# **Freight Rail Negative**

# Status Quo Solves

#### **Several private sector and state government projects solve freight rail infrastructure issues now**

Trunick 11 - Associate Editor, Inbound Logistics Magazine OSM Adjunct Faculty (Perry, A., “Improving Rail Infrastructure: On the Right Track”, Inbound logistics, October 2011, http://www.inboundlogistics.com/cms/article/improving-rail-infrastructure-on-the-right-track/) AW

All that capital investment translates to a more technologically advanced, environmentally friendly, efficient, and competitive transportation system. Here are a few examples of ongoing rail infrastructure projects: The Chicago Region Environmental and Transportation Efficiency Program (CREATE). **Developed to address issues in the nation's busiest rail gateway**, this partnership between Illinois; **Chicago**; Metra, the northeast Illinois commuter rail system; Amtrak; the U.S. Department of Transportation (**DOT);** and six railroads includes **construction** of 31 new overpasses and underpasses; **enhanced grade crossing safety; and extensive upgrades to tracks,** switches, and signal systems. **With** an estimated cost of $3 billion and target completion date in 2030, **the project is expected to create 2,700 jobs,** and deliver $1.1 billion in air quality improvements and $595 million in safety benefits. The Crescent Corridor. This partnership between Norfolk Southern (NS) and 13 states **spans 2,500 miles of rail infrastructure**. NS expects improvements from the $2.5-billion **project will allow it to handle increased traffic more efficiently** and remove an estimated one million trucks from congested roads. Canadian Pacific's (CP) North Dakota project. To support North Dakota's growing ethanol industry, CP will invest $100 million in infrastructure improvements and grow its workforce in the state by 18 percent. **The Transcon Corridor**. **BNSF** has invested $1.8 billion in the corridor, which spans 4,647 miles and 13 states**, connecting the ports and markets in California and the Southwest to the Midwest, Texas, and the Southeast**. The National Gateway. This CSX project spanning six states and the District of Columbia **will improve efficiency and routing in the corridor connecting the mid-Atlantic ports and the Midwest.** The price tag is $842 million, and completion is slated for 2015. UNION PACIFIC'S BIG PLANS In partnership with New Mexico, UP began a $400-million project to construct a state-of-the-art rail facility in southern New Mexico to establish Santa Teresa as a key inland port. The project broke ground in August 2011, in part to provide needed expansion for UP's El Paso, Texas, facility. El Paso will continue to operate, says Tom Lange, UP's director of corporate communications. UP's **commitment to intermodal runs deep. Its other recent projects** include a $370-million expansion at Joliet, Ill., in 2010. The railroad has added 65,000 domestic containers and has expanded services aimed at competing with single-driver truckload moves from the West to the Midwest. UP estimates there are opportunities to convert 11 million truckloads to rail intermodal, and believes it can compete on time, service, and cost with single-driver truckloads between Los Angeles and Chicago; Chicago and Dallas; northern California and Chicago; and Los Angeles and Dallas.

#### **Freight rail is thriving – even Warren Buffett invests in it**

Dovell 12 – contributor for Council on Foreign Relations (Elizabeth, “U.S. Rail Infrastructure, Council on Foreign Relations, March 7th, http://www.cfr.org/united-states/us-rail infrastructure/p27585) AW

**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**," says 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."**

#### Rail is flourishing – private investment and government stimulus

**Grunwald, June 28** (Michael, “Back on Tracks”, Time Magazine, 2012, http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,2118307,00.html)

**Railroads are flourishing, attracting investors like Warren Buffett, and A**ssociation of **A**merican **R**ailroads CEO Ed **Hamberger says their main request of government is to be left alone to continue their renaissance.** That said, President **Obama provided unprecedented support for freight rail through his 2009 stimulus bill.** (Yes, I always come back to the stimulus.) **It didn't include a freight-rail program, but the biggest grants in its Tiger competition--designed to promote transportation projects with the biggest economic and environmental bang for the buck--all went to freight-rail initiatives that will unclog the arteries of U.S. commerce.** These days, Congress won't spend the bucks on infrastructure, regardless of the bang. But **quietly railroads keep spending their own bucks. In an era of austerity, progress chugs along** slowly and rarely blows its horn.

#### Status quo solves – Federal TIGER grants, state and local governments and private sector funding rail improvements U.S. DoT, June 25 (“US DoT Announces $10 Million TIGER Grant for Hunts Point Terminal Produce Market”, 2012, http://www.fra.dot.gov/roa/press\_releases/fp\_DOT68-12%20Hunts%20Point,%20New%20York.shtml)

NEW YORK – **The U.S. D**epartment **o**f **T**ransportation today **announced a $10 million TIGER grant to make freight rail improvements** at the Hunts Point Terminal Produce Market in the Bronx, one of the world’s largest wholesale markets attracting agricultural goods from across the country.  **The project is one of 47 transportation projects in 34 states** and the District of Columbia **selected to receive funding** **under the** U.S. Department of Transportation’s highly competitive $500 million TIGER (Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery) **2012 program. “This grant** for Hunts Point **means construction jobs today, while providing both cleaner air and greater economic benefits for the future**,” said U.S. Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood.  “President Obama’s support for an America built to last is putting people back to work across the country building roads, bridges and other projects that will mean better, safer transportation and a strong economic foundation for years to come.”  **Planned improvements include** building a receiving warehouse specifically for rail shipments, **adding rail capacity** by constructing additional sorting and storage tracks and rehabilitating rail spurs, **and creating new traffic patterns that will reduce congestion** and help separate rail and truck traffic that currently share the loading docks.  **The planned upgrades will help improve the efficiency of freight rail service** and allow the Hunts Point Market to move a greater share of the produce shipped into the terminal. The project will also eliminate major conflicts between truck and rail movements, reduce truck idling in the market, improve air quality and reduce traffic on the Hunts Point road network. The grant covers nearly half of the $20.6 million project cost. “**This is yet another example of how federal, state and local governments are working hard to improve rail service and grow our economy**,” said Federal Railroad Administrator Joseph Szabo. The freight rail improvements will immediately benefit the existing Hunts Point Terminal Produce Market and complement a larger redevelopment project in which two state-of-the-art warehouses will be built, followed by truck traffic circulation improvements.  **Both phases are expected to attract more producers and buyers to the market.  The TIGER program is a highly competitive program that funds innovative projects that are difficult or impossible to fund through other federal programs**.  In many cases, these grants will serve as the final piece of funding for infrastructure investments totaling $1.7 billion in overall project costs.  **These federal funds are being leveraged with money from private sector partners, states, local governments, metropolitan planning organizations and transit agencies.**

# Economy

#### **Freight rail trades off with economic development**

Hunt, 2005, As a Senior Specialist in the Surface Transportation and Energy (STE) Unit at Oliver Wyman. His client list includes most of the North American Class I railroads, intermodal operators, shippers, state DOTs, MPOs, and federal agencies (David, “Return on Investment on Freight Rail Capacity Improvement”, 04/2005, http://www.transportation.org/sites/planning/docs/nchrp43.pdf) VS

It is well documented that high-capacity transportation facilities can adversely affect community cohesion. In general, these issues relate mostly to the existence of infrastructure, but also to an extent their operations. A new grade-separated highway-rail interchange might greatly enhance safety, but could adversely affect a formerly cohesive small town by bifurcating neighborhoods. A town may have to tradeoff economic development potential against rail traffic impacts when deciding whether to allow rail capacity upgrades. Planning professionals should be aware of the adverse impacts transportation facilities can have on local communities, and design freight rail schemes with these **externalities** in mind.

