## Freight Trucking Tradeoff DA:

### 1NC Shell-Trucks Trade Off

### UQ.:

#### Trucking Industry on Brink due to Budget Cuts

Wilson 10 (1 October 10, <http://www.lexisnexis.com/hottopics/lnacademic/>, Lexis Nexis, HS)

MARKET indicators increasingly suggest that tank truck fleets - and trucking companies in general - want to put the recession behind them and move forward. There is a clear sense that trucking wants to get back on the growth path in its role as one of the engines driving the US economy. FTR Associates' Trucking Conditions Index has been climbing and reached a reading of 2.3 in August. That was the sixth consecutive reading in positive territory during 2010 and indicates a healthy trucking environment, according to Eric Starks, FTR president. Strong manufacturing increases have generated truck freight above gross domestic product, and freight should continue to grow at around 4% in 2011. Most fleet managers are expressing cautious optimism about economic growth in 2011. They say they believe that increased shipper demand for truck transportation combined with fleet capacity constraints will continue to push rates higher. Modest increases in driver hiring are projected. Unfortunately, the Obama Administration and the Democrat dominated Congress continue to attack trucking - and the business community as a whole - with anti-business, job-killing programs and policies. Even worse, the Obama Administration has missed few opportunities to vilify the business community. Just in the past few weeks, President Obama and toadies in his administration launched a bizarre attack on the US Chamber of Commerce. Reminiscent of 1950s-era political smear campaigns orchestrated by Senator Joseph McCarthy, the White House alleged that the Chamber of Commerce was allegedly receiving foreign money that it was using for political donations. David Axelrod, a top Obama advisor, even charged that the Chamber's actions pose "a threat to our democracy." Chamber of Commerce officials vehemently denied the allegations, which they said point to Democrat desperation prior to the November elections. The Chamber reportedly will respond to the attacks by spending up to $75 million on the mid-term elections, and most of that will go to Republicans. Overt attacks on business include the ill-conceived moratorium on deep water drilling for oil in the Gulf of Mexico. A wide range of businesses, including trucking, were impacted, and tens of thousands of workers lost their jobs across the region. The Obama Administration's tepid announcement in early October that it is lifting the moratorium was too little, too late. Some of the deep water rigs have been moved to other countries, and drilling companies have expressed reservations about the new federal regulations that could make it too expensive or difficult to resume offshore drilling. More than 300,000 oil industry jobs could disappear over the next 10 years. The Obama Administration and the Democrat-controlled Congress seem likely to let most, if not all, of the Bush-era tax cuts to expire at the end of this year. Small businesses and most individuals in this country will be hit with significant tax increases. That comes at the same time that Americans will begin to feel the impact of new taxes and fees that are part of Obamacare. Former Democrat Senator Tom Daschle recently said that Obamacare could bankrupt the US economy. A blizzard of regulations from the Obama Administration also is raising operating costs for tank truck fleets and other businesses. Federal regulations are costing Americans trillions of dollars annually in hidden taxes. So many new regulations are coming out of Washington DC that it is hard to keep up with all of them. Bulk Transporter is devoting more and more editorial space to federal regulatory activity, such as the wetlines rules that are now expected from the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration in December. Over the past year, Obama Administration regulations mandated electronic on-board recorders for some carriers and tripled the hazardous materials registration fees. Higher fleet operating costs are coming with the Comprehensive Safety Analysis 2010 and new driver hours of service regulations that are expected to reduce productivity. Small businesses in particular (many of them tank truck fleets) seem to be bearing the brunt of the Obama Administration's anti-business tone. These companies have responded by not hiring any new workers or hiring at levels well below what would be typical during an economic recovery. It's no wonder that real unemployment has reached a crisis level of nearly 20%. Recent estimates suggest that more than eight million workers may have lost their jobs since 2008, and companies aren't hiring anywhere near enough new workers to reduce that total. Sadly the situation isn't likely to improve until changes are made in Washington DC. Congress - both the House of Representatives and the Senate - needs a complete makeover. Elected officials must stand firm against Obama Administration policies that are destroying businesses and the economy. Only then will we begin to see a true economic recovery. Hopefully, real change we can believe in will start in November. Agree or disagree? Make your voice heard by visiting Bulk Transporter Interactive at bulktransporter.com and clicking on "Contact Us."

### LINK:

Freight Trucking is improving now but faces direct competition from rail, air and ocean transportation

CompaniesandMarkets.com, 12 (5 March 2012, “Local Freight Trucking in the US - Industry Market Research Report,” LexisNexis, HS)

Local Freight Trucking in the US On the road again: During the recession, sluggish manufacturing production and slow retail spending reduced demand for freight transportation. However, industry conditions will improve as the economy stabilizes and demand for freight services increases. Furthermore, recovering consumer confidence and increased spending will support growth in freight volumes, boosting industry demand. However, the industry will face rising competition from other modes of transportation, such as rail, air and ocean. Operators in this industry provide general freight trucking over short distances. General freight companies handle a wide variety of commodities, which are generally palletized and transported in a container or van trailer. Local general freight trucking companies usually provide trucking within a metropolitan area that may cross state lines, and the trips are generally same-day return.

#### States and Railroad Companies Can’t Come to Agreements, thus Delaying the Construction

Levitz, Wall Street Journal Staff Writer, 10 (Jennifer, 21 September 2010, http://search.proquest.com/news/docview/751626985/1379537474E31EEF626/2?accountid=11091, HS)

Opposition from freight railroads is threatening the Obama administration's multibillion-dollar push to make high-speed passenger trains an integral part of the U.S. transportation network. The standoff demonstrates the difficulties of introducing new passenger service to a rail network that is at least 90% owned by freight railroads and outfitted for slower trains. To save time and money, government officials want new high-speed rail routes to operate on the vast system of train corridors that already crisscross the U.S., unlike European and Asian countries that have built dedicated tracks for high-speed rail. But Norfolk Southern Corp., Union Pacific Corp. and other railroad companies are balking at sharing their tracks or rights-of-way with trains that would run between 90 and 200-plus miles an hour. They argue that mixing high-speed passenger trains with slower freight trains would create safety risks, prevent future expansion and cause congestion. Cargo would be pushed to their competitors--trucking firms--the railroads argue, just as freight loads are picking up after the recession. Weekly average carloads in August were the highest since November 2008, according to the Association of American Railroads, the industry's main trade group. State and railroad officials are struggling to hammer out partnership deals required to release the funds. The Federal Railroad Administration has distributed just $597 million out of $8 billion in stimulus funds awarded by the administration in January to jump-start high-speed rail. An additional $286 million is expected to go out the door soon, the FRA said. Even when states and freight railroads have reached agreements, disagreements remain over the speeds at which the passenger trains will be allowed to travel. "Regrettably, the difficulty in achieving timely stakeholder agreements between the states and freight railroads has delayed putting Americans to work and building the rail system of the future," John Porcari, deputy secretary of the Department of Transportation testified Wednesday before the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation.

