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### Airlines Advantage Answers

#### Only demand management solves. NextGen creates new capacity that will be quickly filled.

Barkowski 10 (Justin T., J.D. Candidate – Pepperdine University, B.A. in Economics – University of California, Berkeley and Instrument-Rated Private Pilot Certificate, “Managing Air Traffic Congestion Through the Next Generation Air Transportation System: Satellite-Based Technology, Trajectories, and - Privatization?”, Pepperdine Law Review, 37 Pepp. L. Rev. 247, Lexis)

D. Unresolved Demand-Management Policies

With or without an ATC commercialization debate, the airlines and the new Secretary of Transportation, Ray LaHood, strongly believe that NextGen is the key to solving congestion. 223 One author even argues that "airside capacity shortages and suboptimal usage/management of airspace" is the underlying cause of air traffic congestion. 224 While these concerns undoubtedly need to be addressed through NextGen, there is a severe problem when airspace capacity increases but corresponding airport resources and infrastructure do not. This will be the case in high-density areas where any room for expansion is nearly impossible. 225 Even the JPDO is skeptical that NextGen is a "cure-for-all," stating that where "airport infrastructure [development] cannot be accomplished using existing resources," the airports will have to implement "market-based mechanisms such as peak period pricing to ease congestion" in times of high demand. 226

Merely increasing the availability of landing and takeoffs at a high-density airport may not have the desired cure-for-all effect that industry participants might expect. For example, in 2004 American and United Airlines agreed with the FAA to voluntarily reduce the number of scheduled flights out of Chicago O'Hare by 12.5% in order to help fight congestion. 227 In effect, this increased the number of potential flights out of that airport during the agreed upon times through its voluntary reduction, just as NextGen [\*296] would do. However, the opening up of more space simply resulted in other airlines adding "flights while the hub carriers cut their schedules," providing no relief to the airport congestion problem. 228 NextGen essentially creates this increased capacity without any supplemental FAA policies to address how this extra space in the system will be allocated to air carriers that are continuously demanding more flights than the system can handle. 229 To prevent air traffic congestion from resulting after the implementation of NextGen, like it had in Chicago, effective demand-management policies are therefore critically in need. Given the historical struggles, 230 this may be difficult to accomplish.

#### Alt cause --- lack of runways and controllers

Williams 9 (Genevra, J.D. Candidate – Southern Methodist University Dedman School of Law and B.B.A. –University of Iowa, “GPS For The Sky: A Survey of Automatic Dependent Surveillance-(ADS-B) and its Implementation in the United States”, Journal of Air Law and Commerce, Spring, 74 J. Air L. & Com. 473, Lexis)

The U.S. aviation infrastructure faces many challenges if it is going to accommodate this expansion in air traffic. For example, there is a shortage in the number of runways from which all of these planes must take off and land. 44 While an in-depth analysis of the airport capacity problems relating to takeoff and landing are outside the scope of this paper, it is worth noting that runway and airport expansion is a special kind of problem. Long takeoff and landing delays, often suffered in the cramped quarters of a plane on the tarmac or circling over an airport, are infuriating to passengers, yet no one wants an already noisy airport further crowding into their neighborhood. 45

Another problem is the profound shortage of qualified air traffic controllers. 46 Over the next ten years, the bulk of today's air traffic controllers must be replaced. 47 The majority of today's controllers were hired in the 1980s after President Reagan fired 10,000 striking controllers, 48 and now they are all approaching the mandatory retirement age of fifty-six years. 49 The FAA has been scrambling to retain experienced air traffic controllers who have not yet hit retirement age by offering six-figure salaries in some locations, and relocation bonuses of up to [\*479] $ 75,000. 50 The shortage is compounded by a protracted labor dispute between the National Air Traffic Controllers Association and the FAA that contributes to serious worker dissatisfaction. 51 Of the 1,876 controllers who retired between 2005 and 2008, only thirty-seven did so because they reached mandatory retirement age. 52 "The attrition rate was 23 percent higher than projected, and even the FAA acknowledges some of that is because of the labor dispute." 53

#### Their author admits NextGen can’t overcome this

Williams 9 (Genevra, J.D. Candidate – Southern Methodist University Dedman School of Law and B.B.A. –University of Iowa, “GPS For The Sky: A Survey of Automatic Dependent Surveillance-(ADS-B) and its Implementation in the United States”, Journal of Air Law and Commerce, Spring, 74 J. Air L. & Com. 473, Lexis)

ADS-B is not a magic bullet however. Many point out that the relatively small number of runways available is the biggest contributor to airport congestion. 110 Additionally, the manner in which ADS-B is implemented will play a big role in whether airport and airspace congestion is improved. 111 However, there appears [\*485] to be a universal acknowledgement that current radar technology must be replaced. 112

#### NextGen implementation is too slow

Halsey 12 – Halsey, Ashley. (Transportation Writer for the Washington Post) "New Guidance System for Skies Could Face Delays." WashingtonPost.com. 04 July 2011. Web. 01 Mar. 2012. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/local/antidote-to-air-gridlock-is-complex- undertaking/2011/06/30/AG9bdnwH\_story\_4.html>.

The very business of getting aloft — the time that passengers know as the minutes between the “buckle your seat belts” order and “you are free to move about the cabin” — is an intricate choreography between controllers and the cockpit. “Two seventy on the heading, Southwest 658 going to departure,” the pilot says just after liftoff from Dulles, repeating the compass direction given by the Dulles tower. Then he tells a controller based in Warrenton that he’s climbing. “Potomac departure, Southwest 658, passing [1,800 feet] for 3,000, heading 270,” he radios. The new controller tells him to keep climbing to 5,000 feet and maintain that altitude. That keeps him 1,000 feet below flights heading to land at Dulles. When the plane reaches a waypoint known as “Blues,” a new controller takes over and orders Flight 658 to 12,000 feet. When Flight 658 reaches another waypoint, over Linden, Va., the pilot is told to head for 17,000 feet. Then he is handed over to a new controller, on a different radio frequency, who takes the flight to 27,000 feet before handing over to yet another controller who ultimately guides the plane to its 40,000-foot cruising altitude. Now, “you are free to move about the cabin.” If all that sounds complicated and open to human error, one goal of NextGen is to replace almost all of it with new technology, much of it in the cockpit. Can the FAA deliver? NextGen has virtually no credible enemies — not in the administration, not on Capitol Hill and not in the airline industry. But the seemingly simple concept is layered like an onion with complexities. In addition to demanding an enormous investment, there is a confluence of history and technology that creates a hurdle to progress. Airlines fear that the FAA will not meet its timetable for creation of the network of ground-based stations and satellite links that will make it all work. “The FAA’s track record on deployment hasn’t been good,” said Russ Chew, a former airline executive and former FAA chief operating officer. “The FAA could be perfect in meeting NextGen deadlines, but [private investors] are looking at past history.” Michael P. Huerta, the FAA deputy administrator who was given charge of NextGen after an internal shake-up this year, said he is well aware of that. “How can they be sure that FAA will deliver on its commitments? That’s a fair question,” Huerta said As for evidence of the rapid pace of technological advancement, one need look no further than GPS. The technology is advancing so quickly that some car buyers opt against the factory-installed unit for fear that it will be outdated in a year or two. Airlines have the same issue. “If I go first, I’ll have to bear the cost of updating the software, and when [NextGen is] turned on, I’ll have the oldest, most obsolete systems out there,” Chew said. In addition, the FAA must clear through a jungle of procedures and retrain 15,475 air traffic controllers to deal with a system that will entirely replace the old one. “A lot of the tough stuff is new procedures, is human-machine interface and human factors, moving from an air traffic control mind frame to an air traffic management mind frame” that puts greater responsibility in the hands of pilots, said Bobby Sturgell, former acting FAA administrator. Congress has tossed more uncertainty into the mix by extending the current FAA funding plan 20 times rather than approving a comprehensive long-term spending plan that imposes strict NextGen deadlines on the agency. “NextGen is threatened,” Chew said. “Everyone knows it. The FAA budget is under pressure. Even they will say that NextGen is on track, but it’s not.” JetBlue, with $4.2 million in federal funding help, and Southwest Airlines, with federal incentives, have installed some of the technology, but other airlines are reluctant to move ahead. “Absolutely I’m concerned about the schedule,” said Gary Kelly, chief executive of Southwest, which has spent $94 million on NextGen. “I’m concerned that we don’t have metrics in place to measure the progress. Any investment, any project, has to be evaluated based upon the risk of the return, and I’m not going to argue with you, this is a very high risk-return, because we’re not in control of the benefits.”

### Aviation Advantage Answers – Agriculture

#### Current yields solve

Poole 6 (Holly Kavana, Institute for Food and Development Policy,“12 Myths About Hunger”, Backgrounder, 12(2), Summer, 4-9, http://www.foodfirst.org/12myths)

Myth 1: Not Enough Food to Go Around Reality: Abundance, not scarcity, best describes the world's food supply. Enough wheat, rice and other grains are produced to provide every human being with 3,200 calories a day. That doesn't even count many other commonly eaten foods - ­vegetables, beans, nuts, root crops, fruits, grass-fed meats, and fish. Enough food is available to provide at least 4.3 pounds of food per person a day worldwide: two and half pounds of grain, beans and nuts, about a pound of fruits and vegetables, and nearly another pound of meat, milk and eggs - ­enough to make most people fat! The problem is that many people are too poor to buy readily available food. Even most "hungry countries" have enough food for all their people right now. Many are net exporters of food and other agricultural products.

#### No famine

Gardiner 8 – Duane T. Gardiner, Texas A&M University, and Raymond W. Miller, Late, Utah University, Soils in Our Environment, 2008, p. 21

In short the world is demanding more food, more fiber, and more industrial crops grown on less land using less water. If the population continues to increase at the current rate (7000 more people per hour), one can predict that the world will experience critical resource shortages during the lifetime of young people alive today. **Despite all this doom and gloom**, most people are not hungry. In fact, the food supply has become more stable, especially for the more developed countries. During the twentieth century, growth in world economies and standards of living exceeded growth in population.

#### No food wars

Salehyan 7 (Idean, Professor of Political Science – University of North Texas, “The New Myth About Climate Change”, Foreign Policy, Summer, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/story/cms.php?story\_id=3922)

First, aside from a few anecdotes, there is **little systematic empirical evidence** that resource scarcity and changing environmental conditions lead to conflict. In fact, several studies have shown that an abundance of natural resources is more likely to contribute to conflict. Moreover, even as the planet has warmed, the number of civil wars and insurgencies has decreased dramatically. Data collected by researchers at Uppsala University and the International Peace Research Institute, Oslo shows a steep decline in the number of armed conflicts around the world. Between 1989 and 2002, some 100 armed conflicts came to an end, including the wars in Mozambique, Nicaragua, and Cambodia. If global warming causes conflict, we should not be witnessing this downward trend.

Furthermore, if famine and drought led to the crisis in Darfur, why have scores of environmental catastrophes failed to set off armed conflict elsewhere? For instance, the U.N. World Food Programme warns that 5 million people in Malawi have been experiencing chronic food shortages for several years. But famine-wracked Malawi has yet to experience a major civil war. Similarly, the Asian tsunami in 2004 killed hundreds of thousands of people, generated millions of environmental refugees, and led to severe shortages of shelter, food, clean water, and electricity. Yet the tsunami, one of the most extreme catastrophes in recent history, did not lead to an outbreak of resource wars. Clearly then, there is much more to armed conflict than resource scarcity and natural disasters.

#### Long term trends prove global food security is increasing

Pingali 3 – Prabhu Pingali, Director of Agriculture and Economic Analysis Division – FAO, and Randy Stringer, Chief of the Comparative Agriculture Development Service – FAO, “Food Security and Agriculture in the Low Income Food Deficit Countries: 10 Years After the Uruguay Round”, 6-23-2003, http://www.ecostat.unical.it/2003agtradeconf/Invited%20papers/Pingali%20and%20Stringer.PDF

From a longer term perspective, food security progress has been **nothing short of remarkable**. The proportion of people in developing countries living with average daily food intakes of less than 2200 kcal fell from 57 percent in the early 1960s to just 10 percent by the end of the century. During this period, per capita food supplies increased by more than 70 percent in China and Indonesia; by more than 50 percent in Pakistan and the Republic of Korea; and by more than 30 percent in Brazil, Burkina Fasso, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Jamaica, Mauritania and the Philippines.

#### Food security is increasing worldwide

Pingali 3 – Prabhu Pingali, Director of Agriculture and Economic Analysis Division – FAO, and Randy Stringer, Chief of the Comparative Agriculture Development Service – FAO, “Food Security and Agriculture in the Low Income Food Deficit Countries: 10 Years After the Uruguay Round”, 6-23-2003, http://www.ecostat.unical.it/2003agtradeconf/Invited%20papers/Pingali%20and%20Stringer.PDF

How serious is the food insecurity problem? At the global level, the long term trends of many food security indicators have been **positive**. For example, the prevalence of undernourishment in developing countries fell from 28 percent of the total population in 1979-81 to 17 percent in 1998-2000. In addition, The average global kcal/person/day grew by 19 percent since the mid-1960 to reach 2800 kcal, with the developing country average expanding by more than 30 percent. As consumption increased, diets shifted towards more meat, milk, eggs, vegetables oils and away from roots and tubers. Livestock products, vegetables and sugars now provide 28 percent of total food consumption in the developing countries, up from 20 percent in the mid 1960s (FAO 2003a).

#### All major populations have sufficient food

Pingali 3 – Prabhu Pingali, Director of Agriculture and Economic Analysis Division – FAO, and Randy Stringer, Chief of the Comparative Agriculture Development Service – FAO, “Food Security and Agriculture in the Low Income Food Deficit Countries: 10 Years After the Uruguay Round”, 6-23-2003, http://www.ecostat.unical.it/2003agtradeconf/Invited%20papers/Pingali%20and%20Stringer.PDF

Much of this past progress in the developing country aggregate food consumption numbers and undernutrition indicators are influenced decisively by the **significant gains** made by the most populated countries -- those with populations of more than 100 million, including Brazil, China, India, Indonesia, Nigeria and Pakistan (FAO 2003a). Bangladesh is the only developing country with more than 100 million people where per capita food consumption remains very low. Brazil, China and Indonesia now have daily food consumption levels in the 2900 to 3000 kcal range. China reduced the number of undernourished by 74 million since 1990-92. Ghana, Nigeria, Peru, Thailand and Viet Nam have all achieved reductions of more than 3 million.

### Environment Advantage Answers

#### NextGen can’t offset rising demand

Sebastian and Piltz 7, Thea Sebastian, Director Climate Science Watch Rick Piltz, Director Climate Science Watch, July 2007, “NextGen Air Transportation System Progress Reports Ignore Climate Change”, <http://www.climatesciencewatch.org/file-uploads/NextGen_final_18jul07.pdf>

Third, NextGen/JPDO makes little commitment to alternative options – besides “improved management increases and marginal increases in fuel efficiency” – for airline companies.26 Aviation is going to be dependent on carbon-based fuels for quite some time, barring a major breakthrough. Accordingly, industry officials argue that climate 23 U.N. holds conference to look at cutting aircraft emissions. Greenwire: May 15, 2007 24 White, Aoife. “EU: Airlines Should Join Carbon-Cap Plan.” Associated Press: June 8, 2007 http://www.forbes.com/feeds/ap/2007/06/08/ap3802324.html 25 White, Aoife. “EU: Airlines Should Join Carbon-Cap Plan.” Associated Press: June 8, 2007 http://www.forbes.com/feeds/ap/2007/06/08/ap3802324.html 26 ibid. 7 change concerns should be deflected to the electric utility, industry, buildings, and automobile sectors, which account for a much larger percentage of current carbon dioxide emissions. There are potential alternatives for the aviation industry. Experiments with alternative fuels – including biodiesel, biokerosene and hydrogen – are currently underway, along with new engine and airframe designs. Breakthroughs would be needed to implement these technologies; however, further research could prove fruitful. There is also some potential for reduced emissions due to improvements in aviation operations, including load factors (reducing the amount of fuel spent per passenger by loading airplanes to capacity), airport and air traffic management improvements (doing more direct flights, as opposed to lay-over flights) and setting high fuel efficiency targets. However, NextGen/JPDO does not appear to have a strategy that would pursue changes designed to offset the projected growth of aviation’s carbon footprint.

#### Alt cause --- ground transportation

Shahan 10 – August 9, 2010, Zachary Shahan (Writer for CleanTechnica), “Cars Cause Global Warming More than Planes, Study Finds”, http://cleantechnica.com/2010/08/09/cars-cause-global-warming-more-than-planes-study-finds/

It is rather well-known now that transportation is one of the leading causes of global warming pollution in the world, and especially in the United States. NASA actually reported in February that motor vehicles are the largest net contributor to global warming pollution. Now, a new scientific finding in the journal Environmental Science & Technology shows that, counter to what most of us believe, driving a car causes more global warming pollution than flying the same distance in a plane. The study, “Specific Climate Impact of Passenger and Freight Transport,” finds that, in the short run, planes cause more global warming because they create more short-lived warming processes at high altitudes. However, when you take ‘everything’ — long- and short-lived gases, aerosols and cloud effects from transportation around the world — into account, an average car trip increases global temperatures more than an average flight the same distance. Furthermore, passenger trains and buses cause even four to five times less global warming pollution than automobiles per passenger mile. Of course, there are a lot of intricacies (i.e. the specific car or plane or bus used), but this is the general finding. “As planes fly at high altitudes, their impact on ozone and clouds is disproportionately high, though short lived. Although the exact magnitude is uncertain, the net effect is a strong, short-term, temperature increase,” lead author of the study, Dr. Jens Borken-Kleefeld, said. “Car travel emits more carbon dioxide than air travel per passenger mile. As carbon dioxide remains in the atmosphere longer than the other gases, cars have a more harmful impact on climate change in the long term.” The point that you probably wouldn’t take such long trips by car that you take by plane was not a part of the study and is an important matter to bring up as well. Nonetheless, this study confirms again that driving is one of the leading ways humans cause global warming. Get out of your car and onto a bike or bus or subway or train today in order to help stop global warming.

#### NextGen increases air traffic

Herbert 12 – Keith Herbert (contributing writer for Newsday, Author) March 31, 2012 “LIers: More study of NextGen air traffic” http://www.newsday.com/long-island/nassau/liers-more-study-of-nextgen-air-traffic-1.3635945

The potential for more frequent noise from Kennedy Airport jets -- a result of the FAA's pathbreaking "Next Generation" air traffic control redesign -- has united residents of Long Island's North and South shores to press for a full environmental impact study of the system's cumulative effects. NextGen, predicted to cost at least $20 billion by 2025, is the Federal Aviation Administration's nationwide plan for satellite navigation of commercial flights, replacing the outmoded ground-based radar system in use since the 1950s. Congress has appropriated $2.8 billion for NextGen since 2007, and the system is in the early stages of development. The satellite navigation system is supposed to increase capacity because planes could fly with 3 miles between them instead of the now-required 5-mile separation. Other NextGen positives, the FAA says, include enhanced safety, because pilots will have precise information about the location of other aircraft aloft; reduced jet noise over a wider swath of Nassau; and energy savings due to jets flying at near-idle throttle, burning less fuel. More capacity should ease flight delays in the metropolitan area, which with three major airports and three regional airports is among the nation's busiest and most congested airspaces, the agency said. Chronic delays at Kennedy and LaGuardia airports often have a domino effect on air traffic, with planes held at the gates of other airports because of the inability to land in New York. But for Nassau residents with homes and businesses beneath Kennedy flight paths, NextGen's precision in setting aircraft departure and arrival paths brings the probability of more frequent jet noise.

