# ECONOMY ADVANTAGE

#### Econ collapse by September

International Business Times 6/29 (MELÉNDEZ, Eleazar D; reporter for the International Business times, “Collapse Of Financial System Will Come In August, Maybe September: Market-Watchers,” June 29th, 2012; http://www.ibtimes.com/articles/357971/20120629/economy-collapse-prediction-august-september.htm)

Disappointed by the lack of aggressive action by the U.S. Federal Reserve at the meeting of its powerful rate-setting committee last week, and assuming a wait-and-see posture on results from this week's European summit, pessimistic market-watchers are turning once again to guessing when the clock atop the euro zone time-bomb will finally run to 0.¶ The consensus? The world economy has entered a final countdown with three months left, and investors should pencil in a collapse in either August or September.¶ Citing a theory he has been espousing since 2010 that predicts "a future lack of policy flexibility from the monetary and fiscal side," Jim Reid, a strategist at Deutsche Bank, wrote a note Tuesday that gloated "it feels like Europe has proved us right."¶ "The U.S. has the ability to disprove the universal nature of our theory," Reid wrote, but "if this U.S. cycle is of completely average length as seen using the last 158 years of history (33 cycles), then the next recession should start by the end of August."¶ Follow us ¶ Reid is not the only one on Wall Street invoking history to predict a late-summer crisis. Since the employment data starting looking pear-shaped in April, economists and strategists have been quick to point out that 2012 is, in economic terms, a deja vú to 2011, when unexpectedly strong gains in manufacturing and employment during the first three months of the year fizzled coming in the summer.¶ Those holding on to the "mirror image" theory point out that, if the pattern continues, things will turn sour very quickly sometime in August or September. To wit, August 2011 was the month that brought the Standard and Poor's downgrade of the U.S. sovereign credit rating and accompanying volatility in the equity markets. It was also the month the European Central Bank acknowledged just how badly the situation was going in Europe, stepping in to buy sovereign bonds.¶ Last September was not much kinder to the global economy, bringing an intensification of the crisis that prompted the Fed to begin its "Operation Twist" program of monetary accommodation.¶ This year, pessimists are pointing to the next meeting of the Fed's rate-setting body, on Aug. 1; the next "progress report" on Greece by the institutions providing bailout monies to that country, also in August; or the September release of the results by auditors currently combing through the Spanish banking system, scheduled for September, as possible catalysts for the next crisis.¶ "Historically, August is a good month for a big European crisis," Simon Johnson, a prominent MIT economist, wrote in the New York Times' Economix blog on June 21.¶ Pundits and experts had been putting a deadline on the current crisis for weeks now. Earlier in June, for example, billionaire financier George Soros noted European leaders had a "three months' window" to resolve the political factors underlying the economic crisis in the Continent.

#### Econ collapse coming soon- banks, commodities, jobs, and Europe

Lendman 6/24 (Stephen, BA from Harvard University and MBA from Wharton, “Heading for Economic Collapse,” June 24, 2012; http://www.opednews.com/articles/Heading-for-Economic-Colla-by-Stephen-Lendman-120624-246.html)

Goldman Sachs "takes the cake," says Roberts. Its $44 trillion in derivatives speculation "is covered by only $19 billion in risk capital." In other words, its bets are "2,295 times larger than" cash on hand covering them. Derivatives bets by America's five largest banks exceed US GDP over 15-fold. Corrupt politicians allowing it assure eventual economic collapse.¶ Banking executives are serial liars. After Moody's downgrades, Citigroup and Bank of America officials said its action failed to reflect "safeguards" in place for years. Roberts destroyed their argument. So did Brown and other independent analysts.¶ Moody's and other rating agencies long ago lost credibility. They failed to acknowledge the sub-prime crisis until headlines revealed it. They bogusly call toxic assets safe in return for large fees and big profits. They're called lagging, not leading indicators. They're many days and dollars short. They're part of the dirty game that scams ordinary people.¶ RBC Capital Markets analyst Gerard Cassidy said Moody's "action is five years too late." Stanford University Professor Anat Admati called its downgrades bad news at a time bank "balance sheets are very fragile." Credit Agricole Securities analyst Mike Mayo said "America doesn't have a coherent solution to its banking crisis. Will actions like Moody's make it safer," he asked?¶ Saying the jury is still out, he doubts it. He also called Thursday's downgrades "unfortunate four years after (a) crisis" that's deepening, not improving. Evidence shows troubled global banking conditions. Central bank liquidity injections alone prevent collapse. They're running their course. Each new round helps less than previous ones. Ahead they'll be ineffective at a price too great to bear.¶ They've bailed out banks at the expense of economic growth. Recovery is more distant than earlier. Speculators alone profited. Good times they alone enjoyed are ending. Economic data show it. The closely watched Markit Eurozone purchasing managers composite index matched May's 46 read. It showed production contracting at the steepest level since June 2009.¶ Its flash measure dropped from 45.1 in May to 44.8 in June. It reflected a 37-month low. Markit's chief economist, Chris Williamson, said the flash reading "rounded off the weakest quarter for three years." China's flash PMI fell to 48.1 in June. Manufacturing contracted for the eighth consecutive month. The Fed slashed 2012 and 2013 US growth. Growing numbers of companies are cutting revenue and profit estimates. Germany's ZEW confidence index plunged to -16.9 from 10.8 in May. It's the largest monthly decline since the 1998 LTCM/Russian debt default crisis.¶ Moreover, its Ifo business confidence index hit a two-year low, and Italy's consumer confidence plunged to its lowest level since 1996. US initial jobless claims are rising. On June 21, they reached a 2012 high. Slowdown is gaining speed. Economic underpinnings look wobbly. In June alone, about 70% of economic reports showed weakness. ¶ The Fed's Operation Twist extension underwhelmed analysts. Officially it's called the Maturity Extension Program. It exchanges short-term debt for longer term holdings. In theory, it's to lower interest rates on 10-year Treasuries. In early June 22 trading, they stood at 1.63%, a near record low.¶ Housing remains in Depression. In the week ending June 15, mortgage purchase applications plunged 8.5%. Companies keep cutting planned capex expenditures. According to the latest Architectural Billings Index, commercial construction keeps contracting.¶ Down 22% from their highs, commodity prices entered bear market territory. Oil prices hit an 18-month low. It signals weak demand. Brent fell 8% in one week. It's down 30% from its earlier high.¶ US factory output reached an 11-month low. Eurozone business activity dropped for the fifth straight month. At a 48.5 read in June, Germany's PMI shows contraction. The Fed's June Philadelphia manufacturing index contracted sharply to -16.6 after dropping 5.8 points in May.¶ The Jolts (Job Opening/Labor Turnover) survey showed job openings plunged 325,000 in May. It was the steepest drop since Lehman's September 2008 collapse. Only twice before in the past decade did it decline that much. All major categories were affected.¶ New hires decreased for the second straight month. They're lowest since July 2011. Again all categories showed weakness. Layoffs keep increasing. Cuts rose in three of the past four months. Data revisions are mostly negative. Peak levels were reached months ago. The full impact of how weak things are has yet to hit home. So-called recovery is an illusion, not reality.¶ Europe's economic condition is grim. Bailing out Spain gets harder. Economist Jack Rasmus estimates its banks need at least $300 billion, not the publicly announced $78.75 billion. He added that hundreds of billions more are needed to rescue Spain's regional and central governments. At issue is who'll supply it. Sick economies can't solve their own problems. ¶ Eurozone ones look to Germany for help. It bears the greatest burden when it's economy is weakening. Italy's troubled economy combined with its 12-month 29% of GDP sovereign financing burden means it can't contribute much.¶ Europe's PIIGS (Portugal, Ireland, Italy, Greece and Spain) combined with troubled France have a combined public debt of 200% of Germany's GDP. Its own debt to GDP ratio is 80%. Simple math says it can't backstop the Eurozone. Bailouts can't continue forever. Debt burdened economies head for collapse. Adding more hastens the timeframe. ¶ Troubled Eurozone economies are so weak that cross-border bank-to-bank lending dried up. ECB chairman Mario Draghi calls inter-bank lending "dysfunctional." It's "not working," he said. As it goes, so does business lending altogether.¶ Rasmus said these developments show deepening crisis conditions. He blames wrongheaded policy measures. Austerity when stimulus is needed hit hard. Government revenues are down. So is consumption. Business spending keeps falling. Debt keeps rising. A looming train wreck approaches.

#### US not key

The Economist 7 (November 23, “America’s Vulnerable Economy”, pg. 13)

The best hope that global growth can stay strong lies instead with emerging economies. A decade ago, the thought that so much depended on these crisis-prone places would have been terrifying. Yet thanks largely to economic reforms, their annual growth rate has surged to around 7%. This year they will contribute half of the globe's GDP growth, measured at market exchange rates, over three times as much as America. In the past, emerging economies have often needed bailing out by the rich world. This time they could be the rescuers. Of course, a recession in America would reduce emerging economies' exports, but they are less vulnerable than they used to be. America's importance as an engine of global growth has been exaggerated. Since 2000 its share of world imports has dropped from 19% to 14%. Its vast current-account deficit has started to shrink, meaning that America is no longer pulling along the rest of the world. Yet growth in emerging economies has quickened, partly thanks to demand at home. In the first half of this year the increase in consumer spending (in actual dollar terms) in China and India added more to global GDP growth than that in America. Most emerging economies are in healthier shape than ever (see article). They are no longer financially dependent on the rest of the world, but have large foreign-exchange reserves—no less than three-quarters of the global total. Though there are some notable exceptions, most of them have small budget deficits (another change from the past), so they can boost spending to offset weaker exports if need be.

#### 93 crises prove no war

Miller ‘00 (Morris, Economist, Adjunct Professor in the Faculty of Administration – University of Ottawa, Former Executive Director and Senior Economist – World Bank, “Poverty as a Cause of Wars?”, Interdisciplinary Science Reviews, Winter, p. 273)

The question may be reformulated. Do wars spring from a popular reaction to a sudden economic crisis that
exacerbates poverty and growing disparities in wealth and incomes? Perhaps one could argue, as some scholars do, that it is some dramatic event or sequence of such events leading to the exacerbation of poverty that, in turn, leads to this deplorable denouement. This exogenous factor might act as a catalyst for a violent reaction on the part of the people or on the part of the political leadership who would then possibly be tempted to seek a diversion by finding or, if need be, fabricating an enemy and setting in train the process leading to war. According to a study undertaken by Minxin Pei and Ariel Adesnik of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, there would not appear to be any merit in this hypothesis. After studying ninety-three episodes of economic crisis in twenty-two countries in Latin America and Asia in the years since the Second World War they concluded that:19 Much of the conventional wisdom about the political impact of economic crises may be wrong ... The severity of economic crisis – as measured in terms of inflation and negative growth - bore no relationship to the collapse of regimes ... (or, in democratic states, rarely) to an outbreak of violence ... In the cases of dictatorships and semidemocracies, the ruling elites responded to crises by increasing repression (thereby using one form of violence to abort another).

# TRADE ADVANTAGE

#### Climate change will reduce shipping costs

**Attavanich et. al 11** [WitsanuAttavanich,\* Ph.D. Candidate Bruce A. McCarl Distinguished and Regents Professor Stephen W. Fuller Regents Professor Dmitry V. Vedenov Associate Professor Zafarbek Ahmedov Ph.D. Candidate Department of Agricultural Economics, Texas A&M University, College Station Selected Paper prepared for presentation at the Agricultural & Applied Economics Association’s 2011 AAEA & NAREA Joint Annual Meeting

July 24-26, “The Effect of Climate Change on Transportation Flows and Inland Waterways Due to Climate-Induced Shifts in Crop Production Patterns” <http://ageconsearch.umn.edu/bitstream/109241/2/AAEASelectedPaper_The%20Effect%20of%20Climate%20Change%20on%20Transportation%20Flows_13247.pdf>]

Several studies find that watersheds supplying water to the Great Lakes–St. Lawrence River system are likely to experience drier conditions, resulting in lower water levels and reduced capacity to ship agricultural and other bulk commodities, and hence increase costs of inland waterway transport (Millerd 2005; Millerd 2011; Chao 1999; Easterling and Karl 2001). Millerd (2005) find that predicted lowering of Great Lakes water levels would result in an estimated increase in Canadian shipping costs between 13 and 29 percent by 2050. The impacts vary between commodities and routes. For grains, the annual average shipping cost shipped from upper lakes to St. Lawrence River is simulated to increase about 11 percent in 2050 compared to shipping cost in 2001. For the US, Millerd (2011) projected the increase in the US vessel operating costs of grains and agricultural products exported from the Great Lakes, which is slightly lower than the Canadian vessel operating costs. They reveal that the US vessel operating 12 costs of grains and agricultural products range from 4.15-4.95, 7.96-9.30, and 21.71-22.62 percent by 2030, 2050, and under doubling CO2 scenario, respectively. However, many studies found that warming temperatures are likely to result in more ice-free ports, improved access to ports, and longer shipping seasons, which could offset some of the resulting adverse economic effects from increased shipping costs. Based on the above studies, all of them mostly focus on the direct influence of climate change on transportation sector especially transportation infrastructures and costs; however no one focuses on the indirect effect of climate change on this sector through climate induced changes in agriculture.

**No impact---regions will shift export locations**

**Attavanich et. al 11** [WitsanuAttavanich\* Ph.D. Candidate Bruce A. McCarl Distinguished and Regents Professor Stephen W. Fuller Regents Professor Dmitry V. Vedenov Associate Professor Zafarbek Ahmedov Ph.D. Candidate Department of Agricultural Economics, Texas A&M University, College Station Selected Paper prepared for presentation at the Agricultural & Applied Economics Association’s 2011 AAEA & NAREA Joint Annual Meeting

July 24-26, “The Effect of Climate Change on Transportation Flows and Inland Waterways Due to Climate-Induced Shifts in Crop Production Patterns” <http://ageconsearch.umn.edu/bitstream/109241/2/AAEASelectedPaper_The%20Effect%20of%20Climate%20Change%20on%20Transportation%20Flows_13247.pdf>]

4.3.1 Regional transportation flows This section reports results of grain transportation flows due to climate-induced shifts in crop production patterns. To minimize transportation costs, we expect the western section of grains’ excess supply region such as Nebraska, Colorado, and Iowa ships grains to fill in the demand in its nearby areas, Pacific Southwest, and southern to central part of the Rocky Mountains regions and export to Mexico via rail and other countries via Pacific Northwest ports. The left part of the northern section of grain’s excess supply region such as North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota ships grains to meet the demand in its nearby areas, the Pacific Northwest, Pacific Southwest, and the Rocky Mountains; exports to the rest of the world (ROW) via Pacific Northwest ports, the Great Lakes ports, Lower Mississippi ports and; exports via rail to meet the demand in Canada. On the other hand, the right part of the northern section of grains’ excess supply region such as New York and Pennsylvania and Eastern section such as Michigan and Ohio are expected to move corn to fill in the demand in its nearby areas, the Northeast and Southeast regions of the US; export corn to the ROW via the Great Lakes ports, and the Atlantic ports; export via rail to Canada. Finally, this study expects grain shipments from the central (such as Illinois, Indiana, and Missouri) and southern (such as Texas, Arkansas, and Kansas) section of grains’ excess supply region to its nearby areas, the excess demand locations in the South Central, Southwest, and Southeast regions of the US; to the Lower Mississippi ports and Texas Gulf ports for export. Under climate change the volume of grain supply in each location and the distribution of excess supply and demand locations are projected to change as discussed in section 4.2.3. These changes will likely affect the pattern of grain flows across the US regions. Table 2 and table 3 provide results of simulated transportation flows of corn and soybeans, respectively, from region to region, and region to destinations for export under climate change from GCMs in 2050 compared to the baseline scenario.

**Transportation infrastructure isn’t key to trade**

**UN Committee on Transport ‘08** [United Nations Economic and Social Council, “ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COMMISSION FOR ASIA AND THE PACIFIC,” TRANSPORT AND POVERTY: FROM FARM TO MARKET—EXTENDING THE REACH OF LOGISTICS, http://www.unescap.org/ttdw/ct2008/ctr\_2e.pdf]

Although the transport and logistics infrastructure is the backbone of efficient food logistics, it has been widely agreed that **to improve the infrastructure alone is not enough to overcome all the problems**. Non-infrastructure barriers must not be underestimated. These non-infrastructure barriers can be found in cross-border procedures, institutional arrangements, commercial practices, a lack of coordination among different actors along the supply chain and regulatory shortcomings reflecting the need for facilitation measures by Governments of countries along the chain. This latter aspect is of particular importance for landlocked countries wishing to engage in the trade of perishable foods, where additional sets of administrative hurdles might have to be faced. In these cases, they would primarily relate to border crossing procedures and transit regimes. Similar problems might be faced in the development of intraregional bilateral trades. While such customs-related issues may be of the highest concern, there are also issues of a regulatory nature that would fall under the auspices of ministries of transport and that need to be addressed. Such issues include, for example, regulatory and promotional policies relating to transport modes, modal policies and the licensing of foreign operators along the cool chain. Policy approaches would need to reflect the requirements of the chain and, consequently, be harmonized in cases where international corridor operations are involved.

### Agriculture

#### Agriculture is a small economic sector

**McDonald- ABARE-‘6**

[Donald, Australian Bureau of Agricultural and Resource Economics, US Agriculture Without Farm Support]

While the United States is one of the largest agricultural producers in the world**, agriculture is only a small sector in the US economy.** As indicated earlier, **agriculture accounts for around 2 per cent of the US labor force**. The agricultural labor force in the United States reached a peak of approximately 13.5 million in 1910 and declined to around 3 million in 2000.

#### Agriculture not key to the economy or jobs

**Smith-fellow Competitive Enterprise Institute-6**

[[http://cei.org/people/fran-smith](https://owa.ku.edu/exchweb/bin/redir.asp?URL=http://cei.org/people/fran-smith)   Time to End Big Sugar's Sweet Deal]

But the U.S. agricultural sector has changed radically since the 1930s. Today, very large and highly mechanized farms predominate, employing substantially fewer people. With the U.S. a highly diversified economy in the 21st century, farming accounted for only 1.4 percent of total U.S. employment in 2001, and only 0.7 percent of U.S. GDP.

## A2 Waterways

#### Status quo solves

USACE 12 (United States Army Corps of Engineers, “President's Fiscal Year 2013 Budget for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers’ Civil Works released”, February 12, 2012, [http://www.lrn.usace.army.mil/pao/pdf/12-002 %20FY13%20President's%20Fis cal%20Year%20 2013%20Budget%20for%20U.S.%20Army%20Corps%20of%20Engineers'%20Civil%20Works%20released.pdf](http://www.lrn.usace.army.mil/pao/pdf/12-002%20%20FY13%20President%27s%20Fis%20cal%20Year%20%202013%20Budget%20for%20U.S.%20Army%20Corps%20of%20Engineers%27%20Civil%20Works%20released.pdf))

The FY13 Budget includes $1.747 billion for the study, design, construction, operation and maintenance of inland and coastal navigation projects. It funds capital investments on the inland waterways based on the estimated revenues to the Inland Waterways Trust Fund, while proposing a new user fee to increase revenue to this trust fund to enable a significant increase in funding for such investments in the future. The FY13 O&M program is funded at $2.532 billion, including $134 million in the Mississippi River and Tributaries (MR&T) account. The Budget emphasizes performance of existing projects by focusing on the those coastal harbors and inland waterways with the most commercial traffic as well as safety improvements at Federal dams and levees based on the risk and consequence of a failure. The Budget also funds maintenance work at harbors that support significant commercial fishing, subsistence, or public transportation benefits. The FY13 construction program is funded at $1.570 billion, including $99 million in the MR&T account. The construction program uses objective, performance-based guidelines to allocate funding toward the highest performing economic, environmental, and public safety investments. The aquatic ecosystem restoration program, whose priorities are informed by interagency collaboration and planning, emphasizes funding to restore several large ecosystems: the California Bay Delta, Chesapeake Bay, the Everglades, the Great Lakes, and the Gulf Coast. USACE will continue to work with other federal, state and local agencies, using the best available science and adaptive management, to protect and restore these ecosystems. Environmental sustainability of these ecosystems also helps to support positive economic growth in the surrounding communities. The Budget funds 101 construction projects, consisting of 11 dam safety assurance, seepage control, and static instability correction projects; 24 projects ranked on the basis of life-saving benefits (including three completions); four additional project completions; three new starts; and 59 other continuing projects.

**Waterways aren’t key**

**Attavanich et. al 11** [WitsanuAttavanich\* Ph.D. Candidate Bruce A. McCarl Distinguished and Regents Professor Stephen W. Fuller Regents Professor Dmitry V. Vedenov Associate Professor Zafarbek Ahmedov Ph.D. Candidate Department of Agricultural Economics, Texas A&M University, College Station Selected Paper prepared for presentation at the Agricultural & Applied Economics Association’s 2011 AAEA & NAREA Joint Annual Meeting

July 24-26, “The Effect of Climate Change on Transportation Flows and Inland Waterways Due to Climate-Induced Shifts in Crop Production Patterns” <http://ageconsearch.umn.edu/bitstream/109241/2/AAEASelectedPaper_The%20Effect%20of%20Climate%20Change%20on%20Transportation%20Flows_13247.pdf>]

Due to the projected increase in overall demand for rail mode, many rail infrastructures may need to be upgrade and expand along routes that are simulated to have new or higher levels of grain transportation flows such as routes from Minnesota and North Dakota to ports in Pacific Northwest and the Great Lakes; North Dakota to Texas; and New York and Pennsylvania to North Carolina. To collect grain from rural farmlands to grain elevators, upgrading short line rail track beds and bride structure could be implemented 16 . To increase the speed of the shipments and their reliability, expanding mainline rail track to double or even triple tracking, and increasing the number of sidings should be taken into the consideration of transportation planners 17 . Like rail, truck is also a mode that is projected to receive increasing grain transportation flows. Road infrastructure may be needed to be expanded and upgraded to accommodate the heavy future truck traffic from areas that grain supply are expected to increase to nearby excess demand locations and ports. Rural areas along the Ohio River and Arkansas River toward nearby barge locations shipped to the Lower Mississippi ports; northern parts of Ohio toward the Great Lakes ports at Toledo; Ohio, Pennsylvania, and New York toward Atlantic Ports at Norfolk (VA) are some of examples. Finally due to a multifaceted system of grain supply chain, improving intermodal connectors which are the truck routes connecting highways with ports and rail terminals might be suitable in those areas.

**Projects to fix the waterways are slow and difficult to implement**

**IWR ’07** (Institute for water resources, “Maritime Transportation System:

Trends and Outlook”, March 13, 2007, <http://www.iwr.usace.army.mil/docs/iwrreports/2007-R-05.pdf>)

**The greatest concern of the inland waterways industry appears to be funding maintenance and modernization of infrastructure rather than accommodating growth.** The House passed a new

Water Resources Development Act (HR 2864) in 2005 and the Senate passed the bill in the

summer of 2006. The Senate and House are working to compromise differences in the two bills.

The June 2005 version of HR 2864 allows **$1.8 billion for seven new 1,200 foot locks on the**

**Upper Mississippi. Regardless of the outcome, over the long term it is clear that any work on the inland waterway system that increases or maintains capacity for commerce will be difficult and therefore slow to implement**

#### Waterways trade off with trucking

**Suarez & Thompson 11** [Evelyn M. Suarez & J. Forbes Thompson, Journal of Commerce Online, “Budget Decisions Churn Waters,” Sept 5, lexis]

Our inland waterways also play an important role in supporting our nation's international trade by linking ports and other waterways**. They provide an important alternative means of transportation to roads**, helping reduce congestion on highways in a far more energy-efficient and safer way **than highway trucking**. Transportation costs using inland waterways are two to three times less than other modes of transportation, representing a savings of $7 billion a year for U.S. companies.

**That internal link turns the aff**

**Bulk Transporter 10** [“Trucks best serve demands of agricultural shippers, according to USDA study,” 9/1, lexis]

Trucks provide America's agriculture producers with the best service for transporting time-sensitive products from supplier to farm and farm to market, said a study released recently by the US Department of Agriculture (USDA), in coordination with the US Department of Transportation. According to the USDA, many high-value agricultural products are perishable and time-sensitive, requiring the efficiency, special handling, or refrigerated services best provided by trucks. "The USDA study provides the first holistic examination of agricultural transportation and **highlights the essentiality of trucking to our modern agricultural production system**," said Russell Laird, executive director of the American Trucking Associations' Agricultural & Food Transporters Conference. The study, commissioned by Congress with the passage of the farm bill in 2008, said agriculture is the largest user of freight transportation in the United States, claiming 31% of all ton-miles transported in the nation in 2007. **Truck transportation is essential to the movement of these goods, providing the primary transport mode** for all agricultural commodities, including grain. Trucks provide a vital flexibility, said the study. "They are the most effective method of moving goods short distances and for assembling quantities of products at elevators and warehouses for transloading to other modes of transportation," said the study.

# HEGEMONY ADVANTAGE

## A2 Rail

### Squo solves

#### TIGER solves Aff – rail infrastructure being funded for adaptation now

Port Strategy,6- 28 [Port Strategy is dedicated to the Marine Ports and Terminals business.¶ ¶ Since 2003, Port Strategy has been the respected source of commercial port development information which our clients have trusted to deliver their marketing message. This has been achieved by providing readers with authoritative editorial prepared by contributors who are experts in their field, “US grants help improve rail infrastructure”, 6-28-12, http://www.portstrategy.com/news101/news-extra/us-grants-help-improve-rail-infrastructure]

 Port freight projects across the US have been awarded US$79m in TIGER IV infrastructure grants with a heavy emphasis on funding green intermodality aiming to get freight off the roads by improving rail infrastructure.¶ ¶ ¶ The federal funds come from the US Department of Transportation's TIGER (Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery) programme. ¶ ¶ Of the 47 capital project funding requests selected to receive awards, eight have gone directly to America’s port related infrastructure – making up 16% of the total capital grant funds available.¶ ¶ Among the grants awarded, the Port of Oakland in California will receive a US$15m grant to boost rail access and capacity at the port, the Port of Mobile in Alabama will receive US$12m to connect a container facility with the national rail system and the Port of Corpus Christi in Texas will receive US$10m to help fund a new rail siding and increase capacity.¶ ¶ The Port of Long Beach (POLB) is also a good example of how a US$17m TIGER grant is being put to good use to improve rail infrastructure. The “Green Port Gateway” aims to improve rail flow and the environment at the port.¶ ¶ A POLB spokesperson said to Port Strategy: "Improving our rail network is critical if the Port of Long Beach is to grow green. The Green Port Gateway project will allow us to increase on-dock rail shipments by adding tracks so we eliminate a potential bottleneck. Moving more cargo by trains rather than trucks will ease roadway congestion and reduce air emissions."¶ ¶ The Green Port Gateway Project will add a third rail line, helping to remove bottlenecks on the existing mainline track to allow port terminals to shift cargo from trucks to trains, which decreases local traffic congestion and air pollution. The improvements will minimise derailments and optimise rail traffic flow to the waterfront terminals. The project will cost an estimated $60 million and take 19 months to construct.¶ ¶ The Green Port Gateway Project, the first of four rail projects expected to begin in the next year to promote more on-dock rail shipments, is also part of the larger San Pedro Bay Ports Rail Enhancement Program, which involves several projects by the Port of Long Beach, the Port of Los Angeles and the Alameda Corridor Transportation Authority.

## A2 Airports

### Inherency

#### Airports already prepared for severe weather

Transport Research Board of the National Academies ’12 – [Transport Research Board of the National Academies, supported by the FAA, “ACRP SYNTHESIS 33

Airport Climate Adaptation and Resilience”, March 2012, TRB or the NA, <http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/acrp/acrp_syn_033.pdf> AD]

**The survey conducted for this Synthesis report found that most airport managers believed** disruptions from weather events were increasing. A majority also believed that **emergency procedures could handle climate risks,** whereas fewer believed that irregular operations processes were a satisfactory means for addressing them. Although risk management systems have been identified as a key method for addressing climate change, this approach had not yet become formal practice at U.S. airports**. Research does indicate that some airports are following the high-level, iterative planning cycle for climate change adaptation that many sources commonly advocate—beginning with identification of relevant climate impacts, assessment of vulnerabilities, high-level identification of risks, development and implementation of a plan, and monitoring and revisiting earlier decisions based on new information.** Other airports have asset management and environmental systems management staff who are determining their own course of action, such as researching best practices in light of the climate risks they saw.

### Case Turn: Airports Kill the Environment

#### Airports kill the environment

Luther ’07 – Congressional Research Service [CRS, “Environmental Impacts of Airport Operations, Maintenance, and Expansions”, April 5, 2007, Congressional Research Service, <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/RL33949.pdf> AD]

In the next 15 years, air travel is projected to grow significantly.3 As a result, airport development and expansion projects will likely become increasingly important. A potential challenge to the completion of these projects is community concern regarding airport environmental impacts. Airport operations involve a range of activities that affect the environment, including ! the operation of aircraft; ! the operation of airport and passenger vehicles, and airport ground service equipment (GSE); ! cleaning and maintenance of aircraft, GSE, and motor vehicles; ! deicing and anti-icing of aircraft and airfields; ! fueling and fuel storage of aircraft and vehicles; ! airport facility operations and maintenance; and ! construction. The environmental impacts of these activities may intensify if an airport is undergoing expansion. In some cases, before a state or local agency will allow an airport to move forward with an expansion project, the airport authority must agree to implement certain environmental mitigation projects. Community concern regarding environmental impacts has caused projects to be delayed or cancelled. All airports, regardless of size or location, are regulated to some degree under local, state, tribal, or federal environmental requirements. Many of the environmental regulatory requirements applicable to noise, water, and air quality have been in effect for years — airport managers are accustomed to their compliance requirements. However, the anticipated growth in air travel has heightened the significance and complexity of some environmental regulatory issues. Also, several new requirements are expected to result in potentially significant changes to airport operations (in terms of procedural changes and potential investment in infrastructure). The most significant issues include ! continuing community concern about noise, ! changes to Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regulations applicable to aircraft and airfield deicing operations, ! changes to EPA regulations applicable to oil spill prevention planning, andstate and local agency directives to monitor and control air pollution, particularly toxic air pollutants. Each of these issues is discussed below within the context of requirements applicable to noise, water quality, and air quality issues. Primarily, the issues discussed in this report involve activities that are unique to airport operations (e.g., deicing and aircraft noise). Environmental compliance requirements commonly applicable to all industrial operations (e.g., waste management, pesticide use, chemical use reporting) are not discussed in this report.4

#### **\*\*Water Pollution**

#### **Airports release harmful pollutants into water bodies**

Luther ’07 – Congressional Research Service [CRS, “Environmental Impacts of Airport Operations, Maintenance, and Expansions”, April 5, 2007, Congressional Research Service, <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/RL33949.pdf> AD]

Airport operations include many activities likely to result in the discharge of pollutants to adjacent water bodies. Those activities include aircraft and airfield deicing and anti-icing,12 fuel storage and refueling, aircraft and vehicle cleaning and maintenance, and construction. These activities are regulated under provisions of the Clean Water Act (CWA). The CWA prohibits any “point source” (a discrete conveyance such as a drainage ditch, pipe, or other outfall) from discharging pollutants into waters of the United States. The primary mechanism for controlling pollutant discharges is through the administration of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program, which is implemented, in most cases, by individual states.13 The NPDES permit program regulates discharges of stormwater14 and wastewater. Due to the nature of their outdoor operations and because airports are included in one of the industrial categories regulated under the NPDES stormwater permitting program (under the Standard Industrial Classification code “Transportation by Air”), all airports are required to have a stormwater permit.15 Airports that discharge other wastewater, such as from equipment maintenance and cleaning operations, require an additional NPDES wastewater permit. Discharges associated with stormwater often pose the greatest challenge to airport managers, because airports may be spread out over a wide surface area, with a majority of operations exposed to the elements. For example, the Dallas Forth Worth International Airport encompasses 18,000 square acres and has 62 stormwater outfalls. Controlling or monitoring every outfall is difficult. The primary method for controlling stormwater discharges is the implementation of best management practices (BMPs) that prevent or minimize the discharge of pollutants into a water body (e.g., construction of a stormwater retention pond to prevent stormwater drainage directly into receiving waters). BMPs appropriate for one airport are not necessarily appropriate for another. Factors that may affect permit requirements (i.e., appropriate BMPs), include ! the local climate (dry versus rainy/wet, cold versus warm); ! the type or size of adjacent water bodies — pollutants are diluted depending on the size of the water body receiving the discharge (e.g., a creek or stream versus a river or ocean); ! the water quality of adjacent water bodies — local permitting authorities consider existing pollutant levels when controlling airport discharges; and ! airport size. To comply with the Clean Water Act, most airport operators are particularly concerned about managing deicing chemicals and preventing oil spills.

#### De-icing solutions cause massive environmental damage.

Luther ’07 – Congressional Research Service [CRS, “Environmental Impacts of Airport Operations, Maintenance, and Expansions”, April 5, 2007, Congressional Research Service, <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/RL33949.pdf> AD]

With regard to water quality compliance issues, the management of deicing and anti-icing chemicals poses the greatest challenge to many airport operators. The deicing and anti-icing of aircraft and airfield surfaces is required by the FAA to ensure the safety of passengers. However, when performed without discharge controls in place, airport deicing operations can result in environmental impacts.16 Discharges from deicing operations have the potential to cause fish kills, algae blooms, and contamination to surface or ground waters. In addition to potential aquatic life and human health impacts from the toxicity of deicing and anti-icing chemicals, the biodegradation of propylene glycol or ethylene glycol (i.e., the base chemical of deicing fluid) in surface waters (e.g., lakes, rivers) can greatly impact water quality, including significant reduction in dissolved oxygen levels.17 Studies have also shown toxicological effects of deicer solutions that cannot be attributed to either propylene glycol or ethylene glycol.18 This has led to concern that these effects are attributable to unknown, proprietary additives.19 The environmental route and impact of these additives is not yet understood. Typically, airlines are responsible for aircraft deicing and anti-icing operations, and airports are responsible for the deicing and anti-icing of airfield pavement. The airport is ultimately responsible for managing the resulting wastewater. This responsibility is typically outlined in the airport’s stormwater permit. As discussed above, significant differences exist among airport NPDES permits. For example, a local permitting authority may impose specific requirements, such as restrictions as to where deicing operations may occur, a requirement to use deicing collection units to vacuum deicing fluid prior to entering the storm water system, or requirements to use monitoring equipment to ensure compliance with the permit. Other permits may simply allow the airport to discharge deicing fluids directly into an adjacent water body. According to the EPA, the disparity in airport permitting requirements has led the agency to consider implementing national standards in the form of effluent limitation guidelines (ELGs) for airport deicing and anti-icing operations.20 ELGs are national regulations for controlling wastewater discharges to surface waters. ELGs are technology-based and specific to an industry. ELGs applicable to airport deicing would be designed to provide uniform guidance for NPDES permit writers across the country, thereby establishing a baseline standard for all airports.21 In 2004, the EPA began to develop ELGs for airport deicing operations. Initial estimates from the EPA indicate that treatment technology and pollution prevention practices could potentially reduce deicing discharges from the current level of 21 million gallons a year to 4 million gallons a year.22 As stated previously, many airports have strict permit provisions that specify the management of deicing chemicals. Others have few controls. Those with few controls may be required to make capital improvements to comply with new permitting requirements. At this stage, cost estimates for the aviation industry as a whole are not available. The EPA is currently collecting survey data from airports and air carriers and conducting detailed sampling programs. The current work will be used to identify the best available technology that is economically achievable for treatment and discharge of spent deicing liquids. The EPA currently plans to publish a proposed rule in December 2007 and to take final action by September 2009.

#### Water pollution has multiple impacts

Walls-Thumma ’09 – Dawn, writer for National Geographic [National Geographic “How Can Water Pollution Affect Animals, Homes and Health?”, 2009, National Geographic, <http://greenliving.nationalgeographic.com/can-water-pollution-affect-animals-homes-health-2921.html> AD]

**Every summer, polluted water pours down the Mississippi River, poisoning the water in the Gulf of Mexico and causing an 8,000-square-mile dead zone** --- an area roughly the size of New Jersey --- **in which aquatic life cannot survive** (see References 1). While a dramatic example, water pollution regularly affects the health of wildlife, ecosystems and perhaps your family. Eutrophication and Dead Zones Dead zones like the one found at the Gulf of Mexico occur when sewage discharge and fertilizer runoff --- from farms, golf courses and lawns --- enter surface waters. Intended to promote the growth of plants, fertilizers also encourage the growth of algae, called eutrophication. As these aquatic plants die, they sink to the bottom, where the bacteria that decompose them use up the oxygen in the water, making the water uninhabitable for aquatic animals. While adult fish can usually move to a higher-oxygen environment, many crustaceans and shellfish cannot move and die from lack of oxygen. (See References 2) Harmful Algal Blooms Proliferation of toxic algae species also impacts the health of both wildlife and humans. When these algae flourish because of nutrient pollution in the water, they produce toxins that poison aquatic organisms, such as seabirds, fish, sea turtles and aquatic mammals, like dolphins, manatees and sea lions. Other algae species clog the gills of fish and aquatic invertebrates. (See References 3) When people become exposed to algae-infested waters or consume fish or shellfish poisoned by algal toxins, they can become ill and can even die (see References 4). Drinking Water Contamination Drinking water comes from surface water, such as lakes and rivers, and from groundwater (see References 5). Pollution in these sources affects the quality and safety of water available in your home and, if the problem is not detected, it can affect your health. Pollution of drinking water occurs because of contamination by human and animal waste, mining activities, fertilizer and pesticides from homes and farms, industrial wastes, hazardous wastes generated by dry cleaners and gas stations, landfills and improperly disposed-of household wastes. (See References 5) Health Risks Pollution with sewage or manure runoff can cause microbial contamination of drinking water. This results in gastrointestinal diseases that can be fatal in high risk individuals. Nitrates --- chemicals used in synthetic fertilizers --- can leach into groundwater or run off into surface waters. While most individuals suffer no adverse effects from high levels of nitrates, infants cannot convert them into a harmless substance; if they consume nitrates, they can die from blue baby syndrome, a disorder in which the blood cannot properly carry oxygen. Infants, young children, pregnant and nursing women and some elderly individuals are most at risk for nitrate poisoning. (See References 6)

#### \*\*Air Pollution

#### Airports release many air pollutants

Luther ’07 – Congressional Research Service [CRS, “Environmental Impacts of Airport Operations, Maintenance, and Expansions”, April 5, 2007, Congressional Research Service, <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/RL33949.pdf> AD]

**Airport emissions affecting local air quality come from both mobile and stationary sources**, including the following: ! Aircraft. ! Motor vehicles (e.g., cars and buses for airport operations, and passenger, employee, and rental agency vehicles). ! Ground service equipment (GSE) (e.g., aircraft tugs, baggage and belt loaders, generators, lawn mowers, snow plows, loaders, tractors, air-conditioning units, and cargo moving equipment). ! Stationary sources (e.g., boilers, space heaters, emergency generators, incinerators, fire training facilities, aircraft engine testing facilities, painting operations, and solvent degreasers).28 **Airport operations may produce various regulated pollutants, including volatile organic compounds** (VOCs**), carbon monoxide** (CO), **particulate matter** (PM), **lead, sulphur oxides** (SOx), **and nitrogen oxides** (NOx), known collectively as “criteria” pollutants. **They also may produce a complex array of toxic or hazardous air pollutants** (HAPs).29

#### **Airports lead to many negative environmental consequences**

Aviation Environment Foundation [last cite 2007] [AEF, “WHAT ARE AN AIRPORT’S IMPACTS?”, last cite 2007, AEF, <http://www.aef.org.uk/uploads/PlanningGuide2.pdf> AD]

Airports and aviation generate air pollution through a range of sources: • Combustion of aviation fuel – which is mostly composed of kerosene - produces nitrogen oxides (NOx), carbon monoxide (CO), sulphur oxides (SOx), hydrocarbons and particulates. It also releases the greenhouse gas carbon dioxide (CO2) which is discussed at Section 2.4. • As engines are working inefficiently on approach (as they only use about 30% of the available power) a certain amount of unburnt kerosene is released. These unburnt fuel droplets are a source of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and give rise to odours. • As aircraft tires get worn and burnt during take-off and (especially) landing, they release particulate matter (PM). • Fuel dumping by aircraft releases unburned aircraft fuel into the air. This is a rare occurrence and usually only takes place in emergencies. In these circumstances, aircraft are expected to dump fuel over water where possible, and at an altitude where they are likely to evaporate before reaching the surface. • Vehicles travelling to and from the airport, and ground service equipment (tugs for aircraft and baggage, fuel and catering lorries, buses and vans that transport passengers etc.) generate NOx, CO2, particulates and (indirectly) ozone through the burning of petrol and diesel fuel. • Fuel storage tanks and transfer facilities can lead to the release of VOCs. • Aircraft and airfield maintenance (painting, metal cleaning, de-icing etc.), and emergency and fire training use complex chemicals which can release VOCs. • Construction of airport-related projects can lead to dust, emissions from asphalt laying etc. (Kenney, 2006). http://www.photographersdirect.com Air pollution can affect the health of people, animals and plants. It can promote eutrophication (essentially over-fertilisation) of water, leading to excessive plant growth and decay. It can also deteriorate buildings and materials and smell bad. Table 2.2 summarises the main impacts of air pollution.

#### **Airports produce hazardous air pollutants**

Luther ’07 – Congressional Research Service [CRS, “Environmental Impacts of Airport Operations, Maintenance, and Expansions”, April 5, 2007, Congressional Research Service, <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/RL33949.pdf> AD]

Ten HAPs comprise the majority reported to occur in aircraft and/or GSE exhaust: lead (also a criteria pollutant), formaldehyde, 1,3-butadiene, acetaldehyde, xylene, benzene, toluene, naphthalene, acrolein, and propionaldehyde.38 Unlike information on criteria air pollutants, information on emission levels, transformation, and transport of aircraft and other airport-related HAPs and their health impacts is not currently well-developed.39

#### And, air pollutants cause many diseases

Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory [no date] [LBL, “How can air pollution hurt my health?”, No Date, LBL, <http://www.lbl.gov/Education/ELSI/Frames/pollution-health-effects-f.html> AD]

Air pollution can affect our health in many ways with both short-term and long-term effects. Different groups of individuals are affected by air pollution in different ways. Some individuals are much more sensitive to pollutants than are others. Young children and elderly people often suffer more from the effects of air pollution. **People with health problems such as asthma, heart and lung disease may also suffer more when the air is polluted.** The extent to which an individual is harmed by air pollution usually depends on the total exposure to the damaging chemicals, i.e., the duration of exposure and the concentration of the chemicals must be taken into account. **Examples of short-term effects include irritation to the eyes, nose and throat, and upper respiratory infections such as bronchitis and pneumonia. Other symptoms can include headaches, nausea, and allergic reactions. Short-term air pollution can aggravate the medical conditions of individuals with asthma and emphysema.** In the great "Smog Disaster" in London in 1952, four thousand people died in a few days due to the high concentrations of pollution. Long-term health effects can include chronic respiratory disease, lung cancer, heart disease, and even damage to the brain, nerves, liver, or kidneys. Continual exposure to air pollution affects the lungs of growing children and may aggravate or complicate medical conditions in the elderly. It is estimated that half a million people die prematurely every year in the United States as a result of smoking cigarettes. **Research into the health effects of air pollution is ongoing. Medical conditions arising from air pollution can be very expensive** . Healthcare costs, lost productivity in the workplace, and human welfare impacts cost billions of dollars each year.

#### Aircraft emissions cause global warming

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [no date] [IPCC, “Aviation and the Global Atmosphere”, No date, IPCC, “http://www.ipcc.ch/ipccreports/sres/aviation/index.php?idp=22 AD]

The chemical products of aircraft jet fuel combustion are emitted at the engine nozzle exit plane as part of a high-velocity plume. This gaseous and particulate stream is subject to chemical and dynamical processes that influence downstream composition. Eventually, plume constituents irreversibly mix with, and are diluted by, ambient air. Subsequently, some of the emitted species act in concert with other natural and anthropogenic chemicals to change ozone abundances in the Earth's atmosphere. The ultimate fates of these aircraft-derived species are determined by larger-scale chemical and transport processes. Concerns about NO and NO2 (i.e., NOx) emissions from present-generation subsonic and supersonic aircraft operating in the upper troposphere (UT) and lower stratosphere (LS) were raised more than 20 years ago by Hidalgo and Crutzen (1977) because these emissions could change ozone levels locally by several percent or so. Despite extensive research and evaluation during the intervening years, WMO-UNEP (1995) concluded that assessments of ozone changes related to aviation remained uncertain and depended critically on NOx chemistry and its representation in complex models. Because of large uncertainties in present knowledge of the tropospheric NOx budget, little confidence has been placed in previous assessments of quantitative model results of subsonic aircraft effects on atmospheric ozone. Assessment tools and their input data continue to improve, however, and reconsideration is appropriate in the light of the extensive research results published since the WMO-UNEP (1995) assessment. The research results published since the WMO-UNEP (1995) assessment have addressed a number of issues relevant to the assessment of ozone impacts of present aviation. These issues have included the development of improved aircraft NOx emission inventories, updating of evaluated chemical kinetic and photochemical databases, studies of aircraft plume chemistry, and the development of three-dimensional (3-D) modeling tools. Reviews have also been published of U.S. (Friedl, 1997) and European (Schumann et al., 1997; Brasseur et al., 1998) research programs addressing ozone and other environmental impacts of present aviation. In this chapter we evaluate, from a qualitative and quantitative standpoint, the impact on atmospheric ozone of aircraft exhaust species, emitted either directly from engines or produced as secondary products of processes occurring in aircraft plumes. Our evaluation is based primarily on global model calculations rather than ozone trends because expected changes are not easily discerned from observations, as discussed below. We use intermodel comparisons and atmospheric observations of ozone to test the physics and chemistry parameterized in these global models and identify areas of remaining uncertainty.Most present-day jet aircraft cruise in an altitude range (9-13 km) that contains portions of the UT and LS. Because these two atmospheric regions are characterized by different dynamics and photochemistry, the placement of aircraft exhaust into these regions must be considered when evaluating the impact of exhaust species on atmospheric ozone. Determination of the partitioning of exhaust into the two atmospheric regions is complicated by the highly variable and latitudinally dependent character of the tropopause (i.e., the transition between the stratosphere and troposphere). Comparisons of aircraft cruise altitudes with mean tropopause heights has led to estimates for stratospheric release of 20-40% of total emissions (Hoinka et al., 1993; Baughcum, 1996; Schumann, 1997; Gettleman and Baughcum, 1999). Carbon dioxide CO2) and water vapor (H2O) are easily the most abundant products of jet fuel combustion (emission indices for CO2 and H2O are 3.15 kg/kg fuel burned and 1.26 kg/kg fuel, respectively). However, both species have significant natural background levels in the UT and the LS (Schumann, 1994; WMO-UNEP, 1995). and neither current aircraft emission rates nor likely future subsonic emission rates will affect the ambient levels by more than a few percent. Future supersonic aviation, on the other hand (which would emit at higher altitudes), could perturb ambient H2O levels significantly at cruise altitudes. Regardless of the magnitude of the aircraft source, CO2 does not participate directly in ozone photochemistry because of its thermodynamic and photochemical stability. It may participate indirectly by affecting stratospheric cooling, which can in turn lead to changes in atmospheric thermal stratification, increased polar stratospheric cloud (PSC) formation, and reduced ozone concentrations. Aircraft water contributions, although relatively small in the troposphere, lead to the atmospheric phenomenon of contrail formation. Depending on the precise composition of contrail particles-which is largely determined by the specific processes occurring in the aircraft plume and by the ambient atmosphere composition and temperature-the particles may act as surfaces for a variety of heterogeneous reactions (K�rcher et al., 1995; Louisnard et al., 1995; WMO-UNEP, 1995; Schumann et al., 1996; Danilin et al., 1997; K�rcher, 1997; Karol et al., 1997). The participation of contrails in atmospheric photochemistry is further addressed in Section 2.1.3. N[itrogen] Ox[ides] constitutes the next most abundant engine emission (emission indices range from 5 to 25 g of NO2 per kg of fuel burned) (Fahey et al., 1995; WMO-UNEP, 1995; Schulte and Schlager, 1996; Schulte et al., 1997). With respect to ozone photochemistry, NOx is the most important and most studied component; its aircraft emission rates are sufficient to affect background levels in the UT and LS. Moreover, its active role in ozone photochemistry in the UT and LS has been well recognized (WMO-UNEP, 1985, 1995). A great deal of the recent scientific literature has focused on aircraft NOx effects, and this chapter neccessarily reflects that focus. Aircraft carbon moNOxide (CO) emissions are of the same order of magnitude as NOx emissions (i.e., 1-2 g kg-1 for the Concorde aircraft and 1-10 g kg-1 for subsonic aircraft) (Baughcum et al., 1996). Like NOx, CO is a key participant in tropospheric ozone production. However, natural and non-aircraft anthropogenic sources of CO are substantially larger than analogous NOx sources, thereby reducing the role of aircraft CO emissions in ozone photochemistry to a level far below that of aircraft NOx emissions (WMO-UNEP, 1995). Emissions of sulfur dioxide (SO2) and hydrocarbons from aircraft, at less than 1 g kg-1 fuel, are significantly less than the more prominent exhaust species discussed above (Spicer et al., 1994; Slemr et al., 1998). Their primary potential impacts are related to formation of sulfate and carbonaceous aerosols that may serve as sites for heterogeneous chemistry. This possibility is discussed in Section 2.1.3. Non-methane hydrocarbon (NMHC) emissions may also contribute to autocatalytic production of HOx, provided that the reactivity of the NHMCs is sufficiently large relative to that of CH4 to overcome their numerical inferiority. However, model studies have indicated that volatile organic emissions from aircraft have an insignificant impact on atmospheric ozone at cruise altitudes (Hayman and Markiewicz, 1996; Pleijel, 1998).

#### **Airports generate significant amounts of greenhouse gases with extremely negative environmental effects**

Aviation Environment Foundation [last cite 2007] [AEF, “WHAT ARE AN AIRPORT’S IMPACTS?”, last cite 2007, AEF, <http://www.aef.org.uk/uploads/PlanningGuide2.pdf> AD]

The so-called ‘greenhouse effect’ occurs when sunlight passes through the atmosphere, warming the earth; heat from the earth’s surface is re-emitted; and this heat is partly absorbed by the atmosphere, trapping the heat. Higher atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases - notably carbon dioxide (CO2)4 but also methane, NOx and others - cause the atmosphere to absorb more heat from the earth’s surface, and lead to higher levels of warming, or climate change. The UK has already warmed by 0.6-0.7oC since the Industrial Revolution. Because of the inertia of the climate system, average global temperatures are expected to rise by about another 0.5oC simply as a result of emissions to date. On current trends, global average temperatures will rise by 2-3oC within the next 50 years (Stern, 2006). This will worsen droughts in the summer, floods in winter, and extreme events such as storms. Planning Policy Statement 1, Delivering Sustainable Development, places climate change issues firmly in the remit of local and regional planning bodies. It charges these planning bodies with the task of ‘addressing the causes and potential impacts of climate change – through policies which reduce energy use, reduce emissions..., and take climate change impacts into account in the location and design of development” (Communities and Local Government, 2005). About half of all local authorities in the UK have also signed the Nottingham Declaration on Climate Change (2000), which pledges that they will actively tackle climate change in their area and work with others to reduce greenhouse gas emissions country-wide. Airports and aviation generate greenhouse gases in three main ways: • Flights are by far the largest source. Aircraft emit large quantities of CO2 and NOx during flights, particularly during take-off and landing. NOx emissions at altitude react to either increase ozone concentrations or decrease methane concentrations in the atmosphere. While this leads to global warming and cooling respectively, the two occur in different regions and latitudes and do not cancel each other out. Water vapour from combustion also contributes to the formation of contrails, and persistent contrails are also thought to cause additional cirrus cloud formation (although the scientific certainty of the precise impact is less compared to other greenhouse gases); • Ground traffic is the second largest source. Vehicles (including construction vehicles) travelling to and from the airport, and around the airport generate CO2; • Airport buildings require electricity and heating. Unless this comes from sources that do not use fossil fuel (e.g. hydro- or wind power), the energy production will generate greenhouse gases. Airport construction also generates CO2 through ‘embodied energy’5.

#### These cause global warming

National Geographic [no date] [National Geographic, “Causes of Global Warming”, No Date, National Geographic, <http://environment.nationalgeographic.com/environment/global-warming/gw-causes/> AD]

Scientists have spent decades figuring out what is causing global warming. They've looked at the natural cycles and events that are known to influence climate. But the amount and pattern of warming that's been measured can't be explained by these factors alone. The only way to explain the pattern is to include the effect of greenhouse gases (GHGs) emitted by humans. To bring all this information together, the United Nations formed a group of scientists called the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, or IPCC. The IPCC meets every few years to review the latest scientific findings and write a report summarizing all that is known about global warming. Each report represents a consensus, or agreement, among hundreds of leading scientists. One of the first things scientists learned is that there are several greenhouse gases responsible for warming, and humans emit them in a variety of ways. Most come from the combustion of fossil fuels in cars, factories and electricity production. The gas responsible for the most warming is carbon dioxide, also called CO2. Other contributors include methane released from landfills and agriculture (especially from the digestive systems of grazing animals), nitrous oxide from fertilizers, gases used for refrigeration and industrial processes, and the loss of forests that would otherwise store CO2. **Different greenhouse gases have very different heat-trapping abilities. Some of them can even trap more heat than CO2. A molecule of methane produces more than 20 times the warming of a molecule of CO2.** Nitrous oxide is 300 times more powerful than CO2. Other gases, such as chlorofluorocarbons (which have been banned in much of the world because they also degrade the ozone layer), have heat-trapping potential thousands of times greater than CO2. But because their concentrations are much lower than CO2, none of these gases adds as much warmth to the atmosphere as CO2 does. In order to understand the effects of all the gases together, scientists tend to talk about all greenhouse gases in terms of the equivalent amount of CO2. Since 1990, yearly emissions have gone up by about 6 billion metric tons of "carbon dioxide equivalent" worldwide, more than a 20 percent increase.

**Warming causes Extinction**

**Tickell 08** (Oliver Tickell, British journalist, author and campaigner on health and environment issues, and author of the Kyoto2 climate initiative “On a planet 4C hotter, all we can prepare for is extinction,” The Guardian, 8-11-08 http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/aug/11/climatechange)

We need to get prepared for **four degrees of global warming**, Bob Watson told the Guardian last week. At first sight this looks like wise counsel from the climate science adviser to Defra. But **the idea that we could adapt to a 4C rise is absurd and dangerous. Global warming** on this scale **would be a catastrophe that would mean**, in the immortal words that Chief Seattle probably never spoke, "the end of living and the beginning of survival" for humankind. Or perhaps the beginning of our **extinction. The collapse of the polar ice caps would become inevitable, bringing long-term sea level rises of 70-80 metres**. All the world's **coastal plains would be lost, complete with ports, cities, transport and industrial infrastructure, and much of the world's most productive farmland.** The world's geography would be transformed much as it was at the end of the last ice age, when sea levels rose by about 120 metres to create the Channel, the North Sea and Cardigan Bay out of dry land. **Weather would become extreme and unpredictable, with more frequent and severe droughts, floods and hurricanes. The Earth's carrying capacity would be hugely reduced. Billions would undoubtedly die**. Watson's call was supported by the government's former chief scientific adviser, Sir David King, who warned that "**if we get to a four-degree rise it is quite possible that we would begin to see a runaway increase**". This is a remarkable understatement. **The climate system is already experiencing significant feedbacks, notably the summer melting of the Arctic sea ice. The more the ice melts,** the more sunshine is absorbed by the sea, and **the more the Arctic warms**. And as the Arctic warms, the release of billions of tonnes of methane – a greenhouse gas 70 times stronger than carbon dioxide over 20 years – captured under melting permafrost is already under way. To see how far this process could go, look 55.5m years to the Palaeocene-Eocene Thermal Maximum, when a global temperature increase of 6C coincided with the release of about 5,000 gigatonnes of carbon into the atmosphere, both as CO2 and as methane from bogs and seabed sediments. Lush subtropical forests grew in polar regions, and sea levels rose to 100m higher than today. **It appears that an initial warming pulse triggered other warming processes. Many scientists warn that this historical event may be analogous to the present: the warming caused by human emissions could propel us towards a similar hothouse Earth.**

#### \*\*Biodiversity

#### Airports kill biodiversity

Aviation Environment Foundation [last cite 2007] [AEF, “WHAT ARE AN AIRPORT’S IMPACTS?”, last cite 2007, AEF, <http://www.aef.org.uk/uploads/PlanningGuide2.pdf> AD]

Biodiversity impacts refer to impacts on plants and animals. These include reduction in the type and extent of habitats; bird strike and road kill; disturbance from light pollution, noise and aircraft/vehicle movements; and air pollution. Habitat loss occurs when previously ‘green’ areas3 are built on, destroying the habitats of the plans and animals that live there. Habitat fragmentation happens when a larger area of habitat is split into smaller areas, for instance if it is split by a road or fence. This can make it difficult for animals to forage for food, breed and migrate. Animals with very consistent foraging patterns (like badgers) or breeding patterns (like toads) may continue to move from one habitat fragment to the other, and may be hit by cars. Some animal species have large land requirements, and may be affected by habitat loss or fragmentation even if these reduce the animals’ habitat a little bit. Habitat degradation reduces the attractiveness of the habitat for the plants and animals on it. This could result, for instance, from the ground being churned up and/or compacted, vegetation clearance, replacement of one type of vegetation by another (e.g. herb-rich grassland by turf), storage or disposal of rubble on the site, litter, or land contamination.

