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#### HSR drastically increases the budget deficit

Vranich Cox and Moore, affiliated with Reason Foundation 8

(Joseph Vranich, Wendell Cox and Adrian Moore; Reason Foundation; September 1, 2008; “The California High-Speed Rail Proposal: A Due Diligence Report”; Policy Study 370; <http://reason.org/news/show/the-california-high-speed-rail>; accessed July 7, 2012) Kristof

With the high costs of building in California and the history of cost overruns on rail projects, the **final price tag for the** complete **high-speed rail system will** actually **be $65 to $81 billion**, according to the Reason Foundation report. And while the **Rail Authority forecasts between 65 and 96 million** intercity **riders** by 2030, **the** due diligence **report finds these projections are dramatically inflated**. After compiling numerous ridership studies previously conducted for California rail systems, the study demonstrates **the state can expect 23 million to 31 million riders** a year in 2030. **Any failure to meet** the Rail Authority's **lofty ridership projections would force ticket-price increases**, further **cutting ridership, or require** taxpayer **subsidies to cover the financial shortfall, adding to** future **budget deficits.** The due diligence report finds "the San Francisco-Los Angeles line alone by 2030 would suffer annual financial losses of up to $4.17 billion."

#### HSR price keeps rising

Rosen, Reporter for The American, 2011

(Michael M., 3/23/11, The American Magazine, The Real Problem with High Speed Rail, <http://www.american.com/archive/2011/march/the-real-problem-with-high-speed-rail>, date accessed 7/10/12, DD)

HSR’s problems stem mainly from implausibly rosy economic predictions followed by deeply disappointing financial results. One expert calls HSR a “budget-buster,” contending that California’s high-speed costs have risen at least 50 percent. Even the model HSR networks around the globe—supposedly exemplary of the wonders of fast train travel—leave much to be desired.But worse even than cost overruns has been the political manipulation afflicting the speedy choo-choos. A recent eye-opening New York Times article revealed the cold, calculating politics behind HSR in sunny Florida, where the federal government pledged $2.4 billion of the total $2.6 billion cost of building an 85-mile-long high-speed track between Tampa and Orlando. The Sunshine State’s Republican governor refused the funds, however, worried that his state would have to foot the bill later for the cost overruns and excess debts that have vexed similar systems throughout the world. The route itself, it turns out, was more or less useless, as critics had contended for years. “It would have linked two cities that are virtually unnavigable without cars,” the Times article states, “and that are so close that the new train would have been little faster than driving.”

#### Cost will be net negative – current lines show

Julian 10

(Liam, research fellow at the Hoover Institution, Stanford University, and managing editor of Policy Review, April/May, Policy Review, “The Trouble with High Speed Rail”, 7/3/12, BR)

The designers of Florida's and California's proposed high-speed rail routes say that ticket sales will pay for their respective system's operating costs. No doubt those who are planning lines in other American corridors will say the same. The claims are surpassingly dubious. Only two dedicated high-speed railways in the world — one connecting Tokyo and Osaka, and the other between Paris and Lyon — have ever broken even on their initial and ongoing expenditures. And many European high-speed rail systems that are deemed cost-effective actually receive lots of extra help. A 2008 study, commissioned by Amtrak's Office of the Inspector General, notes that European passenger railways often count the government funding they receive as revenue, and that some systems receive "off-balance sheet" public funding, "typically provided for staff and pension obligations, debt service, restructuring, and past capital investments." The report concludes that, when all is said and done, "European Passenger Train Operations operate at a financial loss and consequently require significant Public Subsidies." They require far more in subsidies than Amtrak, in many cases, and Amtrak is subsidized at $3.2 per passenger. In 2008, Amtrak lost $1.1 billion. The economics of high-speed rail do not work, especially in America.

#### HSR Fails- Low ridership and financial benefit

Samuelson, writes a weekly economics column, Harvard College, 2011

(Robert J., 2/14/11, Washington Post, “High-Speed Rail is a fast track to government waste,http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2011/02/13/AR2011021302203.html, date accessed 7/10/12, DD)

High-speed rail would transform Amtrak's small drain into a much larger drain. Once built, high-speed-rail systems would face a dilemma. To recoup initial capital costs - construction and train purchases - ticket prices would have to be set so high that few people would choose rail. But lower prices, even with favorable passenger loads, might not cover costs. Government would be stuck with huge subsidies. Even without recovering capital costs, high-speed-rail systems would probably run in the red. Most mass-transit systems, despite high ridership, routinely have deficits. The reasons passenger rail service doesn't work in America are well-known: Interstate highways shorten many trip times; suburbanization has fragmented destination points; air travel is quicker and more flexible for long distances (if fewer people fly from Denver to Los Angeles and more go to Houston, flight schedules simply adjust). Against history and logic is the imagery of high-speed rail as "green" and a cutting-edge technology.

#### They cannot win a positive economic effect; empirics prove that HSR does not boost economy

Glaeser 9

(Edward L, Professor at Harvard’s Economy Department, “Is High-Speed Rail a Good Public Investment?” July-October, New York Times Economix Series, <http://www.lawrence.edu/fast/finklerm/Glaeser%20on%20High%20Speed%20Rail.doc>, 7/9/12, BR)

Any transportation investment can create large economic ripples only if it significantly increases the speed at which an area with cheap real-estate gains access to a booming place that doesn’t have any comparable, closer available land area. For example, in Spain, the city of Ciudad Real seems to have gotten a big lift thanks to high-speed rail because people can now live in Ciudad Real, where housing is cheaper, and commute into Madrid. This logic has led some to think that high-speed rail will do wonders transforming Buffalo into a back office for Manhattan. Buffalo is 376 miles from Manhattan, so a 150-mile-an-hour rail line will take two and a half hours, which is not going to be significantly faster than air. Moreover, vast amounts of low-cost space are closer to Manhattan than the shores of Lake Erie. Faster connections between Buffalo and Toronto might do more, but in that case speed is hampered by the burdens of border crossing. Philadelphia is the more natural beneficiary of high-speed rail access to Manhattan; there are already people who live in Philadelphia and commute to New York. Yet even in this most propitious setting, the coming of Acela seems to have had little impact on the population decline of Philadelphia or growth of Wilmington. Perhaps the absence of any trend break in population growth around 2000 just reflects the incremental nature of the Acela investment, but there is little here to bring confidence that rail lines revitalize cities. Moreover, I don’t see why is it in the national interest to disperse economic activity from Manhattan to Buffalo or Philadelphia. I have long argued that the economic case for directing economic aid to declining regions is weak.

#### **HSR won’t work well in the US and costs will exceed benefits**

Congressional Digest 11

(4/1, “High-Speed Rail Overview: System Components, Potential, and Cost Issues”, 7/3/12, BR)

One of the basic obstacles facing development of highspeed rail lines is that the direct economic benefits of such lines rarely exceed the direct costs. Nevertheless, Japan, France, Germany, Spain, and China are among the countries that have built very high-speed rail networks with trains operating at speeds of over 150 mph. Proponents of HSR often cite the networks in these countries, with the implication that their adoption of HSR makes the feasibility and desirability of building HSR lines in the United States unquestionable. But to extrapolate from the adoption of HSR in other countries to the conclusion that the United States should follow a similar path may not be warranted. The motives that led other countries to implement very high-speed rail lines are varied; some, like Japan and China, did so originally in part to meet the demand on already overcrowded conventional rail lines, while others did so in part to try to preserve rail’s declining mode share in the face of the growing role of car and air travel. In most cases, the regions served were more densely populated than most areas in the United States.

# 1NC Frontline- Competitiveness

### Hegemony

#### The US still has the best infrastructure systems and prospects for global competitiveness

Donohue 11

(Tom, August 16, President and CEO of the United States Chamber of Commerce,

No Time for Wallowing, Free Enterprise, <http://www.freeenterprise.com/article/no-time-for-wallowing>) CL

With our credit downgraded, stock prices falling, economic recovery sputtering, and hope running out for millions of unemployed workers, this may seem like an unusual time to talk about America’s strengths. In fact, it’s the best time. Wallowing in self-doubt will get us nowhere. By harnessing our extraordinary advantages, we can create new growth, jobs, and opportunities for Americans. We’ve got a highly productive manufacturing sector poised for expansion and new hiring. Our competitors’ costs are rising. With the right tax, labor, and regulatory policies, we can enjoy a manufacturing renaissance few dared to imagine a short time ago. Domestic energy production will fuel this renaissance. We have bountiful supplies of natural resources to use at home and sell around the world. We’re home to vast agricultural lands of unmatched potential. Our farms can feed a hungry world, creating businesses and jobs across industries throughout America. We still have one of the best end-to-end infrastructure systems in the world. With smart investments and upgrades, we can create hundreds of thousands of jobs while spurring growth and improving our quality of life. With positive demographics and a continued commitment to openness and individual opportunity, our country will have a constant supply of the hardest workers, smartest innovators, and most adventuresome entrepreneurs. This will keep our high-tech industries, our universities, our tourism destinations, and our health care sector vibrant and on the cutting edge. There’s plenty to criticize when it comes to our laws, politics, and government. Some in the global community have recently piled on the criticism. But who would trade our system for theirs? A strong rule of law, low levels of corruption, and a commitment to open debate and equal treatment are significant advantages too. These and other attributes comprise America’s “secret sauce” that will continue to sustain the most successful economy on earth. That’s why people, rich and poor, are still beating a path to our shores. This is most evident in times of crisis. Investors habitually seek safe haven here. They are doing so to this very day. I’m not suggesting that we try to paint a happy face on today’s lousy circumstances. We’ve got big problems to fix. We must grow our economy, limit the appetite of our government, put the American entrepreneur back in the driver’s seat, and take short and long-term steps to create American jobs. But let’s stop selling America short. There’s no faster way to crush America’s can-do spirit than by throwing up our hands and saying we can’t.

#### US competitiveness suppresses conflict escalation

Baru, Visiting Professor at the Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy in Singapore Geopolitical Implications of the Current Global Financial Crisis, 2009 (Sanjaya, , Strategic Analysis, Volume 33, Issue 2 March 2009 , pages 163 – 168)

The management of the economy**,** and of the treasury,has been a vital aspect of statecraftfrom time immemorial. Kautilya’s Arthashastra says, **‘**From the strength of the treasury the army is born. …men without wealth do not attain their objectives even after hundreds of trials… Only through wealth can material gains be acquired, as elephants (wild) can be captured only by elephants (tamed)…A state with depleted resources, even if acquired, becomesonlya liability.’4 Hence**,** economic policies and performance do have strategic consequences.5 In the modern era, the idea that strong economic performance is the foundation of powerwas argued most persuasively by historian Paul Kennedy. ‘Victory (in war),’ Kennedy claimed, ‘has repeatedly gone to the side with more flourishing productive base.’6 Drawing attention to the interrelationships between economic wealth, technological innovation, and the ability of states to efficiently mobilize economic and technological resources for power projection and national defence,Kennedy argued thatnations that were able to better combine military and economic strength scored over others. ‘The fact remains,’ Kennedy argued, ‘that all of the major shifts in the world’s military-power balance have followed alterations in the productive balances; and further, that the rising and falling of the various empires and states in the international system has been confirmed by the outcomes of the major Great Power wars, where victory has always gone to the side with the greatest material resources**.’7**

### Economy- Turn

#### Competing with China is bad for U.S- Hurts Econ

Washington Post 11

(2/17/11, Washington Post, A lost cause: The high speed rail race, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2011/02/16/AR2011021606768.html>, date accessed 7/12/12, DD)

PRESIDENT OBAMA'S fiscal 2012 budget includes $8 billion for high-speed rail next year and $53 billion over six years. In the president's view, the United States needs to spend big on high-speed rail so that we can catch up with Europe, Japan - and you-know-who. "China is building faster trains and newer airports," the president warned in his State of the Union address. But of all the reasons to build high-speed rail in the United States, keeping up with the international Joneses may be one of the worst. In fact, experience abroad has repeatedly raised questions about the cost-effectiveness of high-speed rail. China would seem to be an especially dubious role model, given the problems its high-speed rail system has been going through of late. Beijing just fired its railway minister amid corruption allegations; this is the sort of thing that can happen when a government suddenly starts throwing $100 billion at a gargantuan public works project, as China did with rail in 2008. Sleek as they may be, China's new fast trains are too expensive for ordinary workers to ride, so they are not achieving their ostensible goal of moving passengers from the roads to the rails. Last year, the Chinese Academy of Sciences asked the government to reconsider its high-speed rail plans because of the system's huge debts. Of course, if the Chinese do finish their system, it is likely to require operating subsidies for many years - possibly forever. A recent World Bank report on high-speed rail systems around the world noted that ridership forecasts rarely materialize and warned that "governments contemplating the benefits of a new high-speed railway, whether procured by public or private or combined public-private project structures, should also contemplate the near-certainty of copious and continuing budget support for the debt."

#### Economic decline causes protectionism and war – their defense doesn’t assume accompanying shifts in global power.

Royal, Director of Cooperative Threat Reduction at the U.S. Department of Defense, 2010

 (Jedediah Royal, , 2010, “Economic Integration, Economic Signaling and the Problem of Economic Crises,” in Economics of War and Peace: Economic, Legal and Political Perspectives, ed. Goldsmith and Brauer, 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 defense behavior 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 crisis could usher in a redistribution of relative power (see also Gilpin, 1981) that leads to uncertainty about power balances, increasing the risk of miscalculation (Fearon, 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). Seperately, 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 behavious 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 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. Crisis could potentially be the trigger for decreased trade expectations either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states. 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 favor. Moreover, the presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which international and external conflict self-reinforce each other. (Blomberg & Hess, 2002. P. 89) Economic decline has 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 increase 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 correlated 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. This implied connection between integration, crisis and armed conflict has not featured prominently in the economic-security debate and deserves more attention.

### Terrorism- Turn

#### Terrorist attacks on HSR exist and are much more likely than attacks on airlines – killing cost-competitiveness

Maurillo 11

(Donna R., Director of Communications and Technology Transfer at the Mineta Transportation Institute, High-Speed Rail in the US: Will It Be a More Attractive Terror Target than Inter-city Rail?, <http://transweb.sjsu.edu/mtiportal/education/alumni/capstones/terror-targets-high-speed-rail-vs-intercity-rail-Maurillo.pdf>) CL

Assuming, then, that high-speed rail does succeed in the US, it could become a target for domestic or global terrorist groups or individuals who specifically attack transportation modes. In that event, which security-related issues could be problematic? Several possibilities exist. First, terrorist attacks against inter-city rail have occurred with almost predictable frequency around the globe. Crowded cars and easy access provide a ready target for anyone with evil intent. Although rail attacks may not deliver the spectacular devastation of an airline attack – such as that of September 11, 2001 – they still can provide sufficient carnage to deliver a stunning message of terror. Second, the discovery of Osama bin Laden’s trove of correspondence and terrorrelated documents has heightened America’s sensitivity to possible attacks on its rail system. Although rail professionals and counter-terrorism experts have long recognized it, Americans are just beginning to realize that rail is much more vulnerable than the relatively closed airline system. In fact, a recent editorial in the Peoria Journal Star said, “It's clear that our enemies view our rail system as having some security holes. Furthermore, ridership on Amtrak continues to increase, up 10 percent so far over last year on Illinois routes for example. “It has been said that 9-11 happened because of a failure of American imagination. We no longer have that excuse. High-speed rail investment is an Obama administration priority. Nothing would kill that concept faster than a high-profile train terrorist strike in the U.S. Passenger safety has to be a part of this discussion.”1 Third, rail security is more difficult than airline security because it must address much larger numbers of travelers. Of necessity, screening must be brief to keep the crowds moving efficiently. This can allow lethal devices to pass through undetected into the cars. Even chemical-sniffing canines and random screening are imperfect enough to leave certain vulnerabilities in the rail system. And crowds standing in long screening lines can be vulnerable to attack, as well. In addition, a new HSR system in the United States could become a tempting target for those who would wish to destroy any icon of Western values – especially if the nation had just invested a staggering sum of money into it. Attacking airlines is not an easy endeavor. The majority of US transportation security investment has focused on air travel, making another attack much more daunting. On the other hand, **rail is so much more accessible and vulnerable not only at the stations, but also along the entire route, where derailments can be carried out in remote areas. By contrast, an airliner is reasonably safe once it has left the ground. One also must consider that a well-placed explosive device planted on high-speed rail could be timed to coincide with that train traveling adjacent to key infrastructure, such as bridges, tunnels, water treatment plants, power stations, and the like. It also is possible to place an explosive device on an inter-city passenger train and time it to explode as the cars pass alongside a high-speed train**. And finally, because it would be a new infrastructure, high-speed rail most certainly would be operated with digital technologies throughout. These systems, while more dependable and robust than mechanical systems on older lines, can be hacked in a way that could affect switches, warning lights, electrical circuits, and even the operating systems of the computer networks. Further, it is not difficult to purchase the means to create electronic identification badges and cards, thereby allowing a criminal to impersonate rail personnel and operate from inside the system. Many of these devices are readily available online, such as at <http://idcardmaker.org/>.