#### NextGen increases air pollution --- planes will fly lower and with more frequency

Wolf 9 – Heather V. Wolf, 2009, (Founder and Director of Our Airspace. Information Advisor for the Alliance for Sensible Airspace Planning. National Advisory Board member for the American Working Group for National Policy.), “Northeast Airspace Redesign”, http://ourairspace.org/background.html

The Northeast Airspace Redesign is the first major overhaul of this airspace in almost 50 years. The chief aim of this project is to increase capacity of the airspace by double in ten years and by triple by 2025. This project is part of the Operational Evolution Plan, National Airspace Redesign, Northeast Airspace Expansion, and relies on Next Gen which is all part of the ultimate objective of achieving Free Flight. The highly congested and delay-prone Northeast is the "test bed" for the national airspace redesign. Once successfully implemented in this region, the airspace across the United States will be redesigned using the same methodology. The redesign project was created to make use of efficiencies created by fascinating new technology upgrades "Next Gen." Unfortunately, Next Gen is 16 years behind schedule and not expected to fully roll out until 2025. The FAA has decided to implement the airspace redesign without the safety net of all the "Next Gen" technology presumably due to industry pressure. It has been fast tracked into implementation well before being safe. The airspace design being implemented is deeply flawed. It failed to meet it's objectives. It does not solve flight delay and it does not safely increase capacity. Instead this project compromises safety, exacts enormous negative impacts and is being implemented without a legal impact study. The FAA is now being sued over this premature implementation in a landmark lawsuit which combined 12 petitioners in 5 states. Many of the 12 petitioners represent communities with populations over 1 million. Several amicus briefs have also been filed by congressmen, senators and State Attorney Generals. Lawmakers across the country are now concerned the Northeastern redesign rollout will become the model for implementing the nationwide redesign; inviting negative public sentiment, litigious action and compromising the nations aviation safety record. Please note: This project is also referred to as "NY/NY/PA Airspace Redesign", "New York Redesign" ,"Airspace Redesign", "Routes and Procedures for Performance Based Navigation" , "Northeast Airspace Redesign" The chief aim of this project was to safely increase capacity of the airspace, reduce complexity to delay by 20 percent. This project is part of a Nationwide Airspace Redesign (NAR)) which requires 'Next Gen' technology. It is part of the FAA's Operational Evolution Plan. All of these initiatives move the industry toward Free Flight. The project was audited by the Inspector General twice with alarming results. The project suffered over the years since it's inception in 1998. Personnel changes, budget management issues, and project management breakdowns plagued the project. They failed to conduct essential studies, failed to involve keep players, failed to document changes, utilized flawed and outdated and incomplete data for modeling and outsourced sensitive information. The project continued towards implementation due to political and industry pressure with a near total lack of transparency. The redesign incorporates controversial actions including the use of restricted airspace, reducing safe distance between the aircraft in flight and on the runways, reducing cruising altitudes over populated areas, intentionally excluding air traffic controllers, pilots, and impacted communities in the planning process, ignoring professional comment put forth by the office of the Inspector General and failing to conduct cost analysis or risk VS. gain studies. These issues notwithstanding, due to intense political pressure, the implementation is rolling out during a staffing crisis at the control tower. Initial changes have begun in 2007 and will implement fully in 2011. The project, which will affect 29 million residents across 5 states, introduces severe noise and air pollution to thousands of communities. Some communities in NJ and NY will have 600 flights a day flying directly over their homes. The environmental and economic consequences of this Project have not been fully researched or discussed with the affected communities by the FAA. Political and industry pressure are sighted as factors in rushing this project into early production. Other factors may include averting pending environmental protection policy changes. This project does not fulfill it's purpose and need. It will not safely expand the capacity of the airspace and it will not reduce flight delay. Significant downsides exist with this ill-conceived project including increase of fuel consumption, overuse of airport facilities, potential national security risks, environmental damages, air quality degradation and noise and air pollution to more communities. The Inspector General of the Department Of Transportation executed an audit of the redesign project in 2003 in response to notice of inefficiencies at the FAA brought forth by members of congress, whistle blowers at the FAA and DOT internally. The public audit details some of the major flaws. The EIS includes data anomalies caused by miscalibration of instrumentation. This was never addressed in the Final EIS and the FAA also refused to produce corrected data.

#### Air travel causes warming --- flight path management can’t solve

FOE ‘9

 (Friends of Earth, 2009 the world's largest grassroots environmental network, “Aviation and global climate change” <http://www.foe.co.uk/resource/reports/aviation_climate_change.pdf> ) IGarcia

Aircraft release more than 600 million tonnes of the world’s major greenhouse gas CO2 into the atmosphere each year. • Aircraft cause about 3.5% of global warming from all human activities. • Aircraft greenhouse emissions will continue to rise and could contribute up to 15% of global warming from all human activities within 50 years. • Nitrogen oxides(NOx) and water vapour have a more significant effect on the climate when emitted at altitude than at ground level. Hence any strategy to reduce aircraft emissions will need to consider other greenhouse gases and not just CO2 alone. • An increase in supersonic aircraft flying could further damage the ozone layer as aircraft emissions of NOx deplete ozone concentrations at high altitudes, where these aircraft would typically fly. • Aircraft vapour trails or contrails, often visible from the ground, can lead to the formation of cirrus clouds. Both contrails and cirrus clouds warm the earth’s surface magnifying the global warming effect of aviation. • The impacts on the global atmosphere from air travel will be concentrated over Europe and the USA where 70-80% of all flights occur. Hence the regional climatic impacts of aircraft emissions over these areas are likely to be greater than predicted by the IPCC report(which used global averages). Most significantly the climate scientists concluded that improvements in aircraft and engine technology and in air traffic management will not offset the projected growth in aircraft emissions. That is, we need to slow the growth in air travel if we want to reduce the growth in aircraft greenhouse gas emissions.

#### Plan increases the number of flights

Kaye ’11 (December 3, 2011, Ken Kaye, is a veteran journalist, having worked more than 30 years as a reporter, editor and columnist at the Sun Sentinel, “Fly faster, safer with new air traffic control plan” <http://articles.sun-sentinel.com/2011-12-03/news/fl-faa-nextgen-20111202_1_air-traffic-faa-projects-faa-estimates>) IGarcia

"We face difficult economic conditions," said Steve Lott, spokesman for Airlines for America, a trade organization that represents the major U.S. carriers. "Without significant modernization, congestion and delays will worsen as traffic increases." At the heart of NextGen is the plan to shift from old-fashioned ground stations to satellites for navigation. Notably, this will allow planes to use GPS to fly directly to airports and make fewer turns while approaching runways. A version of the more efficient approaches already is being used at Miami International Airport. "It's like a continual glide to the runway end," said Paul Fontaine, the FAA's technology development director. "It doesn't imply the engines are shut off." Eventually, the low-power gliding approaches are expected to be approved for all of South Florida's major airports. NextGen will allow planes to fly more precise routes, saving 30 to 100 gallons of fuel and shaving 10 minutes off travel time per flight, according to FAA estimates. Among the other benefits: The program should improve safety by giving pilots a cockpit display of all the air traffic around them, the same display air traffic controllers see. Also through the use of cockpit displays, it should minimize weather delays, which currently cost the airlines about $30 billion a year. Even in poor visibility, the displays would show a pilot the terrain as if it were a sunny day. And NextGen should improve pilot-controller communications through the increased use of "datalink" machines, which work like e-mail and already are installed in many airliners. The devices should ease radio congestion. By the time the program is completed in 2025, at a cost of $15 billion to $22 billion, more planes will be able to take off per hour, more planes will be able to fill the skies and more passengers will reach their destinations without delays, the FAA said. Without NexGen, air travel is doomed to start bogging down as soon as 2015. Despite the down economy, the FAA projects the number of U.S. passengers will increase from 800 million in 2010 to more than 1 billion by 2020.

#### Environment is resilient

Easterbrook 95 (Gregg, Distinguished Fellow – Fullbright Foundation, A Moment on Earth, p. 25)

In the aftermath of events such as Love Canal or the Exxon Valdez oil spill, every reference to the environment is prefaced with the adjective "fragile." "Fragile environment" has become a welded phrase of the modern lexicon, like "aging hippie" or "fugitive financier." But the notion of a fragile environment is profoundly wrong. Individual animals, plants, and people are distressingly fragile. **The environment** that contains them **is** close to **indestructible**. The living environment of Earth has survived ice ages; bombardments of cosmic radiation more deadly than atomic fallout; solar radiation more powerful than the worst-case projection for ozone depletion; thousand-year periods of intense volcanism releasing global air pollution far worse than that made by any factory; reversals of the planet's magnetic poles; the rearrangement of continents; transformation of plains into mountain ranges and of seas into plains; fluctuations of ocean currents and the jet stream; 300-foot vacillations in sea levels; shortening and lengthening of the seasons caused by shifts in the planetary axis; collisions of asteroids and comets bearing far more force than man's nuclear arsenals; and the years without summer that followed these impacts. Yet hearts beat on, and petals unfold still. Were the environment fragile it would have expired many eons before the advent of the industrial affronts of the dreaming ape. **Human assaults** on the environment, though mischievous, **are** **pinpricks** compared to forces of the magnitude nature is **accustomed to resisting**.

#### -- Long time-frame

Kay 1 (Jane, “Study Takes Historical Peek at Plight of Ocean Ecosystems”, San Francisco Chronicle, 7-26, Lexis)

The collapse of ecosystems often occur over a **long period**. In one example, when Aleut hunters killed the Alaskan sea otter about **2,500 years ago**, the population of their natural prey, the sea urchin, grew larger than its normal size. In turn, the urchins grazed down the kelp forests, important habitat for a whole host of ocean life. Then, when fur traders in the 1800s hunted the otters and sea cows almost to extinction, the kelp forests disappeared and didn't start to regenerate until the federal government protected the sea otters in the 20th century. In California, the diversity of spiny lobsters, sheephead fish and abalone kept down the urchin numbers. At present in Alaska, the kelp beds are declining again in areas where killer whales are preying on sea otters. Biologists think the killer whales switched to otters for food because there are fewer seals and sea lions to eat.

#### -- Environment strong and improving – their authors lie

Dutton 1 (Dr. Dennis, Professor of Philosophy – University of Canterbury (New Zealand), “Greener Than You Think”, The Washington Post, 10-21, http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn?pagename=article&node=& contentId=A12789-2001Oct18)

That the human race faces environmental problems is unquestionable. That environmental experts have regularly tried to scare us out of our wits with doomsday chants is also beyond dispute. In the 1960s overpopulation was going to cause massive worldwide famine around 1980. A decade later we were being told the world would be out of oil by the 1990s. This was an especially chilly prospect, since, as Newsweek reported in 1975, we were in a climatic cooling trend that was going to reduce agricultural outputs for the rest of the century, leading possibly to a new Ice Age. Bjorn Lomborg, a young statistics professor and political scientist at the University of Aarhus in Denmark, knows all about the enduring appeal -- for journalists, politicians and the public -- of environmental doomsday tales, having swallowed more than a few himself. In 1997, Lomborg -- a self-described left-winger and former Greenpeace member -- came across an article in Wired magazine about Julian Simon, a University of Maryland economist. Simon claimed that the "litany" of the Green movement -- its fears about overpopulation, animal species dying by the hour, deforestation -- was **hysterical nonsense**, and that the quality of life on the planet was **radically** **improving**. Lomborg was shocked by this, and he returned to Denmark to set about doing the research that would refute Simon. He and his team of academicians discovered something sobering and cheering: In every one of his claims, Simon was correct. Moreover, Lomborg found on close analysis that the factual foundation on which the environmental doomsayers stood was **deeply flawed**: exaggeration, prevarications, white **lies** and even convenient typographical errors had been absorbed unchallenged into the folklore of environmental disaster scenarios.

#### War causes environmental collapse and means the plan won’t be enforced

Adley and Grant 4 (Jessica and Andrea, Sierra Club of Canada, “The Environmental Consequences of War”, 8-24, http://www.sierraclub.ca/national/postings/war-and-environment.html)

Throughout history, war has **invariably resulted** **in environmental destruction**. However, advancements in military technology used by combatants have resulted in increasingly severe environmental impacts. This is well illustrated by the devastation to forests and biodiversity caused by modern warfare. Military machinery and explosives have caused **unprecedented levels of deforestation** and habitat destruction. This has resulted in a serious disruption of ecosystem services, including erosion control, water quality, and food production. A telling example is the destruction of 35% of Cambodia’s intact forests due to two decades of civil conflict. In Vietnam, bombs alone destroyed over 2 million acres of land.[13] These environmental catastrophes are aggravated by the fact that ecological protection and restoration become a **low priority** during and after war. The threat to biodiversity from combat can also be illustrated by the Rwanda genocide of 1994. The risk to the already endangered population of mountain gorillas from the violence was of minimal concern to combatants and victims during the 90-day massacre.[14] The threat to the gorillas increased after the war as thousands of refugees, some displaced for decades, returned to the already overpopulated country. Faced with no space to live, they had little option but to inhabit the forest reserves, home to the gorilla population. As a result of this human crisis, conservation attempts were impeded. Currently, the International Gorilla Programme Group is working with authorities to protect the gorillas and their habitats. This has proven to be a challenging task, given the complexities Rwandan leaders face, including security, education, disease, epidemics, and famine.[15]

### Environment Advantage Answers – Warming

#### CO2 doesn’t cause warming

Chen 10 – Xuefei Chen (People's Daily Online correspondent in Stockholm) “Swedish expert says CO2 is not the main cause of global warming”. 4-22, http://english.peopledaily.com.cn/90001/90777/90853/6959757.html

Dr. Goldberg said that there is an urban effect around heavily populated cities in our world, for example, the gap in temperature between the suburban Stockholm and the city center can often be at least 2 degrees Celsius. And the gap between Beijing city center and Great Wall area can be six degrees Celsius. The urban effect is caused by human's construction, transportation and the density of the housing and population, but this is not a global effect. "You cannot compensate for urban effects because you don't know how much it is, it changes with cloudiness, time of day, sun position over the horizon, wind intensity and direction and winter or summer," Goldberg said. He questioned the accuracy of the measurement in Al Gore's The Inconvenient Truth. He said that in the USA about 900 stations accounting to 78 percent of the total are incorrectly located such as in the parking place or airports near the airplanes or runways where he believes it is definitely hotter than other natural areas such as mountains or rivers. About 90 percent of the places where they measured the temperature are not according to regulations and have an error of 1 to 5 degrees C, which he thinks is very big. The only accurate way to measure temperature is with satellite, Goldberg said. Another thing that matters is that climate scientist must do what they say they do," Goldberg argued. Phil Jones in Hadley Centre said he wouldn't give out the data about his 25 years of work to someone who only wants to find something wrong with it thereby violating the Freedom of Information Act, Goldberg held. How much carbon-dioxide in the atmosphere? How much CO2 is there in the air? Only 0.0387 %, it has neither odor, nor color and is not poisonous. If there isn't CO2, there will not be plant life, therefore, we must have CO2, we need it, Goldberg argued. He said that the average amount of water vapor is 30.000 ppm. So the consequence of that is that 95 percent or even up to 98 percent of the total greenhouse effect is water vapor while only one percent is CO2. The other greenhouse gases are ozone, methane and CFC, etc. Goldberg said even if human beings emit 100 ppm CO2, 98 percent of it will go into the ocean because of the chemical balance between the oceans and the atmosphere. The remaining 2 ppm will be added to the atmosphere which is negligible because there isn't enough oil and gas in the world to generate enough carbon dioxide to change the climate. Over the past 100 years, with an increase of 100 ppm CO2, the earth temperature only increased 0.7 degree. Thus it is not possible for the temperature to increase 2 degrees globally which our politicians want to prevent, Goldberg said. Why? Goldberg explained that the ocean will absorb large amount of CO2. Once it is absorbed by the ocean, it will to some extent become calcium carbonate which is the same thing as limestone. Then the limestone will be building up at the bottom of the oceans. The whole island of Gotland which is the largest island in Sweden is formed of limestone. "It was built up at the bottom of the ocean because the ocean absorbed the CO2 and when saturated it formed limestone sediments at the bottom of the ocean. The CO2 content in the atmosphere has been shrinking continuously. A billion years ago, there was 80 percent CO2 in the atmosphere, now it is 0.038 %. It ‘s been shrinking all the time, it is continuing because of the formations of limestone sediments in the oceans." Goldberg explained. He said that the transport of CO2 is controlled by ocean temperature. For example, one can send CO2 bubbles into a bottle of cold water which is about 5 degrees C, but if one opens the bottle and puts it on the table, the water temperature will increase, and the CO2 will leave the water soon. The same theory, the lakes absorb a lot of CO2 in winter and it releases the CO2 in summer when the temperature reaches 23 to 25 degrees, you won't have much CO2 in the water. Thus this is a natural process and with all the minerals in sea water, the sea water can absorbs 73 times more CO2 than fresh water. "Mount Mauna Loa in Hawaii is the world's largest live volcano which emits a lot of CO2. 87 percent of the data recorded there has to be edited. The data may therefore have been manipulated," Goldberg said. He said that in 1973 there was a big eruption and there were no measurements done for 3 months, but there is no data gap in the diagrams. Why? Asked Goldberg. "Many climate scientists are bluffing in order to please the politicians who want to put a tax on CO2. These scientists live in symbiosis with the politicians. They both depend on each other," Goldberg criticized this. Solar activity decides whether the temperature is up or down Goldberg said that solar activity has increased 3 times according to records from NASA earth observatory. This is something we can't do anything about. "The activity of the sun shows the highest activity ever recorded in 2002. Earlier history of solar activity can be seen from the distribution of isotopes in rocks and biomass which are depending on the solar activity," Goldberg explained. Sun activity heats the sea surface, and the sea releases CO2. Over the past 100 years, 100 ppm CO2 were emitted due to the warming of the sea surface. In the atmosphere, there is 750 gigaton of carbon. In the ocean there is 38.100 gigatons of Carbondioxide. That is 50 times more according to the famous Henry's Law. Henry's law says that 98 percent of CO2 stays in the ocean while about 2 percent stays in the atmosphere. It is estimated that humans today generate about 8 gigaton CO2. Thus we release approx. one percent of CO2 to the atmosphere. The biomass is absorbing 121 gigaton and the oceans 92 gigaton. That means 28 percent of the CO2 in the atmosphere is absorbed each year in a cycle. All the CO2 in the air will be absorbed in less than 5 years, which means if we emit one percent a year, that percent is also included in the absorption. So one can never find more than 4 percent of CO2 in the atmosphere coming from humans," Goldberg explained. Along the equator, the sun is heating the water. When the water is warmer, the water is releasing carbon dioxide (CO2). The colder the water is, the more CO2 it absorbs. And therefore the colder waters around the Arctic and Antarctica will absorb a lot of CO2. There is a huge cycle of CO2. If you take out the CO2 for plants, then the ocean will evaporate more to air. If you emit more, the ocean will take it up. Ocean controls the amount of CO2 in the atmosphere. The sun controls the ocean temperatures which in turn has a strong effect on the climate on earth. "The people of Bangladesh breaths out 75 million tons CO2 per year, Sweden generates 60 million tons per year from all its industrial activities, transports and warming of houses etc. while the people in China breathes out 700-800 million tons per year. What does it mean? It means to reduce the amount of the CO2 will have no effect on our climate at all. You cannot do anything, I mean you cannot stop the sun from coming up tomorrow morning. If we cannot stop the sun from going up in the morning, can we change the CO2 system in the atmosphere? It is self regulated and sun-controlled," Goldberg said.