## A2 Roads

### Roads Improving

#### Our roads are improving- statistics prove

RITA 10 (Research and Innovative Technology Administration, part of USDOT. “Transportation Statistics Annual Report (TSAR)” 2010 <http://www.bts.gov/publications/transportation_statistics_annual_report/2010/pdf/entire.pdf>)

From 2004 to 2008, the share of urban and rural roads with poor and mediocre ratings decreased by 3 and 5 percent per year on average, respectively. In 2008, 79, 94, and 90 percent of urban interstates, freeways, and rural interstates, respectively, were ranked better than the poor or mediocre rating. Although some moderate improvements were made for collector roads, 17 percent of rural collector roads and 35 percent of urban collector roads were still in poor or mediocre condition in 2008

#### **STRAHNET roads are improving – they’re in better condition than other roads**

USDOT 04 (Status of the Nation’s Highways, Bridges, and Transit: 2004 Conditions and Performance 2004 http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/policy/2004cpr/chap18.htm#pave)

Exhibit 18-3 shows the condition of STRAHNET. In 2002, 96.1 percent of all mileage in STRAHNET had a measured pavement roughness (using the International Roughness Index [IRI]) less than or equal to 170 inches per mile. As discussed in Chapters 3 and 17, National Highway System (NHS) pavement with an IRI less than or equal to 170 is classified as "acceptable" in the annual FHWA Performance Plans.¶ ¶ Percent STRAHNET Miles with¶ IRI ≤ 170¶ Interstate 96.2¶ Non-Interstate 95.6¶ Total 96.1¶ Source: Highway Performance Monitoring System.¶ The percent of STRAHNET miles with acceptable ride quality has shown a general increase since 1995. This trend is shown by Exhibit 18-4.¶ ¶ When compared with the NHS, the overall STRAHNET system has consistently been maintained at a higher level of ride acceptability. In 2002, 96.1 percent of the STRAHNET miles were rated at an IRI value of 170 or less, compared with 93.7 percent of the NHS miles rated at an IRI of 170 or less. Exhibit 18-5 compares the percent of miles with IRI in the acceptable range on STRAHNET with that on the NHS from 1998 through 2002.¶ ¶ Exhibit 18-6 compares the percentage of vehicle miles traveled on STRAHNET that occurs on pavements with acceptable ride quality with the percentage of total travel on pavements with acceptable ride quality for selected functional classes. For rural principal arterials, STRAHNET routes have a lower percentage of pavements with acceptable ride quality than do non-STRAHNET routes. However, for the remaining functional classes, pavements on STRAHNET appear to be in the same or better condition than those on non-STRAHNET routes.

#### Bridges and highways are in their best condition in decades

Kilcarr 10 (Sean, Senior Editor of Fleet Owner, “Report: Mixed grades for U.S. highways” Fleet Owner

Sep. 7, 2010 http://fleetowner.com/management/news/us-highways-mixed-grades-0907)

The [Reason Foundation’s](http://reason.org/) [19th Annual Highway Report](http://reason.org/news/show/19th-annual-highway-report) provides a mixed bag of good and poor ratings for American roadways on a state-by-state basis, with reductions in congestion and fatalities offset by uneven cost-effective management. But nationally, the group did find big improvements are being made.¶ Based on 2008 data, the study determined that bridges are in their best condition as a group since 1984, with highway pavement in its best condition since 1993. Traffic congestion is at its lowest since 2000, according to the analysis, with fatalities down to levels not seen since the 1960s.¶ However, the think tank pointed out that the economic recession is partly responsible for some of those improvements as people are driving less, helping to slow pavement deterioration while reducing traffic congestion and fatalities.¶ In terms of highway “cost effectiveness,” though, the record is more uneven. According to the study, North Dakota, Montana and Kansas manage the most cost-effective state highway systems, while Rhode Island, Alaska, California, Hawaii and New York maintain the least cost-effective networks.¶ New Jersey still spends dramatically more than every other state on highways, the report found, plunking down $1.1 million per mile on state roads. The second biggest spender, Florida, spends $671,000 per mile, with California laying out $545,000 per mile. South Carolina, by contrast, recorded the lowest expenses, spending just $34,000 per mile.¶ California also ssends a massive amount of transportation money that never makes it onto roads, the Reason Foundation said, spending $93,464 on administrative costs for every mile of state road. New York ($89,194 per mile), Massachusetts ($71,982), and New Jersey ($62,748) also compare poorly to states like Texas ($6,529) and Virginia ($6,370), which spend dramatically less on administrative costs.¶ Rhode Island has the most troubled bridges in the country, with over 53% of its bridges deficient or functionally obsolete, the study found. For comparison, just 10% of top-ranked Nevada’s bridges are rated deficient. Overall, more than 141,000 (23.7%) of America’s bridges were structurally deficient or functionally obsolete in 2008 – the lowest percentage since 1984.¶ Drivers in California, Minnesota, Maryland, Michigan and Connecticut are stuck in the worst traffic, according to the Reason Foundation research, with over 65% of all urban interstates congested in each of those five states.¶ However, nationally, the percentage of urban interstates that are congested fell below 50% for the first time since 2000, when congestion standards were revised.¶ In terms of highway safety, Massachusetts is at the top of the list with just 0.67 fatalities per 100 million miles driven. By contrast, Montana and Louisiana have the highest fatality rates, with 2.12 and 2.02 fatalities per million miles driven, respectively.¶ Motorists in California and Hawaii have to look out for the most potholes on urban Interstates, the study found, with 25% of urban highway pavement in poor condition in those two states. Alaska and Rhode Island have the bumpiest rural pavement, each with about 10% in poor condition.¶ However, as noted earlier, on a national basis pavement conditions on urban interstates are the best they’ve been since 1993, with rural primary roads the smoothest they’ve been since 1993 as well, noted the report’s primary author, David Hartgen, emeritus professor of transportation studies at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte.¶ “We’re seeing several factors combine to produce significant improvement in highway conditions,” he explained. Hartgen noted in particular that states invested a lot more money to improve pavement and bridges over the last few years, with spending increasing 8% from 2007 to 2008, and per-mile spending on state roads almost tripling since 1984.¶ “The significant reduction in vehicle miles traveled during the recession has also played a role in slowing system decay,” he added. “But as the states deal with large budget deficits and the recession continues, we’ll have to wait and see if this progress can be continued.”

#### **Highway quality is improving**

Solomon 10 ([Mark B. Solomon](http://www.dcvelocity.com/authors/Mark_B_Solomon/) Senior Editor for DC Velocity, former reporter for *Journal of Commerce* *Traffic World*, former head of Media-Based Solutions, a public relations firm based in Atlanta. B.A. in journalism from The American University in Washington, D.C. “DOT report: Condition of U.S. highways, bridges has improved in last decade” May 6, 2010 DC Velocity)

A recent report by the Department of Transportation (DOT) has concluded that the condition of the nation's interstate highways and bridges has improved during the past decade, a finding that runs counter to the conventional wisdom that the U.S. infrastructure is systemically falling apart.¶ The report, which was devoted to laying out a roadmap for the DOT's strategic initiatives through fiscal 2015, found that the percentage of vehicle miles traveled on interstate roads having what DOT called "good ride quality" increased to 57 percent in 2009 from 46 percent in 2000.¶ In addition, DOT, citing data from the Government Accountability Office, concluded that the percentage of bridges classified as "structurally deficient" or "functionally obsolete" declined to 29.4 percent in 2009 from 30.9 percent in 2002. DOT found that most of the progress was made in fixing "structurally deficient" bridges that are in need of significant maintenance, rehabilitation, or replacement. The findings also covered bridges not part of the interstate system; most of the nation's bridges are considered "short span" and do not connect the interstate network.

#### Interstate road quality is increasing

US DOT 08 (U.S. Department¶ Of Transportation¶ Federal Highway¶ Administration¶ Federal Transit¶ Administration¶ “2008 Status of the Nation’s Highways, Bridges, and Transit: Conditions and Performance Report to Congress” PublicationNo.FHWA-PL-09-0000 2008 <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/policy/2008cpr/pdfs/cp2008.pdf>)

The increase in system rehabilitation investment since 1997 has had a positive effect on the physical ¶ condition of key subsets of the Nation’s highway and bridge infrastructure. The National Highway System ¶ (NHS) includes those roads that are most important to interstate travel, economic expansion, and national ¶ defense. While the NHS makes up only 4.0 percent of total mileage, it carries 44.6 percent of total travel ¶ in the United States. The percentage of NHS VMT on pavements with “good” ride quality rose from ¶ 39 percent in 1997 to 57 percent in 2006. The share of NHS VMT on roads with “acceptable” ride ¶ quality (a lower standard that includes roads classified as “good”) has also increased over this period, from ¶ 89 percent to 93 percent. The percentage of deck area on NHS bridges classified as deficient declined from ¶ 33.0 percent in 1997 to 29.2 percent in 2006. About three-quarters of deficiencies on NHS bridges relate to ¶ functional obsolescence rather than to structural issues; some NHS bridges are narrower than current design ¶ standards would call for given the traffic volumes they currently carry.

### Roads Destroy Ecosystems

#### Roads directly cause species decline and crush our ecosystems

Switalski and Davis 09 (Adam Switalski Science Program Director Faculty Affiliate of the University of Montana’s Environmental Studies Program and sits on the Board of the Montana Chapter of the Society for Conservation Biology and Liane Davis “Mitigating the Impacts of Roads as a Climate Change Adaptation Strategy Road” RIPorter Issue: Summer Solstice 2009, Volume 14 # 2 June 25, 2009  [http://www.wildlandscpr.org/road-riporter/mitigating-impacts-roads-climate-change-adaptation-strategy](%20http%3A//www.wildlandscpr.org/road-riporter/mitigating-impacts-roads-climate-change-adaptation-strategy))

Climate change is exacerbating the many human-caused impacts that are already leading to species decline.  One of the most common and far-reaching anthropogenic features on the landscape is roads.  Roads can affect aquatic systems by increasing stream peak flows by impeding water infiltration and expanding the drainage network (Wemple et al. 1996), increasing surface runoff carrying sediment to streams (Sugdon and Woods 2007), and triggering landslides from culvert or road failures that transport large amounts of sediment and debris to streams (Swanston 1991). Roads can also block or disrupt natural transport of materials such as large wood into streams (Furniss et al. 1991), which is critical to salmonid survival because it increases in-stream habitat complexity and provides off-channel areas of refugia during high flow events (Bilby and Bisson 1998). Several studies have also documented deleterious impacts of roads on terrestrial wildlife. One simple, but major impact of roads on wildlife is that they facilitate human access. For example, roads allow access to remote grizzly bear habitat resulting in avoidance of roads by bears (Mace et al. 1999).  In the context of climate change, roads can also adversely affect wildlife habitat by fragmenting landscapes, altering wildlife movement, and acting as a vector for invasive species and plant pathogens (Trombulak and Frissell 2000). Cumulatively, the presence of roads often leads to avoidance and a reduction in available habitat.

#### Roads and infrastructure threaten ecosystems

Meyer et. al. 09, (Michael Frederick R. Dickerson Professor, School of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, PhD Michael Flood Senior Planner at Parsons Brinckerhoff ¶ Chris Dorney Transportation/Land Use Planner at Parsons Brinckerhoff ¶ Ken Leonard Principal of Cambridge Systematics, ¶ Robert Hyman Associate at Cambride Systematics ¶ Joel Smith expert on climate change policy, lead author of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change 2001 and 2007 assessment report; the latter shared the Noble Peace Prize with former Vice President Al Gore. Vice-President of Stratus Consulting, Boulder, CO. “Climate Change and the Highway System: Impacts and Adaptation Approaches”. National Cooperative Highway Research Program. 5/6/2009 http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/nchrp/docs/NCHRP20-83%2805%29\_Task2-3SynthesisReport.pdf)

Coastal Ecosystems: As sea levels rise, coastal ecosystems will migrate inland. Coastal ¶ highways can serve as a barrier to this migration, especially where the road is armored ¶ against rising sea levels. As a result, coastal ecosystems will be squeezed between retreating ¶ shores and immobile highway right-of-ways, in some cases eventually disappearing. (Some ¶ states, such as Massachusetts and Rhode Island, prohibit shoreline armoring along the ¶ shores of some estuaries so that ecosystems can migrate inland, and several states limit ¶ armoring along ocean shores). ¶ x Runoff: Changes in precipitation patterns will affect the magnitude and ecological impact of ¶ storm water runoff. More intense precipitation events in areas of high impervious cover ¶ could result in runoff spikes that can cause increased erosion in streambeds and, in warm ¶ weather, thermal shock to water bodies from the sudden infusion of pavement-heated ¶ runoff. It may also result in pollutant loading spikes, particularly if rainfall events become ¶ less frequent. On the other hand, decreased use of snow and ice chemicals in wintertime will ¶ reduce the harmful effects of these chemicals on water bodies. ¶ x Wildlife Movement: Roads can act as barriers to wildlife movement and migration, either by ¶ preventing movement (e.g., walls and fences) or by increasing the risk of injury and ¶ mortality while crossing roadways.

# PORTS ADVANTAGE

#### Policies and funding are currently in place to secure ports

Medalia (Specialist in National Defense Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division)05

<http://www.fas.org/irp/crs/RS21293.pdf>

Various programs seek to strengthen the security of U.S. ports. As of late 2004, DHS had reportedly distributed about $560 million in port security grants in the past few years. The Maritime Transportation Security Act (MTSA) of 2002 (P.L. 107-295) requires (Sec.102) assessments of the vulnerability of vessels and U.S. maritime facilities “that may be involved in a transportation security incident,” a plan for deterring and responding to such an incident, assessment of the effectiveness of antiterrorism measures at certain foreign ports, etc. CBP is implementing the Automated Commercial Environment, an electronic system to gather and analyze data on goods entering the United States to help select containers for inspection. On December 21, 2004, President Bush reportedly issued “Maritime Security Policy,” National Security Presidential Directive 41/Homeland Security Presidential Directive 13. While the text has apparently not been released as of mid-January 2005, a report indicates that it requires DHS to set standards for maritime recovery operations in the event of a terrorist attack. It also requires creation of a Maritime Security Policy Coordinating Committee, development of a National Strategy for Maritime Security, integration of global maritime intelligence, coordination of domestic and international outreach, and creation of a comprehensive plan for maritime supply chain security.

#### $105 billion bill has elevated the funding and priority of seaports

Dredging Today 7/2/12

America’s Seaports Recognized in MAP-21 Surface Transportation Bill Reauthorizationhttp://www.dredgingtoday.com/2012/07/02/americas-seaports-recognized-in-map-21-surface-transportation-bill-reauthorization/

With congressional passage last week of MAP-21 (Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century), the American Association of Port Authorities (AAPA) says elements in the two-year, $105 billion surface transportation reauthorization bill elevate the priority of freight movement in a way that constitutes major progress in recognizing the value of America’s seaports and freight network to the economy, jobs creation and business development. The bill, which includes important language in support of maintaining federal navigation channels and creating a national freight plan, authorizes and funds transportation programs at current levels through the end of fiscal 2014. AAPA Executive Vice President Jean Godwin said the association and its member ports have fought “long and hard” for many of the provisions agreed to in this bill. “For the first time, a surface transportation reauthorization includes consideration of the water transportation mode and elevates goods movement priorities that have traditionally been ignored in previous surface transportation bills,” said Ms. Godwin. “This legislation demonstrates meaningful progress toward creation of a national freight policy and highlights the critical importance of fully funding the costs of maintaining America’s federal navigation channels.” Freight Mobility Among the provisions in the bill of most interest to ports and the freight community is establishment of a National Freight Policy that includes development of a National Freight Strategic Plan. The National Freight Strategic Plan, along with state freight plans and advisory committees, will enable freight projects that improve cargo movement, reduce congestion, increase productivity and improve the safety, security and resilience of freight transportation. Among the types of projects being addressed are freight intermodal connectors, railway/highway grade separations and geometric improvements to interchanges and ramps – all of which are often sought by the seaport industry. Also, by continuing the Projects of National and Regional Significance (PNRS) program, the bill authorizes funds for large, multimodal projects that bolster freight mobility in locations that generate national or regional economic benefits. AAPA has supported this program since its inception. Harbor Maintenance For the first time in a surface transportation bill, Congress acknowledges the need for and economic importance of maintaining federal navigation channels to their constructed dimensions. This legislation points out the disparity between the money collected from shippers through the federal Harbor Maintenance Tax (HMT) and the funds requested and appropriated for the purpose of maintaining America’s federal navigation channels. In “Sense of Congress” language, the bill acknowledges the shortfall in spending for federal channel maintenance and calls on the administration to request full funding consistent with revenue collected from harbor users for the purpose of maintenance dredging and associated projects. “The ‘Sense of Congress’ language represents an important first step in considering federal channel maintenance needs,” said Ms. Godwin. “Overall,” she continued, “while this bill falls short of dedicating needed funding specifically for freight projects, it does create a framework upon which we can prioritize freight mobility needs and address congestion and capacity demands on America’s freight network going forward.

#### Legislation funds weapon detectors in ports

Weisman (Wash Post staff writer) 06

House Passes $7.4 Billion Port Security Bill[http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp dyn/content/article/2006/05/04/AR2006050401672.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp%20dyn/content/article/2006/05/04/AR2006050401672.html)

The House [overwhelmingly approved](http://projects.washingtonpost.com/congress/109/house/2/votes/127/) legislation yesterday to provide $7.4 billion in spending on new port security inspectors, nuclear weapons screening and the development of an automated system to pinpoint high-risk cargo. The [421 to 2](http://projects.washingtonpost.com/congress/109/house/2/votes/127/) vote came just hours after the White House expressed strong misgivings over the cost and feasibility of the bill. But the lopsided vote underscored how politically sensitive the issue of port security has become since the state-owned Dubai Ports World moved to purchase terminal operations at six major U.S. seaports in February. Republicans had voted several times in the past two years against Democratic proposals to increase funding for port security, saying that enough was already being spent. Indeed, White House officials repeated that assertion yesterday in a policy statement that depicted the House bill as overly generous and technologically unrealistic. But the furor over the Dubai deal brought the two parties together on bipartisan port security legislation. Only two House members opposed the measure yesterday, [Rep. Jeff Flake](http://projects.washingtonpost.com/congress/members/f000444/) (R-Ariz.), who said the price tag is too high, and [Rep. Edward J. Markey](http://projects.washingtonpost.com/congress/109/states/ma/) (D-Mass.), who contended that the bill does not go far enough to ensure the safety of vulnerable seaports. "House Republicans will continue to do what is right to protect American families and prevent a tragedy like September 11th from occurring ever again," said House Speaker [J. Dennis Hastert](http://projects.washingtonpost.com/congress/members/h000323/) (R-Ill.). "We understand that we must secure our ports in order to protect our citizens." But House Republicans blocked consideration of a Democratic amendment that would have required that all cargo be screened before it leaves foreign ports for the United States. The Senate Homeland Security Committee, in drafting its companion bill earlier this week, added a pilot program at three foreign ports to test the feasibility of 100 percent screening. House GOP leaders called Democratic push unreasonable. "One hundred percent screening of every container will shut down worldwide shipping overnight," said House Majority Leader [John A. Boehner](http://projects.washingtonpost.com/congress/members/b000589/) (R-Ohio). He added that a House-passed feasibility study is a "practical, common-sense approach to the issue." Democrats countered that they will continue to push more robust legislation. "All it takes is one atomic or radiological bomb to make 9/11 look like a firecracker," said [Rep. Jerrold Nadler](http://projects.washingtonpost.com/congress/members/n000002/) (D-N.Y.). "If we really want to make this country safer, we must demand that before any container is put on a ship bound for the United States, it must be scanned electronically in the foreign port. It's too late if we find a nuclear bomb in Los Angeles or New York." Providing an additional $7.4 billion over the next five years, the House bill would bolster the Department of Homeland Security's Domestic Nuclear Detection Office, requiring the deployment of nuclear and radiological detection systems in all domestic seaports. It would set up new tracking systems for discovering and monitoring high-risk cargo and would accelerate the creation of a transportation-worker identification card. New port-security training and exercises would also be required. The White House's Office of Management and Budget expressed concern over what it called the measure's "serious resource implications," charging in a statement of policy that it would tie the hands of the Department of Homeland Security in bureaucratic red tape. The required deployment of advanced radiation detectors by September 2007 "might not be feasible given the current state of detector acquisition, installation, and development," the White House said in a statement. It added that $400 million a year in dedicated port security grants would be unnecessary and wasteful. Nonetheless, White House officials stopped short of issuing a veto threat on legislation that appears destined for speedy enactment. Four and a half years after the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks, port security has become an unlikely political issue. The same coalition of liberal interest groups and labor unions that helped kill President Bush's Social Security proposals has launched a national campaign to portray Republicans as opposing port security, through home-district appearances and radio advertisements. The Department of Homeland Security currently opens for inspection 6 percent of the 11 million cargo containers that enter U.S. seaports annually. But all cargo manifests are examined, as is "high-risk cargo," which is identified through an automated targeting system. Republican leaders said going much further than the House bill would slow the flow of international trade and would cost U.S. jobs. The issue came to the fore with the Dubai port deal. Bowing to intense pressure, Dubai Ports World announced in March that it would sell to an American firm its U.S. operations at ports in Baltimore, New York, Newark, Philadelphia, Miami and New Orleans. But two months later, no deal has been struck.

# A2 WARMING

## No Warming

#### No warming now

Singer 2k (Testimony of Prof. S. Fred Singer President, The Science & Environmental Policy Project before the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation on Climate Change, July 18, 2000, http://www.nationalcenter.org/KyotoSingerTestimony2000.html)

Contrary to the conventional wisdom and the predictions of computer models, the Earth's climate has not warmed appreciably in the past two decades, and probably not since about 1940. The evidence is overwhelming: a) Satellite data show no appreciable warming of the global atmosphere since 1979. In fact, if one ignores the unusual El Nino year of 1998, one sees a cooling trend. b) Radiosonde data from balloons released regularly around the world confirm the satellite data in every respect. This fact has been confirmed in a recent report of the National Research Council/National Academy of Sciences [1]. c) The well-controlled and reliable thermometer record of surface temperatures for the continental United States shows no appreciable warming since about 1940. [See figure] The same is true for Western Europe. These results are in sharp contrast to the GLOBAL instrumental surface record, which shows substantial warming, mainly in NW Siberia and subpolar Alaska and Canada. d) But tree-ring records for Siberia and Alaska and published ice-core records that I have examined show NO warming since 1940. In fact, many show a cooling trend. Conclusion: The post-1980 global warming trend from surface thermometers is not credible. The absence of such warming would do away with the widely touted "hockey stick" graph (with its "unusual" temperature rise in the past 100 years) [see figure]; it was shown here on May 17 as purported proof that the 20th century is the warmest in 1000 years. 2. Regional Changes in Temperature, Precipitation, and Soil Moisture? The absence of a current global warming trend should serve to discredit any predictions from current climate models, including the extreme warming from the two models (Canadian and British) selected for the NACC. Furthermore, the two NACC models give conflicting predictions, most often for precipitation and soil moisture [2,3]. For example, the Dakotas lose 85% of their current average rainfall by 2100 in one model, while the other shows a 75% gain. Half of the 18 regions studied show such opposite results; several others show huge differences. [see graph] The soil moisture predictions also differ. The Canadian model shows a drier Eastern US in summer, the UK Hadley model a wetter one. Conclusion: We must conclude that regional forecasts from climate models are beyond the state of the art and are even less reliable than those for the global average. Since the NACC scenarios are based on such forecasts, the NACC projections are not credible.

#### No warming—their authors are alarmists

SPPI 07 (The Viscount Monckton of Brenchley, Science and public policy institute, July 2007, http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/monckton/consensus.pdf

Likewise, if one aggrgates up the UN’s central estimates of the contributions of all climate “forcings” and temperature “feedbacks” to the projected warming from increased greenhouse gases, the total comes to just half the UN’s published central estimate of a 3.2C temperature increase in response to a doubling of the atmospheric CO2 concentration. Once again, a large exaggeration is evident, right at the heart of the alarmist case. If the UN’s documents do not even agree with themselves, how can any kind of “consensus” be claimed? The Russian Academy of Sciences and the US Association of State Climatologists are just two of the scientific organizations that have trenchantly expressed serious doubts about the imagined “consensus” on climate change. They have recently been joined by the Administrator of NASA, who has said that it is arrogant to make the Panglossian assumption that today’s climate is the best of all possible climates, and still more arrogant to assume that any of the more or less futile remedial measures which have been advocated will make any significant climatic difference. The Administrator ought to know: for it is his organization that gathers much of the weather data via satellite upon which the rickety edifice of the climate-change “consensus” is constructed. A growing number of scientists who had previously subscribed to the alarmist presentation of the “consensus” are no longer sure. They are joining the numerous climatologists – many of them with outstanding credentials – who have never believed in the more extreme versions of the alarmist case. Indeed, many scientists now say that there has been no discernible human effect on temperature at all. For instance, Buentgen et al. (2006) say: “The 20th-century contribution of anthropogenic greenhouse gases and aerosol remains insecure.

#### No Warming – Models are skewed and ignore multiple factors – satellites are more reliable and prove no anthropogenic warming

Singer 8, (Fred Singer, professor emeritus of environmental sciences at the University of Virginia, 3/08, www.sepp.org/ publications/ NIPCC-Feb%2020.pdf , “Nature, Not Human Activity, Rules the Climate”)

In this Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change report, we have presented evidence that helps provide answers to all three questions. The extent of the modern warming-- the subject of the first question -- appears to be less than is claimed by the Intergovernmental panel on Climate Change and in the popular media. We have documented shortcomings of surface data, affected by urban heat islands and by the poor distribution of land-based observing stations. Data from oceans, covering 70% of the globe, are also subject to uncertainties. The only truly global observations come from weather satellites, and these have not shown any warming trend since 1998, for the past 10 years. This report shows conclusively that the human greenhouse-gas contribution to current warming is insignificant. Our argument is based on the well-established and generally agreed upon "fingerprint" method. Using data published by the IPCC, we have shown that observed temperature-trend patterns disagree sharply with those calculated from green-house models. It is significant that the IPCC has never made such a comparison, or it would have discovered the same result: namely, that the current warming is primarily of natural origin rather than anthropogenic. Instead, the IPCC relied for its conclusion on circumstantial "evidence" that does not hold up under scrutiny. We show that the 20th century is in no way unusual and that warming periods of greater magnitude have occurred in the historic past -- without any catastrophic consequences. We also discuss the many shortcomings of climate models in trying to simulate what is happening in the real atmosphere. If the human contribution to global warming due to increased levels of greenhouse gases is insignificant, why do greenhouse-gas models calculate large temperature increases, i.e., show high values of "climate sensitivity"? The most likely explanation is that models ignore the negative feedbacks that occur in the real atmosphere. New observations from satellites suggest it is the distribution of water vapour that could produce such strong negative feedbacks. If current warming is not due to increasing greenhouse gases, what are the natural causes that might be responsible for both warming and cooling episodes -- as so amply demonstrated in the historic, pre-industrial climate record? Empirical evidence suggests very strongly that the main cause of warming and cooling on a decadal scale derives from solar activity via its modulation of cosmic rays that in turn affect atmospheric cloudiness. According to published research, cosmic-ray variations are also responsible for major climate changes observed in the paleo-record going back 500 million years. The third question concerns the effects of modest warming. A major scare associated with a putative future warming is a rapid rise in sea level, but even the IPCC has been scaling back its estimates. We show here that there will be little, if any, acceleration, and therefore no additional increase in the rate of ongoing sea-level rise. This holds true even if there is a decades-long warming, whether natural or man-made. Other effects of a putative increase in temperature and carbon dioxide are likely to be benign, promoting not only the growth of crops and forests but also benefitting human health. Ocean acidification is not judged to be a problem, as indicated by available data.

### Climate Change Not Real

IPCC skewed data in their report to hide flaws in the predictions of Climate Change

Idso et al, 11 (Craig D. Idso is the founder, former president and current chairman of the board of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, along with Robert Carter and Fred Singer, “Climate Change Reconsidered,” 2011, http://www.nipccreport.org/reports/2011/pdf/FrontMatter.pdf)

Hulme also admitted, ―Uncertainty pervades scientific predictions about the future performance of global and regional climates. And uncertainties multiply when considering all the consequences that might follow from such changes in climate‖ (p. 83).On the subject of the IPCC‘s credibility, he admitted it is ―governed by a Bureau consisting of selected governmental representatives, thus ensuring that thePanel‘s work was clearly seen to be serving the needs of government and policy. The Panel was not to be a self-governing body of independent scientists‖ (p.95). These are all basic ―talking points‖ of global warming realists, which invariably result in charges of ―denial‖ and ―industry shill‖ when expressed by someone not in the alarmist camp. To see them written by Hulme reveals how the debate has changed. Just months after Hulme‘s book was released, a large cache of emails was leaked by someone at the Climatic Research Unit at the University of East Anglia. ―Climategate,‖ as it has come to be known, revealed deliberate efforts by leading scientific supporters of the IPCC, and of climate alarmism more generally, to hide flaws in their evidence and analysis, keep ―skeptics‖ from appearing in peer-reviewed journals, and avoid sharing their data with colleagues seeking to replicate their results (Bell, 2011; Sussman, 2010; Montford, 2010). The emails reveal that important data underlying climate policy are missing or have been manipulated. In February 2010, the BBC‘s environment analyst Roger Harrabin posed a series of written questions to Philip D. Jones, director of the Climatic Research Unit (CRU) at the University of East Anglia and the person responsible for maintaining the IPCC‘s all important climate temperature records (BBC, 2010).Jones appeared to back away from many of the foundational positions of the IPCC, admitting for example:  The rates of global warming from 1860–1880,1910–1940 and 1975–1998, and 1975–2009 ―are similar and not statistically significantly different from each other.‖  The temperature trend for the period 1995 to 2009―is positive, but not significant at the 95%significance level.‖  When asked, ―When scientists say ―the debate on climate change is over‖, what exactly do they mean– and what don‘t they mean?‖ Jones replied, ―It would be supposition on my behalf to know whether all scientists who say the debate is over are saying that for the same reason. I don‘t believe the vast majority of climate scientists think this. This is not my view. There is still much that needs to be undertaken to reduce uncertainties, not just for the future, but for the instrumental (and especially the palaeoclimatic) past as well.‖ Climategate was followed by a series of revelations that many of the key ―findings‖ of the Fourth Assessment Report of the IPCC (IPCC-AR4) relied on non-peer-reviewed sources, sometimes little more than the newsletters of environmental advocacy groups. As a result, IPCC had to retract claims about Amazon rain forests, African crop harvests, Himalayan glaciers, trends in disaster losses, flooding in Bangladesh, and more. Evidence of these errors and more could be readily found in Climate Change Reconsidered, but the British media apparently preferred to ―discover‖ and announce the errors intheir own way. The media also ignored an excellent audit of all 18,531 references cited in the AR4 that found 5,587—nearly one-third—were not peer reviewed (Laframboise et al., 2008).

#### Models not accurate

Idso and Singer 9 (Craig D. Idso is the founder, former president and current chairman of the board of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change and Fred Singer, American physicist and emeritus professor of environmental science at the University of Virginia, “Climate Change reconsidered” 2009,

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change(IPCC) places great confidence in the ability of general circulation models (GCMs) to simulate future climate and attribute observed climate change to anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gases. It says “climate models are based on well-established physical principles and have been demonstrated to reproduce observed features of recent climate … and past climate changes … There is considerable confidence that Atmosphere-Ocean General Circulation Models (AOGCMs) provide credible, quantitative estimates of future climate change, particularly at continental and larger scales” (IPCC,2007-I, p. 591).To be of any validity, GCMs must incorporate all of the many physical, chemical, and biological processes that influence climate in the real world, and they must do so correctly. A review of the scientific literature reveals numerous deficiencies and shortcomings in today’s state-of-the-art models, some of which deficiencies could even alter the sign of projected climate change. In this chapter, we first ask if computer models are capable in principle of producing reliable forecasts and then examine three areas of model inadequacies: radiation, clouds, and precipitation.

#### No scientific consensus

Bast and Taylor 11 (Joseph, is president and CEO of The Heartland Institute

James M, managing editor of Environment & Climate News, “Global Warming: Not a crisis” 2011, http://heartland.org/ideas/global-warming-not-crisis)

Science doesn’t advance by “consensus.” A single scientist or study can disprove a theory that is embraced by the vast majority of scientists. The search for a consensus is actually part of what philosophers call “post-normal science,” which isn’t really science at all. Still, many people ask: What do scientists believe? Most surveys cited by those who claim there is a consensus ask questions that are too vague to settle the matter. It is important to distinguish between the statement that global warming is a crisis and the similar-sounding but very different statements that the climate is changing and that there is a human impact on climate. Climate is always changing, and every scientist knows this. Our emissions and alterations of the landscape are surely having impacts on climate, though they are often local or regional (like heat islands) and small relative to natural variation. It is easy to find evidence that scientists disagree about climate change. Climate Change Reconsidered cites thousands of articles appearing in peer-reviewed journals that challenge the basic underlying assumptions of AGW ([Idso and Singer, 2009](http://heartland.org/ideas/global-warming-not-crisis#IdsoSinger)). More than 30,000 scientists have signed a petition saying there is no threat that man-made global warming will pose a threat to humanity or nature ([Petition Project](http://heartland.org/ideas/global-warming-not-crisis#Petition)). Alarmists often cite an essay by Naomi Oreskes claiming to show that virtually all articles about global warming in peer-reviewed journals support the so-called consensus. But a no-less-rigorous study by Benny Peiser that attempted to replicate her results searched the abstracts of 1,117 scientific journal articles on “global climate change” and found only 13 (1 percent) explicitly endorse the “consensus view” while 34 reject or cast doubt on the view that human activity has been the main driver of warming over the past 50 years. A more recent search by Klaus-Martin Schulte of 928 scientific papers published from 2004 to February 2007 found fewer than half explicitly or implicitly endorse the so-called consensus and only 7 percent do so explicitly ([Schulte, 2008](http://heartland.org/ideas/global-warming-not-crisis#Schulte)). A survey that is frequently cited as showing consensus actually proves just the opposite. German scientists Dennis Bray and Hans von Storch have surveyed climate scientists three times, in 1996, 2003, and 2007 ([Bray and von Storch, 2010](http://heartland.org/ideas/global-warming-not-crisis#BrayVonStorch)). Their latest survey found most of these scientists say they believe global warming is man-made and is a serious problem, but most of these same scientists do not believe climate science is sufficiently advanced to predict future climate conditions. For two-thirds of the science questions asked, scientific opinion is deeply divided, and in half of those cases, most scientists disagree with positions that are at the foundation of the alarmist case ([Bast, 2011](http://heartland.org/ideas/global-warming-not-crisis#Bast)). On August 2, 2011, von Storch posted the following comment on a blog: “From our own observations of discussions among climate scientists we also find hardly consensus [sic] on many other issues, ranging from changing hurricane statistics to the speed of melting Greenland and Antarctica, spreading of diseases and causing mass migration and wars” ([von Storch, 2011](http://heartland.org/ideas/global-warming-not-crisis#vonStorch)). These are not minor issues. Extreme weather events, melting ice, and the spread of disease are all major talking points for Al Gore and other alarmists in the climate debate. If there is no consensus on these matters, then “skeptics” are right to ask why we should believe global warming is a crisis.

#### IPCC Predictions are overblown – ignore cycles of warming

Bell 12 (Larry, Environmental contributor to Forbes, “Global Warming? No, Natural, Predictable Climate Change” January 10th, 2012, http://www.forbes.com/sites/larrybell/2012/01/10/global-warming-no-natural-predictable-climate-change/)

 An extensively peer-reviewed study published last December in the Journal of Atmospheric and Solar-Terrestrial Physics indicates that observed climate changes since 1850 are linked to cyclical, predictable, naturally occurring events in Earth’s solar system with little or no help from us. The research was conducted by Nicola Scafetta, a scientist at Duke University and at the Active Cavity Radiometer Solar Irradiance Monitor Lab (ACRIM), which is associated with the NASA Jet Propulsion Laboratory in California. It takes issue with methodologies applied by the U.N.’s Intergovernmental Panel for Climate Change (IPCC) using “general circulation climate models” (GCMs) that, by ignoring these important influences, are found to fail to reproduce the observed decadal and multi-decadal climatic cycles.As noted in the paper, the IPCC models also fail to incorporate climate modulating effects of solar changes such as cloud-forming influences of cosmic rays throughout periods of reduced sunspot activity. More clouds tend to make conditions cooler, while fewer often cause warming. At least 50-70% of observed 20th century warming might be associated with increased solar activity witnessed since the “Maunder Minimum” of the last 17th century. Dr. Scafetta’s study applies an astronomically-based model that reconstructs and correlates known warming and cooling phases with decadal and multi-decadal cycles associated with influences of planetary motions, most particularly those of Jupiter and Saturn. This “astronomical harmonics model” was used to address various cycles lasting 9.1, 10-10.5, 20-21, and 60-62 year-long periods. The 9.1-year cycle was shown to be likely related to decadal solar/lunar tidal oscillations, while those of ten years and longer duration relate to planetary movements about the Sun that may have solar influences that modulate electromagnetic properties of Earth’s upper atmosphere which can regulate the cloud system. Scafetta’s findings contradict IPCC claims that all warming observed from 1970 to 2000 has been man-made (“anthropogenically-induced”) based upon models that exclude natural quasi 20-year and 60-year climate cycle contributions. These cycles have been clearly detected in all global surface temperature records of both hemispheres since 1850, and are also evident in numerous astronomical records. The 60-year cycle is particularly easy to observe in significant surface temperature maxima that occurred in 1880-1881, 1940-1941, and 2000-2001. These momentarily warmer periods coincided with times when orbital positions of Jupiter and Saturn were relatively close to the Sun and Earth.A 60-year modulation cycle also corresponds with warming/cooling induced in the ocean surface which appears to correlate with the frequency of major Atlantic hurricanes, and is seen in the sea level rise since 1700 as well as in numerous ocean and terrestrial records dating back centuries. Further evidence of a 60-year cycle is referenced in ancient Sanskrit texts among observed monsoon rainfall cycles. Scafetta believes that a natural 60-year climate cycle associated with astronomical cycles may also explain calendars adopted in traditional Chinese, Tamil and Tibetan civilizations, since all major ancient civilizations knew about 20-year and 60-year Jupiter and Saturn cycles. Indeed, Scafetta pointed out to me that in the Hindu tradition, the 60-year cycle is known as the cycle of Brihaspati, the name of Jupiter, and that every 60 years special ceremonies are celebrated by some populations, such as the Sigui ceremony among the Dogon people of Africa. Proper reconstructions of natural 20-year and 60-year cycles, along with other independent studies, indicate that the IPCC has seriously overestimated human climate contributions. For example, according to all GCM simulations, increased CO2 concentrations should have produced an increased tropical warming trend with altitude, which is contrary to what balloon and satellites observations actually show.GCM interpretations also allege that volcano activity may have contributed an offsetting 0.1-0.2 degrees of cooling influence between from 1970 to 2000. However, that conclusion appears to significantly overestimate the volcano signal because the models predicted deep and large cooling spikes associated with eruptions which are observed to be much smaller in global surface temperature records. Accordingly, this too suggests that the 1970-2000 warming effect attributed to anthropogenic influences should be reduced. Moreover, some of the observed 0.5 degrees of warming recorded by surface stations during the 1970-2000 period which IPCC models associated with human greenhouse gases emissions, may be explained by improperly corrected urban “heat island” effects and other land use change influences.

### Warming Slow

#### Warming would be slow – ocean absorption prevents extinction

Gerald Roe 11, [Department of Earth and Space Sciences, University of Washington, AND Yoram Bauman, Professor, Program on the Environment, University of Washington, 1-1-2011, “Should the climate tail wag the policy dog?”]

 A key player in the physical system is the enormous thermal inertia represented by the deep ocean. The whole climate system cannot reach a new equilibrium until the deep ocean has also reached equilibrium. In response to a positive climate forcing (i.e., a warming tendency), the deep ocean draws heat away from the surface ocean, and so buffers the surface temperature changes, making them less than they would otherwise be. The deep ocean is capable of absorbing enormous amounts of heat and not until this reservoir has been exhausted can the surface temperatures attain their full equilibrium values. A second key player is the inherent relationship between feedbacks and adjustment time scales in physical systems. If it transpires that we do in fact, live on a planet with a high climate sensitivity, it will be because we live on a planet with strong positive feedbacks. In other words, the net effect of all of the dynamic processes (clouds, water vapor, ice reflectivity, etc.) is to strongly amplify the planet's response to radioactive forcing. In this event, it would mean that we live on a planet that is inefficient in eliminating energy perturbations: a positive feedback reflects a tendency to retain energy within the system, inhibiting its ultimate emission to space, and therefore requiring a larger temperature response in order to achieve energy equilibrium. Moreover. it is generally true that, all else being equal, an inefficient system takes longer to adjust than an efficient one. A useful rule of-thumb is that the relevant response time of the climate system is given by the effective thermal inertia of the deep ocean multiplied by the climate sensitivity parameter (defined as AEX/AR" , see. eg., Roe. 2009). This behavior is absolutely fundamental and widely appreciated (e.g., Hansen et al.. 1985: Vlligley and Schlessinger. 1985). As time progresses, more and more of the ocean abyssal waters become involved in the warming, and so the effective thermal inertia of the climate system increases. Hansen et al. (1985) solve a simple representation of this effect and show that the adjustment time of climate is proportional to the square of climate sensitivity. In other words, if it takes 50 yrs to equilibrate with a climate sensitivity of 1.5°C, it would take 100 times longer, or 5,000 yrs to equilibrate if the climate sensitivity is 15°C. Although Nature is of course more complicated than this (see eg., Gregory, 2000), the basic picture described here is reproduced in models with a more realistic ocean circulation. In particular see results Held et al. (2010) for results from fully-coupled global climate models. In the context of the PDF of climate sensitivity, its effects have been reviewed in Baker and Roe (2009).

**Only a 1 or 2 degree shift is inevitable**

NWF 9 [National Wildlife Federation, “Global Warming is Happening now”

http://www.nwf.org/Global-Warming/What-is-Global-Warming/Global-Warming-is-Happening-Now.aspx]

Since 1979, there has been a general consensus that a doubling of carbon dioxide would raise global temperatures 1.5 to 4.5oC, and that such a doubling is likely to occur over the next century (NAS 1979). More recent assessments have pointed out that emissions of methane, nitrous oxide, and numerous other gases that absorb infrared radiation could further increase this warming (Ramanathan et al. 1985), and that warmer temperatures may increase the rate of natural emissions of these gases (Lashoff 1989). Although national policy makers are beginning to formulate strategies to slow global warming, there is an emerging consensus that at least a one or two degree warming is inevitable, due to past emissions and the time it will take to change production practices and retire existing machinery (Seidel and Keyes 1983; Hansen et al. 1985; EPA 1989.)

## No Impact

#### Global Warming is far off and the impacts are false

Michaels 7, [Patrick J. Michaels, Senior Research Fellow for Policy and Economic Development at George Mason University, Past president of the American Association of State Climatologists, chairman of Meteorology Society, “Global Warming: No Urgent Danger; No Quick Fix” <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/global-warming-no-urgent-danger-no-quick-fix>]

Nor would legislation in any state or Washington, D.C., have any standing in Beijing. Although the final figures aren't in yet, it's beginning to look like China has just passed the United States as the world's largest emitter of carbon dioxide. Like the United States, China has oodles of coal, and the Chinese are putting in at least one new coal-fired power plant a month. (Some reports have it at an astonishing one per week.) And just as it does in the United States, when coal burns in China, it turns largely to carbon dioxide and water.¶ What we do in the United States is having less and less of an effect on the concentration of carbon dioxide in the world's atmosphere.¶ We certainly adapted to 0.8 C temperature change quite well in the 20th century, as life expectancy doubled and some crop yields quintupled. And who knows what new and miraculously efficient power sources will develop in the next hundred years.¶ The stories about the ocean rising 20 feet as massive amounts of ice slide off of Greenland by 2100 are also fiction. For the entire half century from 1915 through 1965, Greenland was significantly warmer than it has been for the last decade. There was no disaster. More important, there's a large body of evidence that for much of the period from 3,000 to 9,000 years ago, at least the Eurasian Arctic was 2.5 C to 7 C warmer than now in the summer, when ice melts. Greenland's ice didn't disappear then, either.¶ Then there is the topic of interest this time of year — hurricanes. Will hurricanes become stronger or more frequent because of warming? My own work suggests that late in the 21st century there might be an increase in strong storms, but that it will be very hard to detect because of year-to-year variability.¶ Right now, after accounting for increasing coastal population and property values, there is no increase in damages caused by these killers. The biggest of them all was the Great Miami Hurricane of 1926. If it occurred today, it would easily cause twice as much damage as 2005's vaunted Hurricane Katrina.¶ So let's get real and give the politically incorrect answers to global warming's inconvenient questions. Global warming is real, but it does not portend immediate disaster, and there's currently no suite of technologies that can do much about it.

#### Even if Warming is real, the effects are minimal

Bast and Taylor 11 (Joseph, is president and CEO of The Heartland Institute

James M, managing editor of Environment & Climate News, “Global Warming: Not a crisis” 2011, http://heartland.org/ideas/global-warming-not-crisis)

Alarmists claim global warming will cause massive flooding, more violent weather, famines, and other catastrophic consequences. If these claims are true, then we should have seen evidence of this trend during the twentieth century. Idso and Singer ([2009](http://heartland.org/ideas/global-warming-not-crisis#IdsoSinger)) provide extensive evidence that no such trends have been observed. Even von Storch ([2011](http://heartland.org/ideas/global-warming-not-crisis#vonStorch)) admits there is no consensus on these matters. The preponderance of scientific data suggest sea levels are unlikely to rise by more than several inches, weather may actually become more mild, and since most warming occurs at night and during the winter season, it has little adverse effect (and some positive effect) on plants and wildlife. Hurricanes are likely to diminish, not increase, in frequency or severity ([Spencer, 2008](http://heartland.org/ideas/global-warming-not-crisis#Spencer); [Singer and Avery, 2008](http://heartland.org/ideas/global-warming-not-crisis#SingerAvery)). Higher levels of CO2 have a well-documented fertilizing effect on plants and make them more drought-resistant. Warmer temperatures are also likely to be accompanied by higher soil moisture levels and more frequent rain, leading to a “greening of the Earth” that is dramatically different from the “parched Earth” scenario featured in many biased and agenda-driven documentary films ([Idso, 1995](http://heartland.org/ideas/global-warming-not-crisis#Idso95)). The current best estimate is that, if left unaddressed, by 2060 global warming is likely to have a small (0.2 percent of GDP) positive effect on the U.S. economy and a small (1 to 2 percent of GDP) negative effect on the global economy ([Mendelsohn and Neumann, 1999](http://heartland.org/ideas/global-warming-not-crisis#MendelsohnNeumann)). These estimates are very small and speculative.

#### Cooling Trend means no effect from warming until after 2040

Bell 12 (Larry, Environmental contributor to Forbes, “Global Warming? No, Natural, Predictable Climate Change” January 10th, 2012, http://www.forbes.com/sites/larrybell/2012/01/10/global-warming-no-natural-predictable-climate-change/)

Finally, three major available global surface temperature record sources report a steady-to-cooling trend since 2001. These measurements contradict the strong warming predicted by all IPCC models during the same period that are attributed primarily to a continuing increase in CO2 emissions. Indeed, only one global surface record source shows a slight increase in the temperature since 2001. This occurred because missing temperature data needed to be adjusted or filled in to complete the records…which appears to be the case with NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies model data resulting from poor sampling during the last decade for Antarctic and Arctic regions and the use of a 1200 km smoothing methodology. The Duke University/NASA JPL study estimates that as much as 0.3 degrees of warming from 1970 to 2000 may have been naturally induced by the 60-year modulation during the warming phase, amounting to at least 43-60% of the 0.5-0.7 degrees allegedly caused by human greenhouse emissions. Additional natural warming can be explained by increased solar activity during the last four centuries, as well as simply being part of a natural and persistent warming recovery since the end of the Little Ice Age of AD 1300-1900.Nicola Scaletta concludes that the scientific method requires that a physical model fulfill two conditions…it must be able to reconstruct as well as predict (or forecast) direct physical observations. Here, he argues that all climate models used by the IPCC can do neither. “They seriously fail to properly reconstruct even the large multi-decadal oscillations found in the global surface temperature which have climatic meaning. Consequently, the IPCC projections for the 21st century cannot be trusted.” In fact, he argues that “By not properly reconstructing the 20-year and 60-year natural cycles we found that the IPCC GCMs have seriously overestimated also the magnitude of the anthropogenic contribution to recent warming.” Unlike the current IPCC models, the astronomical harmonics model can have real climate forecasting value. By combining current trend information with natural cycle patterns Scafetta believes that the global temperature “may not significantly increase during the next 30 years mostly because of the negative phase of the 60-year cycle.” He goes on to say: “If multi-secular natural cycles (which according to some authors have significantly contributed to the observed 1700-2010 warming and may contribute to an additional natural cooling by 2100) are ignored, the same projected anthropogenic emissions would imply a global warming by about 0.3-1.2 degrees C by 2100, contrary to the IPCC 1.0-3.6 degree C projected warming.” Scafetta projects that the global climate may remain approximately steady until 2030-2040 (as was observed from the 1940s to the 1970s) because the 60-year cycle entered into its current cooling phase around 2000-2003. The climate may further cool if additional natural long and short-term cycles also enter into cooling phases. In fact the present warm period may well be at the top of a natural millennial cycle as previously occurred during Roman and Medieval times.

#### Warming reduces amount of hurricanes

Loney 8 (Jim Loney, deputy bureau chief in Baghdad and correspondent for Reuters, “Warming may reduce hurricanes hitting the U.S.” January 23rd, 2008, http://www.reuters.com/article/2008/01/23/environment-climate-hurricanes-dc-idUSN2364087920080123?feedType=RSS&feedName=environmentNews)

Rising ocean temperatures linked to global warming could decrease the number of hurricanes hitting the United States, according to new research released on Wednesday. The study, published in Geophysical Research Letters, challenges recent research that suggests global warming could be contributing to an increase in the frequency and the intensity of Atlantic hurricanes. At the same time, it reaffirmed earlier views that warmer sea waters might result in atmospheric instabilities that could prevent tropical storms from forming. Atlantic storms play a pivotal role in the global energy, insurance and commodities markets, particularly since the devastating 2004 and 2005 hurricane seasons, which hammered U.S. oil and gas production in the Gulf of Mexico. The new study suggests that warmer seas, caused by greenhouse gases blamed for a rise in global temperatures, are linked to an increase in vertical wind shear, a difference in wind speeds at different altitudes that can tear apart nascent cyclones. Hurricanes feed on warm water, leading to conventional wisdom supported by some recent research that global warming could be revving up more powerful storms. But the new study, by oceanographer Chunzai Wang of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and Sang-Ki Lee, a scientist at the University of Miami, examined 150 years of hurricane records and found a small decline in hurricanes making landfall in the United States as the oceans warmed. "The attribution of the recent increase in Atlantic hurricane activity to global warming is premature. ... Global warming may decrease the likelihood of hurricanes making landfall in the United States," the researchers wrote. Much of the recent research focused on the total number of tropical storms and hurricanes recorded in the Atlantic Ocean and Caribbean, but Wang said the number of those hurricanes actually hitting the United States is a much better indicator. Prior to the mid-1960s when satellites and other technology made it easier to spot cyclones, some tropical storms and hurricanes lived and died far out at sea, undetected. As a result, scientists trying to track long-term trends in the frequency of Atlantic storms work with uncertain data. "We believe U.S. landings for hurricanes are most reliable measurements over the long term," Wang said. The study found that warming of the tropical Pacific and Indian oceans increases Atlantic wind shear while rising sea temperatures in the tropical North Atlantic decrease shear. The two effects compete, but the net impact is an increase in wind shear in the main Atlantic hurricane development zone, from the west coast of Africa to Central America. "The Pacific and Indian warming wins and the result is a decrease in landfalling U.S. hurricanes," Wang said. In 2004, four strong hurricanes hit Florida, causing billions of dollars in damage across the state. In 2005, a record-breaking 28 tropical storms formed, including Katrina, which killed 1,500 people and caused $80 billion damage. The back-to-back years of unusually intense hurricane activity fueled debate about the impact of global warming.

#### Squo Solves Potential Permafrost issues

Neumann and Price 9 (James E. Neumann, President of Industrial Economics, Incorporated, Mr. Neumann holds a B.A. in Economics and Environmental Studies from Williams College, and a M.P.A. in Public Affairs and Urban and Regional Planning from the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton University,“Adapting to Climate Change” June, 2009, http://www.rff.org/rff/documents/RFF-Rpt-Adaptation-NeumannPrice.pdf)

 Two recent studies expand on issues of infrastructure vulnerability unique to Arctic zones, particularly Alaska. The first, the Arctic Climate Impact Assessment (Instanes et al. 2005), addressed the full range of climate impacts but included a chapter specific to infrastructure.5 The chapter notes infrastructure impacts associated with permafrost warming and degradation, coastal erosion, and transportation routes, among others. Impacts on infrastructure from changes to permafrost due to higher temperatures vary depending on the type of permafrost (continuous or discontinuous), as follows. • In areas of continuous permafrost, climate change is not likely to pose an immediate threat to infrastructure if proper permafrost engineering design procedures have been followed. Maintenance costs are likely to increase, but it should be possible to gradually adjust Arctic infrastructure (through replacement and changing design approaches over time) to a warmer climate. • Projected climate change is very likely to have a serious effect on existing infrastructure in areas of discontinuous permafrost. Permafrost in these areas is already at temperatures close to thawing. The authors believe that engineering experience already employed to address warming and thawing brought on by human activities and construction can help address this

# BIODIVERSITY ADVANTAGE

### No solvency

#### Other factors reduce biodiversityDudley and Stolton No date[“Air pollution and biodiversity: a review” Nigel Dudley Sue Stolton http://www.equilibriumresearch.com/upload/document/airpollutionandbiodi4f9.pdf]

**Biodiversity Over the past few decades, habitat loss has been the greatest single threat to biodiversity and ecosystem stability in most parts of the world**. As a result, conservation effort has been directed towards reduction of these threats through establishment of reserves and protected areas and also, more recently, through changes in management. However, **establishment of conservation areas offer little protection against change from air pollution**, and research has now shown that many **"protected areas" are, in fact, being reduced in value through the impacts of air pollution226**. Indeed, protected areas may be particularly at risk. Recent analysis within Europe has suggested that conservation areas will suffer a disproportionately greater risk of pollution damage, as measured by critical loads, than the environment as a whole227. National parks and other conservation areas have tended to be established on land that is less suitable for agriculture or other commercial uses228, and thus often on acidic or base-poor soils, where effects of acidification are generally more acute.

#### Environmental destruction inev until addressing of social issuesJaslin U. Salmon Ph.D. Jamaica January 2003 “IMPACT OF AGRICULTURAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL POLICIES ON SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN” http://www.iispec.org/main/file/IMPACT%20OF%20AGR%20&%20ENVIR%20POLICIES.pdf

There are several factors that have contributed to the current state of affairs in Latin America. In the region as well as in other parts of the world**, there is a tendency to focus on specific instances of danger to the environment rather than on social causes**; approaches to sustainable development tend to give disproportionate attention to the

18rainforests (especially Amazonia), to the neglect of other areas; because there is the notion that environmental destruction is an inevitable by-product of economic growth, **environmentalist and policy makers are failing to explore the connection between political power and environmental destruction** (Dore, 1996).

# SOLVENCY

## Nonunique

### Emissions

#### CO2 reduction is inevitable and within 40 years

Maizlish et al, Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion

California Department of Public Health, 11

(Neil Maizlish, James Woodcock, Sean Co, Bart Ostro, Amir Fanai, CDPH, “Health Co-Benefits and Transportation-Related Reductions in

Greenhouse Gas Emissions in the Bay Area:”, 11/21/11, <http://www.cdph.ca.gov/programs/CCDPHP/Documents/ITHIM_Technical_Report11-21-11rev3-6-12.pdf>)

For cars and light trucks, Lutsey 40 estimated CO2 reductions from 2000 to 2050 expected from¶ incremental engineering changes (drive train, accessories, refrigerants), penetration of gaselectric¶ hybrid vehicles and light duty diesels, increased biofuels usage, and the penetration of¶ electric vehicles. For incremental changes consistent with the BAU scenario, a 16% reduction is¶ predicted by 2035. The combination of all other technologies is predicted to reduce CO2¶ emissions by an additional 9% to 33.5%.¶ Annual aggregate carbon emissions at baseline were estimated from CO2 emission rates per¶ mile traveled for passenger vehicles in the SF Bay Area and from the annual miles of car-driver¶ travel estimated by BATS. The methods for calculating these carbon dioxide emission rates are¶ based on travel demand models and have been published elsewhere42. Aggregate CO2¶ emission reductions for the BAU and LCD scenarios applied percentage-wise reductions¶ estimated by Lutsey 40 to the 2000 baseline (Table 6). In the active transport scenarios, annual¶ car-driver miles per person were reduced by the active transport miles per person and multiplied¶ by the emission factor of 1.175 lbs. CO2/mi and the total projected population for 2035 38. Active¶ transport miles were credited entirely to car-driver miles holding car-passenger miles constant at¶ BAU levels. (Active transport miles were not apportioned to car-driver and car-passenger miles in their BAU ratio.)

