# NSDA Starter Files

The following file contains full T shells for use against a number of affirmatives. I will be adding ~5 shells per month to this file based on what Affs and T violations I’m seeing run most often. For the first month, I’ve gone with a few shells that I expect to be widely useful.

As always, if you have any questions or feedback, feel free to reach out! My email is bosch1kd@cmich.edu

# T Masterfile

## Generic EPA Definition

#### Water protection refers to 6 different mechanisms – [the aff] isn’t one of them.

EPA 20 – United States Environmental Protection Agency. (Environmental Protection Agency; Updated: 2020; “Source Water Protection Practices”; Accessed: July 19, 2021; https://www.epa.gov/sourcewaterprotection/source-water-protection-practices)//CYang

Communities utilize a combination of regulatory and voluntary approaches to address threats to their drinking water supply. Given that source water protection is not required in most localities and that water utilities cannot regulate their source watersheds, approaches that complement a broad sweep of community objectives, whether protection of water quality, open space, or disaster resilience may receive more widespread public support and participation. Examples of source water protection practices include:

* Land use controls (such as zoning ordinances and growth controls)
* Regulations, permits, and inspections
* Land conservation and "natural infrastructure" solutions
* Best management practices
* Public education and outreach
* Cost share programs and financial incentives

#### Violation – the aff does not meet the EPA definition of water protection

#### RTP –

1. Limits – keeping the topic limited allows negative teams to prep. The aff already gets unlimited prep time; limits are important to keep debate fair
2. Predictability – limiting the topic to the six mechanisms defined by the EPA allows the neg to prepare while still giving the aff a number of competitive plan options
3. Context – prefer our definition from the Environmental Protection Agency. They are THE organization charged with water resource protection in the United States. Contextual evidence rewards better research practices by debaters

## vs Oceans

#### Water Resources only includes drinking water

Georgia Conservancy 20**09** Newton County Land Conservation Plan Blueprints for Successful Communities Spring 2009 <https://smartech.gatech.edu/bitstream/handle/1853/36602/NewtonReportFinal.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y> (ermo/sms/6-22-2021)

A water resource is defined as any area of the landscape or subterranean areas that act as channels, reservoirs, or vessels for water and/or aquatic habitats and are important for ecosystem services and ultimately the community’s drinking water needs. Planners and policy makers must incorporate their knowledge of water resources into their work to protect the wide range of elements that comprise this resource.

#### Violation – the plan deals with oceans, which are not drinking water

#### RTP –

1. Limits – opening this topic up to oceans allows affirmatives to explode their ground, including re-using affirmatives from the oceans topic. Requiring the neg to prepare for two topics worth of affs explodes aff ground in an already aff-biased topic area
2. Predictability – including both freshwater and saltwater makes the topic unpredictable, especially because the resolution states “in the United States” and over 200 miles of US oceans are still disputed areas
3. Context – prefer evidence from conservation groups; contextual evidence rewards better research practices by debaters

Voter for fairness and education

## vs Restoration and/or Wetlands Restoration

#### Restoration and protection are contextually unique

SWMO 11 Scott Watershed Management Organization, Prepared for the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, Credit River Protection Plan, https://www.pca.state.mn.us/sites/default/files/wq-iw11-07h.pdf

The TAC recognized that protection is different than restoration. Water quality restoration needs to reduce pollutant loads and may require significant physical corrections or capital improvements. Protection relies mostly on measures that preserve existing conditions.

#### In regards to wetlands, restoration is separate from protection

EPA 15 VOLUNTARY RESTORATION AND PROTECTION https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-09/documents/restoration\_and\_protection\_cef\_1.pdf

Wetland restoration is the manipulation of a former or degraded wetland’s physical, chemical, or biological characteristics to return its natural functions.1 . Restoration practices include: • Re-establishment, the rebuilding a former wetland; and • Rehabilitation, repairing the functions of a degraded wetland (US EPA, 2007a). Wetlands protection is defined as removing a threat or preventing the decline of wetland conditions (US EPA, 2007a).

#### Violation – the plan deals with restoration, not protection

#### RTP –

1. Topic-specific language – the topic committee researched water resources at length and decided on the word “protection” for a reason
2. XT – restoration is separate from protection. Even if the aff also protects water resources, they access advantages through restoration, which is extra-topical
3. Limits – specific language keeps the topic balanced. Allowing restoration affs explodes aff ground and makes the topic impossible for negative teams to prep
4. Predictability – negative teams prepare to debate about protection, it’s impossible to predict what other verbs the aff could apply to water resources
5. Field context - prefer evidence taken from the field of wetland protection. Contextual evidence rewards better research practices by debaters.

#### Voters –

1. Fairness
2. Education
3. Extra-T is a voter

## vs Pre-Treatment/Sewage

#### Pretreatment is not substantial protection. Reducing sewage is contextually distinct. Reports on past pretreatment plans prove.