#### Can’t solve warming --- coal pollution

Mendelson 11 – 4 11/18/2011 Joe Mendelson (serves as NWF's Director of Policy, Climate & Energy Program where he leads a team of legislative and policy professionals to develop and implement solutions to global warming) “Obama Commits to Tackle Carbon Pollution in 2012 from Wildlife Promise”http://blog.nwf.org/2011/11/obama-commits-to-tackle-carbon-pollution-in-2012/

Yesterday, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Administrator Lisa Jackson announced plans for establishing new carbon pollution limits on the nation’s power plants. This is good news. Just last month NWF had voiced serious concerns that these efforts were going to be delayed indefinitely. Significantly, the new schedule gets the Obama Administration back on track to tackle the nation’s biggest source of air pollution that causes climate change. EPA' Administrator Jackson (image emagazine.com) These new rules will utilize section 111 of the Clean Air Act. This provision of law requires EPA to establish federal air pollution standards to control air pollutants from stationary sources (read here coal-fired power plants) which cause or contribute significantly to the air pollution that harms our health and wildlife. The standards are also intended to promote use of the most modern air pollution control technologies so our power plants stay up to date. Let’s just say the sooner we get on with this effort the better. As NWF’s Senior Scientist Amanda Staudt blogs today, a new report by the Nobel Prize winning U.N. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change says carbon pollution induced climate change will make the drought and flooding events that have battered the United States more frequent in years to come. Right now, our nation’s power plants can belch carbon dioxide pollution into our air without any limits. A recent piece in the New York Review of Books by Yale economist William Nordhaus aptly describes why it is urgent that we address this source of carbon pollution: [The] burning coal is very dirty, releasing both conventional pollutants and greenhouse gases. Per unit of energy, coal emits 27 percent more CO2 than oil and 78 percent more CO2 than natural gas. . . . In the aggregate, the emissions of CO2 from coal-fired electricity- generating facilities are the largest single industrial source of greenhouse gas emissions in the United States. They make up one third of all emissions in an industry that constitutes only about one half of one percent of the US economy! Moreover, studies indicate that reducing coal-fired generation is the least expensive way for the US to reduce its carbon emissions in the near term (emphasis added). The new pollution limits will be established into two parts. In January, the administration will propose limits that any new power plant must meet before it can be constructed. NWF expects that the critically important second part of the standards - new carbon pollution limits on the nation’s existing power plants – will be proposed later in the Spring of 2012.

#### No tipping point

McGrath 11 – 4 August 2011. “Arctic 'tipping point' may not be reached” By Matt McGrath (Science reporter, BBC World Service)http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/science-environment-14408930

The team said they had found an indirect method to give a picture of the ice cover dating back 11,000 years Scientists say current concerns over a tipping point in the disappearance of Arctic sea ice may be misplaced. Danish researchers analysed ancient pieces of driftwood in north Greenland which they say is an accurate way to measure the extent of ancient ice loss. Writing in the journal Science, the team found evidence that ice levels were about 50% lower 5,000 years ago. They say changes to wind systems can slow down the rate of melting. They argue, therefore, that a tipping point under current scenarios is unlikely. While modern observations by ship and by satellite give us a very accurate picture of the recent state of the ice, historic information is limited. The ice comes and goes without leaving a permanent record. But a Danish team believes it has found an indirect method that gives a clear picture of the ice loss dating back 11,000 years. Dr Svend Funder from the Natural History Museum of Denmark led several expeditions to inhospitable regions of Northern Greenland. On these frozen shores the Danish team noticed several pieces of ancient driftwood. They concluded that it could be an important method of unlocking the secrets of the ancient ice. "Driftwood cannot float across the water, it has to be ferried across the ocean on ice, and this voyage takes several years, which means that driftwood is actually a signal of multi-year sea ice in the ocean and it is this ice that is at risk at the moment," said Dr Funder. Carbon dating was used to determine the age of the wood. And figuring out its origins also yielded important information. "It's so lovely that drift wood from Siberia is mainly larch and from North America is mainly spruce. So if we see there was more larch or spruce we can see that the wind system had changed and in some periods there was little spruce and in other periods there was lots," he said. Wind delay? As well as the driftwood, the scientists mapped beach ridges for 500km (310 miles) along the coast. This proved that at one time the waves had reached the shore unhindered by the ice. Dr Funder and his team say their data shows a clear connection between temperature and the amount of sea ice. The researchers concluded that for about 3,000 years, during a period called the Holocene Climate Optimum, there was more open water and far less ice than today - probably less than 50% of the minimum Arctic sea ice recorded in 2007. But the researcher says that even with a loss of this size, the sea ice will not reach a point of no return. "I think we can say that with the loss of 50% of the current ice, the tipping point wasn't reached." The idea of an Arctic tipping point has been highlighted by many scientists in recent years. They have argued that when enough ice is lost it could cause a runaway effect with disastrous consequences.

### Environment Advantage Answers – Air Pollution

#### Air quality is improving

Hayward 4 (Steven F., Senior Fellow – Pacific Research Institute, Index of Leading Indicators, http://www.pacificresearch.org/pub/sab/enviro/04\_enviroindex/Enviro\_2004.pdf)

Average vehicle emissions are dropping about 10 percent per year as the fleet turns over to inherently cleaner vehicles, including modern SUVs. · Since 1985, nitrogen oxides (NOX) emissions from cars have dropped 56 percent and volatile organic compounds (VOCs) are down 67 percent, according to the most recent EPA data. · Stories touting an uptick in ozone pollution are based largely on the .weekend effect,. a paradoxical situation in which the weekend drop in NOX emissions, from 10 to 40 percent, causes an increase in ozone levels. · Asthma rates in children under the age of five rose more than 160 percent between 1980 and 1994, while air pollution rates fell from 25 to 80 percent. Was 2003 the year we started losing the battle against ozone smog? That is what you would think if you read the media headlines. .Smog Woes Back on Horizon,. trumpeted an abovethe- fold Los Angeles Times headline in mid-July.1 .It.s One Smoggy Summer,. declared the Associated Press. And USA Today joined the chorus in October with .Smoggy Skies Persist Despite Decade of Work..2 Unfortunately, a reader of these articles will learn very little about what is behind the recent uptick in ozone levels. To the contrary, most media stories convey loads of misinformation. The USA Today story, for example, offers this explanation of stubborn ozone levels: .One likely reason why the smog isn.t lifting: Americans are driving more miles than they did in the 1980s. And they.re driving vehicles that give off more pollution than the cars they drove in the .80s. (emphasis added). USA Today needs a better fact-checking department.

#### -- Global air pollution inevitable

Watson 5 (Traci, Staff Writer – USA Today, “Air Pollution From Other Countries Drifts into USA”, USA Today, 3-13, http://www.usatoday.com/weather/resources/climate/2005-03-13-pollution-\_x.htm)

Americans drive imported cars, wear imported clothes and chug imported beers. Now scientists are discovering another, less welcome import into the USA: air pollution. Mercury from China, dust from Africa, smog from Mexico — all of it drifts freely across U.S. borders and contaminates the air millions of Americans breathe, according to recent research from Harvard University, the University of Washington and many other institutions where scientists are studying air pollution. There are no boundaries in the sky to stop such pollution, no Border Patrol agents to capture it. Pollution wafting into the USA accounts for 30% of the nation's ozone, an important component of smog, says researcher David Parrish of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. By the year 2020, Harvard University's Daniel Jacob says, imported pollution will be the primary factor degrading visibility in our national parks. While the United States is cutting its own emissions, some nations, especially China, are belching out more and more dirty air. As a result, overseas pollution could partly **cancel out** improvements in U.S. air quality that have cost billions of dollars.

**-- No impact**

Schwartz 3 (Joel, Adjunct Scholar – Competitive Enterprise Institute, “Particulate Air Pollution: Weighing the Risks”, April, http://cei.org/pdf/3452.pdf)

Nonetheless, both the Bush Administration and congressional Democrats have proposed sweeping new measures to further crack down on power plant emissions. The Administration’s Clear Skies Initiative and a more stringent Democratic alternative are largely justified by claims that current levels of particulate matter (PM) pose a serious public health threat. Supporters of these bills promise substantial benefits from additional PM reductions.

Nevertheless, the benefit claims for PM reductions rest on a **weak foundation**. EPA based its new annual fine PM (PM2.5) standard on a study known as the American Cancer Society (ACS) study of PM and mortality, which assessed the association between the risk of death between 1982 and 1998 with PM2.5 levels in dozens of American cities. Although the ACS study reported an association between PM and mortality, some odd features of the ACS results suggest that PM is not the culprit. For example, according to the ACS results, PM increased mortality in men, but not women; in those with no more than a high school degree, but not those with at least some college education; in former- smokers, but not current- or never-smokers; and in those who said they were moderately active, but not those who said they were very active or sedentary. These odd variations in the relationship between PM2.5 and mortality seem **biologically implausible**. Even more surprising, the ACS study reported that higher PM2.5 levels were not associated with an increased risk of mortality due to respiratory disease; a surprising finding, given that PM would be expected to exert its effects through the respiratory system. EPA also ignored the results of another epidemiologic study that found no effect of PM2.5 on mortality in a cohort of veterans with high blood pressure, even though this relatively unhealthy cohort should have been more susceptible to the effects of pollution than the general population. The evidence therefore suggests that the existing annual standard for PM2.5 is unnecessarily stringent. Attaining the standard will be expensive, but is unlikely to improve public health.

#### -- Tons of alt causes

Brook 4 (Robert D. M.D., et al, “Air Pollution and the Cardiovascular Disease”, Circulation: Journal of the American Heart Association, 6-1, <http://circ.ahajournals.org/cgi/content/full/109/21/2655#SEC1/>)

A brief description of several individual air pollutants is provided first for background. A complete discussion is beyond the scope of this statement, and interested readers may find a more comprehensive review on this subject elsewhere.26 Particulate Matter Airborne Particulate Matter consists of a heterogeneous mixture of solid and liquid particles suspended in air, continually varying in size and chemical composition in space and time (Figure 1). Primary particles are emitted directly into the atmosphere, such as diesel soot, whereas secondary particles are created through physicochemical transformation of gases, such as nitrate and sulfate formation from gaseous nitric acid and sulfur dioxide (SO2), respectively. The **numerous** natural and anthropogenic sources of PM include motor vehicle emissions, tire fragmentation and resuspension of road dust, power generation and other industrial combustion, smelting and other metal processing, agriculture, construction and demolition activities, residential wood burning, windblown soil, pollens and molds, forest fires and combustion of agricultural debris, volcanic emissions, and sea spray. Although there are thousands of chemicals that have been detected in PM in different locations, some of the more common constituents include nitrates, sulfates, elemental and organic carbon, organic compounds (eg, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons), biological compounds (eg, endotoxin, cell fragments), and a variety of metals (eg, iron, copper, nickel, zinc, and vanadium).

### Environment Advantage Answers – Disease

#### No extinction

Gladwell 99 (Malcolm, The New Republic, July 17 and 24, 1995, excerpted in Epidemics: Opposing Viewpoints, p. 31-32)

Every infectious agent that has ever plagued humanity has had to adapt a specific strategy but every strategy carries a corresponding cost and this makes human counterattack possible. Malaria is vicious and deadly but it relies on mosquitoes to spread from one human to the next, which means that draining swamps and putting up mosquito netting can all hut halt endemic malaria. Smallpox is extraordinarily durable remaining infectious in the environment for years, but its very durability its essential rigidity is what makes it one of the easiest microbes to create a vaccine against. AIDS is almost invariably lethal because it attacks the body at its point of great vulnerability, that is, the immune system, but the fact that it targets blood cells is what makes it so relatively uninfectious. Viruses are not superhuman. I could go on, but the point is obvious. Any microbe capable of wiping us all out would have to be everything at once: as contagious as flue, as durable as the cold, as lethal as Ebola, as stealthy as HIV and so doggedly resistant to mutation that it would stay deadly over the course of a long epidemic. But viruses are not, well, superhuman. They cannot do everything at once. It is one of the ironies of the analysis of alarmists such as Preston that they are all too willing to point out the limitations of human beings, but they neglect to point out the **limitations** of microscopic life forms.

#### -- Disease inevitable

Sky News 8 (“Warning Over Deadly New Diseases”, 7-21, http://news.sky.com/skynews/Home/Health/New-Disease-Emerges-Every-Year-Pandemic-Outbreak-May-Not-Be-Stopped/Article/200807315047567)

In a highly critical new report, the committee said there was an "urgent need" for a better global surveillance system to identify diseases before they infect large numbers of people. It noted that three-quarters of newly-emerging human infections come from animals - but found many are only detected once they have made humans ill. Experts estimate a devastating pandemic outbreak of a new disease such as SARS or the H5N1 strain of flu could claim anything between two and 50 million lives. In evidence to the House of Lords Intergovernmental Organisations Committee inquiry, the Government said there had been no pandemic disease outbreaks since 1968. However, it warned another pandemic outbreak was "inevitable". Committee chairman Lord Soley said: "The last 100 years have seen great advances in public health and disease control through the world, but globalisation and changes in lifestyles are giving rise to new infections and providing opportunities for them to spread rapidly throughout the world.

#### -- Burn out stops disease

Lederberg 99 (Joshua, Professor of Genetics – Stanford University School of Medicine, Epidemic The World of Infectious Disease, p. 13)

The toll of the fourteenth-century plague, the "Black Death," was closer to one third. If the bugs' potential to develop adaptations that could kill us off were the whole story, we would not be here. However, with very rare exceptions, our microbial adversaries have a **shared interest** in our survival. Almost any pathogen comes to a **dead end** when we die; it first has to communicate itself to another host in order to survive. So historically, the really severe host- pathogen interactions have resulted in a **wipeout** of **both** host and pathogen. We humans are still here because, so far, the pathogens that have attacked us have willy-nilly had an interest in our survival. This is a very delicate balance, and it is easily disturbed, often in the wake of large-scale ecological upsets.

#### -- Humans will adapt

Gladwell 95 (Malcolm, The New Republic, July 17, Excerpted in Epidemics: Opposing Viewpoints, p. 29)

In Plagues and Peoples, which appeared in 1977. William MeNeill pointed out that…while man’s efforts to “remodel” his environment are sometimes a source of new disease. They are seldom a source of serious epidemic disease. Quite the opposite. As humans and new microorganisms interact, they begin to accommodate each other. Human populations slowly build up resistance to circulating infections. What were once virulent infections, such as syphilis become attenuated. Over time, diseases of adults, such as measles and chicken pox, become limited to children, whose immune systems are still naïve.

#### -- Self-interest means no extinction

MacPhee and Marx 98 (Ross, American Museum of Natural History and Aaron Diamond, AIDS Research Facility and Tulane University, “How Did Hyperdisease Cause Extinctions?”, http://www.amnh.org/science/biodiversity/extinction/Day1/disease/Bit2.html)

It is well known that lethal diseases can have a profound effect on species' population size and structure. However, it is generally accepted that the principal populational effects of disease are acute--that is, **short-term**. In other words, although a species many suffer substantial loss from the effects of a given highly infectious disease at a given time, the facts indicate that natural populations tend to **bounce back** after the period of high losses. Thus, disease as a primary cause of extinction seems **implausible**. However, this is the normal case, where the disease-provoking pathogen and its host have had a long relationship. Ordinarily, it is not in the pathogens interest to rapidly kill off large numbers of individuals in its host species, because that might imperil its own survival. Disease theorists long ago expressed the idea that pathogens tend to evolve toward a "benign" state of affairs with their hosts, which means in practice that they continue to infect, but tend **not** to **kill** (or at least not rapidly). A very good reason for suspecting this to be an accurate view of pathogen-host relationships is that individuals with few or no genetic defenses against a particular pathogen will be maintained within the host population, thus ensuring the pathogen's ultimate survival.

### Environment Advantage Answers – Ozone

#### Ozone stable – and no impact

Lieberman 7 (Ben, Senior Policy Analyst – Heritage Foundation, “Ozone: The Hole Truth”, The Washington Times, 9-19, Lexis)

Environmentalists have made many apocalyptic predictions over the last several decades. Virtually none has come to pass. Yet each time, the greens and their political allies proclaim victory, arguing their preventive prescriptions averted disaster. Such is the case with the 1987 Montreal Protocol On Substances That Deplete The Ozone Layer (Montreal Protocol). The lurid predictions of ozone depletion-induced skin cancer epidemics, ecosystem destruction and others haven't come true, for which Montreal Protocol proponents congratulate themselves. But in retrospect, the evidence shows ozone depletion was an exaggerated threat in the first place. As the treaty parties return to Montreal for their 20th anniversary meeting it should be cause for reflection, not celebration, especially for those who hope to repeat this "success story" in the context of global warming. The treaty came about over legitimate but overstated concerns that chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs, a then-widely used class of refrigerants) and other compounds were rising to the stratosphere and destroying ozone molecules. These molecules, collectively known as the ozone layer, shield the Earth from excessive ultraviolet-B radiation (UVB) from the sun. The Montreal Protocol's provisions were tightened in 1990 and again in 1992, culminating with a CFC ban in most developed nations by 1996. So what do we know now? As far as ozone depletion is concerned, the thinning of the ozone layer that occurred throughout the 1980s apparently stopped in the early 1990s, too soon to credit the Montreal Protocol. A 1998 World Meteorological Organization (WMO) report said: "Since 1991, the linear [downward] trend observed during the 1980s has not continued, but rather total column ozone has been almost **constant**." However, the same report noted that the stratospheric concentrations of the offending compounds were still increasing through 1998. This lends credence to the skeptical view, widely derided at the time of the Montreal Protocol, that natural variations better explain the fluctuations in the global ozone layer. More importantly, the feared increase in ground level UVB radiation has also failed to materialize. Keep in mind that ozone depletion, in and of itself, doesn't really harm human health or the environment. It was the concern that an eroded ozone layer will allow more of the sun's damaging UVB rays to reach the Earth that led to the Montreal Protocol. But WMO concedes no statistically significant long-term trends have been detected, noting earlier this year that "outside the polar regions, ozone depletion has been relatively small, hence, in many places, increases in UV due to this depletion are difficult to separate from the increases caused by other factors, such as changes in cloud and aerosol." In short, the impact of ozone depletion on UVB over populated regions is so small it's hard to detect. Needless to say, if UVB hasn't gone up, then the fears of increased UVB-induced harm are unfounded. Indeed, the much-hyped acceleration in skin cancer rates hasn't been documented. U.S. National Cancer Institute statistics show malignant melanoma incidence and mortality, which had been undergoing a long-term increase that predates ozone depletion, has actually been leveling off during the putative ozone crisis. Further, no ecosystem or species was ever shown to be seriously harmed by ozone depletion. This is true even in Antarctica, where the largest seasonal ozone losses, the so-called Antarctic ozone hole, occur annually. Also forgotten is a long list of truly ridiculous claims, such as the one from Al Gore's 1992 book "Earth in the Balance" that, thanks to the Antarctic ozone hole, "hunters now report finding blind rabbits; fisherman catch blind salmon."