### Permafrost

#### US and international community is currently researching further into permafrost and climate change

Schuur, Edward and Abbott, Benjamin 30 November 2011 “Climate change: high risk of permafrost thaw” Edward Schuur is in the Department of Biology at the University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida 32611, USA.¶ Edward A. G. Schuur¶ Benjamin Abbott is in the Institute of Arctic Biology at the University of Alaska, Fairbanks, Alaska 99775, USA. <http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v480/n7375/full/480032a.html>

The scientific community needs to collect more data and develop more-sophisticated models to test the hypotheses presented by this survey. Fortunately, awareness of the problem is increasing and these are starting to happen. The US Department of Energy, for example, has initiated a project called Next-Generation Ecosystem Experiments — Arctic, which aims to improve the representation of these processes in large-scale models. NASA is pursuing an Arctic–Boreal Vulnerability Experiment, which aims to improve satellite observations of this region. The Vulnerability of Permafrost Carbon Research Coordination Network funded by the US National Science Foundation, of which we are part, is bringing together people and observations to synthesize results and validate models. These are just some of the many international initiatives aimed at filling these research gaps.¶ In the meantime, our survey outlines the additional risk to society caused by thawing of the frozen north, and underscores the urgent need to reduce atmospheric emissions from fossil-fuel use and deforestation. This will help to keep permafrost carbon frozen in the ground.¶

## Internal Link Turns

#### Better roads increases public transportation, causes more emissions

Strand, Arvid et al 09 (Næss, Petter; Tennøy, Aud) Institute of Transport Economics, Norway “Better Roads Increase Emissions” <http://www.transportbusiness.net/content/view/436/3/>

Transport infrastructure development, including road construction, has always had as its main purpose to facilitate easier transfer of commodities and skilled labor, thereby increasing the efficiency of and contributing to economic growth. Generating as much transport as possible is, however, not an objective in its own right. The challenges and problems associated with transport show that increasing transport volumes bring about undesirable impacts as well as benefits. The influence of road development on the amount of transport and the distribution between transport modes therefore relates to a discussion that has been going on for decades. The study on which this article is based was funded by the Norwegian Road Directorate who wanted us to shed light on the following main question: how does road construction influence on greenhouse gas emissions? We have elucidated this issue by addressing three sub-topics: whether, how and to what extent improved road standard influences greenhouse gas emissions 1) by reducing the emissions per vehicle km driven; 2) by stimulating growth in car traffic and thereby increasing greenhouse gas emissions; and 3) through the greenhouse gas emissions resulting from construction, operation and maintenance of the road network. The study concludes that the question of whether better roads contribute to lower greenhouse gas emissions must be answered mainly negatively. In most cases, the construction of better roads leads to increased greenhouse gas emissions. There are several reasons for this. For one thing, improved road quality facilitates faster driving, often at speed levels where faster driving causes emissions to increase considerably (above 80 km/h). Emissions also increase because people make on average more and longer trips, and because improved conditions for car travelling cause some previous trips by public or non-motorised modes of transport to be replaced by trips by car. Moreover, the road construction itself and the operation and maintenance of the expanded roads require energy use and thereby contribute to increase greenhouse gas emissions. These last components make up an increasing part of the emissions, the lower the traffic volumes are along the new or widened links.

#### Transportation infrastructure emits and facilitates emissions

Davis, Steven J. *et al.* (2010); *Science* **329**, 1330 “*Future CO2 Emissions and Climate Change from Existing Energy Infrastructure” Science* (print ISSN 0036-8075; online ISSN 1095-9203) is published weekly, except the last week in December, by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1200 New York Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20005. Copyright 2010 by the American Association for the Advancement of Science; all rights reserved. The title *Science* is a registered trademark of AAAS.

If current greenhouse gas (GHG) concentrations remain constant, the world would be committed to several centuries of increasing global mean temperatures and sea level rise (1–3). By contrast, near-elimination of anthropogenic CO2 emissions would be required to produce diminishing GHG concentrations consistent with stabilization of mean temperatures (4–6). Yet long-lived energy and transportation infrastructure now operating can be expected to contribute substantial CO2 emissions over the next 50 years [e.g., (7)]. Barring widespread retrofitting of existing power plants with carbon capture and storage (CCS) technologies or the early decommissioning of serviceable infrastructure, these “committed emissions” represent infrastructural inertia, which may be the primary contributor to total future warming commitment.

Emissions scenarios such as those produced by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) rely on projected changes in population, economic growth, energy demand, and the carbon intensity of energy over time (8). Although these scenarios represent plausible future emissions trends, the infrastructural inertia of emissions at any point in time is not explicitly quantified. Here, we present scenarios reflecting direct emissions from existing energy and transportation infrastructure, along with climate model results showing the warming commitment of these emissions. With respect to GHG emissions, infrastructural inertia may be thought of as having two important and overlapping components: (i) infrastructure that directly releases GHGs to the atmosphere, and (ii) infrastructure that contributes to the continued production of devices that emit GHGs to the atmosphere. For example, the interstate highway and refueling infrastructure in the United States facilitates continued production of gasoline powered automobiles. Here, we focus only on the warming commitment from infrastructure that directly releases CO2 to the atmosphere. Essentially, we answer the following question: What if no additional CO2-emitting devices (e.g., power plants, motor vehicles) were built, but all the existing CO2-emitting devices were allowed to live out their normal lifetimes? What CO2 levels and global mean temperatures would we attain? Of course, the actual lifetime of devices may be strongly influenced by economic and policy constraints. For instance, a ban on new CO2-emitting devices would create tremendous incentive to prolong the lifetime of existing devices. Thus, our scenarios are not realistic, but they offer a means of gauging the threat of climate change from existing devices relative to those devices that have yet to be built.

#### Materials for construction emit large amounts of CO2

ADB, July 2010, Evaluation Knowledge Brief, “Reduction Carbon Emissions from Transport Projects” Asian Development Bank Reference Number: EKB: REG 2010-16 <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/18/46/47170274.pdf>

Table 1 shows the carbon emissions contributions by each transport mode. The initial estimate of the overall carbon footprint of ADB’s transport sector assistance approved between 2000 and 2009 is 792 million tons, covering both construction and operations emissions. This is the aggregate carbon footprint of 78,983 km of infrastructure development using ADB's assistance. To put this cumulative total of emissions into perspective, the set of ADB transport projects approved between 2000 and 2009 is estimated to account for 39.6 million tons of CO2 per year, which could be comparable to the annual land transport emissions of Thailand (44 million tons CO2 in 2005) (footnote 17). The quantum of emissions from ADB's transport projects is about 2% of the United States of America's (USA’s) annual transport emissions for 2008.33 Table 1 shows the relative intensity of the carbon footprint as well as the gross carbon emissions. Typically, ADB-funded projects tend to increase or rehabilitate the size of the transport infrastructure, e.g., an expressway project will increase the number of lanes of an existing two-lane highway to a four-lane expressway. The number of lanes has a significant impact on the total carbon footprint as it influences the demand, volume to capacity (V–C) ratios, speed, and construction emissions. The size of the construction emissions varies between 1.2% and 24.0% of total (construction + operations) emissions. This estimate is based on the quantity of three key construction materials used—cement, steel, and bitumen. Although in absolute terms the construction emissions of ADB-funded rural roads are low, they form about 24% of total emissions in this category since the operations emissions are also low. Construction emissions of ADB-funded railway projects are about 2.4% of total emissions in this category. Expressways account for over 60% of ADB’s transportation project-related emissions, 483 million tons, as nearly 22,000 lane-km of expressways were financed by ADB during the period, and these facilities generally produce a high level of CO2 per km. Railways account for most of the rest, about 32%, which is a function of the high tonnage of bulk and other freight carried per track-km of rail—this adds up to considerable energy use even if railways are considerably more energy-efficient per ton-km than trucks for freight haulage. Road rehabilitation projects on average have a small carbon footprint since they do little to induce new traffic, and they improve vehicle operating efficiency. Although these road rehabilitation projects formed 82% of the total km of transport facilities financed for construction or reconstruction by ADB during the past 10 years, they contributed to 4% of the CO2 footprint of ADB’s transport portfolio. Rural road capacity expansion projects typically have only a modest carbon footprint, and these projects made up 4% of the km of transport facilities improved by ADB during the period, so overall emissions from these were also small. ADB had only marginal investments in other types of transport facilities—BRT, MRT, and nonmotorized facilities—during 2000–2009.

## Mitigation Trade-Off

#### Adaptation and mitigation tradeoff—competing policy options

IPPC 7 (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, “Mitigation and adaptation- synergies and trade-offs”, http://www.ipcc.ch/publications\_and\_data/ar4/wg3/en/ch11s11-9.html)

At the national level, mitigation and adaptation are often cast as competing priorities for policy makers (Cohen et al., 1998; Michaelowa, 2001). In other words, interest groups will fight about the limited funds available in a country for addressing climate change, providing analyses of how countries might then make optimal decisions about the appropriate adaptation-mitigation ‘mix’. Using a public choice model, Michaelowa (2001) finds that mitigation will be preferred by societies with a strong climate protection industry and low mitigation costs. Public pressure for adaptation will depend on the occurrence of extreme weather events. As technical adaptation measures will lead to benefits for closely-knit, clearly defined groups who can organize themselves well in the political process, these will benefit from subsidy-financed programmes. Changes in society will become less attractive as benefits are spread more widely.

#### Mitigation is necessary for US response

IPPC 7 (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, “Mitigation and adaptation- synergies and trade-offs”, http://www.ipcc.ch/publications\_and\_data/ar4/wg3/en/ch2s2-5.html)

IPCC (2001), Chapter 1 initiated a very preliminary discussion about the concept of mitigative capacity. Mitigative capacity (in this context) is seen as a critical component of a country’s ability to respond to the mitigation challenge, and the capacity, as in the case of adaptation, largely reflects man-made and natural capital and institutions. It is concluded that development, equity and sustainability objectives, as well as past and future development trajectories, play critical roles in determining the capacity for specific mitigation options. Following that, it can be expected that policies designed to pursue development, equity and/or sustainability objectives might be very benign framework conditions for implementing cost-effective climate change mitigation policies. The final conclusion is that, due to the inherent uncertainties involved in climate change policies, enhancing mitigative capacity can be a policy objective in itself.¶ It is important to recognize here that the institutional aspects of the adaptive and mitigative capacities refer to a number of elements that have a ‘public-good character’ as well as general social resources. These elements will be common framework conditions for implementing a broad range of policies, including climate change and more general development issues. This means that the basis for a nation’s policy-implementing capacity exhibits many similarities across different sectors, and that capacity-enhancing efforts in this area will have many joint benefits.¶ There may be major differences in the character of the adaptive and mitigative capacity in relation to sectoral focus and to the range of technical options and policy instruments that apply to adaptation and mitigation respectively. Furthermore, assessing the efficiency and implementability of specific policy options depends on local institutions, including markets and human and social capital, where it can be expected that some main strengths and weaknesses will be similar for different sectors of an economy.

#### Climate Adaptation hurts mitigation efforts and creates CO2

IPPC 7 (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, “Mitigation and adaptation- synergies and trade-offs”, http://www.ipcc.ch/publications\_and\_data/ar4/wg3/en/ch2s2-5.html)

There are a number of ways in which adaptation and mitigation are related at different levels of decision-making. Mitigation efforts can foster adaptive capacity if they eliminate market failures and distortions, as well as perverse subsidies that prevent actors from making decisions on the basis of the true social costs of the available options. At a highly aggregated scale, mitigation expenditures appear to divert social or private resources and reduce the funds available for adaptation, but in reality the actors and budgets involved are different. Both options change relative prices, which can lead to slight adjustments in consumption and investment patterns and thus to changes in the affected economy’s development pathway, but direct trade-offs are rare. The implications of adaptation can be both positive and negative for mitigation. For example, afforestation that is part of a regional adaptation strategy also makes a positive contribution to mitigation. In contrast, adaptation actions that require increased energy use from carbon-emitting sources (e.g., indoor cooling) would affect mitigation efforts negatively.

## Impacts

#### Small vehicles omit a lot of emission

DeCicco and Fung, Environmental Defense, 6

(John DeCicco and Freda Fung, Environmental Defense, “Global Warming On The Road The Climate Impact Of America’s Automobiles”, 2006, <http://www.edf.org/sites/default/files/5301_Globalwarmingontheroad_0.pdf>)

Perhaps surprisingly, small cars (compacts, subcompacts and two-seaters)¶ were responsible for the most carbon¶ emissions, amounting to 77 MMTc.¶ Small cars once had been the dominant¶ segment by sales; given the longevity of¶ vehicles, many of them remain on the¶ road today. Thus, despite their higher¶ than average fuel economy, small cars¶ still accounted for the largest share of¶ rolling carbon emissions as of 2004.¶ This situation illustrates the relative¶ durability of automobiles: In terms of¶ usage, the U.S. light vehicle stock now¶ has a “half-life” of roughly eight years;¶ in other words, 50% of vehicles are¶ replaced within that time. It takes¶ 16 years for the fleet to be 90% replaced¶ in terms of the carbon emitted during¶ driving. In short, the choices made¶ regarding new vehicles influence emissions for many years to come.¶ SUVs represent the second largest¶ portion of rolling carbon. They soon¶ will be the main source of automotive¶ CO2 emissions, having overtaken small¶ cars in terms of market share in 2002.¶ Their impact will be all the greater due¶ to their lower than average fuel economy.¶ As of 2004, all the SUVs on the road in¶ the United States emitted 67 MMTc,¶ an amount equivalent to the CO2¶ spewed by 55 large coal-fired power¶ plants. Next were pickup trucks, which¶ collectively emitted 60 MMTc in 2004.

#### Roads and infrastructure threaten ecosystems

Meyer et. al. 09, (Michael Frederick R. Dickerson Professor, School of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, PhD Michael Flood Senior Planner at Parsons Brinckerhoff ¶ Chris Dorney Transportation/Land Use Planner at Parsons Brinckerhoff ¶ Ken Leonard Principal of Cambridge Systematics, ¶ Robert Hyman Associate at Cambride Systematics ¶ Joel Smith expert on climate change policy, lead author of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change 2001 and 2007 assessment report; the latter shared the Noble Peace Prize with former Vice President Al Gore. Vice-President of Stratus Consulting, Boulder, CO. “Climate Change and the Highway System: Impacts and Adaptation Approaches”. National Cooperative Highway Research Program. 5/6/2009 http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/nchrp/docs/NCHRP20-83%2805%29\_Task2-3SynthesisReport.pdf)

Coastal Ecosystems: As sea levels rise, coastal ecosystems will migrate inland. Coastal ¶ highways can serve as a barrier to this migration, especially where the road is armored ¶ against rising sea levels. As a result, coastal ecosystems will be squeezed between retreating ¶ shores and immobile highway right-of-ways, in some cases eventually disappearing. (Some ¶ states, such as Massachusetts and Rhode Island, prohibit shoreline armoring along the ¶ shores of some estuaries so that ecosystems can migrate inland, and several states limit ¶ armoring along ocean shores). ¶ x Runoff: Changes in precipitation patterns will affect the magnitude and ecological impact of ¶ storm water runoff. More intense precipitation events in areas of high impervious cover ¶ could result in runoff spikes that can cause increased erosion in streambeds and, in warm ¶ weather, thermal shock to water bodies from the sudden infusion of pavement-heated ¶ runoff. It may also result in pollutant loading spikes, particularly if rainfall events become ¶ less frequent. On the other hand, decreased use of snow and ice chemicals in wintertime will ¶ reduce the harmful effects of these chemicals on water bodies. ¶ x Wildlife Movement: Roads can act as barriers to wildlife movement and migration, either by ¶ preventing movement (e.g., walls and fences) or by increasing the risk of injury and ¶ mortality while crossing roadways.

# Economy DA

#### **Aviation increases the trade deficit**

Aviation Environment Foundation [last cite 2007] [AEF, “WHAT ARE AN AIRPORT’S IMPACTS?”, last cite 2007, AEF, <http://www.aef.org.uk/uploads/PlanningGuide2.pdf> AD]

Aviation also contributes to the trade deficit in two main ways. First, the difference between what UK residents spent abroad (£35.1 billion) and what foreign residents spent in the UK (£16.1 billion) was £19 billion in the 12 months ending July 2007 (National Statistics, 2007). This deficit has been consistently increasing: it was £2.6 billion in 1995, £9.1 billion in 2000 and £15.7 in 2005 (Ross, 2007). London is the only region in the country with a small net benefit; all the other regions show large tourism deficits.

#### Aviation increases external cost

Aviation Environment Foundation [last cite 2007] [AEF, “WHAT ARE AN AIRPORT’S IMPACTS?”, last cite 2007, AEF, <http://www.aef.org.uk/uploads/PlanningGuide2.pdf> AD]

Aviation also imposes external costs on society which it does not pay for. These include the reduction in home values due to airport noise; the costs of treating respiratory diseases caused by increased particulates; and the cost of cleaning buildings eroded by air pollution. The Department for Transport (2003) estimated that, in 2000, the external costs of aviation included: £1.4 billion due to global warming, expected to rise to £4.8 billion in 2030, assuming no demand or supply side responses; • £25 million due to noise impacts; • depending on the methodology used, either minimal costs or between £119 and £236 million due to air pollution; and • additional costs due to congestion in the skies and from surface transport around airports. The DfT (2004) subsequently estimated that accounting for the costs of noise and climate change alone would add between £3 and £20 to the cost of an airline ticket.

# Drilling DA

#### Uniqueness: Obama already being pushed hard for Alaska drilling – only compromise keeps Republicans from stomping over him

Klimasinska, 6/29/12, (Katarzyna, International Economic Relations Masters; Oil, Natural Gas, Nuclear Reporter; Equities reporter, “Republicans Fault Obama Oil Plan Environmentalists See As Risky” http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-06-28/republicans-fault-obama-s-five-year-oil-plan-as-too-restrictive.html)

The Obama administration’s latest five-year oil-leasing plan angered Republicans, who sought to open more areas for drilling, and environmentalists, who said drilling may lead to disasters similar to BP Plc’s (BP/) 2010 spill. The plan released yesterday by the U.S. Interior Department scheduled 15 lease sales through 2017, in the Gulf of Mexico and Arctic waters, while keeping the Atlantic and Pacific coasts off limits. “The Obama administration has demonstrated that they will not allow the safe and responsible development of oil and gas energy resources off of Virginia’s coast,” Republican Governor Bob McDonnell said in a statement. “Offshore energy exploration and development would mean thousands of new jobs and millions in new revenue.” President Barack Obama has set a target of reducing U.S. oil imports by a third by 2025 through more domestic oil production and increased use of natural gas and renewable resources. Republican challenger Mitt Romney has called for more extensive drilling. The five-year plan includes 12 sales in the Gulf of Mexico, an auction in Alaska’s Cook Inlet in 2016, in Chukchi Sea in 2016 and in the Beaufort Sea in 2017. The regions hold more than 75 percent of total undiscovered and recoverable oil, according to the agency. Safety Risks “The government keeps promoting risky offshore drilling that jeopardizes the health of the entire Gulf and Arctic regions,” said Jacqueline Savitz, vice president for North America at environmental group Oceana. “This plan sets us up for another devastating oil spill, which endangers human lives, coastal economies and marine life.” The administration has held two auctions since BP’s Macondo well blew up in April 2010, killing 11 workers and spewing about 4.9 million of barrels of oil to the Gulf. An auction on June 20 for leases in the Gulf of Mexico off the coast of Louisiana, Alabama and Mississippi raised $1.7 billion, with Royal Dutch Shell Plc (RDSA) offering the most high bids at $406.6 million, or 24 percent of all offers, followed by Statoil ASA (STL) with $333.3 million, the Interior Department said. Industry Demands Interior Secretary Ken Salazar said the 2012-2017 plan responds to demands from the energy industry for additional leasing, while keeping environmentally sensitive areas off limits. “Our plan adopts a regionally tailored approach that accounts for the distinct needs of the different regions,” Salazar told reporters in Washington. “The plan takes into account the range of factors, like resource potential, status of development and emergency-response structure, regional interest, and the need for a balanced approach when it comes to the use of our natural resources.” The American Petroleum Institute, representing more than 500 oil and natural gas companies, criticized the plan. This proposal “will not allow us to realize the full benefits from safe and responsible development of America’s oil and natural gas resources,” said Erik Milito, a director at the Washington-based group. “For example, this plan pushes back the 2015 Beaufort lease sale, where leasing has already occurred.”

#### (Insert politics link here)

#### GOP will link infrastructure spending to expanding oil drilling near Alaska

NY Times, 3/14/2012 (“Senate Passes 2-Year Transportation Bill” http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/15/us/politics/senate-passes-transportation-bill-putting-pressure-on-house .html?\_r=1)

The Senate easily approved a two-year, $109 billion transportation and infrastructure bill on Wednesday, putting pressure on House Republicans to set aside their stalled version and pass the Senate’s before the federal highway trust fund expires at the end of the month. “I hope the House will take this up and not listen to this shrill voice that makes up so much of the Republican caucus in the House,” he said. But the nearly three million jobs expected to be “saved or created” by the measure largely come from construction jobs that stand to be lost if federally financed projects grind to a halt on April 1, when money from the highway trust fund could no longer be used. That deadline appears to be weighing heavily on House Republicans, who initially had wanted to use their measure to change federal transportation policy fundamentally by linking infrastructure spending to the expansion of oil drilling from the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska to the outer continental shelf off the East Coast. The five-year House proposal was stymied by a coalition of opponents in both parties, and Speaker John A. Boehner of Ohio, one of its initial backers, has all but abandoned it. “As the speaker said, the plan as it stands right now is to let the Senate pass a bill and take up something that looks like it,” said Michael Steel, a spokesman for Mr. Boehner, “unless the House coalesces around a better alternative, which we are actively pursuing.”

#### Stubborn push for Keystone XL oil pipeline proves- GOP won’t listen to reason #shocker

The Washington Times, 6/18/12 (“GOP sees roadblock to Keystone pipeline” http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2012/jun/18/gop-sees-keystone-roadblock/)

Capitol Hill Republicans say yet another environmental impact study of the controversial Keystone XL oil pipeline is unwarranted and nothing more than a stall tactic by the Obama administration that threatens the project. The State Department announced Friday it had ordered a new study because the Canadian firm TransCanada revised its proposed Canada-to-Nebraska pipeline to avoid Nebraska’s environmental sensitive Sandhills. In January, President Obama rejected the company’s previous bid because he said more time was needed to vet alternative routes. The Republican lawmakers say the new review should be limited only to the new 88-mile rerouted section in Nebraska, not the entire 900-plus mile route from the Montana-Canada border to Steele City, Neb. - a move they say is unnecessary in light of an exhaustive four-year study of the project completed last year. The “notice from the Department of State seems to be yet another obstructive tactic designed to appease a narrow constituency,” said Sen. John Hoeven, North Dakota Republican. “The environment does not change in the nine months since the issuance, nearly a year ago in August, of the final environmental impact statement. That document concluded that there are ‘no significant impacts.’ “ House Energy and Commerce Committee Chairman Fred Upton, Michigan Republican, said that expanding the review to the entire route would entangle the project in needless red tape and delay the creation of thousands of new jobs the project promises. “With its proposed supplemental review, the Obama administration is taking yet another step farther away from energy security and job creation,” he said. The State Department said its primary goal is to review the pipeline’s proposed new section, an effort to be undertaken by an outside reviewer in conjunction with the state of Nebraska. The agency also said it will take another look at last year’s impact study to see if anything has changed. The study is expected to take six to nine months. TransCanada says reviewing the entire project is unnecessary because the previous study showed that it “would have a degree of safety over any other typically constructed domestic oil pipeline under current code.” “The final review should focus solely on the realigned route that avoids the Nebraska Sandhills,” TransCanada President and Chief Executive Russ Girling said. “The rest of the Keystone XL route remains the same. The geology of the route remains the same. The environmental conditions remain the same. Nothing else has changed.” Some environmentalists also are upset because they say the new review won’t consider possible climate change impacts of the pipeline, which would begin in the tar sands of Alberta, Canada. “The tar sands industry is linked to greenhouse gas emissions,” said Jane Kleeb, executive director of Bold Nebraska, a liberal advocacy group opposed to the pipeline. “In an honest assessment they’d realize that actually, no, this is not good for the environment.” Meanwhile on Capitol Hill, the Keystone pipeline threatens to derail a long-term bill to fund federal transportation projects. House Republicans have pressed to include the pipeline in the measure, while most Democrats in both chambers are adamant on leaving it out, saying it’s unrelated. The issue also continues to haunt presidential politics. One the biggest applause lines on Republican Mitt Romney’s ongoing six-state bus tour through the Rust Belt and Midwest has been his repeated vow to “get that pipeline in from Canada - even if I have to build it myself.”

#### Oil Drilling harms multiple biological hotspots

NRDC, July 2007, (Natural Resource Defense Council, the nation's most effective environmental action group, combining the grassroots power of 1.3 million members and online activists with the courtroom clout and expertise of more than 350 lawyers, scientists and other professionals. The New York Times calls us "One of the nation's most powerful environmental groups." The National Journal says we're "A credible and forceful advocate for stringent environmental protection." Our dedicated staff works with [businesses](http://www.nrdc.org/business/), elected leaders, and community groups on the biggest issues we face today;“The Western Arctic: Protecting America’s Arctic” http://www.nrdc.org/land/wilderness/alaska/warctic.pdf)

In 1976, Congress recognized the need to protect certain special areas in the Western Arctic, namely Teshekpuk Lake, Colville River, and the Utukok Uplands, and directed the Interior Department to study these and other areas for protection. Congress instructed the Interior Department “to meet the energy needs of the Nation,” with “maximum protection” of fish, wildlife, and other surface values. An appropriations rider in 1980 opened the area to an expedited leasing program, yet still no special areas were granted permanent protection. Audubon Alaska has proposed biological “hot spots” for protection from leasing and oil development. Yet the BLM has ignored this balanced proposal and instead moved to open nearly 100 percent of the northern half of the Reserve to leasing. At risk are: Black brant and other geese that feed around the many lakes and ponds. Caribou that calve and seek relief from insects in the area around Teshekpuk Lake in unusually large numbers. Waterfowl and shorebirds, including rare yellow-billed loons that breed nowhere else in the United States, concentrations of rare stilt and buff-breasted sandpipers, and threatened Steller’s and spectacled eiders. Spotted seals and beluga whales, which gather in large numbers in Kasegaluk Lagoon on the Chukchi Sea coast to feed, bear their young, and molt. Polar bear denning areas at Dease Inlet-Meade River and Peard Bay. Fossils of bison, horse, mammoth, and other mammals that date to the late Pleistocene era, some 10,000 to 35,000 years ago. Critical nesting and feeding habitat for migratory birds. At Teshekpuk Lake, as many as 37,000 Pacific brant—one-third of the world’s population—molt in the area each year, fattening up on lush wetland plants alongside two types of geese (greater whitefronted and Canada) and a caribou herd 45,000 strong.

#### **Oil drilling in Alaska -leads to cultural genocide, Drilling will kill off a heavy concentrate of Porcupine Caribou, key to the indigenous Gwich’in Indians lifestyle**

EcoWorld 12/18/04 (Nature and Technology Institution, “Oil Drilling in Alaska” http://www.ecoworld.com/animals/oil-drilling-in-alaska.html)

A major issue is the process of retrieving crude oil from the earth. Pipe leaks, accidents during transport and spills are still commonplace. The American Petroleum Institute claims that many steps are taken to “assure that oil and natural gas can be produced with minimal environmental impact.” API also provides some examples: “Directional drilling technology allows us to access oil and gas resources that underlie a sensitive area, such as a wetland, from an area nearby where a drilling rig can safely be located. In the Arctic, companies build ice roads and ice drilling pads that melt away in the spring. Companies have substantially reduced the amount of land disturbance required for drilling a well and by drilling several wells from a single location (with directional or multi-lateral technology) require a much smaller number of sites to achieve the same level of production.” Yet even with impressive technological advancements in the drilling industry, oil rigs and human intrusions still alter the environment and often devastate habitats. Brian Moore, legislative director of the Alaska Wilderness League, knows just how harmful drilling can be. “Prudhoe bay has 400 toxic spills a year,” he says with concern, “that’s more than one spill a day. These spills don’t only affect the drilling site but lands adjacent as well. Devastating effects are real and clear. Environmentalists have not made them up.” It is hard to forget the oil covered seabirds, otters and seals that slowly died after 10 million gallons of crude oil spilled from the Exxon Valdez in 1989. Naturally, environmentalists cringe when plans arise to drill in an area full of wildlife. The possibility that drilling may take place in Alaska’s Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR), an area renowned for unique wildlife and pristine habitat, is a shock to any nature lover. Drilling in the Alaskan Wildlife Refuge will definitely leave its mark. Moore explains that drilling in the refuge will have devastating effects: “Oil exploration is planned to take place in the most critical and sensitive area of the refuge. 130,000 caribou, the last large migrating mammal in the U.S, migrate hundreds of miles to calf here in late May and June, in this one area, and this is where they want to put oil rigs! Gravel roads and drained wetlands are not conducive to them giving birth. It is also devastating to denning polar bears. The polar bear population is already declining and is already threatened by extinction. Oil drilling and extraction may increase the odds of losing the species. Native Alaskans, Gwich’in Indians, whose life revolves around this piece of land will have the most important thing in their culture, the calving ground, taken away from them Gwich’in Indians, rely on the migratory Porcupine Caribou herd as a key source of food and clothing.] It is cultural genocide.” To make matters worse, the Refuge constitutes the last 5% of the Alaskan North Slope not open to oil drilling. Drilling operations already exist throughout the rest of the area. The Refuge is the last area wildlife can live peacefully.

#### Genocide outweighs all other impacts.

Gray ‘10,(John Gray, Book Reviewer for Newstatesman.com, Citing Daniel Goldhagen, former professor of political science at Harvard University, “Worse Than War: Genocide, Eliminationism and the Ongoing Assault on Humanity” p. 2/4/10 a. 5/12/12)

The 20th century was perhaps the most bloodthirsty in history. The largest numbers were not killed in wars between states, as might be supposed. They were killed by members of their own societies, often by people who had been their neighbours. In ethnic cleansing, in civil conflicts and with the industrialisation of killing in totalitarian states, human beings turned on each other and surpassed all records for savagery. It is difficult and painful to understand this sanguinary history. Who can diagnose a common disorder in affectless bureaucrats, machete-wielding tribesmen and the countless ordinary citizens who have accepted or supported mass killing? And who can find a cure for this pandemic of violence? However necessary, the task threatens to overwhelm the imagination. Fortunately we are not helpless. Daniel Goldhagen is at hand, with a simple explanation and an infallible remedy. In *Hitler's Willing Executioners* (1996), Goldhagen argued that Germans were largely active supporters of Nazi "eliminationism" - an ideology that justified the extermination of minorities, above all Jews, as necessary and right. Goldhagen's claim that many, if not most Germans enthusiastically endorsed Hitler's genocidal policies was predictably controversial and brought him worldwide recognition. His argument that Germany had nurtured a uniquely virulent, "eliminationist" type of anti-Semitism over generations has been forcefully disputed by historians for conflating the hatreds of the interwar era with German culture as a whole (and for neglecting eliminationist anti-Semitism in other countries). But Goldhagen, who rarely refers to other scholars except to dismiss them, is unfazed by these objections. Instead, he has upped the stakes and extended his analysis to cover virtually every kind of mass killing perpetrated in recent times.

Turns Case- Oil Drilling just exacerbates global warming, no oil price relief.

NRDC, September 2008, (Natural Resource Defense Council, the nation's most effective environmental action group, combining the grassroots power of 1.3 million members and online activists with the courtroom clout and expertise of more than 350 lawyers, scientists and other professionals. The New York Times calls us "One of the nation's most powerful environmental groups." The National Journal says we're "A credible and forceful advocate for stringent environmental protection." Our dedicated staff works with [businesses](http://www.nrdc.org/business/), elected leaders, and community groups on the biggest issues we face today; “The “All of the Above” Energy Plan Means More Global Warming and No Relief for Consumers” <http://www.nrdc.org/energy/relief/alloftheabove.pdf>)

Extracting oil from our wildlife refuges and protected coastlines to burn in conventional cars and trucks would release billions of tons of carbon into our atmosphere, where it will trap heat for generations and exacerbate global warming. Supporters of the “All of the Above” plan make wildly inflated claims about how much oil could be produced by opening these areas to exploitation by the oil industry, but analysis by the Energy Information Administration (EIA) shows that production would be merely a drop in the bucket and that the impact on near- and long-term gasoline prices would be “insignificant.”1 EIA’s analysis projects that the oil production from opening both protected offshore areas and the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to drilling would reach a maximum of 1 million barrels per day in 2025. This would do nothing to help consumers at the pump, but burning this much oil would emit 190 million metric tonnes of CO2 per year.

#### Oil Drillers ignore the fact that they don’t know how to clean up oil spills in Alaska

Usborne, 1/4/08, (David Usborne, US editor of The Independent, World News and Foreign Policy; “Plans to Drill for Alaska Oil Threaten Polar Bear Numbers” http://www.biologicaldiversity.org/news/media-archive/AKOilIndie1-4-08.pdf)

The expansion of exploration rights in Alaska is strongly supported by Sarah Palin, the state’s governor, but will always be controversial with environmentalists amid growing evidence that global warming and shrinking sea ice are already threatening populations of Arctic mammals. It is the first time in 15 years that the US government has invited oil companies to bid for new licenses in the area. Pamela Miller, of the Northern Alaska Environmental Centre, said the Bush administration had taken insufficient account of recent changes in Arctic conditions associated with global warming before making its decision and had not clearly examined what impact new drilling might have. But Randall Luthi, director of the MMS, insisted that all environmental risks were explored and taken into account. “We believe our decision is a good balance and will allow companies to explore this intriguing frontier area while still protecting the resources important to the coastal residents,” he said. Moreover, no drilling would be allowed less than 50 miles from shore, he added. But conservationists are also warning of the danger of accidental oil spills. “No one yet has figured out how to clean up a spill in broken ice, so they just stick their head in the sand and pretend it won’t happen,” said Brendan Cummings, of the Centre for Biological Diversity. Researchers recently found that Arctic sea ice had fallen to its lowest level since satellite measurements began in 1979.

#### **Domestic Drilling doesn’t solve for oil dependency, only reduction of consumption solves**

National Wildlife Federation, no date (“Can We Drill Our Way to Lower Fuel prices??” Our Public Lands, <http://www.ourpubliclands.org/files/upload/PublicLandsandFuelPricesMyths_1.pdf>)

More drilling will not achieve “energy independence.” At current consumption levels, U.S. resources are inadequate to achieve energy independence. The United States contains 2.5 % of the world's oil resources and 3% of world natural gas resources. But we account for 24% of total world consumption of oil and 22% of natural gas consumption. The U.S. could drill every national park, wildlife refuge, and coastline and still be importing 60 percent of the oil we use. Opening more areas to drilling in the U.S. can never make us less dependent on foreign oil or natural gas. Additionally, because oil and petroleum products are traded globally, there is no guarantee that oil drilled in the U.S. will stay in the U.S. In fact, a record 1.6 billion barrels a day in U.S. refined petroleum products were exported from January-April of this year, up 33 percent over the same period in 2007. The bottom line is profit -domestically drilled oil will not stay in the U.S. if another nation is willing to pay more for it. The only way we will ever reduce our dependency is to reduce our consumption. Federal legislation that promotes clean, alternative energy and cuts global warming pollution will reduce our oil imports four times more than drilling in the pristine wildlife habitat of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, off our beaches, and in the Rocky Mountains combined. A study by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology found that under the Climate Security Act, U.S. petroleum consumption would drop by nearly half by 2030—saving far in excess of the amount of oil we could ever pull from Alaska or the coasts.

# Politics DA

## Generic Links

### Obama Good

**Transportation bills face a rough time in Congress**

**Schank, 6/16/2012** (Joshua, , President and CEO of the Eno Center for Transportation a neutral, non-partisan think-tank,The Federal Role in Transportation Part II: Four Ideas for Lesser Federal Involvement, http://www.enotrans.org/eno-brief/the-federal-role-in-transportation-part-ii-four-ideas-for-lesser-federal-involvement)

In a remarkable display of bipartisanship, **Congress has finally passed a new surface transportation authorization bill,** which is the first such legislation since SAFETEA-LU expired in 2009. The bill represents a substantial step forward in many respects, and we will provide a full analysis in the next Eno Brief. But **while Congress faced many challenges in passing a new bill, perhaps the greatest challenge was the one they still have yet to deal with**. This bill lacks a viable proposal for paying for stable or increased transportation expenditures in the long-term. Simultaneously, **Congress still seems to be unwilling to cut expenditures to the levels at which they can be maintained within existing revenue streams**. **The bill that finally emerged from Congress is a short-term authorization financed with an influx of general revenues, and will not resolve the long-term funding issue**. While **we are still effectively in a policy stalemate with respect to funding for surface transportation**, the new bill does specify some national goals and directs the development of specific performance measures to evaluate progress towards those goals. Congress is beginning to recognize that no matter what the eventual size of this program, federal funding should focus on areas of national interest. The challenge is to define exactly what that national interest should be, and this challenge is not limited to surface transportation.

**Deficit spending controversial in Congress**

**Schank, 4/16/2012** (Joshua, President and CEO of the Eno Center for Transportation a neutral, non-partisan think-tank, Is Partisanship the Problem?, http://www.enotrans.org/eno-brief/is-partisanship-the-problem)

While **neither party is particularly thrilled with the idea of spending general revenues on transportation** at the moment, **Democrats are more willing to consider it**. Witness the strong Democratic support for the Senate bill, as well as the President’s proposal to pay for more transportation spending with “savings” from ending the wars in the Middle East. **Republicans seem to prefer using these offsets to trim the deficit instead of investing in transportation**, though there is some clear division in the Republican party along these lines, as several Republicans voted for the Senate bill, and the House leadership proposed a bill with a large general fund offset that never went anywhere. **The issue of how we deal with our deficit while also making necessary investments is a tricky one** that several nations around the globe are currently struggling with. It is no surprise **that our political parties are having a difficult time sorting it out,** but there is room for compromise with some combination of deficit-reduction and spending increases.

**Transportation spending is highly partisan**

**Schank, 4/16/2012** (Joshua, President and CEO of the Eno Center for Transportation a neutral, non-partisan think-tank, Is Partisanship the Problem?, http://www.enotrans.org/eno-brief/is-partisanship-the-problem)

The partisan differences between the parties on the issue of transportation are likely resolvable. Admittedly, **we are not immune from the larger political partisanship infecting the nation at the moment.** **The general lack of cooperation between both parties and lack of civility that pervades the political discourse also impacts transportation and makes the job more difficult**. But there is little we can do about that. We can do something, however, about the definition of the federal role, which so far no one in Congress on either side of the aisle has really tried to address. The definition of the federal role is vital to moving forward because there is currently no agreed-upon purpose for the surface transportation program. **We are so challenged by the new rules of bipartisan agreement – no new revenue, no earmarks, and no expanding the constituencies – that we seem to have no idea how to create a new bipartisan majority behind transportation in this new environment**. **Hence we find ourselves with the best-case scenario of passing an 18-month authorization bill using obscure offsets to maintain current investment levels.** **We are unlikely to ever secure funding – of any size – for a long-term transportation reauthorization** unless we begin this discussion of the federal role and move beyond the discussion of funding. If we can begin the conversation about the federal role, and achieve some bipartisan consensus on that, we may just be able to also achieve consensus on funding. That is not to say this will be easy, but we should not let the appearance of rampant partisanship discourage us. Perhaps under such a compromise, funding levels will not be as high as they have been in the past. But in order to maintain past funding levels, transportation agencies have had to sacrifice any semblance of certainty or long-term planning capability. If we focused less on funding levels, and more on program purpose, we might just find ourselves in a better position.

#### Transportation infrastructure spending unpopular among conservatives-Senate bill proves

**Johnson, 2012 (Fawn, correspondent for National Journal, covering a range of issues including immigration, transportation and education, Conservatives: Senate Bill Is 'Crap Sandwich', http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2012/03/conservatives-senate-bill-is-c.php#173458)**

**It took a lot of whining, but the Senate finally passed its two-year, $109 billion surface transportation bill last week** on a solidly bipartisan 74-22 vote. The bill won praise from the likes of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, AAA and the AFL-CIO. No one thinks that it's perfect, but it would smooth out some of the current kinks in the federal highway program and give the transportation industry certainty that they won't face federal cuts for two years. And yet...**there are still some people who don't like it, and many of them are in the House. A GOP aide told me that Republican members see the Senate bill as "a crap sandwich** that they're going to have eat" if they can't come up with an alternative. (That's proving to be something of a problem. House Speaker John Boehner has tried multiple options without getting his caucus to coalesce around one.) Outside the Capitol, Heritage Action for America, a right-wing grassroots group, considered a "no" vote on the Senate bill a "key vote" in determining whether a legislator is sticking to conservative principles. **Conservatives are worried about a "spending boondoggle," which reflects their general anxiety about federal investment**. They are also worried that the Senate bill preserves too much of the previous highway bill, which was loaded with earmarks. Sen. Mike Johanns, R-Neb., claims there is even an earmark in the Senate bill for Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid. Reid hasn't commented. All this is to say that **there is a wing of the conservative party that is gung ho about killing the Senate bill. For them, the legislation involves broader questions about federal spending and how Congress acted in previous years using earmarks and other special favors.**

#### Climate change adaptation is a controversial issue

Theoharides at el. 09 [February 10, 2009 Authors: Katie Theoharides, Gerald Barnhart & Patty Glick Contributors: Noah Matson, Arpita Choudhury, Amanda Staud t<http://www.defenders.org/publications/climate_change_adaptation_across_the_landscape.pdf> “Climate change adaptation across the landscape”]

Implement “proactive” management and restoration strategies **Strategies in this category include all active facilitation of** species, habitats and **ecosystems to accommodate climate change impacts**. Examples include translocating species to new locations, beach re-nourishment, barrier island expansion, marsh creation, and planting climate-resistant species. At this time, none of the participants referenced specific strategies that fell under this category, but did note that proactive management, such as species translocation and the use of dredged material for barrier island expansion **were often controversial issues and usually expensive to implement.**

**Transportation spending is unpopular in Congress.**

**Freemark, 2012** (Yonah – Master of Science in Transportation from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Also a freelance journalist who has been published in Planning Magazine; Next American City Magazine; Dissent; The Atlantic Cities; Next American City Online; and The Infrastructurist – He created and continues to write for the website The Transport Politic – The Transport Politic – “On Infrastructure, Hopes for Progress This Year Look Glum” – January 25th, 2012 http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2012/01/25/on-infrastructure-hopes-for-progress-this-year-look-glum/)

President Obama barely mentions the need for improvements in the nation’s capital stock in his State of the Union. The contributions of the Obama Administration to the investment in improved transportation alternatives have been significant, **but it was clear from the President’s State of the Union address last night that 2012 will be a year of diminished expectations in the face of a general election and a tough Congressional opposition.** Mr. Obama’s address, whatever its merits from a populist perspective, nonetheless failed to propose dramatic reforms to encourage new spending on transportation projects, in contrast to previous years. While the Administration has in some ways radically reformed the way Washington goes about selecting capital improvements, bringing a new emphasis on livability and underdeveloped modes like high-speed rail, there was little indication in the speech of an effort to expand such policy choices. All that we heard was a rather meek suggestion to transform a part of the money made available from the pullout from the Afghanistan and Iraq conflicts — a sort of war dividend whose size is undefined — to “do some nation-building right here at home.” If these suggestions fell flat for the pro-investment audience, they were reflective of the reality of **working in the context of a deeply divided political system in which such once-universally supported policies as increased roads funding have become practically impossible to pursue. Mr. Obama pushed hard, we shouldn’t forget, for a huge, transformational transportation bill in early 2011, only to be rebuffed by intransigence in the GOP-led House of Representatives and only wavering support in the Democratic Senate.** For the first term at least, the Administration’s transportation initiatives appear to have been pushed aside. Even so, it remains to be seen how the Administration will approach the development of a transportation reauthorization program. Such legislation remains on the Congressional agenda after three years of delays (the law expires on March 31st). There is so far no long-term solution to the continued inability of fuel tax revenues to cover the growing national need for upgraded or expanded mobility infrastructure. But if it were to pass, a new multi-year transportation bill would be the most significant single piece of legislation passed by the Congress in 2012. **The prospect of agreement between the two parties on this issue, however, seems far-fetched. That is, if we are to assume that the goal is to complete a new and improved spending bill, rather than simply further extensions of the existing legislation**. The House could consider this month a bill that would fund new highways and transit for several more years by expanding domestic production of heavily carbon-emitting fossil fuels, a terrible plan that would produce few new revenues and encourage more ecological destruction. Members of the Senate, meanwhile, have for months been claiming they were “looking” for the missing $12 or 13 billion to complete its new transportation package but have so far come up with bupkis. The near-term thus likely consists of either continued extensions of the current law or a bipartisan bargain that fails to do much more than replicate the existing law, perhaps with a few bureaucratic reforms.

**Skepticism about funding mechanisms make actual investment under current funding structures unpopular**

**Hart Research Associates and Public Opinion Strategies, 2011(“**The Rockefeller Foundation Infrastructure Survey: Findings from a national survey of registered voters, conducted byHart Research Associates and Public Opinion Strategies” Feb 14 2011 [http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/uploads/files/80e28432-0790-4d42-91ec-afb6d11febee.pdf accessed tm 5/22/12](http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/uploads/files/80e28432-0790-4d42-91ec-afb6d11febee.pdf%20accessed%20tm%205/22/12))

**A large majority of voters see room for improvement in how the government spends money on infrastructure and they endorse a host of reforms in this area**. **64% of voters say that how the government currently spends money on building and maintaining our transportation infrastructure is inefficient and unwise**, including one in four (26%) who says it is very inefficient. Just 32% say the government currently spends efficiently and wisely. **Republicans** (72% unwise) **and independents** (67% unwise**) are particularly adamant that this is the case, though 56% of Democrats say that current spending is unwise as well**. Given this attitude, it is unsurprising that the public supports a number of measures that would change the way in which transportation dollars are spent.

#### GOP against infrastructure spending

**Marshall and Thomasson, 2011 (Will-president and founder of the Progressive Policy Institute, Scott-economic and domestic policy director for the Progressive Policy Institute, Sperling on “Deferred Maintenance”, http://progressivepolicy.org/tag/national-infrastructure-bank#ScottThomasson1)**

**President Obama’s $447 billion jobs plan includes some constructive** – literally – **provisions** **for upgrading America’s economic infrastructure.** These shouldn’t be controversial: **Who could be against** putting people to work rebuilding the rickety foundations of U.S. productivity and competitiveness? **Well, Republicans, that’s who**. **They have dismissed the president’s call for $50 billion in new infrastructure spending as nothing more than another jolt of fiscal “stimulus” masquerading as investment.** It’s hard to imagine a more myopic example of the right’s determination to impose premature austerity on our frail economy. From Lincoln to Teddy Roosevelt to Eisenhower, the Republicans were once a party dedicated to internal nation building**. Today’s GOP is gripped by a raging anti-government fever which fails to draw elementary distinctions between consumption and investment, viewing all public spending as equally wasteful.**

#### House Conservatives oppose transportation infrastructure spending

**Mitchell, 2011 (Josh, Staff reporter for the Wall Street Journal, Dueling Bills Seeks to Fund Road, Infrastructure Plans, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702303544604576430314142653944.html)**

**Enacting big, multiyear highway bills was once a reliable ritual in Washington. Now, the conservative-led campaign against pork-barrel spending, and the bipartisan aversion to raising federal gasoline taxes, is putting the brakes on infrastructure spending**, frustrating business groups and unions alike. House Transportation Committee Chairman John **Mica** (R., Fla.), who spent months drafting his bill, **said he wanted to boost transportation funding but that political realities prevent him from doing so. In January, the new House Republican leadership imposed an in-house rule that forbids lawmakers from approving any new transportation funding that would add to the deficit.**

Congress hostile towards transportation infrastructure spending

**Freemark 12 (Yonah, Master of Science in Transportation from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Also a freelance journalist who has been published in Planning Magazine; Next American City Magazine; Dissent; The Atlantic Cities; Next American City Online; and The Infrastructurist – He created and continues to write for the website The Transport Politic – The Transport Politic, The President’s Budget: Full of Ambition, Short on Congressional Support, http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2012/02/14/the-presidents-budget-full-of-ambition-short-on-congressional-support/)**

**The executive branch’s proposed spending for FY 2013 would greatly expand spending on transit and intercity rail, but it faces a hostile Congress**. It brings good news, however, for five California rail projects and new light rail lines for Charlotte, Honolulu, and Portland. The White House has introduced a budget — and a reauthorization proposal — that would significantly increase investment in transportation infrastructure over the next six years. Though **the legislation as currently designed will not be passed into law because of reluctance from Congress**, the Obama Administration’s continued efforts to expand funding for sustainable mobility options are to be praised. Most of **the** President’s **proposal is unlikely to see the light of day in the House of Representatives, controlled by Republicans newly hostile to the idea** of using Highway Trust Fund revenues to pay for transit projects. Yet their proposal would create a $78 billion funding shortfall in the Highway Trust Fund over the next ten years according to an analysis by the Congressional Budget Office. That’s with $0 committed to transit! The Administration proposal, on the other hand, is fully funded (or at least accounted for\*) and would transform the Highway Trust Fund into the much more reasonably titled Transportation Trust Fund; the priorities of each piece of legislation are very clear. **The defection of several House Republicans away from their own party’s transportation bill suggests that the legislation may not even get out of their chamber**. At this point, the Senate’s bipartisan, mostly status-quo-extending two-year transportation reauthorization bill is now **the most likely of all three proposals to be official government policy** by the end of the spring. **But even** it **faces the strong possibility of being ditched** in favor of a simple extension of the existing bill, which will expire on March 31 according to the current law.

#### GOP opposition to infrastructure spending

**Thoma, /26/12 (Mark, macroeconomist and time-series econometrician, associate professor of economics at the University of Oregon, The Political Empowerment of the Working Class is the Key to Better Employment Policy, Economist’s View, http://economistsview.typepad.com/economistsview/2012/06/the-political-empowerment-of-the-working-class-is-the-key-to-better-employment-policy-1-1.html)**

We are also told that the deficit is too large already, but there’s still plenty of room to do more for the unemployed so long as we have a plan to address the long-run debt problem. But even if the deficit is a problem, **why won’t Republicans support one of the many balanced budget approaches to stimulating the economy?** Could it be that these policies invariably require higher income households to give something up so that we can help the less fortunate? Tax cuts for the wealthy are always welcome among Republicans no matter how it impacts the debt, but creating job opportunities through, say, investing in infrastructure? Forget it. **Even though the costs of many highly beneficial infrastructure projects are as low as they get,** and even though investing in infrastructure now would save us from much larger costs down the road – it’s a budget saver not a budget buster **– Republicans leaders in the House are balking at even modest attempts to provide needed job opportunities for the unemployed**. **The imbalance in political power, obstructionism from Republicans designed to improve their election chances**, and attempts by Republicans to implement a small government ideology are a large part of the explanation for why the unemployed aren’t getting the help they deserve. But Democrats aren’t completely off the hook either. Centrist Democrats beholden to big money interests are definitely a problem, and Democrats in general have utterly failed to bring enough attention to the unemployment problem. Would these things happen if workers had more political power?

Partisan logjam makes passing transportation infrastructure bills difficult and unpopular

**Diaz, 2012 (Kevin, staff writer for the Star Tribune, Highway funding stuck in reverse, The Star Tribune, http://www.lexisnexis.com/hottopics/lnacademic/)**

**Distracted by partisan battles, lawmakers are struggling to fund upgrades to a decades-old transportation infrastructure that highway engineers say is deteriorating faster than the nation's ability to keep up**. **The Senate remains at an impasse**, but the House is working on a plan that would actually give Minnesota nearly $50 million less this year compared to last. The prospective cut mostly reflects the GOP-led ban on earmarks, which have provided the state with about $150 million in additional transportation dollars since 2010. Congress relies heavily on the federal gas tax to help fund highway upgrades, but the tax expires at the end of this month. With each passing day**, transportation officials across the country are waiting to see whether lawmakers can break the partisan logjam**, which has held up a major road bill -- in one form or another -- for 2 1/2 years. Meanwhile, **House GOP leaders have debated scaling back a five-year, $260 billion plan**. Democrats have assailed it as a "giveaway" to oil and gas interests **while conservative groups such as the Club for Growth slam the bill for overspending.**

**Transportation funding unpopular in Congress and with the public**

**Natter, 2008** (Ari, associate editor for Traffic World, Transportation's Dividing Lines, Traffic World, http://www.lexisnexis.com/hottopics/lnacademic/)

**The lines for debate on highway and transportation funding for the coming years are set and they look more than ever like battle lines**. Saying at least $225 billion a year is needed to maintain and upgrade the country's ailing transportation system, a federal commission formed to look at the nation's infrastructure and funding needs recommended a massive overhaul of how the United States manages and pays for its freight and passenger transportation systems. **Congressional Republicans seized on the gas tax increase**, with Sen. Chuck Grassley, R-Iowa, **assailing it as an "old, cold, bad idea."** "An orange traffic cone could have come up with a gas tax increase," said Grassley, the ranking Republican on the Senate Finance Committee, which oversees tax issues. "Everyone knows most members of Congress will toss that recommendation right in the trash." Rep. John L. Mica, R-Fla., the ranking GOP member of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, said the proposal amounted to a greater than 200 percent tax increase, also announced he was opposed to an increase in the user fee. **"While I respect their hard work and efforts, the commission's recommendation of a dramatic increase in a gas tax does not stand a snowball's chance in hell of passing Congress,**" Mica said in a statement. **Although many of the proposals offer substantial changes in existing programs, mixing in the increase in the gas tax will make it difficult to raising political capital** for the proposals, said Robert W. Poole Jr., director of transportation studies at the Reason Foundation, a strong advocate of highway privatization. "**Americans and their elected leaders don't understand the transportation system,**" said Stephen E. Flynn, the Jeanne K. Kirkpatrick Senior Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations. **"Secondly, they don't value it, and thirdly, they don't have confidence in it."**

**Infrastructure Spending unpopular among Republicans**

**Easley, 2011** (Jason, political columnist for Politicus USA who specifically follow the legislative process, Obama Demands That The GOP Explain To America Why They Refuse To Create Jobs, http://www.politicususa.com/obama-demands-gop-jobs.html)

After **Senate Republicans blocked a $60 billion infrastructure spending bill**, President Obama released a statement demanding that the GOP explain to the American people why they refuse to create jobs. Once again, **the Republican Party just doesn’t get it. Not only would they gain points with voters if they would have supported the infrastructure bill, but they also gave Obama a win by blocking the bill.** Republicans don’t understand that every time they refuse to create jobs, they are allowing Obama to campaign both in favor of job creation and against the GOP. **The Republican strategy is literally a case of cutting off your nose to spite your face**. All of the pieces of the American Jobs Act that Republicans have defeated or blocked are very popular with voters. Every time the GOP has said no to job creation, they are also outing themselves to voters as the reason why jobs aren’t being created.

**Policymakers and public opposed to changing transportation infrastructure policies and funding**

**GAO 2007** (report done by the Government Accountability Office, TRANSFORMING TRANSPORTATION POLICY FOR THE 21ST CENTURY, http://www.lexisnexis.com/hottopics/lnacademic/http://www.lexisnexis.com/hottopics/lnacademic/)

**The nation`s transportation network presents particularly complex policy challenges**, because it encompasses many modes air, water, highway, transit, and rail on systems owned, funded, and operated by both the public and the private sectors. Furthermore, **transportation decisions are inextricably linked with economic, environmental, and energy policy concerns**. Addressing these challenges requires strategic and intermodal approaches, effective tools and programs, and coordinated solutions involving all levels of government and the private sector.1 Yet in many cases, the government is still trying to do business in ways that are based on conditions, priorities, and approaches that were established decades ago and are not well suited to addressing 21st century challenges. Addressing these challenges requires a fundamental reexamination of the nation`s transportation policies and programs. Congestion pricing. Participants also supported congestion pricing, which attempts to influence driver behavior by charging drivers higher prices during peak hours. However, participants noted that **few states have actually implemented congestion pricing or other pricing techniques, which, they suggested, likely reflects initial public and political opposition to such proposals.** The most common form of congestion pricing in the United States is high-occupancy toll (HOT) lanes, which are priced lanes that offer drivers of vehicles that do not meet the occupancy requirements the option of paying a toll to use lanes that are otherwise restricted for high-occupancy vehicles. Participants said that **the current system has a lot of supporters and there is not currently enough unrest about the issues facing transportation infrastructure to motivate change on a large scale**. **Educating the public, the Congress, the private sector, environmental groups, and regional leaders on the consequences of the nation`s transportation problems is a key step to initiating change**, according to participants. Participants said that the public, and others, are not connecting the efficiency of the transportation system with their overall quality of life. In addition, the message that transportation affects the global economy and is fundamental to the nation`s economic success is currently not widely recognized. Users must be convinced that it is in their interest to move towards change. Several participants agreed that emphasizing the impending ``crisis`` related to transportation might create an opportunity for change. Along these lines, they suggested messages for the public and others such as:

**GOP says hell no to Obama infrastructure spending policies**

**Fox News, 2010** (Obama's New Jobs Program: Stimulus II or GOP Obstacle Course?, http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2010/09/07/obamas-new-jobs-program-stimulus-ii-gop-obstacle-course/)

**In a Labor Day speech in Milwaukee, Obama called for $50 billion more in infrastructure spending to rebuild roads, railways and runways -- a proposal that GOP leaders immediately cast as dead-on-arrival**. The president taunted **Republicans** for **consistently opposing his economic policies and said they seem to be running on a slogan of "No, we can't**," playing off his 2008 presidential campaign mantra of "Yes we can." "In 2008, they gave him the key to the kingdom, the House, the Senate and White House, and there's not much the Republicans could have done," he said. "**But I'll tell you what the Republicans should do. We shouldn't be the party of 'no,' we should be the party of 'Hell No' to the Obama policies**." The House minority leader, John **Boehner** of Ohio, **added, "We don't need more government 'stimulus' spending. We need to end Washington Democrats' out-of-control spending spree,** stop their tax hikes and create jobs by eliminating the job-killing uncertainty that is hampering our small businesses."