# Environment

### AT: Ethanol

#### **Ethanol is not green and does not have economic value**

Pimental, 3- Cornell Emeritus Professor of Entomology in the College of Agriculture (David, “Ethanol Fuels: Energy Balance, Economics, and Environmental Impacts are Negative”, Natural Resources Research, Vol. 12, No. 2, June 2003, http://www.college.wustl.edu/~anthro/articles/pimentel-ethanol.pdf) ALT

A few government agencies, such as the USDA (Shapouri, Duffuld, and Wang, 2002), support ethanol production. Some industries, including Archer, Daniels, Midland (EV World, 2002), are making huge proﬁts from ethanol production, which is subsidized by federal and state governments. Some politicians have the mistaken belief that ethanol production provides large beneﬁts for farmers, whereas in fact the farmer proﬁts are minimal. In contrast, numerous scientiﬁc studies have concluded that ethanol production does not provide a net energy balance, is not a renewable energy source, is not an economical fuel, and its production and use contributes to air pollution and global warming. Growing the large amounts of corn necessary for ethanol production occupies cropland suitable for food production and causes diverse environmental degradation problems (Pimentel, 1991; Pimentel and Pimentel, 1996). **Conclusions drawn concerning the beneﬁts of ethanol production are incomplete or misleading when only some of the total energy inputs in the ethanol system are included in the assessment**. The objective of this analysis is to update and assess all the recognized inputs that operate in the entire ethanol production system. **These inputs include the direct costs in terms of energy and dollars for producing the corn feedstock as well as for the fermentation/distillation process**. Additional costs to the consumer include federal and state subsidies, plus costs associated with environmental pollution and/or degradation that occur during the entire production system. Ethanol production in the United States does not beneﬁt the nation’s energy security, its agriculture, the economy, the environment, as well as government and consumer expenditures. Also, **ethical questions are related to diverting land and precious food into fuel and actually adding a net amount of pollution to the environment.**

#### **Despite good reputation, ethanol damages ozone and leads to deaths**

Davies, 07 (Tom, “Ethanol comes with environmental impact, despite green image”, USA Today, 5/5/2007, http://www.usatoday.com/money/industries/environment/2007-05-05-ethanolenvironment\_N.htm) ALT

Ethanol has long been touted as a cleaner-burning alternative to gasoline and it carries the image of an environmentally friendly fuel since it's derived from plants and plant waste. Experts say replacing gas with ethanol blends will reduce greenhouse gases and help the fight against global warming. But the more than 200 U.S. refineries in operation or under construction — mostly in a swath from Nebraska and Kansas east into Ohio — also emit thousands of tons of pollutants a year, including nitrogen oxide, a key element of smog. Increased use of ethanol — proposed by President Bush in his January State of the Union address — could raise smog levels about 1% in some areas of the country, according to Environmental Protection Agency officials. In early April, however, the EPA increased how much pollutants ethanol plants can emit before facing tougher restrictions, prompting concern among some environmental groups. "I think word is getting around that ethanol refineries can be a heck of a problem if you live near them," said Frank O'Donnell, president of Clean Air Watch. **"You're taking areas that are generally not seeing a lot of pollution now and darkening the skies."** A recent study by a Stanford University professor concluded that 200 more people each year would die from respiratory problems related to ozone**, the unseen component of smog**, if all vehicles in the United States ran on a mostly ethanol fuel blend by 2020.

# Terrorism

#### **Successful terrorist attack extremely unlikely – terrorists can’t locate hazardous materials – difficulty knowing schedule and sheer number of tankcars**

Toffler 07 – former editor of Fortune magazine, founder of Toffler Associates, Professor at Cornell University, White House correspondent (“Creating A Secure Future: Understanding and Addressing the Threat to TIH Rail Cargoes,” Toffler Associates - executive advisory firm formed by Alvin and Heidi Toffler, http://www.toffler.com/docs/Creating-a-Secure-Future.pdf) AW

But the fluid nature of the schedule of train movements, railcar on-loads and off-loads, and so on belies the idea that tracking trains through the nationwide system would be straightforward even for relatively sophisticated terrorists. Even if they could determine the presence of a specific cargo on a specific train, choosing an opportune specific time would be extremely difficult because of the many unplanned changes in scheduled daily train operations. Once each train begins its journey, the certainty and predictability of its location in the system diminishes, in some cases rapidly. Trains get behind schedule, or ahead of schedule, as they make frequent stops in rail yards to pick up additional railcars and drop off others for delivery to their ultimate destinations.9 In fact, **on** average, trains wind up ahead or behind the intended schedule approximately 40-80% of the tim**e**,10 making it difficult for an attacker to know with confidence that a particular tankcar loaded with chlorine **or other TIH substances** will be where they want it to be in order to mount an attack. In contrast, the scheduling imprecision of passenger rail is not nearly the same concern for the would-be attacker. Because each passenger train will carry innocent citizens, it matters little in their horrific calculus if they miss the opportunity to attack any particular one. Terrorists in search of TIH railcars in the dynamic freight rail system certainly have more clues available to them than someone searching for the needle in the haystack. For one thing, the cars are “advertised” as they wind their way through the system – by law, railcars carrying TIH or other hazmats are marked with symbols that convey the contents of the cargo (see Figure 2).11 These markings are vital for firefighters, safety personnel, and others to know at a glance what they are dealing with in the event of an emergency situation involving a railcar. Of course, it is open knowledge, including to terrorists, what these symbols look like and what they mean, and so anyone can tell which cars are carrying TIH and which are not. But the fact that TIH tankcars are marked only makes them easier to recognize, it doesn’t make it any easier to find these recognizable cars among the thousands of other cars moving across the nation on any given day. Moreover, there is no way for the terrorist to know from the presence of the placard whether a particular tankcar is loaded with TIH or empty.