#### Natural variation determines ozone

Carnacchio 97 (CJ, Staff – The Review, “The Sky Falls on Environmental Myths”, Michigan Review, 10-8, http://www.umich.edu/~mrev/archives/1997/10-8-97/environment.htm)

Myth #2: The Hole in the Ozone Layer: Contrary to the environmentalists' claims, there is no permanent hole in the ozone layer and no ozone shortage. Ozone is constantly created and destroyed. The interaction of ultraviolet radiation with oxygen molecules is what produces ozone. In the stratosphere, 10 to 40 kilometers above the earth's surface, several tons of ozone are produced every second. The amount of ozone present at any one time is influenced by many factors. For example, the amount of ultraviolet radiation reaching the stratosphere (and ultimately producing ozone) depends upon latitude, solar cycle, and season. Concentrations of ozone may differ drastically from one day to the next, sometimes by as much as 50 percent, depending on the weather. Ozone holes are **natural reactions** to these ultraviolet light variations. Ozone levels can also be affected by the amount of volcanic matter in the stratosphere. Each volcanic eruption emits roughly a thousand times the amount of ozone-depleting chemicals than all the CFCs man has ever produced. The ozone hole that appeared over Antarctica and caused all the panic is a natural and annual phenomena. The annual ozone hole was first measured in 1956-57, long before the ozone-destroying CFCs were in common use. The hole appears at the end of the dark, cold Antarctic winter, lasts about three to five weeks, and then disappears. There is no overall or permanent depletion of the ozone layer.

## \*\*\* OFF-CASE LINKS

### Politics Links

#### Loan guarantees for NextGen are unpopular --- even if the program has bipartisan support

Langston 11 (Sara M., Reporter – Aviation Week, “Congressman Introduces Clause To Fund Aviation's Equipage Of Nextgen”, Legal News Dictionary, 2-18, http://law.hukuki.net/congressman-introduces-clause-to-fund-aviations-equipage-of-nextgen.htm)

Rep. Dan Lipinski (D-Ill.) is proposing to add a clause to the FAA reauthorization bill that would provide grants and loan guarantees for aircraft operators to equip for the NextGen program. Lipinski is one of the minority members of the House Transportation &amp; Infrastructure Committee. He has not said how he will attempt to include his proposal in the reauthorization bill that will soon be introduced by Committee Chairman John Mica (R-Fla.). Unless Mica decides to incorporate it, the proposal will likely be offered as an amendment. While there is broad bipartisan support for NextGen, authorizing new spending could be a tough sell in the House. Under the proposal, the FAA would be authorized to issue grants of up to 20% of the cost of equipping aircraft for automatic dependent surveillance-broadcast (ADS-B). The proposal specifies ADS-B "out," which will be used to improve surveillance for controllers. A second part of the proposal would authorize loan guarantees of up to 80% of equipage costs. Under certain conditions, the remaining 20% could be met by the direct grant.

#### ATC reform causes Congressional backlash

Poole 10 (Robert W. Jr., Director of Transportation Policy and Searle Freedom Trust Transportation Fellow – Reason Foundation, and Chris Edwards, Director of Tax Policy Studies – Cato Institute, “Airports and Air Traffic Control”, June, http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/airports-atc)

Political Constraints. A third impediment to ATC reform is political. The redesign of the ATC system foreseen in NextGen could potentially deliver major cost savings and greatly expand ATC capacity. However, realizing those gains would require retirement of large numbers of costly radars and other ground-based navigation aids and the consolidation of ATC facilities. One current proposal would replace 21 en route centers and 171 terminal radar approach control (TRACON) facilities with just 35 air traffic service hubs in a redesign of U.S. airspace.28 Physical control towers located at many smaller airports would gradually be phased out as "virtual tower" functions are built into the new super-hubs.

However, Congress tends to resist consolidating ATC facilities because of concerns about job losses and the like, which is similar to the political resistance to closing post offices and military bases. A major 1982 proposal for consolidating ATC facilities was quietly dropped after it became clear that getting it through Congress would be very difficult. Similarly, Congress came extremely close to forbidding the FAA's recent success in outsourcing its Flight Service Station system, which involved reducing the system from 58 facilities to 20. The prohibition was defeated only by a credible veto threat from the White House. In sum, as long as ATC remains government-owned and controlled, making the needed reforms to improve efficiency and implement NextGen will be very difficult.

#### Economic climate makes funding NextGen a fight

Pyper 12 (Julia, Reporter – Energy & Environment Daily, “Industry Says Efficient Air Traffic Program Still Needs More Political Support”, ClimateWire, 4-13, Lexis)

A system designed to make air transport faster, safer and more fuel efficient still lacks the political backing it needs to really take off, industry leaders said yesterday at the 11th Annual Aviation Summit. Congress passed a Federal Aviation Administration reauthorization bill earlier this year after 23 extensions, which increased authorized spending to develop the Next Generation Air Transportation System, or NextGen. But at a time of steep budget cuts and slow regulatory action, air carriers and their supporting industries are concerned about how the program will roll out. "We haven't made as much progress on capacity and efficiency as we need to make, and this isn't as much about the technology as it is about the political alignment and the will to implement it," said Dennis Muilenburg, president and CEO of Boeing's Defense, Space & Security division. NextGen will make air transport more efficient and less carbon-polluting by integrating new and existing technologies, including satellite navigation and advanced digital communications. FAA estimates NextGen will reduce delays by 38 percent compared to the status quo by 2020 and achieve 14 million metric tons in cumulative reductions of carbon dioxide emissions by the end of the decade. To realize these benefits, the U.S. government needs to provide incentives for airports and airlines to become NextGen-equipped and encourage the adoption of existing technologies that fit with the program, said Muilenburg. Some big commitments For American Airlines, the transition to NextGen "absolutely cannot happen fast enough," said Cpt. Brian Will, the airline's director of airspace modernization and advanced technologies. American has already invested $1.4 billion in its NextGen programs and upgraded the navigation and surveillance technology on hundreds of planes. But FAA has repeatedly delayed the technology certification process. This makes the upgrades unusable, said Will. The road map to mandate many new technologies now lies in the 2020 to 2025 time frame, he said. "For the amount of money that we've put into equipage, we're not seeing the benefits accrue at a rapid enough pace to justify the investment," he said. NextGen is a "transformational" project, said Duane Woerth, U.S. ambassador to the Council of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), the U.N. agency that handles global aviation matters. "When, at long last, NextGen becomes fully operational, it will feel like a chapter from the big bang theory of evolution of aviation policy," he said. A $40B price tag NextGen is made up a multiple programs that must fit together like a puzzle but also need to be put into place in the right order. Woerth added that ICAO is currently working to integrate U.S. technologies with similar systems being developed in Europe and Japan to ensure they are harmonized. To keep up the momentum on NextGen, David Barger, president and CEO of JetBlue Airways Corp., said the airline industry needs to keep selling the benefits of the system to policymakers and the public. "I would like to see NextGen used in the presidential debate. Someone use it, please. Because it really is significant when it comes to energy, the environment and the economy," he said. Clayton Jones, president and CEO of Rockwell Collins, a leading company in aviation electronics, said the price tag on NextGen is about $40 billion over 15 years. Half of that amount is needed for airplane equipage and the other half is needed to upgrade ground systems. "The problem now is getting $40 billion in this economic climate, and I just don't have confidence in that," Jones said.

#### Airlines don’t support the plan

Michaels 11 (Dave, Reporter – Dallas Morning News, “Private Fund Bids to Supply Costly Air-Traffic Gear to Airlines”, The Dallas Morning News (Texas), 6-8, Lexis)

Loan guarantees are an alternative to grant funding that could be acceptable to both parties, analysts say. Sen. Jay Rockefeller, chairman of the Senate Commerce, Science and Transportation Committee, supports financial incentives for carriers' NextGen needs, a Senate aide said.

"Obviously loan guarantees can cost taxpayers nothing if the underlying investment is sound," said Sen. Kay Bailey Hutchison, R-Texas, the top Republican on the transportation panel. "I would want to look at the risks and rewards to taxpayers in this proposal."

Airlines' take

But airlines aren't rushing to Capitol Hill to lobby for it. Some airlines, including Fort Worth-based American Airlines, say the government should fund the equipment because it is public infrastructure.

"We continue to advocate for an infusion of government infrastructure funding to jump-start the modernization of the air traffic control system," said American Airlines spokeswoman Andrea Huguely.

#### Congress doesn’t like the plan- funding disputes, program delays and costs overruns

Poole 4/19 (April 19, 2012, Robert Poole, Robert Poole is director of transportation policy and Searle Freedom Trust Transportation Fellow at Reason Foundation. Poole, an MIT-trained engineer, has advised the Ronald Reagan, the George H.W. Bush, the Clinton, and the George W. Bush administrations. “Air Traffic Control Reform News #92” <http://reason.org/news/show/1012825.html> )IGarcia

An even larger failing is that the report seems to consider the main problem with NextGen to be lack of funding. The author's PowerPoint from the April 4th event rightly notes GAO and Inspector General reports citing a long and continuing history of FAA cost overruns and program delays. A growing number of aviation stakeholders express concern that simply providing more funding, without more-fundamental reforms, would amount to "feeding the beast." They have concluded that the underlying problem is that the governance of the ATC system is poorly matched to the task. The FAA's Air Traffic Organization ought to be focused directly on meeting the needs of its aviation customers. Instead, its real customer is Congress, which provides its funding and to which it must be responsive.

#### The plan is a political football

**McGee ’11** (10/26/2011, Bill McGee, a contributing editor to Consumer Reports and the former editor of Consumer Reports Travel Letter, is an FAA-licensed aircraft dispatcher who worked in airline operations and management for several years. “Five ways to improve air travel (that government won't act on)” <http://travel.usatoday.com/experts/mcgee/story/2011-10-26/Five-ways-to-improve-air-travel-that-government-wont-act-on/50925900/1> ) IGarcia

Now consider that the United States, for all its power and wealth, is dependent upon an outdated air traffic control network that relies on radar rather than satellite-based technology. And further consider that the solution has been a political football, and the punting has continued for years now, ever since a new methodology was proposed in 2003. Benefits abound It's called the Next Generation Air Transportation System - better known as NextGen -- and by employing satellite and data technologies it's designed to reduce flight delays 35% by 2018. The Federal Aviation Administration site provides more background information—in both text and video formats—than most air travelers would ever need. For consumers, the simple fact is the FAA promises that modernizing the nation's antiquated air traffic control system would bring immediate and lasting advantages. Here are the top five benefits for air travelers: 1. A more efficient airline network with fewer flight delays, both in the air and on the ground 2. Fewer flight cancellations, providing passengers with savings in both money and time 3. Less time en route from Point A to Point B, aided by more direct flight paths, thus reversing the "padded flight times" trend I wrote about here in 2009 4. An enhanced level of safety "to better predict risks and then identify and resolve hazards" 5. Fuel savings and a reduction in aviation's carbon footprint, not just by lowering fuel emissions but also by curbing noise What's more, these efficiencies and economic benefits would also flow to airlines, corporate customers and communities as well, thereby strengthening the nation's economy. So the only pressing question concerning NextGen would seem to be: What's holding it up? The answer, of course, is funding, and neither the U.S. Government nor the airline industry has quite resolved this issue. In the meantime, the traveling public keeps waiting for NextGen. Footing the bills Support for NextGen crosses party lines and transcends political ideologies. As far back as 1997, Vice President Al Gore was calling for air traffic control modernization that would "make the notion of 'highway lanes in the sky' as obsolete as the bonfires that used to guide early fliers." The Reason Foundation points out that "the technology the (FAA) uses to navigate $200 million jets is less advanced than the GPS technology drivers use to navigate $20,000 cars." A key roadblock has been Congress. Critics on both sides of the aisle complain that the lack of long-term and sustained funding for the FAA is crippling big-picture capital improvement projects such as NextGen. Last summer, Congressional bickering prevented an extension of funding for an FAA Reauthorization bill and led to a temporary "shutdown" of non-essential FAA funding. That incident underscored that the FAA has been working without a long-term reauthorization since 2007, and has been temporarily funded more than 20 times in five years.

### Spending Links

#### The plan costs 14 billion

Dillingham, 05-06-2008, Gerald L. Dillingham, Ph.D. Director, Physical Infrastructure Issues, “NextGen and Research and Development Are Keys to Reducing Emissions and Their Impact on Health and Climate”, http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d08706t.pdf

Most U.S. airlines have stated that they plan to invest in aircraft and technologies that can increase fuel efficiency and lower emissions, but in the near term, integrating new aircraft into the fleet, or retrofitting aircraft with technologies that can improve their operational efficiency, poses financial challenges to the airline industry. Aircraft have an average lifespan of about 30 years, and the airlines can take almost that entire period to pay for an aircraft. The current fleet is, on average, about half as many years old—11 years for wide-body aircraft, and 14 years for narrow-body aircraft—and therefore is expected to be in operation for many years to come. In addition, the financial pressures facing many airlines make it difficult for them to upgrade their fleets with new, state-of-the-art aircraft, such as the Boeing 787 and Airbus A380, which are quieter and more fuel efficient, emitting lower levels of greenhouse gases.36 Currently, U.S. carriers have placed a small proportion (40, or less than 6 percent) of the over 700 orders that Boeing officials say the company has received for its 787 model. Furthermore, no U.S. carriers have placed orders for the new Airbus 380. These financial pressures also limit the airlines’ ability to equip new and existing aircraft with NextGen technologies such as ADS-B that can enable more efficient approaches and descents, resulting in lower emissions levels. FAA estimates that it will cost the industry about $14 billion to equip aircraft to take full advantage of NextGen.

#### Plan costs at least $15-$22 Billion to implement

JPDO 6

(Joint Planning and Development Office, 2006, Congress created the Joint Planning and Development Office (JPDO) to manage the partnerships designed to bring NextGen online. These partnerships include private-sector organizations, academia, and the following government departments and agencies: Department of Transportation (DOT) Department of Commerce (DOC) Department of Defense (DOD) Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI) – (Ex Officio), “Next Generation Air Transportation In Brief” <http://www.jpdo.gov/library/in_Brief_2006.pdf>) MJA

A natural question is, how much is NextGen going to cost? This is important in making budget and programmatic decisions and in evaluating investments in the NextGen portfolio. In 2006, JPDO delivered the initial cost estimates for NextGen. The expected short-term cost of NextGen through 2012 is estimated at $4.6 billion. This estimate is based on the expected cost of identified programs and research activities. These costs are included in current budgets. Mid- and long-term cost estimates were also developed based on the current five-year picture. Total federal spending will range from $8-$10 billion through 2017, and $15-$22 billion through 2025. Cost estimates for equipping aircraft with NextGen technologies range between $14-$20 billion through 2025. Estimates vary depending on the bundling of the technologies and the pace at which the current commercial aircraft fleet is replaced.

#### NextGen is already $300+ million over budget

Hill 11

(Sad Hill News,10.15.11,Sad Hill News is an alternative broadcast company devoted to analyzing current events that will impact the future of our country. Sad Hill News extracts truth from political expediency and media sensationalism, than networks a factual stronghold against deception. “Big Government’s $20 Billion ‘NextGen’ Air Traffic System Already $300 Million Over Budget” <http://sadhillnews.com/2011/10/15/big-governments-20-billion-nextgen-air-traffic-system-already-300-million-over-budget>) MJA

Not sure what’s more surprising. That big government will only spend $20+ billion on another iffy transportation project that is already $300+ million over budget (just in software), or that government lovin’ NPR actually published this article – albeit quietly. No doubt thousands of metro hippies are rushing to ‘occupy’ Congress and the White House over this financial boondoggle… (sound of one cricket chirping). Big Government’s $20 Billion ‘NextGen’ Air Traffic System (NPR) The government is trying to modernize the nation’s air traffic control system, but cost overruns, software problems and management concerns are making some wonder whether the so-called “Next Generation” system may take another generation to complete. The radar screens in the nation’s aircraft control towers are based on technology dating to World War II. Many of the routes airliners fly were laid out at a time pilots followed bonfires for navigation at night. The promise of NextGen, as explained in a video on the Federal Aviation Administration’s website, is to bring all that into the 21st century. “You will appreciate the increased safety, environmental benefits and reduced delays as the Next Generation Air Transportation System is adopted,” the video says. What sounds so whizzbang in the video isn’t really all that different from the satellite-based GPS navigation systems many Americans have in their cars, but adopting that technology to the airline industry has been a challenge. The Transportation Department’s inspector general reported that one of the key software components of the system is running more than $300 million over budget and might not be fully phased in for another five years. ~snip~ Steve Lott with the Air Transport Association says the airline industry wants the FAA to allow more use of the advanced navigation procedure, for which many aircraft are now equipped. The deputy administrator of the FAA, Michael Huerta, told a congressional panel recently the agency is working on making that happen. “In the year ahead, what we really want to do is focus on how can we improve the quality of these procedures, and how can we see the very real benefits associated with reduced fuel consumption, reduced time and corresponding environmental benefits as well,” he says. But Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood says until Congress approves a long-term bill for the FAA, the NextGen program will remain in a holding pattern. “We’re stuck in mid-air because of the fact that Congress won’t pass an FAA bill. As soon as they pass a bill, we’ve got a big, bold vision for Next Generation technology,” he says. The government’s share of the NextGen program is estimated to be more than $20 billion. That’s another big concern of its supporters — coming up with that cash at the same time the government is desperately looking for ways to cut spending.

