### 2AC Exports DA

#### US prices competitive in any situation – makes exports inevitable

**Renauer, 10/2** investor, contributor (Cory Renauer, Seeking Alpha, 2 October 2012, “Driving Natural Gas Prices, Part 1: Exports,” http://seekingalpha.com/article/900261-driving-natural-gas-prices-part-1-exports)//CC

[](http://static.cdn-seekingalpha.com/uploads/2012/10/635089_13491539432544_3.png)

The decision to export is an easy one for the natural gas industry, implementing it however is more difficult than you might think. The United States is set up to be a net importer of natural gas and currently has only one modern export terminal run by Cheniere Energy. Unlike oil, natural gas doesn't like to stay put. Before being pumped onto special tankers, it must be cooled to its condensation point to change from a gas to a liquid. Natural gas condensation requires the type of cooling well beyond temperatures your household freezer can reach. The gas needs to be cooled to about −162 °C (−260 °F) to become a liquid at atmospheric pressure. Just a glance at the map of world estimated LNG prices and it's hard to imagine why there aren't more export terminals being constructed around the clock. Unfortunately for natural gas producers in the US, there are[regulatory](http://www.fossil.energy.gov/programs/gasregulation/authorizations/Questions.html) [hurdles](http://www.fossil.energy.gov/programs/gasregulation/authorizations/Questions.html) in place that limit exports of natural gas, especially to non free trade agreement (Non-FTA) countries. Currently, Cheniere Energy is running what the Department of Energy calls a pilot study to test the effect that exporting natural gas has on domestic prices. That sounds like a load of nonsense. Exporting natural gas to China might make perfect sense to an educated investor, but to general voters it could be twisted to sound like treason. My guess is that the DOE will bow to [pressure](http://fuelfix.com/blog/2012/09/25/lawmakers-tell-feds-to-speed-up-lng-export-decision/) [from](http://fuelfix.com/blog/2012/09/25/lawmakers-tell-feds-to-speed-up-lng-export-decision/) [state](http://fuelfix.com/blog/2012/09/25/lawmakers-tell-feds-to-speed-up-lng-export-decision/) [lawmakers](http://fuelfix.com/blog/2012/09/25/lawmakers-tell-feds-to-speed-up-lng-export-decision/) to allow producers like Exxon Mobil ([XOM](http://seekingalpha.com/symbol/xom)) and Chesapeake Energy export their gas to areas with wildly higher demand soon after the November elections. I'm confident that Cheniere will get their [chance](http://seekingalpha.com/article/890391-cheniere-s-chance-to-profit-from-cheap-natural-gas) [to](http://seekingalpha.com/article/890391-cheniere-s-chance-to-profit-from-cheap-natural-gas) [profit](http://seekingalpha.com/article/890391-cheniere-s-chance-to-profit-from-cheap-natural-gas) from exporting cheap US gas. Cheniere is currently building a second export terminal near [Corpus](http://www.caller.com/news/2012/sep/11/cheniere-energy-moves-forward-with-engineering/) [Christi](http://www.caller.com/news/2012/sep/11/cheniere-energy-moves-forward-with-engineering/)and the export permit applications are piling up on Steven Chu's desk. Hopefully they will allow exports to rise slowly enough that production can meet rising demand, but quickly enough to take advantage of the currently wide pricing gap before foreign shale deposits are developed.

#### No exports even with approval – consensus

**Levi, ’12** David M. Rubenstein Senior Fellow for Energy and the Environment at the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) and Director of the CFR program on energy security and climate change (Michael Levi, The Hamilton Project, June 2012, “A Strategy for US Natural Gas Exports,” <http://www.hamiltonproject.org/files/downloads_and_links/06_exports_levi.pdf)//CC>

It is far from clear that all or even most of this export volume would be used even if it were approved. A recent MIT study looked at nine scenarios for U.S. and world natural gas markets; none of them led to the emergence of significant U.S. natural gas exports, in large part because other lower cost producers undercut prices offered by the United States in distant markets (MIT 2011). Other forces, discussed in Chapter 2, could also lead global natural gas prices to converge even without U.S. exports, removing opportunities for economically attractive U.S. LNG sales. Indeed, most analysts anticipate that less LNG will be exported than currently pending permits would allow, even if all of those were approved. (They also expect to see more permit applications, since the plans behind many of the pending ones are expected to eventually fizzle.) For example, Citigroup analysts foresee up to 5 billion cubic feet a day of LNG exports by the end of the decade, barring regulatory barriers (Morse et al. 2012). UK gas producer BG has projected up to six billion cubic feet a day by then (Gismatullin 2012), the same volume that Deloitte (2011) analysts have focused their modeling on. Given this consistent view among market analysts on the maximum likely volume of LNG exports from the United States, the main analysis in this paper focuses on the possibility of up to six billion cubic feet of daily exports. This is approximately half the capacity currently awaiting approval and almost ten percent of current U.S. natural gas production. I consider the possibility of significantly greater or lesser exports in Chapter 6; the qualitative conclusions do not change, though the specific costs and benefits of allowing LNG exports do. To provide some context, Figure 2 shows natural gas consumption and LNG trade by region.

