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# AT: Increasing ports is not creating ports

**1) We meet: We don’t increase investment by replacing current ports, we only increase investment by increasing the amount of offshore ports**

**2) Counter-interpretation: An increase can happen from zero:**

**WORDS AND PHRASES** CUMULATIVE SUPPLEMENTARY PAMPHLET, 19**76**, Vol. 20A, 07, 76.

Increase: Salary change of from zero to $12,000 and $1,200 annually for mayor and councilmen respectively **was an “increase” in salary** and not merely the fixing of salary. King v. Herron, 243 S.E.2d36, 241 Ga. 5.

**3) We meet the counter-interpretation: The plan increases infrastructure investment by creating offshore mega ports**

Stephen Wampler, JULY 2, 2010, (Staff Writer) Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory News, Plan floated to ship cargo inspection offshore. https://newsline.llnl.gov/\_rev02/articles/2010/jul/07.02.10-ports.php

In their presentation, Northwestern’s Kellogg School of Business students **recommended building six off-shore megaports** — in **Seattle, Oakland, Los Angeles-Long Beach, the Gulf of Mexico, Georgia and New York.**

**It was estimated that the six ports would cost about $60 billion to build, with an annual economic and tariff benefit of about $5.3 billion per year and a payback period of 23 years**, according to the Kellogg School of Business team.

**4) No ground loss: their disads link better off the creation of a new entity to fund transportation infrastructure.**

**5) They over-limit: limit out the heart of the debate about funding infrastructure in the United States.**

**6) Reasonability: AFF only needs to be reasonably topical.**

**7) No in-round abuse: They had disads, counterplans, etc.**

# AT: Increase Investment

**1) We meet: the United States federal government provides monetary investment towards mega ports.**

 **2) Counter-interpretation: transportation infrastructure investment requires monetary funding:**

Neil **Planzer, 2009** (Vice President, Boeing Aircraft Management), NEXTGEN: A REVIEW OF THE RTCA MID-TERM IMPLEMENTATION TASK FORCE REPORT, House Hrg., Oct. 28, 2009, 176-177.

Leadership also includes accountability. Clear metrics must be established to measure the progress of the government as it quickly introduces NextGen. Without such measurable responsibility, we put at grave risk the necessary speed and effectiveness in bringing NextGen on line within the next few years. Finally, leadership means a very serious commitment to infrastructure investment. That is something we're all familiar with on the ground; now it needs to be applied to equipping aircraft to take advantage of NextGen technology. Given the cost of equipage and the length of time it could take for an individual user to see a payback in such an investment, such funding is crucial. This is **infrastructure investment** that can pay off in the next few years; that payoff is within our reach. To place this in perspective, were Congress to provide a level of funding comparable to its funding for high-speed rail projects in this year's stimulus legislation, NextGen would be an early reality. Without this leadership and funding, implementation of NextGen will drag on, and our nation will suffer even more from airport and airway congestion.

**3) We meet the counter-interpretation: the federal government provides money for offshore mega-ports**

**4) The counter-interpretation provides better ground: gives them links to spending disads, politics, etc.**

**5) Reasonability: good is good enough on Topicality.**

**6) They overlimit: they limit out a core plan on the topic.**

**7) No in-round abuse: they had disads, counterplans, etc.**

# AT: Offshore is not U.S

1. **We meet: The mega ports are created on the United States’ territorial waters.**

West's Encyclopedia of American Law, 2008[West encyclopedia of American law, edition 2, copyright 2008]

In [International Law](http://legal-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/International%2BLaw) the term *territorial waters* refers to that part of the ocean immediately adjacent to the shores of a state and subject to its territorial jurisdiction. The state possesses both the jurisdictional right to regulate, police, and adjudicate the territorial waters and the proprietary right to control and exploit natural resources in those waters and exclude others from them. Territorial waters differ from the high seas, which are common to all nations and are governed by the principle of freedom of the seas. The high seas are not subject to appropriation by persons or states but are available to everyone for navigation, exploitation of resources, and other lawful uses. The legal status of territorial waters also extends to the seabed and subsoil under them and to the airspace above them.

**2) Counter-interpretation: Its means associated with:**

Augustus **Stevenson, 2010** (Editor), NEW OXFORD AMERICAN DICTIONARY, 3rd Ed., 2010, 924.

Its: Belonging to or associated with a thing previously mentioned or easily identified.