#### **Tankcars carrying hazardous materials are nearly impossible for terrorists to rupture and design standards are becoming even more stringent**

Toffler 07 – former editor of Fortune magazine, founder of Toffler Associates, Professor at Cornell University, White House correspondent (“Creating A Secure Future: Understanding and Addressing the Threat to TIH Rail Cargoes,” Toffler Associates - executive advisory firm formed by Alvin and Heidi Toffler, http://www.toffler.com/docs/Creating-a-Secure-Future.pdf) AW

Even if finding a particular railcar on a particular train at a particular time in the rail system were less of a challenge, we must also consider that TIH tankcars possess design features that limit the likelihood of a successful attack (success to the terrorist being a breach of the tankcar resulting in a release of deadly TIH gas). Stringent Department of Transportation (DOT) design specifications and other quality assurance efforts protect railroad tankcars from damage and rupture in the event of an accident or incident.15 For example, **tankcars are fitted with pressure-relief devices that protect the contents when exposed to pool fire for 100 minutes or a torch fire for 30 minutes, and possess steel-head shields that provide protection from punctures.** One industry engineer interviewed for this study, an expert in cleanup and consequence management of rail accidents involving tankcars loaded with hazardous materials, stated “we’ve seen derailments of a 268,000 pound car at 59 miles per hour … that’s a lot of energy to be released, and still no rupture” of the tank car.16 Data and reports on accidents involving TIH tankcars amplify that **causing a release of the toxic gases** they contain **is no mean feat. Of the 1002 rail hazmat incidents** (16,752 across all modes of transportation) reported in 2005, **only 100 were considered serious incidents, with only eight involving poisonous gas.**17 Of course, the conditions that pertain in an accident vary considerably, in a number of ways, from those that likely would pertain in a terrorist attack. Still, experts generally agree that the tankcar designs are sufficient to withstand the kinds of conditions a terrorist attack might create with the capabilities at their disposal. According to one rail industry hazardous materials officer, for example, “we’ve done tests and you can explode a truck next to one of these cars and it’ll just dent it.”18 And today, the **design standards are becoming even more stringent, further lowering the risk** that an accident or deliberate assault on a tankcar could breach the car and cause a deadly release of TIH gas. In testimony to the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the American Association of Railroads (AAR) explained industry efforts to improve tankcar design and construction. For instance, the Tank Car Safety Research and Test Project, funded by railroads, tankcar builders, and tankcar owners, is analyzing accidents involving tankcars and continually updating a comprehensive database on the nature of damage to tankcars. This data is being used to improve researchers’ ability to identify the causes of tankcar releases and to inform research on improvements to tankcar materials and design specification, development of which the Tank Car Safety Research and Test Project also is funding.19

#### **Attack wouldn’t cripple the economy or destroy larger infrastructure - it’d just be re-routed**

Capra ‘6 (Gregory S., Chief of the Program Management Office, Air Force Center for Environmental Excellence, bachelor’s degree in Civil Engineering from the University of Colorado and a master’s degree in Strategic Studies from the Air War College at Maxwell AFB, Alabama, “Protecting Critical Rail Infrastructure”, http://cpc.au.af.mil/PDF/monograph/criticalrailinfrastructure.pdf, December 2006)

A major attack on the freight system would have local and regional impacts but would be unlikely to have a significant economic impact on a national level. The resiliency of the freight rail system was best shown after the 1993 Midwest flood and 2005 Hurricane Katrina. These catastrophic events covered several states but the railroads were able to reroute shipments through other nodes. According to the Association of American Railroads, “Katrina’s damage to rail infrastructure affected six of the seven major railroads and Amtrak. The railroads diverted freight to other routes, going through a number of other gateways, including Memphis, Nashville, Montgomery, St. Louis and Chicago.”61 The worst damage was along the 100-mile line between Pascagoula, Mississippi, and New Orleans, Louisiana.62 Michael Ward, chairman, president and chief executive officer of CSXT said, “The physical impact to our rail infrastructure, while significant, is confined to a relatively small segment of our 22,000 mile network.”63 Another example is the Howard Street Tunnel derailment in the center of Baltimore. The derailment blocked CSX’s only direct route from Florida to New York. The company placed low priority shipments on hold and worked with Norfolk Southern to reroute time sensitive shipments through Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. However, this added up to an extra 36 hours per shipment. The freight rail systems also support the Railroads for National Defense Program which ensures DoD has strategic rail mobility when it is needed. DoD classifies more than 30,000 miles of commercial rail lines, called the Strategic Rail Network, as critical for strategic mobility and shipments of munitions. The Military Surface Deployment and Distribution Command Transportation Engineering Agency manages the Railroads for National Defense Program and the Strategic Rail Network. They worked with the Federal Railroad Administration, state rail planners, installations, and commercial railroads in developing and coordinating the Strategic Rail Network and Strategic Rail Network connector lines.64 In the event of a national emergency, the railroads can give the military first priority to the Strategic Rail Network by restricting shipment of lower priority commercial customers. While Figure 5 shows potential choke points in the system, it also shows the redundancy of the network. If a node or corridor is disrupted, shipments can be rerouted through a different node.

#### **No railroad terrorism - too difficult to execute**

Moore 11(Michael, Writer at the Pacific Standard, " Terrorist Attacks on Railroads Would Be Difficult," May 11, http://www.psmag.com/politics/terrorist-threat-of-wrecking-the-railroad-really-hard-31033/)

Since the raid on Osama bin Laden’s house in Pakistan uncovered some notes about a future vision of derailed American trains, it’s worth remembering that the idea isn’t terribly new. America’s huge rail network — never mind the ambitious high-speed lines yet to be built — would be vulnerable for obvious reasons, and some critics have complained for months that Obama’s expensive high-speed rail dreams would be wide-open targets for al-Qaeda. But news outlets and politicians have overreacted, and a report from last year by the Mineta Transportation Institute gives a number of good reasons why derailment disasters are so rare. The main reason is that blowing up a track is tougher than it sounds. “Getting a bomb to go off at the right time is difficult,” write the Mineta study authors. “Timers are unreliable if the trains do not run precisely on time, and pressure triggers do not always work.” Sabotaging the switching points — the Polish kid’s method — would be more reliable, but it takes more cleverness. Mechanical sabotage of all kinds (high- and low-tech) derailed trains with 76 percent success rate in the Mineta report’s samples — but it was much more rare than setting bombs. Only 25 out of the sample of 181 derailment attempts were acts of mechanical sabotage.

