# Military Readiness CP

#### Plan Text: The United States Federal Government should substantially increase its investment in military technology with fuel cells.

# Solvency

Fuel Cells key to military hard power

Reiman 9

[Adam Reiman, BS, MBA Major, USAF, June 2009, <http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a505106.pdf>, accessed on 7/14/12, Kfo]

Perhaps the one advantage of hydrogen that could enable a transformation of the military is distributed generation. Hydrogen can be made anywhere there is access to fresh water and electricity. JP-8 can have an extremely long logistics chain to get the fuel to the war-fighter. If the fuel could be created near its point of final use, then the logistics chain could be extremely reduced. This would also reduce the need to protect the resource in transit. Portable electrolyzers are currently in existence, but portable hydrogen liquefaction is not. Distributed generation of liquid hydrogen would require serious advances in liquefaction technology. If achieved, distributed generation could alter military concepts of energy logistics.

### On-site generation capabilities solves readiness

Sklar 12

[Scott Sklar, President of the Stella Group, May 28,2012,

<http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2012/05/powering-our-military-whats-th.php#2214408>, accessed on 7/16/12, Kfo]

The US military's job is to protect the United States from its military bases and on the front lines "in theater of war". Energy is one of the critical determinants of how well DOD can fulfill it’s job. Just in 2012, we have had three military bases lose power due to unexpected electric grid outages. On the front lines, we lose a large portion of our soldiers and contractors, ferrying fuel to the front lines for electricity and transportation. Soldiers carry around from 20 – 60 pounds of batteries in the modern fighting force. Diesel engines make noise, leave a heat signature, and when they malfunction. Drop fuel. The integration of renewable energy and on-site distributed generation has spanned over four Administrations and supported by both political parties, with the first such conferences in the early 1990’s, and now embraced by all three services and the last three Secretaries of Defense. The concept is quite simple, just like portfolio theory in stock investing. The military needs to have the maximum options to reduce costs which including transporting and ferrying fuels, reducing het and noise signatures, insuring maximum operating times with the least amount of operations and maintenance, and most importantly, lightening the soldier’s equipment weight and increasing their agility. All new technologies and weapons systems cost more in the beginning and as they scale lower in cost – from the giant one room mainframe computers to the handheld microprocessors as stark examples. We can no longer afford outages at military bases due to squirrels and downed power lines, not our special forces troops being found by the noise and vibration of their diesel generators or have our mile long fuel convoys be sitting ducks for our enemies with the ensuing loss of life. Attempts by either party to make renewable energy a political football undercuts our Defense capabilities. The programs underway are sorting out and improving deployable systems for our Defense and Homeland Security and Emergency Preparedness Missions. Let the defense and security professionals do their jobs.

CP solves heg

Perry 06

(William J. “The US Military: Under Strain and at Risk”, January, <http://globalsecurity.org/military/library/report/2006/us-military_nsag-report_01252006.htm>)

**In the meantime, the United States has only limited ground force capability ready to respond to other contingencies. The absence of a credible strategic reserve in our ground forces increases the risk that potential adversaries will be tempted to challenge the United States. Since the end of World War II, a core element of U.S. strategy has been maintaining a military capable of deterring and, if necessary, defeating aggression in more than one theater at a time. As a global power with global interests, the United States must be able to deal with challenges to its interests in multiple regions of the world simultaneously. Today, however, the United States has only limited ground force capability ready to respond outside the Afghan and Iraqi theaters of operations. If the Army were ordered to send significant forces to another crisis today, its only option would be to deploy units at readiness levels far below what operational plans would require – increasing the risk to the men and women being sent into harm’s way and to the success of the mission. As stated rather blandly in one DoD presentation, the Army “continues to accept risk” in its ability to respond to crises on the Korean Peninsula and elsewhere. Although the United States can still deploy air, naval, and other more specialized assets to deter or respond to aggression, the visible overextension of our ground forces has the potential to significantly weaken our ability to deter and respond to some contingencies.**

## CP Popular

### Likely voters love the plan- studies and voter polls indicate

Romm 12 Government Investment in Renewable Energy Nearly as Popular With Swing Voters as Death of Osama bin Laden By Joe Romm on Jan 25, 2012 at 12:30 pm <http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2012/01/25/411355/government-investment-in-renewable-energy-popular-with-swing-voters-death-of-osama-bin-laden/?mobile=nc> /KG