#### Protectionism causes war and bioterrorism

Pazner Faculty – New York Institute of Finance 2008 (Michael J., Financial Armageddon: Protect Your Future from Economic Collapse, p. 137-138)

The rise in isolationism and protectionism will bring about ever more heated arguments and dangerous confrontations over shared sources of oil, gas, and other key commodities as well as factors of production that must, out of necessity, be acquired from less-than-friendly nations. Whether involving raw materials used in strategic industries or basic necessities such as food, water, and energy, efforts to secure adequate supplies will take increasing precedence in a world where demand seems constantly out of kilter with supply. Disputes over the misuse, overuse, and pollution of the environment and natural resources will become more commonplace. Around the world, such tensions will give rise to full-scale military encounters, often with minimal provocation. In some instances, economic conditions will serve as a convenient pretext for conflicts that stem from cultural and religious differences. Alternatively, nations may look to divert attention away from domestic problems by channeling frustration and populist sentiment toward other countries and cultures. Enabled by cheap technology and the waning threat of American retribution, terrorist groups will likely boost the frequency and scale of their horrifying attacks, bringing the threat of random violence to a whole new level. Turbulent conditions will encourage aggressive saber rattling and interdictions by rogue nations running amok. Age-old clashes will also take on a new, more heated sense of urgency. China will likely assume an increasingly belligerent posture toward Taiwan, while Iran may embark on overt colonization of its neighbors in the Mideast. Israel, for its part, may look to draw a dwindling list of allies from around the world into a growing number of conflicts. Some observers, like John Mearsheimer, a political scientists at the University of Chicago, have even speculated that an “intense confrontation” between the United States and China is “inevitable” at some point. More than a few disputes will turn out to be almost wholly ideological. Growing cultural and religious differences will be transformed from wars of words to battles soaked in blood. Long-simmering resentments could also degenerate quickly, spurring the basest of human instincts and triggering genocidal acts. Terrorists employing biological or nuclear weapons will vie with conventional forces using jets, cruise missiles, and bunker-busting bombs to cause widespread destruction. Many will interpret stepped-up conflicts between Muslims and Western societies as the beginnings of a new world war.

#### Nuclear terrorism is an existential threat—it escalates to nuclear war with Russia and China

**Ayson 10** (Robert Ayson, Professor of Strategic Studies and Director of the Centre for Strategic Studies: New Zealand at the Victoria University of Wellington, 2010 (“After a Terrorist Nuclear Attack: Envisaging Catalytic Effects,” Studies in Conflict & Terrorism, Volume 33, Issue 7, July, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via InformaWorld)

A terrorist nuclear attack, and even the use of nuclear weapons in response by the country attacked in the first place, would not necessarily represent the worst of the nuclear worlds imaginable. Indeed, there are reasons to wonder whether nuclear terrorism should ever be regarded as belonging in the category of truly existential threats. A contrast can be drawn here with the global catastrophe that would come from a massive nuclear exchange between two or more of the sovereign states that possess these weapons in significant numbers. Even the worst terrorism that the twenty-first century might bring would fade into insignificance alongside considerations of what a general nuclear war would have wrought in the Cold War period. And it must be admitted that as long as the major nuclear weapons states have hundreds and even thousands of nuclear weapons at their disposal, there is always the possibility of a truly awful nuclear exchange taking place precipitated entirely by state possessors themselves. But these two nuclear worlds—a non-state actor nuclear attack and a catastrophic interstate nuclear exchange—are not necessarily separable. It is just possible that some sort of terrorist attack, and especially an act of nuclear terrorism, could precipitate a chain of events leading to a massive exchange of nuclear weaponsbetween two or more of the states that possess them. In this context, today’s and tomorrow’s terrorist groups might assume the place allotted during the early Cold War years to new state possessors of small nuclear arsenals who were seen as raising the risks of a catalytic nuclear war between the superpowers started by third parties. These risks were considered in the late 1950s and early 1960s as concerns grew about nuclear proliferation, the so-called n+1 problem. It may require a considerable amount of imagination to depict an especially plausible situation where an act of nuclear terrorism could lead to such a massive inter-state nuclear war. For example, in the event of a terrorist nuclear attack on the United States, it might well be wondered just how Russia and/or China could plausibly be brought into the picture, not least because they seem unlikely to be fingered as the most obvious state sponsors or encouragers of terrorist groups. They would seem far too responsible to be involved in supporting that sort of terrorist behavior that could just as easily threaten them as well. Some possibilities, however remote, do suggest themselves. For example, how might the United States react if it was thought or discovered that the fissile material used in the act of nuclear terrorism had come from Russian stocks,40 and if for some reason Moscow denied any responsibility for nuclear laxity? The correct attribution of that nuclear material to a particular country might not be a case of science fiction given the observation by Michael May et al. that while the debris resulting from a nuclear explosion would be “spread over a wide area in tiny fragments, its radioactivity makes it detectable, identifiable and collectable, and a wealth of information can be obtained from its analysis: the efficiency of the explosion, the materials used and, most important … some indication of where the nuclear material came from.”41 Alternatively, if the act of nuclear terrorism came as a complete surprise, and American officials refused to believe that a terrorist group was fully responsible (or responsible at all) suspicion would shift immediately to state possessors. Ruling out Western ally countries like the United Kingdom and France, and probably Israel and India as well, authorities in Washington would be left with a very short list consisting of North Korea, perhaps Iran if its program continues, and possibly Pakistan. But at what stage would Russia and China be definitely ruled out in this high stakes game of nuclear Cluedo? In particular, if the act of nuclear terrorism occurred against a backdrop of existing tension in Washington’s relations with Russia and/or China, and at a time when threats had already been traded between these major powers, would officials and political leaders not be tempted to assume the worst? Of course, the chances of this occurring would only seem to increase if the United States was already involved in some sort of limited armed conflict with Russia and/or China, or if they were confronting each other from a distance in a proxy war, as unlikely as these developments may seem at the present time. The reverse might well apply too: should a nuclear terrorist attack occur in Russia or China during a period of heightened tension or even limited conflict with the United States, could Moscow and Beijing resist the pressures that might rise domestically to consider the United States as a possible perpetrator or encourager of the attack? Washington’s early response to a terrorist nuclear attack on its own soil might also raise the possibility of an unwanted (and nuclear aided) confrontation with Russia and/or China. For example, in the noise and confusion during the immediate aftermath of the terrorist nuclear attack, the U.S. president might be expected to place the country’s armed forces, including its nuclear arsenal, on a higher stage of alert. In such a tense environment, when careful planning runs up against the friction of reality, it is just possible that Moscow and/or China might mistakenly read this as a sign of U.S. intentions to use force (and possibly nuclear force) against them. In that situation, the temptations to preempt such actions might grow, although it must be admitted that **any** preemption would probably still meet with a devastating response. As part of its initial response to the act of nuclear terrorism (as discussed earlier)Washington might decide to order a significant conventional (or nuclear) retaliatory or disarming attack against the leadership of the terrorist group and/or states seen to support that group. Depending on the identity and especially the location of these targets, Russia and/or China might interpret such action as being far too close for their comfort, and potentially as an infringement on their spheres of influence and even on their sovereignty. One far-fetched but perhaps not impossible scenario might stem from a judgment in Washington that some of the main aiders and abetters of the terrorist action resided somewhere such as Chechnya, perhaps in connection with what Allison claims is the “Chechen insurgents’ … long-standing interest in all things nuclear.”42 American pressure on that part of the world would almost certainly raise alarms in Moscow that might require a degree of advanced consultation from Washington that the latter found itself unable or unwilling to provide. There is also the question of how other nuclear-armed states respond to the act of nuclear terrorism on another member of that special club. It could reasonably be expected that following a nuclear terrorist attack on the United States, both Russia and China would extend immediate sympathy and support to Washington and would work alongside the United States in the Security Council. But there is just a chance, albeit a slim one, where the support of Russia and/or China is less automatic in some cases than in others. For example, what would happen if the United States wished to discuss its right to retaliate against groups based in their territory? If, for some reason, Washington found the responses of Russia and China deeply underwhelming, (neither “for us or against us”) might it also suspect that they secretly were in cahoots with the group, increasing (again perhaps ever so slightly) the chances of a major exchange. If the terrorist group had some connections to groups in Russia and China, or existed in areas of the world over which Russia and China held sway, and if Washington felt that Moscow or Beijing were placing a curiously modest level of pressure on them, what conclusions might it then draw about their culpability? If Washington decided to use, or decided to threaten the use of, nuclear weapons, the responses of Russia and China would be crucial to the chances of avoiding a more serious nuclear exchange. They might surmise, for example, that while the act of nuclear terrorism was especially heinous and demanded a strong response, the response simply had to remain below the nuclear threshold. It would be one thing for a non-state actor to have broken the nuclear use taboo, but an entirely different thing for a state actor, and indeed the leading state in the international system, to do so. If Russia and China felt sufficiently strongly about that prospect, there is then the question of what options would lie open to them to dissuade the United States from such action: and as has been seen over the last several decades, the central dissuader of the use of nuclear weapons by states has been the threat of nuclear retaliation. If some readers find this simply too fanciful, and perhaps even offensive to contemplate, it may be informative to reverse the tables. Russia, which possesses an arsenal of thousands of nuclear warheads and that has been one of the two most important trustees of the non-use taboo, is subjected to an attack of nuclear terrorism. In response, Moscow places its nuclear forces very visibly on a higher state of alert and declares that it is considering the use of nuclear retaliation against the group and any of its state supporters. How would Washington view such a possibility? Would it really be keen to support Russia’s use of nuclear weapons, including outside Russia’s traditional sphere of influence? And if not, which seems quite plausible, what options would Washington have to communicate that displeasure? If China had been the victim of the nuclear terrorism and seemed likely to retaliate in kind, would the United States and Russia be happy to sit back and let this occur? In the charged atmosphere immediately after a nuclear terrorist attack, how would the attacked country respond to pressure from other major nuclear powers not to respond in kind? The phrase “how dare they tell us what to do” immediately springs to mind. Some might even go so far as to interpret this concern as a tacit form of sympathy or support for the terrorists. This might not help the chances of nuclear restraint

# 1NC Pollution Frontline

#### HSR provides minimal highway congestion relief

Peterman, Analyst in Transportation Policy for Congressional Research Service, Frittelli, Specialist in transportation policy for CRS, and Mallet, specialist in transportation policy for CRS, 2009 (David Randall, John, William J, 12/8/9, Congressional Research Service, “High Speed Rail (HSR) in the United States“, <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R40973.pdf>, 7/10/12, CNW)

In heavily traveled and congested corridors, proponents contend that HSR will relieve highway and air traffic congestion, and, if on a separate right-of-way, may also benefit freight rail and commuter rail movements where such services share track with existing intercity passenger rail service. 34 By alleviating congestion, the notion is that HSR potentially reduces the need to pay for capacity expansions in other modes. On the question of highway congestion relief, many studies estimate that HSR will have little positive effect because most highway traffic is local and the diversion of intercity trips from highway to rail will be small. In a study of HSR published in 1997, the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) estimated that in most cases rail improvements would divert only 3%-6% of intercity automobile trips. FRA noted that corridors with short average trip lengths, those under 150 miles, showed the lowest diversion rates. 35 The U.S. Department of Transportation’s Inspector General (IG) found much the same thing in a more recent analysis of HSR in the Northeast Corridor. The IG examined two scenarios: Scenario 1 involved cutting rail trip times from Boston to New York from 3 ½ hours to 3 hours and from New York to Washington from 3 hours to 2 ½; Scenario 2 involved cutting trip times on both legs by another ½ hour over scenario 1. In both scenarios, the IG found that the improvements reduced automobile ridership along the NEC by less than 1%. 36 The IG noted “automobile travel differs from air or rail travel in that it generally involves door-to-door service, offers greater flexibility in time of departure, and does not require travelers to share space with strangers. Consequently, rail travel must be extremely competitive in other dimensions, such as speed or cost, to attract automobile travelers.” 37 Planners of a high speed rail link in Florida between Orlando and Tampa, a distance of about 84 miles, estimated that it would shift 11% of those driving between the two cities to the train, as well as 9% of those driving from Lakeland to either Orlando (54 miles) or Tampa (33 miles). However, because most of the traffic on the main highway linking the two cities, I-4, is not travelling between these cities, it was estimated that HSR would reduce traffic on the busiest sections of I-4 by less than 2%. 38 The final environmental impact statement for the project states that the reduction in the number of vehicles resulting from the HSR system “would not be sufficient to significantly improve the LOS [level of service] on I-4, as many segments of the roadway would still be over capacity.” 39 The estimated cost of the HSR line was $2.0 billion to $2.5 billion, 40 or $22 million to $27 million per mile.

#### Construction will damage property and air quality – current transportation better

McGirr, The Stanford Daily, 10

(Samantha, The Stanford Daily, 11/4/10, “Management professor says high-speed rail not smart investment”, <http://www.stanforddaily.com/2010/11/04/management-professor-says-high-speed-rail-not-smart-investment/>, 7/10/12, ML)

Enthoven further questions the environmental implications of the project, pointing out that the construction alone will damage property and release large amounts of carbon into the air. Rather than building an entire high-speed rail system, Enthoven believes California legislators should direct funds toward the expansion of current public transportation in the state’s large cities. “We ought to use that money to subsidize public transportation within metro areas,” Enthoven said. “[We should] put resources into improving Caltrain and [funding] buses to help people get to Caltrain. We ought to continue to expand BART, improve parking at stations, add another airport or two.”

#### **HSR hurts environment – nitrogen oxide emissions**

**O’Toole, 10**

(Randal, Experiences writer for the CATO Institute, 6/10, “High Speed Rail”, <http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/high-speed-rail>, accessed 7-3-12, BLE)

The environmental benefits of high-speed rail would be negligible at best. President Obama's moderate-speed trains are expected to be powered by diesel locomotives, which burn petroleum and emit pollutants and greenhouse gases. Even electrically powered, true high-speed rail is unlikely to be clean. California rated its proposal as environmentally sound only by projecting impossibly high ridership numbers and unrealistically assuming that future automobiles and airplanes would be no more energy-efficient than they are today. In 2005, Florida's High-Speed Rail Authority proposed a 125-mph rail line between Tampa and Orlando. The environmental impact statement for the proposal estimated that the trains would produce more nitrogen oxide pollution and volatile organic compounds than would be saved by the automobiles taken off the road. It also calculated that operating and maintaining the gas-turbine locomotives would consume 3.5 to 6.0 times as much energy as would be saved by the cars replaced.36 The statement concluded that "the environmentally preferred alternative is the No Build Alternative" because it "would result in less direct and indirect impact to the environment."37 The Tampa-Orlando proposal was subsequently killed, only to be revived by the Obama administration. In January, the Department of Transportation announced that Florida will receive $1.25 billion of the $8 billion in high-speed rail stimulus funding for the route.