Risk of worst-case scenario doesn’t justify every action to prevent it – devoting funds to rail security steal resources from other threats   
Toffler 07 – former editor of Fortune magazine, founder of Toffler Associates, Professor at Cornell University, White House correspondent (“Creating A Secure Future: Understanding and Addressing the Threat to TIH Rail Cargoes,” Toffler Associates - executive advisory firm formed by Alvin and Heidi Toffler, http://www.toffler.com/docs/Creating-a-Secure-Future.pdf) AW

It’s important to be clear about our own “assumptions” here, in addition to anything we conclude about the assumptions underlying worst-case scenario analyses like these. A successful terrorist breach of a loaded chlorine tankcar or other TIH tankcar, even in highly “imperfect” weather and other conditions, would kill and injure innocent people. Whether the number killed and injured is one or 100,000, we cannot abide such barbarous acts – anyone harmed is too many harmed. Still, in deciding what actions to take to increase our security, and what threats to guard against in what ways, we cannot consider only the worst-case analyses. There are simply too many worst cases we can posit, involving too many kinds of targets in addition to TIH railcars and their cargoes, and every effort we expend to secure ourselves against one represents resources we cannot devote to securing ourselves against others. Responsible security planning demands we consider worst-case scenarios, alongside a range of other scenarios, and in context, to help ensure we are focusing the right attention on the right risks at the right time.

# Solvency

#### There are several non-infrastructure alt causes to capacity problems - inefficient carload operations, labor agreements and rail interchange practices

Ostria, 04- Vice President of ICF, 20+ years experience consulting government transportation agencies, MA in economics from George Washington University (Sergio, “2010 and Beyond: A Vision of America’s Transportation Future”, ICF Consulting with DELCAN Transportation Inc, May 2004, http://intermodal.transportation.org/Documents/icf\_report[1].pdf) ALT

3.2.2 Non-Infrastructure Related Rail Capacity Issues As with the trucking industry, a number of non-infrastructure issues affect the effective capacity of the railroads. Examples include the following: ¾ Inefficient Carload Operations: Carload service is movement of small shipments— one or a few cars in a shipment—in all-rail trips from origin to siding. These trips are made in a series of mixed trains running through a railroad’s terminal network. Although carload service accounts for over 30 percent of carloadings and 40 percent of rail revenue, it has been handled, until fairly recently, in an inefficient manner. Rather than maintain schedules for the trains running between terminals, **railroads pursued a strategy of holding trains until some tonnage level was reached. This resulted in lower labor costs** per ton for line-haul movements **but led to higher equipment costs because of poor utilization and to unreliable service.** Railroads are now moving to scheduled operations, which hold the potential of making this service both more reliable and profitable. 34 ¾ Labor Agreements and Short Lines: All of the **Class-**I carriers have union crews and a variety of labor agreements that affect crew sizes and working practices. Over the past two or three decades, substantial progress has been made in removing inefficiencies from these agreements. Many industry observers, however, believe that there are still obstacles to efficiency in these agreements, especially regarding practices in local service—pick-up and drop-off of carload shipments. There are marked contrasts between the way local service is handled on big railroads and the way it is handled on short lines, the latter being free of union contracts. **Some experts believe that the current mode of operation of local service is one of the biggest obstacles to achieving efficient carload operation.** 35 ¾ Interchanges: A great deal of traffic, especially carload traffic, moves on more than one Class-I railroad. While special arrangements are made for high-priority service (e.g., motor vehicles and parts), the general pattern is that current practices for handling cars between railroads are slow and cumbersome, contributing both to unreliable service and inefficient use of equipment.

# AT: Coal

#### New EPA rule means coal will inevitably decline as power source – already below 40% of energy share

Goldenberg 12- US environmental correspondent to the Guardian, won Reporter of the Year from the Foreign Press Association, (Suzanne, “Obama plan cuts emissions for future coal plants”, The Guardian, 3/27/2012, http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2012/mar/27/coal-obama-coal-emissions-environment) ALT

**The Obama administration effectively blocked the construction of any new**[**coal**](http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/coal)**-fired power plants** on Tuesday, **introducing rules to cut carbon dioxide emissions from the next generation of plants.** The proposed [new standards](http://epa.gov/carbonpollutionstandard/) would cut carbon dioxide emissions on new power plants in half and will, over time, help move America away from the carbon-heavy plants that currently produce nearly half of the country's electricity, Lisa Jackson, the head of the environmental protection agency, told a conference call with reporters. "Right now there are no limits to the amount of carbon pollution that future power plants will be able to put into our skies – and the health and economic threats of a changing climate continue to grow," she said. "Today we're taking a common-sense step to reduce pollution in our air, protect the planet for our children, and move us into a new era of American [energy](http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/energy)." Given the deep divide between Republicans and Democrats over energy policy, the new rules for coal are also bound to get caught up in election-year politics. Republicans in Congress, as well as Democrats for coal states, immediately accused President [Barack Obama](http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/barack-obama) and the EPA of waging war on coal. **Coal-fired power plants are the largest single source of carbon dioxide, a main driver of climate change. But their share of America's energy mix has been shrinking, falling below 40% last year, according to the energy information agency. The proposed new rules will make it nearly impossible to build new coal power plants,** unless they are outfitted with carbon capture and storage systems, a technology is still not in use on a commercial scale. Coal plants will be given decades to meet the new standards. The new rules will not apply to existing coal-fired plants, or plants due to go into operation this year. Jackson told reporters they would affect about 15 new coal power projects, currently in the planning phases. **The announcement**, which had been long expected, **was broadly welcomed by environmental groups. "If Old King Coal isn't dead already, he's certainly teetering towards life support,"** Frank O'Donnell, president of Clean Air Watch, told reporters. However, there was disappointment that the EPA had given a pass to old and inefficient coal-fired plants, which are responsible for most of the carbon dioxide emissions. Still, **the new limits will make it impossible to build new plants that are not drastically more efficient**. The average US coal plant emits 2,249lbs of carbon dioxide for each megawatt hour of electricity. The new EPA rules would cap that at 1,000lbs of carbon dioxide for each megawatt hour. That would not pose much of a challenge to natural gas plants, which produce an average of about 1,135lbs of carbon dioxide, and should be achievable by new coal plants using the carbon capture and storage technology, Jackson said.

# Coal Turn

#### Coal industry dependent on rail **Kaplan 07**- Specialist in Energy and Environmental Policy, Congressional Research Service (Stan Mark, “Rail Transportation of Coal to Power Plants: Reliability Issues”, September 26, 2007, <http://www.cnie.org/nle/crs/abstract.cfm?NLEid=1916>)ALT

Freight rail transportation and electric power generation are mutually dependent network industries. Railroads accounted for over 70% of coal shipments to power plants in 2005, and due to economic and physical limitations on other modes (truck, barge, and conveyor) the heavy dependency of the power industry on rail transportation is likely to continue into the future. From the standpoint of the rail industry, coal transportation is an important business, accounting in recent years for about 20% of freight revenues for the major railroads.