**3) We meet: Offshore mega ports are directly associated with and is funded by the United States’ federal government**

Dr. Michael J. Hillyard, (April 2005), President, Rockwell University, The Atlantis Garrison: A Comprehensive, Cost Effective Cargo and Port Security Strategy, http://www.ciaonet.org.mutex.gmu.edu/olj/si/si\_4\_4/si\_4\_4\_him01.pdf

**Third, no entity other than the federal government would be capable of seamlessly conjoining port operations among the existing 351-ports system and integrate critical federal functions such as foreign intelligence, inspection, customs, international law, and law enforcement. An essential federal coordination role—intelligence sharing in the cargo security information system—could be facilitated through the new National Director of Intelligence**, an office envisioned for just this type of task by President Bush who wants to ensure “that our intelligence agencies work as a single, unified enterprise.”[ 30]

**4) Prefer the counter-interpretation: it limits out funding by private agencies and states while allowing the US to create a new agency to fund transportation infrastructure.**

**5) They overlimit: They limit out a core case on the topic.**

**6) Reasonability: good is good enough on topicality.**

**7) No in-round abuse: they have disads, counterplans, etc.**

# AT: Substantial increase

## 1) Counter-interpretation: substantially means 50%:

Anthony **Perl, 2010** (Dir., Urban Studies Program, Simon Fraser U.), THE POST CARBON READER: MANAGING THE 21ST CENTURY’S SUSTAINABILITY CRISIS, 2010, 348.

"Substantial change" means one or both of the following: an ongoing transport activity increases or decreases dramatically, **say by 50 percent,** or a new means of transport becomes prevalent to the extent that it is made use of by 10 percent or more of the society's population.

## 2) We meet the counter-interpretation:

## A) The federal government spends $87 billion a year on transportation infrastructure:

Nathan **Musick, 2010** (Economist, Congressional Budget Office), PUBLIC SPENDING ON TRANSPORTATION AND WATER INFRASTRUCTURE, 2010, 5.

In 2009, the federal government spent $87 billion on transportation and water infrastructure, an increase of $6 billion over the amount spent in 2007. Adjusted for inflation, that spending represented the first annual increase in federal outlays for such infrastructure since 2002. Of those expenditures, about $4 billion was fromappropriations contained in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009.

## B) Six mega-ports ports require $60 billion

Stephen Wampler, JULY 2, 2010, (Staff Writer) Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory News, Plan floated to ship cargo inspection offshore. https://newsline.llnl.gov/\_rev02/articles/2010/jul/07.02.10-ports.php

**It was estimated that the six ports would cost about $60 billion to build, with an annual economic and tariff benefit of about $5.3 billion per year and a payback period of 23 years**, according to the Kellogg School of Business team.

## 3) They overlimit: they limit out the core of the debate on transportation infrastructure.

## 4) Their interpretation allows for process counterplans which destroy AFF ground and topic specific education.

## 5) Their interpretation is arbitrary: they would always change the goalposts right before we meet it.

## 6) Reasonability: good is good enough on Topicality.

## 7) No in-round abuse: they have disads, counterplans, etc.

# AT: Ports not transportation

**1) We meet: we specify that mega ports are created for the transportation off goods**

**2) Counter-interpretation:** **Infrastructure includes the defense and economic security of the US:**

**Pamela Collins, 2009 (Prof., Homeland Security, Eastern Kentucky U.), HOMELAND SECURITY AND CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION, 2009, 5-6.**

On July 15, 1996, President **Clinton signed Executive Order 13010, which** established the President's Commission on Critical Infrastructure Protection (PCCIP) and **expanded the definition of infrastructure to include: "A framework of interdependent networks and systems** comprising identifiable industries, institutions (including people and procedures), and distribution capabilities **that provide a reliable flow of products and services essential to the defense and economic security of the United States,** the smooth functioning of government at all levels, and society as a whole."

 **3) We meet the counter-interpretation: Mega ports enhance security**

David M**. Stone, 3-06-2006 -**  Rear Admiral U.S. Navy (retired) “Port Security: Top Threats and Technology Trends” http://www.securityinfowatch.com/article/10558823/port-security-top-threats-and-technology-trends

**The terrorist threat of greatest concern to U.S. authorities today is a weapon of mass destruction (WMD), particularly nuclear, and the potential for the enormous damage it could create. To prevent a WMD from reaching the U.S., our country's security efforts encompass** air and ground transportation as well as **seaports**. With the current debate about the management of some U.S. port operations by Dubai Ports World, the maritime scenario has spiked on the "radar screen" of popular and political consciousness.

**4) They over-limit: limit out the heart of the debate about funding infrastructure in the United States.**

**5) Creating six mega ports only makes us extra-topical at best—extra-T is good**

 **A) Increases education: gives us more to research.**

 **B) Increases ground: more for them to run disads off of.**

**6) Reasonability: AFF only needs to be reasonably topical.**

**7) No in-round abuse: They had disads, counterplans, etc.**