### IMPACT:

#### Trucking is the Largest Contributor to Freight Transportation

Donovan, ITS Dispatch, has extensive knowledge about trucking industry, 09

(Ray, associated with ITS Dispatch, has extensive knowledge about trucking industry. He was a key person behind the concept of web based trucking and freight brokerage software. Later he also played a significant role in development of IFTA Fuel Tax Software, 6 January 09, http://ezinearticles.com/?Importance-of-Trucking-Companies-For-Business-and-Industry&id=1851177, HS)

Freight transportation is a very important need of every business these days. In fact this is the backbone of several industries and business. One cannot deny its importance in any respect. Although freight transportation depends upon three main modes of transportation Air Cargo, Railways and Road Transport (involving trucks), but trucks remain the major contributor of all time. Different Roles of Trucking Companies Trucking companies play an important role in moving freights from one place of country to another. For agro businesses and several small, medium and large industries these trucking companies are lifeline. Its impact can be felt in case of trucking companies' strikes when the prices of all commodities go up. Importance of Trucks in Agro Business - Trucking companies are among one of the most vital factors for the success and failures of agriculture and other agro businesses. Right from the transportation of seeds, fertilizers and required machinery for agriculture, to the transportation of final products and by-products of agriculture, trucking companies help farmers and other people associated with agriculture based businesses or small industries. Importance of Trucks for Industries - Every industry needs raw materials and fuels to keep their operations smooth. To keep their output rate intact, they need proper supply of both raw materials as well as fuels to induce their production in provocative manners. To serve this need they have to maintain the flow of raw materials and fuels regularly, trucking companies help these industries in maintaining required flow. At the end of production process, trucking companies also help industries to transport their end product to their end customers. Thus, trucking companies are of great help to industries in both pre and post production operations. Trucking Needs of Common Man - Not only industries and business but also common man needs services of trucking companies at several point of time. People need services of trucking companies in home construction, transportation of their furniture and other home stuff in case of shifting to some other places. Even some business entities like packers and movers are completely dependent on trucking companies for all their operations. Thus, we can easily figure out how important trucking companies for everyone are. In first look, not everybody can understand its importance directly, but after an observation everyone can figure out the involvement of trucking companies and their dependence of everybody's life.

#### Freight Transportation has a Direct Link to Economic Growth

UDOT, 02 (January 2002, <http://ops.fhwa.dot.gov/freight/freight_analysis/improve_econ/appa.htm#s1>, HS)

Freight Transportation and the Economy: A Description of the Linkages The American economy can grow and deliver improved living standards through one of two means, more workers or more productivity. With an aging population and net birth rates in decline, the nation is heavily dependent on productivity growth to achieve its economic goals. Transportation investment is important because its principal influence is on productivity. Exhibit 1 illustrates how investments in transportation infrastructure can lead to generative effects2 and growth in the national economy. Although improvements in passenger transportation have important economic ramifications, freight transportation enhancements that reduce the costs of moving goods (and services) to and from markets are critical to economic expansion. This is because the movement of goods is what economists term a factor input in the production of goods. Much like labor and capital, transportation costs affect directly the price of goods and services and the profits of producers. Consequently, investments that reduce the cost of moving goods to and from markets (via improvements in reliability, transit times, service levels, etc.) can help to increase and sustain economic growth. In effect, the efficiency and reliability of the freight transportation system affects economic productivity, and many economists would argue that productivity is the most important determinant of economic performance.

#### Turn-High Speed Rail cuts Diesel funding-Diesel Key to U.S. Economy and Jobs

States New Service, 11 (21 September 2011, MEDIA ADVISORY - SEPT. 28 PRESS CONFERENCE ON NEW REPORT ON ECONOMIC AND JOBS IMPACT OF DIESEL ON U.S. ECONOMY, LexisNexis, HS)

Diesel technology is critical to the U.S. economy the largest economy in the world. It makes and moves the vast majority of goods and services Americans use in everyday life. Diesel producing and reliant sectors of the economy constitute nearly half of the U.S. GDP. It is also largely home grown, providing high wage jobs for Americans - adding to the U.S. economy rather than to the nations trade deficit. A new report that examines the importance of diesel energy and manufacturing to the U.S. economic and employment sectors will be released at a press conference on September 28th at the National Press Club. The report -Diesel Powers the U.S. Economy: Providing High-Paying Jobs, Exports and Long-Term Productivity Gains in the Nations Fundamental Sectors - was conducted by Aspen Environmental Group and M.Cubed for the Diesel Technology Forum.

#### Economic growth is vital to prevent the collapse of U.S. hegemony.

Khalilzad 11 — Zalmay Khalilzad, Counselor at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, served as the United States ambassador to Afghanistan, Iraq, and the United Nations during the presidency of George W. Bush, served as the director of policy planning at the Defense Department during the Presidency of George H.W. Bush, holds a Ph.D. from the University of Chicago, 2011 (“The Economy and National Security,” *National Review*, February 8th, Available Online at http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/print/259024, Accessed 02-08-2011)

Today, economic and fiscal trends pose the most severe long-term threat to the United States’ position as global leader. While the United States suffers from fiscal imbalances and low economic growth, the economies of rival powers are developing rapidly. The continuation of these two trends could lead to a shift from American primacy toward a multi-polar global system, leading in turn to increased geopolitical rivalry and even war among the great powers.

The current recession is the result of a deep financial crisis, not a mere fluctuation in the business cycle. Recovery is likely to be protracted. The crisis was preceded by the buildup over two decades of enormous amounts of debt throughout the U.S. economy — ultimately totaling almost 350 percent of GDP — and the development of credit-fueled asset bubbles, particularly in the housing sector. When the bubbles burst, huge amounts of wealth were destroyed, and unemployment rose to over 10 percent. The decline of tax revenues and massive countercyclical spending put the U.S. government on an unsustainable fiscal path. Publicly held national debt rose from 38 to over 60 percent of GDP in three years.

Without faster economic growth and actions to reduce deficits, publicly held national debt is projected to reach dangerous proportions. If interest rates were to rise significantly, annual interest payments — which already are larger than the defense budget — would crowd out other spending or require substantial tax increases that would undercut economic growth. Even worse, if unanticipated events trigger what economists call a “sudden stop” in credit markets for U.S. debt, the United States would be unable to roll over its outstanding obligations, precipitating a sovereign-debt crisis that would almost certainly compel a radical retrenchment of the United States internationally.

Such scenarios would reshape the international order. It was the economic devastation of Britain and France during World War II, as well as the rise of other powers, that led both countries to relinquish their empires. In the late 1960s, British leaders concluded that they lacked the economic capacity to maintain a presence “east of Suez.” Soviet economic weakness, which crystallized under Gorbachev, contributed to their decisions to withdraw from Afghanistan, abandon Communist regimes in Eastern Europe, and allow the Soviet Union to fragment. If the U.S. debt problem goes critical, the United States would be compelled to retrench, reducing its military spending and shedding international commitments.

We face this domestic challenge while other major powers are experiencing rapid economic growth. Even though countries such as China, India, and Brazil have profound political, social, demographic, and economic problems, their economies are growing faster than ours, and this could alter the global distribution of power. These trends could in the long term produce a multi-polar world. If U.S. policymakers fail to act and other powers continue to grow, it is not a question of whether but when a new international order will emerge. The closing of the gap between the United States and its rivals could intensify geopolitical competition among major powers, increase incentives for local powers to play major powers against one another, and undercut our will to preclude or respond to international crises because of the higher risk of escalation.