#### Plan is at least 20 billion

Reed ‘9 (4/21/2009, Dan Reed, Senior Writer at USA Today, “Airline leaders shift focus on air traffic control replacement” <http://www.usatoday.com/travel/news/2009-04-20-nextgen-air-traffic-control_N.htm?csp=34>) IGarcia

So now the industry's leaders are trying to make quick funding of the long-discussed Next Generation, or NextGen, air traffic control program a priority in the budget battle in Washington. Their message: Planes need to fly in straight lines, guided by satellites, rather than taking longer, twisting routes over the current network of ground-based navigational radio beacon and radar sites that controls flights. Doing so, the industry claims, would save the USA's economy more than $40 billion a year through fuel and labor cost savings for the airlines and time savings for the 740 million fliers a year. The savings, they claim, could begin showing up by 2012, maybe sooner, if the administration and Congress start providing the $20 billion needed to finally build a system that everyone agrees would be more efficient. United Airlines CEO Glenn Tilton launched the airlines' lobbying effort on March 27 at an industry gathering in Phoenix. There, Tilton, who is chairman this year of the Air Transport Association, the industry's big trade group, said the new system has "been too long coming" and the airlines "are growing impatient" with Washington's dithering on funding a project that has been discussed for a decade but has been slow to roll out. Its deployment has been caught in ongoing concerns over how to pay for a system that will cost the government up to $20 billion and the airlines $20 billion for new equipment and training. Some airlines have spent money upgrading their planes to be ready for NextGen, but funding it has been caught in Washington disputes over whether to raise fuel taxes, taxes on tickets or impose takeoff fees.

### General Aviation DA Link

#### NextGen crushes general aviation

Spence 12 (Charles, Washington D.C. Correspondent – General Aviation News, “Could NextGen Ground GA?”, General Aviation News, 4-10, http://www.generalaviationnews.com/2012/04/10/could-nextgen-ground-ga/)

When good developments are made, most people are delighted and few consider the secondary effects. These, however, are often significant. Take the unintended consequences of NextGen.

It has been said a secondary effect of the development of the cheap transistor radio was important in bringing turmoil in the Middle East. Prior to that development, many residents of some nations in that region could not read and lived in unconnected tribes. The cheap radio made widespread communication possible, enabling unification of tribes into stronger governments.

What does this have to do with aviation? Let’s look at the Next Generation Air Transportation System (NextGen). Among the many alleged advantages, NextGen will speed traffic, reduce travel routes, and allow less distances separating flights. These will be needed to safely and more efficiently handle increased air traffic.

Forecasts from the FAA expect revenue passenger miles to increase for U.S. airlines from 814.6 billion in 2011 to 1.57 trillion in 2032. The air carrier fleet, including cargo carriers, is forecast to grow from 7,185 aircraft in 2011 to 9,853 in 2032. The number of GA aircraft is expected to increase from 222,520 in 2011 to 253,205 in 2032.

One of the secondary effects of this growth will be: Where are we going to put all these airplanes on the ground?

By 2015, FAA information indicates that with planned improvements, six major airports will need more capacity. Without these planned improvements, 18 will need more capacity. In some locations not only the current airports need added capacity but so, too, do the entire metropolitan areas. The FAA lists seven metropolitan areas that will need increased capacity. Even with planned improvements at six airports in these areas, four metropolitan areas will still need additional capacity. These constraints are expected in just three years.

By 2025, 14 airports and metropolitan areas need additional capacity — and unless there are on-going improvements, 27 airports and metropolitan areas will need improvements and additional capacity.

Building airports or improving them is a long, tedious affair. In the past 30 years fewer than five major airports have been built in the United States (Denver, Dallas/Fort Worth, O’Hare, and Austin). There have been a few smaller airports built, but many have closed.

Years are required to gain community support for an airport and many more years for construction. Public opposition, environmental issues, funding, and dealing with real estate developers are a few of the issues that must be settled before actual construction can begin.

This needed additional capacity is primarily at major airports in metropolitan areas. Why should this concern general aviation? Here, again, secondary effect might come into play. If there is not enough capacity to accommodate aircraft, there is little question about what segment of flight will get restricted. These restrictions could be added fees, regulations for new equipment, denial of use, limited hours, restricted numbers, or any other type of restraint government minds can conceive. Limited capacity is not limited to airports only, but to the airspace around them and the air traffic management system.

Reaching capacity maximums at metropolitan areas can have a ripple effect to even the smallest GA facility. Use of a personal or charter aircraft will have reduced value if it cannot be used where and when it is wanted or needed.

America’s highway system was in similar difficulties 60 years ago. Highways were two-lane concrete or asphalt strips and interstate routes went through major cities, not around them. President Dwight Eisenhower saw the problem. So did William Randolph Hearst, Jr.

### Fuel Taxes CP

#### Text: The United States federal government should implement fuel taxes on all aviation industries that travel in and out of the Unites States. The United States federal government should also charge an emissions levy on all aviation industries inside of the United States.

#### Counterplan solves a better internal link to warming. 2 reasons-

#### Fuel taxes encourages more efficient aircraft

FOE ‘9

(Friends of Earth, 2009, the world's largest grassroots environmental network, “Aviation and global climate change” <http://www.foe.co.uk/resource/reports/aviation_climate_change.pdf>) IGarcia

Fuel taxes - An aviation fuel tax would encourage more efficient aircraft by taxing fuel consumption. According to the International Air Transport Association, fuel makes up less than 15 % of the cost of flying so there is little incentive for airlines to invest in more efficient aircraft. Unlike an emissions trading scheme, which will take years to develop, an aviation fuel tax could be implemented relatively quickly by removing the fuel tax exemption from existing bilateral air service agreements. Ideally this should happen at a global level but it could begin at an EU wide level if a global agreement couldn’t be reached quickly enough.

#### An emissions levy would directly lower emissions

FOE ‘9

(Friends of Earth, 2009 the world's largest grassroots environmental network, “Aviation and global climate change” <http://www.foe.co.uk/resource/reports/aviation_climate_change.pdf>) IGarcia

***Emissions levy*** - an alternative way to make airlines pay for their pollution is through a charge or tax on aircraft emissions. The European Union has suggested an environmental charge(levy) on aircraft emissions could be implemented on a European wide basis if no action is taken internationally to reduce aircraft emissions (EU Communication on Air Transport and the Environment IP/99/925). The emissions levy has advantages over a fuel tax in that it would directly tax emissions and not just fuel consumption. It would also be easier to introduce a levy as bilateral air service agreements don’t prevent levies on emissions, unlike fuel taxes. An aviation tax or emissions levy is necessary as • airlines should pay for the pollution they cause just like other transport operators • it would encourage the development of more efficient and less polluting aircraft • it would help reduce demand for air travel • it would be consistent with the UK obligations to reduce greenhouse gas emissions • it would much easier to implement then emissions trading permits (see below)

#### Alternative fuel options for plains are viable- planes now can redueup to 40% of emissions using recycled cooking oil

Natt Garun (Journalist, Writer for Buisness Insider, and Gizmodo) “Air Canada conducted its first flight using 50 percent cooking oil biofuel” June 20, 2012 http://www.digitaltrends.com/green-technology/air-canada-conducted-its-first-flight-using-50-percent-cooking-oil-biofuel/

If your future flights begin to smell like there are french fries cooking in the back room, don’t be alarmed. The trend in used cooking oil as biofuel is rising, and yesterday, Air Canada became the first airline to conduct a flight using a 50/50 part recycled oil and regular fuel to power an Airbus A319. With the recycled biofuel mixture, the flight, departing from Toronto to Mexico, was expected to generate at least 40 percent fewer emissions than regular fuel. Other measures to help derive to the 40 percent savings number include reduced thrust during take-off, adjusted air conditioning, and optimized cruising, climbing, and descending speeds. From what we can assess, Air Canada flight AC991 departed Toronto and arrived at Mexico City without any problems, landing just three minutes after scheduled time despite the apparent rainy weather. “[Yesterday's] flight with Air Canada proves that the aviation industry is in a strong position to reduce emissions,” said Fabrice Brégier, Airbus President and CEO. “To make this a day-to-day commercial reality, it requires now a political will to foster incentives to scale up the use of sustainable biofuels and to accelerate the modernization of the air-traffic-management system. We need a clear endorsement by governments and all aviation stakeholders to venture beyond today’s limitations.” Air Canada aims to continue with its movement toward alternative fuel by expanding another green flight option for its Canada to Rio de Janeiro route. All parties involved with making the flight happened ensure the used cooking oil biofuel mixture has been recertified under normal jet fuel standards, therefore making it safe to power an average aircraft’s engine. This alternative fuel option may not be a foolproof way to reduce carbon emissions, but it is a big step toward greener technology since it will be impossible to stop people from traveling by air. “Air Canada fully accepts its responsibility to reduce its footprint and our first flight using biofuel tangibly demonstrates our ongoing commitment to the environment,” said Duncan Dee, Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer at Air Canada. “Since 1990 our airline has become 30 percent more fuel efficient.” While the Air Canada flight proves to have successfully tested one of the largest recycled cooking oil biofuel blends to date, it certainly isn’t the first of its kind. Last November, Alaska Airlines also attempted its own alternative fuel flight, using a 20 percent cooking oil fuel mixture to power 75 flights. While the total impact of both Alaska Airlines and Air Canada may seem small, these successful runs could mean major airlines switching to greener diesel in the near future. It will also be interesting to see if scientists will ever find a way to make a 100 percent recycled biofuel blend safe and usable.

## \*\*\* PRIVATIZATION CP

### Private Sector CP – 1NC

#### Text – The United States Federal Government should organizationally reform air traffic control, making it self-supporting and managed by commercial operators.

#### Privatization solves safety, congestion, and efficiency better --- federal bureaucracy dooms the plan

Poole 10 (Robert W. Jr., Director of Transportation Policy and Searle Freedom Trust Transportation Fellow – Reason Foundation, and Chris Edwards, Director of Tax Policy Studies – Cato Institute, “Airports and Air Traffic Control”, June, http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/airports-atc)

Commercializing Air Traffic Control

The way to address all three of these organizational problems is to take the ATC system out of the federal budget process and make it a self-supporting entity, funded directly by its customers. Variants of this commercialization approach have been recommended by a series of federal studies and commissions over the past 15 years.

As part of Vice President Al Gore's efforts at "reinventing government" in the 1990s, for example, the Clinton administration proposed turning the ATC system into a separate, self-funded, nonprofit government corporation within the Department of Transportation. The 1997 National Civil Aviation Review Commission, which was chaired by Norman Mineta, similarly proposed moving toward a self-supporting air traffic control organization.29

Commercialization would entail shifting from aviation-related taxes paid to the U.S. Treasury to fees for ATC services paid directly by customers to a new self-supporting Air Traffic Organization. This change would allow fees to grow in proportion to the growth of flight activity, rather than being tied to a less-stable variable, such as fuel prices or airline ticket prices. Moreover, a predictable revenue stream that was not subject to the federal budget process would provide the basis for the ATO to issue long-term bonds for funding capital investments.

Commercialization would also address the management problems that have plagued the FAA's efforts to modernize. A non-civil-service ATO could attract the best private-sector managers and engineers skilled at implementing complex technology projects. Such an ATO could hire, fire, and compensate its employees as other high-tech businesses do. Private sector managers would have an incentive to ask tough questions about whether new investments offered real value for the money, a process that often doesn't occur at the FAA or in Congress.

In addition, a separate, self-supporting ATO—no longer part of the FAA—would be overseen at arm's length for aviation safety by the remaining FAA. Numerous studies have pointed out that the FAA's air-safety role is compromised when it comes to the ATC system, since that system is operated "in-house" by a different branch of the same FAA. All other players in aviation—pilots, mechanics, aircraft manufacturers, airlines, and so forth—are regulated at arm's length for safety by the FAA. This separation of ATC operations from safety regulation is especially critical given the major changes entailed by shifting to the semi-automated NextGen, where numerous safety versus capacity questions will need to be addressed in a rigorous and transparent manner.

Finally, a self-supporting ATO would address the political obstacles to improving system efficiency, such as making decisions to close facilities. By passing the enabling legislation for ATC reform, Congress would delegate such contentious issues to the customer-oriented ATO organization.

During the past two decades, nearly 50 governments have commercialized their air traffic control systems. That means they have separated their ATC activities from their transport ministries, removed them from the civil service, and made them self-supporting from fees charged to aircraft operators. These new air navigation service providers (ANSPs) are usually regulated at arm's length by their government's aviation safety agency.

Britain's ATC system has been commercialized by means of a "public-private partnership." National Air Traffic Services is a jointly owned company, with British airlines owning 42 percent, airport company BAA owning 4 percent, employees owning 5 percent, and the government owning the remaining minority stake. NATS is operated on a not-for-profit basis.

Canada's ATC system has been fully commercialized.30 In 1996, Canada set up a private, nonprofit ATC corporation, Nav Canada, which is self-supporting from charges on aviation users. The Canadian system has been widely praised for its sound finances, solid management, and its investment in new technologies.31 The Canadian system is a very good reform model for the United States to consider.

Nav Canada's corporate board is composed largely of aviation stakeholders.32 It has 4 seats for the airlines, 3 for the government, 2 for employees, and 1 for the non-commercial aviation industry. Those 10 stakeholders select 4 directors from outside aviation, and then those 14 select the company president, who becomes the 15th board member. To further strengthen governance, neither elected officials nor anyone connected with suppliers to Nav Canada can serve on the board. Nav Canada also has a 20-member outside Advisory Committee.

A number of studies have found that ATC commercialization has generally resulted in improvements to service quality, better management, and reduced costs.33 At the same time, air safety has remained the same or improved in the countries that have pursued reforms to set up independent ANSP organizations.

A thorough 2009 report by Glen McDougall and Alasdair Roberts compared the performance of 10 commercialized ATC systems and the FAA during the 1997 to 2004 period.34 They looked at large amounts of performance and safety data from the systems in the various countries and conducted over 200 interviews with managers, workers, and users of the different systems. The researchers found:

ANSP commercialization has generally achieved its objectives. Service quality has improved in most cases. Several ANSPs have successfully modernized workplace technologies. The safety records of ANSPs are not adversely affected by commercialization, and in some cases safety is improved. Costs are generally reduced, sometimes significantly. Other risks of commercialization—such as erosion of accountability to government, deterioration of labor relations, or worsened relationships between civil and military air traffic controllers—have not materialized.35

For the United States, a commercialized ATC organization would be more likely than the FAA to efficiently implement the major aviation infrastructure advances that the nation desperately needs. Air traffic control is more complex and dynamic than ever, and it needs to be managed in the sort of efficient and flexible manner that only a commercialized environment can offer. Countries like Canada have shown the way forward for air traffic control, and U.S. policymakers should adopt the proven organizational reforms that have been implemented abroad.

### Private Sector CP – 2NC Solvency

#### Airport over-scheduling swamps gains from NextGen. Only privatization solves.

Barkowski 10 (Justin T., J.D. Candidate – Pepperdine University, B.A. in Economics – University of California, Berkeley and Instrument-Rated Private Pilot Certificate, “Managing Air Traffic Congestion Through the Next Generation Air Transportation System: Satellite-Based Technology, Trajectories, and - Privatization?”, Pepperdine Law Review, 37 Pepp. L. Rev. 247, Lexis)

[\*250] The fundamental goal of NextGen is to "establish an agile air traffic system that accommodates future requirements and readily responds to shifts in demand from all users." 8 As such, the system will be designed specifically to "respond to market elasticity, having the flexibility to deliver capacity and efficiency improvements, and ensuring that equipment and personnel are able to support a wide range and number of operations tailored to customer needs." 9 Undoubtedly the technology needed to incorporate such a system is currently available. 10 But NextGen leaves one significant issue unaddressed, namely, the lack of governmental accountability needed to keep pace with rapidly changing technology. 11 As one author noted, the [\*251] FAA "develops capacity in terms of a 10-year time frame," while the airlines and consumers generating the demand "are changing decisions every three months." 12 Forming an increasingly accountable FAA to engineer a successful transition to NextGen, however, would only address part of the air traffic congestion issue, leaving government-operated airports to continue mismanaging access to the national airspace system.

Given the relatively fixed amount of airport facilities available, 13 the fact that the demand from air carriers has continuously outpaced supply has resulted in significant flight delays that have rippled throughout the country. 14 Yet Congress continues to impose regulatory control over municipally-owned airports across the country, forcing them to provide non-discriminatory access to the airfield. 15 With the non-discriminatory access [\*252] requirement, airports are not allowed to use pricing as a method of allocating ground facilities, which, in turn, renders them unable to control access to the national airspace system. 16 Solely focusing on NextGen and expanding airspace capacity without corresponding corrections in these demand-management policies will only provide greater incentive for airlines to over-schedule in order to fill in the marginal increases in capacity. To avoid this escalation of congestion, the socially efficient solution is for local governments to transfer these "high-density airports" to the private sector on the condition that private owners focus on eliminating congestion. 17 The societal gains from eliminating congestion would outweigh any societal costs incurred from potential airport discrimination against airlines. 18 As a result, airport privatization may be the proper catalyst for exploiting the full potential of NextGen.

This Comment explores the advantages of NextGen in expanding airspace capacity and the potential problems that may arise without a reform in FAA accountability. Recognizing NextGen as merely part of the solution, the Comment argues that airport privatization is a critical supplement to avoid the federal regulatory policies that dampen efforts to control airport resource demand. Part II breaks down the transformation of the air transportation system since its inception and constructs the landscape for existing air traffic congestion. 19 Part III examines Congress's attempts to expand capacity through NextGen, identifies and suggests solutions to the accountability obstacles, and argues that NextGen's efficient routing structures and added capacity are overrun by the inability to manage competition and congestion at the country's high-density airports. 20 Parts IV.A and IV.B criticize the current approach to regulation of the nation's airports by illustrating the damaging effects it has on efforts to manage demand for critical ground facilities. 21 Part IV.C demonstrates the problems mounting with the FAA's policies on regulating access to congested airports while IV.D provides critical [\*253] insight to the future outlook under Secretary of Transportation, Ray LaHood. 22 Part V presents an argument that privatization of high-density airports may lead to a more socially efficient solution and provides suggestions for reforming current privatization laws. 23 Finally, Part VI concludes this Comment.

#### Privatization solves airport demand and effective air traffic control --- commercial operators are more flexible, responsive, and can quickly access liquidity for expansion

Poole 10 (Robert W. Jr., Director of Transportation Policy and Searle Freedom Trust Transportation Fellow – Reason Foundation, and Chris Edwards, Director of Tax Policy Studies – Cato Institute, “Airports and Air Traffic Control”, June, http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/airports-atc)

The U.S. economy depends on safe, reliable, and affordable air transportation. Beginning in 1978, airline deregulation transformed commercial aviation from a luxury for the few to a service available to essentially all Americans. Air transportation is a hugely important part of the economy for business travel, tourism, and domestic and international trade.

The quality and cost efficiency of air travel relies critically on the nation's aviation infrastructure. That infrastructure includes commercial airports, which are virtually all owned and operated by state and local governments in the United States, and the air traffic control (ATC) system, which is operated by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA).

In fiscal 2011, the FAA budget will be about $16.4 billion.1 Of the total, $9.7 billion will go toward "operations," which includes $7.6 billion for air traffic control operations, $1.3 billion for safety regulation and certification, and $0.8 billion for other functions. In addition, the FAA will spend $3.3 billion in 2011 on capital investments in ATC facilities, equipment, and research. Most of the rest of FAA's budget, about $3.4 billion, will go toward grants to state and local governments for airport investments.