#### HSR harms air quality, wetlands, and endangered species

Vartabedian, Los Angeles Times, 12

(Ralph, Los Angeles Times, 6/11/12, “High-Speed Rail Faces Environmental Objections”, <http://www.governing.com/news/state/mct-californias-high-speed-rail-faces-environmental-objections.html>, 7/10/12, ML)

The California bullet train is promoted as an important environmental investment for the future, but over the next decade the heavy construction project would potentially harm air quality, aquatic life and endangered species across the state's Central Valley. Eleven endangered species, including the San Joaquin kit fox, would be affected, according to federal biologists. Massive emissions from diesel-powered heavy equipment could foul the already filthy air. Dozens of rivers, canals and wetlands fed from the rugged peaks of the Sierra Nevada would be crossed, creating other knotty issues. A wide array of state and federal agencies is examining those effects and, over the next several months, will issue scientific findings that could affect the cost and schedule of construction. Beyond the regulators, environmental lawsuits brought by the powerful California agriculture industry are threatening to further delay work. The state rail authority is trying to push ahead with an urgent plan to start construction of a 130-mile segment from Madera to Bakersfield as early as December, arguing that any delays could put more than $2 billion of federal funding at risk. Even if the Legislature appropriates the state's share of money this summer, the construction schedule will depend on friendly and quick decisions by often tough regulators. "We make an independent decision here," Paul Maniccia, a biologist for the Army Corps of Engineers. "We don't willy-nilly say that's OK." The $68 billion bullet train would be the largest infrastructure project in the nation, projected to carry at least 20 million passengers annually with clean electrical power. If it draws motorists off the highway, it would reduce vehicle emissions. But those long-term benefits have to be weighed against heavy immediate effects. Among the most difficult issues will be air quality, which is regulated across eight counties by the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. The district worries that the construction project would exacerbate already problematic levels of nitrogen oxides, particulates and volatile compounds. The district already bears an annual $29 million federal fine for violating the Clean Air Act, a burden levied on businesses and motorists, who must pay higher annual vehicle fees. Without its approval, the California High-Speed Rail Authority cannot sink a shovel into the ground, said Samir Sheikh, the district's director of strategies and incentives. "We have an air quality problem that cannot tolerate an increase in emissions," he said.

# 1NC Oil Dependence Frontline

### Non-Unique

#### U.S. Oil Dependence is Dropping Now

Dogget, energy correspondent for Reuters, 2011

(Tom, May 25, 2011, Reuters, “U.S. relies less on oil imports to meet fuel demand: government”, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/05/25/us-usa-oil-imports-idUSTRE74O78R20110525>, accessed 7/12/2011, TRH)

(Reuters) - U.S. dependence on imported oil fell below 50 percent in 2010 for the first time in more than a decade, thanks in part to the weak economy and more fuel efficient vehicles, the Energy Department said on Wednesday. The department's Energy Information Administration said it expected the moderating trend in U.S. oil-import dependency to continue through the next decade due to improvements in energy efficiency and even higher fuel economy standards. The new data could undercut efforts by Republican lawmakers to expand offshore oil drilling to reduce oil imports, and support the position of the Obama administration and environmental groups that higher mileage requirements for cars and trucks would help cut dependence on foreign oil. Imports of crude and petroleum products accounted for 49.3 percent of U.S. oil demand last year, down from the recent high of 60.3 percent in 2005. It also marked the first time since 1997 that America's foreign oil addiction fell under the 50 percent threshold. "This decline partly reflects the downturn in the underlying economy after the financial crisis of 2008," the EIA said in its weekly review of the oil market. Increased domestic production of ethanol and other biofuels that are blended with gasoline and consumer purchases of more fuel efficient vehicles also slashed the need for oil imports, according to the EIA. Crude oil production, especially in the deep waters of the Gulf of Mexico, increased by 334,000 barrels per day (bpd) between 2005 and 2010, which also cut into foreign oil purchases. U.S. demand for gasoline, jet fuel, heating oil and other petroleum products that were processed from crude oil dropped by 1.7 million bpd to 19.1 million bpd in 2010 from 20.8 million bpd in 2005. At the same time, U.S. exports of petroleum products more than doubled to a record 2.3 million bpd last year from 1.1 million bpd in 2005. "Nowhere have U.S. product exports increased more than in the Americas, including Mexico, Canada, Central and South America and the Caribbean, thanks to economic and population growth and inadequate refining capacity in those countries," the EIA said. As a result, U.S. net imports of refined petroleum products fell last year to their lowest level since 1973, when the government began collecting such data.

### Impact Turn

#### Oil shocks boost economic growth

Kilian, Ph. D in Economics University of Michigan and CEPR, Park, Professor of Economics at the National University of Singapore, 2007

(Lutz and Cheolbeom, 12/31, “The Impact of Oil Price Shocks on the U.S. Stock Market” University of Michigan, <http://www-personal.umich.edu/~lkilian/ier22166r1.pdf>, 7/10/12, MDRJ)

In this paper, we address both of these limitations by relating U.S. stock returns to measures of demand and supply shocks in the global crude oil market, building on a structural decomposition of fluctuations in the real price of oil. We find that the response of aggregate stock returns may differ greatly depending on the cause of the oil price shock. The negative response of stock prices to oil price shocks, often referred to in the financial press, is found only when the oil price rises due to an oil-market specific demand shock such as an increase in precautionary demand driven by concerns about future crude oil supply shortfalls. In contrast, shocks to crude oil production have no significant effect on cumulative stock returns. Finally, higher oil prices driven by an unanticipated global economic expansion have persistent positive effects on cumulative stock returns within the first year of the expansionary shock. This result arises because a positive innovation to the global business cycle will stimulate the U.S. economy directly, while at the same time driving up the price of oil, thereby indirectly slowing U.S. economic activity. Since the stimulating effect dominates in the short run, the U.S. stock market may indeed thrive despite unexpectedly high oil prices. Given that recent increases in the price of crude oil have been driven primarily by strong global demand for industrial commodities, as shown below, this fact helps explain why the U.S. stock market so far has proved resilient to higher oil prices. In contrast, conventional VAR model based on unanticipated oil price changes 3 would have predicted a significant stock market correction in response to the recent oil price surge.

### Impact Takeout

#### Oil shocks don’t have an economic effect – studies prove

Gómez-Loscos, Department of Applied Economics Universidad de Zaragoza, 2011

(Ana, 9/10, “Economic growth, inflation and oil shocks: Are the 1970s coming back?” Department of Applied Economics. University of Oviedo, <http://www.unizar.es/lgadea/documents/DPAE_09_10_rev.pdf>, 7/9/12, MDRJ)

The aim of this paper is to analyse the relationship between oil price shocks and the macroeconomic evolution of the G7 countries. By way of the use of the very recent Qu and Perron (2007) methodology, we provide evidence in favour of a non-linear relationship across the 1970-2008 sample. Our results show that the response of output and inflation to oil price shocks becomes weaker from 1970 until the late 1990s. We further observe the impact of oil price shocks on inflation to recover some of its initial importance in the 2000s, whilst we cannot find robust evidence of an influence of oil price shocks on GDP. Nevertheless, the transmission of oil price shocks to the economy is weaker than in the 1970s, which allows us to conclude that oil price shocks have lost some of their explanatory power. Consequently, the causes of the slight rise of inflation in the G7 countries during the 2000s should be looked for in other factors.

### Solvency Takeout

#### HSR only has a minimal effect on US oil dependency

Druce, part-time independent researcher, 2011

(Paul, 6/29, “Reason and Rail: Bad arguments for high speed rail: Oil consumption,” blogspot, <http://reasonrail.blogspot.com/2011/06/bad-arguments-for-high-speed-rail-oil.html>, 7/10/12, MDRJ)

One of the ancillary benefits which is often inappropriately highlighted as a primary benefit by high speed rail proponents is that of reducing American oil consumption. Often, our reliance upon foreign oil, including some from Middle East nations such as Saudi Arabia, is seized upon by such proponents and the defense costs added to the price of oil. This, however, is a flawed notion that ignores the interconnected nature of global trade. Even if we were completely independent from foreign oil, or at least oil not from North America and Europe, including our shipping, we would still fund foreign militaries and place troops in these areas. A sudden lack of oil shipments from Saudi Arabia would cause major oil price shocks globally, not merely to those depending on oil from Saudi Arabia. Even if we were, by perhaps some magical free energy device, completely free from oil use except in raw industrial processes, we would still be gravely damaged economically because our economy depends on foreign trade. Major economic recessions or depressions in our trading partners will cause the same problems here as well. Now, for the actual matter at hand, that of high speed rail's role in reducing our dependence on oil. The California High Speed Rail Authority estimates that, by 2030, the high speed rail system will be saving 12.7 million barrels of oil per year. This, however, represents only sixteen hours worth of US consumption in 2009 and only 1.9% of California's annual consumption (one week's worth). Clearly it would have minimal, if any, effect on oil prices or oil dependence.

# 1NC Warming Frontline

#### HSR produces 20% more emmisions

Bliss, The Quiet Road, 12

(Jim, The Quiet Road, 1/12/12, “Against High Speed Rail”, <http://numero57.net/2012/01/12/against-high-speed-rail/>, 7/11/12, ML)

And that’s what it is. A vanity project. Railways are a great idea. High Speed Rail is a terrible one. A recent US study (High Speed Rail and Greenhouse Gas Emissions in the U.S.\*) of the carbon emissions of various modes of transport suggests that travelling on HSR produces 20% more emissions than going by conventional rail, and almost double that of coaches. And that’s without factoring in the environmental costs of the actual infrastructure (which are high thanks to the large amounts of concrete and steel used).

#### HSR will cause more emissions – low ridership

Peterman9

(David Randall, December 8, Analyst in Transportation Policy, High Speed Rail (HSR) in the United States, [www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R40973.pdf](http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R40973.pdf)) CL

Another major benefit of HSR according to supporters is that it uses less energy and is relatively less polluting than other modes of intercity transportation.45 For example, the California High Speed Rail Authority contends that HSR uses one-third the energy of air travel and one-fifth the energy of automobile travel.46 While the physics of rail do generally provide favorable energy intensity and carbon emission attributes in comparison with highway and air travel, such claims tend to rest heavily on assumed high passenger loads. Moreover, they also tend to ignore the energy and carbon emission of building, maintaining, and rebuilding the infrastructure that supports each mode. Some argue that this omission tends to bias the analysis in favor of high speed rail, whereas in reality, these critics contend, the relatively small ridership of intercity rail will result in relatively high energy and emissions per passenger mile traveled.47 Another problem with these comparisons, according to critics, is that they tend to assume automotive and airplane engine technology will not become more energy efficient in the future.

#### Turns case - It will be 70 years before HSR can offset the emissions caused by construction; it may never offset the emissions if it suffers from low ridership

Moore et al. 12

(Adrian, Wendell Cox, &Joseph Vranich, vice president of research at Reason Foundation, principal of Wendell Cox Consultancy/Demographia, , Irvine, Calif.-based business consultant 07-02-2012, Reason, 5 Reasons the California High-Speed Rail Project Shouldn’t Get More Money,http://reason.com/archives/2012/07/02/5-reasons-the-california-high-speed-rail/1, date accessed 7-3-2012,DD)

Proponents often say the high-speed rail system is needed to reduce the state’s greenhouse gas emissions. The United Nations has estimated that effective greenhouse gas reduction efforts should cost $20 to $50 per ton. The California high-speed rail system’s emission reductions would come at a monstrous cost of $1,800 a ton. Just as troubling, research at UC Berkeley concluded that if rail ridership met HSRA’s mid-level estimates, it would take 70 years for the rail system just to negate the emissions created by its own construction. If rail suffers lower ridership the system would “never” negate its construction emissions. California is drowning in debt and deficits. State leaders like Gov. Brown are calling for major tax increases. The California High-Speed Rail Authority keeps raising costs, lowering rider estimates, and lengthening travel times. Its current business plan reneges on promises made to voters in Proposition 1A. It would be a major mistake for California legislators to borrow billions of dollars to start building a train system that is far inferior and far more expensive than the one voters were promised when they approved Proposition 1A in November 2008.

#### HSR will not solve warming – it only reduces emissions by 1%

Kosinski et al. 11

(Andrew; University of California, Berkeley; Schipper, Lee; University of California, Berkeley; Deakin, Elizabeth, University of California, Berkeley PhD in City and Regional planning; Transportation Research Board 90th Annual Meeting 2011 January; pg2; TRB database; accessed July 3) Kristof

The US has embarked on a new program of investment in intercity passenger high-speed rail (HSR) systems, with an initial “down payment” of $8 billion in federal funds. The HSR program is intended to provide jobs and support economic development, build a foundation for economic competitiveness, support interconnected livable communities, and promote energy efficiency and environmental quality. In this paper we examine one specific aspect of **HSR’s** anticipated **energy and environmental benefits: its potential to reduce CO2 emissions compared to continued dependence on auto and air modes for** intercity **travel**. Using projections for US travel to 2050 and experience from Europe (as well as US focused projects) of diversion to HSR, we consider the proposed plans for HSR in the US and account for changes in vehicles, fuels, CO2 emissions from travel, and demand levels for the competing auto and air modes through 2050 under two alternative projections of future travel conditions and levels. One scenario assumes trends-extended and a second assumes a "green revolution" with considerably lower levels of travel and emissions. We conclude that under either scenario, **HSR would likely lead to a small (~1%) reduction of CO2 emissions in the transportation sector** compared with the original projections without HSR. **The primary reason why the reductions** in CO2 emissions **are small is the small share of overall travel that is between major metro regions slated to be connected by HSR and in a range likely to shift to HSR**.

#### HSR produces twice as much CO2 per passenger

Whitelegg, The Guardian, 9

(John, The Guardian, 4/28/09, “On the wrong track: Why high-speed trains are not such a green alternative”, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2009/apr/29/high-speed-rail-travel-europe-uk>, 7/10/12, ML)

HSR does not reduce the fuel consumption of domestic aviation or reduce annual carbon emissions from aircraft. And it produces twice as much CO2 per passenger kilometre as a non-high speed train. If we are serious about reducing our carbon emissions by 80% by 2050, we should not move towards higher speed, more carbon intensive forms of transport and a policy of increasing the mass of travel. Supporters of HSR talk about a total bill of £11bn from public funds. This is likely to be a considerable underestimate, but even if correct it is a huge commitment to something regressive. HSR is used by high-income passengers, and the £11bn would be a public investment from all taxpayers to encourage wealthy individuals to travel to and from London more often and at a higher speed. This is far less important than sorting out local travel in all cities, commuter travel around all cities, and inter-regional travel.

#### Global warming is fake; cooling is taking place rather than warming

Todd 12

(Samuel, writer for Policy Mic, “A Really Inconvenient Truth: Global Warming is Not Real”, <http://www.policymic.com/articles/3824/a-really-inconvenient-truth-global-warming-is-not-real>) KA

Sixteen prominent scientists recently signed an op-ed in the Wall Street Journal expressing their belief that the theory of global warming is not supported by science. This has not been getting the attention it deserves because politicians (looking at you Al Gore) are frankly embarrassed to admit that they are wrong about the phenomenon known as global warming. Not only has our planet stopped warming, but we may be headed toward a vast cooling period. New data shows that in fact the Earth has not warmed at all over the last 15 years. In fact, the Daily Mail reports that the Met Office and the University of East Anglia Climatic Research Unit, after taking data from nearly 30,000 stations around the world, have found that the earth stopped warming in 1997. The report suggests we are headed toward a new solar cycle, Cycle 25, which NASA scientists have predicted will be significantly cooler than Cycle 24 which we are in now. This data largely contradicts the accepted theory among the public that carbon dioxide pollution is causing global warming and even proposes that we are actually heading toward global cooling.

#### Data collected supporting global warming is highly flawed

Mick 11

(Jason, writer for Daily Tech, “Study Finds "Huge Discrepancy" Between Hard Data and Warming Models”, [http://www.dailytech.com/Study+Finds+Huge+Discrepancy+Between+Hard+Data+and+Warming+Models/article22301.htm](http://www.dailytech.com/Study%2BFinds%2BHuge%2BDiscrepancy%2BBetween%2BHard%2BData%2Band%2BWarming%2BModels/article22301.htm)) KA

The hard facts show that both the predictions of the amount of heat shed during a full warming scenario, and the amount of heat shed as warming begins were understated. As the data shows the Earth's atmosphere to be trapping less heat; that means the outcomes of any sort of human-based warming caused by the emission of carbon greenhouse gases and other compounds is likely overstated. Thus the dire predictions of models used by the United Nation's International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and researchers are likely flawed. States Professor Spencer in a press release from University of Alabama, "The satellite observations suggest there is much more energy lost to space during and after warming than the climate models show. There is a huge discrepancy between the data and the forecasts that is especially big over the oceans." This is a critical conclusion as it shows that the secondary "indirect" trapping from atmospheric water may be far less than previously predicted.