#### Clean coal is a myth - continued use of coal leads to climate change and ecological collapse

Brown 12- Associate Professor of Environmental Ethics, Science, and Law at Penn State, (Donald, “The Ethics Of ‘Clean Coal’ Propaganda”, Think Progress, 6/3/2012, http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2012/06/03/494130/the-ethics-of-clean-coal-propaganda/) ALT

For over a decade the coal industry has funded campaigns designed to convince Americans that coal can be burned without adverse environmental impacts. These campaigns raise troubling ethical issues. In fact, as we shall see, these campaigns have often been misleading and deceptive in several different ways. This deception is classic propaganda because propaganda presents facts selectively to encourage a particular synthesis, or uses loaded messages to produce an emotional rather than a rational response to the information presented. Although many entities on both sides of an issue who are trying to persuade the general public to think a certain way will frequently resort to the use of propaganda, as we shall see, deceptive propaganda is particularly morally odious when it engages in lying or lying by omission. A lie by omission occurs when an important fact is left out in order to foster a misconception. The clean coal propaganda has frequently engaged in propaganda that must be understood as lying by omission, if not outright lying. It is also lying by omission about something which is potentially very harmful, making the lies even more morally abhorrent Given that academies of science around the world have concluded that climate change is a huge threat to millions of people around the world, that coal is the dirtiest of fossil fuels currently used for electricity generation in regard to climate change, that there are no commercial scale coal-fired power plants in the United States now nor likely to be in wide-spread commercial operation for decades capable of actually removing heat trapping gases, a fact not revealed in TV commercials funded by the clean coal campaign, this campaign which implies that coal is “clean” is deeply misleading about likely harmful and dangerous human activities. In other words, this is deception with huge potential adverse consequences for life on earth and ecological systems on which life depends. Some TV commercials funded through clean coal campaigns visually or verbally reference clean coal without acknowledgment that coal combustion could be considered clean only if new unproven technologies for reducing greenhouse gas emissions from coal combustion are widely deployed. Other commercials contain often vague references to clean coal technologies that could in theory reduce greenhouse gas emissions if commercial scale of these technologies is determined through future research to be environmentally benign and economically feasible. None of these commercials, however, reveal that there are serious open questions about whether geologic carbon sequestration or other unproven greenhouse gas emission reduction technologies for use with coal combustion will be proven to be environmentally acceptable and economically viable at commercial scale. The New York Times reported this month that there is new evidence that carbon capture and storage, the technology most frequently considered to be the best hope for reducing greenhouse gases from coal combustion, may not be economically viable because of cheaper and abundant amounts of natural gas. (Wald, 2012) Claiming that coal is clean because it could be clean if a new technically unproven and economically dubious technology might be adopted is like someone claiming that belladonna is not poisonous because there is a new unproven safe pill under development that sometime in the future might be economically affordable and that may be taken with belladonna to neutralize belladonna’s toxic effects.

### **Coal Bad Ext**

#### **Coal power is biggest source of air pollution as well as a major source of GHG emissions and soil and water contamination**

Environmental Health and Engineering Inc, 11- bio safety consulting firm, (“Emissions of Hazardous Air Pollutants from Coal-Fired Plants”, American Lung Association, March 7, 2011, http://www.lung.org/assets/documents/healthy-air/coal-fired-plant-hazards.pdf) ALT

The National Emissions Inventory prepared by EPA indicates that emissions to the atmosphere from coal-fired power plants: contain 84 of the 187 hazardous air pollutants identified by EPA as posing a threat to human health and the environment, release 386,000 tons of hazardous air pollutants annually that account for 40% of all hazardous air pollutant emissions from point sources, more than any other point source category, and are the largest point source category of hydrochloric acid, mercury, and arsenic releases to air (USEPA 2007). **Coal fired plants are also a major source of emissions for several criteria air pollutants; including sulfur dioxide, oxides of nitrogen, and particulate matter.** Hazardous air pollutants emitted to the atmosphere by coal-fired power plants can cause a wide range of adverse health effects including damage to eyes, skin, and breathing passages; negative effects on the kidneys, lungs, and nervous system; the potential to cause cancer; impairment of neurological function and ability to learn’ and pulmonary and cardiovascular disease (USEPA, 1998; USEPA, 2011a; USEPA 2011, b). Public health risks associated with exposure to mercury in food and metals in airborne fine particulate matter are among the most notable adverse health and environmental impacts associated with emissions of hazardous air pollutants from coal-fired power plants. Coal fired power plants can be significant contributors to deposition of mercury on soil and water. A study in eastern Ohio reported that coal combustion accounted for 70% of the mercury present in rainfall (Keeler et all 2006). In the same area, 42% of the mercury in samples of rain collected in the summer was attributed to emissions from a coal-fired power plant located less than a mile away (White et al 2009). Mercury that deposits to the earth’s surface from air can make its way into waterways where it is converted by microorganisms into methylmercury, a highly toxic for of mercury.

# States CP Solvency

#### **States can fund freight infrastructure – New York proves**

New York DOT, no date New York Department of Transportation “RAIL FUNDING AND FINANCE OPTIONS” https://www.dot.ny.gov/divisions/operating/opdm/passenger-rail/rail-funding

Section 14-d of the New York State Transportation Law authorizes the Commissioner of Transportation to enter into contracts with private corporations, other State Agencies, Public Authorities, political subdivisions of the State, and other States, among others entities listed, for the purpose of maintaining and improving rail transportation services. (NYS Transportation Law, 14-d, 1, b) Thus, the Commissioner is explicitly authorized to fund capital improvements on any rail transportation facilities, whether it is government or privately owned. The Commissioner is also authorized to acquire any rail transportation facilities for the purpose of rail transportation services, but is not required to do so prior to funding capital improvements. The State of New York generally provides State funds for rail capital improvements through the following three programs: Rebuild and Renew New York Transportation Bond Act of 2005. The 2005 Rebuild and Renew New York Transportation Bond Act provided $135 million over five years for passenger rail, freight rail, and port capital improvements to preserve and/or improve service in the State's major trade and passenger travel corridors, including capacity, clearance, intermodal facilities, yards and other projects that enhance competitiveness and economic development. See the NYSDOT Regional Economic Development Councils page for information on the 2011 solicitation. Passenger and Freight Rail Assistance Program. The Passenger and Freight Rail Assistance Program (PFRAP) is a multi-year freight and passenger rail funding program passed by the State Legislature. Funds are appropriated from general state revenues annually. Since 2003, funding from this program has been used for the annual subsidy which NYSDOT pays to Amtrak for operation of Adirondack service between Albany and Montreal, QUE. The balance of the annual appropriation is available to fund freight and passenger capital improvements. There is no local match requirement for this program.