Voters just love government investment in renewable energy — much more than their representatives in Washington, it seems. I was reading an analysis of the State of the Union Address based on the response of “a group of 50 swing voters armed with dial meters” and came across this nugget: Not surprisingly, the moment in the speech that brought the most positive reaction was Obama’s mention of the death of Osama bin Laden. It drew an average reading of 80 on the 0-100 scale used by the meters. Obama’s call for more investment in renewable energy drew nearly as strong a reaction, however, said Andrew Baumann, another of the pollsters who conducted the study. The passages of the speech that talked about phasing out subsidies for oil companies and competing with China and Germany for new developments in wind power and solar energy did particularly well. And while small dial groups are hardly definitive by themselves, Climate Progress readers know that poll after poll after poll show the same thing (see Democrats Taking “Green” Positions on Climate Change “Won Much More Often” Than Those Remaining Silent and links to polls therein). This enthusiasm has not waned even with all the attacks on clean energy — see Independents Support Federal Investment in “Green Jobs” 2-to-1 Despite Solyndra Media Storm: In dozens of focus groups we have conducted this month across the country on a wide variety of subjects, when voters are asked where they would like new jobs in their state to come from, the first words out of their mouths are almost always the same – clean energy and related technology. Voters believe that the clean energy economy is here and is growing, and they want their state to have a part of it. And yet in the face of this overwhelming popularity of clean energy, we’re staring at job-killing cuts in federal clean energy investment and tax credits. Why? As a German State Minister explained: We Can Decarbonize With Renewables Because “We Don’t Have the … Koch Brothers.” Again, the Kochs haven’t won over the majority of Americans or even the majority of swing voters — only the majority of that narrow slice of the electorate that drives conservative politics, the Tea Party (see “Independents, Other Republicans Split With Tea-Party Extremists on Global Warming“). Some day, some masterful, Churchillian politician will figure this all out and lead the country toward true clean energy revolution. Some day

### Florida voters love the plan- perceive economic benefits

Business Wire 12 July 09, 2012 01:23 PM Eastern Daylight Time Florida Legislature Out of Step with Voters on Key Renewable Energy Policieshttp://www.businesswire.com/news/home/20120709006406/en/Florida-Legislature-Step-Voters-Key-Renewable-Energy /KG

ORLANDO, Fla.--(BUSINESS WIRE)--A noticeable disparity between public interest in renewable energy development and Florida’s current legislative policy was evident from a recent poll of registered voters conducted for the Florida Renewable Energy Association (FREA). Strong support was shown for policies that have become common place in a broad portion of the country yet have largely been ignored by Florida lawmakers. “Clearly, the legislature is not on the same page with Florida voters or the rest of the country.” Of those surveyed, 69 percent support legislation requiring utilities to produce a greater percentage of electricity from renewable sources. This policy known as a renewable portfolio standard (RPS) has been adopted by 37 states. In January of 2009, a draft rule developed by the Florida Public Service Commission was submitted to the state legislature but was never enacted and eventually abandoned. “We conducted this survey because it’s important that our elected officials understand where the public interest is on this critical issue,” said Robert Stonerock, FREA president. “Clearly, the legislature is not on the same page with Florida voters or the rest of the country.” Despite difficult economic times, 57 percent were willing to pay at least 50 cents more per month on their electric bill to help fund renewable energy development. This would generate more than $50 million annually to fund incentives to manufacture and install renewable energy systems. This type of public benefit fund is used in 19 other states but has been rejected by Florida state legislators. The issue receiving the strongest voter support (80 percent) was allowing private renewable energy companies to sell electricity directly to consumers and businesses. Two bills, SB1106, and HB 779, designed to achieve this were presented in the 2012 legislative session but died in committees. 67 percent rated the Florida Legislature as doing either a fair, poor, or very poor job in encouraging the development of renewable energy. “The people of Florida understand how developing renewables can help to create jobs, control future energy costs, and maintain a clean environment,” said Stonerock. “It’s an issue beyond ideology. It’s a basic responsibility that, up to now, our legislature has ignored.”