The stakes are high. In modern history, the longest period of peace among the great powers has been the era of U.S. leadership. By contrast, multi-polar systems have been unstable, with their competitive dynamics resulting in frequent crises and major wars among the great powers. Failures of multi-polar international systems produced both world wars.

American retrenchment could have devastating consequences. Without an American security blanket, regional powers could rearm in an attempt to balance against emerging threats. Under this scenario, there would be a heightened possibility of arms races, miscalculation, or other crises spiraling into all-out conflict. Alternatively, in seeking to accommodate the stronger powers, weaker powers may shift their geopolitical posture away from the United States. Either way, hostile states would be emboldened to make aggressive moves in their regions.

As rival powers rise, Asia in particular is likely to emerge as a zone of great-power competition. Beijing’s economic rise has enabled a dramatic military buildup focused on acquisitions of naval, cruise, and ballistic missiles, long-range stealth aircraft, and anti-satellite capabilities. China’s strategic modernization is aimed, ultimately, at denying the United States access to the seas around China. Even as cooperative economic ties in the region have grown, China’s expansive territorial claims — and provocative statements and actions following crises in Korea and incidents at sea — have roiled its relations with South Korea, Japan, India, and Southeast Asian states. Still, the United States is the most significant barrier facing Chinese hegemony and aggression.

Given the risks, the United States must focus on restoring its economic and fiscal condition while checking and managing the rise of potential adversarial regional powers such as China. While we face significant challenges, the U.S. economy still accounts for over 20 percent of the world’s GDP. American institutions — particularly those providing enforceable rule of law — set it apart from all the rising powers. Social cohesion underwrites political stability. U.S. demographic trends are healthier than those of any other developed country. A culture of innovation, excellent institutions of higher education, and a vital sector of small and medium-sized enterprises propel the U.S. economy in ways difficult to quantify. Historically, Americans have responded pragmatically, and sometimes through trial and error, to work our way through the kind of crisis that we face today.

The policy question is how to enhance economic growth and employment while cutting discretionary spending in the near term and curbing the growth of entitlement spending in the out years. Republican members of Congress have outlined a plan. Several think tanks and commissions, including President Obama’s debt commission, have done so as well. Some consensus exists on measures to pare back the recent increases in domestic spending, restrain future growth in defense spending, and reform the tax code (by reducing tax expenditures while lowering individual and corporate rates). These are promising options.

The key remaining question is whether the president and leaders of both parties on Capitol Hill have the will to act and the skill to fashion bipartisan solutions. Whether we take the needed actions is a choice, however difficult it might be. It is clearly within our capacity to put our economy on a better trajectory. In garnering political support for cutbacks, the president and members of Congress should point not only to the domestic consequences of inaction — but also to the geopolitical implications.

As the United States gets its economic and fiscal house in order, it should take steps to prevent a flare-up in Asia. The United States can do so by signaling that its domestic challenges will not impede its intentions to check Chinese expansionism. This can be done in cost-efficient ways.

While China’s economic rise enables its military modernization and international assertiveness, it also frightens rival powers. The Obama administration has wisely moved to strengthen relations with allies and potential partners in the region but more can be done.

Some Chinese policies encourage other parties to join with the United States, and the U.S. should not let these opportunities pass. China’s military assertiveness should enable security cooperation with countries on China’s periphery — particularly Japan, India, and Vietnam — in ways that complicate Beijing’s strategic calculus. China’s mercantilist policies and currency manipulation — which harm developing states both in East Asia and elsewhere — should be used to fashion a coalition in favor of a more balanced trade system. Since Beijing’s over-the-top reaction to the awarding of the Nobel Peace Prize to a Chinese democracy activist alienated European leaders, highlighting human-rights questions would not only draw supporters from nearby countries but also embolden reformers within China.

Since the end of the Cold War, a stable economic and financial condition at home has enabled America to have an expansive role in the world. Today we can no longer take this for granted. Unless we get our economic house in order, there is a risk that domestic stagnation in combination with the rise of rival powers will undermine our ability to deal with growing international problems. Regional hegemons in Asia could seize the moment, leading the world toward a new, dangerous era of multi-polarity.

#### And, economic decline increases the risk of war—*strong statistical support*.

Royal 10 — Jedidiah Royal, Director of Cooperative Threat Reduction at the U.S. Department of Defense, M.Phil. Candidate at the University of New South Wales, 2010 (“Economic Integration, Economic Signalling and the Problem of Economic Crises,” *Economics of War and Peace: Economic, Legal and Political Perspectives*, Edited by Ben Goldsmith and Jurgen Brauer, Published by Emerald Group Publishing, ISBN 0857240048, p. 213-215)

Less intuitive is how periods of economic decline may increase the likelihood of external conflict. Political science literature has contributed a moderate degree of attention to the impact of economic decline and the security and defence behaviour of interdependent states. Research in this vein has been considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow.

First, on the systemic level, Pollins (2008) advances Modelski and Thompson's (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, finding that rhythms in the global economy are associated with the rise and fall of a pre-eminent power and the often bloody transition from one pre-eminent leader to the next. As such, exogenous shocks such as economic crises could usher in a redistribution of relative power (see also Gilpin. 1981) that leads to uncertainty about power balances, increasing the risk of miscalculation (Feaver, 1995). Alternatively, even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflict as a rising power may seek to challenge a declining power (Werner. 1999). Separately, Pollins (1996) also shows that global economic cycles combined with parallel leadership cycles impact the likelihood of conflict among major, medium and small powers, although he suggests that the causes and connections between global economic conditions and security conditions remain unknown.

Second, on a dyadic level, Copeland's (1996, 2000) theory of trade expectations suggests that 'future expectation of trade' is a significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behaviour of states. He argues that interdependent states are likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations. However, if the expectations of future trade decline, particularly for difficult [end page 213] to replace items such as energy resources, the likelihood for conflict increases, as states will be inclined to use force to gain access to those resources. Crises could potentially be the trigger for decreased trade expectations either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states.4

Third, others have considered the link between economic decline and external armed conflict at a national level. Blomberg and Hess (2002) find a strong correlation between internal conflict and external conflict, particularly during periods of economic downturn. They write,

The linkages between internal and external conflict and prosperity are strong and mutually reinforcing. Economic conflict tends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn returns the favour. Moreover, the presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which international and external conflicts self-reinforce each other. (Blomberg & Hess, 2002. p. 89)

Economic decline has also been linked with an increase in the likelihood of terrorism (Blomberg, Hess, & Weerapana, 2004), which has the capacity to spill across borders and lead to external tensions.

Furthermore, crises generally reduce the popularity of a sitting government. “Diversionary theory" suggests that, when facing unpopularity arising from economic decline, sitting governments have increased incentives to fabricate external military conflicts to create a 'rally around the flag' effect. Wang (1996), DeRouen (1995). and Blomberg, Hess, and Thacker (2006) find supporting evidence showing that economic decline and use of force are at least indirectly correlated. Gelpi (1997), Miller (1999), and Kisangani and Pickering (2009) suggest that the tendency towards diversionary tactics are greater for democratic states than autocratic states, due to the fact that democratic leaders are generally more susceptible to being removed from office due to lack of domestic support. DeRouen (2000) has provided evidence showing that periods of weak economic performance in the United States, and thus weak Presidential popularity, are statistically linked to an increase in the use of force.

