

Energy Disadvantage

Negative Off-Case Argument & Affirmative Answers

Table of Contents:

Strategy/ Summary	2
What is an "Off-Case" argument?	2
What is a Disadvantage?	2
Background/ Summary of the Energy DA	3
1NC Shell	4
Uniqueness:	4
Link:	5
Impact:	6
2NC/ 1NR Extensions	8
Uniqueness Extensions	8
Link Extensions	8
Impact Extensions	10
Add On: Warming Impact	10
Affirmative Answers	12
Answer To (AT) Uniqueness:	12
AT Link:	13
AT Impact:	14
Warming	14

Strategy/ Summary

(Do NOT read in round- this is meant to give you background information that will help you debate this disad)

What is an “Off-Case” argument?

To understand what an off-case argument is, we first need to understand what an “on-case” argument is.

In every policy debate round, the Affirmative presents a “case.” A case consists of 1) Inherency (what is the problem?), 2) a Plan (how will they fix this problem?), 3) Solvency (Why will the plan work?), and 4) Advantages (reasons why the plan is a good idea).

On-case Negative Arguments are direct responses to the case.

For example:

1. Inherency- I am hungry
 - a. **Negative Answer to Inherency- You just ate lunch!**
2. Plan- let's go get Chipotle
3. Solvency- Chipotle is delicious and filling
 - a. **Negative Answer to Solvency- Chipotle is nasty and they skimp on portions**
4. Advantages- If I go get Chipotle, then I won't be cranky any more
 - a. **Negative Answer to Advantage: You're not even acting cranky, you're fine.**

But on-case responses are usually very **defensive**. They argue reasons the plan might not be necessary, but they don't always argue why the plan is a *bad idea*. We need **offensive** arguments to show the plan is a bad idea, or there are better ways to do the plan.

This is where Off-Case arguments come in. There are 4 main types of off-case arguments, but for now, we are only going to focus on one of them: Disadvantages (also known as disads or DAs).

What is a Disadvantage?

A Disadvantage is exactly what it sounds like- something bad that will happen if we do the plan. It is the opposite of an Advantage, and it takes the same structure as an Advantage.

- Uniqueness- Where are we right now? (Usually, on the edge of a problem)
- Link- How does the plan change the status quo? (Usually, it makes things worse)
- Impact- What bad things will happen if we do the plan?

Let's go back to our earlier example- the Affirmative's plan was to get Chipotle because they are hungry. Maybe it is true that Chipotle will solve the problem of their hunger, but it could cause other problems. For example:

- Uniqueness- I have no money. There is \$3 in my bank account right now.
- Link- If I buy Chipotle, my bank account will go into the negative.
- Impact- If I overdraw my account, I will be charged a fine.

Background/ Summary of the Energy DA

(Do NOT read in round- this is meant to give you background information that will help you debate this disad)

Right now, 60% of the US electric grid is powered by fossil fuels, and around 98% of cars on the road are powered by gas. That means the vast majority of Americans are still dependent on fossil fuels to survive. It is very expensive to make an individual transition over to renewable energy, and doing it on a societal level will take a long time.

In the meantime, having gas in your car or having electricity and heat in your home is a non-negotiable. For most Americans, this is a fixed cost. That means, when the price of energy goes up, it is the poorest Americans who suffer the most.

This Disadvantage argues that the cost of energy has become a huge burden for American families, and costs are only expected to go up. One way we can address the rising cost of energy is for America to produce more of its own energy (rather than having to buy it from other countries). BUT the plan prevents us from accessing cheap energy in the Arctic. In addition to keeping fuel prices high, this also eliminates thousands of jobs in the Arctic area. In the end, it is low income people who suffer the most.

Important to note: the disadvantage is not necessarily saying that we shouldn't try to switch to renewable energy eventually. It is also not arguing that climate change isn't a problem. It is simply saying that fossil fuels ARE a part of life right now. Americans will burn fossil fuels either way, so we might as well get those fossil fuels from within the US and bring prices down. (The benefits of the case do not outweigh the downsides- higher prices and lost jobs).