Many experts are predicting major problems with U.S. aviation infrastructure in coming years as large demand growth outstrips the capacity of available facilities. In addition to a rising number of airline passengers, the average size of planes has fallen, which increases the number of planes in the sky that the ATC system needs to handle. On the supply side of the aviation equation, the FAA has long had problems with capital funding, high labor costs, and an inability to efficiently implement new technologies. Major changes are needed because the increased air traffic will soon bump up against the limits of the current air traffic control system.

The United States should embrace the types of reforms adopted around the world to privatize airports and commercialize air traffic control services. Investor-owned airports and commercialized ATC companies can better respond to changing market conditions, and they can freely tap debt and equity markets for capital expansion to meet rising demand. Such enterprises also have greater management flexibility to deal with workforce issues and complex technology implementation.

There is vast foreign experience that can be drawn on in pursuing U.S. reforms, such as European airport privatization and Canadian air traffic control commercialization. The next section provides a brief history of federal involvement in airport funding and air traffic control. The subsequent sections describe the global trend toward airport privatization, the brewing crisis in air traffic control, and ways to reform the ATC system.

#### Solves comparatively better than the plan

Barkowski 10 (Justin T., J.D. Candidate – Pepperdine University, B.A. in Economics – University of California, Berkeley and Instrument-Rated Private Pilot Certificate, “Managing Air Traffic Congestion Through the Next Generation Air Transportation System: Satellite-Based Technology, Trajectories, and - Privatization?”, Pepperdine Law Review, 37 Pepp. L. Rev. 247, Lexis)

VI. Conclusion

The nation's air transportation system is nearing insolvency, and with air traffic expected to double or triple in the next fifteen years, the government's attempts to create a more efficient system will have increasing impact. The FAA and local governments' bifurcated approaches in managing airport congestion and fueling competition in the aviation industry have had minimal effect. Congress's ambitious efforts to assist through the implementation of NextGen will promulgate much-needed capacity in many of the nation's airports. However, the FAA's liability-escape maneuvers - throwing the "discretionary function" flag - do not maximize the potential [\*335] safety and flexibility needed throughout the airspace system. Without accountability reform within the FAA and ATO, the revolutionary system will fall behind immediately after it clears the starting gates.

Even with the proper adjustments to NextGen, a system with the cost of nearly twenty billion dollars in the end still misses the mark in dealing with the core problem: congestion at high-density airports. If the current airport policies are not addressed, the multi-billion dollar taxpayer investment will fail to solve those costly and irritating flight delays. As the social costs proliferate from misallocating valuable airport facilities, a relatively unknown and underutilized privatization pilot program becomes more appealing - and against much opposition, necessary.

#### Long-term leases create strong incentives for effective commercial operation --- multiple global examples prove privatization creates efficiency and rapid expansion in capacity

Poole 10 (Robert W. Jr., Director of Transportation Policy and Searle Freedom Trust Transportation Fellow – Reason Foundation, and Chris Edwards, Director of Tax Policy Studies – Cato Institute, “Airports and Air Traffic Control”, June, http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/airports-atc)

Privatizing Airports

Virtually all commercial airports in the United States are owned by state and local governments.12 But around the world, airports are becoming viewed more as business enterprises, and less as monopoly public services. Governments in both developed and developing countries are turning to the private sector for airport management and development.

The benefits of a more entrepreneurial approach to running airports include increased operating efficiency, improved amenities, and more rapid and efficient expansion in capacity to reduce congestion. Airlines, passengers, private-plane owners, and taxpayers can all benefit from this new commercial approach to airport management.

For existing state and local airports, the simplest form of privatization is to contract out management of the airport on a short-term basis. But long-term leases can shift much greater responsibility and entrepreneurial incentive to the airport company, while liberating much of the city's previous investment in the airport. To create new airport facilities, the private sector can be brought in as a partner and granted either a long-term or perpetual franchise to finance, design, own, and operate the new facility. Full private ownership and management of airports is also possible and is becoming fairly common in Europe.

Airports have been fully or partly privatized in many foreign cities, including Amsterdam, Athens, Auckland, Brussels, Copenhagen, Frankfurt, London, Melbourne, Naples, Rome, Sydney, and Vienna. Britain led the way with the 1987 privatization of British Airports Authority, which owns Heathrow and other airports. Other countries followed with a wide range of commercialization reforms under which private firms own or operate various aspects of airport facilities.

Since 1987, more than 100 airports have been partly or fully privatized worldwide. A recent survey found that there are about 100 companies around the world that own and operate airports, finance airport privatization, or participate in projects to finance, design, build and operate new airports or airport terminals.13

Here are some examples of airport privatization reforms in recent years:

France's Aeroports de Paris, which owns Charles de Gaulle and Orly airports, was partially privatized in 2006.

Most of Italy's larger airports have been privatized, including those in Rome, Florence, Naples, Parma, Pisa, and Venice.

Greece plans to sell part of the remaining share of the Athens airport that it retains, and it may privatize some of its larger regional airports.

Spain's government announced in 2008 that it will sell major stakes in the 47 airports operated by state agency AENA.

Mexico has privatized numerous airports, and the country boosts three successful airport operators that plan to expand abroad.

Brazil is planning to privatize Galeao International Airport in Rio de Janeiro.

Most of Australia's major airports have been either privatized or contracted out to private operators under long-term leases.14

#### Federal investment creates bureaucratic and risk-adverse airports that cause congestion and lack of capacity --- privatization spurs competition and better service

Poole 10 (Robert W. Jr., Director of Transportation Policy and Searle Freedom Trust Transportation Fellow – Reason Foundation, and Chris Edwards, Director of Tax Policy Studies – Cato Institute, “Airports and Air Traffic Control”, June, http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/airports-atc)

All too many U.S. airports are still run in an old-fashioned and bureaucratic manner typical of the pre-deregulation era. Their management style is more passive and risk-averse than that of the world's privatized airports. Investor-owned airports are run as businesses, trying to make profits by tailoring their services to meet the needs of different groups of customers, not just airlines. Detailed research by scholars at Oxford University has shown that the management approach of privatized airports is significantly more "passenger friendly" than that of traditional airports.21

Private airport managers are also more willing to take on the risks of new investments, such as the creation of new terminal space to provide gates for new airlines. By contrast, under typical U.S. airport management practice, the major incumbent airlines have signed long-term exclusive-use gate-lease agreements. From the standpoint of risk-averse airport managers, these long-term agreements give them a guaranteed revenue stream. In exchange for this security, they give up substantial control to the major airlines. Usually, the long-term agreements give airlines what amounts to veto power over terminal expansions. That means that when new-entrant airlines want to start service to such an airport, there are often no gates available, which reduces competition.

By contrast, experience has shown that privatized airports generally do not cede de-facto control over their facilities to the large airlines. At most such airports, the gates remain under the control of the airport company, and they are allocated hour by hour to individual airlines, as needed. That is why at many European airports, and the more commercially run airports in Canada, you will observe that the airline signage at each gate is electronic, so that it can be changed in moments from one airline's name to another's.

In sum, airline competition would be expanded and consumers would benefit if we reformed the outmoded ownership and management structures of U.S. airports. Much of the world is moving to a new paradigm—the airport as a for-profit enterprise—that is more consistent with a dynamic, competitive airline market. In the end, all groups—airlines, passengers, and cities—would benefit from airports that were self-funded, more efficient, and more innovative than current U.S. airports following an old-fashioned bureaucratic approach.

### Private Sector CP – Demand Management – 2NC

#### Only demand management solves. NextGen creates new capacity that will be quickly filled.

Barkowski 10 (Justin T., J.D. Candidate – Pepperdine University, B.A. in Economics – University of California, Berkeley and Instrument-Rated Private Pilot Certificate, “Managing Air Traffic Congestion Through the Next Generation Air Transportation System: Satellite-Based Technology, Trajectories, and - Privatization?”, Pepperdine Law Review, 37 Pepp. L. Rev. 247, Lexis)

D. Unresolved Demand-Management Policies

With or without an ATC commercialization debate, the airlines and the new Secretary of Transportation, Ray LaHood, strongly believe that NextGen is the key to solving congestion. 223 One author even argues that "airside capacity shortages and suboptimal usage/management of airspace" is the underlying cause of air traffic congestion. 224 While these concerns undoubtedly need to be addressed through NextGen, there is a severe problem when airspace capacity increases but corresponding airport resources and infrastructure do not. This will be the case in high-density areas where any room for expansion is nearly impossible. 225 Even the JPDO is skeptical that NextGen is a "cure-for-all," stating that where "airport infrastructure [development] cannot be accomplished using existing resources," the airports will have to implement "market-based mechanisms such as peak period pricing to ease congestion" in times of high demand. 226

Merely increasing the availability of landing and takeoffs at a high-density airport may not have the desired cure-for-all effect that industry participants might expect. For example, in 2004 American and United Airlines agreed with the FAA to voluntarily reduce the number of scheduled flights out of Chicago O'Hare by 12.5% in order to help fight congestion. 227 In effect, this increased the number of potential flights out of that airport during the agreed upon times through its voluntary reduction, just as NextGen [\*296] would do. However, the opening up of more space simply resulted in other airlines adding "flights while the hub carriers cut their schedules," providing no relief to the airport congestion problem. 228 NextGen essentially creates this increased capacity without any supplemental FAA policies to address how this extra space in the system will be allocated to air carriers that are continuously demanding more flights than the system can handle. 229 To prevent air traffic congestion from resulting after the implementation of NextGen, like it had in Chicago, effective demand-management policies are therefore critically in need. Given the historical struggles, 230 this may be difficult to accomplish.

### Federal ATC Fails—Creativity/Innovation

#### The FAA is resistant to change and lacks innovation and creativity, which are crucial to NextGen.

Poole and Edwards 10 (Robert W. Poole, Jr. is the director of transportation policy and Searle Freedom Trust Transportation Fellow at Reason Foundation. Chris Edwards is the director of tax policy studies at Cato. Before joining Cato, Edwards was a senior economist on the congressional Joint Economic Committee. “Airports and Air Traffic Control.” June 2010. http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/airports-atc)

Many experts are greatly concerned that the FAA's institutional culture is poorly suited to implementing anything as dramatic as NextGen. In 2004, the National Academy of Sciences convened an expert panel to assist the GAO in understanding the cultural and technical factors that have impeded previous ATC modernization efforts. It found that "the key cultural factor impeding modernization has been resistance to change... [which is] characteristic of FAA personnel at all levels" and that "the key technical factor affecting modernization... has been a shortfall in the technical expertise needed to design, develop, or manage complex air traffic systems."27

### Federal ATC Fails—Culture

#### FAA Fails—resistant to change culture

Poole 07 (Robert W. Poole, Jr. is the director of transportation policy and Searle Freedom Trust Transportation Fellow at Reason Foundation. “The Urgent Need To Reform The FAA’s Air Traffic Control System.” March 2007. http://reason.org/files/7e27c68e7675e8a599716bab220978f5.pdf)

Thus, many observers are greatly concerned that the FAA’s institutional culture is poorly suited to implementing anything as dramatic as the shift from human-centric ATC to network-centric ATM. In late 2004, the National Academy of Sciences convened an expert panel to assist the GAO in understanding the cultural and technical factors that have impeded previous ATC modernization efforts.10 It found that “the key cultural factor impeding modernization has been resistance to change...[which is] characteristic of FAA personnel at all levels” and that “the key technical factor affecting modernization...has been a shortfall in the technical expertise needed to design, develop, or manage complex air traffic systems.”11 The FAA is not designed to take risks, make investments, manage people to produce results, reward excellence, or punish incompetence. It is therefore not equipped to effect fundamental reform of the ATC system. Thus, major institutional change is probably a prerequisite for implementing the proposed network-centric ATM system.

### Federal ATC Fails—Delays and Costs

#### Federal ATC sucks—empiric costs and delays. Private companies solve better

Poole and Edwards 10 (Robert W. Poole, Jr. is the director of transportation policy and Searle Freedom Trust Transportation Fellow at Reason Foundation. Chris Edwards is the director of tax policy studies at Cato. Before joining Cato, Edwards was a senior economist on the congressional Joint Economic Committee. “Airports and Air Traffic Control.” June 2010. http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/airports-atc)

While organized labor has created management challenges for the FAA, so has the implementation of new technologies. Delays and cost overruns on major technology projects have been common. For example, the Advanced Automation System project was launched in the early 1980s and was originally expected to cost $2.5 billion and be completed by 1996. But by 1994, estimated project costs had soared to $7.6 billion and the project was seven years behind schedule.7 The FAA terminated some parts of the AAS program and restructured others, but $1.5 billion of spending ended up being completely wasted. More recently, a 2005 study by the Department of Transportation's Office of Inspector General looked at 16 major air traffic control upgrade projects and found that the combined costs had risen from $8.9 billion to $14.5 billion.8 The cost of the Standard Terminal Automation Replacement System project had jumped 194 percent to $2.7 billion and was seven years behind schedule. The OIG said that the STARS project was "facing obsolescence" even before it was completed.9 Meanwhile, the cost of the Wide Area Augmentation System project had jumped 274 percent to $3.3 billion and was 12 years behind schedule. A Government Accountability Office analysis in 2005 found similar cost overruns and delays in these projects.10 Delays and cost overruns have not been uncommon in federally subsidized airport projects either. For example, Denver's new international airport finally opened in 1995 after many delays and huge cost overruns. The project was originally supposed to cost $1.7 billion but ended up costing almost three times as much at $4.9 billion, with $685 million coming from federal taxpayers.11 In sum, federal funding of airports and the operation of the nation's ATC system have not been models of efficiency over the decades. There is large room for improvement in the management of the nation's aviation infrastructure, and the following sections consider some major structural reforms.

#### The FAA simply does not have adequate capital to fund NextGen

Poole and Edwards 10 (Robert W. Poole, Jr. is the director of transportation policy and Searle Freedom Trust Transportation Fellow at Reason Foundation. Chris Edwards is the director of tax policy studies at Cato. Before joining Cato, Edwards was a senior economist on the congressional Joint Economic Committee. “Airports and Air Traffic Control.” June 2010. http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/airports-atc)

Inflexible Funding. Government funding sources tend to be static and subject to political considerations, and they are decoupled from changing market demands. Changes in aviation over the past decade have hurt the FAA's funding base. A large part of the FAA budget comes from aviation excise taxes, especially the 7.5 percent tax on airline tickets. As average ticket prices have fallen over time, ATC funding has been squeezed. Payroll costs of the current labor-intensive ATC system consume most of the available budget, leaving less funding for capital investment. Making the transition to NextGen will require billions of dollars of new investments in advanced technologies. The FAA's capital budget is still focused mostly on patching up the existing system, such as replacing antiquated display consoles. Such investments are needed in the short-term, but won't add very much capacity to the system. But that is nearly all the FAA can afford under the current funding structure.

#### Studies show FAA will fail—large cost overruns and delays. It’s empirically proven

Poole and Edwards 10 (Robert W. Poole, Jr. is the director of transportation policy and Searle Freedom Trust Transportation Fellow at Reason Foundation. Chris Edwards is the director of tax policy studies at Cato. Before joining Cato, Edwards was a senior economist on the congressional Joint Economic Committee. “Airports and Air Traffic Control.” June 2010. http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/airports-atc)

Technology Implementation Risks. The FAA has been attempting to modernize its system, expand capacity, and increase its productivity for decades. But dozens of reports over the years from the Government Accountability Office and the Office of Inspector General in the Department of Transportation have faulted the FAA for poor management of major projects, which are often delayed and over budget.24 The Advanced Automation System, Wide Area Augmentation System, and other major projects have had large cost overruns and been years behind schedule or cancelled, as discussed above. In 2005 two OIG researchers presented an overview of the FAA's failed efforts over the years to modernization the National Airspace System.25 In reviewing what went wrong, they concluded that FAA modernization efforts had neither reduced costs nor increased productivity**.** NAS modernization plans have been consistently subverted by requirements growth, development delays, cost escalations, and inadequate benefits management. All these things were symptomatic of the fact that FAA didn't think it needed to reduce operating costs.26

#### The FAA has no available capital to successfully implement NextGen

Poole 07 (Robert W. Poole, Jr. is the director of transportation policy and Searle Freedom Trust Transportation Fellow at Reason Foundation. “The Urgent Need To Reform The FAA’s Air Traffic Control System.” March 2007. http://reason.org/files/7e27c68e7675e8a599716bab220978f5.pdf)

Lack of Funding. As FAA Administrator Marion Blakey and then-Transportation Secretary Norman Mineta said repeatedly in 2005 and 2006, the changes in aviation over the past decade have devastated the FAA’s funding base. A large majority of the FAA budget—the ATC system accounts for nearly two-thirds—comes from aviation excise taxes, and the lion’s share of the tax revenue comes from the 7.5 percent tax on the price of airline tickets. The long-term trends of declining ticket prices due to increased market share for low-cost carriers and increasing air traffic due to increased use of smaller planes have put a serious squeeze on ATC funding. Payroll costs of the labor-intensive human-centric ATC system consume most of the available budget, leaving little for capital investment. In fiscal year (FY) 2005 and FY 2006, the FAA budget for facilities and equipment was reduced by 20 percent ($500 million) below the authorized levels. Making the transition to NextGen will require major capital investments over the next two decades to install new technologies and to replace numerous obsolescent facilities with a much smaller number of new ones. The cost estimate produced by the FAA’s Research, Engineering, and Development Advisory Committee—the only estimate available so far—is an extra $1 billion per year over the next 20 years.6 The FAA’s current capital spending budget is focused on patching up the existing system, replacing antiquated display consoles with newer ones, and replacing the host computer system. While necessary in the short term, these investments will add little capacity to the system, but they are all that the FAA can afford under the current funding system.

#### Federal ATC Bad—the FAA can’t afford NextGen

Poole and Edwards 10 (Robert W. Poole, Jr. is the director of transportation policy and Searle Freedom Trust Transportation Fellow at Reason Foundation. Chris Edwards is the director of tax policy studies at Cato. Before joining Cato, Edwards was a senior economist on the congressional Joint Economic Committee. “Airports and Air Traffic Control.” June 2010. http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/airports-atc)

One problem is the mismatch between the growth in air traffic and the projected growth in FAA revenue. The FAA will need about $1 billion more per year over the next 20 years just to implement NextGen. In 2007 the FAA proposed a user-fee-based funding reform that could provide a more efficient and growing revenue source. The idea was to make each air transportation user's burden on the ATC system more closely match that entity's cost for using the system. That approach has thus far been ignored by Congress.