#### Latino voters love the plan- that’s enough to swing the election in Florida, Nevada, and Colorado

Fahey 12 Latinos: A Moral Obligation to Cut Climate Pollution A look at American Latino voters' attitudes on climate, energy, and the environment. Anna Fahey on March 9, 2012 at 10:09 amhttp://daily.sightline.org/2012/03/09/us-latinos-a-moral-obligation-to-cut-climate-pollution/ /KG

Several recent surveys reveal Latino voters to be some of the most stalwart supporters of environmental protections, including robust climate solutions. Most recently, a 2012 Colorado College “State of the Rockies Conservation in the West” poll found that “across multiple issues, Latino voters express stronger pro-conservation views than their Anglo counterparts.” The survey was conducted in Arizona, Colorado, Montana, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming in January. The Colorado College survey also found: Of the 336 Latino voters polled, 87 percent said they believe it is possible to protect land and water and have a strong economy with good jobs at the same time, compared to 78 percent of the general public. More than 8 in 10 view air pollution as a serious problem and see the Clean Air Act and other environmental laws as “important protections rather than burdensome regulations.” Eight in 10 Latino voters also say they want to “reduce consumption of coal, oil, and gas by expanding use of renewable energy.” (Compared to two-thirds of the general public). Western Latino voters see renewable energy as a job creator—78 percent told pollsters that “increasing the use of renewable energy will create jobs in their state.” 81 percent of Hispanics support the EPA’s actions to curb pollution from coal-fired power plants and from other fossil fuels. This compares to 70 percent among Western voters overall who support the EPA’s actions. Pollster Dave Metz said the survey dispels the notion that ethnic communities, particularly hard hit in the economic downturn, are “more willing than others to let the environment take a back seat to [the] economy.” These findings jibe with research conducted in 2010. A series of polls commissioned by the National Latino Coalition on Climate Change in three “swing states”—Florida, Nevada, and Colorado—found that the vast majority of Latino voters not only supported climate and energy policies and agree strongly that we can both reduce global warming pollution and expand jobs and economic prosperity at the same time. They also say it is our moral obligation to find solutions for global warming (89 percent in Florida, 86 percent in Nevada, and 80 percent in Colorado). And in overwhelming numbers, Latino voters in these states say they’d be willing to make sacrifices and changes to do so (91%, 91%, 83%). More highlights: Big majorities support policies that would establish a renewable requirement (94%, 93%, 87%), higher energy efficiency standards (96%, 89%, 87%), and cap carbon pollution (89%, 88%, 78%). Majorities understand climate change is the result of man-made pollution—around 70 percent in each state. Compare that to the national average who “believe” climate change is human-caused: 50 percent. Despite the dire economy, at least 85 percent of Latino voters in each state say they would be willing to pay higher energy prices in order to increase the amount of our energy needs met by renewable energy sources. (Between 6 and 15% said they were unwilling to pay anything. And, it’s not always easy to compare across survey instruments especially when questions are phrased slightly differently, but in another study—by the Brookings Institution in 2011—fully 41% of the general American population said they weren’t willing to pay and 21% of Canadians were unwilling to pay.) More than three-in-five in each state say that efforts to reduce global warming pollution by switching to clean energy will create new American jobs, rather than cost us jobs or not do anything in terms of jobs in this country (66%, 72%, 64%). The national average measured by Yale/George Mason in November 2011 is 54 percent. Strong majorities also agree that solving global warming problems now will cost less money than if we wait until later (71%, 91%, 85%). These findings also reinforce an ongoing study by Yale and George Mason Universities (with data collected in 2008 and updated for an in-depth report in early 2010). In 2008, 66 percent of US Latinos considered climate change a “high” or “very high” priority for the president and Congress to address, compared to just 48 percent of non-Latino whites. (In 2008 Latinos showed the highest intensity of support for EPA regulation of carbon dioxide as a pollutant and were far more likely to support a cap and trade system than the national average—70% total