Disadvantage Structure:

- **Uniqueness-** Energy prices are going to rise, but Trump's policies could keep them down.
- **Link-** The plan will hurt our ability to get cheap energy and cause prices to go up.
- **Impact-** When energy prices go up, low income people suffer the most. People end up going hungry because they have to pay their utility bills before their grocery bills.

Affirmative Answer:

- **No Uniqueness-** Energy prices are already high, and they are going to go up no matter what. The plan doesn't change that fact. (Things like AI will be the real cause of rising electricity costs).
- **No Link-** Even if the US did drill for oil in the Arctic, it wouldn't make the price of gas go down (at least not for a very long time- these projects take forever).
- **No Impact-** Having high electricity prices can actually be a good thing- it will encourage people to transition over to green/ renewable energy sources.
- **Case Outweighs-** the benefits of the case outweigh any potential downsides. It is worth protecting the environment and the wildlife in the Arctic even if prices go up slightly because of it.

1NC Shell

Uniqueness:

Energy prices are set to rise, but Trump's energy policy will keep them from rising now
Aylmer 2025

Jack, 2/26, Straight Arrow News, Trump May hit 50% energy bill reduction goal just by keeping prices stable

<https://san.com/cc/trump-may-hit-50-energy-bill-reduction-goal-by-just-keeping-power-prices-stable/>

President Donald Trump said on the campaign trail that he would reduce U.S. energy bills by 50% within a year. According to one industry expert, this goal could be achieved by keeping power prices from rising. How can Trump cut energy bills in half? **Travis Fisher, the director of energy and environmental policy studies at the Cato Institute**, who has also served in leadership roles at the Department of Energy and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, **said that preventing previously anticipated increases in energy costs could be interpreted as achieving Trump's target.** **"Costs were probably set to double over the next few years,"** Fisher said. "So, you could make a plausible argument that just keeping them stable instead of doubling is cutting them by half of what they would have been." Why had U.S. energy costs been expected to double? **Fisher highlighted policies enacted under President Joe Biden, which he says had the potential to double American electricity prices.** He speculates the current administration could point to that trend of rising rates as a way of saying energy rates had been cut in half, should those costs stay around their current rate. "We were definitely moving in a more expensive direction under Biden," Fisher explained. "The Biden team was saying they wanted to close down every coal plant. They want to make it really hard to build new gas plants. That's like 60% of the power supply right now between coal and gas. So that, I think, would easily double the cost of generation." According to a report from J.D. Power, the average monthly residential electricity bill in the U.S. reached **\$182 last year**. That's the highest ever recorded by the data analytics company. Electricity rates **increased 23%** during Biden's presidency, a rise that the Institute for Energy Research has attributed in part to the administration's climate initiatives. What happens next? **Fisher suggested the reversal of Biden-era policies could impact energy costs.** However, he also noted that the federal government has **limited control** over electricity prices. "It would be really hard for a federal government to even make that promise, especially when it comes to your electricity bills," he said. "I would put that in the category of a nice-sounding campaign promise that's really, in practice, really tough to deliver on, especially on the electricity side." Significant reductions to energy rates, like the 50% cut Trump has pledged, remain challenging objectives due to the multitude of factors that impact power costs. However, **policy changes on energy regulations could still influence price trends.**

Link:

Preventing oil drilling in ANWR will hurt the economy and keep energy prices high, without making any progress against global warming.

Spencer 2023

Jack, Senior Research Fellow, Energy and Environmental Policy, Joe Biden's Knockout Punch for American Energy Independence,

<https://www.heritage.org/energy/commentary/joe-bidens-knockout-punch-american-energy-independence>

Just last month, President Joe Biden took a major swipe at America's [energy independence](#) when he declared nearly a million acres of uranium-rich land outside of Grand Canyon National Park [off limits to energy development](#).

Turns out that was just the setup jab.

The knockout punch is on its way. According to reports, [Biden wants to cancel drilling leases in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, or ANWR, which would deny Americans access to around a total of 11 billion barrels of oil](#) (though it could be much more). That is a lot of oil.