### Federal ATC Fails—FAA Sucks

#### Fed ATC Bad—NextGen is too complicated for the FAA

Poole and Edwards 10 (Robert W. Poole, Jr. is the director of transportation policy and Searle Freedom Trust Transportation Fellow at Reason Foundation. Chris Edwards is the director of tax policy studies at Cato. Before joining Cato, Edwards was a senior economist on the congressional Joint Economic Committee. “Airports and Air Traffic Control.” June 2010. http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/airports-atc)

However, the challenge ahead for the ATC system is more complex than just financial. NextGen will be a major paradigm shift—from 20th-century (manual) air traffic control to 21st-century (semi-automated) air traffic management—and it will be more complex and riskier than any other challenge the FAA has previously attempted. Given the FAA's management and cost overrun problems in the past, simply fixing the funding problem for the ATC system without dramatically reforming its governance poses risks of larger and more dramatic failures and greater congestion down the road.

### Federal ATC Fails—Labor Costs

#### Private companies solve better—the federal ATC system requires high labor costs

Poole and Edwards 10 (Robert W. Poole, Jr. is the director of transportation policy and Searle Freedom Trust Transportation Fellow at Reason Foundation. Chris Edwards is the director of tax policy studies at Cato. Before joining Cato, Edwards was a senior economist on the congressional Joint Economic Committee. “Airports and Air Traffic Control.” June 2010. http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/airports-atc)

While air traffic control is an increasingly technology-intensive industry, labor union issues have long played an important role in the ATC system. A period of labor unrest began in the late 1960s as FAA controllers pushed for job improvements and official status as an employee union. In 1969, about 500 members of the Professional Air Traffic Controllers Organization stayed home "sick" causing air service interruptions. The following year, 3,000 PATCO members took part in another "sickout" or illegal strike, which caused chaos for the nation's air traffic.3 Labor problems continued during the 1970s, with various work slowdowns and union protests over contract issues. Then in 1981, PATCO declared a major system-wide illegal strike after negotiations on a new contract broke down. That prompted President Ronald Reagan to order controllers to return to work within 48 hours or else face termination. More than 11,000 controllers refused to return to work and were fired by Reagan and initially banned from federal service. PATCO was dissolved and a new controllers union was created in 1987, the National Air Traffic Controllers Association. Today, an important aspect of the federal ATC system is the high labor costs. In 2010, the operations portion of FAA had about 43,000 workers who earned a total of $6.5 billion in wages and benefits, or about $151,000 per worker.4 Just looking at controllers, a 2005 FAA study found that compensation packages averaged $166,000 annually.5 Labor costs account for two-thirds of the cost of FAA operations.6

### Federal ATC Fails—Management

#### The FAA contains fundamental management flaws that will prevent it to implement NextGen effectively

Poole and Edwards 10 (Robert W. Poole, Jr. is the director of transportation policy and Searle Freedom Trust Transportation Fellow at Reason Foundation. Chris Edwards is the director of tax policy studies at Cato. Before joining Cato, Edwards was a senior economist on the congressional Joint Economic Committee. “Airports and Air Traffic Control.” June 2010. http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/airports-atc)

As a government agency, the FAA is not designed to judge risks, aim at the most efficient investments, manage people to produce results, reward excellence, or punish incompetence. It is therefore not equipped to fundamentally reform the ATC system. Thus, major institutional change is probably a prerequisite for implementing the advanced ATC system the nation needs to meet rising aviation demand.

### Federal ATC Fails—Political Constraints

#### The FAA fails—political constraints. Only privatization can solve such constraints

Poole 07 (Robert W. Poole, Jr. is the director of transportation policy and Searle Freedom Trust Transportation Fellow at Reason Foundation. “The Urgent Need To Reform The FAA’s Air Traffic Control System.” March 2007.

Political Constraints. The third impediment to implementing a fundamentally different approach is political. The network-centric model can deliver major cost savings, ultimately providing two to three times the ATC capacity with the same number of—or even fewer—people because the changed paradigm makes the operations dramatically less labor-intensive. However, realizing these gains requires relatively swift retirement of huge numbers of costly radars and other ground-based navaids and consolidation of numerous ATC facilities. One current proposal would replace 21 en route centers and 171 TRACONs with 35 air traffic service hubs while redesigning all U.S. airspace.12 Physical control towers located at each airport would gradually be phased out as “virtual tower” functions are built into the new super-hubs. As with the closing of military bases, Congress has a history of resisting the closure and consolidation of ATC facilities. The original 1982 NAS Plan included plans for facility consolidation, which were quietly dropped after it became clear that getting them through Congress would be very difficult. Congress came extremely close to forbidding the FAA’s recent success in outsourcing its Flight Service Station system, which involved consolidating from 58 facilities to 20 facilities. The prohibition was ultimately defeated due to a credible veto threat from the White House. Many observers expect that, if left to the annual appropriations process, a facility consolidation of the magnitude being considered for the next-generation system would suffer the same fate as the consolidations proposed in the NAS Plan.

### Federal ATC Fails—Studies

#### FAA Fails—Studies prove

Poole 07 (Robert W. Poole, Jr. is the director of transportation policy and Searle Freedom Trust Transportation Fellow at Reason Foundation. “The Urgent Need To Reform The FAA’s Air Traffic Control System.” March 2007. http://reason.org/files/7e27c68e7675e8a599716bab220978f5.pdf)

Technology Implementation Risks. The FAA has been attempting to modernize the National Airspace System (NAS), expanding its capacity and increasing its productivity, since it launched the NAS Plan in 1982. During the next 25 years, scores (if not hundreds) of reports from the Government Accountability Office (GAO)7 and the Office of Inspector General (OIG) in the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) faulted the agency for bad management that had led to projects that were chronically late and seriously over budget. In 2005, two OIG researchers presented an overview of this failed modernization experience, trying to assess what went wrong.8 They concluded that FAA modernization efforts had neither reduced costs nor increased productivity: NAS modernization architecture and project designs have been consistently subverted by requirements growth, development delays, cost escalations, and inadequate benefits management. But all these things were symptomatic of the fact that FAA didn’t think it needed to reduce operating costs.9

### Solvency—Must Read

#### Privatized ATC solves all current problems with federal ATC without any materialization of the expected risks of commercialization

Poole and Edwards 10 (Robert W. Poole, Jr. is the director of transportation policy and Searle Freedom Trust Transportation Fellow at Reason Foundation. Chris Edwards is the director of tax policy studies at Cato. Before joining Cato, Edwards was a senior economist on the congressional Joint Economic Committee. “Airports and Air Traffic Control.” June 2010. http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/airports-atc)

A number of studies have found that ATC commercialization has generally resulted in improvements to service quality, better management, and reduced costs.33 At the same time, air safety has remained the same or improved in the countries that have pursued reforms to set up independent ANSP organizations. A thorough 2009 report by Glen McDougall and Alasdair Roberts compared the performance of 10 commercialized ATC systems and the FAA during the 1997 to 2004 period.34 They looked at large amounts of performance and safety data from the systems in the various countries and conducted over 200 interviews with managers, workers, and users of the different systems. The researchers found: ANSP commercialization has generally achieved its objectives. Service quality has improved in most cases. Several ANSPs have successfully modernized workplace technologies. The safety records of ANSPs are not adversely affected by commercialization, and in some cases safety is improved. Costs are generally reduced, sometimes significantly. Other risks of commercialization—such as erosion of accountability to government, deterioration of labor relations, or worsened relationships between civil and military air traffic controllers—have not materialized.35 For the United States, a commercialized ATC organization would be more likely than the FAA to efficiently implement the major aviation infrastructure advances that the nation desperately needs. Air traffic control is more complex and dynamic than ever, and it needs to be managed in the sort of efficient and flexible manner that only a commercialized environment can offer. Countries like Canada have shown the way forward for air traffic control, and U.S. policymakers should adopt the proven organizational reforms that have been implemented abroad.

#### A privatized ATC solves all the problems that the FAA currently struggles with—funding, political obstacles, and culture

Poole and Edwards 10 (Robert W. Poole, Jr. is the director of transportation policy and Searle Freedom Trust Transportation Fellow at Reason Foundation. Chris Edwards is the director of tax policy studies at Cato. Before joining Cato, Edwards was a senior economist on the congressional Joint Economic Committee. “Airports and Air Traffic Control.” June 2010. http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/airports-atc)

The way to address all three of these organizational problems is to take the ATC system out of the federal budget process and make it a self-supporting entity, funded directly by its customers. Variants of this commercialization approach have been recommended by a series of federal studies and commissions over the past 15 years…Commercialization would entail shifting from aviation-related taxes paid to the U.S. Treasury to fees for ATC services paid directly by customers to a new self-supporting Air Traffic Organization. This change would allow fees to grow in proportion to the growth of flight activity, rather than being tied to a less-stable variable, such as fuel prices or airline ticket prices. Moreover, a predictable revenue stream that was not subject to the federal budget process would provide the basis for the ATO to issue long-term bonds for funding capital investments. Commercialization would also address the management problems that have plagued the FAA's efforts to modernize. A non-civil-service ATO could attract the best private-sector managers and engineers skilled at implementing complex technology projects. Such an ATO could hire, fire, and compensate its employees as other high-tech businesses do. Private sector managers would have an incentive to ask tough questions about whether new investments offered real value for the money, a process that often doesn't occur at the FAA or in Congress…Finally, a self-supporting ATO would address the political obstacles to improving system efficiency, such as making decisions to close facilities. By passing the enabling legislation for ATC reform, Congress would delegate such contentious issues to the customer-oriented ATO organization.

### Solvency—General

#### Private companies solve better—better response, access to capital, and superior flexibility

Poole and Edwards 10 (Robert W. Poole, Jr. is the director of transportation policy and Searle Freedom Trust Transportation Fellow at Reason Foundation. Chris Edwards is the director of tax policy studies at Cato. Before joining Cato, Edwards was a senior economist on the congressional Joint Economic Committee. “Airports and Air Traffic Control.” June 2010. http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/airports-atc)

The United States should embrace the types of reforms adopted around the world to privatize airports and commercialize air traffic control services. Investor-owned airports and commercialized ATC companies can better respond to changing market conditions, and they can freely tap debt and equity markets for capital expansion to meet rising demand. Such enterprises also have greater management flexibility to deal with workforce issues and complex technology implementation.

#### Privatization of ATC good—efficiency, less congestion, and amenities

Poole and Edwards 10 (Robert W. Poole, Jr. is the director of transportation policy and Searle Freedom Trust Transportation Fellow at Reason Foundation. Chris Edwards is the director of tax policy studies at Cato. Before joining Cato, Edwards was a senior economist on the congressional Joint Economic Committee. “Airports and Air Traffic Control.” June 2010. http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/airports-atc)

The benefits of a more entrepreneurial approach to running airports include increased operating efficiency, improved amenities, and more rapid and efficient expansion in capacity to reduce congestion. Airlines, passengers, private-plane owners, and taxpayers can all benefit from this new commercial approach to airport management.

#### Private controlled ATC would solve the problems with FAA- overcosts, technical factors and flexibility

COA ’95 (Hearings Before Subcommittees Of The Committee On Appropriations House Of Representatives One Hundred Fourth Congress First Session, January 11, 1995, “Downsizing government and setting priorities of federal programs” <http://www30.us.archive.org/stream/downsizinggovern03unit/downsizinggovern03unit_djvu.txt>)

Coleman. A key feature of the Department's restructuring proposal concerns transferring the air traffic control operations of the Federal Aviation Administration to a private or government- controlled corporation wholly funded by user fees. Some observers have pointed to the FAA's mismanagement of air traffic control modernization efforts — specifically cost overruns and schedule delays associated with the Advanced Automation System — as making the case for the need to privatize the air traffic control system. The GAO has testified before this subcommittee, however, that in- adequate FAA oversight and technical factors — not inadequate funding or Federal procurement or personnel rules — have caused the problems with the AAS. If that is still true, can you tell us what problems have you identified at the FAA that might be solved with the establishment of an ATC Corporation? [The information follows:] Our past work and testimonies have identified inadequate FAA oversight and technical factors — not inadequate fiinding or federal procurement and personnel laws — as the root causes of cost and schedule delays that have plagued FAA's modernization program. Along those lines, we have recommended ways that FAA's ac- quisition process can be improved substantially and the risk of cost and schedule problems minimized. For example, we have urged FAA to follow the common sense, businesslike principles that are outlined in its acquisition policy. The agency did not adhere to these principles during the early years of modernization. Therefore, our past work has focused on improvements that can be made to FAA's acquisition proc- ess under its current structure rather than the creation of alternative organizational structures. Undoubtedly, the creation of a corporation could provide FAA with greater flexibility in its procurement, personnel, and budgeting practices. However, it is also important to recognize that changing to a corporate structure does not necessarily correlate with success or serve as a panacea for the problems of the predecessor organization.

#### Privatization solves funding and congestion by using performance results

Barkowski 12 (Justin T. Barkowski 2-2-12 Mr. Barkowski received the Ronald Sorenson Award for Best Student Article and served as the literary citation editor for Pepperdine Law Review. Prior to attending Pepperdine, Mr. Barkowski graduated from the University of California, Berkeley, where he studied economics. Mr. Barkowski is an instrumentrated private pilot and enjoys flying in his free time. Mr. Barkowski is active in the firm’s business litigation and insurance law practices.

“Managing Air Traffic Congestion Through the Next Generation Air Transportation System: SatelliteBased Technology, Trajectories, and - Privatization?” Pepperdine Law Review Volume 37 | Issue 1 Article 3 p. 319-320 <http://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1039&context=plr>) MJA

Airport privatization has numerous potential benefits that cannot be understated. Those most commonly identified include diversified sources of private capital for development, 343 greater efficiency in airport operations, 344 and increased customer satisfaction. 345 However, private operators could also more effectively fight congestion than a government-run airport by conditioning the transfer on the elimination of congestion, measured by monthly or quarterly performance results. 346 This technique has been recognized for various forms of privatization, predicated on the notion that "governments should shift their focus from specifying inputs to specifying some desired outcome, leaving private sector providers with the opportunity of formulating means of realizing that outcome in the most cost-efficient way possible." 347 The transfer of interests in airports from government operations to a private regulated monopoly could provide a solution for demand management if three conditions are met: the operator is given the ability to price discriminate against carriers for ground facilities; 348 transparent, periodic slot auctions are held; 349 and efficient regulation of an airport’s monopoly power exists. 350[1]

### Solvency—Congestion

#### Feds fail at solving congestion—privatization solves

Barkowski 12 (Justin T. Barkowski 2-2-12 Mr. Barkowski received the Ronald Sorenson Award for Best Student Article and served as the literary citation editor for Pepperdine Law Review. Prior to attending Pepperdine, Mr. Barkowski graduated from the University of California, Berkeley, where he studied economics. Mr. Barkowski is an instrumentrated private pilot and enjoys flying in his free time. Mr. Barkowski is active in the firm’s business litigation and insurance law practices.

“Managing Air Traffic Congestion Through the Next Generation Air Transportation System: SatelliteBased Technology, Trajectories, and - Privatization?” Pepperdine Law Review Volume 37 | Issue 1 Article 3 p. 251-252 <http://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1039&context=plr>) MJA

Given the relatively fixed amount of airport facilities available," the fact that the demand from air carriers has continuously outpaced supply has resulted in significant flight delays that have rippled throughout the country.14 Yet Congress continues to impose regulatory control over municipally owned airports across the country, forcing them to provide nondiscriminatory access to the airfield." With the non-discriminatory access requirement, airports are not allowed to use pricing as a method of allocating ground facilities, which, in turn, renders them unable to control access to the national airspace system.1 6 Solely focusing on NextGen and expanding airspace capacity without corresponding corrections in these demand management policies will only provide greater incentive for airlines to overschedule in order to fill in the marginal increases in capacity. To avoid this escalation of congestion, the socially efficient solution is for local governments to transfer these "high-density airports" to the private sector on the condition that private owners focus on eliminating congestion. 17 The societal gains from eliminating congestion would outweigh any societal costs incurred from potential airport discrimination against airlines.' 8 As a result, airport privatization may be the proper catalyst for exploiting the full potential of NextGen.

### Solvency—Culture

#### Privatization solves cultural and technical obstacles

Poole 07 (Robert W. Poole, Jr. is the director of transportation policy and Searle Freedom Trust Transportation Fellow at Reason Foundation. “The Urgent Need To Reform The FAA’s Air Traffic Control System.” March 2007.

Cultural and Technical Obstacles. The commercialization approach would address the cultural and technical obstacles by enabling the ATO to attract and retain private-sector managers and engineers who are skilled at implementing complex technology projects. The ATO, like the TVA, would operate completely outside the federal civil service system and could hire, fire, and compensate its employees as any other high-tech business does. It would be governed by a board of directors largely representing the aviation customers. Under this system, the overall NextGen approach, individual projects, and their implementation schedules would have to pass muster as delivering real value for the investment. That kind of vetting process is largely absent from the FAA.

### Solvency—Economy

#### Privatization leads to economic growth while decreasing growing budget deficits. Secretary of Transportation wants privatization.

Barkowski 12 (Justin T. Barkowski 2-2-12 Mr. Barkowski received the Ronald Sorenson Award for Best Student Article and served as the literary citation editor for Pepperdine Law Review. Prior to attending Pepperdine, Mr. Barkowski graduated from the University of California, Berkeley, where he studied economics. Mr. Barkowski is an instrumentrated private pilot and enjoys flying in his free time. Mr. Barkowski is active in the firm’s business litigation and insurance law practices.

“Managing Air Traffic Congestion Through the Next Generation Air Transportation System: SatelliteBased Technology, Trajectories, and - Privatization?” Pepperdine Law Review Volume 37 | Issue 1 Article 3 p. 333-334 <http://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1039&context=plr>) MJA

Even beyond the potential congestion savings, several other reasons suggest privatization may be the appealing forecast for local governments. First, dozens of local governments are increasingly considering the sale of their airports in order to decrease growing budget deficits. Second, with the federal government about to make a multi-billion dollar investment in 412 NextGen, an airport's economic value to the private sector will rise significantly, making the sale even more lucrative for governments looking for corrective budget solutions. 413 Finally, unlike the FAA's trembling slot debacle, Secretary of Transportation Ray LaHood has urged for "the private sector [to have] a bigger role in rebuilding the nation's aging . . . infrastructure," 414 which could provide help in reprising answers for congestion relief. But without any reforms to the current pilot program, the optimistic outlook could end hollow and ineffective.

### Solvency—Empirics

#### Countries around the world such as Canada and Britain have already privatized their ATC, and both have been extremely successful

Poole and Edwards 10 (Robert W. Poole, Jr. is the director of transportation policy and Searle Freedom Trust Transportation Fellow at Reason Foundation. Chris Edwards is the director of tax policy studies at Cato. Before joining Cato, Edwards was a senior economist on the congressional Joint Economic Committee. “Airports and Air Traffic Control.” June 2010. http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/airports-atc)

During the past two decades, nearly 50 governments have commercialized their air traffic control systems. That means they have separated their ATC activities from their transport ministries, removed them from the civil service, and made them self-supporting from fees charged to aircraft operators. These new air navigation service providers (ANSPs) are usually regulated at arm's length by their government's aviation safety agency. Britain's ATC system has been commercialized by means of a "public-private partnership." National Air Traffic Services is a jointly owned company, with British airlines owning 42 percent, airport company BAA owning 4 percent, employees owning 5 percent, and the government owning the remaining minority stake. NATS is operated on a not-for-profit basis. Canada's ATC system has been fully commercialized.30 In 1996, Canada set up a private, nonprofit ATC corporation, Nav Canada, which is self-supporting from charges on aviation users. The Canadian system has been widely praised for its sound finances, solid management, and its investment in new technologies.31 The Canadian system is a very good reform model for the United States to consider.