In summary, recent economic scholarship positively correlates economic integration with an increase in the frequency of economic crises, whereas political science scholarship links economic decline with external conflict at systemic, dyadic and national levels.5 This implied connection between integration, crises and armed conflict has not featured prominently in the economic-security debate and deserves more attention.

This observation is not contradictory to other perspectives that link economic interdependence with a decrease in the likelihood of external conflict, such as those mentioned in the first paragraph of this chapter. [end page 214] Those studies tend to focus on dyadic interdependence instead of global interdependence and do not specifically consider the occurrence of and conditions created by economic crises. As such, the view presented here should be considered ancillary to those views.

## NEG ANSWERS:

### A2-ENVIRONMENT

Trucking is Key to Econ and Jobs-We are Working on Becoming More Environmentally friendly Modern Bulk Transporter, 11 (13 July 11, <http://www.lexisnexis.com/hottopics/lnacademic/>, Lexis Nexis, HS)

The SmartWay Drayage Program mirrors the SmartWay Transport Partnership. Drayage trucks, typically older and allegedly more polluting than longhaul trucks, operate in and around port areas and represent one of the largest sources of diesel emissions associated with ports. This program was designed to specifically address the unique environmental issues associated with port trucking, to incentivize the deployment of newer, cleaner port trucks across the nation, and to recognize SmartWay Drayage Partners for reducing diesel emissions from those trucks. "US ports generate jobs and are critical to our nation's economy," says Gina McCarthy, assistant administrator for EPA's Office of Air and Radiation. "EPA's SmartWay dray truck initiative will help ports contribute to their local economies --while protecting the air quality, environment, and public health of nearby communities." Through the SmartWay Drayage program, port trucking companies and independent owner-operators sign a partnership agreement and commit to track diesel emissions, replace older dirtier trucks with cleaner, newer ones, and achieve at least a 50% reduction in particulate matter (PM) and 25% reduction in nitrous oxide (NOx), below the national industry average, within three years. Similarly, SmartWay retailers sign a partnership agreement where they commit to ship at least 75% of their port cargo with SmartWay trucking carriers within three years. By giving business priority to SmartWay drayage carriers, the program creates a market-driven approach to incentivize emissions reductions at port communities across the country. In addition to the financial support provided to trucking companies and owner operators by participating retailers, a number of EPA, state, regional, and local programs provide low interest loans and down payment assistance for transitioning to clean port trucks. CRT's SmartWay Drayage Charter Partners include the following retailers: Best Buy; Hewlett Packard; The Home Depot; JC Penney; Lowe's; Nike; Target; Walmart; and the following port trucking carriers: California Cartage Express LLC; California Multimodal, LLC; Container Connection; Evans Delivery Company, Inc.; GSC Logistics; PDS Trucking Inc; Performance Team/GaleTriangle; Total Transportation Services Inc; and Western Ports Transportation.

High Speed Rail Would Tradeoff With Current Freight Rail Systems, Leading to Problems, Salam author of National Review Online’s The Agenda, 10 (Reihan Salam, 26 July 2010, [http://www.nationalreview.com/agenda/231413/how-think-about-rail-investment-u-s/reihan-salam#](http://www.nationalreview.com/agenda/231413/how-think-about-rail-investment-u-s/reihan-salam), HS)

There is a basic problem with U.S. rail policy: high-speed passenger rail gets the attention, but freight rail is the real success story, on the economic, environmental, and public health fronts. The Economist just published an exceptionally smart, balanced, thoughtful assessment of the rail landscape in the U.S. which explains that there is a tension between existing plans for the expansion of high-speed passenger rail and the success of freight rail. But the problem with America’s plans for high-speed rail is not their modesty. It is that even this limited ambition risks messing up the successful freight railways. Their owners worry that the plans will demand expensive train-control technology that freight traffic could do without. They fear a reduction in the capacity available to freight. Most of all they fret that the spending of federal money on upgrading their tracks will lead the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), the industry watchdog, to impose tough conditions on them and, in effect, to reintroduce regulation of their operations. Attempts at re-regulation have been made in Congress in recent years, in response to rising freight rates. “The freight railroads feel they are under attack,” says Don Phillips, a rail expert in Virginia. The Economist survey gives a brief history of the revival of freight rail, which really is one of the more impressive turnaround stories in the history of American business. Phil Longman has described the federal government’s role in the turnaround while The Economist emphasizes, correctly in my view, the role of deregulation: Giving the railroads the freedom to run their business as they saw fit led to dramatic improvements. The first result was a sharp rise in traffic and productivity and fall in freight costs. Since 1981 productivity has risen by 172%, after years of stagnation. Adjusted for inflation, rates are down by 55% since 1981 (see chart 1). Rail’s share of the freight market, measured in ton-miles, has risen steadily to 43%—about the highest in any rich country.

#### TURN-No Bipartisan Support for High Speed Rail-It Would Lose Millions

Engineering News-Record, 11 (12 September 11, SOUNDING BOARD, LexisNexis, HS)

Almost every industrialized country has a high-speed rail line. With the completion of the new Chinese project, the U.S. [appears to be] bogged down in old ideas, financed by the airline and trucking industries. Florida cities would all benefit from modern connectivity instead of wasting time in airports for short trips within the state. There is little to no bipartisan support for this. It only survives because it was legally too far along to kill. It will lose millions of dollars every year, as evidenced by the promise of subsidized rides and the financial failure of [other] rail lines in the U.S. The 113,000 comically expected construction jobs aptly illustrates the mental bankruptcy of anyone who supported this train wreck.

#### **The Freight Industry Accounts for an Extremely Small Part of U.S. Emissions**

Basu, 11 (Pratik, 27 September 2011, Seven ways freight sector can reduce its carbon footprint, LexisNexis, HS)

Solar powered ships, advanced diesel and electric engines and GPS navigation systems in trucks are going to shape the future of the growing freight sector as per the report given by the Environmental Defense fund. The freight sector is responsible for 25 percent of the transportation sector emissions in the U.S, and on the whole it is about 8 percent of total U.S. emissions. According to a report, in the last 20 years, the emission due to the freight industry has increased to 60 percent as compared to 27 percent for the passenger travel. Keeping the environmental impacts in mind the report has categorized the projects into seven groups to help improve the freight transport:

#### TURN-Railroads are Spending More Money than the Stim Will Get Out

Levitz, Wall Street Journal Staff Writer, 10 (Jennifer, 21 September 2010, http://search.proquest.com/news/docview/751626985/1379537474E31EEF626/2?accountid=11091, HS)

Federal officials call the money an unprecedented federal investment in the U.S.'s rail network, and say the high-speed rail funds will add capacity that will benefit freight railroads. John Gray, senior vice president of policy and economics at the Association of American Railroads, says the stimulus funding pales in comparison to the $460 billion railroads have sunk into their own infrastructure over the past 30 years. "It is interesting money perhaps," he said of the federal funds. "But is it the kind of thing you sell your soul for? No." The success of many of the projects depends on cooperation between freight railroads and states, Mr. Porcari said. "It is something we're going to insist on.