### Obama Bad Links

Bipartisan support for transportation infrastructure spending

**Cooper, 2012 (Donna, Senior Fellow with the Economic Policy team at American Progress. Formerly the deputy mayor for policy for Philadelphia and secretary of policy and planning for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Will Congress Block Infrastructure Spending?, Center for American Progress, http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2012/01/infrastructure\_sotu.html)**

At first glance it would appear that **the president’s call to invest in infrastructure should enjoy wide bipartisan support. The leadership of both parties in Congress is on record as strong advocates for rebuilding the nation’s roads, bridges, rail, ports, and airports**. On Fox News earlier this week, Speaker of the House John **Boehner** (R-OH**) said he wants the president to follow the recommendations** of the White House Jobs and Competitiveness Council **on increasing federal investments in infrastructure** (look for the transcript on the speaker's blog). And Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-KY) is on the record saying, “**Everybody knows we have a crumbling infrastructure. Infrastructure spending is popular on both sides**. The question is how much are we going to spend.” Senate Majority Leader Harry **Reid** (D-NV) **and** House Minority Leader Nancy **Pelosi** (D-CA) **also strongly support President Obama’s infrastructure plans**.

## Railroads Links

### Obama Good

**GOP against all infrastructure spending, specifically public transit**

**Freemark, 2011** (Yonah, Master of Science in Transportation from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Also a freelance journalist who has been published in Planning Magazine; Next American City Magazine; Dissent; The Atlantic Cities; Next American City Online; and The Infrastructurist – He created and continues to write for the website The Transport Politic – The Transport Politic – “Understanding the Republican Party’s Reluctance to Invest in Transit Infrastructure”

January 25th, 2011 – http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2011/01/25/understanding-the-republican-partys-reluctance-to-invest-in-transit-infrastructure/)

**Conservatives in Congress threaten to shut down funding for transit construction projects and investments in intercity rail. One doesn’t have to look far to see why these programs aren’t priorities for them. Late last week, a group of more than 165 of the most conservative members of the House of Representatives, the Republican Study Committee, released a report that detailed an agenda to reduce federal spending by $2.5 trillion over ten years**. Spurred on by increasing public concern about the mounting national debt, the group argues that the only choice is to make huge, painful cuts in government programs. **With the House** now **in the hands of the Republican Party, these suggestions are likely to be seriously considered. Transportation policy is prominent on the group’s list, no matter President Obama’s call for investments in the nation’s transportation infrastructure**, expected to be put forward in tonight’s state of the union address. Not only would all funding for Amtrak be cut, representing about $1.5 billion a year, but **the Obama Administration’s nascent high-speed rail program would be stopped in its tracks**. A $150 million commitment to Washington’s Metro system would evaporate. Even more dramatically, the New Starts program, which funds new rail and bus capital projects at a cost of $2 billion a year, would simply disappear. In other words, **the Republican group suggests that all national government aid for the construction of new rail or bus lines, intercity and intra-city, be eliminated.** These cuts are extreme, and they’re not likely to make it to the President’s desk, not only because of the Democratic Party’s continued control over the Senate but also because some powerful Republicans in the House remain committed to supporting public transportation and rail programs. But how can we explain the open hostility of so many members of the GOP to any federal spending at all for non-automobile transportation? Why does a transfer of power from the Democratic Party to the Republicans engender such political problems for urban transit? We can find clues in considering the districts from which members of the House of Representatives of each party are elected. As shown in the chart above (in Log scale), there was a relatively strong positive correlation between density of congressional districts and the vote share of the Democratic candidate in the 2010 elections. Of densest quartile of districts with a race between a Democrat and a Republican — 105 of them, with a density of 1,935 people per square miles or more — the Democratic candidate won 89. Of the quartile of districts with the lowest densities — 98 people per square mile and below — Democratic candidates only won 23 races. As the chart below demonstrates (in regular scale), this pattern is most obvious in the nation’s big cities, where Democratic Party vote shares are huge when densities are very high. This pattern is not a coincidence. The Democratic Party holds most of its power in the nation’s cities, whereas the GOP retains greater strength in the exurbs and rural areas. The two parties generally fight it out over the suburbs. In essence, the base of the two parties is becoming increasingly split in spatial terms: The Democrats’ most vocal constituents live in cities, whereas the Republicans’ power brokers would never agree to what some frame as a nightmare of tenements and light rail. What does this mean? When there is a change in political power in Washington, the differences on transportation policy and other urban issues between the parties reveal themselves as very stark. **Republicans in the House of Representatives know that very few of their constituents would benefit directly from increased spending on transit, for instance, so they propose gutting the nation’s commitment to new public transportation lines** when they enter office. Starting two years ago, Democrats pushed the opposite agenda, devoting billions to urban-level projects that would have been impossible under the Bush Administration. Highway funding, on the other hand, has remained relatively stable throughout, and that’s no surprise, either: The middle 50% of congressional districts, representing about half of the American population, features populations that live in neighborhoods of low to moderate densities, fully reliant on cars to get around. It is only in the densest sections of the country that transit (or affordable housing, for instance) is even an issue — which is why it appears to be mostly of concern to the Democratic Party. **Republicans in the House for the most part do not have to answer to voters who are interested in improved public transportation**. This situation, of course, should be of significant concern to those who would advocate for better transit. To put matters simply, few House Republicans have any electoral reason to promote such projects, and thus, for the most part they don’t. But that produces a self-reinforcing loop; noting the lack of GOP support for urban needs, city voters push further towards the Democrats. And sensing that the Democratic Party is a collection of urbanites, those from elsewhere push away. It’s hard to know how to reverse this problem. Many Republicans, of course, represent urban areas at various levels of government. No Democrat, for instance, has won the race for New York’s mayoralty since 1989. And the Senate is a wholly different ballgame, since most states have a variety of habitation types. As Bruce McFarling wrote this week, there are plenty of reasons for Republicans even in places of moderate density to support such investments as intercity rail. But the peculiar dynamics of U.S. House members’ relatively small constituent groups, in combination with the predilection of state legislatures to produce gerrymandered districts designed specifically to ensure the reelection of incumbents, has resulted in a situation in which there is only one Republican-controlled congressional district with a population density of over 7,000 people per square mile. And that’s in Staten Island, hardly a bastion of urbanism. With such little representation for urban issues in today’s House leadership, **real advances on transport issues seem likely to have to wait.**

**Mass transit – buses and trains – are received with political battles in congress**

**Wronski, 2012** (Richard, Chicago Tribune, 2/15/12, “Mass transit fund debate splits GOP Congress members,” http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2012-02-15/news/ct-met-congress-transit-funding-20120214\_1\_mass-transit-transportation-bill-highway-trust-fund/2)

**A largely partisan clash in Washington over federal funding for mass transit could jeopardize** up to $450 million a year for Chicago-area **bus and train projects**, transportation officials said Monday. **The funding debate** also **has caused a rift in the ranks of area Republican members of Congress**, who find themselves torn between loyalty to GOP leaders in Washington and pressure from Chicago transit agencies.

## Airways/Airports Links

### Obama Good

**Airport Improvement is politically unpopular**

**Schank, 5/31** (Joshua, President and CEO of the Eno Center for Transportation a neutral, non-partisan think-tank, The Federal Role in Transportation: Four Ideas for Greater Federal Involvement, http://www.enotrans.org/eno-brief/the-federal-role-in-transportation-four-ideas-for-greater-federal-involvement)

**Airports face substantial challenges** in trying to tackle this issue on their own. The most widely recommended solution is pricing airport runways by time of day. But **this politically unpopular solution has faced substantial opposition** **from communities such as smaller cities flying into hubs, or general aviation aircraft that are concerned about being effectively priced out of the market for a given airport**. Congested airports would have a much greater chance of success if they were trying to tackle congestion in partnership with the federal government and other local transportation agencies. **The federal role could be improved by** dedicating a portion of the Airport Improvement Program (AIP) to provide grants to airports in regions that have a plan to work collaboratively to reduce congestion and **overcome some of the political barriers to more effective pricing**. Or the AIP could be retooled to set specific performance goals for airports and rewarding achievement. However it is done, there is a clear national interest at play here and the federal government needs to be more involved.

**Airport funding unpopular and cause political infighting to get passage – recent bill proves**

**Barrett, 2012** (Ted, Senior Congressional Producer, After much delay, Senate clears FAA bill, <http://articles.cnn.com/2012-02-06/travel/travel_faa-funding_1_faa-funding-measure-senate-committee?_s=PM:TRAVEL>, JD)

**After passing 23 temporary extensions, the Senate voted 75 to 20 Monday to approve a long-term funding bill for the FAA and sent it to the president for his expected signature**. The measure provides about $16 billion a year for FAA operations, airport construction and modernization. It includes safety measures, such as a new satellite-based system for air traffic control, as well as other aviation programs, like one that subsidizes air travel to rural areas. **Negotiations over the bill repeatedly stalled over contentious labor issues that congressional leaders finally compromised on in January. Last summer, airport construction projects were halted abruptly when funding temporarily lapsed after Congress couldn't agree on a new extension. "Compromises in the current atmosphere are not easy,"** said Sen. Jay Rockefeller, D-West Virginia, who chairs the senate committee that handled the measure. "**This has been a long process**," agreed Sen. Kay Bailey Hutchison of Texas, the top Republican on the committee. Hutchison said she was pleased to get a four-year funding measure finalized because it will provide stability to the industry. "Now our airports are going to be able to start their building projects. They're going to be able to increase their runway space or repair whatever their priorities are that are decided by the FAA," she said. The House approved the bill Friday.

**Congress is deadlocked when it comes to airport funding – guarantees a political battle**

**Wollack, 2011** (Leslie, National League of Cities, 8/1/11, “Congressional Impasse on Airport Legislation Continues,” http://www.nlc.org/news-center/nations-cities-weekly/articles/2011/august/congressional-impasse-on-airport-legislation-continues)

**Congress will need to resolve the underlying issues around collective bargaining and subsidies to** small **airports** that would otherwise not have commercial air services when they return after the August recess. The stopgap measure will allow the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to operate through Sept. 16. **As the Congressional impasse over an extension of federal airport legislation continues, funds for current and future municipal airport improvements cannot be distributed** by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and current revenues are going to the airlines rather than the Airport Trust Fund for the future. Construction **funds** for municipal airports **across the country have been held up** by the FAA, due to the shutdown of the government program for the first time in its history. **The House and Senate have been unable to reach agreement** on another extension of federal aviation programs, which expired on July 22. Congress has passed 19 extensions since September 2009, when the initial legislation expired.

**Too many differences means that airport funding has resistance in Congress**

**Washington Post 2011** (7/26/11, “FAA falls victim to Congress’s partisan politics,” http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/faa-falls-victim-to-congresss-partisan-politics/2011/07/26/gIQAxLPYbI\_story.html)

CHALK UP **ANOTHER victim of partisan politics in Congress: the Federal Aviation Administration**. The agency’s last long-term authorization lapsed four years ago. Earlier this year, **the** Republican-majority **House and** Democratic-majority **Senate** each passed new long-term bills to replace a series of short-term funding extensions that kept the agency operating in the interim. But they **have been unable to resolve major differences** **between** the two bills, and the last extension expired on Friday. Consequently, the FAA has had to furlough thousands of employees around the country and suspend **airport modernization** projects worth $2.5 billion.

## Highways Links

### Obama Good

**Highway bill unpopular, bogged down by Keystone**

**Laing, 2012** (Keith, The Hill staff reporter, “Insiders pessimistic about highway bill talks”, 5/7/12, <http://thehill.com/business-a-lobbying/225927-pessimism-for-highway-talks>, JD)

**The committee of lawmakers appointed to negotiate a new federal highway bill will meet for the first time Tuesday, beginning their talks amid low expectations for a deal in a charged election-year environment**. Many observers, including Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood, have expressed doubt that Congress will pass a multiyear bill before the November election. But leaders of the 47-member panel from both House and Senate say they have a blueprint — hewing closely to their respective chamber’s approach — for the talks to defy the seemingly long odds. “For the conference to be successful, it must include significant transportation program reforms and ensure that needed jobs will be created,” a spokesman for House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Chairman John Mica (R-Fla.) said in a statement provided to The Hill on Monday. “Now is the time to set aside our personal wish lists and focus on the issue at hand — the reauthorization of a bill that is absolutely essential to our economy,” Sen. Barbara Boxer (D-Calif.) agreed in a statement after conferees were first announced last month. “Controversy should not be part of the conference, and we should come together for the good of the country.” Boxer shepherded a two-year, $109 billion transportation bill through the Senate earlier this year. **Mica tried to do the same in the House with a five-year, $260 billion version of the bill, but was ultimately unsuccessful**. Members of the lawmakers’ respective committees will now begin negotiations based on the Senate transportation bill and a pair of House-passed short-term extensions of current law that kept funds flowing to road and transit projects. The **talks are likely to center**, at least at the outset, **on a controversial cross-country pipeline that has emerged as an anti-Obama rallying cry for Republicans.** The House version of the transportation and infrastructure bill approves the Keystone XL pipeline to bring Canadian oil sands to Gulf Coast refineries**. The Senate’s plan omits the Keystone provision, and Democrats have decried its inclusion in the highway negotiations**. **White House press secretary Jay Carney has called the Keystone pipeline provision “noxious” to the highway negotiations.** “What Congress is asking — in this highly politicized, highly partisan way, attaching a provision on the Keystone pipeline to a piece of legislation that has nothing to do with it ... in advance, blind, approve a pipeline, a proposal for which does not exist — but we’ll approve it anyway — a foreign pipeline built by a foreign company emanating from foreign territory to cross U.S. borders,” Carney said in a White House press briefing last month. A group of business leaders pressed lawmakers Monday to make sure the Keystone approval stays in the final highway bill, should one emerge from the conference committee. “As you commence your work on maintaining vital American transportation investments, Business Roundtable urges you to vote ‘Yes’ on the provision included in the House-passed version of the transportation bill that would expedite approval of the Keystone XL pipeline extension,” said the letter from the Business Roundtable. Even without the Keystone dramatics, transportation supporters say, the stakes for the congressional talks are high. “As House and Senate conferees begin negotiations on surface transportation legislation tomorrow, nearly 2 million current jobs, and up to 1 million new jobs, are at stake in what remains a slow economic recovery,” AFL-CIO Transportation Trades Department President Ed Wytkind said in a statement released Monday. “More stonewalling will not help families pay mortgages, college tuition or healthcare bills,” Wytkind continued. **“Members of Congress have a choice to make. They can make a deal based upon the bipartisan Senate bill (MAP-21), or they can force a debate on controversial provisions — such as privatization giveaways to foreign interests — in the House bill (H.R. 7) that never even made it to the floor for a vote.”**

**Long term highway bill unpopular**

**Franklin, 4/5/2012** (Steven, writer for Z6 Mag and the Eno Center for Transportation, Highway Bill Passage In Doubt Until After Election, http://z6mag.com/business/highway-bill-passage-in-doubt-until-after-election-167418.html)

**Congress has dashed any hopes of the passage of a long-termhighway bill before the elections. The passage of another short-term funding extension has advocates of a federal highway bill feeling like they may have come to the end of the road figuratively and perhaps literally**. President Obama signed the temporary measure that will onlyfund highway projects through June 30. **There were hopes by those in the transportation industry that a multi-year bill would have been passed** by the House that would be similar to the measure that passed in the Senate 74-22. **Transportation advocates** such as President Edward Wytkind of the AFL-CIO Transportation Trades Department (TTD) **are doubtful that Congress will pass the long-term bill once the 90-day continuing resolution ends**. **He attributes this feeling to the lack of the two parties being able to work things out.** He plans to step up his organization’s efforts during the Congressional recess to prod Republicans that opposed the Senate version of the bill to vote in favor of the long-term legislation**. Many others that support the transportation legislation that were initially hopeful for a long-term bill are not very optimistic at this point**. **They are becoming less sure whether Congress will approve a longer version of the legislation. Janet Kavinoky, the executive director of transportation and infrastructure with the U.S. Chamber of Commerce felt that House of Representatives will have to work hard to come up with a multi-year bill** that can make it into conference committee. She feels that if legislation doesn’t get completed after the recess, it will probably get delayed until after the elections.

**Highways policy is highly controversial**

**Laing, 5/31/2012** ((Keith, Staff reporter for The Hill, GOP Rep. Broun draws line in the sand over spending in transit compromise bill, The Hill, http://thehill.com/blogs/transportation-report/highways-bridges-and-roads/230271-gop-lawmaker-wants-conferees-to-limit-highway-spending-to-trust-fund-levels)

**Georgia Rep. Paul Broun (R) is calling for members of the conference committee that is negotiating a new federal highway bill to limit the amount of spending** to the amount of money brought in by the federal gas tax. **Broun, a staunchly conservative member of the House Republican caucus, is introducing a motion to instruct House members of the transportation conference to cap spending** at the approximately $35 billion that is brought in per year by the highway trust fund, his office said. **Transportation observers worried Thursday that the motion signaled the Republican-led House was taking a hard line in negotiations that have been going on among the 47-member conference committee for the better part of a month**. But Broun said transportation advocates should live within their means in any new road and transit funding bill that becomes law this year. **"Over the past month there has been lots of happy talk about passing the transportation bill but this … is the House saying that they are not interested in working together and they are going to derail the process**," Schank said in a statement. The Senate's version of the measure spends about $13 billion more than is brought in each year by the 18.4 cents-per-gallon tax on gas that is used to fill the coffers of the highway trust fund. The House had originally favored a five-year, $260-billion bill that also spent more per year than the highway trust fund's annual intake.

**Conservative Groups pushing against highway bill**

**Laing, 6/29/2012** (Keith, Staff reporter for The Hill specifically focusing on transportation, Conservative groups rev up opposition to highway bill, The Hill, http://thehill.com/blogs/transportation-report/highways-bridges-and-roads/235533-conservative-groups-rev-up-opposition-to-highway-bill)

**Conservative groups are pressuring lawmakers to vote against an agreement between the House and Senate for a $105 billion transportation-spending bill**. The lower chamber is expected to hold a final vote on the measure on Friday. **The pressure from groups like the Heritage Foundation’s political arm and the anti-tax Club for Growth raises the possibility that conservatives in the House will put up a roadblock to the long-sought bicameral transportation agreement** — and in the process put the brakes on a painstakingly negotiated compromise with the Democratically controlled Senate. Both the Heritage Foundation’s political committee and the Club for Growth warned lawmakers on Thursday they would hold votes in favor of it against lawmakers in the run-up to November's election. “**The transportation portion authorizes $53.3 billion per year in spending, $15 billion more per year than the plan proposed by House Republicans last July, which would have successfully ‘realigned’ spending with revenues coming into the federal Highway Trust Fund**,” the Heritage Foundation’s Action for America group said in an alert to its members. RedState.com editor Erick Erickson said the transportation bill was "a massive increase in federal gluttony."

## Ports Links

### Obama Good

**Tight Budget makes spending on seaports unpopular in Congress**

**AP, 6/21/12** (Associated Press, Report to Congress says seaports on Southeast, Gulf coasts need deeper water for giant ships, The Washington Post, http://www.washingtonpost.com/national/report-to-congress-says-seaports-on-southeast-gulf-coasts-need-deeper-water-for-giant-ships/2012/06/21/gJQAjzrJtV\_story.html)

**U.S. seaports in the Southeast likely need up to $5 billion** to deepen their shipping channels so they can trade with supersized cargo ships expected to arrive soon through an expanded Panama Canal, a federal agency said Thursday in a report to Congress. **The budget crisis has made federal funding for port projects extremely tight, especially since Congress and President Barack Obama for the past two years have sworn off so-called “earmark” spending that was used to fund such projects in the past.** The Army Corps report said current funding levels for port improvements won’t cover all the projects that should be done. If **Congress won’t increase the agency’s funding for harbor projects**, the report said, then perhaps state governments and private companies such as shipping lines should be required to pay a greater share.

**Seaports are Unpopular with the People and Congress**

**Shaw, 2006 (GWYNETH K, March 4, Baltimore Sun Reporter, Senators ask role for Congress in latest review of ports deal, http://articles.baltimoresun.com/2006-03-04/news/0603040105\_1\_dp-world-deal-review)**

WASHINGTON -- **Five Republican and five Democratic senators sent a letter to their party leaders** yesterday, **asking for cooperation in giving**[**Congress**](http://articles.baltimoresun.com/2006-03-04/news/0603040105_1_dp-world-deal-review)**a role in** the Bush administration's latest review of Dubai Ports World's planned takeover of **some operations at the port of Baltimore and five other major U.S. seaports**. In a letter to Senate Republican leader Bill Frist and Democratic leader Harry Reid, the 10 senators said they were "encouraged" by DP World's offer to submit to a more in-depth, 45-day review of its plan to buy British-based Peninsular & Oriental Steam [Navigation](http://articles.baltimoresun.com/2006-03-04/news/0603040105_1_dp-world-deal-review) Co. The deal has been approved by a court in Britain, but a last-minute effort to stop the transaction is not expected to be resolved until at least Monday. The company formally filed for the 45-day review yesterday, but it was unclear when it would begin. The senators asked for assurances that other parts of legislation they introduced this week would be addressed, including a promise to keep Congress apprised of the investigation, the opportunity for lawmakers to review the probe's findings for 30 days, and the power to veto the deal if concerns about the transaction are not fully resolved. "If we need to press for a vote on our legislation or to introduce further legislation to achieve the goals outlined above, we hope you will work with us in the coming weeks," the senators said. "The administration must know that we stand united to examine and review this deal independently, and that Congress must have a role in determining whether it should go forward or be stopped as a result of national security concerns." Republicans signing the letter were Sens. Norm Coleman of Minnesota, Susan Collins and Olympia J. Snowe of Maine, Rick Santorum of Pennsylvania and Tom Coburn of Oklahoma. Democrats included Sens. Charles E. Schumer and Hillary Rodham Clinton of New York, New Jersey's Robert Menendez and Frank R. Lautenberg, and Jack Reed of Rhode Island. All have raised questions about the sale of P&O -- which runs some operations at ports in Baltimore; New York; Newark, N.J.; Philadelphia; Miami, and New Orleans -- to DP World, which is owned by the government of Dubai, part of the United Arab Emirates. The transaction was approved in January by a federal government panel, the Committee on Foreign [Investment](http://articles.baltimoresun.com/2006-03-04/news/0603040105_1_dp-world-deal-review) in the United States, which will also conduct the 45-day probe. **The deal is deeply unpopular with the American public and has prompted a flurry of legislation in Congress, some of which is aimed at undoing the deal.** In the [House](http://articles.baltimoresun.com/2006-03-04/news/0603040105_1_dp-world-deal-review), New York Republican Rep. Peter T. King has attracted 96 co-sponsors for a bill similar to the one proposed by the 10 senators. After DP World voluntarily agreed to a new review, many lawmakers said they were willing to delay taking action to stop the deal. But they don't want to be surprised again. "This is a time-sensitive process, and I am hopeful we can work to ensure that the legislative branch has a voice in the final outcome," Snowe said in a statement yesterday. Others are openly skeptical about the thoroughness of another probe, especially since President Bush has said he hasn't changed his mind about his support for the deal. "While I am pleased the administration is finally undertaking the investigation it should have done in the first place, there are serious questions about both its willingness and its ability to act on the results," Menendez said in a statement. "With the president prejudging the outcome of the investigation before it even began, it is clearer than ever that Congress will need to take an up or down vote on this sale."

**Congress doesn’t like funding ports – view it as useless**

**Smith, 2012** (Bruce, The Washington Post, 6/21/12, “Report to Congress says seaports on Southeast, Gulf coasts need deeper water for giant ships,” http://www.washingtonpost.com/national/report-to-congress-says-seaports-on-southeast-gulf-coasts-need-deeper-water-for-giant-ships/2012/06/21/gJQAjzrJtV\_story.html)

**The budget crisis has made federal funding for port projects extremely tight**, especially since **Congress** and President Barack Obama **for the past two years have sworn off so-called “earmark” spending that was used to fund such projects in the past**. The Army Corps report said current funding levels for port improvements won’t cover all the projects that should be done. If **Congress won’t increase the agency’s funding for harbor projects**, the report said, then perhaps state governments and private companies such as shipping lines should be required to pay a greater share.

## Climate Change Links

### Obama Good

**Republicans oppose action on climate change**

**Goldenberg 7/13/12 at 5:17 PM EDT** (Suzanne Goldenberg, US environmental correspondent for The Guardian newspaper, “Climate Change Campaigners Cautioned Over Reaction to Extreme Weather” The Guardian, PD: July 13, 2012 at 5:17 PM EDT, http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2012/jul/13/climate-change-campaigners-cautioned?newsfeed=true)

Half of **the incoming crop of Republicans in that election denied the existence of climate change or opposed action on climate change.** None of **the Republican contenders for the White House in this election has acknowledged the dangers of climate change**.¶ The House energy and commerce committee has yet to hold a hearing on the dangers of wildfires and drought due to climate change, despite 15 requests to date from Democrats on the committee.¶ But Inglis said **Republicans will not be shaken out of their denial through fear.¶ "Those who do speak, speak in apocalyptic visions and that drives us further into denial as a suitable coping mechanism**," Inglis said. "If you tell me we are all toast and it's just terrible, that doom is imminent, if you tell me that then eat, drink and be merry**. If I am toast, I may as well just ignore it,**" he said

**GOP will fight climate change policy**

**Goldenberg 7/13/12 at 5:17 PM EDT** (Suzanne Goldenberg, US environmental correspondent for The Guardian newspaper, “Climate Change Campaigners Cautioned Over Reaction to Extreme Weather” The Guardian, PD: July 13, 2012 at 5:17 PM EDT, http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2012/jul/13/climate-change-campaigners-cautioned?newsfeed=true)

**The recent freak weather does provide powerful evidence of the dangers of climate change**, and could break through the GOP's wall of denial, he said. But scientists and **campaigners need to go easy on the doom.¶** "The thing that would not be helpful is for anybody associated with climate change action to be wagging their finger in Colorado and Texas or wherever it's hot saying, 'See I told you so,'" Inglis said in a telephone interview.¶ "**That is the worst possible thing for anybody wanting climate action to do because then you engender the predictable response of, 'I will show you. I will not budge an inch**.'".

## Adaptation Links

### Obama Good

#### Climate Adaptation faces political opposition

Brunner and Nordgren 4/6/12 (Ron Brunner, Professor of Political Science at University of Colorado at Boulder, and John Nordgren, Senior Program Officer of Environment for Kresge Foundation, “Climate Adaptation as an Evolutionary Process: A White Paper” The Kresge Foundation, 4/6/12[My Birthday])

Practitioners offered few specific examples of what did not work in their past experience. However, they did identify an array of challenges they had encountered. The most formidable challenge was nationally-organized political opposition to climate adaptation. In particular, it was reported that “people are turning up at meetings and disrupting them” in a number of local communities. Apparently, participants did not consider disengaging from these communities. However, several tactics for dealing with disruption or opposition were tried or recommended

## Elections DA

## Generic Links

### Obama Good

#### Obama is hinging the election on REDUCING spending – the plan causes independents to vote Republican

**Kirchgaessner, ’11** (Stephanie, “Obama looks to independent voters,” April 15 2011, http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/7dd54d5c-678c-11e0-9138-00144feab49a.html#axzz1T844vB9m

Barack **Obama is betting that his attack on the Republican deficit reduction plan, which he has derided as un-American, will resonate with** independent voters **as he prepares to hit the campaign trail next week**. The president will hold town hall meetings in California and two swing states: Nevada and Virginia. **The political winds seemed to shift in favour of Democrats this week**, with Mr Obama looking – **for the first time in months – as if he is primed to lead his party into the difficult** fiscal battles **that lie ahead.** It was, at the same time, a tumultuous week for the increasingly divided Republican majority in the House of Representatives. **Party lawmakers called for their leaders to be more aggressive in demanding spending cuts and almost unanimously endorsed a 2012 budget plan that could have** dire political consequences in the next election. The proposal by Republican Paul Ryan to cut $5,800bn in the next decade and transform Medicare, the insurance programme for the elderly, passed 235 to 193 in the House without a single Democratic vote. House passes 2012 budget Republicans in the House of Representatives united on Friday behind a 2012 budget plan slashing trillions of dollars in government spending while cutting taxes. The vote effectively serves as the Republicans’ opening gambit in what are likely to be contentious negotiations with President Barack Obama and his Democrats over debt and deficits in the coming months. The U.S. Congress must decide within weeks on raising the $14,300bn US debt ceiling. By a vote of 235-193, the House passed the plan written by House Budget Committee Chairman Paul Ryan for the 2012 fiscal year beginning October 1. Democrats rejected the measure, which proposes slashing spending by nearly $6 trillion over a decade and reducing benefits for the elderly and poor. All but four Republicans supported it. There is almost no chance of the Senate approving the measure in its current form. The White House swiftly condemned the measure but said it was committed to working with Republicans to bring down record deficits that all sides acknowledged imperil the country’s economic future. Reuters “I think Obama has had his best week in a while,” said Democratic strategist James Carville. “His speech really has got Democrats excited again. Also, they feel they are on the right side of public opinion here.” **Mr Obama’s address on Wednesday satisfied the liberal base by reaffirming his support of tax increases for the wealthy to pay for entitlement programmes for the poor and elderly. It also spoke to independent voters who abandoned Democrats in last year’s congressional election by reassuring them that he believed** the deficit required immediate action.

#### Independents are key to Romney

**Stirewalt, ’12** (Chris, 5/17/12, <http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2012/05/17/grossed-out-independents-help-obama-in-fox-news-poll/>, JD)

Republicans, invariably a pessimistic bunch about their chances to defeat President Obama in the fall, have been experiencing some green shoots of optimism of late as polls show their nominee, Mitt Romney, already nipping at Obama’s heels. And with the president’s job approval rating hovering in the high 40s, Republicans should be optimistic. The nation is in a lousy mood, the economy is poor and a strong anti-incumbent sentiment still pervades. That is not a good climate for Obama. But, the latest FOX News poll shows the path to victory for Obama: an enthusiastic Democratic base, a handful of holdout Republicans and grossed-out independents. The poll shows Obama with his largest lead over Romney, 7 points, since last June. Last month, the poll showed the two men in a dead heat. Obama can credit his good showing the in the poll mostly to the flight of independent voters. The president’s support among Democrats ticked up 1 point to 88 percent while Romney’s support among Republicans fell by 4 points. That wouldn’t be such a big deal on its own. But factor in the 14 percent spike in independent voters who are undecided, and you have the makings of an Obama victory. In April, the poll found independents favoring Romney by a massive 13-point margin, now it’s 5 points. But the closing of the gap didn’t come from a surge in support for Obama among indies. The president dropped four points. **Romney’s problem in this poll is that independents checked out.** Come election time, Romney can expect that the Republicans, who are terrified at the thought of a second Obama term, will vote for him. Things like Rick Santorum’s post-campaign-suspension attack mailer in Iowa and grudging endorsement will have faded from memory. But there are considerably more Democrats than Republicans in the country, so the only way the GOP can win elections is by winning the independent vote. As younger voters become increasingly unwilling to form the lifelong party affiliations of their parents’ generation, the task becomes increasingly important. Romney can safely assume that the 6 percent of undecided Republicans will not only break his way, but that a substantial number of them will actually turn out to vote. He can’t say the same thing about the 36 percent of independents who declined to choose between him and Obama. Given voter attitudes, it’s unlikely for Obama to again win unaffiliated voters, certainly not by the whopping 8 points he carried them in 2008. But it would be enough for him to simply drive down turnout. Fed up independents are only trouble for incumbents if they bother to go vote. An undecided, unaffiliated American is not a very likely voter. This is why a nasty race suits Obama just fine. If the independents, especially moderate independents, get so disgusted with the process, the parties and the candidates that they conclude that all are unworthy, they may not vote. Obama has lost his 2008 brand as healer and change agent, but if he can help independent voters conclude that the two parties and the political system are beyond repair, they will have little reason to go vot**e.** If the electorate in November looks like the sample in the latest FOX News poll, Romney would lose in a rout.Here’s the pickle for Romney. He has to prosecute Obama’s handling of the economy and of federal spending, but if he is locked in a six-month, scorched-earth battle with a better-funded incumbent, voters may simply tune out. Read more: http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2012/05/17/grossed-out-independents-help-obama-in-fox-news-poll/#ixzz1vChexKhE

#### Infrastructure bills cause deficit fights – that allows GOP to galvanize support

**Gruenberg, ’12** (Mark, editor of Press Associates Inc. (PAI), a union news service, 1/20/12, <http://peoplesworld.org/labor-maps-legislative-battle-for-201/>, JD)

In a Jan. 17 interview with Press Associates Union News Service, Samuel said the list includes fighting for a two-year transportation (highway-mass transit) funding bill, pushing for final resolution of a long-running war over airport construction and airways modernization - and union rights for airline workers - and extension of jobless benefits. It also includes legislation to curb Internet piracy of intellectual property, since the piracy robs dollars from royalty-based wages for musicians, actors, screenwriters, and other unionized creative professionals. And the agenda includes a longer extension of emergency federal jobless benefits for the long-term unemployed. **But the outlook is cloudy for all**. Even the jobless benefits bill, which both parties agree upon, is hung up by a partisan dispute over how to pay for the $150 billion measure. Congress returned to town Jan. 17 to start this year's session, after a first year characterized by Senate GOP filibusters on just about everything and by a tea party-dominated House GOP attacking spending and workers. Samuel expects those attacks to continue. He forecasts congressional Republicans will use the Congressional Review Act - a Gingrich-era GOP law - to try to overturn new federal rules streamlining union recognition election procedures. The big fights will be over job creation. Samuel expects the Obama administration to again support the infrastructure bill, jobless benefits, and other measures, though he concedes that aid to state and local governments may be iffy. Obama will outline his agenda in the Jan. 24 State of the Union address. Labor may have, finally, won one battle with the House GOP, Samuel said, over recognition elections for airline and railroad workers. "The Chamber of Commerce has finally dropped its opposition" to new rules for those elections, contained in the airport construction and modernization bill. That legislation would create 80,000-100,000 jobs. House Transportation Committee Chairman John Mica, R-Fla., has insisted that rules governing union recognition elections at airlines and railroads should force unions to win an absolute majority of all eligible voters at a worksite, with non-voters counted as "no" votes. That was the rule until last year when, after pressure from the labor movement and its allies, the government changed it. The requirement in union elections now is the same as in any other election - the winner is determined by the majority of those who actually cast ballots. Business and Mica fought the change, but with the 23rd temporary extension of the airport and airspace construction bill set to expire at the end of January, business seems to have given up. The question for congressional negotiators is if Mica will. As for extending jobless benefits, "we and the Democrats are hopeful" that Congress will OK an extension before the benefits expire Feb. 29, Samuel said. He also said the Democrats are holding fast against cutting any major programs to pay for the cost - even though in the past, Congress did not require cuts elsewhere to pay for aiding the unemployed. The House GOP is insisting on cuts, at least so far. If the GOP holds fast to its no-taxes-on-millionaires stand and the Democrats protect major programs, there could be a stalemate on jobless benefits, Samuel concedes. "But the Republicans badly miscalculated" when the last benefits extension was debated in December that their no-taxes stand was a winner. Instead, they got a political black eye for protecting the rich at the expense of unemployed workers. The two-year highway-mass transit bill, worth $106 billion plus inflation, still needs some details: Its mass transit sections are incomplete and so is its financing, outside of the federal gasoline tax. The measure would create tens of thousands of construction jobs and its passage is a major goal of building trades unions. Once Senate panels finish drafting the measure, the Democratic-run Senate is expected to approve it, Samuel said. The problem is the GOP-run House, again. Mica earlier proposed a five-year bill with much less spending per year - so much less that Laborers President Terry O'Sullivan called Mica's legislation a "job killer."

#### Funding issues uniquely make infrastructure bills unpopular

**Wolf, ’12** (Carol, Bloomberg staff, 1/30/12, <http://www.businessweek.com/news/2012-01-30/obama-call-to-use-war-savings-on-roads-may-fail-in-congress.html>, JD)

Jan. 25 (Bloomberg) -- President Barack Obama’s call to rebuild U.S. infrastructure with money saved by bringing troops home may not resolve Congress’s struggles to set aside more money for roads and bridges, two analysts said. “I’m not entirely convinced that reallocation of war funds will necessarily pick up enough momentum to gain traction in Congress,” Patrick Hughes, an analyst with Washington-based research firm Height Analytics, said in a telephone interview yesterday after Obama’s State of the Union address. Obama is seeking to use half of the savings created by withdrawing troops from Afghanistan and Iraq to rebuild U.S. infrastructure, helping companies ship goods more efficiently, the White House said in a fact sheet yesterday. The plan would fix existing roads and invest more in high-speed rail, according to the fact sheet. “Take the money we’re no longer spending at war, use half of it to pay down our debt, and use the rest to do some nation- building right here at home,” Obama said yesterday. He didn’t specify how much the government expects to save. The Highway Trust Fund, which pays for highway, bridge and mass-transit projects, will run out of money in early 2013, according to the Congressional Budget Office. The U.S. hasn’t passed new legislation to pay for surface-transportation projects since 2005. Funding has continued through a series of extensions since 2009. The current deadline expires March 31. Cutting Red Tape Obama also said he plans to issue an executive order that would reduce regulations that slow down construction projects. The average U.S. transportation project takes 11 years to complete, according to the CBO. Vulcan Materials Co. and Martin Marietta Materials Inc., the two largest U.S. producers of sand, gravel and crushed stone, and cement maker Texas Industries Inc. are among companies that could benefit if war savings were used to fund a highway bill, said Keith Johnson, an analyst with Morgan Keegan & Co. in Memphis, Tennessee. “Infrastructure spending could employ a lot of people quickly, but it’s a matter of getting a bill through Congress,” Johnson said in a telephone interview. Johnson has a “market perform” rating on Vulcan and Texas Industries and an “outperform” on Martin Marietta. Gasoline Tax The U.S. needs $2.2 trillion to repair its infrastructure, according to the American Society of Civil Engineers. Proposals for new highway bills by House and Senate committees don’t increase funding beyond the current legislation. Neither addresses funding for the highway fund’s shortfall. The federal fuel tax, which finances the Highway Trust Fund, has been 18.4 cents a gallon since 1993. Obama has opposed increasing the fuel tax. In last year’s State of the Union address, Obama outlined a goal to give 80 percent of Americans access to high-speed rail within 25 years. Obama’s administration has allotted $10.1 billion for high-speed and intercity rail since 2009. Congress eliminated funding for high-speed rail in the 2012 budget. The House and Senate committees both seek to expand the Transportation and Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act to $1 billion a year from the current $122 million. The program provides low-interest loans to fund transportation projects. Mica Proposal “America needs to rebuild its infrastructure, but I do not support what appears to be the president’s plan to finance that effort by downsizing the military,” Representative John Mica, the Florida Republican who is chairman of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, said in an e-mailed statement. Mica’s committee will introduce a proposal for a five-year, $260 billion surface-transportation bill on Feb. 2, Justin Harclerode, a spokesman, said by phone. Mica said yesterday his committee’s transportation measure would be partially financed through increased U.S. energy production. The Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, headed by California democrat Barbara Boxer, has approved a two-year plan with funding at current levels. With that version, the Highway Trust Fund’s projected expenditure would exceed its incoming revenue by about $12 billion.

#### GOP leadership will thwart the plan to boost party support

**Perks, ’12** (Rob, serves as Transportation Advocacy Director at the Natural Resources Defense Council, 1/31/12, <http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/rperks/republicans_pushing_controvers.html>, JD)

I've heard of "my way or the highway" but this is ridiculous. In an unprecedented move, House Speaker John Boehner (R-OH) is hell-bent on crashing the transportation bill by loading it up with controversial issues that will guarantee more political gridlock. This afternoon Boehner & Co. will unveil their so-called "American Infrastructure and Jobs Act," which is really just a backdoor way to push Big Oil's profits even higher. Transportation legislation has long been a bi-partisan policy area, as evidenced by two polar opposite politicians co-sponsoring the Senate transportation bill: liberal Sen. Barbara Boxer (D-CA), the chair of the Senate Environment & Public Works Committee, and conservative Sen. Jim Inhofe (R-OK), the ranking Republican on the committee. The fact that these two members representing opposite ends of the political spectrum can work together these days on legislation of national importance proves that policy can transcend partisan politics. Not so in the House of Representatives apparently. Speaker Boehner is pushing legislation -- to be added to the House transportation bill that Congress will take up next -- which proposes to cover a portion of infrastructure funding via royalty revenues from new drilling in protected areas off the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, as well as opening the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska. This "drill and drive" scheme is bad for the environment and makes absolutely no economic sense. In fact, conservative critics of this "bait-and-switch" funding proposal include the Competitive Enterprise Insitute, the Reason Foundation and the Heritage Foundation. As Heritage's CEO Michael Needham told Politico: “As more and more people get educated about this, there are members who are starting to raise eyebrows. That's one of the reasons this is moving so quickly.” Certainly Sen. Inhofe's eyebrows are raised. He has repeatedly criticized Boehner's proposal for not adding up and for needlessly politicizing the process -- sharply reducing the prospects of passing a new federal surface transportation bill this year. The deadline for doing so is March 31, when the current bill expires. That would force a ninth temporary extenstion over the past three years. [UPDATE: Today Sen. Inhofe opted to toe the party line by publicly backing away from his previous steadfast criticism of the GOP proposal to tie transportation funding to new drilling. “There is no denying that increased energy production could fund a portion of the bill,” he stated on his website. With a proposed funding level for the transportation bill set at $260 billion for the next five years, even the most generous estimates of the funding that might be derived at some future date from new drilling falls well short of infrastructure needs. In fact, an analysis of the drilling proposals by The Wilderness Society puts potential revenues at $262.5 million over five years -- or less than 1% of transportation funding needs outlined in the House bill. The fact remains that Sen. Inhofe prefers his own bi-partisan transportation bill, which is not hampered by the contentious elements of the House bill. NRDC also prefers the Senate bill as the only viable way toward enacting transportation legislation in Congress this year.] Making matters worse, Speaker Boehner is also threatening to add another poison pill to the bill. On the weekend talk shows, he said Republican lawmakers will try to force the Obama administration to approve the Keystone XL pipeline by attaching it to the transportation bill. President Obama recently denied TransCanada's application for the tar sands pipeline. "If (Keystone) is not enacted before we take up the American Energy and Infrastructure Jobs Act, it will be part of it," Boehner said on ABC's "This Week" news program. NRDC has been leading the charge to stop the Keystone pipeline, which would cut through America's heartland to deliver heavy, highly acidic crude oil from Canada all the way to Texas for easy export to other countries. For all the reasons why Keystone is a dirty deal for us, go here. Given the intense PR battle being wage over the pipeline, Speaker Boehner knows that using the House transportation bill as the policy vehicle to enact the GOP's fossil fuel-friendly agenda will provoke a backlash in the Senate. Best case scenario is two transportation bills -- one passed in the Senate, one in the House -- that cannot be reconciled in a conference committee. Such a stalemate will stymie passage of a new long-term transportation bill to fund much-needed infrastructure improvements, leaving our nation's roads, bridges, rails, runways and ports in disrepair and thousands of Americans out of work. When will politicians realize that putting people back to work fixing America's crumbling infrastructure is job one -- not boosting Big Oil's profits? Unfortunately, by tying transportation programs to controversial and dangerous efforts to require oil drilling in areas that have long been protected, and constructing a dirty oil pipeline, the House Republicans leadership is hijacking a must-pass bill in order to advance an extreme agenda. This is bad policy and bad politics --designed to fail. The result will be that no transportation bill will pass Congress this year, for which you can be sure that Republicans will try to pass the blame.

### Obama Bad

#### An increase in transportation investment will lift us out of the recession in the short term

**Smith 12** (John, CEO and President of Reconnecting America, " Federal Transportation Infrastructure Investment Critically Important," 1/25, http://www.reconnectingamerica.org/news-center/reconnecting-america-news/2012/federal-transportation-infrastructure-investment-critically-important/)

**"Today, as the nation begins to rise out of a deep recession, an investment in transportation infrastructure is critically important, including not only roads and bridges, but other modes such as trains and buses. Transportation choices for Americans are essential for reducing our dependence on foreign oil, increasing access to opportunity, and improving our quality of life. Indeed, transportation is a key component in making many of the President's other proposals work. We need transit options and intermodal links to take students to college, to transport unemployed workers to job training, and to bring employees and customers to small businesses. Quality, reliable public transportation systems are the anchors that help many communities thrive, whether they are in rural, suburban, or urban areas.**

#### Economy swamps all other issues

**Man, ’12** (Anthony, Sun Sentinel staff, 5/13/12, <http://articles.sun-sentinel.com/2012-05-13/news/fl-economy-jobs-election-20120512_1_florida-voters-job-outlook-swing-voters/3>, JD)

Forget gay marriage. Put aside the war in Afghanistan. Ignore illegal immigration. All are dwarfed by the big gorilla of 2012 — the economy. Election 2012 is all about the economy — especially jobs — the one issue with the power to determine if President Barack Obama or Republican Mitt Romney wins Florida's critical electoral votes and, perhaps, the presidency. "That's the No. 1 priority," said Jansew Sang, of Hollywood. Laid off in 2009 from her job as Latin America sales manager for a manufacturer of networking devices, she's still relatively fortunate, being able to work as a translator and banking consultant. "I have the advantage of being able to keep myself afloat in this economy," she said. Advertisement Ads by Google Sang is an independent — the kind of voter coveted by every candidate because independents decide close elections. She voted for Obama in 2008, but hasn't decided if she'll vote for him or Romney this year. She was among 646 people seeking work last week at a career fair in Miramar along with city residents Jenni Ressler and Jim Richardson. Like Sang, they're swing voters and haven't decided which candidate will get their votes this year. Richardson, out of work since August 2011, said jobs are the issue in 2012. And Ressler, who's been looking for two months, said the economy "would play a big role, obviously." Jobs are a salient issue for many more people than the 9 percent of Floridians who were unemployed in March — when the jobless rate was again higher than the national average and the percentage of people with jobs was 43rd in the country. New state unemployment numbers, for April, are due out Friday. Dave Welch, who lives west of Boca Raton, said he feels the employment squeeze — even though he still has his job as a copier mechanic. "I know several people who have lost their jobs: good, hard-working people who have lost their jobs because the economy is in the tank," he said. "We're not selling the products that we have in the past, therefore we don't need the people that we've had. It's been a cascading effect." He blames Obama and the Democrats, and decided long ago to vote for Romney, even though the Republican candidate isn't as conservative as he'd like. Welch's concerns about jobs are far from unique. A Suffolk University/WSVN-Ch. 7 poll conducted last week found 81 percent of Florida voters said the state's job outlook is poor or fair. Just 13 percent termed it good or excellent. More than 80 percent believe the state is still mired in a recession. And 52 percent of the 600 Florida voters surveyed rated the economy as the most important issue facing the country. None of the other nine issues came anywhere close, a finding Suffolk polling director David Paleologos termed "amazing." Troy Samuels, a Miramar city commissioner, Republican Party committeeman and co-chairman of Romney's campaign in Broward County, said there isn't a single event he's attended in the past three years when at least one person hasn't asked him for job leads. He said even plenty of people with a job are concerned about what the near future might bring. "If there's a bump in the economy … will my company all of a sudden lay off 100 people, and I'm one of those 100?" he said. "Those are still serious concerns in the minds of people no matter what party they're from, and they think about it every single day." Advertisement Ads by Google And those kind of worries have a big impact on elections if "the unemployment rate gets reported and people sort of look around and say things don't look so good," said Kevin Wagner, a political scientist at Florida Atlantic University in Boca Raton. And that's bad for incumbents. Conflicting trends mark the all-important unemployment picture, said Xu Cheng, senior economist atMoody'sAnalytics, a leading independent economic forecasting firm. From 2010 to today, the Florida unemployment rate has come down more than 2 percentage points, "In normal times, this would be great," the economist said. "In normal times, if we put this variable in the [election forecasting] model, Obama would win Florida for sure." But there's another factor in play: A state unemployment rate higher than 8 percent produces the "grumpy voter effect," Cheng said. "Despite Florida's relatively strong recovery in the last two years, given that Florida unemployment figures will still be very high — and we believe at the time of the election it will still be about 9 percent — we believe this grumpy voter effect will kick in." That means Floridians are much less likely than normal to give the president any credit for the decline in the unemployment rate, he said.

**Public favors federal government funding for infrastructure—and thinks its underfunded in the SQ**

**Houston Chronicle, 5/18/2012 (“**Americans Value Highways and Bridges as a National Treasure”

[http://www.chron.com/business/press-releases/article/Americans-Value-Highways-and-Bridges-as-a-3568488.php accessed tm 5/19](http://www.chron.com/business/press-releases/article/Americans-Value-Highways-and-Bridges-as-a-3568488.php%20accessed%20tm%205/19) )

**Clearly, Americans hold the nation's infrastructure in high regard. Nearly nine in ten (89 percent) Americans feel it’s important for the federal government to fund the maintenance and improvements of interstate highways. Yet, this infrastructure isn’t receiving the fiscal attention it deserves**. Congress recently approved the ninth extension of transportation legislation that originally expired in 2009. The [Highway Trust Fund](http://www.chron.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=business%2Fpress-releases&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22Highway+Trust+Fund%22) – due to inflation, rising construction costs and increasingly fuel efficient vehicles – no longer collects enough money to support the U.S. surface transportation system, remaining solvent only through a series of infusions from federal general revenue funds. **More than half of Americans (57 percent) believe the nation’s infrastructure is underfunded**.

**Bipartisan support for federal investment in infrastructure**

**Rockefeller Foundation, 2011(“**Rockefeller Foundation Infrastructure Survey Reveals Bipartisan Support for Transportation and Infrastructure Investments and Reform” press release, Feb 14 2011 [http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/news/press-releases/rockefeller-foundation-infrastructure accessed tm 5/22/12](http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/news/press-releases/rockefeller-foundation-infrastructure%20accessed%20tm%205/22/12))

February 14, 2011 **– An exclusive Rockefeller Foundation survey released today reveals overwhelming bipartisan support for federal investment in transportation and infrastructure projects.** The survey showed that 71% of voters think leaders in Washington should seek common ground on legislation related to roads, bridges and transit systems, **including 66% of Tea Party supporters and 71% of Republicans.** **Two out of three voters say that improving the country’s transportation infrastructure is highly important. Nearly half of all voters said that roads are often or totally inadequate and that only some public transportation options exist**. Eighty percent of voters agree that federal funding to improve and modernize transportation will boost local economies and create millions of jobs, and view it as critical to keeping the United States as the world’s top economic superpower.

**Support for infrastructure investment outweighs concerns about spending**

**Halsey, 2012**(Ashley Halsey III is a staff writer for The Washington Post, Infrastructure projects need public support, transportation experts say, Washington Post, http://www.washingtonpost.com/local/trafficandcommuting/experts-want-to-build-public-support-for-infrastructure-projects/2012/04/23/gIQAvmMXcT\_story.html)

The plan to energize public support was outlined Monday in a report by transportation experts brought together by the Miller Center at the University of Virginia. After a conference in November, the group concluded that **most Americans are aware of the infrastructure crisis and support spending to address it. "Recent public-opinion surveys have found overwhelming support for the idea of infrastructure investment**," the report said. "After the 'bridge to nowhere' controversies of recent years, **the public has become sensitized to issues of pork-barrel spending and understandably demands to see a clear connection between federal expenditures, actual transportation needs, and economic benefits**." Despite apprehension about wasteful spending, the report said, **more than two-thirds of voters surveyed by the Rockefeller Foundation said infrastructure improvement was important and 80 percent said spending on it would create millions of jobs.** The transportation group, co-chaired by former transportation secretaries Norman Y. Mineta and Samuel K. Skinner, compiled a comprehensive study on infrastructure in 2010. That report estimated that an additional $134 billion to $262 billion must be spent per year through 2035 to rebuild and improve roads, rail systems and air transportation.

## Railroads Links

### Obama Good

#### Low satisfaction ratings prove, public against rails

**Radnedge, 2012 (Aidan, Chief reporter for Metro News, High fares for poor service, say unsatisfied rail users, Metro News, http://www.metro.co.uk/news/888570-high-fares-for-poor-service-say-unsatisfied-rail-users)**

**Commuter satisfaction with** the **most** unpopular **train operators has slumped to just 27 per cent**, a major survey shows. **Poor value for money is the top complaint** – **weeks after some fares were increased by 11 per cent. Ratings for punctuality and reliability also worsened.** Office of Rail Regulation chairwoman Anna Walker said: ‘The rail industry must work harder to give passengers the service they deserve.’ First Capital Connect, National Express and London Midland were among the companies attracting the most moans in the report by watchdog group Passenger Focus. Passenger Focus **chief executive Anthony Smith said services ranged only from ‘mediocre to good’**. He added: **‘Satisfaction with value for money has gone down, illustrating the impact tough economic times coupled with fare rises are having.’**

#### Train funding causes backlash and bolsters GOP support

**The Economist, ’11** (7/2/11, <http://www.economist.com/blogs/gulliver/2011/07/high-speed-rail>, JD)

AMERICA'S Republican party has succeeded in blocking many of the Obama administration's planned high-speed rail initiatives. (Some of them were bad ideas anyway.) Now Phillip Longman has taken to the Washington Monthly—a publication not exactly sympathetic to the ideals of the modern GOP—to argue that the death of Obama's high-speed dreams may be a good thing. His argument isn't what you might expect: Yes, bullet trains speeding at 180 mph [290 kph] or more from major city to major city are great for business execs in a hurry and on an expense account. But the more conventional, cheaper, "fast enough" high-speed rail lines like the West Rhine line are the real backbone of the German passenger rail system and that of most other industrialized nations. And it is from these examples that America has the most to learn, especially since it now looks as if the U.S. isn't going to build any real high-speed rail lines, except possibly in California, anytime soon. In an ironic twist, between the mounting concern over the state and federal deficits and growing Republican and NIMBY opposition to high-speed rail, the Obama administration is being forced to settle for incremental projects that will only bring passenger rail service up to the kind of standards found on the West Rhine line. And that's a good thing, provided Republicans don’t succeed in killing passenger trains in the United States altogether, as they are increasingly want to try. Mr Longman contends that America's passenger rail system is so bad that even simply upgrading to "fast-enough" trains would represent a vast improvement in service that would build ridership and political support for further upgrades. Right now, he argues, building true high-speed rail in America would be "so expensive, disruptive, contentious, and politically risky that it just might not be possible." The key tipping point, Mr Longman says, is when taking the train becomes faster than driving. And several factors are more important than speed. On-time performance is crucial, and perhaps Amtrak's biggest problem. Mr Longman thinks this can be fixed with "incremental investment in new sidings and track capacity to make sure freight trains don’t get in the way." Improving frequency of service could also help, Mr Longman argues. Blogger Matt Yglesias says he agrees with Mr Longman, but I don't think he actually does. Here's how he wraps up his post on the subject: I do find the whole conversation slightly frustrating. The United States is a really big country. You wouldn’t hear a debate in "Europe" about whether "Europe" should be building a train from Madrid to Barcelona "or" a train connecting the cities of the Rhineland. Nothing about [upgrading a slowish Portland-Seattle line to medium-speed] actually prevents you from building a brand new true HSR connection elsewhere in the country. The overall pot of infrastructure spending money in the United States is currently too low, which prompts a bunch of should-be-avoidable conversations about project priority. That last sentence is crucial. Mr Longman's article rests on the dubious idea that if we spend less on high-speed rail, politicians will for some reason feel compelled to take the money that would otherwise have been spent on high-speed rail and use it to upgrade slow-speed lines to "fast enough." But there's no evidence that is actually true. After all, the reason that the lines are so slow in the first place is that America has never spent the money to make them any faster. It's not as if building more sidings for freight trains and improving signalling are new ideas. Contra Mr Longman, there's not much for America to "learn" here: Europe invested in making its less-than-high-speed lines "fast enough." America didn't. It's a short story. One problem is that it's hard to get politicians to spend money on incremental improvements. The difference between an older service and the newer, incrementally improved service is only noticeable over long periods of time, if at all. Amtrak's Northeast corridor service has gotten incrementally faster over the past few decades. But that hasn't increased the political support for further improvements—in fact, Amtrak's continued failure to make dramatic improvements has been fodder for its critics. "Service between New York and DC is a few minutes faster" is not the kind of statement that fires up members of Congress. It's not the kind of thing you can put on a bumper sticker, either. When Rick Scott, the Republican governor of Florida, nixed a flagship Obama administration high-speed rail project there, I argued that the White House had paid the price for its lack of vision: Much of the blame for how all this turned out has to rest with the White House. The Obama administration's political team didn't seem to anticipate the danger that putting Mr Obama's name behind high-speed rail (or just about anything) would galvanise Republican opposition. If they did anticipate the GOP backlash, and embraced modest rail plans in order to soften a blow they knew would come, that's even worse. If the White House was going to take the political risk of putting its weight behind high-speed rail, it should have gone all-in. A Tampa-Orlando line and some track improvements in the upper Midwest weren't enough to inspire anyone.