support among Hispanics vs. 53% national average.) There’s lots of conjecture as to why Latino voters express such strong support for environmental protections and, in many cases, express greater support than the general US population for climate and energy policies. It should be noted that Latino voters lean Democratic. According to the Pew Hispanic Center, exit polling in 2010 indicated around “60% of Latino voters supported Democratic candidates in House races while 38% supported Republican candidates.” Here’s a breakdown by party for the Colorado College surveys: Colorado College Conservation in the West Poll But there may be reasons for pro-environmental views beyond party affiliation. Maite Arce, executive director of the Hispanic Access Foundation, said in a recent teleconference on Latinos and climate change (and reported by Fox News Latino) that Latino voters’ strong pro-conservationist beliefs are in line with their cultural values: “For Latinos, family is really critical, health is really critical,” she said. “There’s just a strong connection in our heritage to the outdoors, wildlife, land, air. I think the experience of grandfathers and grandmothers [back] in home countries…are definitely still ingrained in who we are. [It’s] the connection to the land.” Javier Sierra, a Sierra Club columnist who writes at Huffington Post, describes this connection as “amor por el terruño, or loosely translated, our love of country, an often spiritual connection with the land that sees us grow, that nurtures us, that gives us life.” And “connection to the land” is often both spiritual and literal. Roberto Lovato, co-founder of the Latino advocacy organization Presente.org, points out that US Latinos live in rural areas in bigger numbers than non-Latino whites. “The poor, immigrant and agricultural workforce is more close to the land,” he said. Another reason may be strong ties outside the US. As Adrianna Quintero of the Natural Resources Defense Council said to teleconference listeners, “Latinos are less likely to question climate change because they have more contact with countries in Latin America that lie closer to the equator, where the repercussions are more evident.” As she put it: “They live it. These impacts are very real and they’re costing lives and they’re costing jobs.” “Costing lives” may sound like an exaggeration, but according to a 2011 study by the National Latino Coalition on Climate Change, Natural Resources Defense Council, the Center for American Progress and the National Wildlife Federation, half the Hispanics in the United States live in counties that frequently violate air pollution standards and are therefore exposed to a greater risk of breathing polluted or harmful air. Exposure to air pollution “can aggravate preexisting health problems—especially respiratory problems like asthma.” This is serious for Latinos. The study showed that in 2008, about 4.7 million Hispanics had been diagnosed by a physician with asthma, and Latinos have three times the chance of dying from that illness as other racial or ethnic groups do. For whatever reasons, or maybe all these reasons, and despite the same old partisan divisions among Latinos that haunt climate attitudes across the entire voting population, these opinions aren’t to be scoffed at when it comes to the ballot box. As pollster Dave Metz points out, Latinos are a growing and politically-significant constituency in the upcoming elections, and, he says, “the Latino population as a whole is overwhelmingly younger. [And for] registered voters, it is a younger population. It’s indicative of where the region is headed. This is a rising segment of the electorate.” In California, pro-conservation, pro-energy reform, and anti-pollution attitudes among Latino voters appear to represent a mighty force. For example, as Kathleen Rogers reported at Huffington Post, in November 2006, massive Latino turnout in California voted 84 percent in favor of the largest water/park bond in US history. “The stellar Latino turnout carried the measure to victory,” she says, “even though it lost the white vote.” (That was Proposition 84.) And, exit polling in 2010 indicated that areas with high percentages of Latinos voted overwhelmingly against Proposition 23, which would have shackled air pollution control laws to unemployment rates, essentially killing California’s showcase climate policy. Even though the fight about Prop 23 was not framed as a battle in the war on climate change per se, it did focus on health concerns about pollution, the tyranny of Big Oil, and the emerging clean energy economy in California. “In East Los Angeles, where Latinos comprise 97 percent of the population,” Rogers writes, “Prop. 23 was defeated by a margin of more than 3 to 1.”