#### **States can fund – Virginia proves**

VDRPT 11 – Virginia Department of Rail and public transportation (http://www.drpt.virginia.gov/activities/rail.aspx) AW

DRPT’s Rail Division supports both passenger and freight rail in Virginia through funding and advocacy for rail improvements, industrial access and preservation projects. In 2005, the first source of dedicated funding for freight and passenger rail improvements in Virginia history was established through the Rail Enhancement Fund. This Fund is complementary to DRPT’s other rail funds: Rail Industrial Access and Rail Preservation. The Rail Division has five areas of activity: Passenger Rail, Freight Rail, Planning and Special Projects, and State Rail Safety Oversight. Passenger Rail involves coordinating with Amtrak, Virginia Railway Express (VRE), other states, local Metropolitan Planning Organizations, and agencies on passenger rail operations, planning and development. Freight Rail involves coordinating with CSX, Norfolk Southern and other freight rail operators on freight rail operations, planning and development. In addition to the Rail Enhancement Fund program mentioned above, two other grant programs are associated with freight rail: Rail Preservation and Rail Industrial Access. Rail Preservation provides for the preservation and development of Virginia’s shortline railroads, while Industrial Access fosters rail development and access to freight rail service for new or expanding business and industries.

#### **States can fund – Illinois CREATE program proves**

Stagl 12 – Managing editor for progressive railroading (Jeff, “Transportation improvement program posts progress in Chicago,” Progressive railroading, July 2012,[http://www.progressiverailroading.com/mow/article/Transportation-improvement-program-posts-progress-in-Chicago--31529#](http://www.progressiverailroading.com/mow/article/Transportation-improvement-program-posts-progress-in-Chicago--31529)) AW

The $3.2 billion CREATE program aims to separate freight and passenger trains at six key junctions, increase freight-rail capacity, speed and reliability, and eliminate 25 grade crossings. The program involves a public-private partnership (PPP) comprising 14 constituents: Amtrak; the Association of American Railroads (AAR); BNSF Railway Co.; Belt Railway Co. of Chicago; Chicago Department of Transportation; Canadian Pacific; CN; CSX Transportation; Illinois Department of Transportation; Indiana Harbor Belt Railroad Co. (IHB); Metra; Norfolk Southern Railway; Union Pacific Railroad; and U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT). CREATE includes 70 projects, including 36 designed to improve rail infrastructure (such as track, switches and signals) and upgrade technologies, and 25 aimed at constructing grade separations (underpasses or overpasses). The program also includes a viaduct improvement program designed to upgrade roadways, sidewalks and drainage at 14 locations, as well as crossing safety enhancements, and rail operation and visibility improvements. As of mid-June, CREATE had capped off one-quarter of all planned work. Fourteen projects were completed, 12 were under construction, 15 remained under environmental review and four were in final design, says Bill Thompson, the AAR’s CREATE program manager, adding that 25 other projects remain on the docket. The good news for CREATE partners is that every project so far is running 10 percent under budget, he says.

#### **States can solve - Colorado proves**

CDOT, 2012 (Colorado Department of Transportation, “State Freight and Passenger Rail Plan”, 5/17/2012, http://www.coloradodot.info/projects/PassengerFreightRailPlan/) VS

CDOT’s Mission is “to provide the best multi-modal transportation system for Colorado that most effectively and safely moves people, goods and information” and we cannot do this without input from our Stakeholders. With the help of CDOT’s public and private stakeholders and the cooperation of the Federal Railroad Administration, CDOT began the task of developing **Colorado’s** first statewide passenger and freight rail plan in January 2011. This plan will provide guidance for investing in future rail needs and present ways to enhance passenger and freight rail development to support economic growth and environmental sustainability. The DRAFT Vision developed for the State Freight and Passenger Rail Plan is shown below: The Colorado rail system will improve the movement of freight and passengers in a safe, efficient and reliable manner. In addition, the system will contribute to a balanced transportation network, coordinated land use planning, economic growth, a better environment and energy efficiency. Rail infrastructure and service will expand to provide increased transportation capacity, cost effectiveness, accessibility and intermodal connectivity to meet freight and passenger market demands through investments which include public-private partnerships.” The finalized plan will fulfill the requirements of the Railroad Safety Enhancement Act of 2008. In addition to meeting the Federal requirements, this plan will be integrated into the Statewide Long Range Multi-Modal Plan. Several Tasks related to this project have been completed and the anticipated completion date for this study is January 2012. The cost for completion of this study is approximately $782,000.

# **Private-State Partnerships Solve**

#### **Private-public partnerships solve – several programs prove**

Trunick 11 - Associate Editor, Inbound Logistics Magazine OSM Adjunct Faculty (Perry, A., “Improving Rail Infrastructure: On the Right Track”, Inbound logistics, October 2011, http://www.inboundlogistics.com/cms/article/improving-rail-infrastructure-on-the-right-track/) AW

All that capital investment translates to a more technologically advanced, environmentally friendly, efficient, and competitive transportation system. Here are a few examples of ongoing rail infrastructure projects: The Chicago Region Environmental and Transportation Efficiency Program (CREATE). **Developed to address issues in the nation's busiest rail gateway**, this partnership between Illinois; **Chicago**; Metra, the northeast Illinois commuter rail system; Amtrak; the U.S. Department of Transportation (**DOT);** and six railroads includes **construction** of 31 new overpasses and underpasses; **enhanced grade crossing safety; and extensive upgrades to tracks,** switches, and signal systems. **With** an estimated cost of $3 billion and target completion date in 2030, **the project is expected to create 2,700 jobs,** and deliver $1.1 billion in air quality improvements and $595 million in safety benefits. The Crescent Corridor. This partnership between Norfolk Southern (NS) and 13 states **spans 2,500 miles of rail infrastructure**. NS expects improvements from the $2.5-billion **project will allow it to handle increased traffic more efficiently** and remove an estimated one million trucks from congested roads. Canadian Pacific's (CP) North Dakota project. To support North Dakota's growing ethanol industry, CP will invest $100 million in infrastructure improvements and grow its workforce in the state by 18 percent. **The Transcon Corridor**. **BNSF** has invested $1.8 billion in the corridor, which spans 4,647 miles and 13 states**, connecting the ports and markets in California and the Southwest to the Midwest, Texas, and the Southeast**. The National Gateway. This CSX project spanning six states and the District of Columbia **will improve efficiency and routing in the corridor connecting the mid-Atlantic ports and the Midwest.** The price tag is $842 million, and completion is slated for 2015. UNION PACIFIC'S BIG PLANS In partnership with New Mexico, UP began a $400-million project to construct a state-of-the-art rail facility in southern New Mexico to establish Santa Teresa as a key inland port. The project broke ground in August 2011, in part to provide needed expansion for UP's El Paso, Texas, facility. El Paso will continue to operate, says Tom Lange, UP's director of corporate communications. UP's **commitment to intermodal runs deep. Its other recent projects** include a $370-million expansion at Joliet, Ill., in 2010. The railroad has added 65,000 domestic containers and has expanded services aimed at competing with single-driver truckload moves from the West to the Midwest. UP estimates there are opportunities to convert 11 million truckloads to rail intermodal, and believes it can compete on time, service, and cost with single-driver truckloads between Los Angeles and Chicago; Chicago and Dallas; northern California and Chicago; and Los Angeles and Dallas.