#### Train funding perceived as inefficient and costly in the current climate

**Johnson, ’12** (Fawn, *National Journal* correspondent, 1/17/12, <http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2012/01/highspeed-rail-in-a-coma.php>, JD)

Policymakers' appetite for high-speed rail seems to be dwindling to almost nothing. It is old news that congressional Republicans are not fans of President Obama's high-speed rail initiative. They view it as a waste of taxpayer dollars at a time when belt-tightening is of the highest order. The national conversation has not advanced much beyond that point, perhaps because the biggest fans of high-speed rail are distracted by other problems. Democrats in Congress raised only a faint protest when the fiscal 2012 appropriations bill cut funding for the Transportation Department's high-speed rail program. Republicans who ostensibly like high-speed rail said the cuts will allow rail enthusiasts to start over from scratch. The problems continue at the state level, particularly in California. The California High Speed Rail Peer Review Group recently refused to recommend that bond money be devoted to the state's high-speed rail plan. The review group said the state's business plan lacked "credible sources of adequate funding" that posed "an immense financial risk" to California. Democratic Gov. Jerry Brown proposed folding the California High-Speed Rail Authority into a broader transportation agency to save money. That move could potentially take some steam out of the state's high-speed rail initiatives as they get lumped in with other transportation priorities. Even so, more than $3.5 billion in federal funding could be at risk if the state Legislature doesn't approve funds for a high-speed rail line, according to Sen. Dianne Feinstein, D-Calif. High-speed rail investments aren't like economic stimulus programs, which are intended to jump start shovel-ready projects that can immediately inject money into a local economy while delivering jobs and paved roads. The initial costs of developing high-speed rail lines are high, and the yield time is years or decades. Is the country ready for long-term investments like that? Or would it make sense to take a break and allow the economy to recover before proposing big new rail projects? What would make policymakers more receptive to high-speed rail? What critiques of high-speed rail are the most in need of a response?

#### Causes political backlash

**Levy, ’12** (Alon, one of the best freelance writers on transit and public affairs, 4/1/12, http://pedestrianobservations.wordpress.com/2012/04/01/amtrak-expects-10-billion-passengers/)

Amtrak had initially proposed to spend $117 billion on implementing high-speed rail on the Northeast Corridor between Boston and Washington, but backlash due to the plan’s high cost led to a scaling back behind the scenes. After the regulatory reforms of 2013, a new team of planners, many hired away from agencies in Japan, France, and Switzerland, proposed a version leveraging existing track, achieving almost the same speed for only $5 billion in upfront investment. They explained that the full cost of the system would be higher, but service could open before construction concluded, and profits could be plugged into the system. To get the plans past Congress, President Barack Obama had to agree to limit the funds to a one-time extension of Amtrak’s funding in the transportation bill S 12, which would give it $13 billion for expansion as well as ordinary operating subsidies over six years. To defeat a Senate filibuster, the extension had a clause automatically dismantling Amtrak and selling its assets in case it ran out of money, leading to the first wave of resignations by longtime officials. Despite assurances that both the cost and the ridership estimates were conservative, the program was plagued with delays and mounting costs, and to conserve money Amtrak needed to cancel some of its money-losing long-distance routes and engage in a controversial lease-back program selling its rolling stock to banks. The modifications required to let the Shinkansen bullet trains decided for the system run in the Northeast pushed back the completion of the first run from the middle of 2015 to the beginning of 2017. The president and most of the board as well as the engineers resigned in 2014, and many of their replacements resigned in the subsequent two years. When the reformed system opened in 2017, it was still incomplete because some of the high-speed segments had no funding yet, travel time from Boston to Washington was four hours and a quarter, rather than the promised three and a half. 2017 was also the last year in which Amtrak lost money. Ridership on the Northeast Corridor intercity trains topped 20 million, and in 2018 it operationally broke even, allowing it to use $1.5 billion in unspent S 12 money on completing the full system by 2020. To simplify its temporary deals with track owners in Connecticut and Massachusetts, it made a complex deal with the Northeastern commuter railroads in which it took over operations, with existing amounts of state money lasting until 2022.

### Obama Bad

#### Trains boosts the economy

**Dovell ’12** (Elizabeth Dovell, Contributor at Council on Foreign Relations, “U.S. Rail Infrastructure”, http://www.cfr.org/united-states/us-rail-infrastructure/p27585, March 7, 2012, LEQ)

**Rail is an essential component of a balanced national transportation** (PDF) **system and a globally competitive economy.** The American Society of Civil Engineers, which graded U.S. rail infrastructure with a C-, notes that the rail industry requires $200 billion in investment by 2035 to meet projected future demand. In the United States, modern freight and passenger rail systems share the same corridors and infrastructure. But while privately owned U.S. freight has succeeded in remaining competitive with other transportation modes, federally run passenger rail has struggled. Experts say the continued success of freight rail will require billions in new funding to avoid congestion, particularly if plans for expanding passenger rail proceed. Funding for the upkeep and expansion of passenger rail--which receives significantly less in federal subsidies than other transportation modes--has remained a controversial issue in Washington. The Obama administration's plan to expand high-speed rail (sustained speeds of more than 125 miles per hour) faces fierce opposition. Supporters cite the unique benefits of high-speed rail, including energy savings, more efficient mobility, and greater manufacturing opportunities for U.S. companies. Moreover, many U.S. economic competitors in Asia and Europe are making significant investments in HSR (WashPost). Opponents argue the economic benefits of HSR rarely surpass the costs, and point out that most systems do not turn a profit and rely heavily on government subsidies. The Shakeup of U.S. Rail The mid-to-late nineteenth century saw thousands of miles of track laid across the United States, and by the turn of the twentieth century, rail companies--which offered both passenger and freight rail services at the time--provided one of the cheapest and most efficient modes of transport. In the 1930s, rail transportation began to struggle in competition with commercial aviation and the increasingly popular automobile. Meanwhile, freight regulations put in place by the Interstate Commerce Commission, along with labor union restrictions, stifled the industry further. By 1968, the Pullman Palace Car Company, a major manufacturer of passenger railroad cars, had gone bankrupt. In an effort to give the industry a much-needed boost, the Penn Central Transportation Company was formed that same year, only to declare shortly thereafter the largest corporate bankruptcy in history (Time). Freight railroad is maintained with little taxpayer money, unlike alternate forms of freight transport such as trucks and barges, for which the government maintains the highway infrastructure. The 1970s and 1980s were a turning point for U.S. rail. Amtrak was established by law in 1971 and ushered in a new era of publicly owned and subsidized passenger rail. The modern freight rail industry was created by the Staggers Act of 1980, which partially deregulated the industry and contributed to mass consolidation and increased investment. As part of the Staggers process, the U.S. government allowed freight carriers to exit the passenger business in exchange for donating equipment to Amtrak and pouring $200 million into the new system. Most of the approximately 22,000 miles of track over which Amtrak runs are still owned by freight railroads. Amtrak pays freight carriers for the right to operate on their tracks and for priority over other customers. The Staggers law also granted railroads the freedom to change prices and negotiate private contracts with shipping companies. Following enactment, the number of large railroad carriers shrank from twenty-six to seven, and the amount of track owned by these companies declined from nearly 165,000 miles in 1980 to about 94,000 in 2008. The Success of Freight **Rail The U.S. freight rail industry continues to thrive today. "America's freight railways are one of the unsung transport successes of the past thirty years," s**ays the Economist. "**They are universally recognized in the industry as the best in the world."** Freight railroad is maintained with little taxpayer money, unlike alternative forms of freight transport such as trucks and barges, for which the government maintains the infrastructure. Over the last several decades, U.S. freight companies have made billion-dollar investments in the national rail network. Warren Buffett highlighted this trend in 2009, increasing Berkshire Hathaway's holdings of BNSF (USA Today)--the nation's second largest railroad--by $26 billion. Remarking on the historic investment, which was the largest in the history of Berkshire, Buffett said, "Our country's prosperity depends on its having an efficient and well-maintained rail system." Compared to other modes of freight transport, **rail also has a smaller environmental impact, better fuel efficiency, and lower costs over large distances.** Steel wheel technology makes rail far more efficient than truck freight due to limited rolling resistance: railcars become more efficient as more weight is added. Trains can now move one ton of cargo approximately 484 miles on just one gallon of fuel, according to the American Association of Railroads. **Lower freight rail costs save consumers money and help keep U.S. manufacturers globally competitive**. According to Dr. Pasi Lautala, director of the Rail Transport Program at Michigan Technological University, "**If you talk to industry experts, everyone has a positive outlook on the future of the freight rail industry**, because it makes sense if you look at the world right now. You look at the economic advances, especially in fuel consumption compared to truck traffic and the limitations of marine transportation." But challenges remain. Freight rail will need substantial investment in the future, despite its current success. Congestion is on the rise, and capacity must increase by approximately 90 percent to meet estimated demands by 2035, according to the U.S. Transportation Department. Re-regulation and the potential for track sharing with high-speed and express intercity rail could also put the freight industry under strain. President Obama has proposed a 110 mile-per-hour intercity passenger speed limit, which could create congestion problems for slower-running freight trains.

## Airways/Airports Links

### Obama Good

#### Airport funding unpopular and cause political infighting to get passage – recent bill proves

**Barrett, ’12** (Ted, Senior Congressional Producer, 2/6/12, <http://articles.cnn.com/2012-02-06/travel/travel_faa-funding_1_faa-funding-measure-senate-committee?_s=PM:TRAVEL>, JD)

After passing 23 temporary extensions, the Senate voted 75 to 20 Monday to approve a long-term funding bill for the FAA and sent it to the president for his expected signature. The measure provides about $16 billion a year for FAA operations, airport construction and modernization. It includes safety measures, such as a new satellite-based system for air traffic control, as well as other aviation programs, like one that subsidizes air travel to rural areas. Negotiations over the bill repeatedly stalled over contentious labor issues that congressional leaders finally compromised on in January. Last summer, airport construction projects were halted abruptly when funding temporarily lapsed after Congress couldn't agree on a new extension. "Compromises in the current atmosphere are not easy," said Sen. Jay Rockefeller, D-West Virginia, who chairs the senate committee that handled the measure. "This has been a long process," agreed Sen. Kay Bailey Hutchison of Texas, the top Republican on the committee. Hutchison said she was pleased to get a four-year funding measure finalized because it will provide stability to the industry. "Now our airports are going to be able to start their building projects. They're going to be able to increase their runway space or repair whatever their priorities are that are decided by the FAA," she said. The House approved the bill Friday.

#### Causes political infighting

**Gruenberg, ’12** (Mark, editor of Press Associates Inc. (PAI), a union news service, 1/20/12, <http://peoplesworld.org/labor-maps-legislative-battle-for-201/>, JD)

In a Jan. 17 interview with Press Associates Union News Service, Samuel said the list includes fighting for a two-year transportation (highway-mass transit) funding bill, pushing for final resolution of a long-running war over airport construction and airways modernization - and union rights for airline workers - and extension of jobless benefits. It also includes legislation to curb Internet piracy of intellectual property, since the piracy robs dollars from royalty-based wages for musicians, actors, screenwriters, and other unionized creative professionals. And the agenda includes a longer extension of emergency federal jobless benefits for the long-term unemployed. **But the outlook is cloudy for all**. Even the jobless benefits bill, which both parties agree upon, is hung up by a partisan dispute over how to pay for the $150 billion measure. Congress returned to town Jan. 17 to start this year's session, after a first year characterized by Senate GOP filibusters on just about everything and by a tea party-dominated House GOP attacking spending and workers. Samuel expects those attacks to continue. He forecasts congressional Republicans will use the Congressional Review Act - a Gingrich-era GOP law - to try to overturn new federal rules streamlining union recognition election procedures. The big fights will be over job creation. Samuel expects the Obama administration to again support the infrastructure bill, jobless benefits, and other measures, though he concedes that aid to state and local governments may be iffy. Obama will outline his agenda in the Jan. 24 State of the Union address. Labor may have, finally, won one battle with the House GOP, Samuel said, over recognition elections for airline and railroad workers. "The Chamber of Commerce has finally dropped its opposition" to new rules for those elections, contained in the airport construction and modernization bill. That legislation would create 80,000-100,000 jobs. House Transportation Committee Chairman John Mica, R-Fla., has insisted that rules governing union recognition elections at airlines and railroads should force unions to win an absolute majority of all eligible voters at a worksite, with non-voters counted as "no" votes. That was the rule until last year when, after pressure from the labor movement and its allies, the government changed it. The requirement in union elections now is the same as in any other election - the winner is determined by the majority of those who actually cast ballots. Business and Mica fought the change, but with the 23rd temporary extension of the airport and airspace construction bill set to expire at the end of January, business seems to have given up. The question for congressional negotiators is if Mica will. As for extending jobless benefits, "we and the Democrats are hopeful" that Congress will OK an extension before the benefits expire Feb. 29, Samuel said. He also said the Democrats are holding fast against cutting any major programs to pay for the cost - even though in the past, Congress did not require cuts elsewhere to pay for aiding the unemployed. The House GOP is insisting on cuts, at least so far. If the GOP holds fast to its no-taxes-on-millionaires stand and the Democrats protect major programs, there could be a stalemate on jobless benefits, Samuel concedes. "But the Republicans badly miscalculated" when the last benefits extension was debated in December that their no-taxes stand was a winner. Instead, they got a political black eye for protecting the rich at the expense of unemployed workers. The two-year highway-mass transit bill, worth $106 billion plus inflation, still needs some details: Its mass transit sections are incomplete and so is its financing, outside of the federal gasoline tax. The measure would create tens of thousands of construction jobs and its passage is a major goal of building trades unions. Once Senate panels finish drafting the measure, the Democratic-run Senate is expected to approve it, Samuel said. The problem is the GOP-run House, again. Mica earlier proposed a five-year bill with much less spending per year - so much less that Laborers President Terry O'Sullivan called Mica's legislation a "job killer."

### Obama Bad

#### Airport investment boosts the economy – key to stop unemployment

**PRINCIPATO ‘12** - president, Airports Council International-North America; M.A. in International Relations from University of Chicago; International Trade and Transportation specialist, Hunton & Williams (Greg, “Why we should invest today in 'Airports Inc.'”. March. <http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/labor/218525-faa-why-we-should-invest-today-in-airports-inc>)

**With the latest** Federal Aviation Administration (**FAA**) **forecast predicting a doubling of passengers and cargo by 2030, the current funding system is not up to the job of ensuring airports will have the infrastructure they need to handle such dramatic increases in traffic**.

**This will have far-reaching consequences. Commercial airports are powerful economic engines, generating 10.5 million jobs and $1.2 trillion for the U.S. economy, according to a new Airports Council International-North America study**. **Across the country, workers and businesses count on local airports to attract investment and move people and goods around the world**. Since 2001, the total number of jobs associated with airports has increased by more than 50 percent.

Despite unprecedented growth and clear evidence of the economic benefits of infrastructure investments, **airports expect to have $80 billion in unmet needs through 2015 because of the flawed system used to pay for infrastructure projects**.

That has not always been the case. Airports generated millions of jobs and trillions of dollars for local communities between 2001 and 2010 because President Bill Clinton and Congress made two decisions to improve airport infrastructure planning and investment in 2000.

The first decision allowed local communities to raise more money to finance airport improvements by giving them the authority to increase the passenger facility charge from $3 to $4.50. This helped meet local needs by expanding airport capacity to serve more passengers, handle more cargo, attract more air service and most important: promote business and commerce.

The second decision increased investments in the federal Airport Improvement Program (AIP) so that the money users pay into the nation’s Airport and Airway Trust Fund could be reinvested into the system, including the airports where all of this economic activity begins and ends. The money for this comes from the aviation trust fund which is funded by users.

Growth in jobs and business activity took place because we made a national decision to invest in the future – the airports that serve as the economic hubs of our national aviation system.

The result is that in 2010, airports were responsible for about 8 percent of U.S. gross domestic product and 7 percent of all U.S. jobs. By any standard, that is a significant return on investment. **Dollar for dollar, commercial airports rate as a remarkably worthwhile infrastructure investment**.

This is not news to other countries. Our international competitors recognize the benefits of modern airport infrastructure. That’s why they are building and expanding airports at a rapid pace (China alone is now building 12 to 15 new airports per year) to prepare for predicted growth in global travel and business.

Unfortunately, **we are retreating from these policy and investment decisions at just the wrong time**. **After five years, 23 extensions and a 14-day shutdown, Congress passed an FAA Reauthorization bill early this year that did not provide for any new funding for airports – the passenger facility charge ceiling was not raised and Airport Improvement Program funding was cut.**

**Yet as the FAA data show, commercial airports need to begin investing now in order to meet the long-term needs of the traveling public over the next two decades**. Commercial airports must have new runways and terminals, and aging facilities must be upgraded. This requires long lead times – as much as eight years – to move through the planning and permitting process. And don’t forget that successful implementation of the future air traffic control system known as NextGen depends on airport infrastructure investment as well.

## Highways Links

### Obama Good

#### Plan’s massively unpopular, sparks backlash over recent spending fights

**Laing, ’12** (Keith, The Hill staff reporter, “Insiders pessimistic about highway bill talks”, 5/7/12, <http://thehill.com/business-a-lobbying/225927-pessimism-for-highway-talks>, JD)

**The committee** of lawmakers appointed **to negotiate a new federal highway bill will meet** for the first time Tuesday, beginning their talks **amid low expectations for a deal in a charged election-year environment**. **Many** observers, including Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood, **have expressed doubt that Congress will pass a multiyear bill before the November election.** But leaders of the 47-member panel from both House and Senate say they have a blueprint — hewing closely to their respective chamber’s approach — for the talks to defy the seemingly long odds. “For the conference to be successful, it must include significant transportation program reforms and ensure that needed jobs will be created,” a spokesman for House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Chairman John Mica (R-Fla.) said in a statement provided to The Hill on Monday. “Now is the time to set aside our personal wish lists and focus on the issue at hand — the reauthorization of a bill that is absolutely essential to our economy,” Sen. Barbara Boxer (D-Calif.) agreed in a statement after conferees were first announced last month. “Controversy should not be part of the conference, and we should come together for the good of the country.” Boxer shepherded a two-year, $109 billion transportation bill through the Senate earlier this year. **Mica tried** to do the same **in the House with a five-year**, $260 billion version of the **bill, but was ultimately unsuccessful**. Members of the lawmakers’ respective committees will now begin negotiations based on the Senate transportation bill and a pair of House-passed short-term extensions of current law that kept funds flowing to road and transit projects. The **talks are likely to center**, at least at the outset, **on a controversial cross-country pipeline that has emerged as an anti-Obama rallying cry for Republicans. The House version of the transportation and infrastructure bill approves the Keystone XL pipeline** to bring Canadian oil sands to Gulf Coast refineries. **The Senate’s plan omits the Keystone provision, and Democrats have decried its inclusion in the highway negotiations. White House press secretary** Jay **Carney** has **called the Keystone pipeline provision “noxious” to the highway negotiations. “What Congress is asking — in this highly politicized, highly partisan way**, attaching a provision on the Keystone pipeline to a piece of legislation that has nothing to do with it ... in advance, blind, approve a pipeline, a proposal for which does not exist — but we’ll approve it anyway — a foreign pipeline built by a foreign company emanating from foreign territory to cross U.S. borders,” Carney said in a White House press briefing last month. A group of business leaders pressed lawmakers Monday to make sure the Keystone approval stays in the final highway bill, should one emerge from the conference committee. “As you commence your work on maintaining vital American transportation investments, Business Roundtable urges you to vote ‘Yes’ on the provision included in the House-passed version of the transportation bill that would expedite approval of the Keystone XL pipeline extension,” said the letter from the Business Roundtable. Even without the Keystone dramatics, transportation supporters say, the stakes for the congressional talks are high. “As House and Senate conferees begin negotiations on surface transportation legislation tomorrow, nearly 2 million current jobs, and up to 1 million new jobs, are at stake in what remains a slow economic recovery,” AFL-CIO Transportation Trades Department President Ed Wytkind said in a statement released Monday. “More stonewalling will not help families pay mortgages, college tuition or healthcare bills,” Wytkind continued. “Members of Congress have a choice to make. They can make a deal based upon the bipartisan Senate bill (MAP-21), or they can force a debate on controversial provisions — such as privatization giveaways to foreign interests — in the House bill (H.R. 7) that never even made it to the floor for a vote.”

#### Gets dragged into polarized debates and opposition from both sides

**Hunter, ’12** (Kathleen, Bloomberg staff reporter, 2/17/12, <http://www.businessweek.com/news/2012-02-27/former-highway-bill-foe-boehner-scavenging-for-votes.html>, JD)

 Feb. 17 (Bloomberg) -- U.S. House Speaker John Boehner has never voted for highway-funding legislation, and he’s having trouble selling fellow Republicans on a plan written with them in mind. The bill he planned to push through the House this week is being delayed amid criticism from his Republican majority as well as Democrats. Although Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, a Democrat, this week called the House plan “a love note to the Tea Party,” Republicans who have made cutting the size of government their chief goal say they are bothered by the $260 billion price tag. “We’re dipping deep, deep into the general fund for what has traditionally been limited to the highway trust fund, and that’s a level of expenditure that’s not wise,” Representative Jeff Flake, an Arizona Republican who opposes the bill, said in an interview. The plan would reauthorize the 18.4-cent federal gasoline tax and set maximum spending levels for roads, bridges and mass transit for five years. The current highway law, which expires March 31, is the eighth temporary extension since a $244 billion, four-year plan ended in 2009. “This is a much more difficult process than we’ve seen in the past,” Boehner of Ohio told reporters yesterday. “There is clearly angst on both sides of the aisle over a number of issues.” Earmarked Funds One reason, the speaker said, is that the plan lacks earmarked funds for lawmakers’ pet projects, which he has previously said numbered more than 6,000 in the last highway measure. The Republican approach to the transportation bill is aimed at appealing to a “new breed” of lawmaker with “little understanding, little appreciation for bill history, who just wants to wipe out what was,” said Jim Oberstar, a former Minnesota representative who served as the top Democrat on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee for 16 years before he was defeated in the 2010 election. Oberstar noted that during his time on the panel, he and the top Republican would -- with their staffs -- write highway bills from scratch, regardless of which party was in the majority. Natural Republican constituencies, such as the investment and contracting sectors, have been alienated by the Republican bill, Oberstar said. ‘Uncomfortable, Miserable’ “Why would you make life so uncomfortable, miserable and uncertain on an issue like this just to make a political point?” Oberstar said. “I don’t understand it.” “In the past people were bought off with earmarks or some special provisions,” Transportation and Infrastructure Chairman John Mica, a Florida Republican, told reporters this week. “We don’t have that luxury. What we have to do is to discuss policy; that takes longer.” The plan would eliminate a program to fund bicycle trails and other transportation-related improvements that anti-tax Republicans view as wasteful. It would expand offshore drilling to provide royalties for highway spending, and raise funds by requiring federal workers to contribute more to their pensions. It also would end the designated use of 2.86 cents of the gasoline tax for mass transit and other projects to improve air quality and reduce highway congestion. Instead, the measure would provide $40 billion in general funds for those purposes. Flake objects to funding such projects at all, saying the bill’s scope should be limited to surface transportation projects that can be funded through gasoline tax revenue. Mass Transit Support Conversely, at least 10 Republicans from urban and suburban districts said they oppose the bill because it would end the automatic funding for mass transit. “As long as that’s in there I can’t vote for it,” Representative Peter King, a New York Republican, said in an interview. “That’s the only program where New York gets more money back” than it pays in gas taxes. Factions of Republicans with objections, combined with opposition from almost all 192 House Democrats, mean “the math is more than tricky, but it can be fixed, and I’m committed the helping the speaker try and fix it,” said Steve LaTourette, an Ohio Republican. House Republicans’ chief vote-counter, Majority Whip Kevin McCarthy of California, told members during a Feb. 1 closed-door party meeting that the 218 votes needed for the highway bill will have to come from within the party’s ranks, said two lawmakers who were in the room and spoke on condition of anonymity. ‘Misplaced Priorities’ Boehner told reporters Feb. 9 that the House measure is the first infrastructure highway bill he has ever supported. Prior measures, he said, “represented everything that was wrong with Washington: earmarks, endless layers of bureaucracy, wasted tax dollars and misplaced priorities.” Even without earmarks, lawmakers can be swayed by parochial concerns. Representative Cory Gardner, a Colorado Republican, said in an interview that he was working to strip a provision that would prohibit horses from being transported in double- decker trailers. The provision has “farmers, ranchers in Colorado -- a huge rodeo industry -- up in arms,” he said. President Barack Obama’s administration on Feb. 14 said it would veto the House bill, saying it would reduce safety, weaken environmental and labor protection and wouldn’t do enough to improve roads and bridges. The Senate is working on its plan, S. 1813, which would authorize $109.8 billion in spending for fiscal 2012 and 2013. Three Bills Republican leaders have split the House plan into three bills, and lawmakers are offering more than 300 amendments. The House passed the first measure last night and is set to consider the other two parts after next week’s Presidents’ Day recess. Allowing votes on amendments to expand states’ responsibility to fund roads, bridges and mass transit and to limit spending on highways and mass transit will help Republicans get the 218 votes they need, even though the amendments probably won’t be adopted, said a Republican lawmaker who is helping rally votes for the measure and spoke on condition of anonymity. The lawmaker said leaders are counting on some Republican critics to come on board after they go on the record in favor of changes. New Jersey Republican Scott Garrett proposed an amendment to create pilot programs allowing states to receive federal transportation funds through block grants. Oklahoma Republican James Lankford is pushing to let states opt out of federal highway programs, either by keeping the funds they contribute to the Highway Trust Fund or by allowing them to increase state gas taxes to cover the loss in revenue. ‘Right Direction’ Although Lankford said the highway bill was a “step in the right direction,” it wouldn’t go as far as he wanted to trim the federal government’s role in funding transportation. In previous years, the highway bill “has always been something that’s attracted three-hundred-and-something votes,” LaTourette said. This year, every Democrat on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee voted against the bill on Feb. 6. A Democrat on the panel, Pennsylvania’s Jason Altmire, said he opposed the plan because of provisions he viewed as anti- labor and because it would eliminate automatic funding for mass transit. He predicted it will take far beyond March 31 for the House and Senate to work out a plan. “The likely outcome, everyone would agree, is we will not have a long-term highway bill by the end of the year,” Altmire said. “I just don’t see, this year, given the politics, how that’s possible.”

#### Recent debates prove

**Plungis, ’12** (Jeff, Bloomberg staff, 3/26/12, <http://www.businessweek.com/news/2012-03-26/road-work-halt-days-away-as-congress-argues-funding-bill>, JD)

Congress’s rhetoric ahead of the March 31 expiration of a law funding U.S. highway and transit projects resembles the dueling that led to last July’s impasse shutting down the Federal Aviation Administration for two weeks. About 4,000 government workers were furloughed. The agency lost $468 million, according to data compiled by Bloomberg, when airlines for 16 days pocketed a ticket tax that would have been used for airport construction. The consequences of a highway-program shutdown would start with construction workers being laid off after states stop getting U.S. reimbursements to pay them, said Pete Rahn, leader of HNTB Holdings Ltd.’s transportation practice in Kansas City, Missouri. As many as 1.87 million jobs may be at risk, according to a Senate fact sheet citing Transportation Department job- calculation models. The U.S. government couldn’t collect as much as $93 million a day in gasoline taxes, he said. “This is by an order of magnitude bigger than the FAA bill,” said Joshua Schank, president and chief executive officer of the Eno Center for Transportation in Washington. “If it lasts any more than a few weeks, there would be serious damage.” Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, a Nevada Democrat, last week urged the House to take up the bill his chamber passed March 14. He wouldn’t discuss what would be the ninth extension of highway legislation that expired in 2009. Representative Bill Shuster, a Pennsylvania Republican rounding up votes on the other side of the Capitol, said that stance may change by March 30. Vote Scheduled The House will vote on a 90-day extension today after 6:30 p.m. in Washington, according to the chamber’s daily schedule. The bill will be taken up under rules requiring a two-thirds majority to pass, meaning the 242 Republicans will need about 48 Democrats to advance the legislation. Representative Nick Rahall, the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee’s senior Democrat, urged a “no” vote in an e-mailed statement. House leaders should schedule a vote on the Senate bill, he said. “Allowing Republicans another 12 weeks would do nothing but feed their dangerous addiction to serial extensions and damaging delays, which are causing uncertainty and chaos at the start of the construction season,” said Rahall, of West Virginia. Insolvency Potential Congress’s struggles to agree on a long-term bill have drawn out so long that the Highway Trust Fund, which pays for road and mass transit construction, is almost insolvent. Its highway account may be unable to meet its obligations as soon as October, the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials said Jan. 31 in a report analyzing Congressional Budget Office data. The fund’s finances have declined as cars have become more efficient and Americans drive less because of higher gasoline prices, according to the U.S. Transportation Department. If a shutdown forces gas-tax collections to stop, “these funds would be gone forever,” Rahn said. “There would be no way to make it up.” The Senate’s two-year, $109 billion transportation plan passed March 14 includes about $14 billion from other accounts and general taxpayer money to shore up the trust fund. The trust fund collected $36.9 billion from all sources in 2011, according to the CBO. When House leaders tried to bring a different bill to the floor last month, majority Republicans were so divided over how to pay for projects and whether mass transit should keep getting gasoline-tax money that it didn’t progress to a vote. Jobs at Stake House Transportation and Infrastructure Chairman John Mica, a Florida Republican, introduced a bill March 22 to extend current programs through June 30. As with the FAA bill, a lapse in the government’s authority to collect gasoline taxes won’t necessarily lead to lower fuel prices for consumers, Schank said. Senator Barbara Boxer, a California Democrat, held several news conferences last week calling for a vote on the approved bill she sponsored. Among the jobs at stake if highway funding lapses are 177,500 highway and transit positions in California, 120,300 in Texas and 113,300 in New York, according to fact sheet prepared by Senate Democrats. The Senate bill may create another 1 million jobs by expanding private-sector financing for projects, according to the fact sheet. House Speaker John Boehner, an Ohio Republican, backed off a pledge to act on the Senate bill if House members wouldn’t back Mica’s five-year, $260 billion plan. House Republicans want to bolster the Highway Trust Fund with revenue from opening up more federal land to oil and gas production, Boehner told reporters March 22.

#### Highway bill sparks opposition

**Holtzman, ’12** (Geoff, Deputy Washington Bureau Chief/News Director, 2/12/12, <http://www.talkradionews.com/news/2012/02/14/highway-bill-generates-bipartisan-backlash.html>)

WASHINGTON — A series of interest groups rarely mentioned in the same breath have come together to oppose a massive transportation bill making its way through Congress. Earlier this week, the pro-environment National Resources Defense Council teamed with a coalition of conservatives — including the Competitive Enterprise Institute, the National Taxpayers Union, Taxpayers for Common Sense and the Reason Foundation — to urge House Republican leaders to scrap a reauthorization of the federal highway bill. The American Energy and Infrastructure Jobs Act (H.R. 7), which could see action as early as Wednesday, would merge a series of GOP domestic energy pet projects into the annual surface transportation legislation. The five-year measure is estimated to cost $260 billion. Meanwhile, the Senate is preparing a smaller two-year version of the bill that would total about $110 billion. In their letter, the groups urged leading lawmakers to reject using projected revenues generated by new oil drilling in areas like Alaska’s Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to aid the National Highway Trust Fund. “Further increasing the reliance of the Highway Trust Fund on revenue streams not connected to use would threaten the future health of America’s highways,” they wrote. The NRDC has on numerous occasions cited environmental health concerns as reasons for lobbying against attempts to open up ANWR. The organization and well as other like-minded groups are also opposed to a Senate GOP-led effort to attach the Keystone XL pipeline to the package. Republicans who support the bill say they have no problem with using royalty fees on the oil and gas industry to fuel new transportation infrastructure projects. “This will prevent the need for more of the same taxpayer bailouts for highway programs that occurred when Democrats ran Congress,” said House Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio). But the groups that are opposed want the authors of the bill to stick to the traditional pay-for-use model, whereby only gas taxes are used to cover the cost of surface transportation projects, rather than tapping into unrelated revenue streams. A new Congressional Budget Office report out this week suggests that the 18.4 percent gas tax might have to increase in order for the trust fund to stay solvent. House GOP’ers are downplaying that study, arguing that it underestimates the amount of revenue that would be created by new energy expansion. Another group, the conservative Heritage Foundation, argues that while boosting domestic energy production is “sound policy,” using the potential dollars to refill the Highway Trust Fund does, in fact, amount to a bailout. “Congress should live within its means,” the group wrote, and use the drilling revenues to instead pay down the nation’s deficit. Boehner’s office, however, pushed back on that claim, saying that the energy provisions in the bill would negate the need for the Treasury Department to direct general dollars to highway projects. Meanwhile, other conservatives say the reauthorization proposal simply includes too much spending. “Instead of opening up American land to energy production and using that energy production to pay down the national debt, we will instead jack up highway spending, bankrupt the highway trust fund as a result, and then use the energy taxes to offset the project funding,” wrote conservative commentator Erick Erickson. One area where conservatives are giving Republicans credit is removing earmarks from the bill. In the past, pork dollars have been used to create tourist attractions, fund gardening projects and even build a National Corvette Museum. GOP leaders say this year’s bill contains only “pro-growth” items, as well as language to consolidate duplicative surface transportation projects. Not surprisingly, some progressives are unhappy with the decision to to cancel or cut back funding for non-highway needs. According to the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, the bill would “cripple transit systems around the country and hurt millions of people who depend on public transportation to reach jobs, doctor appointments, schools, and other necessities of everyday life.” Given such widespread opposition, it appears highly unlikely that the bill in its current form will make its way to President Obama’s desk. Yet, because Congress has not passed a full reauthorization of the highway program since 2007, lawmakers may be willing to creatively deal this time around just so they can put the issue in their rearview mirror.

### Obama Bad

**And investment in highway infrastructure creates jobs and economic competitiveness - ensures long-term resiliency**

-plan is also politically popular

**Boushey ’11** (Heather Boushey is Senior Economist at American Progress, Center for American Progress, “Now Is the Time to Fix Our Broken Infrastructure”, <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2011/09/aja_infrastructure.html>, September 22, 2011, LEQ)

**Investing in infrastructure creates jobs and yields lasting benefits for the economy, including increasing growth in the long run. Upgrading roads, bridges, and other basic infrastructure creates jobs now by putting people to work** earning good, middle-class incomes, which expands the consumer base for businesses. **These kinds of investments also pave the way for long-term economic growth by lowering the cost of doing business and making U.S. companies more competitive. There is ample empirical evidence that investment in infrastructure creates jobs. In particular, investments made over the past couple of years have saved or created millions of U.S. jobs**. Increased investments in infrastructure by the Department of Transportation and other agencies due to the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act saved or created 1.1 million jobs in the construction industry and 400,000 jobs in manufacturing by March 2011, according to San Francisco Federal Reserve Bank economist Daniel Wilson.[1] Although infrastructure spending began with government dollars, these investments created jobs throughout the economy, mostly in the private sector.[2] Infrastructure projects have created jobs in communities nationwide. Recovery funds improved drinking and wastewater systems, fixed bridges and roads, and rehabilitated airports and shipyards across the nation. Some examples of high-impact infrastructure projects that have proceeded as a result of Recovery Act funding include: An expansion of a kilometer-long tunnel in Oakland, California, that connects two busy communities through a mountain.[3] An expansion and rehabilitation of the I-76/Vare Avenue Bridge in Philadelphia and 141 other bridge upgrades that supported nearly 4,000 jobs in Pennsylvania in July 2011.[4] The construction of new railway lines to serve the city of Pharr, Texas, as well as other infrastructure projects in that state that have saved or created more than 149,000 jobs through the end of 2010.[5] **Infrastructure investments are an especially cost-effective way to boost job creation with scare government funds.** Economists James Feyrer and Bruce Sacerdote found for example that at the peak of the Recovery Act’s effect, 12.3 jobs were created for every $100,000 spent by the Department of Transportation and the Department of Energy—much of which was for infrastructure.[6] These two agencies spent $24.7 billion in Recovery dollars through September 2010, 82 percent of which was transportation spending. This implies a total of more than 3 million jobs created or saved. The value of infrastructure spending **Analysis of all fiscal stimulus policies shows a higher “multiplier” from infrastructure spending than other kinds of government spending, such as tax cuts**, **meaning that infrastructure dollars flow through the economy and create more jobs than other kinds of spending.** Economist Mark Zandi found, for example, that every dollar of government spending boosts the economy by $1.44, whereas every dollar spent on a refundable lump-sum tax rebate adds $1.22 to the economy.[7] In a separate study conducted before the Great Recession, economists James Heintz and Robert Pollin of the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, found that **infrastructure investment spending in general creates about 18,000 total jobs for every $1 billion in new investment spending**. This number include jobs directly created by hiring for the specific project, jobs indirectly created by supplier firms, and jobs induced when workers go out and spend their paychecks and boost their local economy.[8] **Investing in transportation infrastructure in particular boosts employment. The Federal Highway Administration periodically estimates the impact of highway spending on direct employment,** defined as jobs created by the firms working on a given project; **on supporting jobs, including those in firms supplying materials and equipment for projects**; and on indirect employment generated when those in the first two groups make consumer purchases with their paychecks. In 2007, $1 billion in federal highway expenditures supported about 30,000 jobs—10,300 in construction, 4,675 in supporting industries, and 15,094 in induced employment.[9] **Investing in infrastructure not only creates jobs; it increases the productivity of businesses small, medium, and large**. At the most basic level, **infrastructure investments make it possible for firms to rely on well-maintained roads to move their goods,** on an electricity grid that is always on to run their factories, and water mains that provide a steady stream of clean water to supply their restaurants. There is a large body of empirical work that documents this. Although the specific effect differs across studies, European Investment Bank economists Ward Romp and Jakob de Haan conclude that “there is now more consensus than in the past that public capital furthers economic growth.”[10] **Because infrastructure investments create jobs and boost productivity, these investments have historically had bipartisan support**. In early 2011, for example, AFL-CIO President Richard Trumka and U.S. Chamber of Commerce President Thomas Donohue issued a joint statement in favor of greater infrastructure investment in the near-term: “**With the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the AFL-CIO standing together to support job creation, we hope that Democrats and Republicans in Congress will also join together to build America’s infrastructure.”**[11] But **investments in infrastructure are now being pared back as states and localities struggle with budget constraints**. Even so, there is a long list of infrastructure projects that municipalities, states, and the federal government can invest in. The American Society of Civil Engineers estimates that **we need to spend at least $2.2 trillion over the next five years just to repair our crumbling infrastructure.**[12] This doesn’t even include things like high-speed rail, mass transit, and renewable energy investments we need to free ourselves from foreign oil and climate change. The American Jobs Act The American Jobs Act seeks to remedy this situation by investing $105 billion in infrastructure.[13] This should raise U.S. economic output by $151.2 billion based on economist Mark Zandi’s most recent economic multiplier for the impact of infrastructure spending on GDP.[14] The American Jobs Act addresses a number of specific infrastructure investments. The $105 billion includes $25 billion to modernize and upgrade our school infrastructure and an additional $5 billion to modernize community colleges. We know there is great need for this kind of investment.[12] The accumulated backlog of deferred maintenance and repair for schools alone amounts to at least $270 billion.[15] The total investment in infrastructure also includes $50 billion in immediate investments for highway, highway safety, transit, passenger rail, and aviation activities. Of that $50 billion, $27 billion will make our nation’s highway systems more efficient and safer for passenger and commercial transportation. Another $9 billion of investments will repair our nation’s transit systems, $2 billion will improve intercity passenger rail service, and $2 billion will improve safety, add capacity, and modernize airport infrastructure across the country. In addition, $10 billion of American Jobs Act funds will be used to set up a National Infrastructure Bank that would provide loans for projects including transportation infrastructure, water infrastructure, and energy infrastructure. The remaining $15 billion would provide funding for neighborhood stabilization projects and the repurposing of vacant properties. Infrastructure is a good investment now because it will get people to work, and at this point, given the lingering high unemployment, we shouldn’t be too concerned if projects take a bit of time to get up and running. As Mark Zandi said in August 2011: **Infrastructure development has a large bang for the buck, particularly now when there are so many unemployed construction workers.** It also has the potential for helping more remote hard-pressed regional economies and has long-lasting economic benefits. It is difficult to get such projects up and running quickly—“shovel ready” is in most cases a misnomer—but given that unemployment is sure to be a problem for years to come, this does not seem in the current context as significant a drawback.[16] We can create jobs. With nearly 14 million Americans unemployed, now is the time to make long-lasting investments in infrastructure that will not only get people to work today but pave the way for long-term economic growth. Repairing potholes, upgrading an elementary school’s aging furnace, and replacing old water mains are all infrastructure investments. These are repairs that must be done and are often cheaper to do as maintenance than waiting to repair a totally failed system. Now is the right time for America to invest in maintaining and upgrading our infrastructure. We have millions of American workers who want to get off the unemployment queue and into a job and borrowing costs at decade lows, making it extraordinarily cost effective to make big investments today.

## Inland Waterways

### Obama Good

**Corps unpopular with public-fabricates economic reports and built the levees that failed during Katrina**

Chris **Edwards 12,** director of tax policy studies at the Cato Institute, Edwards was a senior economist on the congressional Joint Economic Committee, a manager with PricewaterhouseCoopers, and an economist with the Tax Foundation, “Cutting the Army Corps of Engineers,” http://finance.townhall.com/columnists/chrisedwards/

2012/03/19/cutting\_the\_army\_corps\_of\_engineers/page/full/)

Some of these charges still ring true**. The nation was reacquainted with the Corps' shoddy engineering with the tragic failure of the levees in New Orleans during Hurricane Katrina. In recent years, the Corps has hidden information from the public, and has been caught distorting economic analyses to justify wasteful projects. Because of its pro-construction mindset, the Corps continues to pursue projects that would damage the environment and produce limited economic benefits.** In recent decades, **for example, "the Corps has channelized dozens of rivers for barges that never arrived**."35

**Corps unpopular-ignore public interests for private gain**

Chris **Edwards 12**, director of tax policy studies at the Cato Institute, Edwards was a senior economist on the congressional Joint Economic Committee, a manager with PricewaterhouseCoopers, and an economist with the Tax Foundation, “Cutting the Army Corps of Engineers,” http://finance.townhall.com/columnists/chrisedwards/

2012/03/19/cutting\_the\_army\_corps\_of\_engineers/page/full/)

Economists generally support government spending on true "public goods." However**, the purpose of many Corps' projects is to generate private gains, not broad public benefits. The Corps would look favorably on a project that cost taxpayers $100 million** **and generated private benefits** to farmers, developers, or shipping companies of $110 million. But private interests should be willing to invest their own funds in such projects that have positive returns.74

**Plan unpopular- shifts funding burden to taxpayers**

**Southern 12** (Illinois newspaper, “New waterways bill draws criticism,” April 16, 2012, http://thesouthern.com/news/local/new-waterways-bill-draws-criticism/article\_5edfa54e-877c-11e1-ae16-0019bb2963f4.html)

**A recent bill dealing with maintenance of the country’s waterways**, co-sponsored by U.S. Rep Jerry Costello, D-Belleville, is drawing fire **for its revamping of funding measures that critics say shift more of the cost burden to taxpayers**. **Costello and U.S. Rep. Ed Whitfield, R-Ky., announced** March 30 their filing of the Waterways Are Vital for the Economy, Energy, Efficiency and Environment Act of 2012, or the **WAVE4 Act**. A joint news release from Costello and Whitfield about the bill said the WAVE4 Act requires, among other things, the use of objective criteria for the prioritization of essential construction and major rehabilitation projects and protects against cost overruns. Additionally, **the news release said it revises the current cost-sharing structure for inland waterways projects, reforms the Army Corps of Engineers internal project delivery process and calls for additional contributions from the waterways industry to pay for these vital infrastructure investments.**

#### Plan trades off with environmental restoration

**IWLA 10** (The Izaak Walton League of America, formed in 1922 to save outdoor America for future generations, almost every major, successful conservation program that America has in place today can be traced directly to a League activity or initiative, “Conservation and Watchdog Groups Oppose Barge Industry’s Plan to Shift Costs to Taxpayers,” press release, June 21, 2010, http://www.iwla.org/index.php?ht=display/ContentDetails/i/5035/pid/204)

The **Corps of Engineers budget functions in a competitive nature for directing funding to projects and priorities, and the** letter’s authors note that **increasing taxpayer funding for the Inland Waterway System would result in reduced funding available for projects targeting environmental restoration and flood and storm damage prevention.** **“It’s more than just the principle of corporate welfare that we oppose; the proposal would eat up limited resources that should go towards repairing some of the damage we’ve done to the river** over the past 100 years,” **said Glynnis Collins, Executive Director of Prairie Rivers Network. “The public money that has funded most of the navigation system has resulted in untold public costs** in the form of flooding, pollution and decline of fish and waterfowl populations. **Corps funds should be directed to efforts like floodplain restoration and wetland protection that will lead to a cleaner, healthier river.**”

**Environmental groups oppose plan**

**Glass 11** (Pamela, Washington, D.C., correspondent for WorkBoat, reports on the decisions and deliberations of congressional committees and federal agencies that affect the maritime industry, including the Coast Guard, U.S. Maritime Administration and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, graduate of Wesleyan University, “Green, anti-tax groups mobilize against inland waterways funding plan,” 4/28/11, http://www.workboat.com/newsdetail.aspx?id=9899)

**Environmental and taxpayer groups are mobilizing again on Capitol Hill to oppose a waterways financing plan favored by the barge industry.** Although not as well organized and funded as the barge industry, these groups are meeting with congressmen and their staffs and distributing documents that refute barge industry claims that **the plan will more effectively finance improvements to the aging inland lock and dam system. Green groups launched their opposition last spring after the plan was released. Opponents argue that the proposal shifts too much financial burden to taxpayers and would take money away from environmental protection programs.** Citing some of the same arguments, the Obama administration rejected the plan but promised to work on another solution. None has yet emerged.

#### Environmentalists key to Obama re-election

**Georgia Political Review 12** (“Will Key Groups Rally Behind Obama This Election?,” February 15, 2012, http://www.georgiapoliticalreview.com/will-key-groups-rally-behind-obama-this-election/)

**Obama will be looking to present himself as a pragmatic and reasonable choice that has only been ineffective because of a divided and polarized Congress.** His moderate policy decisions in office, however, might cause some liberal voters to stay at home on election day or not campaign as hard as they did four years ago**. Obama is going to need the grassroots momentum** he found during the last campaign cycle **if he wishes to win reelection. While these supporters may not jump ship and vote Republican, they will also not passionately campaign for him as they did four years ago.** Republicans are as determined as ever to defeat him, and their nominee will have plenty of legitimate ways to attack Obama later this year. These three groups – **environmentalists**, LGBT activists and women – **will help Obama gain a majority of the votes this November**, but some might see him as only the lesser of two evils, rather than a champion for their individual causes. **Obama is going to have to rally support from these groups if he wishes to have the same wave of success as he did in 2008 and four more years in the White House.**

**Plan unpopular- shifts funding burden to taxpayers**

**Southern 4/16** (Illinois newspaper, “New waterways bill draws criticism,” April 16, 2012, http://thesouthern.com/news/local/new-waterways-bill-draws-criticism/article\_5edfa54e-877c-11e1-ae16-0019bb2963f4.html)

**A recent bill dealing with maintenance of the country’s waterways**, co-sponsored by U.S. Rep Jerry Costello, D-Belleville, **is drawing fire** **for its revamping of funding measures that critics say shift more of the cost burden to taxpayers**. **Costello and U.S. Rep. Ed Whitfield, R-Ky., announced** March 30 their filing of the Waterways Are Vital for the Economy, Energy, Efficiency and Environment Act of 2012, or the **WAVE4 Act**. A joint news release from Costello and Whitfield about the bill said the WAVE4 Act requires, among other things, the use of objective criteria for the prioritization of essential construction and major rehabilitation projects and protects against cost overruns. Additionally, **the news release said it revises the current cost-sharing structure for inland waterways projects, reforms the Army Corps of Engineers internal project delivery process and calls for additional contributions from the waterways industry to pay for these vital infrastructure investments.**

### Obama Bad

**Ag exports key to Iowa swing vote and Obama re-election**

Jan 3 12 http://internationaltradeexaminer.com/2012/01/03/whats-at-stake-for-iowa/

Today, voters in Iowa will select their preference for the Republican presidential nominee**. The economy remains a significant issue for a number of voters, including those from Iowa.** Since international trade has proven beneficial to Iowa's economy, the presidential candidates' perspectives on international trade are worth highlighting**. International trade has played a role in Iowa's economic growth. As recent reports show, Iowa's economy has grown as a result of its agricultural exports to the international market.** The increased exports are the result of higher demand for U.S. agricultural products, according to a 2011 report.

**Increasing coal exports key to Obama win in critical swing states**

**Lane 5/22** (Moe, Contributor for the popular conservative/Republican website RedState, http://www.redstate.com/moe\_lane/2012/05/22/electoral-implications-of-the-obama-administrations-war-on-coal/)

The basic framework for this argument is this map:…which shows **the top sixteen coal-producing states** in the USA. **There’s a total of 182 Electoral Votes at stake**, there – and in 2008 there were 180. **Obama** actually **won coal-producing states in 2008**, 100 to 80**; and if no states flip** in November, **he’ll win them**, 96 to 86. **Except that… states are going to flip. Indiana’s already gone**; and of the remaining six Obama states only New Mexico and Illinois are not considered toss-ups. **The administration’s relentless hostility towards coal production and use may have already contributed to Democratic electoral disaster: since Obama took office the state governments and legislatures of Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Virginia have all been taken over by Republicans**; in Colorado we flipped the House of Representatives; and in New Mexico we captured the governorship. Heck, we even gained seats in the Illinois legislature, and came very close to winning the governorship.

**Navigation and shipping industries support the plan**

**Greenwire 12** (“ARMY CORPS: Obama's budget touts navigation, but waterway interests aren't happy,” February 15, 2012, Top Stories Vol. 10 No. 9)

The Obama administration is portraying its fiscal 2013 budget proposal for the Army Corps of Engineers as a boon for businesses that rely on navigable inland waterways. As Jo-Ellen Darcy, the Army's assistant secretary of civil works, puts it, the spending plan reflects "the importance the administration places on navigation." **Navigation interests have long grumbled about what they see as the Army Corps' emphasis on ecosystem restoration at the expense of dredging shipping channels, maintaining locks and other projects aimed at keeping waterways open.** President **Obama's overall $4.7 billion Army Corps budget proposal**, Darcy said at a briefing Monday, **would send 37 percent of the agency's cash to navigation projects**, compared with 33 percent for environmental restoration and 30 percent for flood control. And even though Obama's budget proposal is 5.4 percent smaller than what the agency is spending this year, Darcy said, there would be $176 million more for navigation, an 11 percent increase over fiscal 2012 levels. And the corps would spend $848 million on harbor maintenance, up 12 percent from last year. **The industry's reaction? "Overall, disappointment**," said Amy Larson, president of the National Waterways Conference, **whose members include levee managers, shipping companies and engineering firms.** Despite boosting waterways projects, industry officials say, the budget proposal fails to provide enough for navigation and levees to ensure U.S. water infrastructure can adequately provide flood protection and help meet Obama's goal of doubling the nation's exports by 2015. The corps is under unprecedented pressure to do more with less. Spending caps imposed last year during the White House's debt-limit showdown with Congress have rendered the Army Corps' budget a zero-sum game for competing interests of navigation, flood control and ecosystem restoration.

**Public perceives updating inland waterways as major job creation**

**Niemeyer 11** (Garry, president of National Corn Growers Association, B.S. in agricultural economics from the University of Illinois, “Our View: Updating our Nation’s Inland Waterways is Critical for Farmers and Promotes Job Creation,” September 14, 2011, “http://www.ncga.com/news-stories/221-our-view-updating-our-nation-rsquo-s-inland-waterways-is-critical-for-farmers-and-promotes-job-creation/)

**When it comes to the waterways, the top priority for the N**ational **C**orn **G**rowers **A**ssociation **is** **seeing new construction move forward on the seven projects in the Upper Mississippi lock system** that were authorized in the 2007 Water Resources Development Act: Mississippi L&D 25, 24, 22, 21, 20, and LaGrange and Peoria on the Illinois River. **These lock upgrades would require a total of 48 million person hours from skilled trades throughout the Midwest.**

**As President Obama and Congress turn their attention to job creation, we hope these projects will rise to the highest level of priority. We appreciate that President Obama mentioned investment in waterways in his jobs bill andwe hope he pushes for investment in the lock system** on the Upper Mississippi. Likewise, **we hope Congress can see beyond partisan views and understand the importance of an updated waterways system to farmers** across our country **and to promote job creation.**

**Job creation key to Obama re-election**

**AP 6/2** (“Ugly jobs numbers rattle Obama’s reelection bid ,” June 2, 2012, http://articles.nydailynews.com/2012-06-02/news/31989866\_1\_jobs-numbers-jobs-month-jobs-bill)

WASHINGTON — **Nothing upsets a president’s re-election groove like ugly economic numbers. A spring slowdown in hiring and an uptick in the unemployment rate are weighing on Barack Obama, while enhancing Republican challenger Mitt Romney**’s argument that the president is in over his head. Some questions and answers about how Friday’s economic news may play in a close presidential race: Q: **How bad is this for Obama?** A: **Pretty awful. Polls show Obama’s handling of the economy is his biggest weak spot. Americans overwhelmingly rate** the economy as their biggest worry. And **jobs are what they say matters most.**

## Ports Links

### Obama Good

#### Spending on projects that only benefit certain areas is unpopular.

Aued ’12 – Blake Aued is a reporter for the Athens Banner-Herald [Athens Banner-Herald, “Candidates support Savannah port, spar over earmarks”, May 30, 2012, OnlineAthens, <http://m.onlineathens.com/election/2012-05-30/candidates-support-savannah-port-spar-over-earmarks> AD]

Former state Rep. Doug Collins, R-Gainesville, seized on a remark Republican opponent Martha Zoller made at a recent Gilmer County forum about a standalone bill to fund the port. Collins and Zoller are running in the 9th Congressional District, which locally includes northern Athens-Clarke County and all of Jackson and Madison counties, and stretches north and east to the state line. “I’m against earmarks altogether, and a standalone bill is considered an earmark,” Collins said. Earmarks are the politically unpopular practice of congressmen dictating funding for specific pet projects. Zoller is against them, too, spokesman Ryan Mahoney said. “She was saying it needs to go through the regular process,” Mahoney said. “She is against earmarks.” Zoller’s spokesman and Collins said they would advocate for the U.S. Department of Transportation to include funding for the port in an appropriations bill. Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood endorsed the project last year. At the state level, Collins said he voted in favor of $261 million in bonds over the past five years for studies and improvements to the Savannah port so it can accept new, larger ships that will soon be able to pass through the Panama Canal. State officials are seeking another $400 million in federal funds.

### Obama Bad

#### Port funding would generate jobs – key to Obama’s reelection.

Mueller ’12 – Sarah Mueller, reporter for the Jacksonville Business Journal [Jacksonville Business Journal, “Jaxport welcomes House approval of port funding law”, April 20, 2012, Jacksonville Business Journal, <http://www.bizjournals.com/jacksonville/news/2012/04/20/jaxport-welcomes-house-approval-of.html> AD]

The U.S. House of Representatives approved legislation ensuring specific port revenue is spent only on harbor maintenance and dredging construction — much to the delight of the Jacksonville Port Authority . The Realize America’s Maritime Promise (RAMP) Act would allow the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to use money from Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund for maintenance and dredging. “A trust fund should be exactly that — a matter of public trust, not a fund to be raided at will,” said Paul Anderson, CEO of JaxPort in a news release. “Allowing these funds to be used for their dedicated purposes will spur opportunities in the private sector, stimulating the growth and jobs so critical to our continued national economic recovery." Businesses that use Jaxport, along with North Florida residents, stand to benefit from the law’s approval, the news release said. Port improvements will increase business and throughput of goods, resulting in job creation and positive economic impact for the country. The act was included in the surface transportation measure passed by the House this week. Congress passed a three-month extension of the current authorization in March after the Senate and House failed to reach agreement on a longer-term bill. The next step for the transportation legislation is a conference committee between the House and Senate.