Canceling drilling when [Saudi Arabia continues to cut production](#) makes even less sense. That's because **this decision will continue to chill gas and oil development in the United States**, meaning that Americans will not only lose this oil but the oil production that is forgone because of the political environment [Biden has created](#). No company, after all, will risk the massive amounts of capital necessary to develop new energy resources when the government can swoop in and shut you down. Like with the uranium decision, this announcement will most assuredly be cast as necessary to protect the environment. This is diversion politics at its worst. The truth is that while ANWR is about the size of South Carolina, the actual land open for development would be [much, much less](#). According to one industry analysis, surface operations would [take up only around 2,000 acres](#). **More importantly, however, is that developing gas and oil is nothing new in the region. In fact, the American gas and oil industry has a strong record working along Alaska's coastal plain, having safely produced around 18 billion barrels of oil since production began at Prudhoe Bay in 1977.** Then there will be claims about how stopping this oil development is necessary to fight global warming. The truth is that even if one were to take the climate alarmist claims as fact, the amount of carbon dioxide saved by not using this oil would be almost zero. First, **just because Americans don't have access to this domestic source of oil doesn't mean that they will not still demand oil. It will just likely have to come from somewhere else and be more expensive. The CO2 is still going to be released.** Even if not producing the oil in ANWR somehow led to oil not being used in the aggregate, the amount of CO2 saved would be meaningless in global warming terms. **The Heritage Foundation's chief statistician**, Kevin Dayaratna, has investigated exactly this point using the same models government agencies use. **He found that eliminating all U.S. greenhouse gas emissions would reduce temperatures by less than 0.2 degrees Celsius** by the year 2100. In other words, this oil has literally no meaningful impact on world CO2 levels. That said, **taking these resources offline will have a meaningful economic impact**—a very harmful one—in Alaska and in the broader United States. First, gas and oil development is a critical sector for Alaska's economic health. The industry supports nearly 50,000 Alaskan jobs, accounted for [35% of the state's economy at \\$19.4 billion](#), and generally provides nearly 90% of the Alaskan government's general fund, putting over \$180 billion in the state's coffers since Alaska became a state in 1959. Opening ANWR would not only create more jobs and more revenue for Alaskans but also have a real impact on the rest of the country—**with some estimates suggesting up to 77,000 jobs created and \$40 billion in additional economic activity**, though estimates vary. But losing out on tens of thousands of jobs, billions in economic activity, and lower prices at the pump is not why this decision could be a knockout punch for American families and businesses. It is because of the chilling effect it would have on the American energy industry.

Impact:

Higher electricity prices hurt those in poverty, causing hunger, illness, and death.

Clemente, Reporter, 2015

Jude, Sept. 21st, Forbes, Higher Cost Energy Worsens the Shameful Rise in American Poverty, <https://www.forbes.com/sites/judeclemente/2015/09/21/higher-cost-energy-worsens-the-shameful-rise-in-american-poverty/?sh=18f536bc62c4>