#### Scientists are pressured to constantly release false and flawed data

Waugh 11

(Rob, writer for Daily Mail, “Climategate scientists DID collude with government officials to hide research that didn't fit their apocalyptic global warming”, <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-2066240/Second-leak-climate-emails-Political-giants-weigh-bias-scientists-bowing-financial-pressure-sponsors.html>) KA

More than 5,000 documents have been leaked online purporting to be the correspondence of climate scientists at the University of East Anglia who were previously accused of ‘massaging’ evidence of man-made climate change. Following on from the original 'climategate' emails of 2009, the new package appears to show systematic suppression of evidence, and even publication of reports that scientists knew to be based on flawed approaches. And not only do the emails paint a picture of scientists manipulating data, government employees at the Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) are also implicated. One message appeared to show a member of Defra staff telling colleagues working on climate science to give the government a ‘strong message’. The emails paint a clear picture of scientists selectively using data, and colluding with politicians to misuse scientific information.

#### The point of no return for global warming is 2017

Plumer 11

(Brad, 11/10, reporter at the Washington Post writing about domestic policy, particularly energy and environmental issues, Washington Post, When do we hit the point of no return for climate change?, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/ezra-klein/post/when-do-we-hit-the-point-of-no-return-for-climate-change/2011/11/10/gIQA4rri8M_blog.html> ) CL

Based on everything we know about climate science, the basic game plan is that if we want to limit global warming below 2 degrees Celsius (so as not to risk the most dangerous and unpredictable impacts), we’ll need to prevent the amount of carbon-dioxide in the atmosphere from rising above roughly 450 parts per million. Currently, we’re at about 392 parts per million. So we’ve got some wiggle room, right? Actually, no, according to the International Energy Agency’s new 2011 World Energy Outlook report. The key issue here is something known as “infrastructure lock-in.” The coal plants that countries like China and India are constructing right now are going to last another 50 years, at least. The energy-inefficient buildings we’re erecting will stay up for some time. Every gas-guzzling SUV that gets built will likely get sold and then driven for at least a decade. Which is just a way of saying there’s a lag built into our energy infrastructure. It’s not easy to turn off the carbon tap once we edge near 450 ppm. And, as the IEA found, we’re about five years away from building enough carbon-spewing infrastructure to lock us in and make it extremely difficult — maybe impossible — to avoid 450 ppm. The point of no return comes around 2017. Here’s a chart to visualize it: What happens when we lock ourselves in? We could still, technically, avoid 2 degrees Celsius or more of warming, but it becomes much, much more costly and difficult. It’s far more expensive to shut down a shiny new coal plant than it is to have never built one to begin with. It’s more arduous to retrofit a bunch of homes and buildings after the fact than it would’ve been to set rigorous efficiency codes beforehand. As the IEA report notes, “Delaying action is a false economy: for every $1 of investment in cleaner technology that is avoided in the power sector before 2020, an additional $4.30 would need to be spent after 2020 to compensate for the increased emissions.” Right now, hitting that 450 ppm target will require a clean-energy investment of about 1.1 percent of GDP per year, says the IEA (that’s not a pure “cost,” since there are a lot of efficiency savings in there). But the longer we delay, the more expensive it gets. Delays can quadruple the cost. Granted, if Europe vaporizes in the next few months and the global economy plunges into yet another depression, this could change. Energy use will drop, emissions will sag, and we’ll get a little more space to act. Maybe the point of no return moves out to 2020 or 2022. But, as we saw after the last downturn, the world doesn’t tend to take advantage of these reprieves. When the economy’s bad, few countries want to bother with newfangled energy technologies or carbon taxes or figuring out how to curb oil use, and when things recover the world roars back closer and closer to that 450 ppm mark.

# Case extensions

## Inherency

### NUQ – alt methods solve

#### HRS has no unique benefits

APTA 2012(American Public Transportation Association, January 2012, “An inventory of the Criticisms of High-Speed Rail”, <http://www.apta.com/resources/reportsandpublications/Documents/HSR-Defense.pdf>, accessed 7/5/12, TRH)

On the issue of jobs creation and economic impact, critics say: “Potential benefits cited are job creation, decreased traffic congestion, reduced dependence on oil, increased rural development, and a potentially rich new market for rail equipment makers. Proponents of high-speed rail have exaggerated its benefits. Much railroad equipment is imported. Transportation jobs can be created through expansion of highways, using private funding from tolls rather than taxpayer dollars. And additional high-speed rail is unlikely to ease traffic congestion, because traffic congestion occurs within cities, rather than outside them.”

### Inherency – Private

#### Private Industry working on HSR due to lack of State Action

Jaffe 11 Reporter for The Atlantic

Eric Jaffe, “The Future of California's High-Speed Rail Is in Private Sector Hands,” [http://www.theatlanticcities.com/politics/2011/09/future-california-hsr-private-sector-hands/146/#](http://www.theatlanticcities.com/politics/2011/09/future-california-hsr-private-sector-hands/146/), 7-5-12, JL

But the news may be turning with the fall leaves. Earlier this month, on the same day President Obama urged Congress to pass a jobs bill aimed at America's small businesses, the California High-Speed Rail Authority promised to dedicate 30 percent of the line's construction work to the state's own small businesses. The work in the central valley, which is supposed to begin next year, is expected to generate tens of thousands of jobs for the region. And a peer review panel of global high-speed rail experts recently gave the authority's ridership estimates a vote of confidence. The approved ridership figures are particularly encouraging as the state shifts its attention to attracting private investments. The authority's updated business plan — which it will use to solicit bids for the central valley segment — won't be released until next month, but a sneak peek of the plan shows a clear emphasis on raising private capital. Doing that successfully will require public seed money, which the project has in the form of $6 billion in federal funding, and strong ridership estimates, which just got a bit stronger with the new peer review. By now the authority surely recognizes that the future of the project rests on its ability to recruit private money. A commitment of additional state funds seems all but impossible, especially with the rising cost estimates. The House is intent on keeping rail funding low and recently set the 2012 budget discussion for rail at $7 billion less than Obama would like. The president's jobs bill proposes $4 billion in high-speed rail funding, and a strong case can be made for giving it all to California. Still, there's zero certainty the plan will pass, and California can't afford to wait long to find out: the state must spend its federal funding by 2017 or forfeit it, which means construction needs to start in 2012.

#### Private Industry has begun work on HSR to avoid risk of state involvement

Cotey 3/22/12 Reporter for Progressive Railroading, a newspaper on railroads

Angela Cotey, “Florida East Coast Industries to develop private passenger-rail service,” [http://www.progressiverailroading.com/high\_speed\_rail/news/Florida-East-Coast-Industries-to-develop-private-passengerrail-service--30360#](http://www.progressiverailroading.com/high_speed_rail/news/Florida-East-Coast-Industries-to-develop-private-passengerrail-service--30360), 7-5-12, JL

Today, Florida East Coast Industries Inc. (FECI) announced it plans to develop All Aboard Florida, a privately owned, operated and maintained passenger-rail service that would run 240 miles to Miami, Cocoa and Orlando. The service would operate along 200 miles of existing tracks between Miami and Cocoa, and along 40 miles of new track into Orlando. The system eventually could be expanded to include connections to Tampa and Jacksonville. The project will cost about $1 billion. The company launched a feasibility study for the project several months ago, and an “investment-grade” ridership study and engineering work are under way, according to a press release. Now, FECI will begin to work with local, state and federal officials, as well as communities along the route. Because the project currently is in what All Aboard Florida spokesperson Christine Barney terms the “due diligence” phase, FECI has not yet determined what type of trainsets it will need to purchase or what firm will operate the trains, she says. Once ridership and environmental reports are completed, the company will be able to issue a project timeline. At least one date has been issued: FECI plans to launch All Aboard Florida in 2014, a timeframe that’s realistic because the majority of the service will operate along tracks already in service on the Florida East Coast Railway L.L.C. (FEC), Barney says. The studies under way also will help FECI determine train speeds. The company plans to operate trains at top speeds of 100 mph to 110 mph, says Barney. And while the line’s operations, maintenance and ownership will be “100 percent privately funded with no risk to the state,” Barney did not rule out the possibility of obtaining at least some public funds for the line’s construction.

### Inherency – Inevitable

#### Obama and Congress are pushing for HSR

Todorovich, director of America 2050 and assistant visiting professor at the Pratt institute Graduate center for planning and Environment. Schned, associate planner for America 2050 and part-time lecturer at the Edward J. Bloustein, School of Planning and Public Policy at Rutgers university, and Lane, Senior fellow for urban design at Regional Plan association 2011

(Pertra, Daniel, and Robert, September 16, Lincoln Istitute of Land Policy, “High-Speed Rail: nternational Lessons for US Policymakers, <http://www.midwesthsr.org/sites/default/files/pdf/Lincoln_Policy_Institute_HSR_2011.pdf> July 1st, MDRJ)

The United States has been slow to invest in high-speed rail, but planning and policy making are now being pursued more seriously. In 2009 and 2010, the U.S. Congress appropriated $10.1 billion toward a new, competitive grant program for high-speed rail, and President Barack Obama’s 2012 budget proposal assigns $53 billion over the following six years to begin developing a national high-speed and conventional passenger rail network that could connect up to 80 percent of Americans.

#### US pursuing national HSR now

**Galbrath, 10**

(Kate, economy write for The New York Times, 9-5-10, “U.S. Plays Catch-Up on High-Speed Rail”, <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/09/06/business/energy-environment/06green.html>, accessed 7-12-12 BLE)

Soon, perhaps, the United States, with the world’s largest economy will also clamber on board. So far, the United States — in spite of or perhaps because of its vast size — has virtually no fast trains capable of moving swiftly enough over a long distance to compete with airplanes. That could change over the next decade. President Barack Obama has declared high-speed rail to be a priority. He is interested, he has said, in “innovations that change the way we travel in America” through the creation of cleaner, energy-saving options. The economic stimulus package provided $8 billion toward the development of high-speed rail. Another $2.3 billion in government awards should be announced this autumn, using money from the budget. Soon, the U.S. government will publish its first-ever national rail plan, laying out a vision for the future of freight and passenger rail. It is supposed to be released by Sept. 15, but a spokesman for the Federal Railroad Administration, Warren Flatau, said in an e-mail that Congress had recently requested an “additional level of specificity in the document,” and the agency is studying how to proceed to provide a thorough and timely report.

#### Obama is pushing for HRS, but he’s trying to rush it

Todorovich, director of America 2050 and assistant visiting professor at the Pratt institute Graduate center for planning and Environment. Schned, associate planner for America 2050 and part-time lecturer at the Edward J. Bloustein, School of Planning and Public Policy at Rutgers university, and Lane, Senior fellow for urban design at Regional Plan association 2011

(Pertra, Daniel, and Robert, September 16, Lincoln Istitute of Land Policy, “High-Speed Rail: nternational Lessons for US Policymakers, <http://www.midwesthsr.org/sites/default/files/pdf/Lincoln_Policy_Institute_HSR_2011.pdf> July 1st, MDRJ)

Despite a history of disinvestment in rail passenger service by previous administrations and Congresses, the Obama administration is now moving ahead to build and improve conventional passenger rail service and develop selected high-speed rail corridors simultaneously. Most other countries historically have built and improved their conventional rail networks over decades and then made the leap to dedicated, high-speed corridors as the conventional lines reached capacity and required upgrades. In contrast, the case of California represents a leap from minimal existing passenger rail service today to a statewide high-speed rail system, similar to new corridor investments in Spain and China

#### Government and State support Ensure the HSR Plan

Kunz, President And CEO of the U.S. High Speed Rail Association, 2011

(Andy Kunz, March 10, 2011, Yale Environment 360, “U.S. High-Speed Rail: Time to Hop Aboard or BE left Behind”, accessed 7/72012, TRH)

Fortunately, the foresight of the Obama administration and various states will ensure that the foundation of a national high-speed rail network will be laid in the coming years, with $8 billion in federal stimulus funds going to construct the first links in a high-speed rail network that is envisioned to stretch 17,000 miles by 2030. Bullet trains would eventually whisk people between all major U.S. cities — Los Angeles to Seattle, Dallas to Albuquerque, and Boston to Washington, at 220 miles per hour. The cost of such a network would be significant — $600 billion — but a combination of public and private funds would build the system, which would eventually yield benefits that far exceed the original investment.

### A2: Inherency – California

#### Siemens and the US are already partnering on planning HSR in California

James 11 (James, Tony; Engineering & Technology (17509637); Jul2011, Vol. 6 Issue 6, p84-86, 3p, 2 Color Photographs; EBSCO; accessed July 2) Kristof

**Expanding the US rail network is expected to** also **boost economic productivity by reducing travel costs and time**. Not to be forgotten is the fact that **rail network expansion would reduce CO2 emissions by as much as 2.8 million tonnes per year**. “High-speed rail transport is the most efficient and environmentally-friendly way to strengthen the economies in these US regions,” Hans-Jörg Grundmann, CEO of Siemens’ mobility division, says. A **joint study by Siemens and the US** Conference of Mayors last year **highlighted the benefits of high-speed rail**. A good example came from Los Angeles with its four million inhabitants in the city and 13 million spread over its sprawling suburbs. The plan is to have 50 high-speed trains measuring the 500 miles from San Francisco and Sacremento in the north to San Diego in the south – a journey between the two that would take up to eight hours by road sliced to 2 hours 40 minutes. More importantly, **the report suggests that the rail network could take 5,000 commuters of the busy Los Angeles road system. By 2035 it is predicted that 12.3 million long-distance travellers will be plucked out of the skies by America’s new high-speed rail system**.

### A2: Inherency – Competitiveness – US good in SQUO

#### The US still has the best infrastructure systems and prospects for global competitiveness

Donohue 11

(Tom, August 16, President and CEO of the United States Chamber of Commerce,

No Time for Wallowing, Free Enterprise, <http://www.freeenterprise.com/article/no-time-for-wallowing>) CL

With our credit downgraded, stock prices falling, economic recovery sputtering, and hope running out for millions of unemployed workers, this may seem like an unusual time to talk about America’s strengths. In fact, it’s the best time. Wallowing in self-doubt will get us nowhere. By harnessing our extraordinary advantages, we can create new growth, jobs, and opportunities for Americans. We’ve got a highly productive manufacturing sector poised for expansion and new hiring. Our competitors’ costs are rising. With the right tax, labor, and regulatory policies, we can enjoy a manufacturing renaissance few dared to imagine a short time ago. Domestic energy production will fuel this renaissance. We have bountiful supplies of natural resources to use at home and sell around the world. We’re home to vast agricultural lands of unmatched potential. Our farms can feed a hungry world, creating businesses and jobs across industries throughout America. We still have one of the best end-to-end infrastructure systems in the world. With smart investments and upgrades, we can create hundreds of thousands of jobs while spurring growth and improving our quality of life. With positive demographics and a continued commitment to openness and individual opportunity, our country will have a constant supply of the hardest workers, smartest innovators, and most adventuresome entrepreneurs. This will keep our high-tech industries, our universities, our tourism destinations, and our health care sector vibrant and on the cutting edge. There’s plenty to criticize when it comes to our laws, politics, and government. Some in the global community have recently piled on the criticism. But who would trade our system for theirs? A strong rule of law, low levels of corruption, and a commitment to open debate and equal treatment are significant advantages too. These and other attributes comprise America’s “secret sauce” that will continue to sustain the most successful economy on earth. That’s why people, rich and poor, are still beating a path to our shores. This is most evident in times of crisis. Investors habitually seek safe haven here. They are doing so to this very day. I’m not suggesting that we try to paint a happy face on today’s lousy circumstances. We’ve got big problems to fix. We must grow our economy, limit the appetite of our government, put the American entrepreneur back in the driver’s seat, and take short and long-term steps to create American jobs. But let’s stop selling America short. There’s no faster way to crush America’s can-do spirit than by throwing up our hands and saying we can’t.

