Lyons, a former U.S. Agriculture Under Secretary, "the big commodity groups have a stranglehold on policy. And there's not a lot of stomach for new ideas." 227 William Ashworth points out, however, that the depletionof the Ogallala Aquifer is an impending crisis that we ignore at our own peril. 228 Given that the aquifer produces around twenty percent of the U.S. harvest, the ripple effects of its demise could be cataclysmic, nationally and even internationally. 229

#### Leaks bad – 840,000 gallons

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 Keystone XL pipeline will cross the Ogallala Aquifer, an important source of water¶ for Midwest farmers.28 A recent joint report by the Natural Resources Defense Council, National¶ Wildlife Federation, Pipeline Safety Trust, and Sierra Club indicates that diluted bitumen—the¶ raw form of tar sands—is more corrosive to pipelines than conventional crude oil.29 This finding¶ has raised concern among environmentalists about the probability of a spill from this type of¶ pipeline and its potential effects on the fragile ecosystems it passes through.30 In 2010, a pipeline¶ operated by another Canadian oil company, Enbridge, spilled 840,000 gallons of tar sands oil¶ into the Kalamazoo River.31 The spill still has not been fully cleaned up, and sections of the river¶ remain closed.32 A spill of this magnitude could put the Ogallala aquifer at risk and affect¶ farmers and those that rely on the aquifer for their water supply

### GroundWater = Food Supply I/L

#### Ground water key to food supplies

**Morris 6/14/12** (Morris, Bob, blogging since 2003 on progressive politics, [the economy](http://ivn.us/voters/?s=the%20economy), [renewable energy](http://ivn.us/voters/?s=renewable%20energy), [clean tech](http://ivn.us/voters/?s=cleantech), and antiwar, “Groundwater Depletion: The End Of Agriculture As We Know It?”, <http://ivn.us/2012/06/14/groundwater-depletion-the-end-agriculture-know-it/>, Published June 14th, 2012, MS)

A [disturbing report](http://www.utexas.edu/news/2012/05/29/groundwater/) fromthe University of Texas says groundwater depletion in [Texas](http://ivn.us/tag/texas/), [California](http://ivn.us/tag/california/), and elsewhere is so pronounced  it now threatens our food security. These areas include some of our most fertile agricultural areas: the Central Valley in California and the High Plains stretching from northeast Texas to Wyoming and South Dakota. Together,these areas produce much of our vegetables, fruits, and grains. Groundwater levels have droppedprecipitously in these areasdue to decades of pumping groundwater and using it for irrigation. The aquifers simply cannot recharge as fast as water is being pumped out.All of this is made worse by continuing droughts in Texas, the West, and California. “We’re seeing decreases in rural populations in the High Plains. Increasing urbanization is replacing farms in the Central Valley. And during droughts some farmers are forced to fallow their land. These trends will only accelerate as water scarcity issues become more severe,” says Bridget Scanlon, lead author of the study. The southern High Plains will be the worst affected. Scanlon says “irrigated agriculture in much of the southern High Plains is unsustainable.” Farmers will eventually be forced to switch to non-irrigated crops, which are less profitable, or to rangeland.Partial solutions include switching to sprinkle and drip systems from flood irrigation and storing excess water in good years in natural aquifers. While these methods may help, they won’t be enough to forestall inevitable changes in agriculture. We’ve used too much underground water for too long and now must adapt to the consequences of our shortsightedness. This shouldn’t be a political problem, but because both parties are so focused on attacking the other,major problems like water supply are being ignored. Given our current highly polarized political climate, we could also spread plenty of blame to the other side. [Republicans](http://ivn.us/tag/republicans/) will howl that groundwater depletion is due to the dangerous socialist tendencies of [Democrats](http://ivn.us/tag/democrats/) then call for lower taxes as the only rational solution. Democrats will proclaim that skinflint Republican fiscal policies have endangered our food supply then announce a $500 billion plan overseen by the government to drill for water in areas where it is scarce. This squabble could go on for years without any solution being reached. A better way, and one pointed to by the increasing numbers of [independent voters](http://ivn.us/tag/independent-voters/), is to stop the pointless fighting and work together towards solutions. We can’t end droughts or replenish low groundwater levels the way it is now, but by working together we can plan for the future and determine how to handle these challenges. First the political polarization needs to end.Our food supply depends upon it.

### Warming

### Clean Tech T/O 1NC

#### U.S. moving toward renewables – key to heg – keystone reverse progress

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.!

### Clean Tech Uniqueness

#### U.S investments in clean tech increasing now

**Romm 12** (Joe Romm, Senior Fellow at American Progress and holds a Ph.D. in physics from MIT, “Clean Energy Investments Hit Record Highs in 2011, U.S. Clean Tech VC Funding Jumps 30%”,ThinkProgress, Mar 13, 2012, <http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2012/03/13/443507/clean-energy-investments-record-highs-in-2011-us-clean-tech-vc-funding-jumps/?mobile=nc>)

**U.S.-based venture capital investments in clean tech increased 30 percent from $5.1 billion in 2010 to $6.6 billion in2011,** according to data provided by Cleantech Group. Clean Edge analysis found that clean-tech’s percentage of total U.S. venture capital investments accounted for a record 23.2 percent of total U.S. venture activity last year.

#### U.S clean tech spending grew by 33%, surpassing China

**Bakewell 12** (Sally Bakewell,” Clean Energy Investment Rises To $260 Billion, Boosted By Solar”, Bloomberg, January 12, 2012, <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-01-12/clean-energy-investment-rises-to-a-record-260-billion-on-solar.html>)

**Renewable energy investment rose5 percent to a record $260 billion last year driven by a surge in solar developments and increased spending in the U.S.**, Bloomberg New Energy Finance said.¶ New spending on solar energy jumped 36 percent to $136.6 billion in 2011, outpacing the $74.9 billion put into wind power, the London-based research company said today in a statement. Spending **in the U.S. rose by a third to $55.9 billion**, **surpassing the 1 percent gain in** [**China**](http://topics.bloomberg.com/china/) **to $47.4 billion.**¶ A jump in photovoltaic installations in the U.S. and Europe overcame a 50 percent decline the price of modules during 2011, said Michael Liebreich, chief executive of New Energy Finance. Falling prices made more developments possible and is bringing closer the date when wind and solar can rival fossil fuels without subsidies, he said.

### Link

#### Keystone locks us into fossil fuels – infrastructure, market

Orpiszewska 12

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

Keystone XL is not the first pipeline to bring tar sands oil into the U.S. There are already¶ two operating pipelines that bring bitumen from Alberta to the Midwest.20 TransCanada’s¶ Keystone I pipeline has a capacity of nearly 600,000 barrels a day, and Enbridge’s Alberta¶ Clipper has a capacity of 800,000 bpd.21 In 2010, the last year for which full data is available,¶ the U.S. imported approximately 2.5 million barrels of oil a day from Canada—approximately¶ 25% of our daily imports.22 As tar sands extraction grows, this heavy crude oil will become an¶ increasing part of the Canadian oil export mix (and our import mix).23 Pipelines like Keystone¶ XL can facilitate the growth of the tar sands by providing an export market.24 When we commit¶ to importing fossil fuels, we inevitably must develop and maintain the infrastructure to support it.¶ Once this is created, abandoning it makes little economic sense, thereby making a transition¶ away from carbon-intensive fossil fuels nearly impossible.25 Moreover, once the pipeline¶ guarantees a way to transport tar sands oil to the U.S., oil companies seeking to expand tar sands¶ extraction will have a guaranteed market in the U.S., in addition to access to ports for exportabroad.26 Keystone XL threatens to lock the U.S. into dependence on tar sands.27

#### Keystone delays tough energy decisions

Droitsch12

Danielle DroitschDirector at the Natural Resources Defense Council, “Don't be fooled - the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline is not a jobs plan, but an oil export plan, Natural Resources Defense Council 2012http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/ddroitsch/dont\_be\_fooled\_-\_the\_keystone.html)

Steven M. Anderson, retired Army brigadier general, argues the Keystone XL pipeline will not help America cut its petro-addition and will detract from building a clean energy economy: This pipeline would move dirty oil from Canada to refineries in Texas and would set back our renewable energy efforts for at least two decades, much to our enemies’ delight. It would ensure we maintain our oil addiction and delay making the tough decisions regarding energy production, management and conservation that we need to start making today. The laser-focus emphasis on Keystone XL by House Republicans, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and others is nothing short of politics. They are conveniently avoiding a more important point about how the Keystone XL pipeline that provides tar sands oil companies a platform to export oil while making billions of dollars in profit. Instead, the pipeline will take the dirtiest oil on the planet, put America’s heartland at risk, and then send that oil to the highest bidder around the world. Building pipelines to the Gulf Coast, in addition to providing oil companies an avenue to export, also increases oil prices. There is concrete evidence (pp. 27-28) that building Keystone XL will increase oil prices in the Gulf Coast Market and the Midwest. In the end, real job creation won’t come from approving a foreign pipeline. The evidence shows the future of job creation is in global clean energy markets. And that the real purpose of this pipeline is to give tar sands producers access to international markets.

#### Keystone undermines clean energy transition

**Swift 12**

Anthony Swift- Energy Analyst at the National Resource Defense Council, BA in political science and biology “Keystone XL: A Tar Sands Pipeline to Increase Oil Prices” 2012 http://www.nrdc.org/energy/keystone-pipeline/files/Keystone-Oil-Prices-Report.pdf

One of the most misunderstood issues surrounding the proposed Keystone XL tar sands pipeline is the project’s impact on U.S. gasoline prices. The Keystone XL tar sands pipeline would pump up to 830,000 barrels per day (bpd) of some of the world’s dirtiest oil, which is strip mined and drilled from under Canada’s Boreal forests, straight through the heart of America’s breadbasket to refineries on the Texas Gulf Coast. By allowing tar sands access to the lucrative international market,Keystone XL would finance further expansion of tar sands extraction, worsening climate change and undermining efforts to move to clean energy.

### Heg Impact

#### Keystone related climate change hurts heg

Doty and Wilde 11 (Doty, Russ and Wilde, Holly, Russ CEO/general counsel for New World WindPower in Billings. Holly Wilde is an actor, educator and writer in Steamboat, Colo., “Keystone Pipeline Bad For US and Earth”, 2011 http://missoulian.com/news/opinion/columnists/keystone-pipeline-bad-for-the-u-s-and-the-earth/article\_01ebc1f8-0a1b-11e1-a0fc-001cc4c03286.html, Published November 8th, 2011)

TransCanada, KXL's developer, indicates that some oil now refined for domestic production will be diverted to KXL for export to more lucrative markets overseas. As a result, according to the GLI, 15 Mid-western states will experience a 10- to 20-cent per gallon increase in gasoline prices (up to $5 billion a year). Taken together, increases in health care and fuel costs, and decreases in food production, obliterate any financial benefit from KXL jobs and local tax revenues. Others warning of the threats to U.S. national security that climate change poses include the National Intelligence Council, Council on Foreign Relations, Center for Navel Analysis, CIA, Institute for Strategic Studies, and the National Intelligence Council. The NIC's classified assessment for Congress concludes climate change could threaten U.S. security in the next 20 years by causing political instability, mass refugee migration, terrorism, or conflicts over water and other resources. So, our national interest lies in preventing use of tar sands oil, not in facilitating it. When the State Department's Glendive hearing addressed whether KXL was in the national interest, pipeline advocates carried pre-printed signs saying, "Reason Not Extremism." Whose side is reason on?

### EnvImpact

#### Clean Energy key to prevent Extinction

**Wood 10** (Duncan Wood Director – Program in International Relations and Canadian Studies Program – InstitutoTecnológicoAutónomo de México, “Environment, Development and Growth: U.S.-Mexico Cooperation in Renewable Energies,” Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars – Mexico Institute, May, http://www.wilsoncenter.org/topics/pubs/U.S.%20Mexico%20Cooperation%20in%20Renewable%20Energies.pdf)

It is by now common knowledge that theworldis facing a climate change crisiscaused by the effects of fossil fuel driven industrialization. A significant rise in global temperatures, combined with more severe weather conditions, more frequent floods and droughts, are bringing a paradigm shift to the way we think about our relationship with the planet. For the first time in over 150 years policy makers are thinking seriously about decreasing dependency on fossil fuels and looking for alternatives that may be more expensive in the short and medium terms, but ultimately more sustainable. 7 All of this has happened at the same time as two other, related phenomena. The first is that the global population is reaching new highs and by 2040‐50 will total over 9 billion people. Experts predict that 85% of the world’s population will be located in the developing world,which will mean a rapidly growing demand for goods and for energy. Both of these factors will result in a need to increase energy efficiency as well as find new sources of energy. What’s more, this massive jump in population will coincide not only with climate change but also with increasingly difficult conditions for hydrocarbons exploration and production. As most of the world’s “easy” oil has already been discovered, oil companies and nation states are turning to alternatives such a non‐conventional oil reserves (tar sands, complex fields) and reserves that in the past would have been considered unrecoverable, such as in very deep ocean waters. Furthermore, political conditions in many of the world’s oil rich regions are uncertain, unstable and often unfriendly to private oil companies and to the countries of the West.Climate change and natural disastersTheurgency of finding alternatives to fossil fuels has been confirmed in recent years by mounting scientific evidence that we are undergoing a noticeable **anthropogenic shift** in the world’s weather and temperature.Not only are a range of indicators showing that the planet is warming, but the retreat of the polar ice caps, the melting of glaciers, andmostimportantly in the short term extreme weather conditions andincreased incidence of naturaldisasters have highlighted the consequences of maintaining the status quo in our patterns of energy consumption and industrial development. It is estimated that we have experienced a 1 degree Celsius rise in global temperatures over the past 100 years and that by the end of the current century global temperatures may have risen by as much 7 or 8 degrees. Even with the reduction in greenhouse gas emissions that is contemplated by the most ambitious mitigation strategies, global temperatures may rise by as much as 6%. This would have a dramatic and disastrous impact on both developed and developing nations and will **threaten the existence of both humans and animal and plant species**. Though the connection between man‐made greenhouse gases and global warming was denied for many years by industry and governments alike, it has now been accepted that something must be done to reduce the amount of greenhouse gases released into the atmosphere. Given that 86% of all global energy comes from fossil fuels, and that these fossil fuels produce 27,000,000,000 tons of CO2 emissions annually, finding alternative sources of energy is acrucialcomponent of climate change mitigation strategies.