## CP Unpopular

### CP Unpopular with **Congress**

#### **Military hydrogen is massively unpopular- failed to pass committee and coalition opposition**

Kayyem 12 The Pentagon is stopped from going green June 07, 2012|Juliette Kayyem http://articles.boston.com/2012-06-07/opinion/32083273\_1\_fuels-alternatives-pentagon/2 /KG

When a bunch of Birkenstock-wearing environmentalists clamor for cleaner energy alternatives — biofuels, solar, or wind — it’s not entirely a surprise when Senate Republicans scoff in response. But it is odd that when military leaders make the same recommendation, those same legislators don’t even budge. Much worse, they have now prohibited Big Green from going green. When Defense Secretary Leon Panetta testifies before Congress next week, he will be waging an uphill battle to preserve the Pentagon’s energy-efficient programs. Despite the fact that the Pentagon is the single biggest consumer of fossil fuels in the entire world, the Senate Armed Services Committee recently voted to prohibit the military from spending money “for the production or sole purchase of an alternative fuel.” The Senate committee, on a near-party line vote with Democrats Joe Manchin of West Virginia and Jim Webb of Virginia voting with the Republicans, banned the Pentagon from buying alternative fuels or building any facilities to manufacture them “if the cost exceeds the cost of traditional fossil fuels used for the same purpose.” Massachusetts Senator Scott Brown is for the prohibition; New Hampshire’s Jeanne Shaheen is against it. Maine’s Susan Collins did not vote, claiming that she had to take an important call, but has promised to be with the Pentagon on any floor debate. Fossil fuels are obviously cheaper than any alternatives to date; that is why, of course, we use them. But alternatives are getting competitive; in recent years, biofuels have gone from $400 a gallon to $26. And price should be only one barometer for a 21st century military. The military’s dependence on oil means not only that we will fight wars to protect our access to it, but that we will suffer in wars because of our insatiable appetite for it. Fuel convoys are particularly subject to attack by hostile forces, and half of the Marines killed in Afghanistan and Iraq were supporting fuel transportation. Oil and water are the two commodities we import the most to the battlefield; the long line of a supply chain is a welcome mat for every IED and enemy. The biggest cost driver in the Pentagon’s shrinking budget is oil; fuel increases in 2011 and 2012 cost the government an extra $3 billion. In addition, many of the military instruments that use fossil fuels are just plain noisy. And the constant hum of machinery is a battlefield liability. As one senior Pentagon official told me about threats in Afghanistan: “It’s amazing what you can hear when the generators are off.” The Pentagon’s recent move toward energy efficiency is simply sound military planning. Steps include more reliance on biofuels so that a competitive market can be established and geographically dispersed plants can be built; portable solar batteries to reduce the weight on a Marine’s back; and green fleets for our dirty oceans. The Seals are even clamoring for more equipment that is light and clean — leaving no footprint. The motivation for the Senate committee vote may be monetary savings, but the numbers, though substantial, show that clean energy is hardly the only big-ticket item on the Pentagon ledger. The entire green initiative requires a $170 million annual investment, a fraction of the average cost of a Navy ship. The most likely explanation, other than pleasing the oil lobby, is that those who voted for the prohibition have a very narrow view of the military’s traditional role in innovation. Representative Randy Forbes of Virginia snarked to Navy Secretary Ray Mabus, a key champion of new energy sources for the Pentagon: “You’re not the secretary of energy.” But he kind of is. What the committee vote ignores is the extent to which the military has played a crucial role as an early adopter of breakthrough technology. And as a big customer, its efficiency efforts would create the kind of market needed to make “going green” bring in the green. If only it could.

#### **Mass opposition to military hydrogen- Republicans, unions, and coal-state democrats**

Ashbrook 12 Congress Takes Aim At Green Pentagon Programs -Tom Ashbrook Tuesday, June 12, 2012 at 10:00 AM <http://onpoint.wbur.org/2012/06/12/green-pentagon> KG

The Pentagon is the world’s largest consumer of fossil fuel – and it wants to go green. But congress is pushing to torpedo the whole idea. Stay on oil. We’ll look at the military and big oil. The U.S. military is the country’s number one energy consumer. All those warships, planes, Humvees and bases drink a lot of oil. The Pentagon has made a loud, high priority of wanting to get to alternative fuels, green fuels, as an issue of national security. Safer supplies. Less volatile prices. And a candid admission that fossil fuels, long-term, are themselves a security threat. Now, Congress is moving to throw the brakes on the Pentagon’s go-green campaign. Republicans, Texas oil-country reps, coal-state Democrats saying no.

### Plan Unpopular with Public

#### **CP unpopular- public perception overlooks actual safety**

Nicholas 04 Hydrogen Station Siting and Refueling Analysis Using Geographic Information Systems: A Case Study of Sacramento County 12-01-2004 Nicholas, Michael A, University of California – Davis <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/6rd7f7cb> /KG