## Solvency

### A2 Solvency – travel times

#### HSR can’t meet travel times

Cox, principal of Demographia, a St. Louis region-based public policy firm, Vranich, as

President/CEO of the High Speed Rail Association in the early 1990s, 2008

 (Wendell, Joseph, September, The California High Speed Rail Proposal: A Due Diligence Report, <http://reason.org/files/1b544eba6f1d5f9e8012a8c36676ea7e.pdf>, date accessed 7/12/12, DD)

Based upon international HSR experience, it appears that the CHSRA speed and travel time

objectives cannot be met. As a result, HSR will be less attractive as an alternative to airline travel

and is likely to attract fewer passengers than projected. Notably, the CHSRA’s anticipated average

speeds are not being achieved anywhere in the world, including on the most advanced systems.

Additionally, incomplete consideration has been given to California’s urban and terrain profiles

where HSR trains must operate more slowly than circumstances allow in, for example, France.

This study, by assuming realistic speeds, estimates that a non-stop San Francisco–Los Angeles trip

would take 3 hours and 41 minutes—59 minutes longer than the statutory requirement of 2 hours,

42 minutes. In the future, the CHSRA’s travel times may be further lengthened by train weight and

safety issues and also by political demands to add stops to the system.

### A2 Solvency – Subsidies – feasibility

#### Subsidies make HSR not viable

Gessing 1

(Paul, President of New Mexico's Rio Grande Foundation, “High-speed Rail: Making Tracks at Taxpayer Expense”, Oct 18th, 2001; National Taxpayers Union, <http://heartland.org/sites/all/modules/custom/heartland_migration/files/pdfs/8741.pdf>, 7/10/12, BR)

Amtrak, in the allegedly railroad-averse United States, has received $22.5 billion in state and federal subsidies since its inception in 1971.\* That is a substantial level of government support for a system that provides about 0.3 percent of annual intercity passenger trips in the United States3 Amtrak’s dismal track record and constant need for subsidies suggests that rail, high-speed or not, may not be viable in the United States. Even the highly touted Acelu train that runs between Boston and Washington, DC, and is passed off by Amtrak as “high-speed rail,” has been an unmitigated disaster.

### A2 Solvency – Tech – feasibility

#### HSR not technologically feasible in US yet & would take many decades to create

**Cox & Vranich, 8**

(Wendell & Joseph, both writers for the ReasonFoundation, June, 2008, “The California High Speed Rail Proposal: A Due Diligence Report”, <http://reason.org/files/1b544eba6f1d5f9e8012a8c36676ea7e.pdf>, accessed 7-9-12 BLE)

The HSR system can be categorized as a “mega-project,” one taking many years to decades and many billions of dollars to construct and put in operation. Such mega-projects run high risks of failing to meet their ridership projections, financial forecasts and other objectives. This analysis compares the CHSRA’s proposed system with major HSR systems operating overseas. It is noteworthy that California is proceeding with HSR plans based on assumptions that may be appropriate to European and Asian environments but hold little applicability in the state. Moreover, it is not clear that the world’s HSR systems have typically covered their operating and capital costs without subsidies—a determination that would be appropriate in a due diligence process for any commercial HSR proposal. The CHSRA and state officials are proposing or in the past have proposed sources of public funds to pay for HSR’s construction and operation, which include bond issues, sales taxes and matching funds from the federal and local governments. Such an array of public funding is expected to induce private investment. The state Senate Transportation and Housing Committee observed that Californians are being asked to be “investors” in a project based on promises of commercial return. However, most commentary and analysis by the Authority relies on unrealistically optimistic forecasts, is promotional in nature, and falls far short of conveying the project risks to taxpayers and potential investors.

### A2 Solvency – Land

#### HSR not feasible due to land area & lack of use when created

**Schenone, 12**

(Ron, writer for LockerGnome, 2-10-12, “Should Maglev Trains Replace the Airplane?”, <http://www.lockergnome.com/blade/2012/02/10/should-maglev-trains-replace-the-airplane/>, accessed 7-10-12 BLE)

There are several considerations why maglev trains may not work in the US: From coast to coast, the US covers over 3,000 miles, while most European countries are much smaller. The federal government would need to subsidize such a venture; the cost would be enormous at a time when we are deep in debt. Airplane travel offers a fast and reliable system that most travelers would not want to give up. Despite the advantages, one issue that could sabotage the introduction of any form of rapid transport — besides the enormous cost — is the American attitude toward motor vehicles. We are in love with our cars and are of the opinion that owning one is a non-statutory right of our constitution.

#### HSR requires massive land use

Zaidi, TEMPLE JOURNAL OF SCI. TECH. & ENVTL. LAW, 7

(Kamaal, TEMPLE JOURNAL OF SCI. TECH. & ENVTL. LAW, 9/20/07, “High Speed Rail Transit: Developing the Case for Alternative Transportation Schemes in the Context of Innovative and Sustainable Global Transportation Law and Policy”, <http://www.temple.edu/law/tjstel/2007/fall/v26no2-Zaidi.pdf>, 7/10/12, ML)

The most notable disadvantages of high-speed rail transit are its effects on communities, particularly the need for more land and the high construction costs of building new lines. 42 In building a new high-speed line, planners must negotiate around natural geographical barriers such as mountains, hard rocks, existing urban and rural communities, and other land. In order to create high-speed lines specialist engineers and technicians are required to participate in the construction and planning of high-speed train services. However, large parcels of land must often be purchased or set aside to build new, dedicated high-speed tracks. This is where active community participation and environmental assessments become critical, particularly in the initial planning stages of the high-speed project.

#### HSR requires terrain destruction for construction

Zaidi, TEMPLE JOURNAL OF SCI. TECH. & ENVTL. LAW, 7

(Kamaal, TEMPLE JOURNAL OF SCI. TECH. & ENVTL. LAW, 9/20/07, “High Speed Rail Transit: Developing the Case for Alternative Transportation Schemes in the Context of Innovative and Sustainable Global Transportation Law and Policy”, <http://www.temple.edu/law/tjstel/2007/fall/v26no2-Zaidi.pdf>, 7/10/12, ML)

Based on the quality of construction materials, application, and maintenance, high-speed rail transit, from a purely economic perspective, involves enormous operating and technological costs. 43 Significant costs that are taken into consideration in building high-speed rail systems are: (1) length of railway track required for travel within a corridor; (2) evaluating terrain and land use for construction and maintenance; (3) laying electrification and signaling on the railway tracks; (4) the need for specialized labor (engineers, construction workers, technicians); and (5) costs for advanced materials used for constructing high-speed rail cars. 44 An additional cost of high-speed transit involves demolition through mountains in those countries that are dominated by a rugged terrain. 45 Critics of high-speed rail transit argue that these costs far outweigh the benefits of introducing such alternative schemes. The debate is fueled by two different arguments: (1) would it be more practical to spend money on repairs to existing transportation corridors, or (2) would it be feasible to spend money on forwardlooking plans that would alleviate traffic congestion, while creating newer jobs in a new industry?

### A2 Solvency – Maglev – feasibility

#### Maglev’s cost and advanced tech make it unfeasible now

Peterman, Analyst in Transportation Policy, Frittelli , Specialist in Transportation Policy, Mallett, Specialist in Transportation Policy, 2009

(David, John, William, December 8th, Congressional Research Service, “High Speed Rail (HSR) in the United States“ <http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA511142> July 2nd MDRJ)

People have talked about the potential of maglev trains for decades, but maglev projects face a number of obstacles. One is that maglev lines are not compatible with conventional train technology, so a maglev line cannot be added as part of an existing rail network. Also, although the costs of constructing and maintaining a maglev line are not clear, as very few maglev projects have ever been built, it is generally believed that such projects are very expensive. Japan and Germany have both had maglev test tracks in operation since the 1970s and 1980s, respectively, but neither country has gone on to build the commercial maglev lines that were envisioned. Congress established a program to promote the development of maglev lines in the United States in the 1990s, but none of the projects that received support from the program have advanced beyond the planning stage. As of 2009 there is only one commercial maglev system in operation in the world, a 19-mile line completed in 2004 in China, connecting an outlying station on Shanghai’s subway network to the Pudong International Airport. That train, based on German maglev technology, reaches 268 mph in normal operation, though it has a demonstrated top speed of 311 mph.

#### US not prepared for Maglev high speed rail technology

**GAO, 11**

(CONGRESSIONAL DIGEST - “High-Speed Rail Overview System Components, Potential, and Cost Issues From the Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service, report High Speed Rail (HSR) in the United States”,http://www.bafuture.org/sites/default/files/High%20Speed%20Rail%20%20in%20US%20CRS%2012.8.09.pdf)

Maglev train technology was developed in the United States in the 1960s. It uses electromagnets to suspend (levitate) the train above a guideway, as well as to propel the train. By eliminating contact (and hence friction) between the train and the guideway, maglev trains can go very fast, and the trains and tracks are expected to experience less wear and tear, thus reducing maintenance costs, though there is not enough experience with maglev in commercial operations to verify this. People have talked about the potential of maglev trains for decades, but maglev projects face a number of obstacles. One is that maglev lines are not compatible with conventional train technology, so a maglev line cannot be added as part of an existing rail network. Also, although the costs of constructing and maintaining a maglev line are not clear, as very few maglev projects have ever been built, it is generally believed that such projects are very expensive. Japan and Germany have both had maglev test tracks in operation since the 1970s and 1980s, respectively, but neither country has gone on to build the commercial maglev lines that were envisioned. Congress established a program to promote the development of maglev lines in the United States in the 1990s, but none of the projects that received support from the program have advanced beyond the planning stage. As of 2009 there is only one commercial maglev system in operation in the world, a 19-mile line completed in 2004 in China, connecting an outlying station on Shanghai’s subway network to the Pudong International Airport. That train, based on German maglev technology, reaches 268 mph in normal operation, though it has a demonstrated top speed of 311 mph.

### A2 Solvency – Squo sufficient – China

#### Conventional trains can do all that maglev can do. China proves.

Peterman, Analyst in Transportation Policy, Frittelli , Specialist in Transportation Policy, Mallett, Specialist in Transportation Policy, 2009

(David, John, William, December 8th, Congressional Research Service, “High Speed Rail (HSR) in the United States“ <http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA511142> July 2nd MDRJ)

Since conventional train technology is capable of speeds comparable to maglev technology, and the costs of maglev implementation are uncertain, but probably very high, there is little impetus to adopt maglev technology. Moreover, as a different type of rail technology, maglev would not connect to the existing rail network, but would involve creating an entirely separate rail network.

China reportedly built the Shanghai line in part to examine maglev technology as a candidate for high speed lines it planned; it subsequently decided to use conventional train technology for its high speed rail network.

### A2 solvency – other countries

#### Other countries’ HSR systems are not comparable – they have higher population densities, smaller land areas, lower levels of car ownership, higher gas prices

**Peterman, Frittelli, and Mallett ‘09**

(Analyst in Transportation Policy, Specialists in Transportation Policy, from the Congressional Research Service- prepares information for members and committees of Congress, December 8 2009, “High Speed Rail (HSR) in the United States”, p. 7, <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R40973.pdf>, accessed 7-10-12 BLE)

The relative efficiency of HSR as a transportation investment varies among countries, as its level of usage is likely to depend on the interplay of many factors, including geography, economics, and government policies. For example, compared to the United States, countries with HSR have higher population densities, smaller land areas, lower per capita levels of car ownership, higher gas prices, lower levels of car use (measured both by number of trips per day and average distance per trip), and higher levels of public transportation availability and use. Also, there is a significant difference in the structure of the rail industry in these countries compared to the United States. In virtually all of those countries, high speed rail was implemented and is operated by state-owned rail companies that operate over a state-owned rail network, a network on which passenger rail service was far more prominent than freight service even before the introduction of high speed rail. By contrast, in the United States the rail network is almost entirely privately owned, and freight service is far more prominent than is passenger service.

#### **HSR in other countries doesn’t mean it will work in US.**

Congressional Digest 11

(4/1, “High-Speed Rail Overview: System Components, Potential, and Cost Issues” , 7/3/12, BR)

The relative efficiency of HSR as a transportation investment varies among countries, as its level of usage is likely to depend on the interplay of many factors, including geography, economics, and government policies. For example, compared to the United States, countries with HSR have higher population densities, smaller land areas, lower per-capita levels of car ownership, higher gas prices, lower levels of car use (measured both by number of trips per day and average distance per trip), and higher levels of public transportation availability and use. Also, there is a significant difference in the structure of the rail industry in these countries compared to the United States. In virtually all of those countries, high-speed rail was implemented and is operated by state-owned rail companies that operate over a state-owned rail network, a network on which passenger rail service was far more prominent than freight service even before the introduction of high-speed rail. By contrast, in the United States the rail network is almost entirely privately owned, and freight service is far more prominent than is passenger service.

### A2 Solvency – Mode Shift - Cars

#### **HSR won’t compete: cars**

Congressional Digest 11

(4/1, “High-Speed Rail Overview: System Components, Potential, and Cost Issues” , 7/3/12, BR)

It is more difficult for rail to compete with automobile transportation, which in many situations is more attractive than rail travel. For instance, if a traveler needs to make multiple stops en route to or around the destination city, a car may be more convenient, especially if the destination city lacks an extensive mass transit system. If the traveler is carrying bulky items, a car may also be more practical. Driving is likely to be less expensive than rail if two or more people are traveling together, since the added cost of each additional traveler is virtually zero for passenger cars, while each person must purchase a ticket on the train. Yet if the travel distance is uncomfortably long to drive, significant road congestion can be expected, or high gas prices, tolls, and parking substantially raise the cost of driving, then trains may attract automobile drivers.

#### **HSR won’t replace cars**

Congressional Digest 11

(4/1, “High-Speed Rail Overview: System Components, Potential, and Cost Issues” , 7/3/12, BR)

High-speed trains are not expected to compete well against intercity buses in many instances because bus travelers are most concerned about price. Recent improvements in intercity bus service quality and frequency may reduce demand for high-speed rail in some markets.

### A2 Solvency – Mode Shift – Airlines

#### HSR will not trade off with airlines – not cost-competitive

O’Toole 9

(Randal, September 9, senior fellow with the Cato Institute, Cato, High-Speed Rail Is Not “Interstate 2.0”, <http://www.cato.org/pubs/bp/bp113.pdf>) CL

At the time of this writing, $99 will get you from Washington to New York in 2 hours and 50 minutes on Amtrak’s high-speed train, while $49 pays for a moderate-speed train ride that takes 3 hours and 15 minutes. Meanwhile, relatively unsubsidized and energy-efficient buses with leather seats and free Wi-Fi cost $20 for a trip that takes 4 hours and 15-minutes between the two cities. Airfares start at $119 for a 1-hour flight. High-speed rail plans in other parts of the country propose similar fare premiums. Midwest high-speed rail fares “will be competitive with air travel,” says the Midwest High Speed Rail Initiative, and will be “up to 50 percent higher than current Amtrak fares to reflect improved services.”36 Few who pay their own way will spend five times as much for a high-speed train ticket to save less than 90 minutes of their time—and those who value their time that highly would spend another $20 for a plane ticket that would save them an additional hour. Rail advocates respond that high-speed trains have an advantage over flying when adding the time it takes to get between downtowns and airports. Yet less than 8 percent of Americans work in downtowns.37 Who are they? Bankers, lawyers, government officials, and other high-income people who hardly need taxpayer-subsidized transportation.