TURN-Delays Would Take Much More Time, and Run up the Cost-California Proves

Levitz, Wall Street Journal Staff Writer, 10 (Jennifer, 21 September 2010, http://search.proquest.com/news/docview/751626985/1379537474E31EEF626/2?accountid=11091, HS)

In California, Union Pacific has thrown up a potential obstacle to plans to build a $42.6 billion rail link between San Francisco and Los Angeles, with trains running up to 220 mph. The California High Speed Rail Authority proposes, in one plan, to place new tracks for more than 200 miles along Union Pacific's tracks. But a Sept. 2 report by the authority said Union Pacific, the largest U.S. railroad, insisted in letters to the authority that "no part of the high-speed corridor" be located on the railroad's right-of-way or near it. The railroad said it would fight any attempts to take its land--or that of its customers--by eminent domain, according to the authority. In a statement, Union Pacific Chief Executive James Young said the Omaha, Neb., railroad was "committed to working through the issues" related to high-speed rail nationwide. "We may not be able to get there on every project, but we will work toward that goal," he said. Rail authority spokeswoman Rachel Wall said Union Pacific's objections could affect the timeline of the project in the Bay Area, and could "significantly increase costs," because California may have to buy property from multiple landowners. Railroads are also tangling with Ohio and New York officials, with CSX Corp. and Norfolk Southern balking at the speed goals in those states.

## AFF Answers to Trucks:

#### Railroad Industry is Lying, thus Undermining the Trucking Industry

Cleaner Safe Trucking Inc. 12 ( 31 January 12 <http://www.lexisnexis.com/hottopics/lnacademic/>, Lexis Nexis, HS)

Freight railroad industry should support the entire bill: According to coalition officials, freight railroads are using false safety arguments to undermine any effort by Congress to give trucking a modest productivity increase. This is particularly disturbing in light of the almost $6 billion in capital account subsidies they have received since 2009 from the federal government through TIGER grants and the High Speed Rail program (most of the money in the latter goes to the freight lines over which AMTRAK operates). The American Energy and Infrastructure Jobs Act contains numerous provisions to benefit freight railroads and increase their productivity. Coalition officials went on to say it is time for the freight railroad industry to cease its cynical attacks on the trucking provision and support the bill in its entirety. "When transportation industries work together, rather than undermining each other, America benefits through a stronger, safer, more productive transportation system," said the Hon. Jim Burnley, Chairman, CleanerSaferTrucking, Inc., and former Secretary of the U.S. Department of Transportation under President Reagan.

### A2 JOBS/ECONOMY

#### High Speed Rail Creates Jobs and Boosts Econ.-No Reason to Save Trucking

Field professor of economics at Santa Clara University and Ridenour, 11 (Alexander J. Field a professor of economics at Santa Clara University and the author of"A Great Leap Forward: 1930s Depression and U.S. Economic Growth, Amy Ridenour, 19 May 2011, <http://www.lexisnexis.com/hottopics/lnacademic/>, Lexis Nexis, HS)

Would high-speed rail spending add jobs in the United States? Of course. Even if some of the rolling stock for the trains were imported, structures and other permanent way would still have to be built in the United States. Under current conditions, any government spending --- for rails, for bridges, for highways, for the military --- would contribute to job creation. Fears that government spending might displace or crowd out private-sector capital formation would be justified were we at or close to capacity. But we are not. The unemployment rate remains near 9 percent, and this doesn't account for those who, discouraged, have simply left the workforce. Even more telling is the ratio of employment to population, which has fallen from its all-time high of over 64 percent in 1999 to 58 percent today. In spite of large "supply side" tax cuts tilted toward the wealthy, the record of the George W. Bush presidency on job creation was in fact quite poor. For a variety of reasons, including the recent financial crisis, the U.S. economy remains in a serious slump. High-speed rail spending could stimulate job growth and help jump start the economy. These projects would, of course, add to the deficit and concerns about its long term growth, particularly that attributable to health care, are merited. Looking back over the past three decades, however, Republicans' interests in deficit reduction seems to have waxed and waned depending upon who occupied the White House. The deficit ballooned under Bush, due largely to tax cuts but also to increases in military spending and a new unfunded prescription drug benefit. The resulting run-up in the debt was regrettable, but the time to cut government spending is when the economy is strong, not when it is weak. If the country is going to incur new debt, it is better to do so to acquire well-chosen infrastructure and equipment than to fund consumption. Would high-speed rail represent well-chosen infrastructure? In other words, would it help the U.S. "win the future"? This is a more complex question. It requires us to consider not simply whether such projects would help close the output gap, but whether and how effectively they would expand the potential output of the economy. Here there are legitimate concerns about whether the U.S. has enough high density corridors --- such as that between Boston and Washington --- to yield large benefits. And building in dense areas can be costly. For example, the proposed Los Angeles to San Francisco route would go right through my backyard in Palo Alto, Calif., and the extent to which that part of the route will or will not be put underground has become a contentious political issue. That said, state and federal governments have a long and largely successful record of supporting infrastructure development, from the Erie Canal to regional and transcontinental railroads to the Interstate Highway System and, more recently, to the Internet. The build-out of the surface road network during the Great Depression generated large private-sector benefits, contributing to very fast productivity growth in transportation --- railroads and trucking --- as well as in wholesale and retail distribution. High-speed rail projects could certainly create jobs and stimulate the economy in the short run. Whether they would generate benefits similar to those of other government funded infrastructure projects is uncertain. History suggests, however, that there's a good chance they would. Alexander J. Field is a professor of economics at Santa Clara University and the author of"A Great Leap Forward: 1930s Depression and U.S. Economic Growth."

### FREIGHT INCREASE NOW-RAILROADS SOLVE BEST

#### Freight Shipping Increasing Now

AAR, 11 (Association of American Railroads, March 2011, <http://www.aar.org/~/media/aar/Background-Papers/Tax-Incentives.ashx>, HS)

America’s Demand for Freight Transportation Will Grow America has been going through some very difficult economic times, but at some point sustained economic growth will return. When that happens, America’s demand for freight transportation will continue the upward trend that’s been its hallmark for decades. The Federal Highway Administration, for example, recently estimated that total freight movements across all modes will rise from an estimated 16.9 billion tons in 2010 to 27.1 billion tons in 2040 — a 61 percent increase.

#### Railroads are the Best Option to Solve Current Demands

AAR, 11 (Association of American Railroads, March 2011, <http://www.aar.org/~/media/aar/Background-Papers/Tax-Incentives.ashx>, HS)

Railroads are the best way to meet this demand. They are safe, stimulate economic activity, save fuel, promote job growth, reduce greenhouse gas and other emissions, and keep trucks off overcrowded highways. And they do it while providing affordable, reliable transportation to American businesses and consumers. Railroads Are Reinvesting Record Amounts, But More is Needed

### A2 COST

#### Collapse of railroads turns the case – railroad industry pays for their own infrastructure and it spills over to businesses and consumers reducing costs for everyone while reducing emissions.