### Climate Change

#### Passage of the Keystone XL will be detrimental to efforts to fight global warming

**Hansen 11** (James, directs the NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies and is the author of “Storms of My Grandchildren.” “Silence is Deadly” 03 June 2011)

The U.S. Department of State seems likely to approve a huge pipeline to carry tar sands ¶ oil (about 830,000 barrels per day) to Texas refineries unless sufficient objections are raised.¶ The scientific community needs to get involved in this fray now. If this project gains ¶ approval, it will become exceedingly difficult to control the tar sands monster.¶ Although there are multiple objections to tar sands development and the pipeline, ¶ including destruction of the environment in Canada¶ 1¶ An overwhelming objection is that exploitation of tar sands would make it implausible to ¶ stabilize climate and avoid disastrous global climate impacts. The tar sands are estimated (e.g., ¶ see IPCC AR4 WG3 report) to contain at least 400 GtC (equivalent to about 200 ppm CO2).¶ and the likelihood of spills along the ¶ pipeline's pathway, such objections, by themselves, are very unlikely to stop the project.¶ Easily available reserves of conventional oil and gas are enough to take atmospheric CO2¶ well above 400 ppm. However, if emissions from coal are phased out over the next few decades ¶ and if unconventional fossil fuels are left in the ground, it is conceivable to stabilize climate¶ 2,3¶ Phase out of emissions from coal is itself an enormous challenge. However, if the tar ¶ sands are thrown into the mix it is essentially game over. There is no practical way to capture ¶ the CO2 emitted while burning oil, which is used principally in vehicles.¶ .¶ Governments are acting as if they are oblivious to the fact that there is a limit on how ¶ much fossil fuel carbon we can put into the air. Fossil fuel carbon injected into the atmosphere ¶ will stay in surface reservoirs for millennia. We can extract a fraction of the excess CO2 via ¶ improved agricultural and forestry practices, but we cannot get back to a safe CO2 level if all ¶ coal is used without carbon capture or if unconventional fossil fuels are exploited.¶ A document describing the pipeline project is available at http://www.keystonepipelinexl.state.gov/clientsite/keystonexl.nsf?Open Comments, due by 6 June, can be submitted to ¶ http://www.keystonepipeline-xl.state.gov/clientsite/keystonexl.nsf/CommentFset?OpenFrameSet¶ or by e-mail to keystonexl@cardno.com or mail to Keystone XL EIS Project, P.O. Box 96503–¶ 98500, Washington, DC 20090–6503 or fax to 206-269-0098.¶ I am submitting a comment that the analysis is flawed and insufficient, failing to account ¶ for important information regarding human-made climate change that is now available. I note ¶ that prior government targets for limiting human-made global warming are now known to be ¶ inadequate. Specifically, the target to limit global warming to 2°C, rather than being a safe ¶ "guardrail", is actually a recipe for global climate disasters. I will include drafts of the ¶ "Paleoclimate Information"¶ 4¶ , "Earth's Energy Imbalance"¶ 5¶ ¶ 1¶ Asserted impacts include: irreversible effects on biodiversity, the natural environment, reduced water quality, ¶ destruction of fragile pristine Boreal Forest and associated wetlands, aquatic and watershed mismanagement, habitat ¶ fragmentation, habitat loss, disruption to life cycles of endemic wildlife particularly bird and Caribou migration, fish ¶ deformities and negative impacts on the human health in downstream communities.¶ and "The Case for Young People and ¶ Nature"¶ 3¶ papers, which are so far only published in arXiv; we will submit revised versions of all ¶ of these papers for publication this summer. I also will comment that the pipeline project does not serve the national interest, because ¶ it will result in large adverse impacts, on the public and wildlife, by contributing substantially to ¶ climate change. These impacts must be evaluated before the project is considered further.¶ It is my impression and understanding that a large number of objections could have an ¶ effect and help achieve a more careful evaluation, possibly averting a huge mistake. Brief ¶ pointed comments may be just as well as longer statements.

#### Canada tar sand exploitation is game over for climate—drastic CO2 increases would exacerbate climate impacts—civilization would be at risk.

**Hansen 2012**

James Hansen directs the NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies and is the author of “Storms of My Grandchildren.” NYTimes, Opedpiece “Game Over for the Climate” Published: May 9, 2012 (<http://www.nytimes.com/2012/05/10/opinion/game-over-for-the-climate.html>)

GLOBAL warming isn’t a prediction. It is happening. That is why I was so troubled to read a recent interview with President Obama in Rolling Stone in which he said that Canada would exploit the oil in its vast tar sands reserves “regardless of what we do.” If Canada proceeds, and we do nothing, it will be game over for the climate. Canada’s tar sands, deposits of sand saturated with bitumen, contain twice the amount of carbon dioxide emitted by global oil use in our entire history. If we were to fully exploit this new oil source, and continue to burn our conventional oil, gas and coal supplies, concentrations of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere eventually would reach levels higher than in the Pliocene era, more than 2.5 million years ago, when sea level was at least 50 feet higher than it is now. That level of heat-trapping gases would assure that the disintegration of the ice sheets would accelerate out of control. Sea levels would rise and destroy coastal cities. Global temperatures would become intolerable. Twenty to 50 percent of the planet’s species would be driven to extinction. Civilization would be at risk. That is the long-term outlook. But near-term, things will be bad enough. Over the next several decades, the Western United States and the semi-arid region from North Dakota to Texas will develop semi-permanent drought, with rain, when it does come, occurring in extreme events with heavy flooding. Economic losses would be incalculable. More and more of the Midwest would be a dust bowl. California’s Central Valley could no longer be irrigated. Food prices would rise to unprecedented levels. If this sounds apocalyptic, it is. This is why we need to reduce emissions dramatically. President Obama has the power not only to deny tar sands oil additional access to Gulf Coast refining, which Canada desires in part for export markets, but also to encourage economic incentives to leave tar sands and other dirty fuels in the ground. The global warming signal is now louder than the noise of random weather, as I predicted would happen by now in the journal Science in 1981. Extremely hot summers have increased noticeably. We can say with high confidence that the recent heat waves in Texas and Russia, and the one in Europe in 2003, which killed tens of thousands, were not natural events — they were caused by human-induced climate change. We have known since the 1800s that carbon dioxide traps heat in the atmosphere. The right amount keeps the climate conducive to human life. But add too much, as we are doing now, and temperatures will inevitably rise too high. This is not the result of natural variability, as some argue. The earth is currently in the part of its long-term orbit cycle where temperatures would normally be cooling. But they are rising — and it’s because we are forcing them higher with fossil fuel emissions. The concentration of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere has risen from 280 parts per million to 393 p.p.m. over the last 150 years. The tar sands contain enough carbon — 240 gigatons — to add 120 p.p.m. Tar shale, a close cousin of tar sands found mainly in the United States, contains at least an additional 300 gigatons of carbon. If we turn to these dirtiest of fuels, instead of finding ways to phase out our addiction to fossil fuels, there is no hope of keeping carbon concentrations below 500 p.p.m. — a level that would, as earth’s history shows, leave our children a climate system that is out of their control. We need to start reducing emissions significantly, not create new ways to increase them. We should impose a gradually rising carbon fee, collected from fossil fuel companies, then distribute 100 percent of the collections to all Americans on a per-capita basis every month. The government would not get a penny. This market-based approach would stimulate innovation, jobs and economic growth, avoid enlarging government or having it pick winners or losers. Most Americans, except the heaviest energy users, would get more back than they paid in increased prices. Not only that, the reduction in oil use resulting from the carbon price would be nearly six times as great as the oil supply from the proposed pipeline from Canada, rendering the pipeline superfluous, according to economic models driven by a slowly rising carbon price. But instead of placing a rising fee on carbon emissions to make fossil fuels pay their true costs, leveling the energy playing field, the world’s governments are forcing the public to subsidize fossil fuels with hundreds of billions of dollars per year. This encourages a frantic stampede to extract every fossil fuel through mountaintop removal, longwall mining, hydraulic fracturing, tar sands and tar shale extraction, and deep ocean and Arctic drilling. President Obama speaks of a “planet in peril,” but he does not provide the leadership needed to change the world’s course. Our leaders must speak candidly to the public — which yearns for open, honest discussion — explaining that our continued technological leadership and economic well-being demand a reasoned change of our energy course. History has shown that the American public can rise to the challenge, but leadership is essential. The science of the situation is clear — it’s time for the politics to follow. This is a plan that can unify conservatives and liberals, environmentalists and business. Every major national science academy in the world has reported that global warming is real, caused mostly by humans, and requires urgent action. The cost of acting goes far higher the longer we wait — we can’t wait any longer to avoid the worst and be judged immoral by coming generations.

#### Keystone is going to cause way to much greenhouse gas emissions we must stop it

**Weissmann 11** ([JORDAN WEISSMANN](http://www.theatlantic.com/jordan-weissmann/) - Jordan Weissmann is an associate editor at *The Atlantic*. He has written for a number of publications, including *The Washington Post* and *The National Law Journal*.) http://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2011/11/keystone-xl-oil-pipeline-todays-most-explosive-environmental-debate/247954/

Because the pipeline crosses international borders, approval falls to the State Department. Initially, it looked like a sure bet. Hillary Clinton told an interviewer she was "inclined" to approve it, even before an official analysis of the environmental impact was complete. But resistance by green groups has swelled into an worldwide movement. The fiercest opposition is in Nebraska. There are two big issues at play here. Global warming and Nebraska. First global warming: Because of the intense amount of energy required to refine oil from tar sands, it's considered a particularly dirty source of fuel. According to some estimates, it produces 15% more greenhouse gases than your average barrel of oil once production is taken into account. Al Gore may have severely when he claimed that "gasoline made from the tar sands gives a Toyota Prius the same impact on climate as a Hummer using gasoline made from oil." But he captured the sentiment shared by environmentalists who would prefer that the tar sands never be developed. Then there are those Cornhuskers. The Keystone XL pipeline would cross through six states (see The Perryman Group's map above), but it has run into a wall protest in Nebraska, where some legislators are attempting to block the project entirely. Oil pipelines caused billions of dollars in property damage due to leaks, fires and explosions during the past decade. A single spill in 2010 dumped as much as a million gallons of oil into the Kalamazoo River. That track record has Nebraskans nervous, since the pipeline's route runs through the massive Ogallala Aquifer, and many are concerned about the potential impact of an oil spill on the region's drinking water. TransCanada has tried to ease local fears, but a professor at the University of Nebraska has cast doubt on the company's safety predictions.

**Keystone Pipeline xl will cause long term disasters** Doty 11 (Russ Doty is CEO/general counsel for New World WindPower in Billings. Helena native Holly Wilde is an actor, educator and writer in Steamboat, Colo.) http://missoulian.com/news/opinion/columnists/keystone-pipeline-bad-for-the-u-s-and-the-earth/article\_01ebc1f8-0a1b-11e1-a0fc-001cc4c03286.html

Are projects that make climate change worse - like the Keystone XL Pipeline - in the national interest? Not if short-term expedience creates long-term disaster. The 1,711-mile-long, yard-wide KXL would transport oil from underneath Alberta's boreal forests to refineries in Oklahoma and Texas. The oil would most likely be exported from there. One long-term cost of KXL is its contribution to raising the Earth's temperature. Burning fossil fuel carried in the pipeline produces carbon dioxide. Dr. James Hansen, who heads NASA's Goddard Institute for Space Studies, calculates KXL will carry enough tar sands oil to raise the level of CO2 on Earth by 200 parts per million (ppm). Eighteen American scientific organizations support the consensus view that excess CO2, which is at its highest level in the last 800,000 years (392 ppm), is warming our planet. An increase in the Earth's temperature causes climate change, which has many negative effects. For example, climate change has enlarged the range of disease-bearing insects that once thrived only in warmer climates. In Africa, malaria kills a child every 30 seconds. Climate change will expand the habitat of the tropical mosquitoes that carry malaria, adding 80 million cases annually to that toll. In 1933, malaria infected 30 percent of the Tennessee Valley Authority's inhabitants.

#### Tar sands oil is one of the worst and most plentiful source of CO2

Jennifer **Huseman and** Damien **Short 11** ( “Throwing petrol on a fire: the human and environmental ¶ cost of tar sands production” November 2011 <http://www.commonwealthadvisorybureau.org/fileadmin/CPSU/documents/Publications/Opinion_Nov11.pdf> Page 1)

Tar Sands or Oil Sands? Canada’s tar sands are widely considered to be the most destructive industrial project on earth by environmental, human rights, and indigenous activists alike 1 . The expression ‘tar sands’ is a colloquial term used to describe sands that would perhaps be more accurately described as bituminous sands. They constitute a naturally occurring mixture of sand, clay, water, and bitumen – an exceptionally viscous and dense form of petroleum – which has, since the late 19th and early 20th century, been referred to as ‘tar’ due to its similar viscosity, odour, and colour. However, naturally occurring bitumen is chemically more similar to asphalt than to tar, and the term ‘oil sands’ is now more commonly used by industry and in the producing areas than ‘tar sands’, since synthetic oil is what is manufactured from the bitumen. Even so, the term ‘oil sands’ fails to convey the constituent complexity of the sands, and moreover, serves to sanitise the environmentally destructive industrial processes intrinsic to this particular form of oil production. Indeed, the environmental costs (externalities) of this form of unconventional oil production are enormous. Tar sands-derived oil must be extracted by strip mining or the oil made to flow into wells by ‘in situ’ techniques, which reduce the viscosity by injecting steam, solvents, and/or hot air into the sands. These processes use much more water than conventional oil extraction and produce huge ‘tailing ponds’ – although ‘tailing lakes’ would be a more accurate description – into which over 480 million gallons of contaminated toxic waste water are dumped daily. Taken together, Canada’s toxic waste lakes ‘cover more than 50 square kilometres (12,000 acres) and are so extensive that they can be seen from space.’2 In addition, producing liquid fuels from such sands requires huge amounts of energy for steam injection and refining processes which generate two to four times the amount of greenhouse gases per barrel of final product as the production of conventional oil. 3 If combustion of the product itself is included, known as the ‘Well to Wheels’ approach, bituminous sands extraction, upgrade and use has been shown to be the most polluting and carbon intensive oil process known to humankind, generating three to five times the greenhouse gas emissions it takes to produce a barrel of conventional oil. Thus, if one is not seeking ¶ to minimise the impact of these externalities the term ¶ ‘tar sands’ is preferable: it suggests the sand has a ¶ more complex constitution and that useable oil must be ¶ extracted from the sticky, heavy, viscous base material ¶ (bitumen) through industrial processes which have huge ¶ environmental and human costs.