#### USFG blocks sales

**Reuters, 7/27** (Reuters, 27 July 2012, “Insight: As Congress looks away, U.S. tiptoes toward exporting a gas bounty,” http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/06/27/us-usa-lng-exports-idUSBRE85Q05820120627)//CC

If the gap between global and domestic prices remains wide, as many analysts expect, more export projects are certain to be brought forward and the government may draw a line in the sand. A ban on energy exports is not without precedent. The Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 and the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act require a presidential waiver for the sale of most unrefined crude oil abroad, essentially blocking exports. Even with a boom in domestic oil output, the United States is in little danger of becoming an oil exporter. But gas is far less fraught with geopolitical significance. "Oil has been a political issue. Natural gas has never been that," said David Wochner, an attorney for the Sutherland law firm that represents natural gas producers.

### 2AC Obama Good Elections

#### Obama will win but it will be close

**Blumenthal, 10/1/12** - senior polling editor of the Huffington Post and the founding editor of Pollster.com (Mark, New 2012 Polls Show Little Change In State Of Race, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/10/01/2012-polls-obama-romney_n_1928472.html?utm_hp_ref=elections-2012>)

WASHINGTON -- With attention turning to the first of three upcoming national debates, new polls show President Barack Obama continuing to hold a narrow lead over Republican nominee Mitt Romney, both nationwide and in the key battleground states that are likely to decide the election.

Two new national surveys released on Monday morning both show a slightly closer race than most other recent polls, although those new results are consistent with previous surveys from the same organizations, indicating that Obama's September lead is holding.

The new Washington Post/ABC News survey finds Obama leading by just 2 percentage points nationwide (49 percent to 47 percent) among the voters deemed most likely to vote. But that result was no different than their previous survey, taken just after the Democratic convention three weeks ago, which showed Obama with a 1-point edge (49 percent to 48 percent).

However, among all registered voters nationwide, the new Post/ABC poll shows Obama leading by 5 percentage points (49 percent to 44 percent), again the same margin as their survey found three weeks ago. The Post also reports that Obama's lead over Romney is larger (52 percent to 41 percent) among a subset of likely voters in swing states.

Similarly, a new Politico/George Washington University Battleground poll also finds Obama leading by 2 percentage points among likely voters (49 percent to 47 percent), a finding essentially unchanged from the 3-point Obama margin (50 percent to 47 percent) found in their previous survey.

The four results have been collectively more favorable to Romney than those produced by other recent national polls, and more importantly, they have shown no statistically meaningful trend in September. The HuffPost Pollster tracking model, which draws on all national and state-level polling and corrects for consistent "house effect" differences among pollsters, continues to give Obama a slightly larger, 4 percentage point lead over Romney.

Similarly, a handful of new statewide surveys released over the weekend shows results consistent with a 3- to 4-point Obama lead nationwide.

In Iowa, a new Des Moines Register Iowa poll found Obama leading by 4 percentage points (49 percent to 45 percent), exactly the same margin as the Pollster tracking model.

In Ohio, an automated recorded-voice survey by the Democratic-affiliated firm Public Policy Polling gives Obama a 4 percentage point advantage, while a new Columbus Dispatch mail-in survey gives Obama a 9-point lead. Not surprisingly, Obama's lead on the Pollster tracking model falls somewhere in between.

Finally, another new PPP poll from North Carolina shows a dead-even race, with each candidate at 48 percent -- again, consistent with a similarly close margin on HuffPost's tracking model. North Carolina has been the closest of the 50 states over the last three weeks.

Thus, the combination of national and statewide polling continues to show Obama leading Romney by statistically meaningful margins in all of the battleground states except North Carolina. Were he to carry all of the states where he is currently leading, Obama would win 332 electoral votes -- far more than the 270 needed to win. Romney currently leads in states accounting for 191 electoral votes.

Can Wednesday night's nationally televised debates between Obama and Romney, the first of three to be held between now and late October, be a "game changer" for Romney? Not likely, according to George Washington University political scientist John Sides.