#### Port spending generates jobs and keeps economies afloat.

Hassan ’12 – Amna Hassan is a reporter for the Oakland North news network [Oakland North, “Port still waiting on federal funds for dredging”, April 20, 2012, Oakland North, <http://oaklandnorth.net/2012/04/20/port-still-waiting-on-federal-funds-for-dredging/> AD]

In September 2009, after a hard battle to secure federal funds, Port of Oakland officials and local politicians celebrated completion of a 10-year, $432 million project to deepen the port channels to 50 feet. The dredging project was meant to allow the port to host massive cargo ships and usher in an era of booming business. Less than three years later, those business dreams have run aground over funding delays that hamper maintenance dredging. As of a few months ago, up to four feet of silt and sediment still clogged the channel floor, forcing the port to limit the weight of entering vessels and cramping its business. The Port of Oakland is the heart of Oakland’s economy, generating $6.8 billion in revenue and $462.7 million in taxes in a year, and generating around 73,600 jobs in the area. But ports are subject to the constant effects of time and tide, with bay waters constantly threatening to remodel channel floors with sand and silt deposits. The Port of Oakland was allocated $18 million in FY 2011 and $17.2 million in FY 2012 by the federal government for a dredging project that would clear the channels by the end of April. Currently, the US Army Corps of Engineers is evaluating the work the contractors have done to gauge whether it has been successful. But if the port is to run at full capacity throughout the year, the regular build-up along the channels’ floors needs to be addressed as soon as it occurs. The federal government has been collecting the Harbor Maintenance Tax from port customers for years with the specific purpose of port maintenance and dredging. When the government increased the tax in 1990, it did so with the explicit promise that all dredging needs would be met with funds collected from the tax, according to Port of Oakland’s spokesperson Marilyn Sandifur. Today, in the long, drawn-out battle over port funds, Port of Oakland officials claim the government has not released sufficient funds for maintenance over the years, and the proof is in the channels’ depths. The funds for dredging all federal channels or waterways come directly from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund (HMTF), and releasing these funds requires convincing government officials that a port needs them. The Army Corps of Engineers makes the initial budget request through its headquarters, based on its in-house labor expenses and project costs. The Federal Office of Management and Budget then develops the president’s budget. “Their proposal is often not the full amount that we are capable of executing in a given year,” says Jessica Burton Evans, the Navigation Program Manager for the US Army Corps of Engineers in San Francisco. “But they have to consider other federal expenses.” The final allocation is made based on the president’s request to Congress. Once Congress approves the request, the money is released by the Federal Office of Management and Budget to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the Corps in turn prioritizes project-level funding, such as the need for dredging in Oakland. “Just because the president has made the request doesn’t mean that is what Congress is going to fund,” says Jim Haussener, Executive Director of the California Marine Affairs and Navigation Conference. “We had a continuing resolution for FY 2011 which allowed the Corps of Engineers to move the money around,” Haussener says. The continuing resolution allows the Corps to fund projects at a previous level, if a bill dictating the distribution has not been enacted that year. “The President’s budget request for 2011 was $7.5 million. Because there was a continuing resolution, the allocation that finally came out for the Corps was $18 million,”says Haussener. Because the amount of money a port receives to clear the mud and silt from its channels can change, that leaves port authorities dependent on each year’s allocation process and on yearly surveys by the Corps to gauge the depth of all federal navigation channels. These survey results are also used by the San Francisco Bar Pilots to determine the weight limit for a container ship entering ports in the Bay Area. These are the pilots who meet the container ships in little tugboats, sometimes as far as 11 miles offshore, climb aboard the foreign vessels and help navigate them into the waters of the port. The higher the humps of silt deposited in the channel, the lighter a ship has to be. So far, no accidents have occurred in the channel’s murky depths, according to John Coleman, executive Director of the Bay Planning Coalition.. But the incessant lowering of the weight limit for container ships is still bad for business, port officials say. Advances in nautical technologies have allowed ever-larger ships to traverse the oceans, and history has favored Oakland over its neighboring city to the West in terms of increasing traffic. Two hundred years ago, Oakland was a marshland lying east of the main port city of San Francisco. When the transcontinental railroad was laid out, channels were deepened in the East Bay to allow boats to take small cargo and passengers to the big city. But with the advent of container ships, Oakland eclipsed San Francisco, which had neither the capacity to dock the ships, nor the rail connections to transfer goods inland. From 1960 to today, channel depth has increased from 35 to 50 feet to accommodate larger and heftier modern cargo vessels. The expense of keeping channels clear and open presages a constant battle for funds. “Your expectation is that tax is there essentially to make sure that that depth is maintained. Now we’re looking at a channel that’s 46 feet deep,” said Mike Jacob, Vice President of the Pacific Merchant Shipping Association. The channel is supposed to be 50 feet deep. “Even though money is there to maintain it, it isn’t being spent.” “We do not specifically earmark funding – we work off of the President’s budget request,” a congressional staffer said, adding there’s concern about any underfunding of the Corps of Engineers. Coleman says part of the problem is that Congress has been late in approving budgets, which has an impact on the Corps’ operations. Despite this, he says the Port of Oakland has fared well compared to other local ports. Ports like those in Redwood City and Stockton have received far fewer resources for dredging, and have channels that are deeply clogged. “Ships are being light-loaded, and that’s driving up the cost of moving commodities in and out of these ports,” Coleman said. “Businesses are going to see which port is the most competitive, and competitiveness is derived from being able to fill all the containers on a ship.” In September, California State Senators Mark De Saulnier and Jean Fuller jointly authored Senate Joint Resolution 15, asking that the government release the $5.6 billion sitting in the HMTF for ports across the country. Oakland port officials and stakeholders allege the federal government has an incentive for maintaining the surplus – it allows it to decrease the deficit in its annual budget. Meanwhile U.S. Rep. Charles Boustany [the Republican representative from Louisiana] sponsored H.R. 104, also known as the RAMP Act (Realize America’s Maritime Potential), which also seeks to ensure that the funds are used for port maintenance by tying future HMTF appropriations to HMTF revenues. It would not address the current balance of already-collected tax money in the fund. The bill has 174 co-sponsors and has been referred to committee. However, neither one of these bills has been passed yet. Meanwhile ports like Oakland across the country will continue to have to limit the cargo coming in through their channels at the risk of losing business to Canadian ports. On April 17, the House Appropriations Committee released the Energy and Water Appropriations Bill, allocating around $4.8 billion to the Corps of Engineers. Of this, almost $1 billion comes from the HMTF, an increase of $102 million from $898 million last year. But groups such as the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund Fairness Coalition maintain the government still needs to pass the RAMP Act, in order to ensure that future revenues and appropriations are tied together, and funds released immediately for port maintenance. “Right now $5 billion has been collected, and is earning interest to the tune of millions of dollars a year, and is not being redirected to the Corps of Engineers,” Coleman said. “H.R. 104 and the Senate Bill would require that that money be allocated back to the Corps to do the job that they are supposed to be doing.”

## Climate Change Links

### Obama Bad

#### Independents view climate change as priority problem

CSI ’10 (Civil Society Institute, non-profit innovation think tank, “2010 Election Survey: Tea Party, Independent Voters Differ Significantly on Climate and Clean Energy Issues” Civil Society Institute, October 26, 2010, http://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/2010-election-survey-tea-party-independent-voters-differ-significantly-on-climate-and-clean-energy-issues-105790663.html)

Independents are more than twice as likely as Tea Party supporters (62 percent versus 27 percent) to see global warming as a problem in need of a solution, compared to 39 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Democrats. Overall, more than three out of five Americans agree that "(g)lobal warming and climate change are already a big problem and we should be leading the world in solutions," compared to about a quarter (27 percent) who think "(g)lobal warming may or may not be happening. We should let other countries act first while the science sorts itself out."

# Elections DA

## Generic Links

### Obama Good

#### Obama is hinging the election on REDUCING spending – the plan causes independents to vote Republican

**Kirchgaessner, ’11** (Stephanie, “Obama looks to independent voters,” April 15 2011, http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/7dd54d5c-678c-11e0-9138-00144feab49a.html#axzz1T844vB9m

Barack **Obama is betting that his attack on the Republican deficit reduction plan, which he has derided as un-American, will resonate with** independent voters **as he prepares to hit the campaign trail next week**. The president will hold town hall meetings in California and two swing states: Nevada and Virginia. **The political winds seemed to shift in favour of Democrats this week**, with Mr Obama looking – **for the first time in months – as if he is primed to lead his party into the difficult** fiscal battles **that lie ahead.** It was, at the same time, a tumultuous week for the increasingly divided Republican majority in the House of Representatives. **Party lawmakers called for their leaders to be more aggressive in demanding spending cuts and almost unanimously endorsed a 2012 budget plan that could have** dire political consequences in the next election. The proposal by Republican Paul Ryan to cut $5,800bn in the next decade and transform Medicare, the insurance programme for the elderly, passed 235 to 193 in the House without a single Democratic vote. House passes 2012 budget Republicans in the House of Representatives united on Friday behind a 2012 budget plan slashing trillions of dollars in government spending while cutting taxes. The vote effectively serves as the Republicans’ opening gambit in what are likely to be contentious negotiations with President Barack Obama and his Democrats over debt and deficits in the coming months. The U.S. Congress must decide within weeks on raising the $14,300bn US debt ceiling. By a vote of 235-193, the House passed the plan written by House Budget Committee Chairman Paul Ryan for the 2012 fiscal year beginning October 1. Democrats rejected the measure, which proposes slashing spending by nearly $6 trillion over a decade and reducing benefits for the elderly and poor. All but four Republicans supported it. There is almost no chance of the Senate approving the measure in its current form. The White House swiftly condemned the measure but said it was committed to working with Republicans to bring down record deficits that all sides acknowledged imperil the country’s economic future. Reuters “I think Obama has had his best week in a while,” said Democratic strategist James Carville. “His speech really has got Democrats excited again. Also, they feel they are on the right side of public opinion here.” **Mr Obama’s address on Wednesday satisfied the liberal base by reaffirming his support of tax increases for the wealthy to pay for entitlement programmes for the poor and elderly. It also spoke to independent voters who abandoned Democrats in last year’s congressional election by reassuring them that he believed** the deficit required immediate action.

#### Independents are key to Romney

**Stirewalt, ’12** (Chris, 5/17/12, <http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2012/05/17/grossed-out-independents-help-obama-in-fox-news-poll/>, JD)

Republicans, invariably a pessimistic bunch about their chances to defeat President Obama in the fall, have been experiencing some green shoots of optimism of late as polls show their nominee, Mitt Romney, already nipping at Obama’s heels. And with the president’s job approval rating hovering in the high 40s, Republicans should be optimistic. The nation is in a lousy mood, the economy is poor and a strong anti-incumbent sentiment still pervades. That is not a good climate for Obama. But, the latest FOX News poll shows the path to victory for Obama: an enthusiastic Democratic base, a handful of holdout Republicans and grossed-out independents. The poll shows Obama with his largest lead over Romney, 7 points, since last June. Last month, the poll showed the two men in a dead heat. Obama can credit his good showing the in the poll mostly to the flight of independent voters. The president’s support among Democrats ticked up 1 point to 88 percent while Romney’s support among Republicans fell by 4 points. That wouldn’t be such a big deal on its own. But factor in the 14 percent spike in independent voters who are undecided, and you have the makings of an Obama victory. In April, the poll found independents favoring Romney by a massive 13-point margin, now it’s 5 points. But the closing of the gap didn’t come from a surge in support for Obama among indies. The president dropped four points. **Romney’s problem in this poll is that independents checked out.** Come election time, Romney can expect that the Republicans, who are terrified at the thought of a second Obama term, will vote for him. Things like Rick Santorum’s post-campaign-suspension attack mailer in Iowa and grudging endorsement will have faded from memory. But there are considerably more Democrats than Republicans in the country, so the only way the GOP can win elections is by winning the independent vote. As younger voters become increasingly unwilling to form the lifelong party affiliations of their parents’ generation, the task becomes increasingly important. Romney can safely assume that the 6 percent of undecided Republicans will not only break his way, but that a substantial number of them will actually turn out to vote. He can’t say the same thing about the 36 percent of independents who declined to choose between him and Obama. Given voter attitudes, it’s unlikely for Obama to again win unaffiliated voters, certainly not by the whopping 8 points he carried them in 2008. But it would be enough for him to simply drive down turnout. Fed up independents are only trouble for incumbents if they bother to go vote. An undecided, unaffiliated American is not a very likely voter. This is why a nasty race suits Obama just fine. If the independents, especially moderate independents, get so disgusted with the process, the parties and the candidates that they conclude that all are unworthy, they may not vote. Obama has lost his 2008 brand as healer and change agent, but if he can help independent voters conclude that the two parties and the political system are beyond repair, they will have little reason to go vot**e.** If the electorate in November looks like the sample in the latest FOX News poll, Romney would lose in a rout.Here’s the pickle for Romney. He has to prosecute Obama’s handling of the economy and of federal spending, but if he is locked in a six-month, scorched-earth battle with a better-funded incumbent, voters may simply tune out. Read more: http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2012/05/17/grossed-out-independents-help-obama-in-fox-news-poll/#ixzz1vChexKhE

#### Infrastructure bills cause deficit fights – that allows GOP to galvanize support

**Gruenberg, ’12** (Mark, editor of Press Associates Inc. (PAI), a union news service, 1/20/12, <http://peoplesworld.org/labor-maps-legislative-battle-for-201/>, JD)

In a Jan. 17 interview with Press Associates Union News Service, Samuel said the list includes fighting for a two-year transportation (highway-mass transit) funding bill, pushing for final resolution of a long-running war over airport construction and airways modernization - and union rights for airline workers - and extension of jobless benefits. It also includes legislation to curb Internet piracy of intellectual property, since the piracy robs dollars from royalty-based wages for musicians, actors, screenwriters, and other unionized creative professionals. And the agenda includes a longer extension of emergency federal jobless benefits for the long-term unemployed. **But the outlook is cloudy for all**. Even the jobless benefits bill, which both parties agree upon, is hung up by a partisan dispute over how to pay for the $150 billion measure. Congress returned to town Jan. 17 to start this year's session, after a first year characterized by Senate GOP filibusters on just about everything and by a tea party-dominated House GOP attacking spending and workers. Samuel expects those attacks to continue. He forecasts congressional Republicans will use the Congressional Review Act - a Gingrich-era GOP law - to try to overturn new federal rules streamlining union recognition election procedures. The big fights will be over job creation. Samuel expects the Obama administration to again support the infrastructure bill, jobless benefits, and other measures, though he concedes that aid to state and local governments may be iffy. Obama will outline his agenda in the Jan. 24 State of the Union address. Labor may have, finally, won one battle with the House GOP, Samuel said, over recognition elections for airline and railroad workers. "The Chamber of Commerce has finally dropped its opposition" to new rules for those elections, contained in the airport construction and modernization bill. That legislation would create 80,000-100,000 jobs. House Transportation Committee Chairman John Mica, R-Fla., has insisted that rules governing union recognition elections at airlines and railroads should force unions to win an absolute majority of all eligible voters at a worksite, with non-voters counted as "no" votes. That was the rule until last year when, after pressure from the labor movement and its allies, the government changed it. The requirement in union elections now is the same as in any other election - the winner is determined by the majority of those who actually cast ballots. Business and Mica fought the change, but with the 23rd temporary extension of the airport and airspace construction bill set to expire at the end of January, business seems to have given up. The question for congressional negotiators is if Mica will. As for extending jobless benefits, "we and the Democrats are hopeful" that Congress will OK an extension before the benefits expire Feb. 29, Samuel said. He also said the Democrats are holding fast against cutting any major programs to pay for the cost - even though in the past, Congress did not require cuts elsewhere to pay for aiding the unemployed. The House GOP is insisting on cuts, at least so far. If the GOP holds fast to its no-taxes-on-millionaires stand and the Democrats protect major programs, there could be a stalemate on jobless benefits, Samuel concedes. "But the Republicans badly miscalculated" when the last benefits extension was debated in December that their no-taxes stand was a winner. Instead, they got a political black eye for protecting the rich at the expense of unemployed workers. The two-year highway-mass transit bill, worth $106 billion plus inflation, still needs some details: Its mass transit sections are incomplete and so is its financing, outside of the federal gasoline tax. The measure would create tens of thousands of construction jobs and its passage is a major goal of building trades unions. Once Senate panels finish drafting the measure, the Democratic-run Senate is expected to approve it, Samuel said. The problem is the GOP-run House, again. Mica earlier proposed a five-year bill with much less spending per year - so much less that Laborers President Terry O'Sullivan called Mica's legislation a "job killer."

#### Funding issues uniquely make infrastructure bills unpopular

**Wolf, ’12** (Carol, Bloomberg staff, 1/30/12, <http://www.businessweek.com/news/2012-01-30/obama-call-to-use-war-savings-on-roads-may-fail-in-congress.html>, JD)

Jan. 25 (Bloomberg) -- President Barack Obama’s call to rebuild U.S. infrastructure with money saved by bringing troops home may not resolve Congress’s struggles to set aside more money for roads and bridges, two analysts said. “I’m not entirely convinced that reallocation of war funds will necessarily pick up enough momentum to gain traction in Congress,” Patrick Hughes, an analyst with Washington-based research firm Height Analytics, said in a telephone interview yesterday after Obama’s State of the Union address. Obama is seeking to use half of the savings created by withdrawing troops from Afghanistan and Iraq to rebuild U.S. infrastructure, helping companies ship goods more efficiently, the White House said in a fact sheet yesterday. The plan would fix existing roads and invest more in high-speed rail, according to the fact sheet. “Take the money we’re no longer spending at war, use half of it to pay down our debt, and use the rest to do some nation- building right here at home,” Obama said yesterday. He didn’t specify how much the government expects to save. The Highway Trust Fund, which pays for highway, bridge and mass-transit projects, will run out of money in early 2013, according to the Congressional Budget Office. The U.S. hasn’t passed new legislation to pay for surface-transportation projects since 2005. Funding has continued through a series of extensions since 2009. The current deadline expires March 31. Cutting Red Tape Obama also said he plans to issue an executive order that would reduce regulations that slow down construction projects. The average U.S. transportation project takes 11 years to complete, according to the CBO. Vulcan Materials Co. and Martin Marietta Materials Inc., the two largest U.S. producers of sand, gravel and crushed stone, and cement maker Texas Industries Inc. are among companies that could benefit if war savings were used to fund a highway bill, said Keith Johnson, an analyst with Morgan Keegan & Co. in Memphis, Tennessee. “Infrastructure spending could employ a lot of people quickly, but it’s a matter of getting a bill through Congress,” Johnson said in a telephone interview. Johnson has a “market perform” rating on Vulcan and Texas Industries and an “outperform” on Martin Marietta. Gasoline Tax The U.S. needs $2.2 trillion to repair its infrastructure, according to the American Society of Civil Engineers. Proposals for new highway bills by House and Senate committees don’t increase funding beyond the current legislation. Neither addresses funding for the highway fund’s shortfall. The federal fuel tax, which finances the Highway Trust Fund, has been 18.4 cents a gallon since 1993. Obama has opposed increasing the fuel tax. In last year’s State of the Union address, Obama outlined a goal to give 80 percent of Americans access to high-speed rail within 25 years. Obama’s administration has allotted $10.1 billion for high-speed and intercity rail since 2009. Congress eliminated funding for high-speed rail in the 2012 budget. The House and Senate committees both seek to expand the Transportation and Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act to $1 billion a year from the current $122 million. The program provides low-interest loans to fund transportation projects. Mica Proposal “America needs to rebuild its infrastructure, but I do not support what appears to be the president’s plan to finance that effort by downsizing the military,” Representative John Mica, the Florida Republican who is chairman of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, said in an e-mailed statement. Mica’s committee will introduce a proposal for a five-year, $260 billion surface-transportation bill on Feb. 2, Justin Harclerode, a spokesman, said by phone. Mica said yesterday his committee’s transportation measure would be partially financed through increased U.S. energy production. The Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, headed by California democrat Barbara Boxer, has approved a two-year plan with funding at current levels. With that version, the Highway Trust Fund’s projected expenditure would exceed its incoming revenue by about $12 billion.

#### **Obama’s infrastructure investment would have to raise taxes: that’s a “stumbling block”.**

Associated Press ’10 [AP, “Obama calls for $50B in infrastructure spending”, September 6, 2010, AP, Obama calls for $50B in infrastructure spending]

President Barack Obama is asking Congress to approve at least $50 billion in long-term investments in the nation's roads, railways and runways in a pre-election effort to show he's trying to stimulate the sputtering economy. The infrastructure investments are part of a package of targeted proposals the White House announced on Monday. With November's elections for control of Congress approaching, Obama planned to discuss the proposal later Monday at a Labor Day event in Milwaukee. The proposals would require congressional approval, which is highly uncertain at a time when many legislators and voters are worried about adding to federal deficits that are already sky-high. EPA President Obama Even if lawmakers could pass a bill in the short window between their return to Capitol Hill in mid-September and the elections, it's unlikely the spending would give the economy a significant boost by the time voters head to the polls. While the proposal calls for investments over six years, the White House said spending would be front-loaded with an initial $50 billion to help create jobs in the near future. The goals of the infrastructure plan include: rebuilding 150,000 miles of roads; constructing and maintaining 4,000 miles of railways, enough to go coast-to-coast; and rehabilitating or reconstructing 150 miles of airport runways, while also installing a new air navigation system designed to reduce travel times and delays. Obama will also call for the creation of a permanent infrastructure bank that would focus on funding national and regional infrastructure projects. Administration officials wouldn't say what the total cost of the infrastructure investments would be, but did say the initial $50 billion represents a significant percentage. Officials said the White House would consider closing a number of special tax breaks for oil and gas companies to pay for the proposal. Obama made infrastructure investments a central part of the $814 billion stimulus Congress passed last year, but with that spending winding down, the economy's growth has slowed. Officials said this infrastructure package differs from the stimulus because it's aimed at long-term growth, while still focusing on creating jobs in the short-term. In a Labor Day interview on CBS' "Early Show," Labor Secretary Hilda Solis said the plan Obama was to unveil Monday would "put construction workers, welders, electricians back to work ... folks that have been unemployed for a long time." With the unemployment rate ticking up to 9.6 percent, and polls showing the midterm elections could be dismal for Democrats, the president has promised to unveil a series of new measures on the economy. In addition to Monday's announcement in Milwaukee, Obama will travel to Cleveland Wednesday to pitch a $100 billion proposal to increase and make permanent research and development tax credits for businesses, a White House official said. While the idea is popular in Congress, coming up with offsetting tax increases or spending cuts has been a stumbling block. Similar to his proposal to pay for the infrastructure investments, Obama will ask lawmakers to close tax breaks for oil and gas companies and multinational corporations to pay for the plan. Other stimulus measures the administration is considering include extending a law passed in March that exempts companies that hire unemployed workers from paying Social Security taxes on those workers through December. Sen. Chuck Schumer, D-N.Y., has proposed extending the exemption an additional six months. Obama is also continuing to prod the Senate to pass the small business bill that calls for about $12 billion in tax breaks and a $30 billion fund to help unfreeze lending. Republicans have likened the bill to the unpopular bailout of the financial industry. And the president wants to make permanent the portion of George W. Bush's tax cuts affecting the middle class. Wary of the public's concern over rising deficits, the administration insists a second stimulus plan, similar to last year's $814 billion bill, is not in the works.

#### GOP leadership will thwart the plan to boost party support

**Perks, ’12** (Rob, serves as Transportation Advocacy Director at the Natural Resources Defense Council, 1/31/12, <http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/rperks/republicans_pushing_controvers.html>, JD)

I've heard of "my way or the highway" but this is ridiculous. In an unprecedented move, House Speaker John Boehner (R-OH) is hell-bent on crashing the transportation bill by loading it up with controversial issues that will guarantee more political gridlock. This afternoon Boehner & Co. will unveil their so-called "American Infrastructure and Jobs Act," which is really just a backdoor way to push Big Oil's profits even higher. Transportation legislation has long been a bi-partisan policy area, as evidenced by two polar opposite politicians co-sponsoring the Senate transportation bill: liberal Sen. Barbara Boxer (D-CA), the chair of the Senate Environment & Public Works Committee, and conservative Sen. Jim Inhofe (R-OK), the ranking Republican on the committee. The fact that these two members representing opposite ends of the political spectrum can work together these days on legislation of national importance proves that policy can transcend partisan politics. Not so in the House of Representatives apparently. Speaker Boehner is pushing legislation -- to be added to the House transportation bill that Congress will take up next -- which proposes to cover a portion of infrastructure funding via royalty revenues from new drilling in protected areas off the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, as well as opening the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska. This "drill and drive" scheme is bad for the environment and makes absolutely no economic sense. In fact, conservative critics of this "bait-and-switch" funding proposal include the Competitive Enterprise Insitute, the Reason Foundation and the Heritage Foundation. As Heritage's CEO Michael Needham told Politico: “As more and more people get educated about this, there are members who are starting to raise eyebrows. That's one of the reasons this is moving so quickly.” Certainly Sen. Inhofe's eyebrows are raised. He has repeatedly criticized Boehner's proposal for not adding up and for needlessly politicizing the process -- sharply reducing the prospects of passing a new federal surface transportation bill this year. The deadline for doing so is March 31, when the current bill expires. That would force a ninth temporary extenstion over the past three years. [UPDATE: Today Sen. Inhofe opted to toe the party line by publicly backing away from his previous steadfast criticism of the GOP proposal to tie transportation funding to new drilling. “There is no denying that increased energy production could fund a portion of the bill,” he stated on his website. With a proposed funding level for the transportation bill set at $260 billion for the next five years, even the most generous estimates of the funding that might be derived at some future date from new drilling falls well short of infrastructure needs. In fact, an analysis of the drilling proposals by The Wilderness Society puts potential revenues at $262.5 million over five years -- or less than 1% of transportation funding needs outlined in the House bill. The fact remains that Sen. Inhofe prefers his own bi-partisan transportation bill, which is not hampered by the contentious elements of the House bill. NRDC also prefers the Senate bill as the only viable way toward enacting transportation legislation in Congress this year.] Making matters worse, Speaker Boehner is also threatening to add another poison pill to the bill. On the weekend talk shows, he said Republican lawmakers will try to force the Obama administration to approve the Keystone XL pipeline by attaching it to the transportation bill. President Obama recently denied TransCanada's application for the tar sands pipeline. "If (Keystone) is not enacted before we take up the American Energy and Infrastructure Jobs Act, it will be part of it," Boehner said on ABC's "This Week" news program. NRDC has been leading the charge to stop the Keystone pipeline, which would cut through America's heartland to deliver heavy, highly acidic crude oil from Canada all the way to Texas for easy export to other countries. For all the reasons why Keystone is a dirty deal for us, go here. Given the intense PR battle being wage over the pipeline, Speaker Boehner knows that using the House transportation bill as the policy vehicle to enact the GOP's fossil fuel-friendly agenda will provoke a backlash in the Senate. Best case scenario is two transportation bills -- one passed in the Senate, one in the House -- that cannot be reconciled in a conference committee. Such a stalemate will stymie passage of a new long-term transportation bill to fund much-needed infrastructure improvements, leaving our nation's roads, bridges, rails, runways and ports in disrepair and thousands of Americans out of work. When will politicians realize that putting people back to work fixing America's crumbling infrastructure is job one -- not boosting Big Oil's profits? Unfortunately, by tying transportation programs to controversial and dangerous efforts to require oil drilling in areas that have long been protected, and constructing a dirty oil pipeline, the House Republicans leadership is hijacking a must-pass bill in order to advance an extreme agenda. This is bad policy and bad politics --designed to fail. The result will be that no transportation bill will pass Congress this year, for which you can be sure that Republicans will try to pass the blame.

### Obama Bad

#### An increase in transportation investment will lift us out of the recession in the short term

**Smith 12** (John, CEO and President of Reconnecting America, " Federal Transportation Infrastructure Investment Critically Important," 1/25, http://www.reconnectingamerica.org/news-center/reconnecting-america-news/2012/federal-transportation-infrastructure-investment-critically-important/)

**"Today, as the nation begins to rise out of a deep recession, an investment in transportation infrastructure is critically important, including not only roads and bridges, but other modes such as trains and buses. Transportation choices for Americans are essential for reducing our dependence on foreign oil, increasing access to opportunity, and improving our quality of life. Indeed, transportation is a key component in making many of the President's other proposals work. We need transit options and intermodal links to take students to college, to transport unemployed workers to job training, and to bring employees and customers to small businesses. Quality, reliable public transportation systems are the anchors that help many communities thrive, whether they are in rural, suburban, or urban areas.**

#### Economy swamps all other issues

**Man, ’12** (Anthony, Sun Sentinel staff, 5/13/12, <http://articles.sun-sentinel.com/2012-05-13/news/fl-economy-jobs-election-20120512_1_florida-voters-job-outlook-swing-voters/3>, JD)

Forget gay marriage. Put aside the war in Afghanistan. Ignore illegal immigration. All are dwarfed by the big gorilla of 2012 — the economy. Election 2012 is all about the economy — especially jobs — the one issue with the power to determine if President Barack Obama or Republican Mitt Romney wins Florida's critical electoral votes and, perhaps, the presidency. "That's the No. 1 priority," said Jansew Sang, of Hollywood. Laid off in 2009 from her job as Latin America sales manager for a manufacturer of networking devices, she's still relatively fortunate, being able to work as a translator and banking consultant. "I have the advantage of being able to keep myself afloat in this economy," she said. Advertisement Ads by Google Sang is an independent — the kind of voter coveted by every candidate because independents decide close elections. She voted for Obama in 2008, but hasn't decided if she'll vote for him or Romney this year. She was among 646 people seeking work last week at a career fair in Miramar along with city residents Jenni Ressler and Jim Richardson. Like Sang, they're swing voters and haven't decided which candidate will get their votes this year. Richardson, out of work since August 2011, said jobs are the issue in 2012. And Ressler, who's been looking for two months, said the economy "would play a big role, obviously." Jobs are a salient issue for many more people than the 9 percent of Floridians who were unemployed in March — when the jobless rate was again higher than the national average and the percentage of people with jobs was 43rd in the country. New state unemployment numbers, for April, are due out Friday. Dave Welch, who lives west of Boca Raton, said he feels the employment squeeze — even though he still has his job as a copier mechanic. "I know several people who have lost their jobs: good, hard-working people who have lost their jobs because the economy is in the tank," he said. "We're not selling the products that we have in the past, therefore we don't need the people that we've had. It's been a cascading effect." He blames Obama and the Democrats, and decided long ago to vote for Romney, even though the Republican candidate isn't as conservative as he'd like. Welch's concerns about jobs are far from unique. A Suffolk University/WSVN-Ch. 7 poll conducted last week found 81 percent of Florida voters said the state's job outlook is poor or fair. Just 13 percent termed it good or excellent. More than 80 percent believe the state is still mired in a recession. And 52 percent of the 600 Florida voters surveyed rated the economy as the most important issue facing the country. None of the other nine issues came anywhere close, a finding Suffolk polling director David Paleologos termed "amazing." Troy Samuels, a Miramar city commissioner, Republican Party committeeman and co-chairman of Romney's campaign in Broward County, said there isn't a single event he's attended in the past three years when at least one person hasn't asked him for job leads. He said even plenty of people with a job are concerned about what the near future might bring. "If there's a bump in the economy … will my company all of a sudden lay off 100 people, and I'm one of those 100?" he said. "Those are still serious concerns in the minds of people no matter what party they're from, and they think about it every single day." Advertisement Ads by Google And those kind of worries have a big impact on elections if "the unemployment rate gets reported and people sort of look around and say things don't look so good," said Kevin Wagner, a political scientist at Florida Atlantic University in Boca Raton. And that's bad for incumbents. Conflicting trends mark the all-important unemployment picture, said Xu Cheng, senior economist atMoody'sAnalytics, a leading independent economic forecasting firm. From 2010 to today, the Florida unemployment rate has come down more than 2 percentage points, "In normal times, this would be great," the economist said. "In normal times, if we put this variable in the [election forecasting] model, Obama would win Florida for sure." But there's another factor in play: A state unemployment rate higher than 8 percent produces the "grumpy voter effect," Cheng said. "Despite Florida's relatively strong recovery in the last two years, given that Florida unemployment figures will still be very high — and we believe at the time of the election it will still be about 9 percent — we believe this grumpy voter effect will kick in." That means Floridians are much less likely than normal to give the president any credit for the decline in the unemployment rate, he said.

**Public favors federal government funding for infrastructure—and thinks its underfunded in the SQ**

**Houston Chronicle, 5/18/2012 (“**Americans Value Highways and Bridges as a National Treasure”

[http://www.chron.com/business/press-releases/article/Americans-Value-Highways-and-Bridges-as-a-3568488.php accessed tm 5/19](http://www.chron.com/business/press-releases/article/Americans-Value-Highways-and-Bridges-as-a-3568488.php%20accessed%20tm%205/19) )

**Clearly, Americans hold the nation's infrastructure in high regard. Nearly nine in ten (89 percent) Americans feel it’s important for the federal government to fund the maintenance and improvements of interstate highways. Yet, this infrastructure isn’t receiving the fiscal attention it deserves**. Congress recently approved the ninth extension of transportation legislation that originally expired in 2009. The [Highway Trust Fund](http://www.chron.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=business%2Fpress-releases&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22Highway+Trust+Fund%22) – due to inflation, rising construction costs and increasingly fuel efficient vehicles – no longer collects enough money to support the U.S. surface transportation system, remaining solvent only through a series of infusions from federal general revenue funds. **More than half of Americans (57 percent) believe the nation’s infrastructure is underfunded**.

**Bipartisan support for federal investment in infrastructure**

**Rockefeller Foundation, 2011(“**Rockefeller Foundation Infrastructure Survey Reveals Bipartisan Support for Transportation and Infrastructure Investments and Reform” press release, Feb 14 2011 [http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/news/press-releases/rockefeller-foundation-infrastructure accessed tm 5/22/12](http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/news/press-releases/rockefeller-foundation-infrastructure%20accessed%20tm%205/22/12))

February 14, 2011 **– An exclusive Rockefeller Foundation survey released today reveals overwhelming bipartisan support for federal investment in transportation and infrastructure projects.** The survey showed that 71% of voters think leaders in Washington should seek common ground on legislation related to roads, bridges and transit systems, **including 66% of Tea Party supporters and 71% of Republicans.** **Two out of three voters say that improving the country’s transportation infrastructure is highly important. Nearly half of all voters said that roads are often or totally inadequate and that only some public transportation options exist**. Eighty percent of voters agree that federal funding to improve and modernize transportation will boost local economies and create millions of jobs, and view it as critical to keeping the United States as the world’s top economic superpower.

**Support for infrastructure investment outweighs concerns about spending**

**Halsey, 2012**(Ashley Halsey III is a staff writer for The Washington Post, Infrastructure projects need public support, transportation experts say, Washington Post, http://www.washingtonpost.com/local/trafficandcommuting/experts-want-to-build-public-support-for-infrastructure-projects/2012/04/23/gIQAvmMXcT\_story.html)

The plan to energize public support was outlined Monday in a report by transportation experts brought together by the Miller Center at the University of Virginia. After a conference in November, the group concluded that **most Americans are aware of the infrastructure crisis and support spending to address it. "Recent public-opinion surveys have found overwhelming support for the idea of infrastructure investment**," the report said. "After the 'bridge to nowhere' controversies of recent years, **the public has become sensitized to issues of pork-barrel spending and understandably demands to see a clear connection between federal expenditures, actual transportation needs, and economic benefits**." Despite apprehension about wasteful spending, the report said, **more than two-thirds of voters surveyed by the Rockefeller Foundation said infrastructure improvement was important and 80 percent said spending on it would create millions of jobs.** The transportation group, co-chaired by former transportation secretaries Norman Y. Mineta and Samuel K. Skinner, compiled a comprehensive study on infrastructure in 2010. That report estimated that an additional $134 billion to $262 billion must be spent per year through 2035 to rebuild and improve roads, rail systems and air transportation.

## Railroads Links

### Obama Good

#### Low satisfaction ratings prove, public against rails

**Radnedge, 2012 (Aidan, Chief reporter for Metro News, High fares for poor service, say unsatisfied rail users, Metro News, http://www.metro.co.uk/news/888570-high-fares-for-poor-service-say-unsatisfied-rail-users)**

**Commuter satisfaction with** the **most** unpopular **train operators has slumped to just 27 per cent**, a major survey shows. **Poor value for money is the top complaint** – **weeks after some fares were increased by 11 per cent. Ratings for punctuality and reliability also worsened.** Office of Rail Regulation chairwoman Anna Walker said: ‘The rail industry must work harder to give passengers the service they deserve.’ First Capital Connect, National Express and London Midland were among the companies attracting the most moans in the report by watchdog group Passenger Focus. Passenger Focus **chief executive Anthony Smith said services ranged only from ‘mediocre to good’**. He added: **‘Satisfaction with value for money has gone down, illustrating the impact tough economic times coupled with fare rises are having.’**

#### Train funding causes backlash and bolsters GOP support

**The Economist, ’11** (7/2/11, <http://www.economist.com/blogs/gulliver/2011/07/high-speed-rail>, JD)

AMERICA'S Republican party has succeeded in blocking many of the Obama administration's planned high-speed rail initiatives. (Some of them were bad ideas anyway.) Now Phillip Longman has taken to the Washington Monthly—a publication not exactly sympathetic to the ideals of the modern GOP—to argue that the death of Obama's high-speed dreams may be a good thing. His argument isn't what you might expect: Yes, bullet trains speeding at 180 mph [290 kph] or more from major city to major city are great for business execs in a hurry and on an expense account. But the more conventional, cheaper, "fast enough" high-speed rail lines like the West Rhine line are the real backbone of the German passenger rail system and that of most other industrialized nations. And it is from these examples that America has the most to learn, especially since it now looks as if the U.S. isn't going to build any real high-speed rail lines, except possibly in California, anytime soon. In an ironic twist, between the mounting concern over the state and federal deficits and growing Republican and NIMBY opposition to high-speed rail, the Obama administration is being forced to settle for incremental projects that will only bring passenger rail service up to the kind of standards found on the West Rhine line. And that's a good thing, provided Republicans don’t succeed in killing passenger trains in the United States altogether, as they are increasingly want to try. Mr Longman contends that America's passenger rail system is so bad that even simply upgrading to "fast-enough" trains would represent a vast improvement in service that would build ridership and political support for further upgrades. Right now, he argues, building true high-speed rail in America would be "so expensive, disruptive, contentious, and politically risky that it just might not be possible." The key tipping point, Mr Longman says, is when taking the train becomes faster than driving. And several factors are more important than speed. On-time performance is crucial, and perhaps Amtrak's biggest problem. Mr Longman thinks this can be fixed with "incremental investment in new sidings and track capacity to make sure freight trains don’t get in the way." Improving frequency of service could also help, Mr Longman argues. Blogger Matt Yglesias says he agrees with Mr Longman, but I don't think he actually does. Here's how he wraps up his post on the subject: I do find the whole conversation slightly frustrating. The United States is a really big country. You wouldn’t hear a debate in "Europe" about whether "Europe" should be building a train from Madrid to Barcelona "or" a train connecting the cities of the Rhineland. Nothing about [upgrading a slowish Portland-Seattle line to medium-speed] actually prevents you from building a brand new true HSR connection elsewhere in the country. The overall pot of infrastructure spending money in the United States is currently too low, which prompts a bunch of should-be-avoidable conversations about project priority. That last sentence is crucial. Mr Longman's article rests on the dubious idea that if we spend less on high-speed rail, politicians will for some reason feel compelled to take the money that would otherwise have been spent on high-speed rail and use it to upgrade slow-speed lines to "fast enough." But there's no evidence that is actually true. After all, the reason that the lines are so slow in the first place is that America has never spent the money to make them any faster. It's not as if building more sidings for freight trains and improving signalling are new ideas. Contra Mr Longman, there's not much for America to "learn" here: Europe invested in making its less-than-high-speed lines "fast enough." America didn't. It's a short story. One problem is that it's hard to get politicians to spend money on incremental improvements. The difference between an older service and the newer, incrementally improved service is only noticeable over long periods of time, if at all. Amtrak's Northeast corridor service has gotten incrementally faster over the past few decades. But that hasn't increased the political support for further improvements—in fact, Amtrak's continued failure to make dramatic improvements has been fodder for its critics. "Service between New York and DC is a few minutes faster" is not the kind of statement that fires up members of Congress. It's not the kind of thing you can put on a bumper sticker, either. When Rick Scott, the Republican governor of Florida, nixed a flagship Obama administration high-speed rail project there, I argued that the White House had paid the price for its lack of vision: Much of the blame for how all this turned out has to rest with the White House. The Obama administration's political team didn't seem to anticipate the danger that putting Mr Obama's name behind high-speed rail (or just about anything) would galvanise Republican opposition. If they did anticipate the GOP backlash, and embraced modest rail plans in order to soften a blow they knew would come, that's even worse. If the White House was going to take the political risk of putting its weight behind high-speed rail, it should have gone all-in. A Tampa-Orlando line and some track improvements in the upper Midwest weren't enough to inspire anyone.

#### Train funding perceived as inefficient and costly in the current climate

**Johnson, ’12** (Fawn, *National Journal* correspondent, 1/17/12, <http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2012/01/highspeed-rail-in-a-coma.php>, JD)

Policymakers' appetite for high-speed rail seems to be dwindling to almost nothing. It is old news that congressional Republicans are not fans of President Obama's high-speed rail initiative. They view it as a waste of taxpayer dollars at a time when belt-tightening is of the highest order. The national conversation has not advanced much beyond that point, perhaps because the biggest fans of high-speed rail are distracted by other problems. Democrats in Congress raised only a faint protest when the fiscal 2012 appropriations bill cut funding for the Transportation Department's high-speed rail program. Republicans who ostensibly like high-speed rail said the cuts will allow rail enthusiasts to start over from scratch. The problems continue at the state level, particularly in California. The California High Speed Rail Peer Review Group recently refused to recommend that bond money be devoted to the state's high-speed rail plan. The review group said the state's business plan lacked "credible sources of adequate funding" that posed "an immense financial risk" to California. Democratic Gov. Jerry Brown proposed folding the California High-Speed Rail Authority into a broader transportation agency to save money. That move could potentially take some steam out of the state's high-speed rail initiatives as they get lumped in with other transportation priorities. Even so, more than $3.5 billion in federal funding could be at risk if the state Legislature doesn't approve funds for a high-speed rail line, according to Sen. Dianne Feinstein, D-Calif. High-speed rail investments aren't like economic stimulus programs, which are intended to jump start shovel-ready projects that can immediately inject money into a local economy while delivering jobs and paved roads. The initial costs of developing high-speed rail lines are high, and the yield time is years or decades. Is the country ready for long-term investments like that? Or would it make sense to take a break and allow the economy to recover before proposing big new rail projects? What would make policymakers more receptive to high-speed rail? What critiques of high-speed rail are the most in need of a response?

#### Causes political backlash

**Levy, ’12** (Alon, one of the best freelance writers on transit and public affairs, 4/1/12, http://pedestrianobservations.wordpress.com/2012/04/01/amtrak-expects-10-billion-passengers/)

Amtrak had initially proposed to spend $117 billion on implementing high-speed rail on the Northeast Corridor between Boston and Washington, but backlash due to the plan’s high cost led to a scaling back behind the scenes. After the regulatory reforms of 2013, a new team of planners, many hired away from agencies in Japan, France, and Switzerland, proposed a version leveraging existing track, achieving almost the same speed for only $5 billion in upfront investment. They explained that the full cost of the system would be higher, but service could open before construction concluded, and profits could be plugged into the system. To get the plans past Congress, President Barack Obama had to agree to limit the funds to a one-time extension of Amtrak’s funding in the transportation bill S 12, which would give it $13 billion for expansion as well as ordinary operating subsidies over six years. To defeat a Senate filibuster, the extension had a clause automatically dismantling Amtrak and selling its assets in case it ran out of money, leading to the first wave of resignations by longtime officials. Despite assurances that both the cost and the ridership estimates were conservative, the program was plagued with delays and mounting costs, and to conserve money Amtrak needed to cancel some of its money-losing long-distance routes and engage in a controversial lease-back program selling its rolling stock to banks. The modifications required to let the Shinkansen bullet trains decided for the system run in the Northeast pushed back the completion of the first run from the middle of 2015 to the beginning of 2017. The president and most of the board as well as the engineers resigned in 2014, and many of their replacements resigned in the subsequent two years. When the reformed system opened in 2017, it was still incomplete because some of the high-speed segments had no funding yet, travel time from Boston to Washington was four hours and a quarter, rather than the promised three and a half. 2017 was also the last year in which Amtrak lost money. Ridership on the Northeast Corridor intercity trains topped 20 million, and in 2018 it operationally broke even, allowing it to use $1.5 billion in unspent S 12 money on completing the full system by 2020. To simplify its temporary deals with track owners in Connecticut and Massachusetts, it made a complex deal with the Northeastern commuter railroads in which it took over operations, with existing amounts of state money lasting until 2022.

### Obama Bad

#### Trains boosts the economy

**Dovell ’12** (Elizabeth Dovell, Contributor at Council on Foreign Relations, “U.S. Rail Infrastructure”, http://www.cfr.org/united-states/us-rail-infrastructure/p27585, March 7, 2012, LEQ)

**Rail is an essential component of a balanced national transportation** (PDF) **system and a globally competitive economy.** The American Society of Civil Engineers, which graded U.S. rail infrastructure with a C-, notes that the rail industry requires $200 billion in investment by 2035 to meet projected future demand. In the United States, modern freight and passenger rail systems share the same corridors and infrastructure. But while privately owned U.S. freight has succeeded in remaining competitive with other transportation modes, federally run passenger rail has struggled. Experts say the continued success of freight rail will require billions in new funding to avoid congestion, particularly if plans for expanding passenger rail proceed. Funding for the upkeep and expansion of passenger rail--which receives significantly less in federal subsidies than other transportation modes--has remained a controversial issue in Washington. The Obama administration's plan to expand high-speed rail (sustained speeds of more than 125 miles per hour) faces fierce opposition. Supporters cite the unique benefits of high-speed rail, including energy savings, more efficient mobility, and greater manufacturing opportunities for U.S. companies. Moreover, many U.S. economic competitors in Asia and Europe are making significant investments in HSR (WashPost). Opponents argue the economic benefits of HSR rarely surpass the costs, and point out that most systems do not turn a profit and rely heavily on government subsidies. The Shakeup of U.S. Rail The mid-to-late nineteenth century saw thousands of miles of track laid across the United States, and by the turn of the twentieth century, rail companies--which offered both passenger and freight rail services at the time--provided one of the cheapest and most efficient modes of transport. In the 1930s, rail transportation began to struggle in competition with commercial aviation and the increasingly popular automobile. Meanwhile, freight regulations put in place by the Interstate Commerce Commission, along with labor union restrictions, stifled the industry further. By 1968, the Pullman Palace Car Company, a major manufacturer of passenger railroad cars, had gone bankrupt. In an effort to give the industry a much-needed boost, the Penn Central Transportation Company was formed that same year, only to declare shortly thereafter the largest corporate bankruptcy in history (Time). Freight railroad is maintained with little taxpayer money, unlike alternate forms of freight transport such as trucks and barges, for which the government maintains the highway infrastructure. The 1970s and 1980s were a turning point for U.S. rail. Amtrak was established by law in 1971 and ushered in a new era of publicly owned and subsidized passenger rail. The modern freight rail industry was created by the Staggers Act of 1980, which partially deregulated the industry and contributed to mass consolidation and increased investment. As part of the Staggers process, the U.S. government allowed freight carriers to exit the passenger business in exchange for donating equipment to Amtrak and pouring $200 million into the new system. Most of the approximately 22,000 miles of track over which Amtrak runs are still owned by freight railroads. Amtrak pays freight carriers for the right to operate on their tracks and for priority over other customers. The Staggers law also granted railroads the freedom to change prices and negotiate private contracts with shipping companies. Following enactment, the number of large railroad carriers shrank from twenty-six to seven, and the amount of track owned by these companies declined from nearly 165,000 miles in 1980 to about 94,000 in 2008. The Success of Freight **Rail The U.S. freight rail industry continues to thrive today. "America's freight railways are one of the unsung transport successes of the past thirty years," s**ays the Economist. "**They are universally recognized in the industry as the best in the world."** Freight railroad is maintained with little taxpayer money, unlike alternative forms of freight transport such as trucks and barges, for which the government maintains the infrastructure. Over the last several decades, U.S. freight companies have made billion-dollar investments in the national rail network. Warren Buffett highlighted this trend in 2009, increasing Berkshire Hathaway's holdings of BNSF (USA Today)--the nation's second largest railroad--by $26 billion. Remarking on the historic investment, which was the largest in the history of Berkshire, Buffett said, "Our country's prosperity depends on its having an efficient and well-maintained rail system." Compared to other modes of freight transport, **rail also has a smaller environmental impact, better fuel efficiency, and lower costs over large distances.** Steel wheel technology makes rail far more efficient than truck freight due to limited rolling resistance: railcars become more efficient as more weight is added. Trains can now move one ton of cargo approximately 484 miles on just one gallon of fuel, according to the American Association of Railroads. **Lower freight rail costs save consumers money and help keep U.S. manufacturers globally competitive**. According to Dr. Pasi Lautala, director of the Rail Transport Program at Michigan Technological University, "**If you talk to industry experts, everyone has a positive outlook on the future of the freight rail industry**, because it makes sense if you look at the world right now. You look at the economic advances, especially in fuel consumption compared to truck traffic and the limitations of marine transportation." But challenges remain. Freight rail will need substantial investment in the future, despite its current success. Congestion is on the rise, and capacity must increase by approximately 90 percent to meet estimated demands by 2035, according to the U.S. Transportation Department. Re-regulation and the potential for track sharing with high-speed and express intercity rail could also put the freight industry under strain. President Obama has proposed a 110 mile-per-hour intercity passenger speed limit, which could create congestion problems for slower-running freight trains.

## Airways/Airports Links

### Obama Good

#### Airport funding unpopular and cause political infighting to get passage – recent bill proves

**Barrett, ’12** (Ted, Senior Congressional Producer, 2/6/12, <http://articles.cnn.com/2012-02-06/travel/travel_faa-funding_1_faa-funding-measure-senate-committee?_s=PM:TRAVEL>, JD)

After passing 23 temporary extensions, the Senate voted 75 to 20 Monday to approve a long-term funding bill for the FAA and sent it to the president for his expected signature. The measure provides about $16 billion a year for FAA operations, airport construction and modernization. It includes safety measures, such as a new satellite-based system for air traffic control, as well as other aviation programs, like one that subsidizes air travel to rural areas. Negotiations over the bill repeatedly stalled over contentious labor issues that congressional leaders finally compromised on in January. Last summer, airport construction projects were halted abruptly when funding temporarily lapsed after Congress couldn't agree on a new extension. "Compromises in the current atmosphere are not easy," said Sen. Jay Rockefeller, D-West Virginia, who chairs the senate committee that handled the measure. "This has been a long process," agreed Sen. Kay Bailey Hutchison of Texas, the top Republican on the committee. Hutchison said she was pleased to get a four-year funding measure finalized because it will provide stability to the industry. "Now our airports are going to be able to start their building projects. They're going to be able to increase their runway space or repair whatever their priorities are that are decided by the FAA," she said. The House approved the bill Friday.

#### Causes political infighting

**Gruenberg, ’12** (Mark, editor of Press Associates Inc. (PAI), a union news service, 1/20/12, <http://peoplesworld.org/labor-maps-legislative-battle-for-201/>, JD)

In a Jan. 17 interview with Press Associates Union News Service, Samuel said the list includes fighting for a two-year transportation (highway-mass transit) funding bill, pushing for final resolution of a long-running war over airport construction and airways modernization - and union rights for airline workers - and extension of jobless benefits. It also includes legislation to curb Internet piracy of intellectual property, since the piracy robs dollars from royalty-based wages for musicians, actors, screenwriters, and other unionized creative professionals. And the agenda includes a longer extension of emergency federal jobless benefits for the long-term unemployed. **But the outlook is cloudy for all**. Even the jobless benefits bill, which both parties agree upon, is hung up by a partisan dispute over how to pay for the $150 billion measure. Congress returned to town Jan. 17 to start this year's session, after a first year characterized by Senate GOP filibusters on just about everything and by a tea party-dominated House GOP attacking spending and workers. Samuel expects those attacks to continue. He forecasts congressional Republicans will use the Congressional Review Act - a Gingrich-era GOP law - to try to overturn new federal rules streamlining union recognition election procedures. The big fights will be over job creation. Samuel expects the Obama administration to again support the infrastructure bill, jobless benefits, and other measures, though he concedes that aid to state and local governments may be iffy. Obama will outline his agenda in the Jan. 24 State of the Union address. Labor may have, finally, won one battle with the House GOP, Samuel said, over recognition elections for airline and railroad workers. "The Chamber of Commerce has finally dropped its opposition" to new rules for those elections, contained in the airport construction and modernization bill. That legislation would create 80,000-100,000 jobs. House Transportation Committee Chairman John Mica, R-Fla., has insisted that rules governing union recognition elections at airlines and railroads should force unions to win an absolute majority of all eligible voters at a worksite, with non-voters counted as "no" votes. That was the rule until last year when, after pressure from the labor movement and its allies, the government changed it. The requirement in union elections now is the same as in any other election - the winner is determined by the majority of those who actually cast ballots. Business and Mica fought the change, but with the 23rd temporary extension of the airport and airspace construction bill set to expire at the end of January, business seems to have given up. The question for congressional negotiators is if Mica will. As for extending jobless benefits, "we and the Democrats are hopeful" that Congress will OK an extension before the benefits expire Feb. 29, Samuel said. He also said the Democrats are holding fast against cutting any major programs to pay for the cost - even though in the past, Congress did not require cuts elsewhere to pay for aiding the unemployed. The House GOP is insisting on cuts, at least so far. If the GOP holds fast to its no-taxes-on-millionaires stand and the Democrats protect major programs, there could be a stalemate on jobless benefits, Samuel concedes. "But the Republicans badly miscalculated" when the last benefits extension was debated in December that their no-taxes stand was a winner. Instead, they got a political black eye for protecting the rich at the expense of unemployed workers. The two-year highway-mass transit bill, worth $106 billion plus inflation, still needs some details: Its mass transit sections are incomplete and so is its financing, outside of the federal gasoline tax. The measure would create tens of thousands of construction jobs and its passage is a major goal of building trades unions. Once Senate panels finish drafting the measure, the Democratic-run Senate is expected to approve it, Samuel said. The problem is the GOP-run House, again. Mica earlier proposed a five-year bill with much less spending per year - so much less that Laborers President Terry O'Sullivan called Mica's legislation a "job killer."

### Obama Bad

#### Airport investment boosts the economy – key to stop unemployment

**PRINCIPATO ‘12** - president, Airports Council International-North America; M.A. in International Relations from University of Chicago; International Trade and Transportation specialist, Hunton & Williams (Greg, “Why we should invest today in 'Airports Inc.'”. March. <http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/labor/218525-faa-why-we-should-invest-today-in-airports-inc>)

**With the latest** Federal Aviation Administration (**FAA**) **forecast predicting a doubling of passengers and cargo by 2030, the current funding system is not up to the job of ensuring airports will have the infrastructure they need to handle such dramatic increases in traffic**.

**This will have far-reaching consequences. Commercial airports are powerful economic engines, generating 10.5 million jobs and $1.2 trillion for the U.S. economy, according to a new Airports Council International-North America study**. **Across the country, workers and businesses count on local airports to attract investment and move people and goods around the world**. Since 2001, the total number of jobs associated with airports has increased by more than 50 percent.

Despite unprecedented growth and clear evidence of the economic benefits of infrastructure investments, **airports expect to have $80 billion in unmet needs through 2015 because of the flawed system used to pay for infrastructure projects**.

That has not always been the case. Airports generated millions of jobs and trillions of dollars for local communities between 2001 and 2010 because President Bill Clinton and Congress made two decisions to improve airport infrastructure planning and investment in 2000.

The first decision allowed local communities to raise more money to finance airport improvements by giving them the authority to increase the passenger facility charge from $3 to $4.50. This helped meet local needs by expanding airport capacity to serve more passengers, handle more cargo, attract more air service and most important: promote business and commerce.

The second decision increased investments in the federal Airport Improvement Program (AIP) so that the money users pay into the nation’s Airport and Airway Trust Fund could be reinvested into the system, including the airports where all of this economic activity begins and ends. The money for this comes from the aviation trust fund which is funded by users.

Growth in jobs and business activity took place because we made a national decision to invest in the future – the airports that serve as the economic hubs of our national aviation system.

The result is that in 2010, airports were responsible for about 8 percent of U.S. gross domestic product and 7 percent of all U.S. jobs. By any standard, that is a significant return on investment. **Dollar for dollar, commercial airports rate as a remarkably worthwhile infrastructure investment**.

This is not news to other countries. Our international competitors recognize the benefits of modern airport infrastructure. That’s why they are building and expanding airports at a rapid pace (China alone is now building 12 to 15 new airports per year) to prepare for predicted growth in global travel and business.

Unfortunately, **we are retreating from these policy and investment decisions at just the wrong time**. **After five years, 23 extensions and a 14-day shutdown, Congress passed an FAA Reauthorization bill early this year that did not provide for any new funding for airports – the passenger facility charge ceiling was not raised and Airport Improvement Program funding was cut.**

**Yet as the FAA data show, commercial airports need to begin investing now in order to meet the long-term needs of the traveling public over the next two decades**. Commercial airports must have new runways and terminals, and aging facilities must be upgraded. This requires long lead times – as much as eight years – to move through the planning and permitting process. And don’t forget that successful implementation of the future air traffic control system known as NextGen depends on airport infrastructure investment as well.

## Highways Links

### Obama Good

#### Plan’s massively unpopular, sparks backlash over recent spending fights

**Laing, ’12** (Keith, The Hill staff reporter, “Insiders pessimistic about highway bill talks”, 5/7/12, <http://thehill.com/business-a-lobbying/225927-pessimism-for-highway-talks>, JD)

**The committee** of lawmakers appointed **to negotiate a new federal highway bill will meet** for the first time Tuesday, beginning their talks **amid low expectations for a deal in a charged election-year environment**. **Many** observers, including Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood, **have expressed doubt that Congress will pass a multiyear bill before the November election.** But leaders of the 47-member panel from both House and Senate say they have a blueprint — hewing closely to their respective chamber’s approach — for the talks to defy the seemingly long odds. “For the conference to be successful, it must include significant transportation program reforms and ensure that needed jobs will be created,” a spokesman for House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Chairman John Mica (R-Fla.) said in a statement provided to The Hill on Monday. “Now is the time to set aside our personal wish lists and focus on the issue at hand — the reauthorization of a bill that is absolutely essential to our economy,” Sen. Barbara Boxer (D-Calif.) agreed in a statement after conferees were first announced last month. “Controversy should not be part of the conference, and we should come together for the good of the country.” Boxer shepherded a two-year, $109 billion transportation bill through the Senate earlier this year. **Mica tried** to do the same **in the House with a five-year**, $260 billion version of the **bill, but was ultimately unsuccessful**. Members of the lawmakers’ respective committees will now begin negotiations based on the Senate transportation bill and a pair of House-passed short-term extensions of current law that kept funds flowing to road and transit projects. The **talks are likely to center**, at least at the outset, **on a controversial cross-country pipeline that has emerged as an anti-Obama rallying cry for Republicans. The House version of the transportation and infrastructure bill approves the Keystone XL pipeline** to bring Canadian oil sands to Gulf Coast refineries. **The Senate’s plan omits the Keystone provision, and Democrats have decried its inclusion in the highway negotiations. White House press secretary** Jay **Carney** has **called the Keystone pipeline provision “noxious” to the highway negotiations. “What Congress is asking — in this highly politicized, highly partisan way**, attaching a provision on the Keystone pipeline to a piece of legislation that has nothing to do with it ... in advance, blind, approve a pipeline, a proposal for which does not exist — but we’ll approve it anyway — a foreign pipeline built by a foreign company emanating from foreign territory to cross U.S. borders,” Carney said in a White House press briefing last month. A group of business leaders pressed lawmakers Monday to make sure the Keystone approval stays in the final highway bill, should one emerge from the conference committee. “As you commence your work on maintaining vital American transportation investments, Business Roundtable urges you to vote ‘Yes’ on the provision included in the House-passed version of the transportation bill that would expedite approval of the Keystone XL pipeline extension,” said the letter from the Business Roundtable. Even without the Keystone dramatics, transportation supporters say, the stakes for the congressional talks are high. “As House and Senate conferees begin negotiations on surface transportation legislation tomorrow, nearly 2 million current jobs, and up to 1 million new jobs, are at stake in what remains a slow economic recovery,” AFL-CIO Transportation Trades Department President Ed Wytkind said in a statement released Monday. “More stonewalling will not help families pay mortgages, college tuition or healthcare bills,” Wytkind continued. “Members of Congress have a choice to make. They can make a deal based upon the bipartisan Senate bill (MAP-21), or they can force a debate on controversial provisions — such as privatization giveaways to foreign interests — in the House bill (H.R. 7) that never even made it to the floor for a vote.”