#### HSR does not trade off with airlines

Cox, Los Angeles County Transportation Commission and policy analyst, and Vranich, former President/CEO of the High Speed Rail Association, 2008 (Wendell, Joseph, September 2008, Reason Foundations, “The California High Speed Rail Proposal:

A Due Diligence Report”, http://reason.org/files/1b544eba6f1d5f9e8012a8c36676ea7e.pdf

, 7/5/12, CNW)

Also, diversion of air travelers is over-estimated. The CHSRA assumes that airlines will cancel a large share of the flights within California because passengers will have switched to HSR—and the diversion will free up airport capacity and make it possible to avoid costly airport expansions. This is not the experience even on the premier Japanese and French systems, which show that strong air markets remain after HSR corridors are in operation. Moreover, the CHSRA treats the commercial aviation system as if it is static—as if efficiencies to enhance capacity are impossible.

### A2: Mode Shift – generally

#### HSR expensive to build, not feasible in US, & would not be used by Americans

Morrison, 92

(Steven, writer for the Boston Globe, 12-1-92, “High-speed Rail a Mistake”, <http://www.economics.neu.edu/morrison/research/bg921201.htm>, accessed 7-10-12 BLE)

High-speed rail systems are cheap to operate, but they are very expensive to build. The National Research Council, in its study of the technological and financial feasibility of high-speed rail in this country, found that the middle-of-the-road estimate for constructing high-speed rail systems is $18 million per mile $3.6 billion for a typical 200-mile route.To amass the large number of travelers necessary to spread the high fixed cost among many users requires a high population density and unattractive alternatives to rail. The United States lacks these prerequisites. First, we live in a country with a lot of land per person, putting us 148th out of 208 countries in population density. Our 69 people per square mile is one-fifth of Western Europe's 380 and one-12th of Japan's 850. Of course, there are regions in this country with high population densities. Nonetheless, the National Research Council could find only one route San Francisco to Los Angeles on which a high-speed rail system could cover its cost, and then only if all existing air passengers switched from air to rail! Second, rail alternatives auto and air are more attractive in the United States than in Japan and Europe. Our automobile ownership rate is nearly 50 percent higher than Western Europe's and more than twice Japan's, giving more of us an alternative that is available on a moment's notice and provides door-to-door service. We can afford to use our cars because our gasoline costs about one-third of what the Europeans and Japanese pay. Finally, our high incomes (one-third higher than Japan's and 50 percent higher than Western Europe's) and low air fares put air travel within the means of most Americans.

#### HSR Tradeoff Low, Not superior to Current forms of transportation

APTA 2012(American Public Transportation Association, January 2012, “An inventory of the Critucisms of High-Speed Rail”, <http://www.apta.com/resources/reportsandpublications/Documents/HSR-Defense.pdf>, accessed 7/5/12, TRH)

“This claim does not pass the laugh test. Using the report’s own ridership estimates, HSR will carry at least 35 to 45 million passenger-miles per weekday. 175 lane-miles of highway capacity is only sufficient to transport 4-5 million vehicle miles travelled per day, so by their own calculations only about 1 in 10 HSR riders will be a road-diverted driver. They also claim that HSR will have limited success in capturing airline passengers, so fully 80 percent or more of the passengers in their ridership forecasts are induced demand. This is an incredible result that no reasonable economic model could generate. **I**t also strengthens the case for HSR, rather than weakening it, because induced demand is better than demand captured from other modes. If HSR steals people from highways or airplanes, all that we can conclude is that it provides a product that is at least as good as those modes. But if HSR induces new travel, we can conclude that it is providing a product that is superior to those modes, since people who before refused to use either air or highways are now being induced to travel by the new superior modal option.”

#### HSR Tradeoff Low, Not superior to Current forms

APTA 2012(American Public Transportation Association, January 2012, “An inventory of the Critucisms of High-Speed Rail”, <http://www.apta.com/resources/reportsandpublications/Documents/HSR-Defense.pdf>, accessed 7/5/12, TRH)

“This claim does not pass the laugh test. Using the report’s own ridership estimates, HSR will carry at least 35 to 45 million passenger-miles per weekday. 175 lane-miles of highway capacity is only sufficient to transport 4-5 million vehicle miles travelled per day, so by their own calculations only about 1 in 10 HSR riders will be a road-diverted driver. They also claim that HSR will have limited success in capturing airline passengers, so fully 80 percent or more of the passengers in their ridership forecasts are induced demand. This is an incredible result that no reasonable economic model could generate. **I**t also strengthens the case for HSR, rather than weakening it, because induced demand is better than demand captured from other modes. If HSR steals people from highways or airplanes, all that we can conclude is that it provides a product that is at least as good as those modes. But if HSR induces new travel, we can conclude that it is providing a product that is superior to those modes, since people who before refused to use either air or highways are now being induced to travel by the new superior modal option.”

### A2 Solvency – Safety – alt

#### HSR riders won’t be safer than riders of alternatives.

Peterman, Analyst in Transportation Policy, 2009

(David Randall, December 8, High Speed Rail (HSR) in the United States, www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R40973.pdf)

Safety is another benefit of HSR that is sometimes mentioned by its advocates. Intercity passenger rail transport is relatively safe, at least compared with highway travel. And HSR in other countries generally has a very good safety record. France’s TGV, for example, boasts that it has never had a single on-board fatality running at high speed in over two decades of operation. However, it is unlikely that HSR will significantly reduce the number of transportation-related deaths and injuries in this country. As noted above, the ability of HSR to divert highway travelers to rail is likely to be limited, and the diversion of flyers will make little difference because air transportation is also very safe. Moreover, some have pointed out that high-profile HSR trains and facilities may become a target for terrorists that may end up requiring airport-like security procedures. If this occurs, the mobility benefits of competitive travel times with air travel will also be diminished.

### A2 Solvency – congestion

#### HSR won’t replace highways

Furchtgott-Roth, former chief economist at the U.S. Department of Labor, 2011

(Diana, 4/21/11, Washington Examiner, “No Cost Benefit Studies Done for Obama’s $53 billion high-speed rail boondoggle, <http://washingtonexaminer.com/article/39669>, date accessed 7/10/12, DD)

There's no better example of excessive government spending than the $53 billion President Obama allocated for high-speed rail in his 2012 budget. Shockingly, in a response to a Freedom of Information Act request by Crossroads GPS, a nonprofit advocacy group, the U.S. Department of Transportation admitted this week that it has performed no cost-benefit analysis -- routine comparisons of costs of infrastructure projects versus their benefits -- of constructing a high-speed rail system. High-speed rail is not faster, cheaper or easier than building more freeways or expanding the overburdened air traffic control system, services that users are generally prepared to pay for. Few transportation experts believe that passengers will be prepared to pay for high-speed rail. Ticket prices for high-speed rail would be even more expensive, further limiting its customer base. High-speed rail proponents have overstated its benefits. Transportation jobs can be created through expansion of highways, using private funding from tolls rather than taxpayer dollars. And high-speed rail is unlikely to relieve traffic jams, because they occur within cities, rather than outside them. High-speed rail is expensive, it reaches only small segments of the country, and it cannot substitute for most highways. Building high-speed lines -- capable of speeds of 150 to 200 miles per hour -- on newly laid track, as well as incremental improvements in existing rail infrastructure, would cost between $250 billion and $500 billion, perhaps more. Obama's $53 billion would be just the start.

#### HSR provides minimal highway congestion relief

Peterman, Analyst in Transportation Policy for Congressional Research Service, Frittelli, Specialist in transportation policy for CRS, and Mallet, specialist in transportation policy for CRS, 2009 (David Randall, John, William J, 12/8/9, Congressional Research Service, “High Speed Rail (HSR) in the United States“, <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R40973.pdf>, 7/10/12, CNW)

In heavily traveled and congested corridors, proponents contend that HSR will relieve highway and air traffic congestion, and, if on a separate right-of-way, may also benefit freight rail and commuter rail movements where such services share track with existing intercity passenger rail service. 34 By alleviating congestion, the notion is that HSR potentially reduces the need to pay for capacity expansions in other modes. On the question of highway congestion relief, many studies estimate that HSR will have little positive effect because most highway traffic is local and the diversion of intercity trips from highway to rail will be small. In a study of HSR published in 1997, the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) estimated that in most cases rail improvements would divert only 3%-6% of intercity automobile trips. FRA noted that corridors with short average trip lengths, those under 150 miles, showed the lowest diversion rates. 35 The U.S. Department of Transportation’s Inspector General (IG) found much the same thing in a more recent analysis of HSR in the Northeast Corridor. The IG examined two scenarios: Scenario 1 involved cutting rail trip times from Boston to New York from 3 ½ hours to 3 hours and from New York to Washington from 3 hours to 2 ½; Scenario 2 involved cutting trip times on both legs by another ½ hour over scenario 1. In both scenarios, the IG found that the improvements reduced automobile ridership along the NEC by less than 1%. 36 The IG noted “automobile travel differs from air or rail travel in that it generally involves door-to-door service, offers greater flexibility in time of departure, and does not require travelers to share space with strangers. Consequently, rail travel must be extremely competitive in other dimensions, such as speed or cost, to attract automobile travelers.” 37 Planners of a high speed rail link in Florida between Orlando and Tampa, a distance of about 84 miles, estimated that it would shift 11% of those driving between the two cities to the train, as well as 9% of those driving from Lakeland to either Orlando (54 miles) or Tampa (33 miles). However, because most of the traffic on the main highway linking the two cities, I-4, is not travelling between these cities, it was estimated that HSR would reduce traffic on the busiest sections of I-4 by less than 2%. 38 The final environmental impact statement for the project states that the reduction in the number of vehicles resulting from the HSR system “would not be sufficient to significantly improve the LOS [level of service] on I-4, as many segments of the roadway would still be over capacity.” 39 The estimated cost of the HSR line was $2.0 billion to $2.5 billion, 40 or $22 million to $27 million per mile.

#### HSR will not carry enough passengers to relieve congestion and improve air quality

Staley, Reason Foundation, 9

(Samuel, Reason Foundation, 6/22/09, “The Pragmatic Case Against High-Speed Rail”, <http://reason.org/blog/show/the-pragmatic-case-against-hig>, 7/10/12, ML)

While these criticisms all have merit, we can't lose sight of the fact the biggest reason high-speed rail won't work in the U.S. is that it doesn't make sense as a project funded from general tax revenues. High-speed rail is not a public good and it's not mass transit. It is corridor transit. At best, it's a niche market serving a highly specialized, relatively wealthy, and narrow customer base (high-income business travelers with expense accounts and tourists). It won't relieve urban traffic congestion and its contribution to improving air quality (or reducing carbon dioxide emissions) will be negligible because it won't carry enough riders to make a big difference. These factors undermine high-speed rail justificatons based on public good arguments.

#### HSR unable to solve congestion – costly and ineffective

IPI, Illinois Policy Institute, 11

(Illinois Policy Institute, 5/7/11, “High Speed Rail”, <http://illinoispolicy.org/uploads/files/2011-2012ILLegGuideHighSpeedRail.pdf>, 7/11/12, ML)

High-speed rail is a technology whose time has come and gone. The concept had its usefulness in years past, but today will simply cost taxpayers tens or hundreds of billions of dollars yet contribute little to mobility or environmental quality. People who want to save energy should encourage the state to relieve the traffic congestion that wastes nearly three billion gallons of fuel each year. Traffic signal coordination and other common sense, low-cost techniques can do more to relieve congestion and save energy than high-speed rail, and at a far lower cost. Illinois has many ways to cost-effectively improve transportation while saving energy, reducing accidents, and cutting toxic and greenhouse gas emissions. Highspeed rail is not among them.

### States say no

#### States Won’t Accept the Money, Wisconsin, Ohio, And Florida Prove

Kunz, President And CEO of the U.S. High Speed Rail Association, 2011

(Andy Kunz, March 10, 2011, Yale Environment 360, “U.S. High-Speed Rail: Time to Hop Aboard or BE left Behind”, <http://e360.yale.edu/feature/us_high-speed_rail_time_to_hop_aboard_or_be_left_behind/2378/>, accessed 7/72012, TRH)

And the United States? For the past several months the news on the high-speed rail front has been dominated by several governors, swept into power by the Tea Party movement, proudly proclaiming that they will have nothing to do with high-speed rail projects, which they contend are boondoggles. Indeed, the governors of Florida, Wisconsin, and Ohio have collectively rejected $3.6 billion in federal funds that would have covered nearly all of the cost of building rail lines on such routes as Orlando to Tampa, Milwaukee to Madison, and Cleveland to Columbus.

### A2 Solvency – NEC – Land-use restrictions

#### The land restrictions of the northeast corridor will challenge HRS efficiency

Todorovich, director of America 2050 and assistant visiting professor at the Pratt institute Graduate center for planning and Environment. Schned, associate planner for America 2050 and part-time lecturer at the Edward J. Bloustein, School of Planning and Public Policy at Rutgers university, and Lane, Senior fellow for urban design at Regional Plan association 2011

(Pertra, Daniel, and Robert, September 16, Lincoln Istitute of Land Policy, “High-Speed Rail: nternational Lessons for US Policymakers, <http://www.midwesthsr.org/sites/default/files/pdf/Lincoln_Policy_Institute_HSR_2011.pdf> July 1st, MDRJ)

High-speed rail in the United States is a story that, until recently, has been limited to the Northeast Corridor, where Amtrak began operating the Acela Express service in 2000. Its trains reach top speeds of 150 mph and average around 75 mph. Federal investments being made in the south end of the corridor, where trains average 86 mph, will soon bring top speeds to 160 mph. The Northeast Corridor is the country’s largest segment of publicly owned passenger rail infrastructure, which has contributed to its relative success. Most other passenger rail services nationwide operate on tracks owned by private freight railroads. The challenges of balancing freight and passenger operations in a single corridor restrict the ability to develop passenger rail speed, frequency, and reliability

## Econ

### Link – Fiscal Discipline – Cost

#### HSR price keeps rising

Rosen, Reporter for The American, 2011

(Michael M., 3/23/11, The American Magazine, The Real Problem with High Speed Rail, <http://www.american.com/archive/2011/march/the-real-problem-with-high-speed-rail>, date accessed 7/10/12, DD)

HSR’s problems stem mainly from implausibly rosy economic predictions followed by deeply disappointing financial results. One expert calls HSR a “budget-buster,” contending that California’s high-speed costs have risen at least 50 percent. Even the model HSR networks around the globe—supposedly exemplary of the wonders of fast train travel—leave much to be desired.But worse even than cost overruns has been the political manipulation afflicting the speedy choo-choos. A recent eye-opening New York Times article revealed the cold, calculating politics behind HSR in sunny Florida, where the federal government pledged $2.4 billion of the total $2.6 billion cost of building an 85-mile-long high-speed track between Tampa and Orlando. The Sunshine State’s Republican governor refused the funds, however, worried that his state would have to foot the bill later for the cost overruns and excess debts that have vexed similar systems throughout the world. The route itself, it turns out, was more or less useless, as critics had contended for years. “It would have linked two cities that are virtually unnavigable without cars,” the Times article states, “and that are so close that the new train would have been little faster than driving.”

#### Not enough money for HSR

Cox, principal of Demographia, a St. Louis region-based public policy firm, Vranich, as

President/CEO of the High Speed Rail Association in the early 1990s, 2008

 (Wendell, Joseph, September, The California High Speed Rail Proposal: A Due Diligence Report, <http://reason.org/files/1b544eba6f1d5f9e8012a8c36676ea7e.pdf>, date accessed 7/12/12, DD)

In the final analysis, it will be most difficult for CHSRA to obtain sufficient financing to complete

the Phase I San Francisco–Los Angeles–Anaheim route. This Due Diligence report concludes that

commercial revenues from that route are unlikely to be sufficient to pay operating costs and debt

service, much less finance Phase II and other extensions. As a result, it seems highly unlikely that

the Inland Empire–San Diego, Sacramento, East Bay San Jose–Oakland and Altamont Pass routes

will be built. Further, in the worst case, funding shortfalls could require greater use of improved

conventional rail infrastructure in Phase I, which could add hours to the promised travel times.

All of this could lead to negative financial consequences, such as substantial additional taxpayer

subsidies, private investment losses, and commercial bond defaults.