AAR, 11 (Association of American Railroads, March 2011, <http://www.aar.org/~/media/aar/Background-Papers/Tax-Incentives.ashx>, HS)

Trucks, airlines, and barges operate on publicly financed highways, airways, and waterways. By contrast, freight railroads pay nearly all of the costs of their tracks, bridges, and tunnels themselves. From 1980 to 2010, freight railroads reinvested approximately $480 billion of their own funds — more than 40 cents out of every revenue dollar — to maintain and improve their tracks and equipment. Railroads spend so much because the capital intensity of freight railroading is so high. The average U.S. manufacturer spends about 3 percent of revenue on capital spending. For freight railroads, it’s almost 17 percent, or more than five times higher. Railroad investment in plant and equipment per employee is eight times the average for all manufacturing. The four ￼Tax Incentives For Freight Railroad Infrastructure Investments Page 1 of 2 largest railroads each spend far more on their rail networks than the vast majority of state highway agencies spend on their respective highway networks. How to Expand Rail Capacity and Stimulate the Economy. As they do today, freight railroads will continue to pay the overwhelming majority of the costs of their tracks, bridges, tunnels, and other infrastructure. However, there is a gap between the socially-optimal level of rail capacity and what railroads are likely to be able to afford on their own. Smart public policy is needed if we are to take full advantage of railroads’ unparalleled potential to lower shipping costs, ease highway congestion, save fuel, and reduce emissions. A sensible way to help is to enact legislation that provides tax incentives for projects — such as new track, bridges, tunnels, and intermodal facilities — that expand freight rail capacity. All businesses that make capacity-enhancing rail investments, not just railroads, would be eligible. Costs associated with a recent unfunded Congressional mandate for railroads to install positive train control systems should also be eligible for the tax incentive.

#### High Speed Rail Key to Economy and Jobs Growth-England Proves

Walker, 12 (Jonathan, 18 June 2012, HIGH SPEED RAIL IS VITAL, SAY BOSSES, LexisNexis, HS)

"We cannot allow our future prosperity and growth to be derailed by a minority of vocal opponents in the South. Cities are the natural drivers of growth and job creation and as such people naturally flock to them. "We must link our engines of growth up with a fast, direct and reliable railway network - HS2. If we continue to muddle along we must accept that our economy will follow suit and watch as we are out paced by the dynamic economies that had the foresight to invest in high speed rail." Supporters of HS2 say a new network is needed because existing lines are becoming overcrowded while passenger numbers are increasing. PM David Cameron has restated his personal backing for the scheme, saying: "I think HS2 is very important for the economy of our country. I think it's very important we get on board this high speed rail revolution. I'm very keen that we press ahead with it."

#### High Speed Rail Would Boost the Economy, Clear Congestion, and Transport Goods in the Most Efficient Way Possible

Tendersinfo News, 12 (5 May 2012, United States : Illinois, Indiana and Michigan to Move Forward on Critical Midwest High Speed Rail Study, LexisNexis, HS)

This is an important step toward achieving higher speeds along the entire Chicago to Detroit rail corridor and improving the flow of freight to the east coast," said Secretary LaHood. Eliminating bottlenecks will boost the economy by reducing delays and allow for the freer flow of both people and goods throughout the region. An important focus of the study will be reducing congestion by linking a double track passenger main to the 110 mph service at Porter. The study will build on progress Michigan has already made by achieving 110 mph service from Porter to Kalamazoo. The comprehensive study will help us establish faster passenger rail service for business and leisure travelers moving between Chicago and Detroit, as well as make freight movements more efficient, Illinois Governor Pat Quinn said. In Illinois, we have made high-speed rail and freight infrastructure improvement top priorities, and I am pleased to work with our neighboring states and Secretary LaHood, who understands the importance of providing significantly reduced travel times and promoting economic development through rail improvements. This is an important partnership in our efforts to reinvent Michigan, specifically creating an accelerated rail connection between Detroit and Chicago for both citizens and businesses, said Michigan Gov. Rick Snyder. Relieving congestion will also help the Midwest s freight industry by better enabling the rapid and efficient movement of manufactured and agricultural products. The Chicago to Detroit line is part of the Midwest Regional Rail Network, which is located in one of five densely populated mega-regions, areas already overwhelmed by congestion and in need of better transportation options. Bringing safe, fast, convenient, affordable high-speed rail to these areas will create jobs, increase economic opportunities and relieve congestion.

### RAILROADS MORE EFFICIENT

#### Collapse of railroads turns the case – railroads are four times more efficient than truck shipping turning your global warming and air pollution advantages.

AAR, 11 (Association of American Railroads, March 2011, <http://www.aar.org/~/media/aar/Background-Papers/Tax-Incentives.ashx>, HS)

The cost of freight railroad infrastructure tax incentives would be a few hundred million dollars per year, but the economic and other public benefits would be much higher:  Strengthen the economy – Based on a U.S. Depart- ment of Commerce model of the U.S. economy, every $1 of new rail infrastructure investment that would be stimulated by a tax incentive would generate more than $3 in total economic output. Thus, $300 million in additional freight rail capacity investment would result in nearly $1 billion in overall economic benefits. Each $1 billion of new rail investment induced by the tax incentives would create around 20,000 jobs.  Fuel efficiency – On average, railroads are four times more fuel efficient than trucks. In 2009, U.S. railroads moved a ton of freight an average of 480 miles per gallon of fuel. If 10 percent of the long-distance freight that currently moves by truck moved by rail instead, fuel savings would exceed one billion gallons per year.  Greenhouse gases – Because greenhouse gas emissions are directly related to fuel consumption, moving freight by rail instead of truck reduces greenhouse gas emissions by 75 percent, on average.  Highway congestion – Highway gridlock costs the U.S. economy $115 billion per year — and that’s just in wasted fuel and time. Lost productivity, cargo delays, and other costs add tens of billions of dollars to this tab. But a train can carry the freight of 280 or more trucks. That means railroads reduce highway gridlock, the high costs of maintaining existing highways, and the pressure to build costly new highways.  Pollution – Moving freight by rail rather than truck significantly reduces emissions, and that means cleaner air for all of us.

#### Freight Rail Key to U.S. Economy and Competitiveness

NationalAtlas.Gov, 04 (July 04, <http://www.nationalatlas.gov/articles/transportation/a_freightrr.html>, HS)

Freight railroads are critical to the economic well-being and global competitiveness of the United States. They move 42 percent of our nation's freight (measured in ton-miles) - everything from lumber to vegetables, coal to orange juice, grain to automobiles, and chemicals to scrap iron - and connect businesses with each other across the country and with markets overseas. They also contribute billions of dollars each year to the economy through investments, wages, purchases, and taxes. There were 554 common carrier freight railroads operating in the United States in 2002, classified into five groups.

### HSR SOLVES GAS PRICES

#### High Speed Rail is the Answer to Rising Gas Prices

Bothwell, 11 (6 September 11, New Deal Democrat Cecil Bothwell vs Blue Dog Heath Shuler-- A Study In Contrasts, LexisNexis, HS)

We need high speed rail nationwide-- air travel and over-the-road trucking are going to be priced out of the market as oil prices rise in the future. Trains are the answer. And we need multi-modal transit systems that connect us to the trains, to our jobs and to our extended families.