#### **Private-public partnerships solve freight rail - Wisconsin proves**

The Herald, 2012 (“Our View: Public-private partnership works well here”, 7/19/12, http://chippewa.com/news/opinion/editorial/our-view-public-private-partnership-works-well-here/article\_dde526d4-ba49-11e1-ba72-0019bb2963f4.html) VS

Sometimes government gets it right. Sometimes a little government interference in the private marketplace can set the table for much greater things to happen in the future. Sometimes government and private business can work together with positive results. For proof of all that, one need look no further than the tremendous success of the Western Wisconsin Rail Transit Authority, which the Chippewa County Board is taking the first steps toward dissolving. The organization is no longer needed. The county boards in Chippewa and Barron counties deserve praise for support of this program, as do the state officials who supported funding grant programs for improvement of freight rail infrastructure, and the private-sector businesses that joined in on the effort. This is a marvelous example of how a private-public partnership works. The growth of the frac sand industry is the reason why WWRTA is obsolete, but the organization’s existence is one of the reasons the industry focused on Chippewa County. The industry needed rail, and without the WWRTA, the future of freight rail service in this area was very much in doubt. In a nutshell, this is how it worked: The major rail companies were ready to abandon as unprofitable deteriorating rail lines in Chippewa and Barron counties. That would have left businesses like Bloomer Plastics and the Jennie-O Turkey Store in Barron County without an essential service, and put hundreds of jobs at risk. The solution was creating the WWRTA, through which private industry and local governments pledged to put up matching funding to go with state grants to rehabilitate the rail lines. The WWRTA would purchase the lines from the rail companies, improve them with those funds, and hire a short-line operator to keep the rail service active. The continued and improving rail service would save local jobs and preserve the possibility of other industries coming to the area because of the availability of the rail service. Progressive Rail, the short-line operator hired, was very active in this regard. It’s hard to say how this all would have turned out without frac sand, but that’s hardly the point. The commitment to rail made the area attractive to frac sand companies, who might otherwise have focused on other areas of the state with the resource. When that industry exploded in growth, it brought with it the money for the immediate rehabilitation of the rail lines without use of tax money. This saved Chippewa County alone $800,000, which it had already borrowed to spend on rail improvements. Now that money is available either to pay back the debt created, or for other uses. Now the rapidly improving rail lines have made the area all the more attractive to manufacturers and warehouse businesses that need rail service. The potential is there for the addition of many more high-paying jobs. When the WWRTA concept was first proposed back in 2001, through its formal creation in 2003 and through the borrowing of that $800,000, we repeatedly advocated for this project. We agreed with its other advocates that it was money well spent to protect and improve a valuable piece of the local transportation infrastructure. That position has without a doubt been proven to be correct — especially since Chippewa County ultimately did not even have to spend the money it had committed.

# HTF CP Idea

*Possible states CP funding mechanism??*

#### Freight rail projects should be eligible for highway trust fund money – this allows state and local governments to solve the problem inexpensively

**Frittelli, 2003** (John F., Transportation Analyst – Resources, Science, and Industry Division, Congressional Research Service, “Intermodel Rail Freight: A Role for Federal Funding?”, March 31, http://www.policyarchive.org/handle/10207/bitstreams/1673.pdf)

Rather than creating additional trust funds, **another option** being debated **is making it easier for rail projects to qualify for existing highway trust fund** (HTF) **financed programs. Federal assistance could**, for example, **be targeted to rail projects where the alternative highways are heavily congested. Use of highway trust fund monies for non-highway projects is a long standing debate**. Although ISTEA’s language encouraged an intermodal approach for solving transportation needs, it did not mandate it. **State DOTs**, consulting with Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), are **given the power and flexibility to decide which projects get funded. Intermodal freight, particularly rail freight, has not received significant amounts of funding** from ISTEA, nor TEA-21. **Intermodalism has largely been a market-driven rather than a policy-driven development**. The real focus of intermodalism in these laws is that it allowed the use of highway trust fund money more broadly for mass transit projects. **An advantage of allowing HTF funds to be used for non-highway projects is that it increases the options of state and local planners in solving their transportation needs**. It should be noted that some state laws prohibit gas tax money being used for non-road projects. Nevertheless, **more options could lead to more cost efficient systemwide solutions**. For example, **it could be less expensive to improve an existing rail line to handle more traffic than to build additional highway lane miles**. Another advantage of this approach is that it maintains the basic program framework created by ISTEA and TEA-21.

# RRIF Reform CP

#### *Counterplan text: The United States federal government should reform and restructure the lending terms used by the Railroad Rehabilitation and Improvement Financing program.*

#### The RRIF doesn’t need more funding - currently only uses 1% of its loan authority

Progressive Railroading 11- Progressive Railroading is a industry executives and managers from a cross section of disciplines, (“RRIF program needs reforms to incent private rail investments, Mica and Shuster say”, 2/18/2011, Progressive Railroading: Rail Trends, <http://www.progressiverailroading.com/rail_industry_trends/news/RRIF-program-needs-reforms-to-incent-private-rail-investments-Mica-and-Shuster-say--25832>) ALT

Yesterday, Reps. John Mica (R-Fla.) and Bill Shuster (R-Pa.) addressed the importance of improving the federal Railroad Rehabilitation and Improvement Financing (RRIF) program during their testimony at a House hearing titled, “Sitting on our Assets: Rehabilitating and Improving our Nation’s Rail Infrastructure.” Created in 1998**, the RRIF program authorizes the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) to lend up to $35 billion for railroad infrastructure improvements,** equipment and facilities development. **However, loan processing time is averaging about 13-and-a-half months instead of the 90 days stipulated in the RRIF law**, said Mica, who chairs the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, according to a prepared statement. “**The cost of the RRIF program to taxpayers is exactly zero**, yet only $400 million is currently out in loans of a total $35 billion loan authority, utilizing only a little more than 1 percent,” he said, adding that **the FRA approved only two loans in 2010, two in 2009 and one in 2008. Government must do more with less and leverage its federal investments to the fullest extent.**