Policies that admittedly increase the cost of energy in the name of "improving health" must always be challenged. That's because **wealth is the root of our health, and higher cost energy takes money away from us, disproportionately hurting those that can least afford it.** Simply put, there's nothing better that we can do to allow Americans to live healthier, better, and longer lives than increase their earning potential and disposable income. **Because energy is a necessity, affordable energy is fundamental to our progress and frees up money to be spent to grow our consumer-based economy.** Unfortunately, **Americans today face a growing anti-fossil fuel agenda designed to: 1) increase the cost of energy** to reduce usage and greenhouse gas emissions and 2) prop up the more costly and less reliable competing sources. Ultimately, however, this movement is based on reducing disposable income of families and increasing the cost of doing business in America. Thus, the Clean Power Plan and the New Methane Rule (which will be the most expensive regulation in history) cannot be as beneficial as proponents claim because such overregulation increases the cost of indispensable items like electricity, oil, and natural gas. This attack on fossil fuels is the real "wealth and health problem" because they constitute 85% of our energy, having nowhere near large-scale replacements, particularly not the higher cost, naturally intermittent sources of energy that the anti-fossil fuel movement promotes. And we already know what these policies bring: drastically higher energy costs. See Europe, California, Ontario, and Australia. We need "facts, not fear on U.S. air pollution," as our pollutant emissions continue to plummet, and Americans have never been healthier. The "Law of Diminishing Returns" indicates that incremental gains in air quality are becoming much smaller and costlier, and "these costs are ultimately paid by people in the form of higher prices, lower wages, and reduced choices." Meanwhile, our worst health problem, poverty, worsens. The BLS' Electricity Price Index continues to break record highs, and critically, we know that it's policy that's increasing power rates because fuel prices for electricity for both natural gas and coal (which are a combined 70% of U.S. electricity) have fallen and remain very low. Indeed, when you can't solve the very real domestic problems of today such as spiraling poverty, it's much easier to over focus on the more eccentric and distant ones whose solutions lie in the actions of other countries. In short, "tackling climate" is much easier than "tackling poverty" because progress, or the lack thereof, is much less defined. As related, "climate scientists" are typically tenured university professors where losing your job is virtually impossible (unless you do something REALLY stupid!), in stark contrast to the typical American who can easily get laid off when costs such as energy increase for companies. For many, climate altruism comes pretty damn cheap. Even worse, policies that increase the cost of energy are being promoted under the guise of helping our most vulnerable, when the exact opposite is true. That's because **our most vulnerable are the ones that can least afford higher costs for indispensable necessities like energy - minorities, the elderly, women (especially single mothers), and children.** They have far less ability to take care of themselves. As such, we should be doing all we can to decrease, not increase, energy prices. "Working minority families lag behind white ones in every state," and the Kaiser Family Foundation has the U.S. poverty rate at 24% for Hispanics, 27% for African Americans, and just 10% for Whites. The National Black Chamber of Commerce estimates that the Clean Power Plan will lead to 7 million job losses for African Americans and 12 million lost for Hispanics, with the poverty rate increasing by more than 23% and 26%, respectively. Another study by the Pacific Research Institute found that the rule would increase home energy bills for African Americans by \$410 a year. Over 70% of U.S. elderly live on fixed incomes and simply can't absorb higher energy costs. In fact, a monthly Social Security check gets devoured just paying for the utility bill each year. The 60 Plus Association reports that 72% of likely voters aged 55 and over put the effect of government regulations on their energy bills among top concerns. Indeed, the real "War on Women" is being waged by those that push policies that increase the price of energy. With 11 million single mothers and female-headed families much more likely to be poor, poverty is the ultimate "women's issue." The female-to-male earnings ratio is still less than 80%. Pew Research estimates that about 38% of African American children live below the poverty line, and are four times as likely as White or Asian children to grow up poor. For the first time since 1974, the number of poor African American children (4.2 million) outnumber White children (4.1 million), even though there are three times as many White children in America.

And there are 5.4 million poor Hispanic children, or equivalent to the entire population of Minnesota. **Researchers at the University of California, Berkeley document the obvious: how being poor erodes health and increases mortality rates, all exacerbated by already rising living expenses like utility bills.** Overall, [three million more children are in poverty since 2008. 22% of all kids](#) are now poor. Policies that increase energy prices have very real and [even deadly](#) consequences. A staggering 110 million Americans - 35% of the country - are eligible for the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP), but typically just 10-20% get that vital help. From 2009-2015, LIHEAP funding fell 33% to \$3.4 billion. Keeping cool in hot Summer and warm in cold Winter are necessities for health and safety, and higher energy costs make them much harder for tens of millions. As Joan McCarty of American Association of Retired Persons New York puts it: ["every extra dollar that goes to a utility bill is a dollar less for food and medicine."](#) Higher electricity and other fuel prices like gasoline or diesel are the proverbial "double whammy." Not only do they directly make Americans pay more to use those key products, but they also increase costs for businesses, which just get passed onto consumers in the form of higher priced items (Reagan once explained this on Carson, see [here](#)). Today, 1 in 5 U.S. families survive on food stamps (SNAP program), with over [46 million Americans on SNAP for over 35 months. Per Feeding America](#), "Hunger in America exists for over 50 million people...including more than 1 in 5 children." **For low-income families responses to rising energy bills, the National Energy Assistance Directors Association finds that: 24% went without food for at least one day, 37% went without medical or dental care, 34% did not fill a prescription or took less than the full dose, 19% had someone become sick because their home was too cold.**

2NC Extensions

Note- You do not have to read all of these cards- pick the ones you like best! Focus on extending and defending the arguments made by your partner in the 1NC and responding to any arguments made by the Affirmative.