#### The entire world recognizes the benefits of ATC privatization

Poole and Edwards 10 (Robert W. Poole, Jr. is the director of transportation policy and Searle Freedom Trust Transportation Fellow at Reason Foundation. Chris Edwards is the director of tax policy studies at Cato. Before joining Cato, Edwards was a senior economist on the congressional Joint Economic Committee. “Airports and Air Traffic Control.” June 2010. http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/airports-atc)

Virtually all commercial airports in the United States are owned by state and local governments.12 But around the world, airports are becoming viewed more as business enterprises, and less as monopoly public services. Governments in both developed and developing countries are turning to the private sector for airport management and development… Airports have been fully or partly privatized in many foreign cities, including Amsterdam, Athens, Auckland, Brussels, Copenhagen, Frankfurt, London, Melbourne, Naples, Rome, Sydney, and Vienna. Britain led the way with the 1987 privatization of British Airports Authority, which owns Heathrow and other airports. Other countries followed with a wide range of commercialization reforms under which private firms own or operate various aspects of airport facilities. Since 1987, more than 100 airports have been partly or fully privatized worldwide. A recent survey found that there are about 100 companies around the world that own and operate airports, finance airport privatization, or participate in projects to finance, design, build and operate new airports or airport terminals.13

#### Here’s more ev

Poole and Edwards 10 (Robert W. Poole, Jr. is the director of transportation policy and Searle Freedom Trust Transportation Fellow at Reason Foundation. Chris Edwards is the director of tax policy studies at Cato. Before joining Cato, Edwards was a senior economist on the congressional Joint Economic Committee. “Airports and Air Traffic Control.” June 2010. http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/airports-atc)

Here are some examples of airport privatization reforms in recent years: France's Aeroports de Paris, which owns Charles de Gaulle and Orly airports, was partially privatized in 2006. Most of Italy's larger airports have been privatized, including those in Rome, Florence, Naples, Parma, Pisa, and Venice. Greece plans to sell part of the remaining share of the Athens airport that it retains, and it may privatize some of its larger regional airports. Spain's government announced in 2008 that it will sell major stakes in the 47 airports operated by state agency AENA. Mexico has privatized numerous airports, and the country boosts three successful airport operators that plan to expand abroad. Brazil is planning to privatize Galeao International Airport in Rio de Janeiro. Most of Australia's major airports have been either privatized or contracted out to private operators under long-term leases.14

### Solvency—Funding

#### Privatization solves the federal funding problem

Poole 07 (Robert W. Poole, Jr. is the director of transportation policy and Searle Freedom Trust Transportation Fellow at Reason Foundation. “The Urgent Need To Reform The FAA’s Air Traffic Control System.” March 2007.

Funding Problem. This approach would address the funding problem by shifting from aviation excise taxes that are paid to the Treasury and appropriated annually by Congress to fees for ATC services that are paid directly by customers to the new self-supporting Air Traffic Organization (ATO). Thus, fees would grow in proportion to the growth of flight activity rather than being tied to something much less relevant, such as airline ticket prices. Moreover, a predictable revenue stream, not subject to the federal budget process, would provide the basis for issuing long-term revenue bonds to fund modernization, in particular the transition to the network-centric system.

#### Increased federal funding will still fail—only privatization can solve

Barkowski 12 (Justin T. Barkowski 2-2-12 Mr. Barkowski received the Ronald Sorenson Award for Best Student Article and served as the literary citation editor for Pepperdine Law Review. Prior to attending Pepperdine, Mr. Barkowski graduated from the University of California, Berkeley, where he studied economics. Mr. Barkowski is an instrumentrated private pilot and enjoys flying in his free time. Mr. Barkowski is active in the firm’s business litigation and insurance law practices.

“Managing Air Traffic Congestion Through the Next Generation Air Transportation System: SatelliteBased Technology, Trajectories, and - Privatization?” Pepperdine Law Review Volume 37 | Issue 1 Article 3 p. 320-324 <http://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1039&context=plr>) MJA

Several policies with respect to allocating ground facilities at high-density airports are necessary for the private party to eliminate airport congestion. First, eliminating the availability of long-term leases and majority in-interest clauses is a requisite for creating more fluid entry and thus, increased competition. 3 1 ' Forcing airlines into short-term arrangements will produce a more flexible air transportation system that can adjust to rapidly changing demand. 352 Second, Congress needs to loosen the regulations that require airport proprietors to equate revenues with their costs of providing the airfield's resources. 353 The current price controls prevent excessive monopoly profits by forcing airports into reasonable investment returns and uniform cost allocation across all carriers. 354 But while regulation seems to ensure that the monopolists' profits are minimal, it allows for an "unknown extent of productive inefficiency." 355 Price controls create inefficiency losses, which result when "economic resources are directed away from [airlines] where those resources have the largest benefit .. . and toward [airlines] which value those resources less” 356 Because prices are a necessary mechanism to ensure "resources are used in the most economically efficient fashion," 357 " ground facilities should be charged based upon willingness to pay or expected profitability, commonly called "Ramsey pricing."" A private operator will be more capable of determining the carrier's risk of failure, a reflection of each carrier's willingness to pay. 3 For instance, if an airline pays the maximum it is willing to pay for a gate facility, it is forced to extract all of the gate's potential value in order to recover its investment. In essence Ramsey pricing forces the airline to use the gate more efficiently than it had before. The loosening of limitations on discriminatory pricing and prohibiting long-term lease arrangements for ground facilities will enhance a private operator's ability to perfectly price discriminate, which "may be consistent with and even necessary to allocative efficiency" of airport resources. 360 This pricing structure ensures there is limited deadweight loss from the use of scarce airport facilities by forcing unprofitable and wasteful air carriers out of the system. 36 1 Critics against using a different rate structure argue that airlines will raise their rates on passengers, effectively passing the costs of congestion onto consumers. 362 However, because airport costs are roughly five percent of airlines' total costs it would not be disastrous to raise rates on them. One study suggests that for every one percent increase in the price of airline tickets, more than one percent declines to buy tickets. 6 As a result, airlines will arguably internalize the rising costs and force reductions in other areas. 3 Alternatively though, decreased fuel costs from the implementation of NextGen may offset increased facility prices as well. But if for some reason the airline cannot handle the increased costs, any potential increases on passengers' rates would only be temporary because an entrant could come in and undercut them, assuming the barriers to entry are more fluid from privatization and short-term leases. 365 Nonetheless, there are several arguments supporting the notion that consumers would be minimally affected under Ramsey pricing. Any concerns about potential collusion between the airport proprietor and an air carrier will be regulated by antitrust legislation.1 66 Through modest disclosure requirements, the FAA could require that the private airport proprietors disclose their justifications for the charges upon airlines, creating a more transparent environment that would prevent anticompetitive behavior. 36' Ramsey pricing allows the airport proprietor to get the most profitable airlines within the first barrier to entry-ground facilities-and maximizes the economic value of these resources. Subsequently though, the airport proprietor must prevent these air carriers from scheduling amounts of flights exceeding the airport's practical capacity. 368

#### Privatization would solve funding and congestion—federal government fails

Barkowski 12

(Justin T. Barkowski 2-2-12 Mr. Barkowski received the Ronald Sorenson Award for Best Student Article and served as the literary citation editor for Pepperdine Law Review. Prior to attending Pepperdine, Mr. Barkowski graduated from the University of California, Berkeley, where he studied economics. Mr. Barkowski is an instrumentrated private pilot and enjoys flying in his free time. Mr. Barkowski is active in the firm’s business litigation and insurance law practices.

“Managing Air Traffic Congestion Through the Next Generation Air Transportation System: SatelliteBased Technology, Trajectories, and - Privatization?” Pepperdine Law Review Volume 37 | Issue 1 Article 3 p. 324-326 <http://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1039&context=plr>) MJA

Realizing that slots are seemingly unavoidable, the private operator will be responsible for configuring the optimal level of slots allowed per hour. 369 Assigning control to the proprietors, subject to extensive safety regulations, will allow them to set an efficient cap that helps meet their mandate of eliminating airport congestion. 37 0 The FAA's new role is to collaborate with the private airport operator in looking for ways to expand the number of slots per hour while the airport becomes responsible for administering a slot system. 7 Once the airport finds an optimal number of slots per hour, there must be a form of allocating them efficiently. 372 The FAA's slot auction proposal and the airport proprietor's landing fees are duplicative-creating an ineffective system that is currently plagued by redundant fees and stale airline-airport contracts. Slot and landing fees need to be consolidated into one fee that will be determined through auctions held by the airport proprietor." The new system will consolidate slot and landing fees into one transparent market. For instance, the airport could hold bi-monthly or quarterly auctions for the rights to takeoff or land at a certain time. 374 By requiring slot auction prices to be publicly listed, increased transparency of airport-facility markets will allow potential new entrants to gauge its costs more easily before entering the market. One possible argument against this potential "two-step pricing method" is that the airport extracts the airline's surplus twice instead of through only an initial charge for gate facilities. However, once airlines have obtained a gate/terminal space, the auction prices will simply reflect the remaining economic value an airline has allocated towards the use of all its necessary ground facilities. 37 5 With increased amounts of short-term leases, constructing a more transparent market for airport facilities will increase competition for airport resources, and subsequently award them to the airline that can use them most effectively. 376 Not only does the consolidated pricing system allow a private operator to manage its limited airport facilities efficiently, it is necessary for ensuring a reduction in airport congestion and airline over-scheduling. It does, however, raise the determinative question of monopolistic abuse.

### AT: Monopoly Bad

#### The state managing the airport holding an auction for the airports monopolizing capabilities and the company paying the government a fee at a rate of 65% for the rights to collect monopoly ensures severe mitigated monopolistic abuses.

Barkowski 12 (Justin T. Barkowski 2-2-12 Mr. Barkowski received the Ronald Sorenson Award for Best Student Article and served as the literary citation editor for Pepperdine Law Review. Mr. Barkowski graduated from the University of California, Berkeley, where he studied economics. Mr. Barkowski is an instrumentrated private pilot and enjoys flying in his free time.

“Managing Air Traffic Congestion Through the Next Generation Air Transportation System: SatelliteBased Technology, Trajectories, and - Privatization?” Pepperdine Law Review Volume 37 | Issue 1 Article 3 p. 326-329 <http://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1039&context=plr>) MJA

The main criticism against a "two-step pricing method" or similar pricing structure for ground facilities is that "allowing the unilateral imposition of congestion pricing would end the airlines' regulatory protection against the exercise of monopoly power by airport proprietors and would transfer revenue from airlines and their customers to airport proprietors." 7 The monopolist's potential for ignoring cost-reducing measures and enjoying the advantages of a "two-step pricing method" is the biggest legal issue facing airport privatization in the present time. 378 In any shift towards privatization of airport monopolies, there will always be some economic rents or monopoly profits. 379 Given these realities, the government needs to ensure monopolistic abuse is mitigated enough for the gains from eliminating airport congestion to outweigh any potential costs of monopoly behavior. a. Modeling Privatization Welfare Effects Modeling each actor's welfare effects can illustrate the government's trouble of eliminating airport congestion through privatization, and provides clearer guidance for dealing with the risk of monopolistic abuse. Suppose the private operator obtains the monopoly profits from the airlines, X, 380 through its "two-step pricing method," and eliminates the social costs of airport congestion, Z, 38 ' in accordance with its mandate. The result is a transfer of X from the airlines to the airports and an overall net societal benefit of Z and X 382 Because every actor gains, social efficiency is clearly achieved by the transfer of the airport to the monopolist. 383 But one may perceive this transfer as unfair because "society"-including everyone except for the monopolist-must pay the value of monopoly profits, X, to the airport proprietor (through the airlines) in order to obtain gains from congestion relief, Z. 384 Therefore, public policy must encourage "fairness" by ensuring that society's gain, Z, outweighs its "fee," X, thereby making privatization the socially efficient outcome from congestion-dominated airports. With the added potential for abuse of monopoly power that could ultimately reduce society's gains, however, what policies could maximize Z by ensuring an airport proprietor's competitive-type behavior? 385 b. Maximizing the Return on Privatization Several policies are available for society in ensuring that its investment, X, will yield a far greater return in Z.316 First, a tax on the profits of the monopolist in the form of a "surtax," at a rate of sixty or seventy percent for instance, could ensure that any monopoly profits would at least be limited by that respective amount. 8 Another possibility, and potentially the best solution, is for the state or local subdivision managing the airport to hold an auction, accepting bids for the airport's monopolizing capabilities. That way, for example, if the government finds the monopoly profits are worth the value of X, the company pays the government a fee, Y, for rights to collect the monopoly profits in its most efficient manner. The fee, Y, paid to the government would likely be high, such as sixty or seventy percent of X, acting in essence as another form of a tax. Alternatively, the government could incorporate the airport and issue stock as a publicly-held company, subjecting it to numerous requirements and scrutiny that would allow it to be more transparent. 388 By allowing the local government to retain a minority stake in the airport and have individuals on the board of directors, both the cities' and passengers' interests in ensuring fairness may be heard. 8 Similar to the example above, the government could tax, through a surtax, the dividends of the corporation, in effect acting as a redistributive income mechanism. 390 Lastly, there has been a rise of secondary airports in the main regions where high-density congestion is occurring. 39 ' This competition could lead to a decrease in the amount of monopoly profits the airport can obtain. 392 Altogether, the prescribed policies create two benefits from the monopoly abuse problem. First, they act as a redistributive measure of the monopolist's eventual profits-which were discriminatorily taken from airlines-in order to restore fairness to the two-step pricing method. Second, it would force private operators to act more efficiently and implement cost-reducing measures in order to profit-maximize and recoup the windfall they lost to the government. By minimizing the potential for monopolistic abuse, transferring interests in high-density airports to the private sector will provide aggregate benefits to society in terms of social efficiency. However, Congress must first address the current federal laws governing airport privatization that are insufficient to yield the potential benefits described.

### AT: We Fiat Funding (MUST READ)

#### Increasing federal funding wouldn’t solve the funding problem—reveunue bonds and customer-provider relationship

Poole 07 (Robert W. Poole, Jr. is the director of transportation policy and Searle Freedom Trust Transportation Fellow at Reason Foundation. “The Urgent Need To Reform The FAA’s Air Traffic Control System.” March 2007.

First, in the context of large federal deficits as far as the eye can see, increasing general-fund support for any federal program is highly unlikely, especially if that program has identifiable users who could be charged for its services. Second, even if this were possible, it would do nothing to enable the ATO to issue revenue bonds to finance the long-term capital expenditures for the next-generation ATC system. Issuing bonds requires a reliable revenue stream that is not subject to the risks and uncertainties of annual appropriations. Third, creating a customer–provider relationship is the key to reforming the ATC governance system so that cost control and a clear business case for each new investment become standard practice. The general fund should continue to support the FAA’s vital air-safety functions, including the operations of the Flight Service Stations that assist general aviation pilots.

### AT: Why No Privatization Now

#### Federal aid and current federal aid policies have killed incentive for privatization

Poole and Edwards 10 (Robert W. Poole, Jr. is the director of transportation policy and Searle Freedom Trust Transportation Fellow at Reason Foundation. Chris Edwards is the director of tax policy studies at Cato. Before joining Cato, Edwards was a senior economist on the congressional Joint Economic Committee. “Airports and Air Traffic Control.” June 2010. http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/airports-atc)

Why has the United States resisted these types of airport reforms occurring around the world?15 One reason is that U.S. state and local airports have for decades received federal aid for development and construction. Federal law generally provides that governments that have received federal aid for an infrastructure facility have to repay previous federal grants if the facility is privatized. Moreover, the FAA has interpreted a legal provision requiring that all "airport revenues" be used solely for airport purposes to apply to any lease or sale proceeds, which prevents a city from selling its airport and using the proceeds for its general fund. Another important factor is that state and local governments can issue tax-exempt bonds to finance airports because they are government-owned facilities. Thus, borrowing can be done at a lower cost than borrowing by private airport owners issuing taxable debt. However, this bias against private ownership can be overcome. The federal government could pursue tax reforms to reduce or eliminate the tax exemption on municipal bond interest. Alternatively, the government could permit private airport operators to make use of tax-exempt revenue bonds ("private activity bonds"), as it has done for companies involved in the toll road business.

#### Airlines have been too scared to privatize

Poole and Edwards 10 (Robert W. Poole, Jr. is the director of transportation policy and Searle Freedom Trust Transportation Fellow at Reason Foundation. Chris Edwards is the director of tax policy studies at Cato. Before joining Cato, Edwards was a senior economist on the congressional Joint Economic Committee. “Airports and Air Traffic Control.” June 2010. http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/airports-atc)

A final hurdle to airport privatization in the United States has often been the airlines. For various structural reasons, they worry that their costs may be higher or they may face more airline competition if airports were privatized. Typically, major airlines are like an anchor tenant in a shopping mall. At U.S. airports, major airlines generally have long-term lease-and-use agreements, which often give them control over terminals or concourses and the right to approve or veto capital spending plans. That gives them the power to oppose airport expansion if it would mean more airline competition in that location.

### Solvency

#### Privatization is the best option

Poole and Edwards 10 (Robert W. Poole, Jr. is the director of transportation policy and Searle Freedom Trust Transportation Fellow at Reason Foundation. Chris Edwards is the director of tax policy studies at Cato. Before joining Cato, Edwards was a senior economist on the congressional Joint Economic Committee. “Airports and Air Traffic Control.” June 2010. http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/airports-atc)

For existing state and local airports, the simplest form of privatization is to contract out management of the airport on a short-term basis. But long-term leases can shift much greater responsibility and entrepreneurial incentive to the airport company, while liberating much of the city's previous investment in the airport. To create new airport facilities, the private sector can be brought in as a partner and granted either a long-term or perpetual franchise to finance, design, own, and operate the new facility. Full private ownership and management of airports is also possible and is becoming fairly common in Europe.

### Congress won’t give funding

#### Congress won’t give funding

Poole 07 (Robert W. Poole, Jr. is the director of transportation policy and Searle Freedom Trust Transportation Fellow at Reason Foundation. “The Urgent Need To Reform The FAA’s Air Traffic Control System.” March 2007. http://reason.org/files/7e27c68e7675e8a599716bab220978f5.pdf)

Some, especially in the general aviation community, argue that Congress could solve the problem by appropriating a larger amount of general federal revenue each year, such as 25 percent to 30 percent of the FAA’s budget instead of the recent level of about 18 percent to 21 percent. Yet given the federal budget deficit and numerous other claims on general-fund monies, this alternative appears extremely unlikely, especially for a program that has the potential to raise revenue from its users. This is why Blakey and Mineta have called funding reform essential for ATC modernization.