#### Gets dragged into polarized debates and opposition from both sides

**Hunter, ’12** (Kathleen, Bloomberg staff reporter, 2/17/12, <http://www.businessweek.com/news/2012-02-27/former-highway-bill-foe-boehner-scavenging-for-votes.html>, JD)

 Feb. 17 (Bloomberg) -- U.S. House Speaker John Boehner has never voted for highway-funding legislation, and he’s having trouble selling fellow Republicans on a plan written with them in mind. The bill he planned to push through the House this week is being delayed amid criticism from his Republican majority as well as Democrats. Although Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, a Democrat, this week called the House plan “a love note to the Tea Party,” Republicans who have made cutting the size of government their chief goal say they are bothered by the $260 billion price tag. “We’re dipping deep, deep into the general fund for what has traditionally been limited to the highway trust fund, and that’s a level of expenditure that’s not wise,” Representative Jeff Flake, an Arizona Republican who opposes the bill, said in an interview. The plan would reauthorize the 18.4-cent federal gasoline tax and set maximum spending levels for roads, bridges and mass transit for five years. The current highway law, which expires March 31, is the eighth temporary extension since a $244 billion, four-year plan ended in 2009. “This is a much more difficult process than we’ve seen in the past,” Boehner of Ohio told reporters yesterday. “There is clearly angst on both sides of the aisle over a number of issues.” Earmarked Funds One reason, the speaker said, is that the plan lacks earmarked funds for lawmakers’ pet projects, which he has previously said numbered more than 6,000 in the last highway measure. The Republican approach to the transportation bill is aimed at appealing to a “new breed” of lawmaker with “little understanding, little appreciation for bill history, who just wants to wipe out what was,” said Jim Oberstar, a former Minnesota representative who served as the top Democrat on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee for 16 years before he was defeated in the 2010 election. Oberstar noted that during his time on the panel, he and the top Republican would -- with their staffs -- write highway bills from scratch, regardless of which party was in the majority. Natural Republican constituencies, such as the investment and contracting sectors, have been alienated by the Republican bill, Oberstar said. ‘Uncomfortable, Miserable’ “Why would you make life so uncomfortable, miserable and uncertain on an issue like this just to make a political point?” Oberstar said. “I don’t understand it.” “In the past people were bought off with earmarks or some special provisions,” Transportation and Infrastructure Chairman John Mica, a Florida Republican, told reporters this week. “We don’t have that luxury. What we have to do is to discuss policy; that takes longer.” The plan would eliminate a program to fund bicycle trails and other transportation-related improvements that anti-tax Republicans view as wasteful. It would expand offshore drilling to provide royalties for highway spending, and raise funds by requiring federal workers to contribute more to their pensions. It also would end the designated use of 2.86 cents of the gasoline tax for mass transit and other projects to improve air quality and reduce highway congestion. Instead, the measure would provide $40 billion in general funds for those purposes. Flake objects to funding such projects at all, saying the bill’s scope should be limited to surface transportation projects that can be funded through gasoline tax revenue. Mass Transit Support Conversely, at least 10 Republicans from urban and suburban districts said they oppose the bill because it would end the automatic funding for mass transit. “As long as that’s in there I can’t vote for it,” Representative Peter King, a New York Republican, said in an interview. “That’s the only program where New York gets more money back” than it pays in gas taxes. Factions of Republicans with objections, combined with opposition from almost all 192 House Democrats, mean “the math is more than tricky, but it can be fixed, and I’m committed the helping the speaker try and fix it,” said Steve LaTourette, an Ohio Republican. House Republicans’ chief vote-counter, Majority Whip Kevin McCarthy of California, told members during a Feb. 1 closed-door party meeting that the 218 votes needed for the highway bill will have to come from within the party’s ranks, said two lawmakers who were in the room and spoke on condition of anonymity. ‘Misplaced Priorities’ Boehner told reporters Feb. 9 that the House measure is the first infrastructure highway bill he has ever supported. Prior measures, he said, “represented everything that was wrong with Washington: earmarks, endless layers of bureaucracy, wasted tax dollars and misplaced priorities.” Even without earmarks, lawmakers can be swayed by parochial concerns. Representative Cory Gardner, a Colorado Republican, said in an interview that he was working to strip a provision that would prohibit horses from being transported in double- decker trailers. The provision has “farmers, ranchers in Colorado -- a huge rodeo industry -- up in arms,” he said. President Barack Obama’s administration on Feb. 14 said it would veto the House bill, saying it would reduce safety, weaken environmental and labor protection and wouldn’t do enough to improve roads and bridges. The Senate is working on its plan, S. 1813, which would authorize $109.8 billion in spending for fiscal 2012 and 2013. Three Bills Republican leaders have split the House plan into three bills, and lawmakers are offering more than 300 amendments. The House passed the first measure last night and is set to consider the other two parts after next week’s Presidents’ Day recess. Allowing votes on amendments to expand states’ responsibility to fund roads, bridges and mass transit and to limit spending on highways and mass transit will help Republicans get the 218 votes they need, even though the amendments probably won’t be adopted, said a Republican lawmaker who is helping rally votes for the measure and spoke on condition of anonymity. The lawmaker said leaders are counting on some Republican critics to come on board after they go on the record in favor of changes. New Jersey Republican Scott Garrett proposed an amendment to create pilot programs allowing states to receive federal transportation funds through block grants. Oklahoma Republican James Lankford is pushing to let states opt out of federal highway programs, either by keeping the funds they contribute to the Highway Trust Fund or by allowing them to increase state gas taxes to cover the loss in revenue. ‘Right Direction’ Although Lankford said the highway bill was a “step in the right direction,” it wouldn’t go as far as he wanted to trim the federal government’s role in funding transportation. In previous years, the highway bill “has always been something that’s attracted three-hundred-and-something votes,” LaTourette said. This year, every Democrat on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee voted against the bill on Feb. 6. A Democrat on the panel, Pennsylvania’s Jason Altmire, said he opposed the plan because of provisions he viewed as anti- labor and because it would eliminate automatic funding for mass transit. He predicted it will take far beyond March 31 for the House and Senate to work out a plan. “The likely outcome, everyone would agree, is we will not have a long-term highway bill by the end of the year,” Altmire said. “I just don’t see, this year, given the politics, how that’s possible.”

#### Recent debates prove

**Plungis, ’12** (Jeff, Bloomberg staff, 3/26/12, <http://www.businessweek.com/news/2012-03-26/road-work-halt-days-away-as-congress-argues-funding-bill>, JD)

Congress’s rhetoric ahead of the March 31 expiration of a law funding U.S. highway and transit projects resembles the dueling that led to last July’s impasse shutting down the Federal Aviation Administration for two weeks. About 4,000 government workers were furloughed. The agency lost $468 million, according to data compiled by Bloomberg, when airlines for 16 days pocketed a ticket tax that would have been used for airport construction. The consequences of a highway-program shutdown would start with construction workers being laid off after states stop getting U.S. reimbursements to pay them, said Pete Rahn, leader of HNTB Holdings Ltd.’s transportation practice in Kansas City, Missouri. As many as 1.87 million jobs may be at risk, according to a Senate fact sheet citing Transportation Department job- calculation models. The U.S. government couldn’t collect as much as $93 million a day in gasoline taxes, he said. “This is by an order of magnitude bigger than the FAA bill,” said Joshua Schank, president and chief executive officer of the Eno Center for Transportation in Washington. “If it lasts any more than a few weeks, there would be serious damage.” Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, a Nevada Democrat, last week urged the House to take up the bill his chamber passed March 14. He wouldn’t discuss what would be the ninth extension of highway legislation that expired in 2009. Representative Bill Shuster, a Pennsylvania Republican rounding up votes on the other side of the Capitol, said that stance may change by March 30. Vote Scheduled The House will vote on a 90-day extension today after 6:30 p.m. in Washington, according to the chamber’s daily schedule. The bill will be taken up under rules requiring a two-thirds majority to pass, meaning the 242 Republicans will need about 48 Democrats to advance the legislation. Representative Nick Rahall, the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee’s senior Democrat, urged a “no” vote in an e-mailed statement. House leaders should schedule a vote on the Senate bill, he said. “Allowing Republicans another 12 weeks would do nothing but feed their dangerous addiction to serial extensions and damaging delays, which are causing uncertainty and chaos at the start of the construction season,” said Rahall, of West Virginia. Insolvency Potential Congress’s struggles to agree on a long-term bill have drawn out so long that the Highway Trust Fund, which pays for road and mass transit construction, is almost insolvent. Its highway account may be unable to meet its obligations as soon as October, the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials said Jan. 31 in a report analyzing Congressional Budget Office data. The fund’s finances have declined as cars have become more efficient and Americans drive less because of higher gasoline prices, according to the U.S. Transportation Department. If a shutdown forces gas-tax collections to stop, “these funds would be gone forever,” Rahn said. “There would be no way to make it up.” The Senate’s two-year, $109 billion transportation plan passed March 14 includes about $14 billion from other accounts and general taxpayer money to shore up the trust fund. The trust fund collected $36.9 billion from all sources in 2011, according to the CBO. When House leaders tried to bring a different bill to the floor last month, majority Republicans were so divided over how to pay for projects and whether mass transit should keep getting gasoline-tax money that it didn’t progress to a vote. Jobs at Stake House Transportation and Infrastructure Chairman John Mica, a Florida Republican, introduced a bill March 22 to extend current programs through June 30. As with the FAA bill, a lapse in the government’s authority to collect gasoline taxes won’t necessarily lead to lower fuel prices for consumers, Schank said. Senator Barbara Boxer, a California Democrat, held several news conferences last week calling for a vote on the approved bill she sponsored. Among the jobs at stake if highway funding lapses are 177,500 highway and transit positions in California, 120,300 in Texas and 113,300 in New York, according to fact sheet prepared by Senate Democrats. The Senate bill may create another 1 million jobs by expanding private-sector financing for projects, according to the fact sheet. House Speaker John Boehner, an Ohio Republican, backed off a pledge to act on the Senate bill if House members wouldn’t back Mica’s five-year, $260 billion plan. House Republicans want to bolster the Highway Trust Fund with revenue from opening up more federal land to oil and gas production, Boehner told reporters March 22.

#### Highway bill sparks opposition

**Holtzman, ’12** (Geoff, Deputy Washington Bureau Chief/News Director, 2/12/12, <http://www.talkradionews.com/news/2012/02/14/highway-bill-generates-bipartisan-backlash.html>)

WASHINGTON — A series of interest groups rarely mentioned in the same breath have come together to oppose a massive transportation bill making its way through Congress. Earlier this week, the pro-environment National Resources Defense Council teamed with a coalition of conservatives — including the Competitive Enterprise Institute, the National Taxpayers Union, Taxpayers for Common Sense and the Reason Foundation — to urge House Republican leaders to scrap a reauthorization of the federal highway bill. The American Energy and Infrastructure Jobs Act (H.R. 7), which could see action as early as Wednesday, would merge a series of GOP domestic energy pet projects into the annual surface transportation legislation. The five-year measure is estimated to cost $260 billion. Meanwhile, the Senate is preparing a smaller two-year version of the bill that would total about $110 billion. In their letter, the groups urged leading lawmakers to reject using projected revenues generated by new oil drilling in areas like Alaska’s Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to aid the National Highway Trust Fund. “Further increasing the reliance of the Highway Trust Fund on revenue streams not connected to use would threaten the future health of America’s highways,” they wrote. The NRDC has on numerous occasions cited environmental health concerns as reasons for lobbying against attempts to open up ANWR. The organization and well as other like-minded groups are also opposed to a Senate GOP-led effort to attach the Keystone XL pipeline to the package. Republicans who support the bill say they have no problem with using royalty fees on the oil and gas industry to fuel new transportation infrastructure projects. “This will prevent the need for more of the same taxpayer bailouts for highway programs that occurred when Democrats ran Congress,” said House Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio). But the groups that are opposed want the authors of the bill to stick to the traditional pay-for-use model, whereby only gas taxes are used to cover the cost of surface transportation projects, rather than tapping into unrelated revenue streams. A new Congressional Budget Office report out this week suggests that the 18.4 percent gas tax might have to increase in order for the trust fund to stay solvent. House GOP’ers are downplaying that study, arguing that it underestimates the amount of revenue that would be created by new energy expansion. Another group, the conservative Heritage Foundation, argues that while boosting domestic energy production is “sound policy,” using the potential dollars to refill the Highway Trust Fund does, in fact, amount to a bailout. “Congress should live within its means,” the group wrote, and use the drilling revenues to instead pay down the nation’s deficit. Boehner’s office, however, pushed back on that claim, saying that the energy provisions in the bill would negate the need for the Treasury Department to direct general dollars to highway projects. Meanwhile, other conservatives say the reauthorization proposal simply includes too much spending. “Instead of opening up American land to energy production and using that energy production to pay down the national debt, we will instead jack up highway spending, bankrupt the highway trust fund as a result, and then use the energy taxes to offset the project funding,” wrote conservative commentator Erick Erickson. One area where conservatives are giving Republicans credit is removing earmarks from the bill. In the past, pork dollars have been used to create tourist attractions, fund gardening projects and even build a National Corvette Museum. GOP leaders say this year’s bill contains only “pro-growth” items, as well as language to consolidate duplicative surface transportation projects. Not surprisingly, some progressives are unhappy with the decision to to cancel or cut back funding for non-highway needs. According to the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, the bill would “cripple transit systems around the country and hurt millions of people who depend on public transportation to reach jobs, doctor appointments, schools, and other necessities of everyday life.” Given such widespread opposition, it appears highly unlikely that the bill in its current form will make its way to President Obama’s desk. Yet, because Congress has not passed a full reauthorization of the highway program since 2007, lawmakers may be willing to creatively deal this time around just so they can put the issue in their rearview mirror.

### Obama Bad

**And investment in highway infrastructure creates jobs and economic competitiveness - ensures long-term resiliency**

-plan is also politically popular

**Boushey ’11** (Heather Boushey is Senior Economist at American Progress, Center for American Progress, “Now Is the Time to Fix Our Broken Infrastructure”, <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2011/09/aja_infrastructure.html>, September 22, 2011, LEQ)

**Investing in infrastructure creates jobs and yields lasting benefits for the economy, including increasing growth in the long run. Upgrading roads, bridges, and other basic infrastructure creates jobs now by putting people to work** earning good, middle-class incomes, which expands the consumer base for businesses. **These kinds of investments also pave the way for long-term economic growth by lowering the cost of doing business and making U.S. companies more competitive. There is ample empirical evidence that investment in infrastructure creates jobs. In particular, investments made over the past couple of years have saved or created millions of U.S. jobs**. Increased investments in infrastructure by the Department of Transportation and other agencies due to the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act saved or created 1.1 million jobs in the construction industry and 400,000 jobs in manufacturing by March 2011, according to San Francisco Federal Reserve Bank economist Daniel Wilson.[1] Although infrastructure spending began with government dollars, these investments created jobs throughout the economy, mostly in the private sector.[2] Infrastructure projects have created jobs in communities nationwide. Recovery funds improved drinking and wastewater systems, fixed bridges and roads, and rehabilitated airports and shipyards across the nation. Some examples of high-impact infrastructure projects that have proceeded as a result of Recovery Act funding include: An expansion of a kilometer-long tunnel in Oakland, California, that connects two busy communities through a mountain.[3] An expansion and rehabilitation of the I-76/Vare Avenue Bridge in Philadelphia and 141 other bridge upgrades that supported nearly 4,000 jobs in Pennsylvania in July 2011.[4] The construction of new railway lines to serve the city of Pharr, Texas, as well as other infrastructure projects in that state that have saved or created more than 149,000 jobs through the end of 2010.[5] **Infrastructure investments are an especially cost-effective way to boost job creation with scare government funds.** Economists James Feyrer and Bruce Sacerdote found for example that at the peak of the Recovery Act’s effect, 12.3 jobs were created for every $100,000 spent by the Department of Transportation and the Department of Energy—much of which was for infrastructure.[6] These two agencies spent $24.7 billion in Recovery dollars through September 2010, 82 percent of which was transportation spending. This implies a total of more than 3 million jobs created or saved. The value of infrastructure spending **Analysis of all fiscal stimulus policies shows a higher “multiplier” from infrastructure spending than other kinds of government spending, such as tax cuts**, **meaning that infrastructure dollars flow through the economy and create more jobs than other kinds of spending.** Economist Mark Zandi found, for example, that every dollar of government spending boosts the economy by $1.44, whereas every dollar spent on a refundable lump-sum tax rebate adds $1.22 to the economy.[7] In a separate study conducted before the Great Recession, economists James Heintz and Robert Pollin of the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, found that **infrastructure investment spending in general creates about 18,000 total jobs for every $1 billion in new investment spending**. This number include jobs directly created by hiring for the specific project, jobs indirectly created by supplier firms, and jobs induced when workers go out and spend their paychecks and boost their local economy.[8] **Investing in transportation infrastructure in particular boosts employment. The Federal Highway Administration periodically estimates the impact of highway spending on direct employment,** defined as jobs created by the firms working on a given project; **on supporting jobs, including those in firms supplying materials and equipment for projects**; and on indirect employment generated when those in the first two groups make consumer purchases with their paychecks. In 2007, $1 billion in federal highway expenditures supported about 30,000 jobs—10,300 in construction, 4,675 in supporting industries, and 15,094 in induced employment.[9] **Investing in infrastructure not only creates jobs; it increases the productivity of businesses small, medium, and large**. At the most basic level, **infrastructure investments make it possible for firms to rely on well-maintained roads to move their goods,** on an electricity grid that is always on to run their factories, and water mains that provide a steady stream of clean water to supply their restaurants. There is a large body of empirical work that documents this. Although the specific effect differs across studies, European Investment Bank economists Ward Romp and Jakob de Haan conclude that “there is now more consensus than in the past that public capital furthers economic growth.”[10] **Because infrastructure investments create jobs and boost productivity, these investments have historically had bipartisan support**. In early 2011, for example, AFL-CIO President Richard Trumka and U.S. Chamber of Commerce President Thomas Donohue issued a joint statement in favor of greater infrastructure investment in the near-term: “**With the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the AFL-CIO standing together to support job creation, we hope that Democrats and Republicans in Congress will also join together to build America’s infrastructure.”**[11] But **investments in infrastructure are now being pared back as states and localities struggle with budget constraints**. Even so, there is a long list of infrastructure projects that municipalities, states, and the federal government can invest in. The American Society of Civil Engineers estimates that **we need to spend at least $2.2 trillion over the next five years just to repair our crumbling infrastructure.**[12] This doesn’t even include things like high-speed rail, mass transit, and renewable energy investments we need to free ourselves from foreign oil and climate change. The American Jobs Act The American Jobs Act seeks to remedy this situation by investing $105 billion in infrastructure.[13] This should raise U.S. economic output by $151.2 billion based on economist Mark Zandi’s most recent economic multiplier for the impact of infrastructure spending on GDP.[14] The American Jobs Act addresses a number of specific infrastructure investments. The $105 billion includes $25 billion to modernize and upgrade our school infrastructure and an additional $5 billion to modernize community colleges. We know there is great need for this kind of investment.[12] The accumulated backlog of deferred maintenance and repair for schools alone amounts to at least $270 billion.[15] The total investment in infrastructure also includes $50 billion in immediate investments for highway, highway safety, transit, passenger rail, and aviation activities. Of that $50 billion, $27 billion will make our nation’s highway systems more efficient and safer for passenger and commercial transportation. Another $9 billion of investments will repair our nation’s transit systems, $2 billion will improve intercity passenger rail service, and $2 billion will improve safety, add capacity, and modernize airport infrastructure across the country. In addition, $10 billion of American Jobs Act funds will be used to set up a National Infrastructure Bank that would provide loans for projects including transportation infrastructure, water infrastructure, and energy infrastructure. The remaining $15 billion would provide funding for neighborhood stabilization projects and the repurposing of vacant properties. Infrastructure is a good investment now because it will get people to work, and at this point, given the lingering high unemployment, we shouldn’t be too concerned if projects take a bit of time to get up and running. As Mark Zandi said in August 2011: **Infrastructure development has a large bang for the buck, particularly now when there are so many unemployed construction workers.** It also has the potential for helping more remote hard-pressed regional economies and has long-lasting economic benefits. It is difficult to get such projects up and running quickly—“shovel ready” is in most cases a misnomer—but given that unemployment is sure to be a problem for years to come, this does not seem in the current context as significant a drawback.[16] We can create jobs. With nearly 14 million Americans unemployed, now is the time to make long-lasting investments in infrastructure that will not only get people to work today but pave the way for long-term economic growth. Repairing potholes, upgrading an elementary school’s aging furnace, and replacing old water mains are all infrastructure investments. These are repairs that must be done and are often cheaper to do as maintenance than waiting to repair a totally failed system. Now is the right time for America to invest in maintaining and upgrading our infrastructure. We have millions of American workers who want to get off the unemployment queue and into a job and borrowing costs at decade lows, making it extraordinarily cost effective to make big investments today.

## Inland Waterways Links

### Obama Good

**Corps unpopular with public-fabricates economic reports and built the levees that failed during Katrina**

Chris **Edwards 12,** director of tax policy studies at the Cato Institute, Edwards was a senior economist on the congressional Joint Economic Committee, a manager with PricewaterhouseCoopers, and an economist with the Tax Foundation, “Cutting the Army Corps of Engineers,” http://finance.townhall.com/columnists/chrisedwards/

2012/03/19/cutting\_the\_army\_corps\_of\_engineers/page/full/)

Some of these charges still ring true**. The nation was reacquainted with the Corps' shoddy engineering with the tragic failure of the levees in New Orleans during Hurricane Katrina. In recent years, the Corps has hidden information from the public, and has been caught distorting economic analyses to justify wasteful projects. Because of its pro-construction mindset, the Corps continues to pursue projects that would damage the environment and produce limited economic benefits.** In recent decades, **for example, "the Corps has channelized dozens of rivers for barges that never arrived**."35

**Corps unpopular-ignore public interests for private gain**

Chris **Edwards 12**, director of tax policy studies at the Cato Institute, Edwards was a senior economist on the congressional Joint Economic Committee, a manager with PricewaterhouseCoopers, and an economist with the Tax Foundation, “Cutting the Army Corps of Engineers,” http://finance.townhall.com/columnists/chrisedwards/

2012/03/19/cutting\_the\_army\_corps\_of\_engineers/page/full/)

Economists generally support government spending on true "public goods." However**, the purpose of many Corps' projects is to generate private gains, not broad public benefits. The Corps would look favorably on a project that cost taxpayers $100 million** **and generated private benefits** to farmers, developers, or shipping companies of $110 million. But private interests should be willing to invest their own funds in such projects that have positive returns.74

**Plan unpopular- shifts funding burden to taxpayers**

**Southern 12** (Illinois newspaper, “New waterways bill draws criticism,” April 16, 2012, http://thesouthern.com/news/local/new-waterways-bill-draws-criticism/article\_5edfa54e-877c-11e1-ae16-0019bb2963f4.html)

**A recent bill dealing with maintenance of the country’s waterways**, co-sponsored by U.S. Rep Jerry Costello, D-Belleville, is drawing fire **for its revamping of funding measures that critics say shift more of the cost burden to taxpayers**. **Costello and U.S. Rep. Ed Whitfield, R-Ky., announced** March 30 their filing of the Waterways Are Vital for the Economy, Energy, Efficiency and Environment Act of 2012, or the **WAVE4 Act**. A joint news release from Costello and Whitfield about the bill said the WAVE4 Act requires, among other things, the use of objective criteria for the prioritization of essential construction and major rehabilitation projects and protects against cost overruns. Additionally, **the news release said it revises the current cost-sharing structure for inland waterways projects, reforms the Army Corps of Engineers internal project delivery process and calls for additional contributions from the waterways industry to pay for these vital infrastructure investments.**

#### Plan trades off with environmental restoration

**IWLA 10** (The Izaak Walton League of America, formed in 1922 to save outdoor America for future generations, almost every major, successful conservation program that America has in place today can be traced directly to a League activity or initiative, “Conservation and Watchdog Groups Oppose Barge Industry’s Plan to Shift Costs to Taxpayers,” press release, June 21, 2010, http://www.iwla.org/index.php?ht=display/ContentDetails/i/5035/pid/204)

The **Corps of Engineers budget functions in a competitive nature for directing funding to projects and priorities, and the** letter’s authors note that **increasing taxpayer funding for the Inland Waterway System would result in reduced funding available for projects targeting environmental restoration and flood and storm damage prevention.** **“It’s more than just the principle of corporate welfare that we oppose; the proposal would eat up limited resources that should go towards repairing some of the damage we’ve done to the river** over the past 100 years,” **said Glynnis Collins, Executive Director of Prairie Rivers Network. “The public money that has funded most of the navigation system has resulted in untold public costs** in the form of flooding, pollution and decline of fish and waterfowl populations. **Corps funds should be directed to efforts like floodplain restoration and wetland protection that will lead to a cleaner, healthier river.**”

**Environmental groups oppose plan**

**Glass 11** (Pamela, Washington, D.C., correspondent for WorkBoat, reports on the decisions and deliberations of congressional committees and federal agencies that affect the maritime industry, including the Coast Guard, U.S. Maritime Administration and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, graduate of Wesleyan University, “Green, anti-tax groups mobilize against inland waterways funding plan,” 4/28/11, http://www.workboat.com/newsdetail.aspx?id=9899)

**Environmental and taxpayer groups are mobilizing again on Capitol Hill to oppose a waterways financing plan favored by the barge industry.** Although not as well organized and funded as the barge industry, these groups are meeting with congressmen and their staffs and distributing documents that refute barge industry claims that **the plan will more effectively finance improvements to the aging inland lock and dam system. Green groups launched their opposition last spring after the plan was released. Opponents argue that the proposal shifts too much financial burden to taxpayers and would take money away from environmental protection programs.** Citing some of the same arguments, the Obama administration rejected the plan but promised to work on another solution. None has yet emerged.

#### Environmentalists key to Obama re-election

**Georgia Political Review 12** (“Will Key Groups Rally Behind Obama This Election?,” February 15, 2012, http://www.georgiapoliticalreview.com/will-key-groups-rally-behind-obama-this-election/)

**Obama will be looking to present himself as a pragmatic and reasonable choice that has only been ineffective because of a divided and polarized Congress.** His moderate policy decisions in office, however, might cause some liberal voters to stay at home on election day or not campaign as hard as they did four years ago**. Obama is going to need the grassroots momentum** he found during the last campaign cycle **if he wishes to win reelection. While these supporters may not jump ship and vote Republican, they will also not passionately campaign for him as they did four years ago.** Republicans are as determined as ever to defeat him, and their nominee will have plenty of legitimate ways to attack Obama later this year. These three groups – **environmentalists**, LGBT activists and women – **will help Obama gain a majority of the votes this November**, but some might see him as only the lesser of two evils, rather than a champion for their individual causes. **Obama is going to have to rally support from these groups if he wishes to have the same wave of success as he did in 2008 and four more years in the White House.**

**Plan unpopular- shifts funding burden to taxpayers**

**Southern 4/16** (Illinois newspaper, “New waterways bill draws criticism,” April 16, 2012, http://thesouthern.com/news/local/new-waterways-bill-draws-criticism/article\_5edfa54e-877c-11e1-ae16-0019bb2963f4.html)

**A recent bill dealing with maintenance of the country’s waterways**, co-sponsored by U.S. Rep Jerry Costello, D-Belleville, **is drawing fire** **for its revamping of funding measures that critics say shift more of the cost burden to taxpayers**. **Costello and U.S. Rep. Ed Whitfield, R-Ky., announced** March 30 their filing of the Waterways Are Vital for the Economy, Energy, Efficiency and Environment Act of 2012, or the **WAVE4 Act**. A joint news release from Costello and Whitfield about the bill said the WAVE4 Act requires, among other things, the use of objective criteria for the prioritization of essential construction and major rehabilitation projects and protects against cost overruns. Additionally, **the news release said it revises the current cost-sharing structure for inland waterways projects, reforms the Army Corps of Engineers internal project delivery process and calls for additional contributions from the waterways industry to pay for these vital infrastructure investments.**

### Obama Bad

**Ag exports key to Iowa swing vote and Obama re-election**

Jan 3 12 http://internationaltradeexaminer.com/2012/01/03/whats-at-stake-for-iowa/

Today, voters in Iowa will select their preference for the Republican presidential nominee**. The economy remains a significant issue for a number of voters, including those from Iowa.** Since international trade has proven beneficial to Iowa's economy, the presidential candidates' perspectives on international trade are worth highlighting**. International trade has played a role in Iowa's economic growth. As recent reports show, Iowa's economy has grown as a result of its agricultural exports to the international market.** The increased exports are the result of higher demand for U.S. agricultural products, according to a 2011 report.

**Increasing coal exports key to Obama win in critical swing states**

**Lane 5/22** (Moe, Contributor for the popular conservative/Republican website RedState, http://www.redstate.com/moe\_lane/2012/05/22/electoral-implications-of-the-obama-administrations-war-on-coal/)

The basic framework for this argument is this map:…which shows **the top sixteen coal-producing states** in the USA. **There’s a total of 182 Electoral Votes at stake**, there – and in 2008 there were 180. **Obama** actually **won coal-producing states in 2008**, 100 to 80**; and if no states flip** in November, **he’ll win them**, 96 to 86. **Except that… states are going to flip. Indiana’s already gone**; and of the remaining six Obama states only New Mexico and Illinois are not considered toss-ups. **The administration’s relentless hostility towards coal production and use may have already contributed to Democratic electoral disaster: since Obama took office the state governments and legislatures of Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Virginia have all been taken over by Republicans**; in Colorado we flipped the House of Representatives; and in New Mexico we captured the governorship. Heck, we even gained seats in the Illinois legislature, and came very close to winning the governorship.

**Navigation and shipping industries support the plan**

**Greenwire 12** (“ARMY CORPS: Obama's budget touts navigation, but waterway interests aren't happy,” February 15, 2012, Top Stories Vol. 10 No. 9)

The Obama administration is portraying its fiscal 2013 budget proposal for the Army Corps of Engineers as a boon for businesses that rely on navigable inland waterways. As Jo-Ellen Darcy, the Army's assistant secretary of civil works, puts it, the spending plan reflects "the importance the administration places on navigation." **Navigation interests have long grumbled about what they see as the Army Corps' emphasis on ecosystem restoration at the expense of dredging shipping channels, maintaining locks and other projects aimed at keeping waterways open.** President **Obama's overall $4.7 billion Army Corps budget proposal**, Darcy said at a briefing Monday, **would send 37 percent of the agency's cash to navigation projects**, compared with 33 percent for environmental restoration and 30 percent for flood control. And even though Obama's budget proposal is 5.4 percent smaller than what the agency is spending this year, Darcy said, there would be $176 million more for navigation, an 11 percent increase over fiscal 2012 levels. And the corps would spend $848 million on harbor maintenance, up 12 percent from last year. **The industry's reaction? "Overall, disappointment**," said Amy Larson, president of the National Waterways Conference, **whose members include levee managers, shipping companies and engineering firms.** Despite boosting waterways projects, industry officials say, the budget proposal fails to provide enough for navigation and levees to ensure U.S. water infrastructure can adequately provide flood protection and help meet Obama's goal of doubling the nation's exports by 2015. The corps is under unprecedented pressure to do more with less. Spending caps imposed last year during the White House's debt-limit showdown with Congress have rendered the Army Corps' budget a zero-sum game for competing interests of navigation, flood control and ecosystem restoration.

**Public perceives updating inland waterways as major job creation**

**Niemeyer 11** (Garry, president of National Corn Growers Association, B.S. in agricultural economics from the University of Illinois, “Our View: Updating our Nation’s Inland Waterways is Critical for Farmers and Promotes Job Creation,” September 14, 2011, “http://www.ncga.com/news-stories/221-our-view-updating-our-nation-rsquo-s-inland-waterways-is-critical-for-farmers-and-promotes-job-creation/)

**When it comes to the waterways, the top priority for the N**ational **C**orn **G**rowers **A**ssociation **is** **seeing new construction move forward on the seven projects in the Upper Mississippi lock system** that were authorized in the 2007 Water Resources Development Act: Mississippi L&D 25, 24, 22, 21, 20, and LaGrange and Peoria on the Illinois River. **These lock upgrades would require a total of 48 million person hours from skilled trades throughout the Midwest.**

**As President Obama and Congress turn their attention to job creation, we hope these projects will rise to the highest level of priority. We appreciate that President Obama mentioned investment in waterways in his jobs bill andwe hope he pushes for investment in the lock system** on the Upper Mississippi. Likewise, **we hope Congress can see beyond partisan views and understand the importance of an updated waterways system to farmers** across our country **and to promote job creation.**

**Job creation key to Obama re-election**

**AP 6/2** (“Ugly jobs numbers rattle Obama’s reelection bid ,” June 2, 2012, http://articles.nydailynews.com/2012-06-02/news/31989866\_1\_jobs-numbers-jobs-month-jobs-bill)

WASHINGTON — **Nothing upsets a president’s re-election groove like ugly economic numbers. A spring slowdown in hiring and an uptick in the unemployment rate are weighing on Barack Obama, while enhancing Republican challenger Mitt Romney**’s argument that the president is in over his head. Some questions and answers about how Friday’s economic news may play in a close presidential race: Q: **How bad is this for Obama?** A: **Pretty awful. Polls show Obama’s handling of the economy is his biggest weak spot. Americans overwhelmingly rate** the economy as their biggest worry. And **jobs are what they say matters most.**

## Ports Links

### Obama Good

#### Spending on projects that only benefit certain areas is unpopular.

Aued ’12 – Blake Aued is a reporter for the Athens Banner-Herald [Athens Banner-Herald, “Candidates support Savannah port, spar over earmarks”, May 30, 2012, OnlineAthens, <http://m.onlineathens.com/election/2012-05-30/candidates-support-savannah-port-spar-over-earmarks> AD]

Former state Rep. Doug Collins, R-Gainesville, seized on a remark Republican opponent Martha Zoller made at a recent Gilmer County forum about a standalone bill to fund the port. Collins and Zoller are running in the 9th Congressional District, which locally includes northern Athens-Clarke County and all of Jackson and Madison counties, and stretches north and east to the state line. “I’m against earmarks altogether, and a standalone bill is considered an earmark,” Collins said. Earmarks are the politically unpopular practice of congressmen dictating funding for specific pet projects. Zoller is against them, too, spokesman Ryan Mahoney said. “She was saying it needs to go through the regular process,” Mahoney said. “She is against earmarks.” Zoller’s spokesman and Collins said they would advocate for the U.S. Department of Transportation to include funding for the port in an appropriations bill. Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood endorsed the project last year. At the state level, Collins said he voted in favor of $261 million in bonds over the past five years for studies and improvements to the Savannah port so it can accept new, larger ships that will soon be able to pass through the Panama Canal. State officials are seeking another $400 million in federal funds.

### Obama Bad

#### Port funding would generate jobs – key to Obama’s reelection.

Mueller ’12 – Sarah Mueller, reporter for the Jacksonville Business Journal [Jacksonville Business Journal, “Jaxport welcomes House approval of port funding law”, April 20, 2012, Jacksonville Business Journal, <http://www.bizjournals.com/jacksonville/news/2012/04/20/jaxport-welcomes-house-approval-of.html> AD]

The U.S. House of Representatives approved legislation ensuring specific port revenue is spent only on harbor maintenance and dredging construction — much to the delight of the Jacksonville Port Authority . The Realize America’s Maritime Promise (RAMP) Act would allow the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to use money from Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund for maintenance and dredging. “A trust fund should be exactly that — a matter of public trust, not a fund to be raided at will,” said Paul Anderson, CEO of JaxPort in a news release. “Allowing these funds to be used for their dedicated purposes will spur opportunities in the private sector, stimulating the growth and jobs so critical to our continued national economic recovery." Businesses that use Jaxport, along with North Florida residents, stand to benefit from the law’s approval, the news release said. Port improvements will increase business and throughput of goods, resulting in job creation and positive economic impact for the country. The act was included in the surface transportation measure passed by the House this week. Congress passed a three-month extension of the current authorization in March after the Senate and House failed to reach agreement on a longer-term bill. The next step for the transportation legislation is a conference committee between the House and Senate.

#### Port spending generates jobs and keeps economies afloat.

Hassan ’12 – Amna Hassan is a reporter for the Oakland North news network [Oakland North, “Port still waiting on federal funds for dredging”, April 20, 2012, Oakland North, <http://oaklandnorth.net/2012/04/20/port-still-waiting-on-federal-funds-for-dredging/> AD]

In September 2009, after a hard battle to secure federal funds, Port of Oakland officials and local politicians celebrated completion of a 10-year, $432 million project to deepen the port channels to 50 feet. The dredging project was meant to allow the port to host massive cargo ships and usher in an era of booming business. Less than three years later, those business dreams have run aground over funding delays that hamper maintenance dredging. As of a few months ago, up to four feet of silt and sediment still clogged the channel floor, forcing the port to limit the weight of entering vessels and cramping its business. The Port of Oakland is the heart of Oakland’s economy, generating $6.8 billion in revenue and $462.7 million in taxes in a year, and generating around 73,600 jobs in the area. But ports are subject to the constant effects of time and tide, with bay waters constantly threatening to remodel channel floors with sand and silt deposits. The Port of Oakland was allocated $18 million in FY 2011 and $17.2 million in FY 2012 by the federal government for a dredging project that would clear the channels by the end of April. Currently, the US Army Corps of Engineers is evaluating the work the contractors have done to gauge whether it has been successful. But if the port is to run at full capacity throughout the year, the regular build-up along the channels’ floors needs to be addressed as soon as it occurs. The federal government has been collecting the Harbor Maintenance Tax from port customers for years with the specific purpose of port maintenance and dredging. When the government increased the tax in 1990, it did so with the explicit promise that all dredging needs would be met with funds collected from the tax, according to Port of Oakland’s spokesperson Marilyn Sandifur. Today, in the long, drawn-out battle over port funds, Port of Oakland officials claim the government has not released sufficient funds for maintenance over the years, and the proof is in the channels’ depths. The funds for dredging all federal channels or waterways come directly from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund (HMTF), and releasing these funds requires convincing government officials that a port needs them. The Army Corps of Engineers makes the initial budget request through its headquarters, based on its in-house labor expenses and project costs. The Federal Office of Management and Budget then develops the president’s budget. “Their proposal is often not the full amount that we are capable of executing in a given year,” says Jessica Burton Evans, the Navigation Program Manager for the US Army Corps of Engineers in San Francisco. “But they have to consider other federal expenses.” The final allocation is made based on the president’s request to Congress. Once Congress approves the request, the money is released by the Federal Office of Management and Budget to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the Corps in turn prioritizes project-level funding, such as the need for dredging in Oakland. “Just because the president has made the request doesn’t mean that is what Congress is going to fund,” says Jim Haussener, Executive Director of the California Marine Affairs and Navigation Conference. “We had a continuing resolution for FY 2011 which allowed the Corps of Engineers to move the money around,” Haussener says. The continuing resolution allows the Corps to fund projects at a previous level, if a bill dictating the distribution has not been enacted that year. “The President’s budget request for 2011 was $7.5 million. Because there was a continuing resolution, the allocation that finally came out for the Corps was $18 million,”says Haussener. Because the amount of money a port receives to clear the mud and silt from its channels can change, that leaves port authorities dependent on each year’s allocation process and on yearly surveys by the Corps to gauge the depth of all federal navigation channels. These survey results are also used by the San Francisco Bar Pilots to determine the weight limit for a container ship entering ports in the Bay Area. These are the pilots who meet the container ships in little tugboats, sometimes as far as 11 miles offshore, climb aboard the foreign vessels and help navigate them into the waters of the port. The higher the humps of silt deposited in the channel, the lighter a ship has to be. So far, no accidents have occurred in the channel’s murky depths, according to John Coleman, executive Director of the Bay Planning Coalition.. But the incessant lowering of the weight limit for container ships is still bad for business, port officials say. Advances in nautical technologies have allowed ever-larger ships to traverse the oceans, and history has favored Oakland over its neighboring city to the West in terms of increasing traffic. Two hundred years ago, Oakland was a marshland lying east of the main port city of San Francisco. When the transcontinental railroad was laid out, channels were deepened in the East Bay to allow boats to take small cargo and passengers to the big city. But with the advent of container ships, Oakland eclipsed San Francisco, which had neither the capacity to dock the ships, nor the rail connections to transfer goods inland. From 1960 to today, channel depth has increased from 35 to 50 feet to accommodate larger and heftier modern cargo vessels. The expense of keeping channels clear and open presages a constant battle for funds. “Your expectation is that tax is there essentially to make sure that that depth is maintained. Now we’re looking at a channel that’s 46 feet deep,” said Mike Jacob, Vice President of the Pacific Merchant Shipping Association. The channel is supposed to be 50 feet deep. “Even though money is there to maintain it, it isn’t being spent.” “We do not specifically earmark funding – we work off of the President’s budget request,” a congressional staffer said, adding there’s concern about any underfunding of the Corps of Engineers. Coleman says part of the problem is that Congress has been late in approving budgets, which has an impact on the Corps’ operations. Despite this, he says the Port of Oakland has fared well compared to other local ports. Ports like those in Redwood City and Stockton have received far fewer resources for dredging, and have channels that are deeply clogged. “Ships are being light-loaded, and that’s driving up the cost of moving commodities in and out of these ports,” Coleman said. “Businesses are going to see which port is the most competitive, and competitiveness is derived from being able to fill all the containers on a ship.” In September, California State Senators Mark De Saulnier and Jean Fuller jointly authored Senate Joint Resolution 15, asking that the government release the $5.6 billion sitting in the HMTF for ports across the country. Oakland port officials and stakeholders allege the federal government has an incentive for maintaining the surplus – it allows it to decrease the deficit in its annual budget. Meanwhile U.S. Rep. Charles Boustany [the Republican representative from Louisiana] sponsored H.R. 104, also known as the RAMP Act (Realize America’s Maritime Potential), which also seeks to ensure that the funds are used for port maintenance by tying future HMTF appropriations to HMTF revenues. It would not address the current balance of already-collected tax money in the fund. The bill has 174 co-sponsors and has been referred to committee. However, neither one of these bills has been passed yet. Meanwhile ports like Oakland across the country will continue to have to limit the cargo coming in through their channels at the risk of losing business to Canadian ports. On April 17, the House Appropriations Committee released the Energy and Water Appropriations Bill, allocating around $4.8 billion to the Corps of Engineers. Of this, almost $1 billion comes from the HMTF, an increase of $102 million from $898 million last year. But groups such as the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund Fairness Coalition maintain the government still needs to pass the RAMP Act, in order to ensure that future revenues and appropriations are tied together, and funds released immediately for port maintenance. “Right now $5 billion has been collected, and is earning interest to the tune of millions of dollars a year, and is not being redirected to the Corps of Engineers,” Coleman said. “H.R. 104 and the Senate Bill would require that that money be allocated back to the Corps to do the job that they are supposed to be doing.”

#### Port infrastructure spending in the TIGER acts is popular.

Bondareff and Peranich ’12 – Joan Bondareff is of counsel specializing in marine transportation, environmental and legislative issues at the Blank Rome law firm in Washington. Stephen Peranich is senior adviser in Blank Rome’s Government Relations practice [The Journal of Commerce, “US Fails Its Ports”, February 27, 2012, JOC, <http://www.blankromegr.com/siteFiles/Publications/4B042B5642B48AA2A98C6ECED7F5A70B.pdf> AD]

Two other opportunities for port funding are the ever-popular TIGER grants and port security grants. Congress appropriated $500 million for TIGER IV for fiscal 2012. Unfortunately, this is half the funds that used to be appropriated for TIGER grants. Ports can compete for TIGER grants — and have been somewhat successful in doing so — but they’re up against all other surface transportation projects, including high-speed rail that has been favored with a $100 million set-aside. TIGER has proved to be a popular and successful program that should enable ports to develop significant intermodal infrastructure projects. These projects also have the benefit of increasing jobs, which should be a goal of both political parties. But where is the commitment to funding TIGER at a level commensurate with its success?

#### Improving harbor infrastructure helps trade.

AP ’11 [Associated Press, “Deal hopes for federal port funding”, June 1, 2011, Augusta Chronicle, <http://chronicle.augusta.com/news/government/2011-06-01/deal-hopes-federal-port-funding> AD]

Deal and Atlanta Mayor Kasim Reed were pushing the Savannah project Wednesday in meetings with Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood and with Georgia's congressional delegation. Like other East Coast ports, Savannah is racing for federal funding and permits to deepen its harbor to accommodate supersized container ships expected to arrive via an expanded Panama Canal by the end of 2014. President Obama allocated $600,000 for the Savannah harbor in his proposed budget earlier this year -- enough money to keep it moving through a bottleneck of competing projects, but not nearly enough to start digging. "We are hopeful that with our congressional delegation's help we can get that number up significantly higher," Deal said. "We think if we had $70 million, that's the figure we'd probably need to go forward on a timely schedule." Deal said lawmakers also might have found a way to get the money without running afoul of Congress' ban on so-called earmark spending. Those line-item projects are typically how port projects get funded. But Republicans in Congress, under pressure from tea party activists, have agreed to a two-year moratorium on earmarks. Obama has also pledged to reject them. Deal said that's proven to be a "very practical problem" in getting funds for Savannah. However, he said, lawmakers might be able to get around the earmark ban if they can redirect money to the Savannah harbor from within the budgets proposed for agencies involved in the project -- such as the Army Corps of Engineers and the Environmental Protection Agency. "We don't know if that's possible," Deal said. "But it's something the congressional delegation said it would look at." Ultimately it's expected to cost up to $600 million to dredge 6 feet of sand and mud along more than 30 miles of the Savannah River. The federal government would foot about two-thirds of the bill. A few of the giant ships have already begun to arrive at the Savannah port via the Suez Canal. But without deeper water they can't come fully loaded and must wait until high tide to navigate the river. Reed has become one of the most avid proponents of deepening the harbor. The Atlanta mayor calls it Georgia's most important economic development project.

#### **Trade key to the economy improving.**

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development ’12 [Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, “Trade-induced economic growth boosts employment and wages”, 5/23/12, [http://www.oecd.org/document/8/0,3746,en\_21571361\_44315115\_50424378\_1\_1\_1\_1,00.html](http://www.oecd.org/document/8/0%2C3746%2Cen_21571361_44315115_50424378_1_1_1_1%2C00.html) AD]

Governments that foster open markets and resist protectionism have the best chance of stimulating inclusive economic growth and creating high-value jobs, according to a new study from 10 international organisations presented in Paris. Policy Priorities for International Trade and Jobs, launched by OECD Secretary General Angel Gurria during the annual OECD Forum, shows that protectionist and discriminatory trade measures do not protect or preserve jobs. On the contrary, closing markets is actually more likely to stifle growth and put additional pressure on labour markets. The report, a product of the International Collaborative Initiative on Trade and Employment (ICITE)\*, analyses the complex interactions between globalisation, trade and labour markets. Drawing on numerous studies covering different parts of the globe and countries at very different levels of development, the report highlights the powerful role trade can play in driving growth and improving employment. Of the 14 main studies undertaken since 2000 reviewed in the report, all 14 have concluded that trade plays an independent and positive role in raising incomes. Through its impact on productivity, trade also raises average wages. Over the 1970-2000 period, manufacturing workers in open economies benefitted from pay rates that were between 3 and 9 times greater than those in closed economies, depending on the region. In Chile, workers in the most open sectors earned on average 25% more in 2008 than those in low-openness sectors. Fears of the impact of offshoring may be exaggerated. Studies for the United Kingdom, United States, Germany and Italy demonstrate that off-shoring of intermediate goods has either no impact or, if any, a positive effect on both employment and wages. The report also shows, however, that openness to trade is not enough. Complementary policies – such as sound macroeconomic policies, a positive investment climate, flexible labour markets and adequate social safety nets – are needed to realise the full benefits of trade. “In today’s challenging policy environment of a hesitant recovery and slow job creation, market openness can be a critical element to boost growth and employment,” Mr Gurria said. “Trade liberalisation has historically gone hand in hand with better economic performance when accompanied by sound institutions and effective employment and education policies, in both developed and developing economies alike. Opening up further will benefit workers, firms and consumers.” The ICITE report debunks the principal argument against freeing up trade – the supposed impact of imports on jobs. The report says that there is no systematic link between imports and unemployment. Instead, evidence shows that in country after country, both exports and imports push productivity growth upward while helping create better skilled and higher paying jobs. Offshoring and outsourcing by developed countries – two commonly-cited negative aspects of globalisation – often complement, rather than replace domestic jobs, while creating new, higher-wage opportunities in developing countries, according to the report.

#### **Then read the Man ’12 – econ key to election.**

# Kritiks

## Cultural Hegemony

#### Airports disregard cultural destinations – shows modern man’s disregard for the past.

Aviation Environment Foundation [last cite 2007] [AEF, “WHAT ARE AN AIRPORT’S IMPACTS?”, last cite 2007, AEF, <http://www.aef.org.uk/uploads/PlanningGuide2.pdf> AD]

Heritage (or cultural) assets include archaeological remains, both above ground and buried; historic buildings and sites such including listed buildings, cemeteries, parks, village greens, bridge and canals; historic areas and landscapes; and other structures of architectural or historic merit. Heritage designations include, at the international level World Heritage Sites (e.g. Blenheim Palace); and at the national level Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Areas of Archaeological Importance, listed buildings of different grades (in decreasing order of importance Grades I, II\* and II), conservation areas, and parks and gardens of historic interest. Ancient woodlands are often valued and protected for their biodiversity, but their sheer age also gives them heritage value. The county archaeologist and local conservation officer(s) will normally keep a list and map of heritage assets, including areas with potential but not yet confirmed archaeological remains. Heritage assets can be affected by aviation and airports several ways: • They can be razed or built over to make way for airport-related development. This would happen to a number of listed buildings, for instance, if a second runway was built at Stansted; • Their structure can be affected by vibrations from aircraft or road traffic: there are concerns, for instance, that this could happen at Speke Hall, a Tudor building situated near Liverpool John Lennon Airport; • Their building materials can weather faster due to air pollution; • The vegetation of historic parks and landscapes can be harmed by air pollution: this is the case, for instance, with Hatfield Forest, a medieval forest near Stansted; • Their curtilage (the enclosed area of land surrounding a house) or geneal landscape setting can be eroded, so that one can no longer view them in context. Ideally, heritage assets should be preserved in their context, including the wider landscape in which they are seen. Mitigation (as opposed to avoidance) measures include digging up archaeological artefacts, recording them, and moving them to a museum; preserving buildings or archaeological remains in a different setting (e.g. as part of the open space in an office development, or under a car park with a raised ground floor); and taking them apart and moving them to a different location. However it is impossible to replace the sheer age of heritage assets. Often it will not be possible to mitigate impacts on them.

#### Destroying cultural heritage allows a cultural revolution to occur: this sterilizes humanity and creates a dystopia – it allows for the cultural and social elite to decide our attitudes.

Kang ’97 [Muse, “Hegemony and Cultural Revolution”, 1997, New Literary History 28.1 (1997) 69-86, <http://muse.jhu.edu.turing.library.northwestern.edu/journals/new_literary_history/v028/28.1liu.html> AD]

**In view of the tangled relationship of revolutionary traditions to contemporary cultural studies and postcolonialism, a reassessment of the relationship between Gramsci's hegemony theory and Chinese Marxist theory and practice of cultural revolution is necessary.** Such a reassessment may first of all shed light on the revolutionary "core" of Gramsci's theory, now recognized as an "analytical pluralism" in cultural studies of the industrial West. 2 A double displacement within contemporary cultural studies can thus be uncovered by contrasting Gramsci's strategies of revolution with its new academic labels and usage. The double displacement, prevalent among the academic Left of the West, involves first of all a replacement of revolutionary theory by academic theoretical discourse, and secondly a replacement of the issues of commodification and of economic and political inequality by erratic, fragmented "war of positions," "identity politics," and so on. Furthermore, Gramsci's hegemony theory and the Chinese Marxist theories and practices of cultural revolution are mutually illuminating. The Gramscian "hegemony" provides a significant frame of reference from which to reexamine Chinese revolution. In light of Gramsci's theory, a main feature of the Chinese revolutionary legacy can be seen as the construction and consolidation of a revolutionary hegemony through cultural revolution. The Chinese experience in both revolutionary and postrevolutionary periods, on the other hand, problematizes hegemony and cultural revolution as strategies to oppose capitalist modernity. China, after all, remains a socialist country where the revolutionary tradition and ideology still legitimate the social order. Simply to dismiss or displace this revolutionary tradition from a postcolonialist position helps us very little in comprehending the historical transformations that China has gone through since the late-nineteenth century. To see China's revolutionary legacy as a continuing process of constructing and consolidating a revolutionary hegemony, however, may illuminate China's own way of socialism, which differed from Russia's in the past and has not followed the track of the former Soviet Union recently. Last but not least, a comparison of Gramscian and Chinese theories of hegemony and cultural revolution may reveal their misconceptions and false resolutions, and hopefully open up a space for rethinking the structural relationship of culture, revolution, and economic-political determinations within the context of post-cold war globalization. [End Page 71]

#### **We end up with a society like Communist China – the ruling class decides how they want the current to be – even in capitalistic societies the top 1% get to decide our norms and expectations.**

Kang ’97 [Muse, “Hegemony and Cultural Revolution”, 1997, New Literary History 28.1 (1997) 69-86, <http://muse.jhu.edu.turing.library.northwestern.edu/journals/new_literary_history/v028/28.1liu.html> AD]

The Chinese revolution was conceived by Mao as an alternative to the capitalist modernity, and as such, it was limited by modernity as its condition of possibility. The recent assaults against the Chinese revolution, however, stem largely from the presumption that the Chinese revolution was an obstacle to modernity and Mao essentially an antimodern traditionalist, deeply entrenched in China's traditional culture. Mao's radical iconoclasm, of course, is interpreted as a manifestation of the "totalistic" mode of thinking inherent in China's past, as opposed to liberal, pluralistic frames of mind characteristic of the modern West. 10 But this kind of account tells us less about the Chinese revolution than about the "pluralistic frames of mind" of the narrators, who by and large still possess unchallenged power over the production of knowledge about China. One way to challenge this power, however, is to look beyond the interpretive models or "master narratives" for narrativizing China, models that take the historically specific assumptions and values of Western modernity as universally applicable and indisputable. Gramsci's hegemony theory, conceived as a critique of capitalist modernity, then, offers an alternative look at the Chinese revolution. Furthermore, it helps to reevaluate the relationship of modernity and revolution. 11 As Raymond Williams puts it, the concept of "hegemony" "affects thinking about revolution in that it stresses not only the transfer of political and economic power, but the overthrow of a specific hegemony: that is to say an integral form of class rule which exists not only in political and economic institutions and relationships but also in active forms of experience and consciousness." 12 Mao Zedong's theory of revolution made precisely such "hegemony" central to its strategy. He focused on the transformation of the peasants and the vast rural areas into the material forces and bases of revolution. For Mao, a key issue was how to translate Marxist principles into concrete practices of revolution. Mao's solution of "making Marxism Chinese," or Makesizhuyi zhongguohua (sinification of Marxism) was to endow the urban, cosmopolitan, and foreign thought, that is, classical Marxism, with a "national form," that is, a form that in its rural, nativist, national-popular incarnations was accessible and acceptable by the peasants, and operative as a pragmatic, ideological guide for action. 13 It can be argued that "national form" lies at the heart of Mao Zedong's project of "making Marxism Chinese," in which the establishment of revolutionary hegemony has had the highest priority. In other words, the question of cultural and aesthetic formation ("national form") was elevated to the center of revolutionary strategies for creating a Chinese Marxism in a vernacular and nationalist version, [End Page 79] in order to instill revolutionary consciousness into the peasants and mobilize them in the revolutionary struggles. However, as cultural and aesthetic formations involve the essential problem of consciousness and subjectivity, the staggering absence of any theorization of subjectivity by Mao left a major lacuna in his whole project of revolution and hegemony.