Hydrogen is perhaps best known for causing the Hindenburg disaster. The airship, Hindenburg, was filled with hydrogen and it exploded over Lakehurst New York on May 6, 1937.32 Hydrogen was blamed for the accident, but years later, the true cause of the accident was discovered. The metallic paint on the skin of the airship was extremely flammable, and this skin caught fire before the hydrogen. The spectacle of the Hindenburg disaster influenced public perception about hydrogen thereafter, even though the hydrogen was not the main contributor to the explosion at Lakehurst The public may also incorrectly associate hydrogen with the hydrogen bomb.33 The hydrogen bomb is the most powerful weapon in the world, but the power of the hydrogen bomb is attributable to a fusion reaction, not a chemical reaction, such as happens in normal conditions. Many people know only that hydrogen is related to a weapon, and don’t know why. Both the Hindenburg and the hydrogen bomb could potentially give hydrogen a bad public image. Hydrogen’s reputation may cause public resistance to hydrogen stations being sited next to homes and businesses. Public resistance such as this has been dubbed NIMBYism or Not In My Back Yard-ism. NIMBYism usually refers to opposition to a large project that local residents do not want such as: interstate highways, dams, prisons, nuclear power plants, or casinos. However, NIMBY attitudes can also apply to smaller scale projects such as a hydrogen station. NIMBYism often arises when zoning ordinances fail to prevent the siting of objectionable projects near residential areas. The concept of zoning emerged nearly a century ago as a way of preventing the siting of potentially noxious land uses near residential areas. The credit for the first comprehensive zoning law in the United States goes to New York City for its 1916 ordinance that grouped the entire city into one zone or another.35 Although the zoning was supported by many groups, it was most strongly supported by those who wanted to preserve the value of their land by keeping out undesirable land uses such as industry or apartments.36 This point is articulated in a quote from 1920: “So long as undesirable properties could encroach upon an area in which good residences and good income bearing properties were already established, there would be no stability or trust in real estate as an investment”.37 The official rationale, that developed a bit later, differed a little bit from the reasoning in New York. The officials justified widespread zoning with the following objectives: 1) To segregate inconsistent land uses comply with the land use zoning category for the site in question.40 The variance procedure usually mandates that the neighbors in the immediate vicinity be informed of the land use change. These meetings are often the breeding ground for opposition to the land use, and objections in these meetings must be heard. One of the universal factors that influence NIMBYism is geographical proximity.41 Simply stated, those who live closer to the planned development are more concerned about it. Those living or working 2-6 blocks away are more or less indifferent for small scale projects such as a gasoline station. Paradoxically, consumers prefer that their refueling stations are close to their residences. Resolving this inconsistency will enable more efficient siting of stations. 2) To prevent congestion 3) To provide for the economical provision of public services.38 However, real estate values (and itinerant economic and class segregation) seem to have been the main driver in developing zoning law. As of now, the siting of hydrogen facilities is governed by the National Fire Protection Association 50A standard.39 This standard is designed to regulate large scale hydrogen transfer stations, and is not well suited to reflect the realities of urban or suburban siting. The cautiousness of this standard is indicative of the way hydrogen is viewed by the public and officials. Even though this standard is overly restrictive and is likely to change, opposition groups may use this standard as evidence that hydrogen is indeed not safe for consumers. Until hydrogen codes stabilize, zoning variances will likely have to be granted to allow hydrogen station siting. A variance is needed when a development does not

#### Backlash will happen- empirics

Nicholas 04 Hydrogen Station Siting and Refueling Analysis Using Geographic Information Systems: A Case Study of Sacramento County 12-01-2004 Nicholas, Michael A, University of California – Davis <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/6rd7f7cb> /KG

Since hydrogen stations do not exist in any great number, there are no case studies of NIMBYism regarding hydrogen station siting. However, a study in New Zealand by Tom Fookes examines NIMBYism as it relates to regular gasoline stations. The station chosen for the study went through a neighborhood review process just as many projects do in the United States. Hydrogen stations, if publicly funded, would go through a 16 formal review process under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and, in California, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). As part of the process in New Zealand, local residents were given the chance to voice objections and concerns to the potential siting of a gasoline station situated near a neighborhood. The research was conducted five years after the construction of a gasoline station and compared the original objections to the views of the same people after five years of operation. His conclusions were as follows: 1) Some adverse effects were present, but turned out to be minor. 2) Some positive amenity such as increased lighting and security resulted from the developments. 3) The range of issues raised was similar to those raised in NIMBYism on a regional scale. 4) The closer the resident to the development, the more likely he/she is to voice concern. 5) “Factory style activity”52 was seen as a detriment to residential character. 6) Reactions were “knee-jerk” and attributable to fear of the unknown. 7) Efforts to address people’s concerns in the beginning were subsequently seen as positive by the residents. Perhaps the most important points we can glean from his conclusions are that the community can act hastily, but that working with the community to address their concerns is seen as positive.