"When it comes to shifting enough votes to decide the outcome of the election," Sides writes in the Washington Monthly, "presidential debates have rarely, if ever, mattered."

Sides cites research by political scientists Robert Erikson and Christopher Wlezien, who studied polling from every election from 1952 to 2008 and found that while debates sometimes nudge results, they rarely produce substantial changes in voter preferences. Erikson and Wlezien found that since 1960, the leader in the polling before the debates remained the leader after the debates.

The most significant before-and-after debate shift was toward Gerald Ford in his 1976 race against Jimmy Carter. However, as Erikson and Wlezien note, "Carter's support was in steady decline" during the final month of the race.

It is worth remembering that while Obama enjoys a statistically meaningful lead in national polling, his margin remains relatively modest compared to past elections. So while a "nudge" toward Romney on the order of what debates produced in 1980, 2000 or 2004 might not be enough to move Romney ahead, it could make for a much closer race.

#### Romney is done, it’s not reversible

**Rothkopf, 10/1/**12 - CEO and Editor-at-Large of Foreign Policy (David, Foreign Policy, The Election Is Over,

<http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/10/01/election_effectively_over_it_s_time_to_start_worrying_about_2013>)

It's the first of October, and here's your October surprise: October is already over. So is the first week of November. The campaign is over. The voters have decided. The only remaining step is watching as the clock strikes midnight after Election Day is done and Mitt Romney disappears from the American political scene like Cinderella's coach.

Poof. What was that fellow's name again?

This is a surprise because the United States remains a deeply divided country politically. Opposition to the president remains strong, and his record remains spotty at best. It is a surprise because the past few weeks have seen bad news on the economic front and the unraveling of the story that Barack Obama is a foreign-policy master.

The race should be closer. By some reasoning, Romney should even be ahead. Heck, if Romney had gone on vacation to Lake Winnipesaukee for the past three weeks, he might be. But every time events have turned against the president -- from weak job numbers to bad manufacturing results, from the debacle in Libya to the rapid deterioration in Iraq, Afghanistan, Syria, and U.S.-Israel relations -- Romney has come to Obama's rescue with a boneheaded statement or some distracting gaffe of his own.

So now the swing-state polls suggest it is highly unlikely that the Republican candidate can orchestrate a victory. Behind by 9 percentage points in the latest Columbus Dispatch poll in the state he must win, Ohio, and trailing in eight of the nine Florida polls tracked by RealClearPolitics, Mitt has no clear path to 270 electoral votes. The media will spin this election up and down between now and Nov. 6 to try to create the illusion of drama, but stick a fork in it: The Romney goose is cooked.

Although this might be a letdown for political junkies, it is a relief for normal people who can tune out the incessant, mind-numbing, serially prevaricating television spots for the candidates and get on with their lives. Better to look ahead instead and start doing the planning for 2013 that the Obama White House, senior-level sources tell me, is not really doing right now. They're caught up in the election, and as a result they are letting a lot of big issues slide.

#### Their evidence is written by clowns who let ideology stand in for evidence

**Martin, 10/1**/12 - senior political reporter at POLITICO, where he covers national politics (Jonathan, Politico, “The parallel universe where Mitt Romney leads all polls”

<http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0912/81845.html?hp=t1>)

To talk with any working Republican political operative these days is to hear the same tale of woe: a grim accounting of the past few weeks, a dash of gallows humor and a measure of hope that President Obama is still beatable. Never in question is that Mitt Romney is trailing — the private surveys these strategists see for their down-ballot clients make that clear. The only question is by how much.

But hanging up the phone or clicking out of e-mail is to find a parallel universe on the right. On TV, talk radio and especially the Internet is a place where the swing-state polls that show Romney losing are not just inaccurate but part of an intentional plot by the heretofore unknown media-pollster axis to depress Republican voters. In this other world, Romney not only isn’t losing — he’s on the verge of a convincing victory.

“I believe if the election were held today, Romney would win by 4 or 5 points,” trumpeted Dick Morris on Fox News last week, predicting a win for the GOP ticket in Florida, Ohio, Virginia, Nevada and Pennsylvania. In public polls right now, Romney is losing in each of those states. But, Morris said, that’s because the data are all wrong.

“People need to understand that the polling this year is the worst it has ever been,” said the onetime Clinton svengali turned conservative pundit.

Conservative talk radio king Rush Limbaugh senses something more nefarious in the media and university polls.

“They are designed to do exactly what I have warned you to be vigilant about and that is to depress you and suppress your vote,” Limbaugh told his listeners last week, after bringing up swing-state surveys from The Washington Post and CBS News and Quinnipiac University. “These two polls today are designed to convince everybody this election is over.”