#### **And, this attitude justifies a destruction of other cultures.**

Kang ’97 [Muse, “Hegemony and Cultural Revolution”, 1997, New Literary History 28.1 (1997) 69-86, <http://muse.jhu.edu.turing.library.northwestern.edu/journals/new_literary_history/v028/28.1liu.html> AD]

Western cultural domination and colonization in the Third World have become the principal targets of attacks by postcolonial critics. China, like the Arab countries, India, and other non-Western states, has experienced in its passage to modernity cultural intrusion and domination from the West. But this Western domination has been inseparable from Chinese modernity since the May Fourth (1919) movement of enlightenment and cultural revolution, which drew primarily on Western ideas and models. The Chinese revolution, too, had as an essential component of its modernity Western revolutionary theories and practices, Marxism, and the Russian October Revolution in particular. Now the radical May Fourth revolutionists are said to have fallen victim to the Western totalizing "master narratives" and "epistemic violence" that denied native voices and forms of discourse. 3 But such a description simply ignores the fact that the Chinese revolutionary tradition is characterized precisely by its native and indigenous reconstruction of an exogenous system of thought, namely Marxism. This fact is crucial in that the native, indigenous reconstruction of Marxism in China corresponds significantly to Gramsci's hegemony theory and notions of the national-popular, which constitute a theoretical basis for postcolonialism. [End Page 72]

# COUNTERPLAN NOTES

There are a few options for a counterplan:

-GENERAL CP’S

-Bikes CP: Riding bicycles apparently solves for climate adaptation.

-States CP: This card alone doesn’t really do much, so I’ve added it to the other states CP’s below.

-XO CP: Just one card – the president does the plan.

-ROADS SPECIFIC CP’S

-States CP – Roads Specific: The 50 states separately invest in maintaining and fixing the roads and highways. Utt has some pretty good reasons as to why the FG itself shouldn’t work on the highway.

-AIRLINE EMISSIONS SPECIFIC CP’S

-Market-Based CP – General: This is mostly just a time-suck kind of CP. Market-based approaches to solving airline emissions include a cap-and-trade program or an emissions tax – you, conversely, could just use this card as block solvency extensions to either the c-and-t CP or emissions tax CP.

-Cap-and-Trade CP: The USFG institutes a cap-and-trade program in order to solve emissions problems in the US – these emissions problems are within the airline industry. The cap-and-trade CP is probably the best CP in this file.

-Emissions Tax CP: The USFG institutes an emissions tax in order to solve airline emissions.

-Subsidies CP: The USFG issues incentives to reduce airline emissions.

-Tech Standards CP: The USFG tells airline industries which tech they can and cannot use in order to reduce emissions.

-States CP – Cap-and-Trade Specific: The 50 states do the cap-and-trade program. You can also use the generic cap-and-trade CP cards in your speeches and read the states solve cards in addition to that.

# CP’s – General

## Bikes CP

#### Text: The United States Federal Government should enforce investment in bicycle development.

#### Cycling reduces carbon emissions with multiple benefits – UK proves

Adonis, 9

(The Lord Adonis, UK Secretary of State for Transport, Department for Transport, “Low Carbon Transport: A Greener Future A Carbon Reduction Strategy for Transport, July 2009, <http://www.official-documents.gov.uk/document/cm76/7682/7682.pdf>)

Cycling is a viable alternative to car journeys for ¶ many short trips. As well as reducing emissions, ¶ cycling can bring additional benefits for health, ¶ reduced congestion on our roads and improved ¶ local air quality, making our towns and cities more ¶ pleasant places to live. We are providing ¶ investment and support to 18 Cycling ¶ Demonstration Towns and Cities across England.¶ Our Sustainable Travel Towns programme has pioneered an approach that ¶ includes a combination of travel planning, improved information and marketing, as ¶ well as organising and providing new travel services. Following the success of this ¶ programme, in May 2009 we announced that large urban areas across England are ¶ being given the chance to bid to become the country's first Sustainable Travel City.¶ We are also committed to developing a National Cycle Plan to further promote ¶ cycling as a mainstream form of personal transport. We will complement this with ¶ a new active transport strategy, laying out plans to encourage low carbon ¶ transport options that also promote personal health and wellbeing.

## States CP

#### Text: The fifty states of the United States should each increase its transportation infrastructure investment for climate adaptation including changes in design, construction, and maintenance of infrastructure.

#### **States can adopt a climate adaptation plan.**

Meyer et al. 09, (Michael Frederick R. Dickerson Professor, School of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, PhD Michael Flood Senior Planner at Parsons Brinckerhoff ¶ Chris Dorney Transportation/Land Use Planner at Parsons Brinckerhoff ¶ Ken Leonard Principal of Cambridge Systematics, ¶ Robert Hyman Associate at Cambride Systematics ¶ Joel Smith expert on climate change policy, lead author of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change 2001 and 2007 assessment report; the latter shared the Noble Peace Prize with former Vice President Al Gore. Vice-President of Stratus Consulting, Boulder, CO. “Climate Change and the Highway System: Impacts and Adaptation Approaches”. National Cooperative Highway Research Program. 5/6/2009 http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/nchrp/docs/NCHRP20-83%2805%29\_Task2-3SynthesisReport.pdf)

Twelve states have developed or are developing some kind of climate adaptation plan, and in ¶ another eight states an adaptation plan was recommended in the state Climate Action Plan (CAP) ¶ (see Figure 4-1). In most cases, these adaptation plans are an outgrowth of climate action planning ¶ that is primarily focused on mitigation (reducing emissions). ¶ Typically, these climate action plans are led by the governor’s office, or by the state Department of ¶ Natural Resources. In many states, the Governor issued an Executive Order that established a State ¶ Commission or Sub-Cabinet to develop a State Climate Change Plan. These states formed multistakeholder working groups to broadly address climate change impacts to the human and natural ¶ environments, with transportation as one of many components being addressed by these working ¶ groups.

#### **Climate adaption is performed by the states**

CEMA and CNRA April 2012 [<http://resources.ca.gov/climate_adaptation/docs/APG_-_PUBLIC_DRAFT_4.9.12_small.pdf> California Emergency management agency and California natural Recources Agency April 2012]

**State actions will play an important role in** strengthening California’s resilience to projected **climate impacts** and associated secondary consequences. However, many of the development characteristics most important for reducing climate risks, such as land use, are locally controlled. **Local and regional jurisdictions are critical collaborators in preparing for** unavoidable **climate impacts**. The degree to which communities are at risk to secondary climate impacts is influenced by local conditions including culture and community values, economic base, ecological setting, and local resources. As a result, there is no single “right” adaptation strategy. **The best strategies for adapting to climate change must vary with local needs and context.**

## XO CP

#### Text: The president of the United States should issue an executive order to increase US transportation infrastructure investment for climate adaptation including changes in design, construction, and maintenance of infrastructure.

#### The president is able to take various actions just by XO

BPC, 10 (Bipartisan Policy Center; non-profit and politically-balanced organization, public policy think tank; “Transportation Adaptation to Global Climate Change;” 1/21/10; http://bipartisanpolicy.org/sites/default/files/Transportation%20Adaptation%20(3).pdf)

Some transportation resilience actions can be ¶ implemented simply by Executive Order of the ¶ President. Some actions particularly suited for ¶ executive policy are:¶ B Address project development/National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) considerations. Adaptation and resiliency considerations can permeate ¶ all aspects of the NEPA process, from shaping a ¶ project’s pur pose to its mitigation. Transportation and other planning and resource agencies ¶ will require guidance and support in developing feasible and appropriate techniques to ¶ incorporate climate information at the project ¶ level. This could include developing nationally ¶ standardized practice and data sources related to ¶ emerging climate impact information (including mapping data needs), developing guidance ¶ on the incorporation of climate considerations ¶ into project development, and developing ¶ guidance on edu cating stakeholders on climate ¶ adaptation considerations. ¶ B Incorporate climate risk analysis into Federal ¶ Infrastructure Investment policies. Revise Federal Infrastructure Investment Executive Order(s) ¶ to explicitly incorporate climate-related risk ¶ analysis into infrastructure investment plans and ¶ decision-making. This could include developing ¶ inventories of transportation facilities vulnerable to climate change, and developing updated ¶ construction standards to address transportation ¶ and other infrastructure in vulnerable locations. B Conduct a federal interagency assessment to develop and prioritize a climate adapta tion research, ¶ data, and policy agenda. This could be an important precursor to funding of a recommended ¶ interagency, interdisciplinary, long-term, ¶ national climate-adaptation research program in ¶ transportation and climate legislation this year

# CP – Roads Specific

## States CP – Roads Specific

#### Text: The fifty states of the United States should each invest in the development of roads and highways as a means of climate adaptation.

### FG fails

#### Federal government fails – multiple reasons:

#### Regional spending inequity

Utt 12 (Ronald Utt, PhD; Senior Research Fellow in the Thomas A Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies at The Heritage Foundation; “’Turn Back’ Transportation to the States;” February 7, 2012; http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2012/02/turn-back-transportation-to-the-states)

Chief among the ongoing sources of friction have been the pervasive regional spending inequities embodied in the federal program and maintained in all of its subsequent reauthorizations. Because of the current law’s flawed allocation formulas, about half of the states (called donors and located mostly in the South and Great Lakes region) pay proportionately more into the trust fund than they get back, and vice versa for the other half (called donees and located mostly in the Northeast).¶ On a share-by-share basis, some donor states such as Texas, Florida, and South Carolina get less than an 85 percent share of the highway money they pay in, while New York, Connecticut, and Massachusetts get more than 100 percent. As bad as this disparity is, the allocation of federal transit spending is even more inequitable.[1] Many highway donor states are also transit donor states, receiving much less for transit projects than they paid into the transit account, while many of the highway donee states are also transit donees.¶ In response to growing complaints from donor states about the pervasive unfairness of the program, Congress has proposed a number of halfhearted efforts to accommodate the donor states. The current goal in draft legislation (S. 1813) is to achieve at least a 95 percent return, but that still leaves hundreds of millions of dollars on the table for the perennially shortchanged donor states. [2] The equity issue has since become more complicated as a consequence of the three general-fund bailouts of the trust fund, but the degree of inequity has not disappeared.

#### Leaks and diversions

Utt 12 (Ronald Utt, PhD; Senior Research Fellow in the Thomas A Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies at The Heritage Foundation; “’Turn Back’ Transportation to the States;” February 7, 2012; http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2012/02/turn-back-transportation-to-the-states)

For the first several decades of the federal highway program’s existence, virtually all of its energy and resources were devoted to the task it was created to fulfill: building a 42,000-mile high-speed, limited-access interstate highway system from coast to coast and border to border, connecting all of the major cities in between. That task was largely completed by the early 1980s, and with no compelling and clear objective to guide the highway program in the aftermath of this accomplishment, successive Congresses began the process of diverting the trust fund’s resources to other purposes.¶ While the diversions focused initially on non-road, transportation-related investments such as urban transit programs, non-transportation projects such as nature trails, museums, flower plantings, metropolitan planning organizations, bicycles, Appalachian regional development programs, parking lots, university research, thousands of earmarks, and historic renovation became eligible over time for financial support from the highway trust fund. As a consequence of this growing number of diversions, as much as 35 percent of federal fuel tax revenues paid by the motorists is spent on projects unrelated to general-purpose roads.¶ The magnitude of these leakages also undermines assertions by many in Congress and the road-building industry that road conditions and congestion can be improved if fuel taxes are increased to allow for more highway spending. To the extent that the existing leakages maintain their share of total trust fund resources—as they traditionally do—a substantial portion of any increase in fuel tax revenues will be diverted to spending programs that offer little or no benefit to general motorists or to improvements in capacity, safety, or congestion mitigation. Under the allocations mandated by existing law, an additional dollar raised in tax revenues would provide only an extra 65 cents for roads because 35 percent would be siphoned off for other purposes.

#### Regulatory mandates

Utt 12 (Ronald Utt, PhD; Senior Research Fellow in the Thomas A Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies at The Heritage Foundation; “’Turn Back’ Transportation to the States;” February 7, 2012; http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2012/02/turn-back-transportation-to-the-states)

Over time, the highway program has been subject to a number of regulatory burdens. Many of these burdens are designed to assist select segments of the workforce in achieving goals other than, and often in conflict with, enhanced mobility. These regulations have added substantially to project costs and/or project delays. Such regulations include the Davis–Bacon Act, Section 13(c) of the Urban Mass Transit Act, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), small-business and minority contracting requirements, and Buy America provisions. Federal regulations also discourage and complicate the use of public–private partnerships; tolled express lanes; conversion of HOV (high occupancy vehicle) lanes to HOT (high occupancy toll) lanes; and general tolling of the interstate system even though these highways are owned by the states.¶ Threats to withhold federal transportation money have also been used to force states and regions to adopt regulations that foster other federal goals—a tactic used by the Clinton Administration in its attempts to force Atlanta to change its land-use policies. Currently, a state’s failure to meet federal environmental standards could lead to a suspension of federal transportation funds.

### States solve

#### **States can adopt a climate adaptation plan**

Meyer et al. 09, (Michael Frederick R. Dickerson Professor, School of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, PhD Michael Flood Senior Planner at Parsons Brinckerhoff ¶ Chris Dorney Transportation/Land Use Planner at Parsons Brinckerhoff ¶ Ken Leonard Principal of Cambridge Systematics, ¶ Robert Hyman Associate at Cambride Systematics ¶ Joel Smith expert on climate change policy, lead author of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change 2001 and 2007 assessment report; the latter shared the Noble Peace Prize with former Vice President Al Gore. Vice-President of Stratus Consulting, Boulder, CO. “Climate Change and the Highway System: Impacts and Adaptation Approaches”. National Cooperative Highway Research Program. 5/6/2009 http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/nchrp/docs/NCHRP20-83%2805%29\_Task2-3SynthesisReport.pdf)

Twelve states have developed or are developing some kind of climate adaptation plan, and in ¶ another eight states an adaptation plan was recommended in the state Climate Action Plan (CAP) ¶ (see Figure 4-1). In most cases, these adaptation plans are an outgrowth of climate action planning ¶ that is primarily focused on mitigation (reducing emissions). ¶ Typically, these climate action plans are led by the governor’s office, or by the state Department of ¶ Natural Resources. In many states, the Governor issued an Executive Order that established a State ¶ Commission or Sub-Cabinet to develop a State Climate Change Plan. These states formed multistakeholder working groups to broadly address climate change impacts to the human and natural ¶ environments, with transportation as one of many components being addressed by these working ¶ groups.

#### **Climate adaption is performed by the states**

CEMA and CNRA April 2012 [<http://resources.ca.gov/climate_adaptation/docs/APG_-_PUBLIC_DRAFT_4.9.12_small.pdf> California Emergency management agency and California natural Recources Agency April 2012]

**State actions will play an important role in** strengthening California’s resilience to projected **climate impacts** and associated secondary consequences. However, many of the development characteristics most important for reducing climate risks, such as land use, are locally controlled. **Local and regional jurisdictions are critical collaborators in preparing for** unavoidable **climate impacts**. The degree to which communities are at risk to secondary climate impacts is influenced by local conditions including culture and community values, economic base, ecological setting, and local resources. As a result, there is no single “right” adaptation strategy. **The best strategies for adapting to climate change must vary with local needs and context.**

#### States would turn the highway idea back to where it should be

Utt 12 (Ronald Utt, PhD; Senior Research Fellow in the Thomas A Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies at The Heritage Foundation; “’Turn Back’ Transportation to the States;” February 7, 2012; http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2012/02/turn-back-transportation-to-the-states)

The federal transportation program has lost its way: It is less and less about transportation and mobility and, for the most part, has evolved into a costly spending program distributing financial rewards to a growing number of influential constituencies on a pay-to-play basis.

One reform proposal that could substantially change this is legislation to “turn back” the federal highway program to the states, where it once was lodged. Arguing that the program was created to build the interstate highway system—a goal that was met in the early 1980s—turnback advocates believe it is time to declare victory and shift the resources back to the states, recognizing that today’s surface transportation problems are largely local or regional in nature and that a Washington-based, centrally planned, command-and-control program has little to offer in the way of solutions.

#### States can spend how they like

Utt 12 (Ronald Utt, PhD; Senior Research Fellow in the Thomas A Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies at The Heritage Foundation; “’Turn Back’ Transportation to the States;” February 7, 2012; http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2012/02/turn-back-transportation-to-the-states)

Now free of the federal one-size-fits-all program, states could tailor their spending and investment strategies to their particular needs, not those of a Washington bureaucracy or the privileged constituencies appended to it like barnacles on an aging ship. States would also be free of the costly and time-consuming regulatory mandates that the federal program now imposes on their transportation programs.

#### States would fix roads at a much lower cost

Utt 12 (Ronald Utt, PhD; Senior Research Fellow in the Thomas A Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies at The Heritage Foundation; “’Turn Back’ Transportation to the States;” February 7, 2012; http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2012/02/turn-back-transportation-to-the-states)

Finally, as a consequence of these improvements and the more efficient use of resources that turnback would yield, transportation service for the traveling public would improve at a much lower cost than the attainment of that same measure of improvement would have required under the old system. At the same time, and once an improved economy restores fuel tax revenues to their long-run trend, donor states that lose money under the current system would be made whole, while donee states would no longer benefit from undeserved subsidies.

# CP’s – Airline Emissions Specific

## Market-Based CP – General

#### Text: The United States Federal Government should enforce market-based policies in order to reduce emissions as a means of climate adaptation.

### Reduces emissions

#### Market-Based policies incentivize airlines to reduce emissions – cap-and-trade or subsidy programs are examples

GAO, 09 (United States Government Accountability Office; the audit, evaluation, and investigative arm of the US Congress; “Aviation and Climate Change: Aircraft Emissions Expected to Grow, but Technological and Operational Improvements and Government Policies Can Help Control Emissions”; June 2009; http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d09554.pdf)

Economists and other experts we interviewed stated that establishing a price on greenhouse gas emissions through market-based policies, such as a cap-and-trade program or a tax on emissions from commercial aircraft and other sources, would provide these sources with an economic incentive to reduce their emissions. Generally, a cap-and-trade program or an emissions tax (for example, on carbon dioxide) can achieve emissions reductions at less cost than other policies because they would give firms and consumers the flexibility to decide when and how to reduce their emissions. Many experts we surveyed said that establishing a price on emissions through a cap-and-trade program or a tax would help promote the development and adoption of a number of low-emissions technologies for airlines, including open rotor engines and blended wing-body aircraft. Another market-based policy, subsidy programs, such as a payment per unit of emissions reduction, can in principle provide incentives for firms and consumers to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions. However, subsidy programs need to be financed—for example through existing taxes or by raising taxes—and can create perverse incentives resulting in higher emissions.

## Cap-and-Trade CP

The cap-and-trade process is used to control pollution by providing economic incentives for achieving reductions in the emissions of pollutants. The government sets up a cap on the amount of a pollutant that can be emitted. The cap is then sold to businesses and groups in the form of emissions permits. The businesses are then allowed to trade the permits amongst themselves.

#### Text: The United States Federal Government should begin a cap-and-trade program as a means of climate adaptation.

### Solvency

#### A cap-and-trade program would be the lowest-cost way to reduce emissions

GAO, 09 (United States Government Accountability Office; the audit, evaluation, and investigative arm of the US Congress; “Aviation and Climate Change: Aircraft Emissions Expected to Grow, but Technological and Operational Improvements and Government Policies Can Help Control Emissions”; June 2009; http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d09554.pdf)

One market-based option for controlling emissions is a cap-and-trade program. Also known as an emissions trading program, a cap-and-trade program would limit the total amount of emissions from regulated sources. These sources would receive, from the government, allowances to emit up to a specific limit—the “cap.” The government could sell the allowances through an auction or provide them free of charge (or some combination of the two). In addition, the government would establish a market under which the regulated sources could buy and sell allowances with one another. Sources that can reduce emissions at the lowest cost could sell their allowances to other sources with higher emissions reduction costs. In this way, the market would establish an allowance price, which would represent the price of carbon dioxide (or other greenhouse gas) emissions. Generally, according to economists, by allowing sources to trade allowances, policy makers can achieve emissions reductions at the lowest cost.

#### Cap-and-trade can be used in an upstream or downstream approach – both solve for airline fuel reduction

GAO, 09 (United States Government Accountability Office; the audit, evaluation, and investigative arm of the US Congress; “Aviation and Climate Change: Aircraft Emissions Expected to Grow, but Technological and Operational Improvements and Government Policies Can Help Control Emissions”; June 2009; http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d09554.pdf)

A cap-and-trade program can be designed to cap emissions at different points in the economy. For example, a cap-and-trade program could be designed to cap “upstream” sources like fuel processors, extractors, and importers. Under this approach, a cap would be set on the emissions potential that is inherent in the fossil fuel. The upstream cap would restrain the supply and increase the prices of fossil fuels and thus the price of jet fuel relative to less carbon-intensive alternatives. Alternatively, under a “downstream” program, direct emitters, such as commercial airlines, would be required to hold allowances equal to their total carbon emissions each year. (See fig. 9.) However, economic research indicates that both types of programs would provide commercial airlines with an incentive to reduce their fuel consumption in the most cost-effective way for each airline, such as by reducing weight, consolidating flights, or using more fuel-efficient aircraft, if they were included in such a program. To the extent that airlines would pass along any program costs to customers through higher passenger fares and shipping rates, travelers and shippers could respond in various ways, including by traveling less frequently or using a different, cheaper transportation mode.51

#### Cap-and-trade provides greatest possibility of emission reduction

GAO, 09 (United States Government Accountability Office; the audit, evaluation, and investigative arm of the US Congress; “Aviation and Climate Change: Aircraft Emissions Expected to Grow, but Technological and Operational Improvements and Government Policies Can Help Control Emissions”; June 2009; http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d09554.pdf)

The effectiveness of a cap-and-trade program in balancing the benefits and costs of the emission reductions could depend on factors included in its design. Generally, by establishing an upper limit on total emissions from regulated sources, a cap-and-trade program can provide greater certainty than other policies (for example, an emissions tax) that emissions will be reduced to the desired level. Regulated sources would be required to hold allowances equal to their total emissions, regardless of the cost. However, allowance prices could be volatile, depending on factors such as changes in energy prices, available technologies, and weather,52 making it more expensive for sources to meet the cap. To limit price volatility, a cost-containment mechanism called a “safety valve” could be incorporated into the cap-and-trade program to establish a ceiling on the price of allowances. For example, if allowance prices rose to the safety-valve price, the government could sell regulated sources as many allowances as they would like to buy at the safety-valve price.53 Although the safety valve could limit price spikes, the emissions cap would be exceeded if the safety valve were triggered.

#### The EU has begun to implement cap-and-trade programs

GAO, 09 (United States Government Accountability Office; the audit, evaluation, and investigative arm of the US Congress; “Aviation and Climate Change: Aircraft Emissions Expected to Grow, but Technological and Operational Improvements and Government Policies Can Help Control Emissions”; June 2009; http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d09554.pdf)

Some countries are planning to address aviation emissions through cap-and-trade programs. The European Union originally implemented the EU ETS in 2005, covering industries representing about 50 percent of its carbon dioxide emissions.57 The EU is planning on including all covered flights by aircraft operators flying into or out of EU airports, starting in 2012.58 Please see appendix I for more details on the EU ETS, including a comprehensive discussion of the potential legal implications and stakeholders’ positions on this new framework. Other countries are considering cap-and-trade programs that would affect the aviation sector.59

### AT: Creates price volatility

#### To prevent price volatility, the cap-and-trade program would include a safety valve

GAO, 09 (United States Government Accountability Office; the audit, evaluation, and investigative arm of the US Congress; “Aviation and Climate Change: Aircraft Emissions Expected to Grow, but Technological and Operational Improvements and Government Policies Can Help Control Emissions”; June 2009; http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d09554.pdf)

The effectiveness of a cap-and-trade program in balancing the benefits and costs of the emission reductions could depend on factors included in its design. Generally, by establishing an upper limit on total emissions from regulated sources, a cap-and-trade program can provide greater certainty than other policies (for example, an emissions tax) that emissions will be reduced to the desired level. Regulated sources would be required to hold allowances equal to their total emissions, regardless of the cost. However, allowance prices could be volatile, depending on factors such as changes in energy prices, available technologies, and weather,52 making it more expensive for sources to meet the cap. To limit price volatility, a cost-containment mechanism called a “safety valve” could be incorporated into the cap-and-trade program to establish a ceiling on the price of allowances. For example, if allowance prices rose to the safety-valve price, the government could sell regulated sources as many allowances as they would like to buy at the safety-valve price.53 Although the safety valve could limit price spikes, the emissions cap would be exceeded if the safety valve were triggered.

### AT: Hurts airline industry

#### Cap-and-trade and emission tax won’t affect the industry at all

GAO, 09 (United States Government Accountability Office; the audit, evaluation, and investigative arm of the US Congress; “Aviation and Climate Change: Aircraft Emissions Expected to Grow, but Technological and Operational Improvements and Government Policies Can Help Control Emissions”; June 2009; http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d09554.pdf)

Both a cap-and-trade program and an emissions tax would impose costs on the aviation sector and other users of carbon-based fuels. The extent to which the costs associated with an emissions control program are incurred by commercial airlines and passed on will depend on a number of economic factors, such as the level of market competition and the responsiveness of passengers to changes in price. Officials of some industry organizations we met with said that because airlines are in a competitive industry with a high elasticity of demand,65 they are constrained in passing on their costs, and the costs to industry likely will be large. The Association of European Airlines reported that airlines will have very limited ability to pass on the costs of the EU ETS. Furthermore, the International Air Transport Association has estimated that the costs to the industry of complying with the EU ETS will be €3.5 billion in 2012,66 with annual costs subsequently increasing.67 Others we interviewed, however, stated that airlines will be able to pass on costs, and the increases in ticket prices will not be large. For example, the EU estimates that airlines will be able to pass on most of the costs of their compliance with the EU ETS, which will result in an average ticket price increase of €9 on a medium-haul flight.68 However, the revenue generated by the tax or by auctioning allowances could be used to lessen the overall impact on the economy, or the impact on certain groups (for example, low income) or sectors of the economy by, for example, reducing other taxes.69

Finally, according to some airline industry representatives, a program to control greenhouse gas emissions would add to the financial burden the aviation industry and its consumers already face with respect to other taxes and fees. For example, passenger tickets in the United States are subject to a federal passenger ticket tax of 7.5 percent, a segment charge of $3.40 per flight segment, and fees for security and airport facilities (up to $4.50 per airport). In addition, international flights are subject to departure taxes and customs-related fees. However, none of these taxes and fees attempt to account for the cost of greenhouse gas emissions, as a tax or cap-and-trade program would do. In addition, the revenue generated from an emissions tax or by auctioning allowances under a cap-and-trade program, could be used to offset other taxes, thereby lessening the economic impact of the program.

## Emissions Tax CP

An emissions tax would be like a carbon tax that the government would issue for every ton of pollutant that’s emitted.

#### Text: The United States Federal Government should begin an emissions tax as a means of climate adaptation.

### Solvency

#### An emissions tax would also reduce emissions in an upstream way

GAO, 09 (United States Government Accountability Office; the audit, evaluation, and investigative arm of the US Congress; “Aviation and Climate Change: Aircraft Emissions Expected to Grow, but Technological and Operational Improvements and Government Policies Can Help Control Emissions”; June 2009; http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d09554.pdf)

An emissions tax is another market-based policy that could be used to reduce emissions from commercial aviation and other emissions sources. Under a tax on carbon dioxide (or other greenhouse gas), the government would levy a fee for every ton of carbon dioxide emitted. Similar to a cap-and-trade program, a tax would provide a price signal to commercial airlines and other emission sources, creating an economic incentive for them to reduce their emissions. A carbon tax could be applied to “upstream” sources such as fuel producers, which may in turn pass along the tax in the form of higher prices to fuel purchasers, including commercial airlines. Similar to a cap-and-trade program, emissions taxes would provide regulated sources including commercial airlines with an incentive to reduce emissions in the most cost-effective way, which might include reducing weight, consolidating flights, or using more fuel-efficient aircraft.

#### An emissions tax would be the most cost-effective way to reduce emissions

GAO, 09 (United States Government Accountability Office; the audit, evaluation, and investigative arm of the US Congress; “Aviation and Climate Change: Aircraft Emissions Expected to Grow, but Technological and Operational Improvements and Government Policies Can Help Control Emissions”; June 2009; http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d09554.pdf)

An emissions tax is another market-based policy that could be used to reduce emissions from commercial aviation and other emissions sources. Under a tax on carbon dioxide (or other greenhouse gas), the government would levy a fee for every ton of carbon dioxide emitted. Similar to a cap-and-trade program, a tax would provide a price signal to commercial airlines and other emission sources, creating an economic incentive for them to reduce their emissions. A carbon tax could be applied to “upstream” sources such as fuel producers, which may in turn pass along the tax in the form of higher prices to fuel purchasers, including commercial airlines. Similar to a cap-and-trade program, emissions taxes would provide regulated sources including commercial airlines with an incentive to reduce emissions in the most cost-effective way, which might include reducing weight, consolidating flights, or using more fuel-efficient aircraft.

### Solves better than Cap-and-Trade

#### Emissions tax would be better than cap-and-trade when it comes to social benefits and costs

GAO, 09 (United States Government Accountability Office; the audit, evaluation, and investigative arm of the US Congress; “Aviation and Climate Change: Aircraft Emissions Expected to Grow, but Technological and Operational Improvements and Government Policies Can Help Control Emissions”; June 2009; http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d09554.pdf)

Economic research indicates that an emissions tax is generally a more economically efficient policy tool to address greenhouse gas emissions than other policies, including a cap-and-trade program, because it would better balance the social benefits and costs associated with the emissions reductions. In addition, compared to a cap-and-trade program, an emissions tax would provide greater certainty as to the price of emissions. However, it would in concept provide less certainty about emissions reductions because the reductions would depend on the level of the tax and how firms and consumers respond to the tax.64

### AT: Hurts airline industry

#### Cap-and-trade and emission tax won’t affect the industry at all

GAO, 09 (United States Government Accountability Office; the audit, evaluation, and investigative arm of the US Congress; “Aviation and Climate Change: Aircraft Emissions Expected to Grow, but Technological and Operational Improvements and Government Policies Can Help Control Emissions”; June 2009; http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d09554.pdf)

Both a cap-and-trade program and an emissions tax would impose costs on the aviation sector and other users of carbon-based fuels. The extent to which the costs associated with an emissions control program are incurred by commercial airlines and passed on will depend on a number of economic factors, such as the level of market competition and the responsiveness of passengers to changes in price. Officials of some industry organizations we met with said that because airlines are in a competitive industry with a high elasticity of demand,65 they are constrained in passing on their costs, and the costs to industry likely will be large. The Association of European Airlines reported that airlines will have very limited ability to pass on the costs of the EU ETS. Furthermore, the International Air Transport Association has estimated that the costs to the industry of complying with the EU ETS will be €3.5 billion in 2012,66 with annual costs subsequently increasing.67 Others we interviewed, however, stated that airlines will be able to pass on costs, and the increases in ticket prices will not be large. For example, the EU estimates that airlines will be able to pass on most of the costs of their compliance with the EU ETS, which will result in an average ticket price increase of €9 on a medium-haul flight.68 However, the revenue generated by the tax or by auctioning allowances could be used to lessen the overall impact on the economy, or the impact on certain groups (for example, low income) or sectors of the economy by, for example, reducing other taxes.69

Finally, according to some airline industry representatives, a program to control greenhouse gas emissions would add to the financial burden the aviation industry and its consumers already face with respect to other taxes and fees. For example, passenger tickets in the United States are subject to a federal passenger ticket tax of 7.5 percent, a segment charge of $3.40 per flight segment, and fees for security and airport facilities (up to $4.50 per airport). In addition, international flights are subject to departure taxes and customs-related fees. However, none of these taxes and fees attempt to account for the cost of greenhouse gas emissions, as a tax or cap-and-trade program would do. In addition, the revenue generated from an emissions tax or by auctioning allowances under a cap-and-trade program, could be used to offset other taxes, thereby lessening the economic impact of the program.

## Subsidies CP

Subsidies are incentives that the government issues that would encourage industries to use more environmentally-friendly technologies.

#### Text: The United States Federal Government should issue subsidies as a means of climate adaptation.

### Solvency

#### Subsidies would reduce emissions and encourage industries to adopt more low-emission technologies

GAO, 09 (United States Government Accountability Office; the audit, evaluation, and investigative arm of the US Congress; “Aviation and Climate Change: Aircraft Emissions Expected to Grow, but Technological and Operational Improvements and Government Policies Can Help Control Emissions”; June 2009; http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d09554.pdf)

Subsidies are another market-based instrument that could, in principle, provide incentives for sources to reduce their emissions. For example, experts we met with said that the government could use subsidies to encourage industry and others to adopt existing low-emissions technologies and improvements, such as winglets. In addition, some experts told us that NextGen-related technologies are candidates for subsidies because of the high costs of the technologies and the benefits that they will provide to the national airspace system. According to IPCC, subsidies can encourage the diffusion of new low-emissions technologies and can effectively reduce emissions. For example, as newer, more fuel-efficient engines are developed and become commercially available, subsidies or tax credits could lower their relative costs and encourage airlines to purchase them.

#### Current subsidy programs need to be refinanced

GAO, 09 (United States Government Accountability Office; the audit, evaluation, and investigative arm of the US Congress; “Aviation and Climate Change: Aircraft Emissions Expected to Grow, but Technological and Operational Improvements and Government Policies Can Help Control Emissions”; June 2009; http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d09554.pdf)

Although subsidies are similar to taxes, economic research indicates that some subsidy programs can be economically inefficient, and need to be financed (for example, using current tax revenue or by raising taxes). For example, although some subsidy programs could lead to emissions reductions from individual sources, they may also result in an overall increase by encouraging some firms to remain in business longer than they would have under other policies such as an emissions tax.

## Tech Standards CP

Tech standards would mean that the government or whoever would tell airlines which technologies they can and cannot use

#### Text: The United States Federal Government should implement tech standards as a means of climate adaptation.

### Solvency

#### Standards which mandate or promote certain technologies reduces cost of compliance and avoids aviation safety implications

GAO, 09 (United States Government Accountability Office; the audit, evaluation, and investigative arm of the US Congress; “Aviation and Climate Change: Aircraft Emissions Expected to Grow, but Technological and Operational Improvements and Government Policies Can Help Control Emissions”; June 2009; http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d09554.pdf)

Mandating the use of certain technologies or placing emissions limits on aircraft and aircraft engines are also potential options for governments to address aircraft emissions. Standards include both technology standards, which mandate a specific control technology such as a particular fuel-efficient engine, and performance standards, which may require polluters to meet an emissions standard using any available method. The flexibility in the performance standards reduces the cost of compliance compared with technology-based standards and, according to DOT, avoids potential aviation safety implications that may occur from forcing a specific technology across a wide range of operations and conditions.

## States CP – Cap-and-Trade Specific

#### Text: The fifty states of the United States should each implement a cap-and-trade program as a means of climate adaptation.

### Won’t pass in FG

#### Congress doesn’t want to pass cap-and-trade

Cart 11 (Julie Cart, on the environmental staff for theLos Angeles Times, “California becomes first state to adopt cap-and-trade program,” October 21, 2011, http://articles.latimes.com/2011/oct/21/local/la-me-cap-trade-20111021)

The California Air Resources Board on Thursday unanimously adopted the nation's first state-administered cap-and-trade regulations, a landmark set of air pollution controls to address climate change and help the state achieve its ambitious goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.¶ The complex market system for the first time puts a price on heat-trapping pollution by allowing California's dirtiest industries to trade carbon credits. The rules have been years in the making, overcoming legal challenges and an aggressive oil industry-sponsored ballot initiative.¶ The air board met in Sacramento for more than eight hours in a packed hearing room. Board members listened to sometimes scathing comments from union workers fearful of losing their jobs and a parade of industry representatives who likewise characterized the regulations as anti-business. Other speakers called the proposal historic and groundbreaking.¶ Late in the day, as the eight board members voted to approve the regulations, to scattered applause, Chairman Mary Nichols looked up and said, "We've done something important."¶ "Cap-and-trade is a new tool that for the first time allows us to reward companies for doing the right thing," she added.¶ Cap-and-trade is the centerpiece of AB 32, California's historic climate change law that mandates a reduction in carbon pollution to 1990 levels by 2020. Beginning in 2013 the state's largest carbon emitters will be required to meet the caps or buy credits if they cannot.¶ A second phase of compliance begins in 2015 and is expected to include 85% of California's emissions sources.¶ Former Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger, a strong supporter of the original legislation, applauded the vote in a statement released Thursday evening.¶ "Today's adoption of a cap-and-trade program is a major milestone for California's continued leadership on reducing the world's greenhouse gases. As I said both when we signed the legislation in 2006, and when we fought to protect it last year when Texas oil companies attempted to overturn it with Proposition 23, the most critical phase in the fight against climate change is diligently, aggressively, and correctly implementing this law."¶ The vote was closely watched by other states and, if the program is deemed successful, it will likely serve as a model for future markets. The U.S. Congress has rejected a similar national program.¶ "If California gets it right, others will see it's possible to regulate greenhouse gas emissions while protecting its economy and while fostering a new green economy and industry," said Gary Gero, president of the L.A.-based Climate Action Reserve, a nonprofit that runs North America's largest carbon offset registry. "People watch what California does and do emulate it. Future cap-and-trade programs are going to pick up a lot of the design features we are implementing here. You'll see regional programs develop. They will put pressure on the federal government. It will send out ripples around the country."

#### Republican Congressmen don’t want the cap and trade

Buntin 10 (John Buntin; staff writer for Governing Magazines, covers health care, public safety, and urban affairs; “A Cap-and-Trade Program That Works;” December, 2010; http://www.governing.com/topics/energy-env/cap-trade-program-that-works.html)

But something strange happened on the way to a national cap-and-trade system: At the very moment when a state-created regional program has demonstrated that the method can work, policymakers in Washington are turning against it. What started as a conservative idea has become an expletive for many in the Republican Party. According to an analysis conducted by the liberal Center for American Progress, 86 of the 100 freshmen Republicans elected to Congress in November are opposed to any climate change legislation that would increase government revenue. At a post-election press conference, even President Barack Obama conceded that cap and trade was effectively dead. That leaves the states participating in RGGI -- as well as the states participating in other regional climate change initiatives, such as the Western Climate Initiative and the Midwestern Greenhouse Gas Reduction Accord -- facing a difficult question: Should states build what the federal government will not?

### States solve

#### **States can adopt a climate adaptation plan.**

Meyer et al. 09, (Michael Frederick R. Dickerson Professor, School of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, PhD Michael Flood Senior Planner at Parsons Brinckerhoff ¶ Chris Dorney Transportation/Land Use Planner at Parsons Brinckerhoff ¶ Ken Leonard Principal of Cambridge Systematics, ¶ Robert Hyman Associate at Cambride Systematics ¶ Joel Smith expert on climate change policy, lead author of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change 2001 and 2007 assessment report; the latter shared the Noble Peace Prize with former Vice President Al Gore. Vice-President of Stratus Consulting, Boulder, CO. “Climate Change and the Highway System: Impacts and Adaptation Approaches”. National Cooperative Highway Research Program. 5/6/2009 http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/nchrp/docs/NCHRP20-83%2805%29\_Task2-3SynthesisReport.pdf)

Twelve states have developed or are developing some kind of climate adaptation plan, and in ¶ another eight states an adaptation plan was recommended in the state Climate Action Plan (CAP) ¶ (see Figure 4-1). In most cases, these adaptation plans are an outgrowth of climate action planning ¶ that is primarily focused on mitigation (reducing emissions). ¶ Typically, these climate action plans are led by the governor’s office, or by the state Department of ¶ Natural Resources. In many states, the Governor issued an Executive Order that established a State ¶ Commission or Sub-Cabinet to develop a State Climate Change Plan. These states formed multistakeholder working groups to broadly address climate change impacts to the human and natural ¶ environments, with transportation as one of many components being addressed by these working ¶ groups.

#### **Climate adaption is preformed by the states**

CEMA and CNRA April 2012 [<http://resources.ca.gov/climate_adaptation/docs/APG_-_PUBLIC_DRAFT_4.9.12_small.pdf> California Emergency management agency and California natural Recources Agency April 2012]

**State actions will play an important role in** strengthening California’s resilience to projected **climate impacts** and associated secondary consequences. However, many of the development characteristics most important for reducing climate risks, such as land use, are locally controlled. **Local and regional jurisdictions are critical collaborators in preparing for** unavoidable **climate impacts**. The degree to which communities are at risk to secondary climate impacts is influenced by local conditions including culture and community values, economic base, ecological setting, and local resources. As a result, there is no single “right” adaptation strategy. **The best strategies for adapting to climate change must vary with local needs and context.**

#### States can implement cap-and-trade independent of the USFG – RGGI proves

Hibbard et al, 11 (Paul J. Hibbard, Vice President of the Analysis Group, an Economic, Financial, and Strategy Consultation group, MS in energy and resources from University of California at Berkeley; Susan F. Tierney, Managing Principal at Analysis Group, PhD and MA in regional planning and public policy from Cornell University; Andrea M. Okie, Manager at Analysis Group, Master of Public Policy from University of California at Berkeley; Pavel G. Darling, Associate at Analysis Group; “The Economic Impacts of the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative on Ten Northeast and Mid-Atlantic States;” November 15, 2011 http://www.analysisgroup.com/uploadedFiles/Publishing/Articles/Economic\_Impact\_RGGI\_Report.pdf)

In 2009, ten Northeastern and Mid-Atlantic states began the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative ¶ (known as RGGI), the country’s first market-based program to reduce emissions of carbon dioxide ¶ (CO2) from power plants. Understanding the program’s performance and outcomes is important ¶ given that RGGI states account for one-sixth of the population in the US and one-fifth of the nation’s ¶ gross domestic product. Through the development of the RGGI program, these states have gained ¶ first-mover policy experience and have collaborated to merge a common policy into well-functioning ¶ electricity markets. Insights and observations gleaned from an analysis of the program’s performance ¶ will be valuable in evaluating past policy decisions and future policy recommendations.

#### RGGI produced $1.6 billion in NPV, spurred the local economies, and dropped consumers’ electric bill

Hibbard et al, 11 (Paul J. Hibbard, Vice President of the Analysis Group, an Economic, Financial, and Strategy Consultation group, MS in energy and resources from University of California at Berkeley; Susan F. Tierney, Managing Principal at Analysis Group, PhD and MA in regional planning and public policy from Cornell University; Andrea M. Okie, Manager at Analysis Group, Master of Public Policy from University of California at Berkeley; Pavel G. Darling, Associate at Analysis Group; “The Economic Impacts of the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative on Ten Northeast and Mid-Atlantic States;” November 15, 2011 http://www.analysisgroup.com/uploadedFiles/Publishing/Articles/Economic\_Impact\_RGGI\_Report.pdf)

What happened to the dollars? First, RGGI produced $1.6 billion in net present value (NPV) ¶ economic value added to the ten-state region.¶ 4¶ The region’s economy – and each state’s as well – ¶ benefits from the RGGI program expenditures. When spread across the region’s population, these ¶ economic impacts amount to nearly $33 per capita in the region.¶ 5¶ Figure ES2 shows the net economic value broken out by the macroeconomic effects of the impacts of RGGI on consumers and power ¶ plant owners, as well as effects that flow from direct spending of RGGI allowance revenues This economic benefit reflects the complex ways that RGGI dollars interact with local economies: the ¶ states’ use of RGGI auction proceeds on programs leads to more purchases of goods and services in ¶ the economy (e.g., engineering services for energy audits, more sales of energy efficiency equipment, ¶ labor for installing solar panels, dollars spent to train those installers and educators, and so forth). ¶ Together, these dollar flows have direct and indirect multiplier effects locally and regionally. ¶ RGGI has also produced changes in consumers’ overall expenditures on electricity. Although CO2¶ allowances tend to increase electricity prices in the near term, there is also a lowering of prices over ¶ time because the states invested a substantial amount of the allowance proceeds on energy efficiency ¶ programs that reduce electricity consumption.¶ 6¶ After the early impacts of small electricity price increases, consumers gain because their overall electricity bills go down as a result of this investment ¶ in energy efficiency. All told, electricity consumers overall – households, businesses, government ¶ users, and others – enjoy a net gain of nearly $1.1 billion, as their overall electric bills drop over ¶ time.¶ 7¶ This reflects average savings of $25 for residential consumers, $181 for commercial ¶ consumers, and $2,493 for industrial consumers over the study period. Consumers of natural gas and ¶ heating oil saved another $174 million. Figure ES3 shows the net bill reductions to consumers.

#### States solve best – too much governmental skepticism

Buntin 10 (John Buntin; staff writer for Governing Magazines, covers health care, public safety, and urban affairs; “A Cap-and-Trade Program That Works;” December, 2010; http://www.governing.com/topics/energy-env/cap-trade-program-that-works.html)

Skepticism of this sort had stalled cap-and-trade legislation in the U.S. Senate even before last month’s election. After November’s vote, most observers believe that the prospective of legislative action on cap and trade in the 112th Congress is now nil. There is, however, likely to be a push by the new House Republican majority to prevent the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency from moving ahead with plans to regulate carbon dioxide as a harmful pollutant. That leaves state efforts such as RGGI standing alone as virtually the sole governmental attempt to address climate change. It also raises an uncomfortable question: When a global solution is needed, what can a handful of states really do?¶ Conceptually the case for pessimism seems strong. But in a state like Massachusetts, it’s hard not to be impressed by the enthusiasm for collaboration and experimentation evident in many cities and towns. In addition to its new windows, Athol recently became one of the commonwealth’s 35 designated “green communities” by enacting stringent new zoning commissions and committing to reduce its energy consumption by 20 percent over five years. Thanks to RGGI, stimulus money and ratepayer changes, Massachusetts is also expanding the reach of its energy efficiency programs from between 10,000 and 15,000 homes a year to between 50,000 and 100,000 homes a year.¶ “Cap and trade is only one area of collaboration” among the RGGI states, says Burt. Thirty states now have climate action plans, and what those “are really doing is a portfolio approach,” says Burt. Indeed, the RGGI states, along with Pennsylvania and Washington, D.C., are now looking at transportation sector initiatives, such as California-style fuel efficiency and auto emissions standards, and promoting smart growth.¶ RGGI has also fostered striking collaboration within states, between departments of environmental protection and energy resources, which have historically been at odds. In Massachusetts, it was the Department of Energy Resources that administered Athol’s grant. That department has also worked with Burt’s agency to create such innovative tools as MassEnergyInsight, which allows cities and towns to go online and document exactly how much energy local government is consuming.

# Relocation CP

#### Text: The United States Federal Government should relocate vulnerable transportation infrastructure away from coastal areas.

#### Relocation of TI and economic centers away from coastal/vulnerable areas is key to preventing further damage

National Research Council of The National Academies, 8

(NRC, Online Pubs, “Potential Impacts of Climate Change on U.S. Transportation”, 7/18/8,

<http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/sr/sr290.pdf>)

One of the most effective strategies for reducing the risks of climate change¶ is to avoid placing people and infrastructure in vulnerable locations, such¶ as coastal areas. Chapter 3 described the continuing development pressures¶ on coastal counties despite the increased risk of flooding and damage from¶ storm surge and wave action accompanying projected rising sea levels.¶ Many areas along the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coasts will be affected. Once¶ in place, settlement patterns and supporting infrastructure are difficult to¶ change. In New York City, for example, a major concern of emergency¶ planners is handling the evacuation of some 2.3 million New Yorkers from¶ flood-prone areas in the event of a Category 3 or greater hurricane (New¶ York City Transit 2007). Continued development of such vulnerable areas will only place more communities and businesses at risk and increase the difficulty of evacuation in the event of a major storm

#### Investment into coastal area infrastructure is pointless. Sea level rising is inevitable.

Gillis, 12

(Justin Gillis, NY Times, “Rising Sea Levels Seen as Threat to Coastal U.S.”, 3/13/12, <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/14/science/earth/study-rising-sea-levels-a-risk-to-coastal-states.html?_r=1>)

Insurance companies got out of the business of writing flood insurance decades ago, so much of the risk from sea level rise is expected to fall on the financially troubled National Flood Insurance Program, set up by Congress, or on state insurance pools. Federal taxpayers also heavily subsidize coastal development when the government pays to rebuild infrastructure destroyed in storm surges and picks up much of the bill for private losses not covered by insurance.¶ For decades, coastal scientists have argued that these policies are foolhardy, and that the nation must begin planning an orderly retreat from large portions of its coasts, but few politicians have been willing to embrace that message or to warn the public of the rising risks.¶ Organizations like Mr. Ebell’s, even as they express skepticism about climate science, have sided with the coastal researchers on one issue. They argue that Congress should stop subsidizing coastal development, regarding it as a waste of taxpayers’ money regardless of what the ocean might do in the future.¶ “If people want to build an expensive beach house on the Florida or Carolina coast, they should take their own risk and pay for their own insurance,” Mr. Ebell said.¶ The new research calculates the size of the population living within one meter, or 3.3 feet, of the mean high tide level, as estimated in a new tidal data set from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. In the lower 48 states, that zone contains 3.7 million people today, the papers estimate, a figure exceeding 1 percent of the nation’s population.¶ Under current coastal policies, the population and the value of property at risk in that zone are expected to continue rising.¶ The land below the 3.3-foot line is expected to be permanently inundated someday, possibly as early as 2100, except in places where extensive fortifications are built to hold back the sea. One of the new papers calculates that long before inundation occurs, life will become more difficult in the low-lying zone because the rising sea will make big storm surges more likely.

## Ext: Aff solvency d

#### Trying to build upgrade/help coastal infrastructure is a lost cause.

Posse Incitatus, 9

(Posse Incitatus, Political blogger, “Think Twice Before Building, 9/1/9, http://posseincitatus.typepad.com/posse\_incitatus/2009/09/think-twice-before-building.html)

In short, there are too many people living in places they ought not to be living. And the surprising thing is, I thought California was full of liberals who despised development that scars the landscape and disrupts natural habitat for all God's creatures. But I've been out to the Golden State a couple of times, and was amazed and incredulous at the precarious locations of homes on steep, high mountains, propped up by what looked like stilts on one side. The roads leading to and from these homes are often winding and treacherous. Beautiful scenery, yes, but practical? Heck no!¶ Incredibly, in New Orleans, four years after Katrina ravaged that city, there are still people who want to use taxpayer money to rebuild neighborhoods in flood plains that are BELOW SEA LEVEL. How freakin' STUPID can you get? I don't give a damn how much culture or how many good memories people have of those communities. We cannot repeat the same idiotic mistakes of years past.¶ The fiasco aftermath of Katrina was far more the fault of New Orleans' inept Mayor, Ray Nagin, than it was of FEMA, Michael Brown, and George Bush, but try telling that to the brain-dead mainstream media. First, Nagin had no evacuation plan, and he and Louisiana's governor waited WAY too long to order people out of the city. It was also outrageous to send them to the Superdome, knowing that once power went out (only a matter of hours), the stadium would become a hellish sauna bath with conditions deteriorating rapidly. ¶ Emergency management is first and foremost a LOCAL issue, then the state steps in. FEMA is not intended to be a first responder. But bashing Bush was fully in vogue by 2005, so the press piled on despite being ignorant of what they were reporting on. (Does that surprise anyone?)¶ Anyway, we could be facing some more hurricanes in the coming weeks. The federal government needs to stop providing flood insurance to fools who continuously place themselves, their families, and property in peril by building in flood-prone hurricane zones.¶ And Californians ought to wake up and realize that steep mountains may be beautiful, but they are dangerous locations for homes.¶ Yes, I know. Too late for many people. But perhaps some out there will avoid setting themselves up for disaster.

## Ext: cp solvency

#### Only relocation solves.

USGCRP, No Date

(United States Global Change Research Program, “Integrating federal research on global change and climate change”, last updated 7/16/12, http://www.globalchange.gov/publications/reports/scientific-assessments/us-impacts/climate-change-impacts-by-sector/society)

Cities also have considerable potential to adapt to climate change through technological, institutional, structural, and behavioral changes. For example, a number of cities have warning programs in place to reduce heat-related illness and death (see Human Health sector). Relocating development away from low-lying areas, building new infrastructure with future sea-level rise in mind, and promoting water conservation are examples of structural and institutional strategies. Choosing road materials that can handle higher temperatures is an adaptation option that relies on new technology (see Transportation sector). Cities can reduce heat loads by increasing reflective surfaces and green spaces. Some actions have multiple benefits. For example, increased planting of trees and other vegetation in cities has been shown to be associated with a reduction in crime,338 in addition to reducing local temperatures, and thus energy demand for air conditioning. Human well-being is influenced by economic conditions, natural resources and amenities, public health and safety, infrastructure, government, and social and cultural resources. Climate change will influence all of these, but an understanding of the many interacting impacts, as well as the ways society can adapt to them, remains in its infancy.

#### Relocation is the only option that solves sea level rise

World Ocean Review, No Date

(World Ocean Review, “The million dollar question: how bad will it be?”, last updated 7/16/12, http://worldoceanreview.com/en/coasts/living-in-coastal-areas/”)

During the same timeframe the coastal megacities will continue to grow. New cities will be built, particularly in Asia. In Europe an estimated 13 million people would be threatened by a sea-level rise of 1 metre. One of the implications would be high costs for coastal protection measures. In extreme cases relocation may be the only solution. A total of a billion people worldwide now live within 20 metres of mean sea level on land measuring about 8 million square kilometres. This is roughly equivalent to the area of Brazil. These figures alone illustrate how disastrous the loss of the coastal areas would be. The Coastal Zone Management Subgroup of the IPCC bases its evaluation of the vulnerability of coastal regions, and its comparison of the threat to individual nations on other features too:¶ the economic value (gross domestic product, GDP) of the flood-prone area;¶ the extent of urban settlements;¶ the extent of agricultural land;¶ the number of jobs;¶ the area/extent of coastal wetlands which could act as a flood buffer.

#### Relocation is key

Krajick et al, 8

(Kevin Krajick, Kyu Lee, Kim Martineu, all journalists, “Climate Change Will Hit Transport Systems Hard, Says Government Panel”, The Earth Institute Columbia University, 3/12/8, http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/2138)

Preparing for projected climate changes will be costly, says the report. Needed measures range from retrofitting infrastructure to making major additions, to constructing entirely new infrastructure. The committee noted a need for trading off “the costs of making the infrastructure more robust against the economic costs of failure." Some areas may need drastic measures. With rising sea level, roads, rail lines and airport runways in low-lying coastal areas may have to protected with expensive sea walls or levees; some facilities may require total relocation.¶ The report calls for the federal government to take a strong role in implementing some recommendations. These include creation of a clearinghouse for information on transportation and climate change; establishment of a research program to re-evaluate existing design standards; and updating flood insurance maps with climate change in mind.

# Miscellaneous

#### Solving Permafrost thawing key to DoD and Air Force in Alaska

SERDP, 7/12/2012, Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program Department of Defense, “Addressing the Impacts of Climate Change on U.S. Army Alaska with Decision Support Tools Developed through Field Work and Modeling (RC-2110)” Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Energy, We harness the latest science and technology to develop and demonstrate innovative, cost-effective, and sustainable solutions. These innovations improve DoD's environmental performance, reduce costs, and enhance mission capabilities.

The Department of Defense (DoD) manages 1.5 million acres of training land in three main areas within the Tanana River basin of Interior Alaska--Donnelly Training Area, the Yukon Training Area, and the Tanana Flats Training Area. Geographically, this region extends from Fairbanks south to the Alaska Range and east and west across the Tanana River basin. These lands are managed by the Army but are also used by the Air Force. Due to increased training pressures at other major installations in the U.S. the Alaska training areas have seen increased interest in training, usage, and infrastructure development over the past ten years. This increased training land usage and management is expected to continue. Future climate scenarios predict an approximately 5°C increase in mean annual air temperatures for this region over the next 80 years. This warming is expected to degrade permafrost in many areas of Alaska, which will dramatically affect surface hydrology, soil, and vegetation. Some locations are expected to become wetter, which would affect wetlands status, vegetation, and species diversity. This would likely present potential access and mobility issues for the Army or other land users. Other locations are expected to become drier with climate warming. This could lead to increased wildfire frequency and vegetation shifts. The potential ecosystem responses to climate warming and to non-climatic anthropogenic stressors could have severe ramifications for how, where, and when the DoD can train in Alaska. Other land users in Interior Alaska are facing a similar challenge.

#### Plan creates more environmental research to help non-military lands in Alaska

SERDP, 7/12/2012, Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program Department of Defense, “Addressing the Impacts of Climate Change on U.S. Army Alaska with Decision Support Tools Developed through Field Work and Modeling (RC-2110)” Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Energy, We harness the latest science and technology to develop and demonstrate innovative, cost-effective, and sustainable solutions. These innovations improve DoD's environmental performance, reduce costs, and enhance mission capabilities.

The objective of this project is to develop a geographic information systems (GIS) based decision support system using spatially explicit ecosystem response data on climate and non-climate related anthropogenic stressors. We will use a combination of field work and modeling to make predictions on how climate warming is most likely to affect surface hydrology, soils, and vegetation in Interior Alaska. The results will be synthesized into a decision support system to provide U.S. Army Alaska land and facility managers with information to help make decisions regarding development of future training and installation management plans. Our GIS-based approach will combine user input and critical landscape-change analyses, field surveys, and coupled hydrologic thermal modeling based on projected climate change outcomes to generate ecosystem response parameters to the year 2100. This type of research effort has never been done in Interior Alaska. We will work with other land managers, research collaborators, and other land users to ensure our results provide input to planning on non-Department of Defense lands in Interior Alaska as well. We anticipate the results from our climate and thermal modeling will have application to other locations where seasonally frozen (and thawed) soils are present. Though the project objectives are mostly applied research we plan to identify and address basic research gaps in our understanding of permafrost hydrology, climate modeling, and ecosystem responses to change.