#### HSR costs are higher than they appear.

Peterman, Analyst in Transportation Policy, Frittelli , Specialist in Transportation Policy, Mallett, Specialist in Transportation Policy, 2009

(David, John, William, December 8th, Congressional Research Service, “High Speed Rail (HSR) in the United States“ http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA511142 July 3rd MDRJ)

In addition, at least one study suggests that transportation project cost estimates, especially those authored by project sponsors, should be rigorously scrutinized. 65 This study examined 258 transportation infrastructure projects around the world and found that in almost 90% of the cases costs were underestimated, that actual costs on average were 28% higher than estimated, and that rail projects in particular were the most severely underestimated, costing on average 45% more than estimated

#### HSR expensive to build, not feasible in US, & would not be used by Americans

**Morrison, 92**

(Steven, writer for the Boston Globe, 12-1-92, “High-speed Rail a Mistake”, <http://www.economics.neu.edu/morrison/research/bg921201.htm>, accessed 7-10-12 BLE)

High-speed rail systems are cheap to operate, but they are very expensive to build. The National Research Council, in its study of the technological and financial feasibility of high-speed rail in this country, found that the middle-of-the-road estimate for constructing high-speed rail systems is $18 million per mile $3.6 billion for a typical 200-mile route.To amass the large number of travelers necessary to spread the high fixed cost among many users requires a high population density and unattractive alternatives to rail. The United States lacks these prerequisites. First, we live in a country with a lot of land per person, putting us 148th out of 208 countries in population density. Our 69 people per square mile is one-fifth of Western Europe's 380 and one-12th of Japan's 850. Of course, there are regions in this country with high population densities. Nonetheless, the National Research Council could find only one route San Francisco to Los Angeles on which a high-speed rail system could cover its cost, and then only if all existing air passengers switched from air to rail! Second, rail alternatives auto and air are more attractive in the United States than in Japan and Europe. Our automobile ownership rate is nearly 50 percent higher than Western Europe's and more than twice Japan's, giving more of us an alternative that is available on a moment's notice and provides door-to-door service. We can afford to use our cars because our gasoline costs about one-third of what the Europeans and Japanese pay. Finally, our high incomes (one-third higher than Japan's and 50 percent higher than Western Europe's) and low air fares put air travel within the means of most Americans.

#### HSR drastically increases the budget deficit

Vranich Cox and Moore, affiliated with Reason Foundation 8

(Joseph Vranich, Wendell Cox and Adrian Moore; Reason Foundation; September 1, 2008; “The California High-Speed Rail Proposal: A Due Diligence Report”; Policy Study 370; <http://reason.org/news/show/the-california-high-speed-rail>; accessed July 7, 2012) Kristof

With the high costs of building in California and the history of cost overruns on rail projects, the **final price tag for the** complete **high-speed rail system will** actually **be $65 to $81 billion**, according to the Reason Foundation report. And while the **Rail Authority forecasts between 65 and 96 million** intercity **riders** by 2030, **the** due diligence **report finds these projections are dramatically inflated**. After compiling numerous ridership studies previously conducted for California rail systems, the study demonstrates **the state can expect 23 million to 31 million riders** a year in 2030. **Any failure to meet** the Rail Authority's **lofty ridership projections would force ticket-price increases**, further **cutting ridership, or require** taxpayer **subsidies to cover the financial shortfall, adding to** future **budget deficits.** The due diligence report finds "the San Francisco-Los Angeles line alone by 2030 would suffer annual financial losses of up to $4.17 billion."

**The Cost of High Speed Rail would be $1 Trillion**

**O’Toole 09**

**(Randal, August 2009, Texas Public Policy Foundation, “The High Cost of High – Speed Rail”,** [**http://www.texaspolicy.com/pdf/2009-08-RR03-HSR-rotoole.pdf**](http://www.texaspolicy.com/pdf/2009-08-RR03-HSR-rotoole.pdf)**, accessed 7/10/12, TRH)**

**A true high-speed rail system, with average speeds of 140-150 mph connecting major cities in 33 states, would cost well over $500 billion**. **Meeting political demands to close gaps in the system could bring the cost close to $1 trillion**. **At twice the cost of the Interstate Highway System, such a true high-speed rail system would provide less than 1/10th the mobility offered by the interstates**. **These costs include only the projected capital costs. States that decide to build moderate- or high-speed rail may be responsible for cost overruns, operating losses, and the costs of replacing and rehabilitating equipment about every 30 years.**

#### HSR will cost hundreds of billions – their evidence assumes the Obama administrations utopian vision

Staley director of urban and land use policy at Reason Foundation 10

(Sam Staley; director of urban and land use policy at Reason Foundation; December 16, 2010; “Infeasible and Not Cost Effective”; <http://www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2010/10/13/will-we-ever-have-high-speed-trains/a-national-high-speed-network-in-the-us-is-infeasible-and-not-cost-effective>; accessed July 7) Kristof

Second, success is a moving target for high-speed rail advocates. The **Obama administration's commitment is based on vision** and political commitment to rail, **not a rational analysis of potential costs compared to benefits**. Indeed, simply looking at the initial projects receiving federal money -- most notably California and Florida -- reveals that the purpose is to jump start spending on rail projects rather than strategically invest in high potential corridors. Forecasts for California, which on the surface would seem like a good candidate, are rife with dubious assumptions and rosy scenarios to make the numbers work. Third, **the financing simply isn't there**. While very **early estimates suggest some corridors might cover operating costs, the vast majority will not**. States (and **the federal government**) **will be saddled with billions of dollars of** ongoing operating and capital **costs under** the most **optimistic assumptions**. The $50 billion infrastructure spending bill the president is supporting is merely a drop in the bucket for what's needed to maintain the existing transportation network irrespective of **financing a** "**new**" **network** of trail lines that **will likely cost hundreds of billions of dollars** over decades.

#### **HSR is too costly – geography**

Congressional Digest 11

(4/1, “High-Speed Rail Overview: System Components, Potential, and Cost Issues” , 7/3/12, BR)

Some believe, therefore, that future intercity passenger mobility will be dependent on fully utilizing all of the available options; however, much of the criticism of HSR is based on concerns about its cost-effectiveness in the near to medium term. This is of particular concern since HSR is likely to rely more heavily than other modes (automobile, air, and intercity bus) on general tax revenues, as opposed to user fees/taxes, although the user fees/taxes that support those other modes may not cover their so-called externality costs (that is, costs that those modes impose on other people, such as environmental pollution and deaths and injuries due to crashes). The poor cost effectiveness of HSR, according to critics, rests in large part on the Nation’s geography, with lower-density urban areas that are much more widely spaced than are urban areas in much of Europe and Asia.

#### Cost Changes Dramatically in Heavily Costed Areas

Levinson, graduate student in civil and environmental engineering at the

University of California, Berkeley, NoDate

(David, NoDate, MSU, “The Full Cost of Intercity Travel: A Comparison of Air, Highway, and High-Speed Rail, <http://msu.jsimmer.com/fall06projects/Group2/research_projects/Papers/FullCostAccess.pdf>, 7-9-12, GHK)

Overall, in the California corridor, a high-speed rail system will have higher infrastructure costs per passenger kilometer compared with air and highway. If the highspeed rail system were in a more heavily traveled corridor, there would be a trade-off between higher capital costs due to higher land and construction costs, and more passengers to share those costs. How that trade-off is resolved depends on site- specific conditions. The high cost of high-speed rail infrastructure comes as no surprise. The tracks serve only one corridor for one type of trip (intercity) and are usually underused, while airports serve many corridors for both short- and long-distance intercity trips. Roads similarly operate over many transportation markets and serve local travel as well. Rail infrastructure is the least flexible among the three modes with its tracks standing idle most of the time.

### A2 Solvency – Econ – must have stats

#### Disregard claims without numerical, statistics-based evidence

Glaeser 9

(Edward L, Professor at Harvard’s Economy Department, “Is High-Speed Rail a Good Public Investment?” July-October, New York Times Economix Series, <http://www.lawrence.edu/fast/finklerm/Glaeser%20on%20High%20Speed%20Rail.doc>, 7/9/12, BR)

Economics doesn’t have any inherent opinion on trains, but it does strongly suggest the value of cost-benefit analysis, which may be the best tool ever created for evaluating public investments. Large infrastructure projects are complicated things that all have hundreds of consequences, some good and some bad. It is easy to come up with good and bad side effects of high-speed rail: More people coming into a centralized train station might reduce long car trips associated with sprawling airports (that’s good), but increase congestion in the city (that’s bad). These ideas are so cheap that unless they are seriously quantified they have no place in the debate. Serious accounting, not clever debating points or soaring rhetoric, is the critical ingredient in good public decision-making.

### A2 Solvency – Squo – Jobs

#### **With the current amount of investment, HRS Will create 100,000+ Jobs in the us**

APTA 2012(American Public Transportation Association, January 2012, “An inventory of the Critucisms of High-Speed Rail”, <http://www.apta.com/resources/reportsandpublications/Documents/HSR-Defense.pdf>, accessed 7/5/12, TRH)

This is the same collection of rants that is propagated on a regular basis from the likes of the Reason Foundation, the CATO and Hover Institutes, the Heritage Foundation and good old Wendell Cox. An Inventory of the Criticisms of High-Speed Rail With Suggested Responses and Counterpoints The job creation benefits are documented in, among many sources, a 2007 Federal Highway Administration study that identified that for every $1 billion invested in infrastructure development, 20,000 long- and short-term jobs are created. The American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, on their website (AASHTO. org) substantiates the number of highway mile/lanes that can be replaced by commuter and intercity passenger rail service, as well as the impact transit and intercity rail can have on energy consumption. The Urban Institute, Transportation For America, and the National Council of State Legislatures document the urban renewal impact of transit and passenger rail. Finally, in both the PRIIA and the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act of 2009 (ARRA), strict “Buy American” provisions require that at least 80 percent of the equipment and material procured to build and operate America’s newly rejuvenated passenger rail system, including high-speed rail, be built and acquired from companies based in the United States and employing American workers.

### No Solvency – Econ – cost

#### Cost will be net negative – current lines show

Julian 10

(Liam, research fellow at the Hoover Institution, Stanford University, and managing editor of Policy Review, April/May, Policy Review, “The Trouble with High Speed Rail”, 7/3/12, BR)

The designers of Florida's and California's proposed high-speed rail routes say that ticket sales will pay for their respective system's operating costs. No doubt those who are planning lines in other American corridors will say the same. The claims are surpassingly dubious. Only two dedicated high-speed railways in the world — one connecting Tokyo and Osaka, and the other between Paris and Lyon — have ever broken even on their initial and ongoing expenditures. And many European high-speed rail systems that are deemed cost-effective actually receive lots of extra help. A 2008 study, commissioned by Amtrak's Office of the Inspector General, notes that European passenger railways often count the government funding they receive as revenue, and that some systems receive "off-balance sheet" public funding, "typically provided for staff and pension obligations, debt service, restructuring, and past capital investments." The report concludes that, when all is said and done, "European Passenger Train Operations operate at a financial loss and consequently require significant Public Subsidies." They require far more in subsidies than Amtrak, in many cases, and Amtrak is subsidized at $3.2 per passenger. In 2008, Amtrak lost $1.1 billion. The economics of high-speed rail do not work, especially in America.

### No IL – Econ – Ridership

#### **Economic success depends on ridership which will be low**

Congressional Digest 11

(4/1, “High-Speed Rail Overview: System Components, Potential, and Cost Issues” , 7/3/12, BR)

Given the high cost of constructing and operating highspeed rail service, its cost-effectiveness depends on achieving high ridership levels. The ridership levels needed to make a high-speed rail system viable vary according to the cost of the system; a high-speed route with a dedicated track and electric power supporting speeds in excess of 150 mph will be much more expensive than upgrading existing track to support 110 mph service. Estimates of the level of ridership needed to justify the cost of high-speed systems similar to those in other countries range from 6 million to 9 million riders in the first year. To put that figure in context, Amtrak’s current high-speed service, the Acela, which began operating in 2000 in the most densely populated corridor in the United States, carried 3.4 million passengers in 2008.

#### Due to lack of ridership, costs will be extreme

Glaeser 9

(Edward L, Professor at Harvard’s Economy Department, “Is High-Speed Rail a Good Public Investment?” July-October, New York Times Economix Series, <http://www.lawrence.edu/fast/finklerm/Glaeser%20on%20High%20Speed%20Rail.doc>, 7/9/12, BR)

But as President Obama has said one of the appeals of high-speed rail is “walking only a few steps to public transportation, and ending up just blocks from your destination.” That’s bad news for Texas. In Dallas less than 5 percent of the population takes public transportation to work, and more than 60 percent of all jobs are more than 10 miles from the city center. For these reasons, driving will continue to be extremely attractive for travelers who want to save parking fees and need cars once they arrive. I’ll go with 1.5 million trips a year (even including future growth), which would make the new rail line about as popular as all airplane flights between the two cities are today. Now it’s just down to multiplying: 1.5 million trips times $68 a trip means $102 million for benefits minus operating costs. Annual capital costs came in $648 million, more than six times that amount. If you think that the right number is three million trips, then the benefits rise to $200 million, and the ratio between the per rider net benefits and costs drops to one-to-three. This is the cruel arithmetic faced by people, like myself, who would love to be pro-rail. One hint for train lovers who would like to make this comparison look better: make a compelling case that the interest rate should be much lower, as nothing else makes nearly as much difference. Also keep in mind that I haven’t brought in the environment or congestion. They’re up next week.

#### HSR projection ridership is unrealistic

Cox, principal of Demographia, a St. Louis region-based public policy firm, Vranich, as

President/CEO of the High Speed Rail Association in the early 1990s, 2008

 (Wendell, Joseph, September, The California High Speed Rail Proposal: A Due Diligence Report, <http://reason.org/files/1b544eba6f1d5f9e8012a8c36676ea7e.pdf>, date accessed 7/12/12, DD)

It appears that the CHSRA 2030 ridership projections are absurdly high—so much so that they could well rank among the most unrealistic projections produced for a major transport project anywhere in the world. Under a passenger-mile per route-mile standard, the CHSRA is projecting higher passenger use of the California system than is found on the Japanese and French HSR networks despite the fact that these countries have conditions that are far more favorable to the use of HSR. The CHSRA’s ridership projections reflect assumptions contrary to actual experience, forecasts inconsistent with independent projections, load factors and other calculations that are highly questionable, and reliance on extraordinarily low fares that are not found on similar systems

#### HSR Fails- Low ridership and financial benefit

Samuelson, writes a weekly economics column, Harvard College, 2011

(Robert J., 2/14/11, Washington Post, “High-Speed Rail is a fast track to government waste,http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2011/02/13/AR2011021302203.html, date accessed 7/10/12, DD)

High-speed rail would transform Amtrak's small drain into a much larger drain. Once built, high-speed-rail systems would face a dilemma. To recoup initial capital costs - construction and train purchases - ticket prices would have to be set so high that few people would choose rail. But lower prices, even with favorable passenger loads, might not cover costs. Government would be stuck with huge subsidies. Even without recovering capital costs, high-speed-rail systems would probably run in the red. Most mass-transit systems, despite high ridership, routinely have deficits. The reasons passenger rail service doesn't work in America are well-known: Interstate highways shorten many trip times; suburbanization has fragmented destination points; air travel is quicker and more flexible for long distances (if fewer people fly from Denver to Los Angeles and more go to Houston, flight schedules simply adjust). Against history and logic is the imagery of high-speed rail as "green" and a cutting-edge technology.