#### Key stone pipeline is negatively effecting our environment

**Beinecke 12**(France Beinecke is the President, Natural Resources Defense Council)http://www.huffingtonpost.com/frances-beinecke/congress-keystone-xl\_b\_1326537.html

Instead of allowing engineers, public safety, and other experts to assess the pipeline's sweeping impacts -- on American communities, drinking water supplies, and the stability of our climate -- this amendment would let the politicians in Congress decide what is safe. It would bypass our nation's long-standing environmental review process and give Congress the unprecedented authority to hand out permits on massive projects. This amendment, sponsored by Senator John Hoeven (R-ND) and attached to a largely sensible, bipartisan transportation bill, is bad for government process and worse for America's national interest. Pipeline supporters and their allies in Congress are trying to capitalize on rising gas prices by claiming the pipeline would lower prices at the pump. That is patently false. The company behind Keystone XL, TransCanada, has admitted the pipeline would increase the price Americans pay for Canadian oil by up to $4 billion a year. It's no wonder oil companies want to build it.

### Existential Risk

#### Climate change outweighs every other impact

**Doebbler 11.** Curtis, International Human Rights Lawyer.(Two threats to our existence. Ahram Weekly. July 2011. <http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/2011/1055/envrnmnt.htm>)

Climate change is widely acknowledged to be the greatest threat facing humanity. It will lead to small island states disappearing from the face of the earth, serious global threats to our food and water supplies, and ultimately the death of hundreds of millions of the poorest people in the world over the course of this century. No other threat -- including war, nuclear disasters, rogue regimes, terrorism, or the fiscal irresponsibility of governments -- is reliably predicted to cause so much harm to so many people on earth, and indeed to the earth itself. The International Panel on Climate Change, which won the Nobel Prize for its evaluation of thousands of research studies to provide us accurate information on climate change, has predicted that under the current scenario of "business-as-usual", temperatures could rise by as much as 10 degrees Celsius in some parts of the world. This would have horrendous consequences for the most vulnerable people in the world. Consequences that the past spokesman of 136 developing countries, Lumumba Diaping, described as the equivalent of sending hundreds of millions of Africans to the furnace. Yet for more than two decades, states have failed to take adequate action to either prevent climate change or to deal with its consequences. A major reason for this is that many wealthy industrialised countries view climate change as at worst an inconvenience, or at best even a potential market condition from which they can profit at the expense of developing countries. Indeed, history has shown them that because of their significantly higher levels of population they have grown rich and been able to enslave, exploit and marginalise their neighbours in developing countries. They continue in this vein.

#### Independently, warming is the only existential risk.

**Deibel 07**( TerryDeibel, Professor of National Strategy at the National War College. , Foreign Affairs Strategy: Logic for American Statecraft, Conclusion: American Foreign Affairs Strategy Today, Google books)

Finally, there is one major existential threat to American security (as well as prosperity) of a nonviolent nature, which, though far in the future, demands urgent action. It is the threat of global warming to the stability of the climate upon which all earthly life depends. Scientists worldwide have been observing the gathering of this threat for three decades now, and what was once a mere possibility has passed through probability to near certainty. Indeed not one of more than 900 articles on climate change published in refereed scientific journals from 1993 to 2003 doubted that anthropogenic warming is occurring. “In legitimate scientific circles,” writes Elizabeth Kolbert, “it is virtually impossible to find evidence of disagreement over the fundamentals of global warming.” Evidence from a vast international scientific monitoring effort accumulates almost weekly, as this sample of newspaper reports shows: an international panel predicts “brutal droughts, floods and violent storms across the planet over the next century”; climate change could “literally alter ocean currents, wipe away huge portions of Alpine Snowcaps and aid the spread of cholera and malaria”; “glaciers in the Antarctic and in Greenland are melting much faster than expected, and…worldwide, plants are blooming several days earlier than a decade ago”; “rising sea temperatures have been accompanied by a significant global increase in the most destructive hurricanes”; “NASA scientists have concluded from direct temperature measurements that 2005 was the hottest year on record, with 1998 a close second”; “Earth’s warming climate is estimated to contribute to more than 150,000 deaths and 5 million illnesses each year” as disease spreads; “widespread bleaching from Texas to Trinidad…killed broad swaths of corals” due to a 2-degree rise in sea temperatures. “The world is slowly disintegrating,” concluded Inuit hunter Noah Metuq, who lives 30 miles from the Arctic Circle. “They call it climate change…but we just call it breaking up.” From the founding of the first cities some 6,000 years ago until the beginning of the industrial revolution, carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere remained relatively constant at about 280 parts per million (ppm). At present they are accelerating toward 400 ppm, and by 2050 they will reach 500 ppm, about double pre-industrial levels. Unfortunately, atmospheric CO2 lasts about a century, so there is no way immediately to reduce levels, only to slow their increase, we are thus in for significant global warming; the only debate is how much and how serous the effects will be. As the newspaper stories quoted above show, we are already experiencing the effects of 1-2 degree warming in more violent storms, spread of disease, mass die offs of plants and animals, species extinction, and threatened inundation of low-lying countries like the Pacific nation of Kiribati and the Netherlands at a warming of 5 degrees or less the Greenland and West Antarctic ice sheets could disintegrate, leading to a sea level of rise of 20 feet that would cover North Carolina’s outer banks, swamp the southern third of Florida, and inundate Manhattan up to the middle of Greenwich Village. Another catastrophic effect would be the collapse of the Atlantic thermohaline circulation that keeps the winter weather in Europe far warmer than its latitude would otherwise allow. Economist William Cline once estimated the damage to the United States alone from moderate levels of warming at 1-6 percent of GDP annually; severe warming could cost 13-26 percent of GDP. But the most frightening scenario is runaway greenhouse warming, based on positive feedback from the buildup of water vapor in the atmosphere that is both caused by and causes hotter surface temperatures. Past ice age transitions, associated with only 5-10 degree changes in average global temperatures, took place in just decades, even though no one was then pouring ever-increasing amounts of carbon into the atmosphere. Faced with this specter, the best one can conclude is that “humankind’s continuing enhancement of the natural greenhouse effect is akin to playing Russian roulette with the earth’s climate and humanity’s life support system. At worst, says physics professor Marty Hoffert of New York University, “we’re just going to burn everything up; we’re going to heat the atmosphere to the temperature it was in the Cretaceous when there were crocodiles at the poles, and then everything will collapse.” During the Cold War, astronomer Carl Sagan popularized a theory of nuclear winter to describe how a thermonuclear war between the Untied States and the Soviet Union would not only destroy both countries but possibly end life on this planet. Global warming is the post-Cold War era’s equivalent of nuclear winter at least as serious and considerably better supported scientifically. Over the long run it puts dangers from terrorism and traditional military challenges to shame. It is a threat not only to the security and prosperity to the United States, but potentially to the continued existence of life on this planet

### Disease

#### Keystone destroying aquifers leads to disease and food depletion.

**Doty and Wilde 11/8/11**(Doty, Russ and Wilde, Holly, Russ CEO/general counsel for New World WindPower in Billings. Holly Wilde is an actor, educator and writer in Steamboat, Colo., “Keystone Pipeline Bad For US and Earth”, <http://missoulian.com/news/opinion/columnists/keystone-pipeline-bad-for-the-u-s-and-the-earth/article_01ebc1f8-0a1b-11e1-a0fc-001cc4c03286.html>, Published November 8th, 2011, MS)

Are projects that make climate change worse - like the Keystone XL Pipeline - in the national interest? Not if short-term expedience creates long-term disaster. The 1,711-mile-long, yard-wide KXL would transport oil from underneath Alberta's boreal forests to refineries in Oklahoma and Texas. The oil would most likely be exported from there. One long-term cost of KXL is its contribution to raising the Earth's temperature. Burning fossil fuel carried in the pipeline produces carbon dioxide.Dr. James Hansen, who heads NASA's Goddard Institute for Space Studies, calculates KXL will carry enough tar sands oil to raise the level of CO2 on Earth by 200 parts per million (ppm).Eighteen American scientific organizations support the consensus view that excess CO2, which is at its highest level in the last 800,000 years (392 ppm), is warming our planet. An increase in the Earth's temperature causes climate change, which has many negative effects. For example, climate change has enlarged the range of disease-bearing insects that once thrived only in warmer climates. In Africa, malaria kills a child every 30 seconds. Climate change will expand the habitat of the tropical mosquitoes that carry malaria, adding 80 million cases annually to that toll.In 1933, malaria infected 30 percent of the Tennessee Valley Authority's inhabitants. The spraying of DDT, which is no longer considered safe, eradicated malaria in the U.S. by 1951. However, if climate change produces the warming and torrential rains that exacerbate stagnant water pools, malaria could return. Another example of an increase in the spread of disease due to climate change is painful and occasionally fatal dengue. Before being eradicated here, it infected half a million Texans in 1922. On the rise in other countries, dengue is expected to revisit the U.S. Southwest and areas stretching to Chicago where one of its carriers, the Asian tiger mosquito, has migrated.Lyme disease - carried by ticks - is increasing as our U.S. climate warms.From 2000 to 2006, the Centers for Disease Control reported between 17,000 and 24,000 cases a year. At the close of 2009, the CDC reported 29,959 cases. Let's compare. The KXL Pipeline will produce 5,060 to 9,250 full-time equivalent, temporary, non-local jobs over the two-year construction phase, as calculated by Cornell University's Global Labor Institute - a realistic number lower than the inflated 20,000 claimed by KXL supporters. Thus KXL will produce $253 million - $555 million in wages (at $50,000 to $60,000 per job). Compare that with the $534 million-plus cost of treating 6,000 added U.S. cases of Lyme disease every three years (at $89,000 per case). Thus, within three years or less, global warming-related, impaired health costs will begin to outweigh wage benefits of the Earth-warming KXL project.

### Ag

#### The fossil fuel admissions from KXL will take out our agriculture food sources

Doty 11 (Russ Doty is CEO/general counsel for New World WindPower in Billings. Helena native Holly Wilde is an actor, educator and writer in Steamboat, Colo.) http://missoulian.com/news/opinion/columnists/keystone-pipeline-bad-for-the-u-s-and-the-earth/article\_01ebc1f8-0a1b-11e1-a0fc-001cc4c03286.html

Burning fossil fuel also detrimentally affects agriculture and fuel costs. For example, Montana is 20 percent dryer than it was in 1911. Excess CO2 created from burning more fossil fuel will increase dryness. Scientists at the USDA and elsewhere note a 10 percent to 17 percent decline in wheat, corn, soybean, and rice yields for every 1 degree Celsius rise in temperature during growing periods. As temperatures rise our ability to raise food will diminish. TransCanada, KXL's developer, indicates that some oil now refined for domestic production will be diverted to KXL for export to more lucrative markets overseas. As a result, according to the GLI, 15 Mid-western states will experience a 10- to 20-cent per gallon increase in gasoline prices (up to $5 billion a year). Taken together, increases in health care and fuel costs, and decreases in food production, obliterate any financial benefit from KXL jobs and local tax revenues. Others warning of the threats to U.S. national security that climate change poses include the National Intelligence Council, Council on Foreign Relations, Center for Navel Analysis, CIA, Institute for Strategic Studies, and the National Intelligence Council. The NIC's classified assessment for Congress concludes climate change could threaten U.S. security in the next 20 years by causing political instability, mass refugee migration, terrorism, or conflicts over water and other resources. So, our national interest lies in preventing use of tar sands oil, not in facilitating it. When the State Department's Glendive hearing addressed whether KXL was in the national interest, pipeline advocates carried pre-printed signs saying, "Reason Not Extremism." Whose side is reason on?