There has always been a divide between the Republican consultant class and conservative media figures. Operatives must dwell in the real world because their jobs depend on winning and losing. The likes of Morris and Limbaugh have different incentives. They want to build their email lists and listening audiences and there’s no faster way to conservative hearts than to kick the dreaded mainstream media. And when it’s well after Labor Day of a presidential year and the Republican nominee isn’t faring well, reassuring the home team that there’s just a scoreboard malfunction offers a seeming dose of logic to the situation.

But the Internet has let the alternate campaign reality flower this fall in a way that’s both striking and depressing to political professionals and pollsters. One website, unskewedpolls.com, even readjusts the public polling to include more Republicans in samples. The results: Romney leads in nearly every national poll released in September. Of course arbitrarily reweighting polls is wildly unscientific, but that hasn’t stopped Republicans like Limbaugh and even Texas Gov. Rick Perry from mentioning the site.

“Always nice to get unfiltered, or in this case ‘unskewed,’ information,” Perry tweeted last week with a link to the page.

Andrew Kohut, President of the Pew Research Center and before that the head of Gallup, said it’s a matter of simple denial.

“We’ve moved from a place where it looked like the race was close, and there’s now an unwillingness to accept reality,” said Kohut. “So if you don’t like the message you shoot the messenger.”

The attempt to debunk polls is in many ways the logical, if absurd, outgrowth of a choose-your-own-adventure political news environment where partisans have outlets that will echo their views.

“It’s ‘you-are-right’ news,” sighed longtime Republican strategist Mike Murphy, adding that if it was Democrats losing liberals would be baying about “Rupert [Murdoch] doing mind control on the numbers.”

But it’s one thing to advocate for a preferred party and portray the other in the worst possible light. Questioning the integrity of professional pollsters is something different: It’s preposterous.

Consider: For the vast polling conspiracy of 2012 to be legitimate would be to presume that longtime GOP pollster Bill McInturff is on the deal. McInturff co-runs the respected Wall Street Journal/NBC News poll with veteran Democratic pollster Peter Hart.

McInturff is also business partners with Neil Newhouse, Romney’s own pollster. So, by this standard, Romney’s own campaign could also be part of the conspiracy to … hurt the Romney campaign.

Of course, there’s no such motivation on the part of any pollster hired by mainstream news organizations to gauge public opinion.

“The Prime Directive of pollster survival is to make sure you ‘get it right’ — whether that be good or bad — for your party,” McInturff explained in an e-mail.

#### No plan solvency

#### 1: Neither president can or will make a move quickly – no Congressional support

Michael Schmidt 8-22-2012; Energy Group Lead, GolinHarris Different emphasis, about same result http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2012/08/sizing-up-romney-and-obama-ene.php

[Regardless of who wins the White House, what should the next president prioritize in these areas?]

Different emphasis and tone, but without a crisis and with Congress deadlocked, it will be more or less the same result for consumers whether it’s Obama or Romney. Don’t expect a dramatic shift or a major improvement in certainty for industry. The impact of their policies won’t be felt for years if not decades.

#### A: No impact – Romney will copy Obama on foreign policy

Aaron David Miller, 5-23-2012; distinguished scholar at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars; Barack O'Romney http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/05/23/barack\_oromney

And that brings up an extraordinary fact. What has emerged in the second decade after 9/11 is a remarkable consensus among Democrats and Republicans on a core approach to the nation's foreign policy. It's certainly not a perfect alignment. But rarely since the end of the Cold War has there been this level of consensus. Indeed, while Americans may be divided, polarized and dysfunctional about issues closer to home, we are really quite united in how we see the world and what we should do about it. Ever wondered why foreign policy hasn't figured all that prominently in the 2012 election campaign? Sure, the country is focused on the economy and domestic priorities. And yes, Obama has so far avoided the kind of foreign-policy disasters that would give the Republicans easy free shots. But there's more to it than that: Romney has had a hard time identifying Obama's foreign-policy vulnerabilities because there's just not that much difference between the two. A post 9/11 consensus is emerging that has bridged the ideological divide of the Bush 43 years. And it's going to be pretty durable. Paradoxically, both George W. Bush's successes and failures helped to create this new consensus. His tough and largely successful approach to counterterrorism -- specifically, keeping the homeland safe and keeping al Qaeda and its affiliates at bay through use of special forces, drone attacks, aggressive use of intelligence, and more effective cooperation among agencies now forms a virtually unassailable bipartisan consensus. As shown through his stepped-up drone campaign, Barack Obama has become George W. Bush on steroids. And Bush 43's failed policies -- a discretionary war in Iraq and a mismanaged one in Afghanistan -- have had an equally profound effect. These adventures created a counter-reaction against ill-advised military campaigns that is now bipartisan theology as well. To be sure, there are some differences between Romney and Obama. But with the exception of Republicans taking a softer line on Israel and a tougher one on Russia -- both stances that are unlikely to matter much in terms of actual policy implementation -- there's a much greater convergence