World Bank 5 Document of The World Bank FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY Report No: 34135 IMPLEMENTATION COMPLETION REPORT (CPL-40100) ON A LOAN IN THE AMOUNT OF US$40 MILLION TO THE KINGDOM OF MOROCCO FOR THE MOROCCO SECOND SEWERAGE AND WATER REUSE PROJECT December 22, 2005, https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/441381468121749470/text/34135.txt

Original objective: Protecting the environment, improving hygiene and public health, and preserving water resources through appropriate collection, treatment and disposal of wastewater. This outcome is rated satisfactory. The extensive augmentation and rehabilitation of the sewerage network has considerably improved sanitation across Fez, with benefits to hygiene, public health and quality of life. Such benefits, which are acknowledged by all stakeholders (RADEEF, citizens, public officials), albeit inadequately and not scientifically documented, can be attributed to reduced exposure to flowing or stagnating wastewater, and thus to water borne pathogens. By reliably collecting all sewage flows, the project has improved environmental conditions in the city and along the Oued Fez. The project did not achieve substantial protection of water resources, as it could only implement a pretreatment station, and had to forgo a flawed treatment plant concept. The project nevertheless prepared the groundwork for a viable plant, and delivered the necessary design and studies which now allow implementation of the plant. As a result, the likely outcome on the environmental objective is satisfactory. The following facts illustrate sewerage results, which have environmental and public health impacts: l From a baseline of 62,000 sewerage connections, the project has made possible to establish 53,000 additional connections, reaching a total of 115,000 connections, i.e. an 85% increase in connected households. Of these, 30,000 were "social connections" in poor neighborhoods. Population access to house connections was thus raised from 65% in 1996 to 95% in 2005, which translates into approximately 300,000 additional urban dwellers connected to modern sewerage network. RADEEF furthermore estimates more broadly that sewerage improvements have benefited over 500,000 people (see Annex 9). l Dozens of open air sewage flow and pooling areas have been eliminated. By RADEEF's account, chronic sewage backflows into homes and wet weather sewer overflows have been substantially reduced. The quality of life, amenity and sanitary conditions of Fez have thus been improved, particularly in the Medina (the densely populated medieval core of Fez), along the Oued Fez and in downtown areas previously known as "black spots". Anecdotally, notoriously noxious downtown areas now feature tourist traffic and restaurants. l 100% of sewage flows are now captured in enclosed sewers, and dozens of sewers previously discharging into local oueds are intercepted. About 80% of sewage undergoes pre-treatment (screening and desilting) at the Zenjfour pretreatment station, before discharge to the downstream reaches of Oued Fez.

#### Violation – the plan implements a pretreatment plan, which is not considered substantial protection in context

#### RTP –

1. Limits and predictability – the word “substantial” in the topic is vital to keeping debate balanced. The neg can never sufficiently prep for every hyper-specific adjustment to water treatment plants, which unfairly increases aff ground
2. Field context – prefer evidence from past sewage treatment initiatives. Contextual evidence rewards better research practices by debaters.

#### Voter for fairness and education

## vs Conservation

#### Conservation and protection are contextually distinct. The aff is conservation, not protection.

Matanich 96 --- Johanna Matanich, JD 1995, Lewis and Clark Law School, “A Treaty Comes of Age for the Ancient Ones: Implications of the Law of the Sea for the Regulation of Whaling”, 8 Int'l Legal Persp. 37 (1996), https://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?handle=hein.journals/intlegp8&div=7&id=&page=

The Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties establishes rules for the interpretation of treaties. n138 UNCLOS is to be interpreted “in good faith in accordance with the ordinary meaning to be given to the terms of the treaty in their context and in the light of [their] object and purpose.” n139 What then, does the term “conservation” mean? Generally, there is little difference between the use of the terms “conservation” and “preservation.” In the context of environmental protection, however, conservation connotes a conservative use of a resource, but a use nonetheless, while the term “protection” is used to command a cessation of use. n140 Indeed, the term “conservation” is used in UNCLOS article 64 to characterize the regulation of active fisheries. n141 Because conservation is associated with use in that article, it is logical to assume the UNCLOS drafters associated the term conservation with “use” in Article 65. The word “protection” was used in an early draft of the article, then deleted, n142 [\*60] which provides further support for this conclusion.

#### Field context proves

Interreg 18 --- Italy - Croatia CBC Programme, “iDEAL - DEcision support for Adaptation pLan”, European Regional Development Fund, December 2018, https://www.italy-croatia.eu/documents/107398/1753358/4.1.2+A+report+on+selected+indicators.pdf/4ed35df4-f413-875f-c5ad-7d12dc504bfa?t=1587993039363

the term “water protection” means the set of water bodies under protection i.e. where it is not possible to carry out human activities, which are set up by the strategies/actions/projects/plants implementation

#### Violation – the plan deals with conservation, not protection

#### RTP –

1. Topic-specific language – the topic committee researched water resources at length and decided on the word “protection” for a reason
2. XT – conservation is separate from protection. Even if the aff also protects water resources, they access advantages through conservation, which is extra-topical
3. Limits – specific language keeps the topic balanced. Allowing conservation affs explodes aff ground and makes the topic impossible for negative teams to prep
4. Predictability – negative teams prepare to debate about protection, it’s impossible to predict what other verbs the aff could apply to water resources
5. Field context - prefer evidence taken from the field of water resource protection. Contextual evidence rewards better research practices by debaters.

#### Voters –

1. Fairness
2. Education
3. Extra-T is a voter