## Indigenous Rights

#### Tar Sands hurt indigenous people

Orpiszewska 12

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

Mining of tar sands oil also threatens the indigenous communities that depend on the¶ Athabasca River for their way of life. Higher incidence of cancer, high mercury levels in the¶ food and water they rely on, and other health impacts have been reported in the communities¶ downstream of the tar sands.18 As a result, these communities have asked the Canadian¶ government for a moratorium on tar sands development until proper land management planning¶ can be implemented.19

## Eminent Domain Turn

### Links

#### Pipeline violates individuals property rights

Orpiszewska 12

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

Keystone XL will cross six U.S. states between Hardisty, Alberta and the Gulf Coast¶ ports – Montana, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma and Texas.56 The Kansas section¶ has already been built, and TransCanada has also begun the process of negotiating leases with¶ landowners whose property the pipeline will cross.57 While some owners readily agreed to lease¶ their land, those who don’t have already been threatened with eminent domain. States have¶ generally granted corporations building pipelines, roads, and other infrastructure and utility¶ projects the right to seize private property through the power of eminent domain.58 Because¶ pipeline projects often have only one feasible route, and alternatives may prove to be expensive,¶ corporations may need to enact the power of eminent domain for owners along the route who¶ will not negotiate for the lease or sale of land.59 Each state has its own laws on eminent domain¶ and can confer this power to companies building certain projects.60 The Texas Gulf Coast is the¶ final destination of Keystone XL, and the pipeline will cut across the state’s eastern half. Texaslaw provides that “[i]n the exercise of the power of eminent domain . . . a common carrier may¶ enter on and condemn the land, rights-of-way, easements, and property of any person or¶ corporation necessary for the construction, maintenance, or operation of the common carrier¶ pipeline”.61 The oil and gas industry is an important part of the Texan economy,62 as well as the¶ other states that the pipeline crosses. States stand to earn substantial revenue from property taxes¶ companies must pay on the land the pipeline crosses.63 Therefore, there is often little recourse¶ for a landowner who does not want to lease his land.64 A landowner can challenge the¶ designation of the company as a common carrier, gas utility, or gas corporation, but courts are¶ not likely to overturn this designation.65 Moreover, if a legislature has designated a corporation¶ as a common carrier, the courts do not have authority to alter that determination.66 Although¶ regulations vary, most states allow corporations building gas or oil pipelines to condemn land.67¶ Problems for landowners stem from the broad statutes granting almost any oil and gas company¶ this power.68

### Impact

**Eminent domain hurts growth**

**Fed Reserve Bank of St. Louis 7**

Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis “Press Release: St. Louis Fed Analysis Suggests Eminent Domain Could Hinder Economic Development 2007 http://www.stlouisfed.org/newsroom/displayNews.cfm?article=299

Eminent domain the power of governments to acquire private property for public usetends to transfer income from one group to another and is unlikely to provide an overall benefit to a community. That's one of the points offered in an analysis by economists Thomas A. Garrett and Paul Rothstein, writing in the January issue of The Regional Economist, a quarterly publication of business and economic topics published by the Reserve Bank. In June 2005, the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in Kelo vs. New London provoked widespread outrage. The decision allowed the city of New London, Conn., which was officially designated as "distressed," to employ eminent domain to acquire 15 properties, one of which belonged to homeowner SusetteKelo. Garrett and Rothstein cited one economic study which suggests eminent domain can improve market outcomes under certain conditions, but they said that any analysis of the Kelo decision "must recognize the tradeoffs inherent in giving local governments this kind of power over local economic development." One point emphasized by Garrett and Rothstein is that inefficiencies often result when government intervenes in private markets. They said that that historical, anecdotal information and formal academic research show that, in general, countries with less government involvementin private markets experience greater economic growth." When governments interfere in the private market, whether it be a market for apples, cars or property," said Garrett and Rothstein, "the likely result is greater economic inefficiency and less economic growth. The reason is that even the most well-intentioned policymaker cannot comprehend or replicate the complex interaction of buyers and sellers that occurs in free markets." Of course, several groups will benefit from the taking of private property: namely, developers, property managers and local politicians. The latter, said Garrett and Rothstein, benefit because politicians believe property development will result in increased employment and tax revenue. "Not realized, however," they said, "is that the supposed immediate and tangible benefits from taking private property for economic development are outweighed by the greater economic costs of government intervention in private markets." So, if eminent domain and some of its "relativestax increment financing, tax breaks, local development grants, etc.aren't that effective, are there any other economic development strategies that governments can use to yield positive growth? Garrett and Rothstein argue that local governments should ask the fundamental question: Why is the desired level of economic growth not occurring in the local area without significant economic development incentives? For example, are taxes too high, thereby discouraging businesses from locating or expanding in an area? Or, are current regulations stifling business development and expansion? "All of the targeted economic development in the world will not compensate for a poor business environment," they noted. Moreover, Garrett and Rothstein said that communities that rely on eminent domain as a primary tool of economic development run a risk. "Research has shown that without property rights, individuals will no longer face the incentive to make the best economic use of their property, be it a business or home, and economic growth will be limited," they said.

## \*\*\*Rail Roads DA

## 1NC

#### A. Uniquness/Link --With Pipelines down – rail surging.

Vanderklippe 12

Nathan Vanderklippe “Rail makes big inroads in oil transport” The Globe and Mail May 21, 2012 (http://www.theglobeandmail.com/report-on-business/industry-news/energy-and-resources/rail-makes-big-inroads-in-oil-transport/article4198192/)

The crude oil flows thick and black, pouring like hot coffee sludge into a rail tanker on the Saskatchewan prairie. The tracks it sits on bisect a snow-covered tableau of wheat fields and grain elevators and oil wells. The rails stretch past the horizon, winding their way to distant refineries in Texas and California and Pennsylvania, a network of oil-bearing steel ribbon that, in a sudden shift for Canada’s energy industry, has become an important new avenue for exporting oil. The tanker sits at a loading terminal near Lashburn, Sask., that has sprung up almost overnight to serve the new demand. A string of trucks pulls up beside a small forest of black tanks next to the tracks. Each one wrangles a hose into place, empties, then leaves. Workers pump the oil from the tanks into railcars, one at a time. When they’re busy, they load 15,000 barrels per day, destined for markets across the U.S. At a time when the pipeline industry is facing opposition to new projects, rail is surging. In the span of months, executives who had never considered moving oil by train are not just tinkering with rail shipments, but embracing them. While these shipments are small for now, by one estimate rail could be carrying 100,000 barrels a day out of Canada by next year; others have suggested more than 75,000 barrels a day is already moving by train. Even that is only the beginning: Plans are being laid to carry crude from the oil sands, as rail enters a head-to-head competition with the pipelines that have dominated the oil patch for the better part of a century.Altex Energy Ltd., the company that runs the Lashburn terminal, and is working to build others in Fort McMurray and Peace River, Alta., estimates that 10 per cent of oil sands output could one day flow on rails. Lashburn oil is already finding its way to eight terminals across the continent, and rail cars are opening up surprising new opportunities. Heavy oil sent by rail is finding new markets as shipping companies, for example, find they can burn it unrefined in ocean-going vessels. Cenovus Energy Inc., Canadian Natural Resources Ltd., Crescent Point Energy Corp., Husky Energy Inc. and Baytex Energy Corp. are among the companies experimenting with rail. But what started as an experiment is, for some, quickly becoming a change in business practice that stands to have a long-lasting impact on the way crude oil moves across North America. Take Crescent Point. It has built its own facility to load rail cars and, in spring, was shipping 8,000 barrels a day by train. By summer, “we should be up to 15,000 to 16,000 barrels per day,” or a fifth of its oil , said Trent Stangl, Crescent Point’s vice-president of marketing and investor relations. The markets the company is accessing by rail are paying so much more for the oil that Crescent Point expects to pay off the loading facility in under a year.

#### B. Impact -- Rail best – efficiency, environment, jobs.

**Nunweiler 12**

Alf Nunweiler was NDP MLA for Fort George from 1972-1975 and was BC Northern Affairs minister during that period. He is retired after 42 years with CN Rail. “Letter: Bitumen pipeline already exists – rail” Northern Sentinel Posted on March 5, 2012 (http://www.ridgesentinel.com/letter-bitumen-pipeline-already-exists-rail/)

Transporting tar sands oil by rail to Prince Rupertâ€™s deep-water port would be far less costly and much less environmentally disruptive than the Enbridge Northern Gateway pipeline proposed from Bruderheim, Alberta, across northern British Columbia to Kitimat. Many of us railroaders in northern British Columbia canâ€™t help but wonder why there should be a pipeline past our back door wilderness when at our front door there already is a first-class railway that can do the job with five times the capacity in less than half the time and less cost, and with more good-paying jobs – and it is under-used.â€ Prince Rupert has a super port which is one of the deepest water ports in the world served by the railway for high-volume loading of coal and grain onto ocean tankers. The super port has been there for more than 25 years. Yet Enbridge plans to build a new marine port in the sensitive Douglas Channel at Kitimat, which is 85 kilometres from open water. CN Rail could move 2.6 million barrels from eastern Alberta to Prince Rupert daily with current infrastructure, while the proposed Enbridge pipeline could move only a half million barrels a day to port. If the pipeline can carry only half a million barrels, you can see they would require more pipelines to increase capacity. Saskatchewan has also expressed a desire to transport some of their oil to the Western market by rail as well. Alberta will soon be doubling oil production in less than 10 years, according to Alberta government and oil media forecasts. As volume increases, Enbridge would already have their foot in the door and would be looking for a second and third pipeline that would further disturb the virgin wilderness. Rail would also be flexible in that they would be able to adjust the number of cars as demand increases or decreases. The pipeline would cost around $5.5 billion to construct. By contrast, modifications and upgrades required for the rail transport of bitumen, or crude oil, to the port at Prince Rupert would cost only about $100 million, according to information in recent statements by Glen Perry, president of Altex Energy Ltd. Would you rather spend $6 billion or close to zero? Pipelines are less efficient in transporting crude oil than rail cars becausethey can only carry the actual petroleum to 70 per cent of their capacity. The remaining 30 per cent of the pipeline capacity is taken up by a diluent required for lubricating the oil to make it run under pressure. When it reaches its destination at the coast, the diluent is separated and sent back in a parallel pipeline to eastern Alberta to re-enter the main pipeline again. So a pipeline can carry only a 70-per-cent load – almost doubling transportation costs- whereas rail cars don’t require the diluent and can carry a 100-per-cent load.â€ CN Rail has upgraded the line between Jasper and Prince Rupert to a first-class rail standard. It has the latest technology available on railroads – that is, automatic signals and computerized systems for traffic control. They have upgraded to the highest-standard rails, with sensors that can detect overheated wheels and bearings and send an alarm signal immediately to the computers in the dispatcherâ€™s office. Train derailments have occurred mainly on second-class branch lines that arenâ€™t always kept up to the same standard as the main lines. The main lines from Jasper to Prince Rupert, and from Jasper to Vancouver, are of first-class status, capable of handling high-volume traffic with good management and maintenance. When volume eventually reaches the single-rail maximum, itâ€™s easy to add another track to make it a double track, without disturbing any virgin wilderness. Most dispatchers, or rail traffic controllers, know that double tracks can handle three times the capacity of a single track because there are no opposing movements. Mountainous terrain poses far greater challenges for pipelines than the flat land or low rolling hills of the Prairies. I have worked as dispatcher in both the Prairies and the mountains and am familiar with both. Thereâ€™s absolutely no comparison in terrain. I remember my fatherâ€™s, grandfatherâ€™s and neighboursâ€™ farms with a pipeline through their land in Saskatchewan; and even there the occasional pipeline rupture occurred over the years, although they never seemed to make the news. It was very simple to get immediate access and make repairs to minimize serious damage. Itâ€™s almost impossible to expect the same access and repairs to pipelines in the rugged wilderness of BC. People should be reminded that a pipeline burst near Chetwynd in the summer of 2000 that contaminated the source of that communityâ€™s water supply. Pipeline proponents talk about the jobs to be created. Employment-wise the railway would probably provide more jobs in northern British Columbia than the pipeline could. When Tumbler Ridge was developed in the 1980â€™s, we heard a lot of complaints about British Columbia residents not getting the jobs because contractors were brought in from Alberta with Alberta workers, at the expense of BC workers. This we would not want to see happen again. The race is on between Enbridge and CN Rail to transport crude oil 1,200 kilometres from Alberta to Prince Rupert or Kitimat. Transport of the oil by rail makes far more economic and environmental sense than a pipeline over unusually rugged terrain and vulnerable wilderness, and it would also provide far more permanent employment and benefits to northern British Columbia as a whole.

## Uniqueness

#### Oil Transpo competitive battle

Vanderklippe 11

Nathan Vanderklippe “CN, CP eye shipping oil to West Coast” The Globe and Mail Jan. 24 2011 (http://www.theglobeandmail.com/globe-investor/cn-cp-eye-shipping-oil-to-west-coast/article563560/)

The race to deliver Canadian crude to Asian shores has become a four-way battle, as transportation companies work to sign agreements with Chinese companies that are interested in shipping oil across the Pacific. Although Enbridge Inc. has attracted the most attention for its planned Northern Gateway pipeline, which would create a Pacific outlet for Alberta's oil sands, Canadian National Railway Co. has also received a favourable response to its plan for a "pipeline on rail" that would also deliver oil to West Coast tanker ships. For decades, Canada has been almost solely reliant on the United States as a purchaser of Canadian crude. Yet political and industry leaders have increasingly called for a change, with hopes that adding more buyers will increase the value of one of Canada's most important export products, thereby boosting the fortunes of both the country's oil patch and government coffers. The rising fortunes of a growing Asian middle class are now a major force propelling global oil demand. As they seek to satisfy that energy thirst, Chinese companies are "interested in every alternative" for moving Canadian crude, said Glen Perry, president of Altex Energy Ltd., which has partnered with CN to create and market the rail idea. "They're looking at the economics." But that interest, he added, has yet to result in a signed shipping contract as the lure of opening a new crude export market draws proposals from a group of companies vying to be the favoured transportation option. Enbridge, which was one of the first to raise the idea of shipping oil sands crude over the Rockies, has since been joined by Kinder Morgan Canada, with a competing pipeline alternative into Vancouver, and both CN and Canadian Pacific Railway Ltd., which confirmed Monday it is working on a similar proposal. "It's kind of a competitive situation now," Mr. Perry said in an interview Monday. The CN idea is the latest oil transport proposal to attract attention. "We believe this has a real potential," Saskatchewan Energy and Resources Minister Bill Boyd told The Wall Street Journal after meeting with CN officials Sunday in China. He cautioned, however, that the railroad's discussions remain at "a very early stage."

#### Rail growing and sustainable

Vanderklippe 12

Nathan Vanderklippe “Rail makes big inroads in oil transport” The Globe and Mail May 21, 2012 (http://www.theglobeandmail.com/report-on-business/industry-news/energy-and-resources/rail-makes-big-inroads-in-oil-transport/article4198192/)

The rail companies are pushing hard, too. Former CN chief executive officer Hunter Harrison was personally involved with launching oil movements on that company’s tracks. And CP, the company Mr. Harrison is now seeking to lead, has made oil a key push going forward. In 2009, CP moved 500 carloads of oil – about 250,000 barrels a year. By 2014, it expects that to grow to 70,000 carloads a year, or nearly 100,000 barrels a day. CP is optimistic that its burgeoning oil business is here to stay. “What we’re discovering as we open up our destination matrix is that rail can get to markets that pipelines don’t serve now and really have no intention of serving,” said Tracy Robinson, a CP vice-president who has helped direct the company’s crude ambitions. She pointed, for example, to the oil trains currently heading to the northeastern U.S. “We do believe it will be a permanent model,” she said.

### A2 Coal decreasing

#### Keystone oil offsets coal

Mylant 12

John Mylant–“Slow Coal Production hasn’t Slowed Down the Railways” Motley Fool’s Investment Blog April 18 ://beta.fool.com/johnmylant/2012/04/18/mining-coal-has-slowed-so-heavy-equipment-sales-be/3685/

Despite the lower coal shipments, the rebounding economy is showing signs the Rail Industry is surging: This is especially true in intermodal and container volume increases. Strong auto sales means parts are now being shipped more. Petroleum and chemical tanker growth is also taking place. When President Obama rejectedthe Keystone Pipeline, the volume of oils and chemicals shipped by rail offset the depletion of coal shipments. Union Pacific(NYSE: [UNP](http://caps.fool.com/Ticker/UNP.aspx))has increased its revenue base as a result.