#### 2: Link Turn - Fracking worries the public and hurts Obama’s environmental issues – He can’t do enough to quell the fears

States News Service 12 (States News Service – Quoting a release from Stanford University, “STANFORD GEOPHYSICIST: MORE ENVIRONMENTAL RULES NEEDED FOR SHALE GAS”, February 6 2012, Lexis) AC

The following information was released by Stanford University:¶ BY MARK GOLDEN. In his State of the Union address, President Barack Obama praised the potential of the country's tremendous supply of natural gas buried in shale. He echoed the recommendations for safe extraction made by an advisory panel that included Stanford geophysicist Mark Zoback. The panel made 20 recommendations for regulatory reform, some of which go well beyond what the president mentioned in his address.¶ The topic is controversial. Breaking up rock layers thousands of feet underground with hydraulic fracturing has unleashed so many minuscule bubbles of methane that shale gas now accounts for 30 percent of U.S. gas production, an increase in supply that has pummeled the commodity's price. The gas industry will support more than 600,000 jobs by the end of the decade, Obama said.¶ But environmental concerns about the technology behind the boom specifically hydraulic fracturing receive near daily news coverage, with opponents saying that toxic additives in the water used for the fracturing have found their way into household tap water, among other concerns.¶ Obama said natural gas producers will have to disclose the chemicals they add to the fracturing slurry of water and sand when they are working on federal lands. The Secretary of Energy's seven-person advisory group on shale gas, of which Zoback was a member, called for such disclosure by shale gas operators on all lands. The advisory group further recommended that data on a well-by-well basis be posted on publicly available, searchable websites.¶ "The problem is that the president only has jurisdiction over federal lands, while states regulate development on private land, where most of the shale formations are found," Zoback said. "The so-called 'Halliburton exclusion' passed by Congress says gas companies don't have to disclose the chemicals in fracturing

fracturing fluids. That was a real mistake because it makes the public needlessly paranoid."

### 2AC Reg Neg CP

#### Perm do CP – just a delay CP

#### Perm do both – announces consultation and offers to reinstate moratorium, solves offense

#### Process CPs illegit – steal 1AC and no offense to a consultation, forces debates about implementation, sucks up all research time which kills CBA

#### CP waters the aff down to the lowest common denominator – results in vague policy agreements that cause confusion and backlash

Cary Coglianese (Associate Professor of Public Policy, Harvard University, John F. Kennedy School of Government; Chair of the¶ Regulatory Policy Program, Center for Business and Government; and Affiliated Scholar, Harvard Law School) 2001 “Assessing The Advocacy Of Negotiated Rulemaking:¶ A Response To Philip Harter” <http://www.hks.harvard.edu/m-rcbg/research/c.coglianese_new.york_assessing.advocacy.pdf>

In addition to giving priority to tractable issues, negotiated rulemaking may encourage¶ imprecision or ambiguity.273 Since it is usually easier to achieve consensus at higher levels of¶ abstraction, the potential always exists that negotiators will adopt abstract or vague language.274 As¶ Neil Kerwin has observed, when an agency commits itself to obtaining consensus, that is, “to¶ producing a rule with which everyone with a recognized interest can agree, the only way to break¶ certain deadlocks is to produce a rule that ignores unresolved (or unresolvable) issues or deals with¶ them through vague language whose meaning will be disputed during the implementation¶ process.”275 Adopting vague language may Negotiated rulemaking’s emphasis on unanimity also makes it more likely that the final outcome will succumb to the lowest-common-denominator problem. The outcome that is minimally acceptable to all the members of a negotiated rulemaking committee will not necessarily be optimal or effective in terms of achieving social goals. A recent study of negotiated rulemaking conducted by Charles Caldart and Nicholas Ashford shows that in industries that are not likely to innovate in the absence of strong governmental regulation, the lowest-common-denominator problem keeps negotiated rules from promoting the technological innovation needed to improve environmental and safety performance.276 They conclude that because industry representatives in these types of industries will be reluctant to agree to regulations that would compel firms to make dramatic investments in new technologies, “negotiated rulemaking’s focus on consensus can effectively remove the potential to spur innovation.”277