### HSR GETS US AWAY FROM TRUCKS

#### High Speed Rail Would Steer us Away from Trucks

Congressional Documents and Publications, 12 (3 April 2012, Nadler, Sires, New York and New Jersey Members Support Federal Funding for Rail Freight Connection Between New York and New Jersey;

Rep. Jerrold Nadler (D-NY) News Release, LexisNexis, HS)

The Port Authority is already doing important work to stabilize the carfloat operation and restore it to a state of good repair, and is now seeking a TIGER IV grant for $14.48 million in support of the total $18.1 Million project. This project will implement further improvements that will help establish the carfloat operation as a true "second rail gateway." Specifically, the grant will support the purchase of three (3) new ultra low emissions locomotives for NYNJR operations, rehabilitation of track and other facilities at the 65th Street Yard in Brooklyn, and the construction of a second large rail barge (carfloat) to increase system capacity and improve reliability. The "second rail gateway" will offer shippers more options and increase competition within the rail freight industry. With appropriate support and funding, it can divert significant amounts of freight away from trucks (the predominant mode of freight transport in the East of Hudson region today), yielding important social and environmental benefits for both New York and New Jersey such as reduced traffic congestion, less wear and tear on area highways, bridges and tunnels, and fewer harmful diesel air emissions.

### **TRUCKING INDUSTRY HURTS RAIL INDUSTRY**

#### Freight Railroads Already Unregulated Now

Levitz, Wall Street Journal Staff Writer, 10 (Jennifer, 21 September 2010, http://search.proquest.com/news/docview/751626985/1379537474E31EEF626/2?accountid=11091, HS)

Under FRA rules, high-speed passenger trains traveling between 90 mph and 125 mph can share tracks with freight railroads, while trains going between 125 mph and 250 mph must run on a separate track. Currently, Amtrak's conventional trains, which go up to 79 mph, share tracks with freight railroads in most of the country. Freight railroads say running faster and slower trains on the same track could slow their trains because they would have to give faster trains more leeway. Freight railroads also worry partnerships with states will bring federal regulations, an unwelcome prospect for an industry largely deregulated in 1980. The Transportation Department is requiring that railroads that benefit from stimulus funds meet performance standards in return. Ohio received $400 million in stimulus funds toward a train between Cleveland and Cincinnati by 2012. The state's application to the federal government says speeds will be 79 mph, eventually reaching 110 mph. But both Norfolk Southern and CSX Corp., which each own part of that track, say they won't allow passenger trains to go above 79 mph. New York officials and CSX are also tangling over speed. The state has announced plans to increase rail speeds to 110 mph from 79 mph in upstate New York, but CSX says it will permit passenger trains no faster than 90 mph on or near its tracks.

**Cheaper fuel for trucks hurts rail industry**

**Whitfield, investment writer, 2012** (Paul, 6/20/12, Investor’s Business daily, “Railway Etches Base on Base; 3% Off High”, lexis, TG)

Canadian National Railway is working on the eighth week of a base-on-base pattern. The buy point is 87.20, and the stock is about 3% off its high. Among the 10 stocks in IBD's rail group, Canadian National Railway has the second-biggest market cap. The rail line has 20,600 miles of track reaching from coast to coast in Canada and as far south as New Orleans. Earnings have a steady history. The five-year and three-year EPS Stability Factors are 9 and 6, respectively, on a scale that runs from 0 (calm) to 99 (erratic). Traditionally **the rail group's chief competitor has been** and is **trucking. Rail has an advantage over trucking in fuel efficiency. Yet, some market watchers believe the abundance of natural gas -- along with fracking technology** that expands recovery capabilities -- **could hurt railroads.** Gains in natural gas could come at the expense of coal, and railroads transport coal. Also, **if the trucking industry converts to natural gas as a cheaper source of fuel that could make them a tougher competitor for railroads.** Canadian National, though, derives only about 7% of its revenue from coal. The company's portfolio is balanced, with the biggest items being 20% intermodal, 17% grains, 16% petroleum and chemicals, 14% forest products and 11% metals. Geographically, about two-thirds of revenue is tied to Canada, the U.S. and transborder traffic. A third is overseas-related, mostly Asia. Europe makes up only 4%. Earnings in recent quarters grew 14%, 18% and 28%. Revenue stepped up 7%, 10% and again 10%. After-tax margin increased on a year-ago basis in each of the past nine quarters. The Composite Rating, which combines all five IBD ratings into a single number, is 93. The rail industry group, though, is mediocre -- No. 81 of 197 groups in Tuesday's IBD. The dividend in U.S. dollars is about 36.75 cents a share for an annualized yield of 1.7%. The company raised the payout in each of the past 16 years, more than doubling the dividend since 2006. Canadian National Railway is in this week's Big Cap 20, the only railroad stock to make the list.

### TRUCKS TAKE $ FROM RAILROADS

**Heavier trucks hurt the rail industry-direct competition**

**Flohr, business journalist, 91** (Bruce, 2/24/1991, <http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m1215/is_n2_v192/ai_10383244/?tag=content;col1>, “In Michigan, a new menace - longer combination vehicles imperil short rail freight lines”, TG)

In Michigan, a new menace The debate has begun on the issue of larger trucks. However, **heavier trucks as much as longer trucks are a threat to the railroad industry. Heavier trucks will kill smaller railroads**. Groups such as CRASH are calling attention to the threat posed by longer combination vehicles, especially three 28-foot trailers behind a single tractor. These combinations can appear visually intimidating to drivers trying to pass them. Recently, much attention has been directed to a video tape filmed in California which dramatically shows the snaking effects of triple trailers and the problems of curb override on long doubles. The video also shows that stopping tests had to be suspended because of an accident in the very first test. Also, Railway Age's widely-reprinted article "The myth of the monster trucks" (Aug. 1990, p. 35), focuses on longer combination trucks. Why then, after all this publicity, should another "large truck" article be necessary? Simply because there's a very real threat to the railroad industry from the expanded use of heavier trucks. These are road monsters that carry twice the loads of the traditional 18 wheeler. Usually, there are six more axles mounted beneath the traditional-length vehicle. That means there are 42 tires on 11 axles. This increases the load limit from 80,000 pounds to 135,000 pounds, and the revenue load from 20 tons to over 40 tons. On first seeing one of the heavy trucks, the impression is one of an approaching tank or centipede. The State of Michigan now permits these heavy trucks, and the trucking industry has adopted the concept with enthusiasm. These heavy trucks haul construction aggregate, coal, foundry sand, fuel oil, garbage, steel products, cement, grain and scrap iron. Since this phenomenon exists only in Michigan, why should the railroad industry care about heavy trucks? **Every one of the commodities moved by heavy trucks may also be hauled by rail.** On RailTex railroads, we haul cement 30 miles, steel angle iron 16 miles, grain 45 miles, and construction aggregate 70 miles, all from origin to final destination. We also handle all these products to interchange with our connecting Class I's. However, most of our big increase in business has been these commodities in short haul situations where the Class I's could not economically attract the business. **Increase in the weight limits on trucks would be disastrous for the feeder railroads; heavier trucks are a much greater threat** than the longer truck **to the feeder railroad industry. Large railroads could lose much of their intermodal business if longer combination vehicles were legalized,** and Class I profits would be hurt. However, **the large trucks could lead to the death of the small railroads.** Heavier trucks cause highway problems which affect automobile (and truck) driver safety. The heavier load means a longer stopping distance, even if more tires are touching the road. The larger, double-size load, concentrated in the same length wheelbase, is possible only if the load is piled higher in the trailer. This creates a higher center of gravity on the same width wheelbase, and the resulting consequences of increased rollover hazard. In a rain situation, passing a large truck is a hazardous experience because of the spray thrown off by the tires. If 18 wheelers are intimidating on a wet roadway, think what 42 wheels will produce in spray. Most heavy rigs are powered by the same size diesel engines as their 20 ton "little brothers." Therefore, the acceleration to enter freeways is adversely affected, and "stop/start" traffic congestion is slowed even more than it is by "normal" trucks. When a heavy truck reaches an uphill section of the freeway, it will slow to a snail's pace lugging up the grade. Increased rear end collisions are a probability. Many of these heavy rigs in Michigan turn on their "hazard" four-way flashers as warnings to minimize the potential for rear end collisions because they move so slowly. Highway engineers may argue heavier trucks do not adversely harm roadways, at least not any more than other trucks. Why? The additional wheels carry the extra load so that tire/surface pressures are not increased. The pavement is no worse off than before, and the axle load on bridges is not adversely affected. Yet this overlooks two significant facts. First, the total weight on the bridge is doubled! That impacts the spanning beam, stringers, piers, bents and foundations. The bridge surface may not be harmed, but the support structure suddenly is asked to bear twice the load. Recently John D. Schulz in Traffic World stated that only 4% of our 7,000 interstate and primary bridges would require rebuilding and it would cost "only $2.8 billion." The 4% is bad enough, especially if the bridge is a key link in a heavily used road system. However, what about our secondary highway system--and county roads too? Mr. Schulz stated another 19,000 bridges would need "altering" at a $4.1 billion cost. These bridges are already recognized as being our weak link, and are getting worse. Double-weight trucks would be a disaster to our secondary system. The other fact experts avoid publicizing is the number of wheel impacts on the road surface. A 42-wheel heavy truck carries the equivalent of two trucks. If this means product transferred from rail into truck, the total highway usage doubles. Twice the load means twice the surface war, and roadways will deteriorate at an accelerated rate. Who wants this, except the road construction industry? The railroad industry needs to continue to focus the attention of the public to the issue of larger trucks. The longer trucks are visually easier to explain. However, the heavy truck cannot be overlooked. The next time you visit Michigan, look for the heavy trucks: they are everywhere. The railroads have been badly hurt by the Michigan weight rule. Heavy trucks cannot be allowed to hurt the rail industry elsewhere.