## Link

#### Bottleneck encourages rail investment.

Cattaneo 12

Claudia Cattaneo As pipelines stall, railways keep oil flowing “ Financial Post Mar 2, 2012 – 8:05 PM ET | Last Updated: Mar 5, 2012 8:10 AM ET http://business.financialpost.com/2012/03/02/as-pipelines-stall-railways-keep-oil-flowing/?\_\_lsa=2b3ddea1

On any given week, three to seven CP Rail trains laden with crude oil from the North Dakota Bakken field whisk across North America, bypassing the pipeline bottlenecks in mid-continent that are depressing oil prices and unaffected by the noise in Washington, D.C., that is holding back the Keystone XL pipeline. It’s a roaring business. In 2009, when Calgary-based Canadian Pacific Railway Ltd. started dabbling in crude oil transportation, it moved 500 of its black barrel-shaped cars out of the basin. Last year, its oil trains carried 13,000 cars and soon CP could be moving 70,000 cars or more a year out of the North Dakota Bakken tight-oil field alone. With each tank car containing 650 barrels of oil, that’s 126,000 barrels a day — a significant pipeline on rail. “We think that’s foreseeable in the not-too-distant future, and we think based on what we are doing now there is potential above that,” Tracy Robinson, CP’s energy and merchandise vice-president, said in an interview. It’s not the pipeline on rail that some were envisioning some years ago, when Canada’s major railway companies, Montreal-based Canadian National Railway Co. and CP, started looking for ways to get a piece of the growing Alberta oil sands by offering alternative transportation. The idea was greeted with skepticism. Pipeline and oil companies have been so interdependent for so long that large-scale rail transportation seemed like a costly, unsafe detour from a proven model. Now, rail transportation is gaining traction for new reasons. For one, tight oil production is increasing rapidly and rail transportation can be scaled up quickly. Then there are pipeline bottlenecks due to rising production out of Western Canada and the Bakken — that are depressing oil prices in the U.S. Midwest and justifying rail’s higher costs — and the controversy surrounding the Keystone XL expansion is pushing producers to look at all options. Meanwhile, the North Dakota Bakken experience has demonstrated that railways can do the job, Ms. Robinson said. With production increasing rapidly to about 600,000 barrels a day in about six years, companies like CP, whose tracks traverse North Dakota, moved in aggressively to fill the void. During 2011, rail capacity in the region tripled to almost 300,000 barrels a day, according to the U.S. State Department. “Our phone is ringing a lot more often,” Ms. Robinson said. “We have always thought there was some potential here. What really gave us the opportunity was the technological enhancement that allowed the shale drilling on a more economic basis. It started first for us in the Bakken area, where there was suddenly a lot of oil that had no mode of transportation to get into the market place.” The process involves piping or trucking oil into a tank and loading it into a specially built, double-lined tank car. The car is assembled into a train dedicated to crude oil that takes it to refineries or tanks that feed other pipelines. “The way we approached that market is to create a matrix of origins and destinations,” Ms. Robinson said. “We have multiple-origin train loading points in North Dakota, and we are developing multiple-destination options for our customers, in Eastern Canada, Northeast U.S., the Gulf and the Midwest, and we are playing around on a test basis to the West.” CP is building capacity in the Canadian side of the Bakken, located largely in Saskatchewan, where activity and production are ramping up, and looking for opportunities to carry more heavy oil. In the last year, it has opened oil transload facilities in Alberta and Saskatchewan. When CN started marketing its ambitious pipeline on rail strategy about 2008, it was dreaming big. The railway was talking about moving millions of barrels a day from the oil sands, using existing tracks, to the U.S. Gulf Coast or to the West Coast for shipment to Asia. Today, the company won’t talk about its progress, other than to say its energy business is growing. “CN, in response to customer demand, is moving crude (i.e., heavy crude, light crude, pure bitumen) from areas in Western Canada to various markets,” it said in an emailed statement. “CN has also been providing truck-to-rail transportation solutions for crude oil, where CN is loading directly from truck to rail.” CP is also eager to step into the oil sands. Ms. Robinson said discussions are continuing but “nothing significant is happening yet. “The oil sands, there is a lot of dialogue that continues to take place, and exactly how that oil can get to market,” she said. “And as that develops and as decisions are made, I would expect that given the infrastructure that exists on rail, rail will play a role. “It’s very early on at this point. We have collectively as a market more work to do to see what the potential of the oil sands is.” John Heida, a consultant at Purvin&Gertz, said oil transportation by rail has increased, but it’s hard to quantify by how much because rail information is not as readily available as pipeline data. He expects rail to remain an option on a “case-by-case” basis rather than an industry-wide solution. The main driver for the recent increase in rail use is the steep discount for mid-continent crudes caused by the pipeline bottleneck at Cushing, Okla., he said. While carriers keep costs confidential, it’s estimated that it costs $10 to $12 a barrel to transport it by rail, and about $5 for pipeline, making the option attractive when the discount is in the $30 or more range, as it has been recently. Meanwhile, despite the targeting of pipeline expansions by environmental organizations, pipeline companies are continuing to come up with new options. TransCanada Corp. proposed this week to break up the Keystone XL pipeline to speed up construction of a southern leg and the portion from the U.S./Canada border in Montana to Steele City, Nebraska, that is not in dispute. It would collect North Dakota Bakken oil. Enbridge Inc. launched an open season this week for an addition to its North Dakota Bakken oil pipeline system. And Kinder Morgan Energy Partners LP said last month it has received enough shipper support to decide this month whether to go ahead with an expansion of its TransMountain pipeline to Canada’s West Coast. The pipeline would compete with Enbridge’s proposed Northern Gateway. But the railways say they can offer flexibility to producers that pipelines can’t. They can scale up or down quickly. Because their tracks are in place, they can provide transportation now, while pipeline permitting and construction takes years. As for safety, Ms. Robinson says rail transportation has a top record relative to the amount moved and its exposure to spills is limited. If a rail car breaks open, the most it spills is 650 barrels.

#### Keystone trades off with rail industry

Kingston 11

John Kingston “Rail makes a comeback in moving oil around the US” The Barrel July 28, 2011 4:26 PM | No Comments | No TrackBacks

In the latest edition of "what was once old is new again," the oil industry brings you: the choo-choo train. Trains were a primary means of moving crude oil around the US and other countries years ago; John D. Rockefeller's Standard Oil used trains to help solidify the power of his trust. (A paper written by two professors on the history of Standard Oil and rail put it this way: "The charge leveled most consistently against Standard Oil is that it secured unfair competitive advantages by negotiating advantageous rates with the railroads over which it shipped crude from the 'Oil Regions' of Pennsylvania and Ohio to its Cleveland refineries and sent kerosene and other refined petroleum products to markets on the East Coast.") Pipelines for land transit long ago replaced trains, but in just the past two years, as a result of booming supplies out of the Bakken and Eagle Ford shale plays where pipeline infrastructure is inadequate or non-existent, trains have made a remarkable comeback. A spokeswoman for national railway BNSF would not disclose specific numbers, but said that the amount of Bakken oil it was hauling, as well as the destinations, had doubled in the past year. She added that each train has about 680 barrels in each railcar, and the enormous train links enough of those cars to pull 70,000 barrels in each delivery. Platts' editors Leslie Moore Mirra and Lucretia Cardenas have tracked some of these new developments. Here's a sampling of them, just in the last few months. --Savage Cos. just recently began working on its "multi-user rail terminal" in Trenton, North Dakota, near the Bakken, to begin moving Bakken crude to market via rail. It's a 270-acre site and expects to be fully subscribed, but the company won't disclose the facility's capacity. --Not all the oil is heading south. Earlier this month, Tesoro said it was engaged in a project that would pull Bakken crude to the west, to be refined at its Anacortes, Washington facilities. Anacortes now processes about 1,000-2,000 b/d of Bakken crude at the plant; the project would take it up to 30,000 b/d. --Numerous companies are getting in the game by building new terminals. U.S. Development Group LLC, which describes itself as a developer of unit train logistics and terminal facilities, is already planning a doubling of its St. James, Louisiana terminal to have a capacity of 130,000 b/d, which it said is the equivalent of two unit trains. (A unit train is a train that carries only one product. Ethanol is transported in unit trains.) --Late last year, pipeline and midstream company Kinder Morgan invested $150 million in Watco, a short-line railroad holding company. The two have since announced several projects. -It's not just in the Bakken. The Eagle Ford is heavily dependent upon rail to haul oil out of that south Texas field. That same U.S. Development Group is about to begin operating an Eagle Ford crude terminal that will include storage tanks and a direct truck-to-rail loading capability with a capacity of 40,000 b/d. There are more. But not all of the projects are aimed at getting oil in directions where pipelines don't go, such as from the Bakken to Anacortes. One of the first incentives of "first mover" companies into this area, like NuStar, was to get Bakken crude away from the Cushing, Oklahoma delivery bottleneck and straight down into the Gulf for better prices. Constructing more pipeline capacity from the Bakken into Cushing, and then some sort of exit out of Cushing, could dampen the rail trade. As far as how much all of this costs, Turner Mason's John Auers said an average rail cost over a long distance would be $7-$8/b for large volumes and $11-$12/b for smaller amounts, versus an equivalent price of $6/b over pipeline transportation (while adding that the numbers could vary.) Whatever the price, it's a choice for a Bakken producer to move it into Guernsey, Wyoming and sell it at $102.50 (roughly the price earlier this week), get less than $100 at Cushing or move it by rail into St. James where it can get LLS-like prices up near $120. At those sorts of differentials, the costs of rail do not trump the value in doing a pipeline deal, and all the deals getting done prove that. Looming out there are a whole range of projects that would allow oil, particularly from the Bakken, to be delivered via pipeline--the more efficient means of transport. The Keystone XL pipeline would head that list, because it would give new capacity to take oil not just to Cushing, but also to the Gulf of Mexico. So if the full force of Bakken-related pipeline deals ever hits the market, the 21st century revival of rail in transporting oil might be remembered as a quirky time when markets had to dust off a once-dormant means of transportation to adapt to a rapidly changing landscape.

#### Railroads good/keystone trades off

Sivy 12

Michael Sivy“The Unlikely Green Alternative to the Keystone Pipeline? Railroads” BusinessTimes Jan 24, 2012 http://business.time.com/2012/01/24/railroads-the-unlikely-green-alternative-to-the-keystone-pipeline/#ixzz20KcXHwFA

President Obama’s decision last week to kill the Keystone XL Pipeline that would carry oil from Canada to the U.S. was cheered by some environmental activists like Robert Redford. But many mainstream commentators reacted with dismay. A Washington Post editorial called the decision wrong on the substance of the question. And a columnist for the same newspaper described it more hyperbolically as “an act of national insanity.” The argument for the pipeline is not only that it would give the U.S. a secure source of oil with low transportation costs, create jobs and help our close ally Canada, but also that the alternative is actually worse from an environmental point of view. Canada is still going to produce its oil, and the U.S. is still going to need energy. Without the pipeline, Canada will have to try to sell some of its oil to China, which means building a pipeline to the Canadian West Coast. And we will buy more from the Middle East or somewhere else. The overall result: more oil shipped longer distances and greater chances of an oil spill. Whichever side is right in this argument, one beneficiary is clear: Railroads. Quite simply, some of the oil that would have been moved through the pipeline will now have to go by tanker car. If oil is more expensive or less available in some places, that will encourage the use of low-sulfur coal. Either way, it means more hauling business for the Big Rails, especially Burlington Northern, now owned by Warren Buffett’s company Berkshire Hathaway. (Conspiracy theorists were quick to point out that Buffett is an informal advisor to President Obama. Liberal billionaire George Soros is supposedly involved, too, somehow.) But railroads offer more than just an alternative to a pipeline unpopular with environmentalists. They are in fact one of Americas most energy-efficient modes of transport – and as such a legitimate “green” industry, whether environmentalists acknowledge that fact or not. Here are two key reasons for the rails’ green appeal: Productivity is high and rising. The industry was largely deregulated in 1980 and had an incentive to reinvest, especially in technology. As railroads merged and rail networks grew more complex, it became increasingly important to route the trains – and even individual cars – in the most efficient ways. Sophisticated software now calculates the best way to put different cars together into trains. And onboard electronics assess topography, track curvature, train length and weight to calculate the optimum speed for conserving fuel. Energy efficiency is steadily growing. Railroads are far more energy-efficient than their competitors. Locomotives today get 80% more mileage from a gallon of diesel than they did in 1980. As a result, trains are two-to-five times more efficient than trucks per ton of freight. That not only saves on costs, it reduces emissions of greenhouse gases. In fact, the Environmental Protection Agency calculates that moving freight by train rather than truck over long distances reduces greenhouse gas emissions by up to 75%. Three railroads stand out as the leaders in the group and all three stocks have done at least as well as the broad market over the past three months. In order of their recent performance, they are: Union Pacific, the largest U.S. railroad, Norfolk Southern, and CSX. All three stocks trade at 12-to-13 times projected earnings for 2012 and offer yields slightly above the 1.9% paid by the S&P 500. The trouble with all debates like the one over the pipeline is that no solution is totally safe. If you don’t rely on oil, then you’ll end up instead using fracking to get natural gas and risking water pollution, or building nuclear plants. And that means that decisions end up being based on politics, not rational policy. Whether you think the XL Pipeline would have been good or bad for the environment, one thing is sure: The decision to kill it is good for the railroads.

## Rail Best

### General

#### Many Benefits

Vanderklippe 11

Nathan Vanderklippe “CN, CP eye shipping oil to West Coast” The Globe and Mail Jan. 24 2011 (http://www.theglobeandmail.com/globe-investor/cn-cp-eye-shipping-oil-to-west-coast/article563560/)

A PIPELINE ON RAILS BenefitsUses existing rail lines from Fort McMurray, Alta., to Prince Rupert, B.C., skirting opposition to Pacific crude exports via new pipeline(s). Low capital costs. Each 550-barrel tanker car costs roughly $100,000; given a 10-day transit time from Fort McMurray to the West Coast, 55,000 barrels per day of capacity would cost $100-million for 1,000 rail cars, running in 100-car trains every day. CN would also need to build a terminal on the coast, at a cost of $200-million to $500-million. Could be put in place quickly, and scaled up or down rapidly. Rail, by CN's calculation, is less greenhouse-gas intensive than pipelines.