#### RRIF loans would solve if utilized but currently only 2% of the funding has been used Sussman, 2011 – president of Strategic Rail Finance, a financial services and business advisory firm (Michael, “A RRIF Centered Capitalization Growth Strategy”, April, *Railway Age,* http://www.strategicrail.com/news\_detail.php?id=20110404)

**The FRA's** Rehabilitation and Improvement Financing **(RRIF) program is authorized to lend $35 billion**, an amount equal to the fourth largest hedge fund in the world. Imagine the opportunity if this "hedge fund" pledged 100% of its capital to the United States rail industry, and in return demanded no equity, no control, and no decision-making power. Better still if there were 35 years to repay at the same interest rate enjoyed by the federal government and payments could be deferred for up to five years. That, in essence, is what RRIF offers, **but since the RRIF program began in 2000, only 2% of the funding has been utilized while 7000 miles of a 147,000 mile rail system have been abandoned**. Is there a direct connection? No, but there is a missed connection. The RRIF program was conceived to support more direct, local rail service, particularly by the branch line network. But across the country, from the Philadelphia metro area to southeast Arkansas to the Wasatch Front to California, **direct rail service may be in retreat. Closing more RRIF loans without confronting a shrinking rail network will doom the country to higher transportation costs, as more of rural and urban America invests in economic revitalization without the benefit of local rail service. Highway congestion, air quality concerns, and increasing mining for natural resources all point to the urgent need for expanding direct rail service**, not just high-volume corridors and terminals. **Surging demand for freight rail transportation has yet to be met with a comprehensive plan for growing rail service. RRIF loans can transform the financial prospects of individual borrowers, and the industry as a whole**, if conceived within this long-range plan for growth. **When the collateral agreements, terms, and timing are engineered thoughtfully, RRIF loans can seed a significant increase in overall capitalization. The RRIF program, however, continues to be treated as a "lender of last resort" rather than the catalyst for a rebuilding boom.** The RRIF program as it always has been is available but challenging. That should improve this year as the House Railroad Subcommittee and the FRA take steps to streamline the process. But more than anything, what's needed is an alignment among stakeholders around an industry-wide growth plan developed and implemented by the public and private sectors working in concert, not opposition.

#### RRIF funds would cover projects ranging from small to large

Ehl 12- currently works with Senate Transportation committee, former Federal Relations Manager for the Washington State Department of Transportation, (Larry, “What Railroad Construction Industry Wants in Final Transportation Bill”, Transportation Issues Daily May 14, 2012, http://www.transportationissuesdaily.com/what-railroad-construction-industry-wants-in-final-transportation-bill-part-1/) ALT

This request is a little more specific to the rail industry. The Railroad Rehabilitation & Improvement Financing (RRIF) Program is a $35 billion dollar federal credit program that railroads, rail shippers, and public entities may access for rail-related capital investment. RRIF has funded projects ranging from as small as $600,000 shortline railroad investments up to very large freight rail and passenger rail projects costing hundreds of millions of dollars. [Learn more about RRIF from this article by Tom Loftus of The Seneca Group LLC.] “The NRC supports the language improving the RRIF program in the Senate-passed MAP-21 legislation (Sec. 35408) and also the RRIF improvements in the House T&I Committee-passed H.R.7. These provisions do not conflict with each other, and the NRC recommends a combination of the language from both bills.”

#### RRIF needs to be reformed; it’s uniquely key to spurring private investment

Progressive Railroading 11- Progressive Railroading is a industry executives and managers from a cross section of disciplines, (“RRIF program needs reforms to incent private rail investments, Mica and Shuster say”, 2/18/2011, Progressive Railroading: Rail Trends, <http://www.progressiverailroading.com/rail_industry_trends/news/RRIF-program-needs-reforms-to-incent-private-rail-investments-Mica-and-Shuster-say--25832>) ALT

**The program’s barriers need to be eliminated or reformed so “RRIF can be an innovative and successful way to finance rail infrastructure projects,** including high-speed rail,” **said Mica.** “We need to stop sitting on our assets and make the RRIF program more accessible, faster and better utilized.” Despite efforts to strengthen and improve the RRIF program — such as by increasing the repayment period from 25 years to 35 years — the program “is in serious need of improvement,” said Shuster, who chairs the House committee’s Railroads, Pipelines and Hazardous Materials Subcommittee. “At a time when our nation is doing all that it can to spur economic activity, the RRIF program stands out as a potential model for how government can encourage economic growth,” he said. “Because RRIF is an innovative loan program — not a grant where the government merely hands out cash — the private sector is incentivized to invest money in projects that will pay a financial dividend down the road. Shuster also expressed interest in exploring ways to reform the program to leverage federal funding with private-sector resources or to improve the eligibility for high-speed rail projects. “I look forward to working with the chairman and the members of the subcommittee to improve and better utilize the RRIF program,” he said.

# Plan Unpopular

#### Congress is highway focused – dislikes freight rail investment

**Longman, 2009** – Senior research fellow with New America Foundation, Schwartz senior fellow at Washington Monthly, senior writer and deputy assistant managing editor at U.S. News & World Report, graduate of Oberlin College, fellow at Columbia University (Phillip, “Back on Tracks”, The Washington Monthly, January/February 2009, http://www.newamerica.net/publications/articles/2009/back\_tracks\_9914)

Yet despite this astounding potential**, virtually no one in Washington is talking about investing** any of that $1 trillion **in freight rail capacity**. Instead, **almost all the talk out of the Obama camp and Congress has been about spending for roads and highway bridges**, projects made necessary in large measure by America's over reliance on pavement-smashing, traffic-snarling, fossil-fuel-guzzling trucks for the bulk of its domestic freight transport. This could be an epic mistake. Just as the Interstate Highway System changed, for better and for worse, the economy and the landscape of America, so too will the investment decisions Washington is about to make. The choice of infrastructure projects is de facto industrial policy; it's also de facto energy, land use, housing, and environmental policy, with implications for nearly every aspect of American life going far into the future. **On the door step of an era of infrastructure spending unparalleled in the past half century**, we need to conceive of a transportation future in which each mode of transport is put to its most sensible use, deployed collaboratively instead of competitively. To see what that future could look like, however, we need to look first at the past.