Uniqueness Extensions

Electricity prices were projected to rise without ANWR drilling, demand is increasing from AI and digitalization

Loyola 2025

Mario, Senior Fellow, Law, Economics, Technology, Heritage Foundation,

1/28, We must move fast to avert a national electricity crisis,

<https://www.heritage.org/energy/commentary/we-must-move-fast-avert-national-electricity-crisis>

Years of misguided climate policy have pushed America to the brink of an electricity crisis.

Fossil fuel plants are retiring faster than renewable sources can replace them, at the same time as electricity demand is soaring from AI data centers and the push to electrify everything from vehicles to appliances. Congress and **the new administration will have to move fast to avert what could be years of soaring prices and dangerous blackouts.** The

scale of the looming capacity shortfall is staggering. Coal plants representing [more than 15 percent of America's electrical generation](#) are expected to close by 2032, just as demand is [expected to climb](#) by at least 15 percent. That's a potential shortfall of 30 percent of the 1,200 Gigawatts of generation capacity that could be needed by 2030, the equivalent of 400 average-sized nuclear plants. Nonsense, say environmentalists. Despite the retirement of 8.5 GW of coal capacity last year, the nation's grid grew by 8.4 GW because of the addition of 13.3 GW of solar and 4.3 GW of battery capacity. Shouldn't that solve the problem? Unfortunately, no. **The new renewable capacity is a mirage. Solar plants produce just 24 percent of their nominal capacity on average, much less during the winter, and often nothing at all, depending on the weather.** Utility-scale batteries can maintain their maximum output for no more than a few hours. **In contrast, most natural gas, coal and nuclear plants can operate above 90 percent capacity** and can be ramped up and down as needed. **Despite soaring demand, the grid is actually contracting in terms of projected energy availability. Grid operators are now warning that large swathes of the country will fall below minimum reserve margins starting in summer 2025.**

Link Extensions

Drilling in ANWR can lower prices – restrictions on oil production are key

Roberts 2022

Kevin, Heritage Foundation President, Mar. 8th, Unleash US Energy production to provide Americans relief, hold Russia accountable,

<https://www.heritage.org/press/heritage-president-unleash-us-energy-production-provide-americans-relief-hold-russia>

“The American people are suffering from gas prices never seen before. The skyrocketing price of oil is causing historic pain not just at the pump, but also for Americans trying to heat their homes and for businesses shipping goods around **the** country. President Biden blames everyone else—oil companies, Vladimir Putin, and others—but his administration’s anti-energy policies are the primary culprit. **“Biden’s clampdown on domestic U.S. energy production,** which began well before the war in Ukraine, **has made it harder and more expensive to take advantage of America’s abundant energy resources, driving up costs for hard-working families.** Our legitimate interests in holding Putin accountable should not come at the expense of Americans’ well-being. These sanctions will only hurt Americans even more and further enrich Putin if they are not coupled with a dramatic expansion of energy production in this country. Sadly, this administration is continuing to hold the U.S. hostage to President Biden’s infatuation with ‘green energy’ and continuing with actions to regulate conventional energy out of existence. **“We must provide relief to Americans already struggling from historic inflation and high prices,** while also holding Russia accountable for its invasion of Ukraine. **To start, this administration could immediately hold lease sales on federal lands—including in ANWR**—and waters for new oil and gas exploration, suspend the Jones Act, and provide regulatory relief under the Renewable Fuels Standard. If Biden truly cares about Americans, he should act now.”