#### Even if spills more likely with rail – accidents = less magnitude

Van Kooten 12

G Cornelis van KootenProfessor of Economics and Canada Research Chair in Environmental Studies and Climate in the Department of Economics, University of Victoria, Canada. I am responsible for the Resource Economics and Policy Analysis (REPA) Research Group that consists of graduate students and affiliated researchers who are interested in applying economic analysis to issues in agriculture, forestry, energy and natural resources more broadly. “Pipelines and Canada’s Oil Sands” Posted on May 3, 2012 http://www.vkooten.net/?p=348

The federal government recognizes that, as oil production increases, there is a real need to resolve the environmental issues and come up with solutions to facilitate the movement of oil. In the absence of an agreement, the clear alternative is the ‘pipeline on rail,’ which would send oil to the west coast ports of Prince Rupert and Vancouver at Roberts Bank. This would mitigate some of the tanker traffic issues because it would make the routes somewhat shorter and perhaps somewhat less risky. However, it would increase the likelihood of oil spills, although they would be limited to at most 65,000 barrels (assuming a 100-car train) at any given time. To confine a break in an oil pipeline to less than that amount would, in a worst case scenario, require shutting off the pumps within 2 to 2½ hours. Of course, shipping oil by rail is more costly, thereby dissipating rents.

### Econ

### Key

#### Railroads are key to the economy

**Hamberger, 99**(Edward, CEO of the Association of American Railroads, FDCH Congressional Testimony, 3/2, lexis)

North America's economic future and its ability to compete in world markets is best served by a freight railroad industry that provides excellent service at reasonable rates and a safe working environment for its employees. Railroads have achieved much success since 1980 by reducing costs and becoming more efficient. But further success will require growth in the "top-line."In other words, we have to "grow the business," and that means we have to provide better service. We are striving to do this. Last year, railroads held a series of customer outreach meetings in which we discussed a number of issues that would help us serve our customers better. One result of those meetings is that railroads became the first industry to publish weekly performance measures on the Internet. We are continuing our dialogue with rail customers this year. We will shortly hold another meeting with rail customers - this one in Chicago - where we will address issues relating to customer communications over the entire cycle of a shipment, from the time a car is ordered until it is delivered, including problem resolution. Also as a result of our customer outreach efforts. we have agreed to accelerate development of an Interline Service Management business plan. As much as 40 percent of our revenue involves shipmentsmoving over more than one railroad so anything we can do to improve the handling of these interline moves will have a direct impact on the quality of service. Nearly two years ago, the industry developed NetREDI - an Internet-based means by which railroad customers can trace their individual shipments. This is now being used on a daily basis by our customers. Our customer-service centers provide around-the- clock assistance for those who ship by rail. Last year railroads reached a landmark agreement with the National Grain and Feed Association to arbitrate service issues and mediate rate disputes. We even adopted, in total, NGFA's own century-old arbitration system. Railroads also resolved to work better with each other, including an historic agreement between the Class I railroads and the American Short Line and Regional Railroad Association that will mean better service for the customers we cooperatively serve. Staggers helped us achieve our goal of providing customized, efficient, economical and safe service. Since 1980, average rates have declined by 55 percent on an inflation-adjusted basis. Just as remarkable has been the improvement in railroad safety. Both train accident and employee injury rates have declined by 70 percent since 1980. (See Chart 3 at the back of this testimony.) Railroad workers have lower injury rates than their counterparts in the truck, aviation and transit industries. Indeed. their injury rate is lower than the average for manufacturing as a whole. (See Chart 3A at the back of this testimony.) Staggers had everything to do with this as it increased cash flow, providing railroads with the money needed to eliminate deferred maintenance, upgrade track and purchase new and safer equipment. (Chart is available on hard copy only). The present freight rail system in the U.S. works. Indeed, it has become the model for countries around the world.According to World Bank statistics, U.S. freight railroads move more freight, more efficiently and more economically than do railroads in Western Europe, in Japan or any other place in the world. I know it is customary for industries faced with change to come before Congress and predict disaster. But the railroad industry is different in one important respect. Prior to 1980, we lived through the consequences of what is being proposed and it took an act of Congress and nearly 20 years for this industry to regain its footing.The health and vitality of our economy depends on the efficiency of our nation's transportation system. Why jeopardize the future of our nation's economy by reregulating railroads? The railroad industry of two decades ago was a capital-starved industry. Some twenty percent of the industry sunk into bankruptcy during the 1970s. Return on investment was under two percent. Accident rates were soaring. Average rates were climbing faster than inflation. Market share was declining. The government was pouring $1 billion a year in direct subsidy to keep Conrail running, and there was discussion of nationalizing the railroads.

#### Railroads key to US Economy

**Association of American Railroads 2011**(Association of American Railroads, “Great Expectations 2011; Freight’s Role in U.S. Economic Recovery”, 2011)

In 2010, as America continued emerging from the worst economic recession in a generation, freight railroads played a key role in this forward progress. According to the U.S. Department of Commerce, freight railroads generate nearly $265 billion in total annual economic activity. Freight rail drives our economy – supporting vital jobs, meeting the needs of an incredibly diverse set of customers, facilitating both interstate and international commerce, and offering environmentally sound solutions to some of our nation’s worst transportation problems. The Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) reports that every American requires the movement of 40 tons of freight per-person annually. “This includes bulk commodities such as coal for power, grains for food, and high-value consumer goods,” the FRA said in its September 2010 update to the National Rail Plan. Freight railroads account for 43 percent of all intercity freight – more than any other mode of transportation. Freight rail moves the things businesses need and consumers want without relying on taxpayer dollars. Unlike trucks, barges andairlines, freight railroads own, build and maintain the vitalinfrastructure upon which they and others operate, using almostexclusively their own private capital.These private investments have built, maintained, and continue to nurture a 140,000 milenational rail network that is the envy of the world, serving both passenger and freight railcustomers. This thriving network enables U.S. businesses – large and small – to get their goods to the global market. It does this while providing the literal foundation for millions of commuter and intercity passenger rail trips every year. Unlike trucks, barges and airlines, railroads operate across infrastructure they have built, maintained, grown and owned with private capital. Even during the economic downturn, America’s freight railroads continued making significant private investments in building, maintaining and growing the national rail network. In 2010, freight railroads spent a record amount oncapital expenditures – approximately $10.7 billionto build and expand their network infrastructureand purchase equipment. Further, all of the majorClass I railroads have publicly announced plannedcapital spending programs in 2011 that will be greater than those in 2010. Combined, the major freight railroads have projected capitalexpenditures of $12 billion in 2011. Including the cost of maintenance, railroads in recent years have been pouring roughly $20 billion a year in private investments into the nation’s rail infrastructure. In fact, railroads since 2006 have been spending on average more than $200,000 per mile on rail infrastructure each year. Since 1980, when railroads were partially deregulated, freight railroads have spent $480 billion – more than 40 cents of every revenue dollar – on these critical infrastructure investments. Private funds pay for tracks, bridges, tunnels, signals, terminals and other infrastructure that serves both passenger and freight rail customers. As our economy continues to recover, the demand to move more people and goods by rail will also increase. According to the FRA National Rail Plan, total freight shipments are expected to rise 61 percent in the next three decades – to 16.9 billion tons in 2050 compared with the roughly 12.5 billion tons moved in 2010. Freight railroads are committed to meeting the call to move more by rail, in both the near- and long-term. This commitment is not reliant on federal stimulus funds. Rather, it will be made possible with the freight railroads providing private funds. Those investments will go to a broad range of projects needed to meet the needs of customers and the challenges that lie ahead. At the same time, they will sustain well-paying jobs in numerous states. Private funding will support expenditures such as: • large-scale corridor expansion projects; • new intermodal terminal facilities; • new, more efficient locomotives and rail cars; • upgrades to railway track and structures, and • new technology and communication systems, including those required to meet the federal mandate for positive train control (PTC). The level of private infrastructure investment railroads make is evidence that freight rail is a highly capital-intensive business. Between 2000 and 2009, the average U.S. manufacturer spent roughly 3 percent of revenue on capital expenditures – while railroads spent five times more at 17 percent. In fact, the four largest Class I railroads each spend more on their private. As railroads began to see a return in traffic in 2010, they brought workers back, and hired to meet the growing needs of their customers. At the end of 2010, railroademployment was up roughly 5.2 percent, bringing totalemployment at the nation’s freight railroads to more than175,000.Every railroad job supports an additional 4.5 jobs. Railroadbusiness activities and buying power support an additional1.2 million jobs across the broader economy. Railroads alsosupport jobs in industries such as manufacturing,construction, iron and steel, as well as communications and information technology jobs thatare supported by rail supplier industries.Railroads also are well positioned to sustain hiring in the years ahead – both to fill jobs neededto meet growing demand and those vacated through retirements and attrition. According tothe U.S. Railroad Retirement Board, more than67,000 railroad employees, or roughly 30 percentof the total workforce, will be eligible to retire inthe next five to 10 years.Railroads also have said they plan to hire moreworkers in 2011, as rail traffic continues torecover. Among the seven major Class Irailroads, the companies estimate they will hireclose to 10,000 workers in 2011 – some toaddress these retirements and general attrition,while others will be filling jobs needed to meetincreased demand. Railroad employees are among America’s most highly compensated workers. According to U.S. government data, the average full-time worker in 2009, the most recent year for data, earned wages of $81,563 and benefits of $25,522 for a total average compensation of $107,085. That compares with the average U.S. employee who in 2009 saw average total compensation of $64,552, or roughly 60 percent of the average total annual compensation for a rail employee. Freight rail provides the vital link for American goods andcommodities to the global market, carrying one third of allU.S. exports. In 2008, the most recent year for data, freightrailroads moved roughly 235 million tons of U.S. goods andmaterials to ports and borders, worth more than $190billion.Of the American commodities and goods shipped overseas,coal and grain far outweigh others in terms of volumemoved by rail. In 2008, the nation’s railroads moved 74.4million tons of grain to export, valued at $14 billion, as wellas 68.5 million tons of coal to export, valued at $14.9billion. Global events affecting international demand for grain and coal last year included droughts inRussia and the Ukraine, as well as flooding in Australia – making the U.S. a growing globalleader in both grain and coal supply. According to the U.S. Energy Information Administration, coal exports through the third quarter of 2010 were up 46.8 percent, to 60.8 million tons, compared with 41.4 million tons total in 2009. In 2010, coal represented 45.4 percent of all rail carload traffic by tons. In general, freight railroads moved 1,149,855 carloads of grain in 2010, up 10.8 percent over2009, reflecting the strong demand for the high-quality, competitively priced U.S. grainoverseas. According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, U.S. wheat exports are projected tohit 35.4 million tons in 2011, their highest level since 1992.Rail intermodal traffic — shipping containers and truck trailers on railroads — has been thefastest growing rail traffic segment over the past 25 years. Most intermodal traffic consists ofconsumer goods, and approximately 60 percent of rail intermodal traffic involves imports orexports, reflecting the vital role railroads play in international trade. Today, intermodal traffic accounts for around 21 percent of U.S. rail revenue — second only to coal among all rail traffic segments. Railroads are essential to the transport of coal, more so than any other mode of transportation. That’sbecause coal is mined in a handful of states, but must move to customers located across the country. Nearlyhalf of America’s electricity is produced from coal, and railroads haul 70 percent of it. The electricityproduced from rail-delivered coal is enough to meet the power needs of every home in America.Just as rail is vital to coal, coal is important to railroads. Coal represented 45.5 percent of all traffic in 2010, and roughly 25 percent of annual rail revenue. Coal also supports one in every five railroad jobs, and railroadshave invested tens of billions of dollars in unique assets to serve coal customers.The use of highly productive unit trains – which operate around the clock, use dedicated equipment and stickto direct shipping routes – has helped railroads and customers improve efficiency in getting coal from themine to the marketplace. These types of trains have lower costs-per-unit, and can efficiently carry coal longdistances. In 2009, the average coal car carried 115 tons, up 17 percent from 98.2 tons in 1990.

### (Comparative)

#### Rail best – adaptable market access, cheaper

Vanderklippe 12

Nathan Vanderklippe “Rail makes big inroads in oil transport” The Globe and Mail May 21, 2012 (http://www.theglobeandmail.com/report-on-business/industry-news/energy-and-resources/rail-makes-big-inroads-in-oil-transport/article4198192/)

Pipelines are still dominant – and a raft of new proposals, which would carry vast amounts of Alberta and Saskatchewan crude to the south, west and east, has raised questions over whether trains are merely a short-term solution. Rail does suffer from one important problem: It’s expensive. In rough terms, it costs twice as much to ship oil by train, some $5 to $10 more a barrel. That’s the reason the Lashburn tanker car is so important. Unlike the light oil that Crescent Point is pumping, the oil in this corner of Saskatchewan is heavy. It’s thick. Heavy oil requires an expensive thinner called diluent to move in pipe. By rail, it moves undiluted, which evens the playing field on transportation costs. And with rail, companies can rapidly switch markets, since rail networks reach most points of the U.S. – including areas, such as the Gulf Coast and California, that pipes from Canada barely touch.