**Heavier trucks directly trade-off with rail roads**

**Gallagher, author, 2009** (John, 3/2/9, Journal of commerce, “Weight Limit Standoff;

Renewed push by shippers to increase truck weights hits a freight train”, Lexis, TG)

The atmosphere surrounding the trucking and railroad debate over truck size and weight limits is more frigid than ever, and shippers claim they’re stuck in the middle. At a National Association of Manufacturers transportation subcommittee meeting in Washington last month, a representative of International Paper pleaded the shippers case to increase federal truck weight limits to 97,000 pounds from the current 80,000 pounds. John Runyan, IP s senior public affairs manager, said the plea was swiftly rejected. Not only did the railroads oppose this when I raised the issue, but they expressed support for a higher vehicle use tax on existing 80,000-pound trucks, said Runyan, who also co-chairs the Coalition for Transportation Productivity, whose members include Kraft Foods, Boise Cascade and MillerCoors. It was a little bit of a stunner to see them not only oppose improved truck productivity but support higher fees on existing vehicles and higher costs for U.S. manufacturers during an economic recession. Railroad industry officials were not immediately available for comment. Class I railroads have long opposed changes to federal size and weight limits for trucks. Longer combination vehicles tractors with two or more trailers having gross vehicle weight of more than 80,000 pounds are limited to certain highways in 21 states that allowed such trucks before 1991. Beyond safety concerns, the Association of American Railroads points to a Department of Transportation Highway Cost Allocation Study that concludes taxes levied on combination trucks weighing 80,000 to 100,000 pounds cover only half the cost of the damage the trucks cause to highways. But the railroads are more likely concerned that **boosting truck weight limits would give trucks a competitive edge** in the fight over shipper dollars. The AAR cites a 1999 DOT study suggesting **increasing truck size and weights would result in a decline in rail revenue of between $2.9 billion and $6.7 billion.** Rail earnings would decline 32 percent to 46 percent, **and** rail car-miles would decline 4 percent to 20 percent, the study said. The association also refers to a Massachusetts Institute of Technology study that said **increasing federal truck weight limits to 97,000 pounds could reduce merchandise traffic on short line railroads** by 44 percent. **Traffic diversion would mean that railroads would have less money to reinvest in their networks**, the AAR said in a position paper. **This would lead directly to reduced rail capacity and poorer rail service**. Remaining rail customers could face higher rates, reduced service, or both. The Coalition for Transportation Productivity, which launched its campaign for heavier trucks in December, said its proposal refutes rail arguments against the higher weight limits. The proposal advocates adding a sixth axle to the heaviest trucks. This would spread out the added weight and actually place less pressure per tire on the roadways. The group cites a Transportation Research Board study showing with an extra axle, braking capacity would be maintained even at 97,000 pounds. The coalition said its supporters would be willing to pay more through a permit fee dedicated to bridge repair and to offset any additional wear on roads. And raising weight limits could significantly reduce fuel use and carbon emissions without compromising safety, the coalition said, and would also spur investment in upgraded equipment and create jobs. The National Industrial Transportation League, which supports increasing truck length in addition to weight, said the benefits to shippers are difficult to ignore. This would help the carriers productivity by adding more revenue per truck, said Wayne Johnson, who heads the NIT League s highway committee and is director of logistics for American Gypsum. Being able to haul another 17,000 pounds per truck would save carriers money, and that can be passed on to the shipper. Johnson, whose company is a major player in the home building market, said the railroads claim they would lose business to trucks is tenuous given his difficulty in getting railroads to haul American Gypsum s goods. I’m still shocked railroads have taken no steps to getting more product on the rails from the forest industry products sector, he said. They’ve got empty cars parked all along their network. Our customers are asking for rail, and we’re telling them no until the railroads can be more competitive with trucks.

### TRUACKING COMPANIES OPPOSES HSR

#### High Speed Rail Opposition from Trucking Companies-England proves

The Journal (Newcastle, UK), 11 (20 July 2011, Don't Let The Opposition Derail Scheme, LexisNexis, HS)

All is not lost yet. The Government is proposing to build a high-speed rail line that will link Birmingham and London, before going northwards. This new, fast railway line will be of massive benefit to everyone even if you never, ever, take the train. For instance, this line will help to ease the strains on employment and economic growth that regions outside London are battling in the current recession. Without it, we do not stand a chance of redressing the problem of a London-centric economy. This is because it will be easier to get from London to the North East. Past experience shows that greater connectivity produces a corresponding rise in investment and job creation. High-speed rail will make places like Newcastle more attractive to potential investors. It will bring new businesses to the region, lead to wage increases, and attract jobs. Not only that, but, as long-distance travellers move on to the new high-speed line, there will be a vast increase in the number of seats on existing lines. This will substantially ease overcrowding on congested commuter routes. But sadly we are facing a loud and organised opposition along the route of the new line, from Tory MPs to rich landowners and big trucking firms, who want to look after their own interests. And, in less than two weeks, the Government's public consultation on the first stage of the proposed high-speed rail line will close. If you'll excuse the pun, without your support, high-speed rail faces being derailed.