The plan would cause inflation and cause a recession
Mills, Faculty Fellow at Northwestern University, 2019

Mark, 12/17/2019, Issues 2020: A Fracking Ban Would Trigger Global Recession, Manhattan Institute, <https://www.manhattan-institute.org/issues-2020-economic-consequences-fracking-ban-recession#:~:text=A%20ban%20on%20fracking%20would%20end%20U.S.%20exports%2C,even%20a%201%25%E2%80%93932%25%20change%20in%20the%20supply%2Fdemand%20balance.>

A ban on fracking would end U.S. exports, cause imports to soar, and increase the trade deficit by hundreds of billions of dollars. **The more serious impact would come from the shock to global markets. Global oil prices swing widely when markets are surprised by even a 1%–2% change in the supply/demand balance.** A fracking ban would entail a loss of 7% of global oil production, comparable to the 7% lost with the infamous 1973 Arab oil embargo—an embargo that drove world oil prices up 400% and triggered a global recession.[25] Similarly, the 1979 Iranian revolution took 5% of oil off global markets. Prices rose more than 200%, sparking another global recession.[26] Today, **taking** shale production off the market would also constitute an additional 17% loss to global markets in the form of natural gas.[27] **Higher energy prices would hit global consumers; Americans would pay more than \$100 billion a year at the gas pump alone, an average of \$1,000 per household.**[28] **Even a slow 10-year production phase-out would trigger an estimated two-year recession in America** and eliminate \$270 billion of private investment.[29] There would be some winners: Russia and OPEC would derive huge revenue and geopolitical benefits.

Banning oil in ANWR increases oil prices for families
Antoni, 2023

EJ, Aster Fellow, Hermann Center for the Federal Budget, Biden’s Latest attack on American Energy is costing your family,

<https://www.heritage.org/energy/commentary/biden-latest-attack-american-energy-costing-your-family>

Want to pay more for energy? If so, President Joe Biden's new drilling prohibition in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) is good news for you. The rest of us, though, are less than thrilled with his efforts to throttle the energy sector. **They're needlessly costing American families an extra \$2,400 on their annual energy bills.** On his first day in office, Biden canceled the Keystone XL pipeline and issued what was supposed to be a temporary moratorium on all oil and natural gas activities in ANWR. But now he has canceled all leases and permits there, closing off one of the nation's most energy-rich areas. This unwise maneuver follows closely on the heels of the administration's ban on shipping liquified natural gas by rail. By blocking transport of domestic natural gas via additional pipelines and now railroads, **the president is simultaneously increasing the nation's dependence on energy imports, driving up energy prices and increasing countless costs** throughout the chemical and manufacturing industries. While about 80% of the world derives their fossil-fuel-based chemical feedstocks from crude oil, America gets about 80% of its feedstocks from its abundant reserves of inexpensive, clean natural gas. This gives American industry about a 70% cost savings on feedstocks, which are passed to consumers on countless items. But hamstringing the transportation of inexpensive natural gas curtails how much is available to domestic industry, squandering that advantage. **The result is higher prices throughout the economy. Even without considering these broader negative implications, the increase in energy prices alone is devastating to American families.** Since Biden took office, every energy source has seen a dramatic increase in price: gasoline 60%, diesel 47%, natural gas 25% and propane 23%. These increases, combined with a 70% increase in the price of coal, have also driven electricity prices up 24%. Those higher electricity prices are also the result of Biden administration mandates that force unreliable energy sources into the nation's electricity grid. That's another cost that ultimately gets passed to consumers. And these costs are certainly adding up during Biden's tenure. The average American family is spending about \$2,400 more on energy today than when he took office. That means families' energy bills have increased more than a third in less than three years.

Impact Extensions

Extend our Clemente card from the 1NC- the people hit hardest by rising energy costs are low income families and our most vulnerable populations. People need energy to survive, so many families have to make the choice between their gas and electricity bills or a meal on the table. The plan makes this worse.

Affirmative Answers

Answer To (AT) Uniqueness:

Energy prices already high now- the plan doesn't change the status quo Estes 2024

Adam Clarke, Aug 15th, Vox Media, the hidden reason why your power bill is so high, <https://www.vox.com/technology/366885/utility-power-bill-price-clean-energy>
If your utility bill confuses you and makes you sweat every month when it demands hundreds of your hard-earned dollars, you're not alone. **The price of electricity is continuing to rise across the United States, and there's no end in sight.** Why are our electricity bills getting so expensive? **Energy prices have been creeping up across the nation for over a decade.** The latest consumer price index [saw inflation dip below 3 percent](#) for the first time since 2021, but inflation for electricity prices nationwide [remains stubbornly high at 4.9 percent](#). There's no single reason why electricity keeps getting more expensive in any one place, however. **The drivers behind rising energy costs are** myriad, overlapping, and vexing. **Inflation, rising energy demands, volatile natural gas prices, and extreme weather** are all contributing factors. The transition to renewable energy is, too.