#### Rail 5X faster and cheaper

Vanderklippe 11

Nathan Vanderklippe “CN, CP eye shipping oil to West Coast” The Globe and Mail Jan. 24 2011 (http://www.theglobeandmail.com/globe-investor/cn-cp-eye-shipping-oil-to-west-coast/article563560/)

Building a West Coast outlet has proven to be a major challenge for Canada's oil industry. Enbridge has spent more than a decade pursuing the $5.5-billion Gateway project, which would add 525,000 barrels-a-day of capacity and create a major reconfiguration of Canadian crude flows. Though it has won a $100-million initial investment from a coalition of Asian and Canadian interests, including Chinese state oil firm Sinopec, it has encountered pitched opposition among B.C. native communities and environmental groups, and remains years from construction. CN's pipeline alternative offers a potentially simpler option that could be placed into service using existing infrastructure. Proponents of the rail alternative say it can compete on both timeline - crude moves more than five times faster on tracks than in a pipe - and price. Take West Coast exports, for example. For bitumen to flow to Kitimat, B.C., as Enbridge has proposed, it must be thinned with a product called condensate, in a ratio that includes only 70 per cent bitumen. That condensate must then be brought back to Fort McMurray, doubling the transportation costs. Rail cars, by contrast, can ship pure bitumen. And rather than the $5.5-billion price tag for Gateway, rail cars with enough capacity to move 55,000 barrels per day - a reasonable initial flow - would cost $100-million, Altex's Mr. Perry. That makes rail a more cost-effective way to stir up better prices for Canadian crude, he argued. "What you're doing is buying an option on an alternative market," he said. "The cost of the option with the pipeline is [close to]$6-billion. The cost of the option with rail is [close to]zero. Would you rather spend $6-billion or zero?"CN would also have to build a West Coast terminal for roughly $200-million to $500-million - a cost that CN, which declined comment, is not likely to commit to until it has solid shipper support, which may not materialize for years.But shipping by rail is not just an idea: several oil sands companies have already tested the service by sending crude in CN cars to the Gulf Coast. Rail can provide a good alternative when, for example, pipeline outages make it difficult to find enough available space to transport oil, or lower the price of what is shipped. "It's a way of getting around current problems," said Cameron Todd, senior vice-president of operations, refining and marketing with Connacher Oil and Gas Ltd., an early supporter of the CN idea that has shipped bitumen to the southern U.S. by rail. Yet the idea is limited by the difficulty in getting crude in and out of rail cars, and the fact that some refineries are set up to only receive product by pipe. "There are some logistical challenges to doing it, and it costs a lot of money to pay for the cost of railing it down," Mr. Todd said. "I'm not bullish on this. But I think it's a reasonable alternative."

### Meet Demand

#### No demand from international market

Vanderklippe 11

Nathan Vanderklippe “CN, CP eye shipping oil to West Coast” The Globe and Mail Jan. 24 2011 (http://www.theglobeandmail.com/globe-investor/cn-cp-eye-shipping-oil-to-west-coast/article563560/)

Even Mr. Perry acknowledges that West Coast exports - by rail or otherwise - are not likely imminent. For now, strong demand among Midwestern and Gulf Coast refiners has made the U.S. the best market for Canadian product."I don't think right today the producers are desperately seeking an alternative," he said. "What they're seeking is an alternative that might kick in three, four, five years from now."

#### Rail costs won’t deter oil production – flexible to scale and region.

Efstathiou 12

Jim Efstathiou Jr. – “Buffett’s Burlington Northern Among Pipeline Winners” Bloomberg News Jan 23, 2012 5:04 PM CT (http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-01-23/buffett-s-burlington-northern-among-winners-in-obama-rejection-of-pipeline.html

Shipping oil using tank cars on rail costs about $3 more a barrel than pipeline transport, using prices in North Dakota, a differential “unlikely” to slow the development of oil sands crude if no pipeline is build, the State Department said. The gap is shrinking as larger storage terminals are built, the agency said.

‘Ready to Haul’ Burlington Northern carries about 25 percent of the oil from the Bakken, said Krista York-Wooley, the railroad spokeswoman. The company can carry higher volumes from North Dakota or Alberta, she said. Canadian Pacific Railway Ltd. (CP)’s shipments from North Dakota climbed to more than 13,000 carloads last year from about 500 in 2009, Ed Greenberg, a spokesman, said in an e-mail. The Calgary- based company has a similar plan in western Canada. “With an extensive rail network and proven expertise in moving energy, CP offers a flexible option for transporting crude oil and other energy-related products to and from key locations in North America,” Vice President Tracy Robinson said in an e-mail. “Rail is scalable, allowing CP to effectively keep pace with the shipping needs of producers.” Oil Sands Canadian National Railway Co. (CNR), the biggest Canadian railroad based on annual sales, considers Alberta’s oil sands a chance to expand its business, according to company filings. “CN continues to work closely with customers in Alberta to capitalize on oil-and-gas related opportunities,” the Montreal- based company said. “CN sees potential for the outbound movement of oil sands products such as bitumen and synthetic crude to refineries in the U.S. Gulf Coast region, or eventually through West Coast ports to offshore markets.” Imperial Oil Ltd. (IMO), a Calgary-based unit of Exxon Mobil Corp. (XOM), will consider “various transportation options” for oil sands exports, according Pius Rohlheiser, a spokesman. Cenovus Energy Inc. (CVE) uses railroads to bring in dilutants needed to mix with heavy crude before it can be shipped by pipeline, and to export oil from the Bakken formation in Canada, according to Jessica Wilkinson, a spokeswoman.

Environmentalists’ Opposition Environmental groups such as the Natural Resources Defense Council have campaigned to stop Keystone XL because leaks could threaten drinking water supplies and processing Alberta crude produces more greenhouse gas emissions than conventional oil. Railroads too present environmental issues. Moving crude on trains produces more global warming gases than a pipeline, the State Department said. Union Pacific Corp. (UNP), based in Omaha, Nebraska, anticipated an increase in rail traffic with or without Keystone, Chief Executive Officer Jim Young said in an interview. “We would have been involved with moving the pipe and a lot of the construction business in building it,” Young said. “On the other hand, if you don’t build any pipeline capacity, you’re going to be moving a lot of crude by train.” It will take five to eight years before oil sands production outstrips existing export capacity, the State Department said. Tank car utilization is at “record levels” fueled by demand from oil and natural gas producers, according to Doug Reece, director of marketing for Oakville, Ontario-based Procor Ltd., a rail-car leasing company. The soonest new cars will be available is 2013, he said. “In western Canada, shippers and third parties are investing in the necessary infrastructure and we see strong growth ahead,” Reece said in an e-mail. “We are having regular dialog with customers about their potential needs, as collaboration and fleet planning have become critical.” Rail allows shippers to reach different markets and capture better prices at refineries, said John Mims, a transportation analyst at Friedman Billings Ramsey & Co. in Arlington, Virginia. “It’s a good secular growth story for the railroads,” Mims said in an interview.“They’re playing an increasing role, especially as you see this push back from a regulatory standpoint on the pipelines.”

### Env

#### Rail transport solves production without harming agriculture or water supplies.

Efstathiou 12

Jim Efstathiou Jr. – “Buffett’s Burlington Northern Among Pipeline Winners” Bloomberg News Jan 23, 2012 5:04 PM CT (http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-01-23/buffett-s-burlington-northern-among-winners-in-obama-rejection-of-pipeline.html

With modest expansion, railroads can handle all new oil produced in western Canada through 2030, according to an analysis of the Keystone proposal by the U.S. State Department. “Whatever people bring to us, we’re ready to haul,” Krista York-Wooley, a spokeswoman for Burlington Northern, a unit of Buffett’s Omaha, Nebraska-based Berkshire Hathaway Inc. (BRK/A), said in an interview. If Keystone XL “doesn’t happen, we’re here to haul.”The State Department denied TransCanada a permit on Jan. 18, saying there was not enough time to study the proposal by Feb. 21, a deadline Congress imposed on President Barack Obama. Calgary-based TransCanada has said it intends to re-apply with a route that avoids an environmentally sensitive region of Nebraska, something the Obama administration encouraged. The rail option, though costlier, would lessen the environmental impact, such as a loss of wetlands and agricultural productivity, compared to the pipeline, according to the State Department analysis. Greenhouse gas emissions, however, would be worse. If completed, Keystone XL would deliver 700,000 barrels a day of crude from Alberta’s oil sands to refineries along the Gulf of Mexico, crossing 1,661 miles (2,673-kilometers) over Montana, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma and Texas. Investors such as John Stephenson, who helps manage $2.7 billion for First Asset Management Inc. in Toronto said he anticipated the project would move forward next year. Pipeline shipping costs remain lower than rail, and a lack of readily available tanker cars may create a bottleneck. The availability of tank cars may create a temporary “hiccup” in transport capacity, according to Tony Hatch, an independent railroad analyst in New York. Rail cars are “a pretty hot commodity,” as a result of demand from oil producers in North Dakota, he said. Rail car production is already at a three-year high as manufacturers such as Greenbrier Cos Inc. (GBX) and American Railcar Industries Inc. (ARII) expand to meet demand for sand used in oil and gas exploration, according to Steve Barger, an analyst at Keybanc Capital Markets Inc. in Cleveland, citing Railway Supply Institute statistics. ‘Long-Term Solution’ Rail-car suppliers can add capacity, Hatch said. “Railroads are not just a stopgap while we wait for a pipeline,” Hatch said in an interview. “They are potentially part of the long-term solution.” Railroads are being used in North Dakota (STOND1), where oil producers have spurred a fivefold increase in output by using intensive drilling practices in the Bakken, a geologic formation that stretches from southern Alberta to the northern U.S. Great Plains. During 2011, rail capacity in the region tripled to almost 300,000 barrels a day as higher production exceeded what pipelines handle, according to the State Department report on Keystone XL.

#### Pipeline Bitumen makes spills more likely

**Fehling 12**

Dave Fehling lectures on journalism at the University of Houston. “Will Canadian Crude Make the Keystone XL Pipeline Leak? He now NPR” April 18, 2012 (http://stateimpact.npr.org/oklahoma/2012/04/18/will-canadian-crude-make-the-keystone-xl-pipeline-leak/)

The United States loves crude from Canada. No other single foreign country is now providing more imported oil to the U.S. But with the proposed Keystone XL pipeline has come the claim that the crude from north of the border is uniquely risky. Last June in Washington, the House Energy and Power Subcommittee questioned a federal regulator about whether pipelines in the United States were built to handle the kind of crude coming from Canada, diluted bitumen. “Were your regulations developed with the properties of diluted bitumen in mind?”, asked Rep. Henry Waxman, a Democrat from California. “I don’t believe it was a part of the equation, no,” responded Cynthia Quarterman, head of the U.S. Department of Transportation’s Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration. After hearing from critics of the pipeline, Waxman said he was concerned “that the industry is changing but the safety regulations are not keeping up with the changes.That could be a recipe for disaster down the road.” When it comes to interstate pipelines, the federal government has the lead on setting and enforcing safety regulations. The Texas Railroad Commission’s Oil and Gas Division would have jurisdiction only if a pipeline ruptured and created a threat to the Texas environment. Diluted bitumen, nicknamed dilbit, comes from oil contained in massive deposits of sand. Steam is used to extract the oil from the sand and the resulting crude is partially processed before it’s piped to refineries. Critics say dilbit is more corrosive than conventional crude and can “lead to weakening of pipelines”. “Bitumen blends are more acidic, thick and sulfuric than conventional crude oil” and “contain significantly higher quantities of abrasive quartz sand particles” said a report by a coalition of critics including the Sierra Club and the Natural Resources Defense Council. Denise Hamsher of Enbridge Energy When asked to respond, one of the first things people in the Canadian pipeline industry point out is that while the Keystone XL Pipeline project has become a lightning rod for criticism, the dilbit crude it would carry has already been flowing into the United States for years “This isn’t new. Enbridge has been transporting these types of products since 1999 in our pipelines,” Denise Hamsher told StateImpact Texas Hamsher is head of planning for Enbridge’s $12 billion in new pipeline projects. Enbridge is a competitor of TransCanada, the company behind the Keystone XL project. “There have been no incidents of pipelines carrying Canadian crude (that resulted) from internal corrosion despite more than two decades of transporting crude oil,” said Hamsher. That’s not to say there have been any spills. In July 2010, one of Enbridge’s 30-inch pipelines ruptured in southern Michigan, spewing hundreds of thousands of gallons of Canadian crude into a creek that flowed to the Kalamazoo River. While an official cause won’t come from government investigators until this summer, Enbridge said internal corrosion had nothing to do with it. “All you’d have to do is look at the picture of the pipe,” said Hamsher. “There’s no reason or evidence that the leak was at all related to internal corrosion.” There have also been leaks involving TransCanada’s existing Keystone Pipeline (the Keystone XL is an expansion project). Since it began operating in 2010, the Keystone line—from Alberta to Illinois and Oklahoma—has had 14 “spills” according to the U.S. State Department’s report on the potential environmental impact of the XL project. TransCanada This map shows the original route of the Keystone XL pipeline. Construction on the southern portion, from Oklahoma to Texas, has already started. None of the 14 leaks were because of corrosion of the actual pipeline. Instead, the State Department report said they all involved “fittings and seals at pump or valve stations”. The report said all but three of the spills were of less than 100 gallons. The biggest was in North Dakota where 21,000 gallons of crude escaped from a faulty fitting. Most of the oil stayed on the pump station site according to the report. The State Department projected that the proposed Keystone XL pipeline would have about one spill a year of over 2,100 gallons. TransCanada spokesperson Jim Prescott said the State Department’s environmental impact statement confirms what the company has contended. “Don’t take our word for it. Look at the final environmental impact statement which was the result of 41 months of study of this project and reach the conclusion that this oil is no different than the oil that is already in the pipeline infrastructure of the United States,” Prescott told StateImpact Texas. So corrosion is no problem for such pipelines? To the contrary, it’s one of the leading causes of pipeline failure according to Oliver Moghissi. He’s the past president of NACE International, an association of corrosion engineers. “Corrosion tends to be number two. Number one is usually outside force damage, usually by an excavator,” Moghissi told StateImpact Texas. Keystone XL Moghissi works for DNV, a risk management company that did a forensic examination of the blowout preventer from the Deepwater Horizon disaster. But while Moghissi said corrosion is a serious threat to crude oil pipelines, he contends there’s nothing in Canadian crude that makes it any more risky than conventional crude to the long-term reliability of a pipeline. “I don’t agree that it presents a unique kind of corrosion threat,” said Moghissi. Yet, the issue is hardly resolved in the eyes of at least some in Congress. Under the Pipeline Safety, Regulatory Certainty and Jobs Creation Act of 2011, Congress mandated a study to determine if there’s “any increased risk” of transporting diluted bitumen crude. Last month, a contract was awarded to the National Academy of Sciences which is expected to release the findings of its investigation to Congress by July 2013.