Substantial growth of AI will make electricity prices rise inevitably- the plan isn't the cause of rising prices Toussaint, 2024

Kristin, Editor, Fast Magazine, 11/15 AI Data Centers could make your electricity bill go up by 70%. <https://www.fastcompany.com/91229319/ai-data-centers-could-make-your-electric-bill-go-up-by-70>
Every use of AI requires massive amounts of data, meaning as AI has surged, companies have been building more and more data centers across the country. **Those data centers also require lots of energy to operate, and that means they could soon require more energy than what's available on the grid. If AI's energy demand outstrips electricity supplies, that has real impacts for Americans**—like a higher risk of electricity outages, and higher energy costs. **By 2029, consumers and small businesses could see their electricity bills increase 70% because of surging energy demand from AI data centers,** according to a [new report](#) by the [Jack Kemp Foundation](#), a Washington, D.C. think tank created by former Republican Representative Jack Kemp. That means consumers will bear the brunt of AI's increasing energy use, says Ike Brannon, coauthor of the study and a senior fellow at the Jack Kemp Foundation. **This is already beginning to play out in Northern Virginia, which currently has the highest concentration of data centers in the world. In Virginia, data centers could use almost half of the state's total electricity by 2030.** The surge of data centers in Northern Virginia—driven by the federal government and national security agencies—is already leading to utility increases. “We haven't really increased [energy] supply all that much around here, but demand is going up,” Brannon says.

AT Link:

Drilling for oil won't lower gas prices

Semanco 2024

Anja, Alaska Wild, Drilling in the Arctic Refuge: A Financial Disaster and a Threat to Our Future
December 11, 2024

<https://alaskawild.org/blog/drilling-in-the-arctic-refuge-a-financial-disaster-and-a-threat-to-our-future/#:~:text=Despite%20claims%20to%20the%20contrary,prices%20or%20solve%20economic%20hardships.>

Despite claims to the contrary, more drilling in the Arctic won't lower gas prices or solve economic hardships. Why? Because **U.S. oil is sold on the global market to the highest bidder. Domestic production has little impact on local gas prices, which are driven by international supply chains, geopolitical instability, and global demand—not by how much we drill at home. Moreover, investing in Arctic oil locks us into a volatile and unstable market. It doesn't provide the economic security Americans need; it simply pads the profits of fossil fuel companies while leaving consumers to face unpredictable energy costs.**

New drilling in ANWR will take too long to impact electricity prices

Brooks 2024

James, 10/25, The Alaska Beacon, Several key steps towards drilling in Alaska's Arctic Refuge are due before year's end,

<https://alaskabeacon.com/2024/10/25/several-key-steps-toward-drilling-in-alaskas-arctic-refuge-are-due-before-years-end/#:~:text=As%20a%20result%2C%20the%20next,the%20clock%2C%E2%80%9D%20Murkowski%20said.>

Donald **Trump**, conversely, **has repeatedly said he wants to keep ANWR open for drilling.**

He's made the issue one of the refrains of his campaign stump speech and [reiterated his support this week](#) in a phone call with Nick Begich, Alaska's Republican candidate for U.S. House. "We're gonna tap the liquid gold that's under there, and we're gonna drill, baby, drill. We're going to make Alaska rich and prosperous with jobs all over the place," Trump said.

Even if Trump wins and presses ahead with ANWR leasing, a successful oil development would take years, if not decades, to begin production. And that's only after a lot of "ifs" are answered — if there's oil to be drilled, if the cost of drilling is low enough to make it economically viable, if the legal issues can be resolved, if the state and federal governments stay supportive. Given those uncertainties, will ANWR ever be developed?

AT Impact:

High electricity prices good – encourage transition to green tech faster

Holman 2024

Rachel, European Investment Bank, 10/15, The Only Way Forward.

<https://www.eib.org/en/essays/europe-energy-transition-renewable>

The Ukraine war prompted an energy reckoning throughout Europe. About one-quarter of the energy Europe consumes comes from natural gas, and before the Ukraine war, much of that **came from Russia. Europe needed new sources of natural gas – quickly.** The European Union filled the Russian void with imports from the United States and Norway. Germany built terminals to store liquified natural gas. The result was a profound shift in European energy imports. Before the war, Russia accounted for 45% of gas imports. By 2023, those imports had **shrunk by two-thirds**, to 15%. **High energy prices also pushed Europe to accelerate the green transition. Renewables had doubled as a share of EU energy consumption from 2004 to 2022**, but they still only accounted for about **one-fifth of total consumption**. In 2023, the European Union increased its 2030 target for renewable energy from 32% (set in 2018) to **42.5% of energy consumption, with the aim of reaching 45%.** **In addition to upping the targets, the European Union also moved to facilitate clean energy investments, such as wind and solar farms**, through a directive that required member countries to give **renewable energy projects priority when issuing permits**. **“The renewable energy drive was there already, but the seriousness of the energy crisis and the implications for security were made even more prominent** on the political agenda,” says Boschi of the European Investment Bank.

Climate change is causing electricity prices to rise- not the plan. We have to solve the root issue to address affordability. The need for the plan outweighs the Disadvantage.

Cohen and Wholf, 2024

Li, Senior Producer, and Tracy, Reporter, CBS News, Electricity prices are on the rise. Is it inflation or an underlying issue?

<https://www.cbsnews.com/news/electricity-prices-rising-inflation-climate-change-clean-energy/>

The cost of electricity is based on a multitude of factors, including the volatile prices for natural gas, wildfire risk, electricity transmission and distribution, regulations and, the one factor Americans know all too well, inflation. **But experts say there's an underlying problem that, unlike inflation, isn't going away anytime soon — the heat.** **An unreliable national grid** **Recent years have seen back-to-back heat records across the world, including in the U.S.** **Rising temperatures fuel extreme weather events**, such as heat waves in the summer and snow storms in the winter, **which then increases energy consumption as people try to keep their homes warm or cool**. It also increases the costs for the utility companies themselves to make sure that the electric infrastructure can handle it. Currently, it can't. **Power outages** remain a major problem across the U.S. When **Tropical Storm Ernesto** passed by the U.S. Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico earlier this month, it **knocked out power to hundreds of thousands of residents**. At one point, nearly half of Puerto Rico and almost all of USVI were without electricity.

But it's not just the islands — it's the mainland too. Of all the major power outages in the U.S. from 2000 to 2023, scientists at the nonprofit Climate Central found that [80% were because of weather](#). Every four years, the American Society of Civil Engineers issues a "report card" on how U.S. infrastructure fares in a variety of categories. In the latest report, [the energy sector received a C-](#). Engineering experts acknowledged that spending on transmission lines had grown and that utilities were being proactive about strengthening the national grid, but said that "weather remains an increasing threat" that is continuously causing power outages. Transmission and distribution systems are a major concern, they said, and "is likely to accelerate as the impacts of climate change persist and the public's expectation of more reliable, 'always-on' electricity increases." "While the weather has always been the number one threat to the energy sector's reliability, **climate change has only exacerbated the frequency and intensity of these events and associated costs.**" the report states. "The Department of Energy (DOE) found that power outages are costing the U.S. economy \$28 billion to \$169 billion annually." Multiple polls and studies show how pervasive energy poverty and the heat can be. An early August poll by The Associated Press-NORC Center for Public Affairs Research found that [39% of Americans say that heat has had a "major impact" on their electricity bills](#), with another 30% identifying a "minor impact." About 40% of poll takers say they also had unexpected utility expenses because of extreme weather events, including storms, flooding, heat and wildfires. **The heat isn't just costly, it's also dangerous. Extreme heat is the No. 1 weather-related killer in the U.S. and is known for exacerbating cardiovascular and respiratory conditions.** The cold is also a concern, with the EPA reporting that more than [19,000 Americans have died from cold-related causes](#) since 1979.