#### Railroads env good

Sivy 12

Michael Sivy“The Unlikely Green Alternative to the Keystone Pipeline? Railroads” BusinessTimes Jan 24, 2012 http://business.time.com/2012/01/24/railroads-the-unlikely-green-alternative-to-the-keystone-pipeline/#ixzz20KcXHwFA

But railroads offer more than just an alternative to a pipeline unpopular with environmentalists. They are in fact one of Americas most energy-efficient modes of transport – and as such a legitimate “green” industry, whether environmentalists acknowledge that fact or not. Here are two key reasons for the rails’ green appeal: Productivity is high and rising. The industry was largely deregulated in 1980 and had an incentive to reinvest, especially in technology. As railroads merged and rail networks grew more complex, it became increasingly important to route the trains – and even individual cars – in the most efficient ways. Sophisticated software now calculates the best way to put different cars together into trains. And onboard electronics assess topography, track curvature, train length and weight to calculate the optimum speed for conserving fuel. Energy efficiency is steadily growing. Railroads are far more energy-efficient than their competitors. Locomotives today get 80% more mileage from a gallon of diesel than they did in 1980. As a result, trains are two-to-five times more efficient than trucks per ton of freight. That not only saves on costs, it reduces emissions of greenhouse gases. In fact, the Environmental Protection Agency calculates that moving freight by train rather than truck over long distances reduces greenhouse gas emissions by up to 75%. Three railroads stand out as the leaders in the group and all three stocks have done at least as well as the broad market over the past three months. In order of their recent performance, they are: Union Pacific, the largest U.S. railroad, Norfolk Southern, and CSX. All three stocks trade at 12-to-13 times projected earnings for 2012 and offer yields slightly above the 1.9% paid by the S&P 500. The trouble with all debates like the one over the pipeline is that no solution is totally safe. If you don’t rely on oil, then you’ll end up instead using fracking to get natural gas and risking water pollution, or building nuclear plants. And that means that decisions end up being based on politics, not rational policy. Whether you think the XL Pipeline would have been good or bad for the environment, one thing is sure: The decision to kill it is good for the railroads.

#### Rail spills more localized

Gotthardt 7-12

Karl GotthardtEnbridge pipelines: Michigan oil spill aftermath in view of NTSB findings” Jul 12, 2012 at 3:58 AM PDT (http://www.allvoices.com/contributed-news/12574628-enbridge-pipelines-michigan-oil-spill-aftermath-in-view-of-ntsb-findings)

Debbie Hersman likened the incident to a Pacific Gas & Electric pipeline explosion in California in 2010 that injured 58 people and killed another eight. During an interview on CBCs Power and Politics she said that the spill put the whole North American pipeline system under a magnifying glass. While the NTSB only responds while an incident happened, it is he regulators who should provide to oversight to ensure regulations are followed. Needless to say the EPA also has some work to do.She said while this spill is one of the biggest disasters in history, pipelines are still the most economical method of transporting oil. She mentioned that there are more localized spills when oil is transported by rail.

#### Even if spills more likely with rail – accidents = less magnitude

Van Kooten 12

G Cornelis van Kooten Professor of Economics and Canada Research Chair in Environmental Studies and Climate in the Department of Economics, University of Victoria, Canada. I am responsible for the Resource Economics and Policy Analysis (REPA) Research Group that consists of graduate students and affiliated researchers who are interested in applying economic analysis to issues in agriculture, forestry, energy and natural resources more broadly. “Pipelines and Canada’s Oil Sands” Posted on May 3, 2012 http://www.vkooten.net/?p=348

The federal government recognizes that, as oil production increases, there is a real need to resolve the environmental issues and come up with solutions to facilitate the movement of oil. In the absence of an agreement, the clear alternative is the ‘pipeline on rail,’ which would send oil to the west coast ports of Prince Rupert and Vancouver at Roberts Bank. This would mitigate some of the tanker traffic issues because it would make the routes somewhat shorter and perhaps somewhat less risky. However, it would increase the likelihood of oil spills, although they would be limited to at most 65,000 barrels (assuming a 100-car train) at any given time. To confine a break in an oil pipeline to less than that amount would, in a worst case scenario, require shutting off the pumps within 2 to 2½ hours. Of course, shipping oil by rail is more costly, thereby dissipating rents.

## \*\*\*Politics

## Election

### Key

#### Keystone’s a political issue

Wertz 12

Joe Wertz ‘What the Glut? Why Cushing is Bursting and Hurting Oklahoma’s Economy’ NPR April 17, 2012 | 6:10 AM //stateimpact.npr.org/oklahoma/2012/04/17/what-the-glut-why-cushing-is-bursting-and-hurting-oklahomas-economy/

Pipeline reliability comes with a price. It means monetary investment and political exposure. And the bigger a pipeline project gets the more political it becomes. TransCanada’s Keystone XL pipeline — which would have transported crude from the oil-sands of Alberta through Cushing on its way to the Gulf Coast — became a policy football when President Barack Obama rejected the company’s proposal in January.

#### Keystone is biggest election issue

**Burwell**12

DavidBurwell – director of the Energy and Climate Program at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Keystone XL pipeline, a post child for political posturing, CNN May 3 2012 <http://www.cnn.com/2012/05/30/opinion/burwell-keystone-pipeline/index.html>)

The Keystone XL pipeline has turned into a poster child for political posturing. While it is merely one of many pipelines crisscrossing North America, this project has become "red meat" that both sides of the congressional aisle are using to weaken each other in an election season. To make matters more complicated, Canadian public and private-sector officials have jumped into the fray by coming to town to extol the virtues of the pipeline.

### Environment

#### Keystone kills key Environmental Support

**Schnur**12

Dan SchnurUniversity of Southern California, “The President, Gas Prices and the Pipeline” NYT.April 9, 2012 http://campaignstops.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/04/09/the-president-gas-prices-and-the-keystone-pipeline/

Where the issue becomes more tangible and therefore trickier for Obama is when the multiple choices become binary. The debate over the proposed XL Keystone Pipeline that would transport Canadian oil through the nation’s heartland to the Gulf of Mexico crystallizes the choices involved and forces a shades-of-gray conversation into starker hues of black and white. Obama recognizes that the devoted environmentalists who represent a critical portion of the Democratic party base need some motivation to turn out for him in the fall. But he also understands that centrist voters who support him on a range of other domestic and foreign policy matters could be lured away by a Republican opponent who either promises relief at the gas pump or who can lay blame at the White House doorstep for those higher prices. Even more complicated is the role of organized labor, which has poured immense amounts of support into Obama’s re-election but also prioritizes the job-creation potential of the pipeline.

## Politics

### Controversial

#### Keystone is a partisan issue --- causes massive fights

Clayton 12

Mark Clayton “How much would Keystone pipeline help US consumers” MSNBC March 9 2012. http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/46689167/ns/us\_news-christian\_science\_monitor/t/how-much-would-keystone-pipeline-help-us-consumers/#.T-pMTbVYt2A)

Often lost in the political wrangling over the controversial Keystone XL pipeline – on hold after President Obama rejected TransCanada’s initial construction proposal – are some key findings that run counter to the rosy picture of abundant supply and lower prices so often painted by US politicians. Canadian companies backing the Keystone XL – touted as enhancing US energy security with a big new surge of imported Canadian oil – actually expect it to supply more lucrative Gulf Coast export markets as well as raise Midwest oil prices by reducing “oversupply” in that region. These little-publicized findings are contained in the studies and testimony of experts working for TransCanada, the company that wants to build the pipeline from Alberta’s tar sands across America’s heartland to Gulf Coast refineries. Some of these concerns popped up, albeit briefly, in US congressional testimony last year on the pipeline project, and have given rise to a recent proposal to bar the sale of Keystone oil overseas. In the latest round of Capitol Hill fighting over the pipeline, Senate Democrats on Thursday defeated a Republican amendment to the transportation bill that would have fast-tracked the project by stripping the State Department of its approval authority and giving it to Congress. In February, legislation to force US approval of the pipeline passed the House 237-187. That bill would strip the president of authority to block the project and give the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission 30 days to approve the pipeline. But most of the heated partisan rhetoric over job creation and gasoline prices glosses over what Keystone would or wouldn’t do for the US.

#### Keystone is toxic

**Barber**12

Nigel Barber “Keystone Pipeline: Gift Horse or Threat to America” Huffington Post Jan 18, 2012<http://www.huffingtonpost.com/nigel-barber/keystone-pipeline_b_1214122.html>)

The Keystone pipeline pits jobs for Americans versus environmentalism and is politically toxic to the Obama administration, which is why Obama wanted to kick the can down the road whereas Republicans want to force an early Presidential decision on the project that can be used as a stick to beat him with during the election. Now Obama seems poised to reject the pipeline based on objection to the route, leaving the door open to a new application.

### Draws in Obama

#### Obama forced to lobby

German and Ryan 12

Ben Geman and Josiah Ryan “Senate rejects Keystone in 56-42 vote” March 8, 2012 http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/215051-senate-blocks-keystone-pipeline-approval-plan)

The Senate has rejected a GOP plan to approve construction of the Keystone XL oil pipeline after President Obama made personal calls to Democrats urging them to oppose it. The 56-42 vote staves off an election-year rebuke of Obama, but will give political ammunition to backers of TransCanada Corp.’s plan to build a pipeline connecting Alberta’s massive tar sands projects to Gulf Coast refineries. Despite Obama's efforts, 11 Democrats brushed off Obama on the vote and sided with Republicans.

## Flip-flop

#### Flip-Flop destroys public and political support

**Cohen 97**

Jeffrey Cohen Fordham University, Presidential Responsiveness and Public Policy Making, p. 123 1997

A president cannot, without good reason, alter his policy stance. And even if he has good reason to change his policy position on an issue, he may have to bear some costs from doing so. The public and other political elites may view him as waffling, indecisive, weak, uncommitted, and/or duplicitous. This seems very much to be one of the major charges against Bill Clinton’s presidency. After abandoning his campaign promise of a middle-class tax cut because of budget deficit pressures, Clinton reoffered a tax cut in the wake of the devastating 1994 midterm elections, in which his party lost control of Congress. From being publicly cool toward the North American Free Trade pact during his presidential election campaign, he became an ardent promoter of that policy once in the Oval Office. From these, and many other occasions, Clinton has developed an image of a waffling politician, one who is forever changing his mind, perennially trying to stake out the most popular position with the public and not necessarily a president who is able to lead.

#### Flip-Flop bad

Fitts 96

Michael A. Fitts, Prof at University of Pennsylvania Law School, University of Pennsylvania Law Review, 144 U. Pa. L. Rev. 827 Jan 1996

Centralized and visible power, however, becomes a double-edged sword, once one explores the different ways in which unitariness and visibility can undermine an institution's informal influence, especially its ability to mediate conflict and appear competent. In this context, the visibility and centralization of the presidency can have mixed effects. As a single visible actor in an increasingly complex world, the unitary president can be prone to an overassessment of responsibility and error. He also may be exposed to a normative standard of personal assessment that may conflict with his institutional duties. At the same time, the modern president often does not have at his disposal those bureaucratic institutions that can help mediate or deflect many conflicts. Unlike members of Congress or the agencies, he often must be clear about the tradeoffs he makes. Furthermore, a president who will be held personally accountable for government policy cannot pursue or hold inconsistent positions and values over a long period of time without suffering political repercussions. In short, the centralization and individualization of the presidency can be a source of its power, as its chief proponents and critics accurately have suggested, as well as its political illegitimacy and ultimate weakness.

## Topicality

## Infrastructure

### 1NC – Transportation Infra

#### A. Interpretation – Transportation infrastructure is defined as roadways, railways, harbors, pipelines, railroads and highways – pipelines are excluded

United States Chamber of Commerce 10

U.S. Chamber of Commerce “Transportation Performance Index – Summary Report” 9/23/10 <http://www.uschamber.com/sites/default/files/lra/files/LRA_TPI%20_Summary_Report%20Final%20092110.pdf>

It is important to establish a definition of transportation infrastructure in order to establish the¶ scope of the index.General Definition: Moving people and goods by air, water, road, and rail.¶ Technical Definition: The fixed facilities―roadway segments, railway tracks, public¶ transportation terminals, harbors, and airports―flow entities―people, vehicles, container units,¶railroad cars―and control systems that permit people and goods to traverse geographical space¶ in a timely, efficient manner for an intended purpose. Transportation modes include highway,¶public transportation, aviation, freight rail, marine, and intermodal.Note that pipeline infrastructure is not included in this definition. For purposes of the InfrastructurePerformance Index it is considered an element of energy infrastructure.

#### Violation – Aff builds pipeline

#### Standards

#### 1. Limits – limits are important to establish scope of literature – that’s the Chambers of Commerce evidence

a) Multiple different pipelines routes, multiple forms of energy – natural gas, smart grid, etc–all kill predictability – means no research and clash.

2) BrightLine – Our definition is inclusive and exclusive – best for precision

**3) Common person and Contextual – we define both the general and technical meaning of the word – we access predictability best**

**Voter for education and fairness**

### Not Germane

Keystone not germane – obfuscates real transpo issues

Burwell12

David Burwelldirector of the Energy and Climate Program at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. CNN WireMay 30, 2012 Keystone XL pipeline's collateral damage http://www.cnn.com/2012/05/30/opinion/burwell-keystone-pipeline/index.html

All the pressures aside, the United States needs to pause and think carefully about its national interest. Our future energy balance and supply chain should not be short-stopped by attaching Keystone XL as a nongermane rider to a transportation bill for temporary political gain. Politicians come and go; nations generally do not.

### Distinct

#### Infrastructure distinct

MSCI Barra 8

MSCI Barra - is a leading provider of investment decision support tools to investment institutions worldwide. MSCI Barra products include indices and portfolio analytics for use in managing equity, fixed income and multi-asset class portfolios (“MSCI Infrastructure Indices Methodology” April 2008 p.2

2.1. Infrastructure Sectors1 and Corresponding GICS® Sub-industriesThe infrastructure indices are dividedinto five infrastructure sectors namely 1)Telecommunication Infrastructure, 2) Utilities, 3) Energy Infrastructure, 4) Transportation Infrastructure and 5) SocialInfrastructure.