### No IL – Econ – Stimulus

#### They cannot win a positive economic effect; empirics prove that HSR does not boost economy

Glaeser 9

(Edward L, Professor at Harvard’s Economy Department, “Is High-Speed Rail a Good Public Investment?” July-October, New York Times Economix Series, <http://www.lawrence.edu/fast/finklerm/Glaeser%20on%20High%20Speed%20Rail.doc>, 7/9/12, BR)

Any transportation investment can create large economic ripples only if it significantly increases the speed at which an area with cheap real-estate gains access to a booming place that doesn’t have any comparable, closer available land area. For example, in Spain, the city of Ciudad Real seems to have gotten a big lift thanks to high-speed rail because people can now live in Ciudad Real, where housing is cheaper, and commute into Madrid. This logic has led some to think that high-speed rail will do wonders transforming Buffalo into a back office for Manhattan. Buffalo is 376 miles from Manhattan, so a 150-mile-an-hour rail line will take two and a half hours, which is not going to be significantly faster than air. Moreover, vast amounts of low-cost space are closer to Manhattan than the shores of Lake Erie. Faster connections between Buffalo and Toronto might do more, but in that case speed is hampered by the burdens of border crossing. Philadelphia is the more natural beneficiary of high-speed rail access to Manhattan; there are already people who live in Philadelphia and commute to New York. Yet even in this most propitious setting, the coming of Acela seems to have had little impact on the population decline of Philadelphia or growth of Wilmington. Perhaps the absence of any trend break in population growth around 2000 just reflects the incremental nature of the Acela investment, but there is little here to bring confidence that rail lines revitalize cities. Moreover, I don’t see why is it in the national interest to disperse economic activity from Manhattan to Buffalo or Philadelphia. I have long argued that the economic case for directing economic aid to declining regions is weak.

### No IL – Econ – motives

#### Building HSR won’t boost the economy. Their authors are comparing the US to countries that had completely different reasons to build HSR

(David, John, William, December 8th, Congressional Research Service, “High Speed Rail (HSR) in the United States“ <http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA511142> July 2nd MDRJ)

Proponents of HSR often cite the networks in these countries, with the implication that their adoption of HSR makes the feasibility and desirability of building HSR lines in the United States unquestionable. But to extrapolate from the adoption of HSR in other countries to the conclusion that the United States should follow a similar path may not be warranted. The motives that led other countries to implement very high speed rail lines are varied; some, like Japan and China, did so originally in part to meet the demand on already overcrowded conventional rail lines, while others did so in part to try to preserve rail’s declining mode share in the face of the growing role of car and air travel. In most cases, the regions served were more densely populated than most areas in the United States

### No IL – Econ – cost/benefit

#### **HSR won’t work well in the US and costs will exceed benefits**

Congressional Digest 11

(4/1, “High-Speed Rail Overview: System Components, Potential, and Cost Issues”, 7/3/12, BR)

One of the basic obstacles facing development of highspeed rail lines is that the direct economic benefits of such lines rarely exceed the direct costs. Nevertheless, Japan, France, Germany, Spain, and China are among the countries that have built very high-speed rail networks with trains operating at speeds of over 150 mph. Proponents of HSR often cite the networks in these countries, with the implication that their adoption of HSR makes the feasibility and desirability of building HSR lines in the United States unquestionable. But to extrapolate from the adoption of HSR in other countries to the conclusion that the United States should follow a similar path may not be warranted. The motives that led other countries to implement very high-speed rail lines are varied; some, like Japan and China, did so originally in part to meet the demand on already overcrowded conventional rail lines, while others did so in part to try to preserve rail’s declining mode share in the face of the growing role of car and air travel. In most cases, the regions served were more densely populated than most areas in the United States.

#### HSR not effective/worth costs – Japan & Europe prove

O’Toole 8

(Randal, Senior Fellow at the CATO Institute & public policy analyst, “High-Speed Rail: The Wrong Road for America”, Oct. 31, CATO Institute, <http://www.cato.org/publications/policy-analysis/highspeed-rail-wrong-road-america>, 7/10/12, BR)

These assessments are confirmed by the actual experience of high-speed rail lines in Japan and Europe. Since Japan introduced high-speed bullet trains, passenger rail has lost more than half its market share to the automobile. Since Italy, France, and other European countries opened their high-speed rail lines, rail's market share in Europe has dwindled from 8.2 to 5.8 percent of travel. If high-speed rail doesn't work in Japan and Europe, how can it work in the United States?

#### The most credible stats prove HSR is too expensive

Glaeser 9

(Edward L, Professor at Harvard’s Economy Department, “Is High-Speed Rail a Good Public Investment?” July-October, New York Times Economix Series, <http://www.lawrence.edu/fast/finklerm/Glaeser%20on%20High%20Speed%20Rail.doc>, 7/9/12, BR)

The up-front costs of rail are primarily the cash outlays, and these are perhaps easiest to quantify. The Government Accountability Office’s summary of building costs in Europe range from $37 million to $53 million a mile. The Japanese lines cost from $82 million to $143 million a mile. (Higher costs in Japan reflect difficult earthquake-prone terrain and expensive land.) Cost estimates in the United States range from $22 million a mile, for a Victorville, Calif., to Las Vegas route, to $132 million a mile for connecting Baltimore and Washington. These figures are all debatable, but anyone who thinks that the G.A.O. got it wrong needs to come up with alternative figures that are equally plausible. As such, the cost of a 240-mile line, like the one that could connect Dallas and Houston, would probably run about $12 billion, but it could be as cheap as $6 billion or as expensive as $24 billion, and these are the numbers that we have most confidence about.

#### HSR is too hyped

Glaeser 9

(Edward L, Professor at Harvard’s Economy Department, “Is High-Speed Rail a Good Public Investment?” July-October, New York Times Economix Series, <http://www.lawrence.edu/fast/finklerm/Glaeser%20on%20High%20Speed%20Rail.doc>, 7/9/12, BR)

There is a powerful magic in the president’s vision of fast, sleek trains carrying Americans at dazzling speeds. Why shouldn’t the transport technology that hauled Americans during the glory days of American industry also bring us to a brighter future? Older cities, like New York and Boston, were built around rail lines: A move from cars to rail would certainly help other cities develop. Europe’s fast trains, like the speedy connection between Madrid and Barcelona, are marvels that show the progress that trains have made since the plodding trip I first took on that route in 1985. Personally, I almost always prefer trains to driving. Yet the public must be wary every time our leaders decide to spend billions of our tax dollars. The Government Accountability Office’s comprehensive report on high-speed rail that reminds us that: While some U.S. corridors have characteristics that suggest economic viability, uncertainty associated with rider and cost estimations and the valuation of public benefits makes it difficult to make such determinations on individual proposals. Research on rider and cost has shown they are often optimistic and the extent that U.S. sponsors quantify and value public benefits vary. The founders of transportation economics, like John Meyer and the deeply missed John Kain, found that the benefits of passenger rail rarely exceeded the costs. Their views were caricatured by generations of Harvard graduate students as “Bus Good, Train Bad.” Is money really better spent on fast trains than on educating our children? I would be delighted to share the president’s optimism about high-speed rail, but if benefits do not exceed the costs, then America will just be living through a real-life version of “Marge vs. the Monorail,” where the residents of the Simpsons’ Springfield were foolishly infatuated with a snazzy rail project oversold in song by Phil Hartman’s character.

## Competitiveness

### Solvency – Competitiveness – Alt causes

#### HSR doesn’t solve US competitiveness – alt causes

Nazworth 11

(Napp, September 8, Reporter and Political Analyst, CP Politics, United States Global Competitiveness Falls for Third Straight Year,

<http://www.christianpost.com/news/united-states-global-competitiveness-falls-for-third-straight-year-55278/>) CL

The United States fell from fourth to fifth place in global competitiveness, mostly due to its government debt, in the World Economic Forum's (WEF) annual report. This marks the third straight year it has declined. To measure a nation's competitiveness levels, the report examines 12 primary factors including governmental institutions, education and job training, government debt and its ability to pay its debt, market efficiency, market size, and technological readiness and innovation. The report states the reasons for the United States' decline were its lack of trust in politicians by business leaders, the government's unwillingness to remain neutral in the affairs of the private sector, wasteful government spending, a lack of transparency in the policy-making process, and burdensome regulations. The biggest factor leading to the decline, however, is government debt. “Over the past decade, the country has been running repeated fiscal deficits, leading to burgeoning levels of public indebtedness that are likely to weigh heavily on the country’s future growth,” the report states. Among all G-7 economies, the United States ranked third in public debt as a percentage of GDP at 91.6 percent.

### No IL – Competitiveness – squo

#### The US still has the best infrastructure systems and prospects for global competitiveness

Donohue 11

(Tom, August 16, President and CEO of the United States Chamber of Commerce,

No Time for Wallowing, Free Enterprise, <http://www.freeenterprise.com/article/no-time-for-wallowing>) CL

With our credit downgraded, stock prices falling, economic recovery sputtering, and hope running out for millions of unemployed workers, this may seem like an unusual time to talk about America’s strengths. In fact, it’s the best time. Wallowing in self-doubt will get us nowhere. By harnessing our extraordinary advantages, we can create new growth, jobs, and opportunities for Americans. We’ve got a highly productive manufacturing sector poised for expansion and new hiring. Our competitors’ costs are rising. With the right tax, labor, and regulatory policies, we can enjoy a manufacturing renaissance few dared to imagine a short time ago. Domestic energy production will fuel this renaissance. We have bountiful supplies of natural resources to use at home and sell around the world. We’re home to vast agricultural lands of unmatched potential. Our farms can feed a hungry world, creating businesses and jobs across industries throughout America. We still have one of the best end-to-end infrastructure systems in the world. With smart investments and upgrades, we can create hundreds of thousands of jobs while spurring growth and improving our quality of life. With positive demographics and a continued commitment to openness and individual opportunity, our country will have a constant supply of the hardest workers, smartest innovators, and most adventuresome entrepreneurs. This will keep our high-tech industries, our universities, our tourism destinations, and our health care sector vibrant and on the cutting edge. There’s plenty to criticize when it comes to our laws, politics, and government. Some in the global community have recently piled on the criticism. But who would trade our system for theirs? A strong rule of law, low levels of corruption, and a commitment to open debate and equal treatment are significant advantages too. These and other attributes comprise America’s “secret sauce” that will continue to sustain the most successful economy on earth. That’s why people, rich and poor, are still beating a path to our shores. This is most evident in times of crisis. Investors habitually seek safe haven here. They are doing so to this very day. I’m not suggesting that we try to paint a happy face on today’s lousy circumstances. We’ve got big problems to fix. We must grow our economy, limit the appetite of our government, put the American entrepreneur back in the driver’s seat, and take short and long-term steps to create American jobs. But let’s stop selling America short. There’s no faster way to crush America’s can-do spirit than by throwing up our hands and saying we can’t.

### China Competitiveness Bad

#### Competing with China is bad for U.S

Washington Post 11

(2/17/11, Washington Post, A lost cause: The high speed rail race, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2011/02/16/AR2011021606768.html>, date accessed 7/12/12, DD)

PRESIDENT OBAMA'S fiscal 2012 budget includes $8 billion for high-speed rail next year and $53 billion over six years. In the president's view, the United States needs to spend big on high-speed rail so that we can catch up with Europe, Japan - and you-know-who. "China is building faster trains and newer airports," the president warned in his State of the Union address. But of all the reasons to build high-speed rail in the United States, keeping up with the international Joneses may be one of the worst. In fact, experience abroad has repeatedly raised questions about the cost-effectiveness of high-speed rail. China would seem to be an especially dubious role model, given the problems its high-speed rail system has been going through of late. Beijing just fired its railway minister amid corruption allegations; this is the sort of thing that can happen when a government suddenly starts throwing $100 billion at a gargantuan public works project, as China did with rail in 2008. Sleek as they may be, China's new fast trains are too expensive for ordinary workers to ride, so they are not achieving their ostensible goal of moving passengers from the roads to the rails. Last year, the Chinese Academy of Sciences asked the government to reconsider its high-speed rail plans because of the system's huge debts. Of course, if the Chinese do finish their system, it is likely to require operating subsidies for many years - possibly forever. A recent World Bank report on high-speed rail systems around the world noted that ridership forecasts rarely materialize and warned that "governments contemplating the benefits of a new high-speed railway, whether procured by public or private or combined public-private project structures, should also contemplate the near-certainty of copious and continuing budget support for the debt."

### I! – Competitiveness – Terrorism

#### Terrorist attacks on HSR exist and are much more likely than attacks on airlines – killing cost-competitiveness

Maurillo 11

(Donna R., Director of Communications and Technology Transfer at the Mineta Transportation Institute, High-Speed Rail in the US: Will It Be a More Attractive Terror Target than Inter-city Rail?, <http://transweb.sjsu.edu/mtiportal/education/alumni/capstones/terror-targets-high-speed-rail-vs-intercity-rail-Maurillo.pdf>) CL

Assuming, then, that high-speed rail does succeed in the US, it could become a target for domestic or global terrorist groups or individuals who specifically attack transportation modes. In that event, which security-related issues could be problematic? Several possibilities exist. First, terrorist attacks against inter-city rail have occurred with almost predictable frequency around the globe. Crowded cars and easy access provide a ready target for anyone with evil intent. Although rail attacks may not deliver the spectacular devastation of an airline attack – such as that of September 11, 2001 – they still can provide sufficient carnage to deliver a stunning message of terror. Second, the discovery of Osama bin Laden’s trove of correspondence and terrorrelated documents has heightened America’s sensitivity to possible attacks on its rail system. Although rail professionals and counter-terrorism experts have long recognized it, Americans are just beginning to realize that rail is much more vulnerable than the relatively closed airline system. In fact, a recent editorial in the Peoria Journal Star said, “It's clear that our enemies view our rail system as having some security holes. Furthermore, ridership on Amtrak continues to increase, up 10 percent so far over last year on Illinois routes for example. “It has been said that 9-11 happened because of a failure of American imagination. We no longer have that excuse. High-speed rail investment is an Obama administration priority. Nothing would kill that concept faster than a high-profile train terrorist strike in the U.S. Passenger safety has to be a part of this discussion.”1 Third, rail security is more difficult than airline security because it must address much larger numbers of travelers. Of necessity, screening must be brief to keep the crowds moving efficiently. This can allow lethal devices to pass through undetected into the cars. Even chemical-sniffing canines and random screening are imperfect enough to leave certain vulnerabilities in the rail system. And crowds standing in long screening lines can be vulnerable to attack, as well. In addition, a new HSR system in the United States could become a tempting target for those who would wish to destroy any icon of Western values – especially if the nation had just invested a staggering sum of money into it. Attacking airlines is not an easy endeavor. The majority of US transportation security investment has focused on air travel, making another attack much more daunting. On the other hand, **rail is so much more accessible and vulnerable not only at the stations, but also along the entire route, where derailments can be carried out in remote areas. By contrast, an airliner is reasonably safe once it has left the ground. One also must consider that a well-placed explosive device planted on high-speed rail could be timed to coincide with that train traveling adjacent to key infrastructure, such as bridges, tunnels, water treatment plants, power stations, and the like. It also is possible to place an explosive device on an inter-city passenger train and time it to explode as the cars pass alongside a high-speed train**. And finally, because it would be a new infrastructure, high-speed rail most certainly would be operated with digital technologies throughout. These systems, while more dependable and robust than mechanical systems on older lines, can be hacked in a way that could affect switches, warning lights, electrical circuits, and even the operating systems of the computer networks. Further, it is not difficult to purchase the means to create electronic identification badges and cards, thereby allowing a criminal to impersonate rail personnel and operate from inside the system. Many of these devices are readily available online, such as at <http://idcardmaker.org/>.

## Environment

### A2 Enviro – Emissions – low threshold

#### HSR will not solve warming – it only reduces emissions by 1%

Kosinski UC Berkeley, Schipper UC Berkeley and Deakin PhD in city and Regional planning, professor at UC Berkeley, 11

(Kosinski, Andrew; University of California, Berkeley; Schipper, Lee; University of California, Berkeley; Deakin, Elizabeth, University of California, Berkeley PhD in City and Regional planning; Transportation Research Board 90th Annual Meeting 2011 January; pg2; TRB database; accessed July 3) Kristof

The US has embarked on a new program of investment in intercity passenger high-speed rail (HSR) systems, with an initial “down payment” of $8 billion in federal funds. The HSR program is intended to provide jobs and support economic development, build a foundation for economic competitiveness, support interconnected livable communities, and promote energy efficiency and environmental quality. In this paper we examine one specific aspect of **HSR’s** anticipated **energy and environmental benefits: its potential to reduce CO2 emissions compared to continued dependence on auto and air modes for** intercity **travel**. Using projections for US travel to 2050 and experience from Europe (as well as US focused projects) of diversion to HSR, we consider the proposed plans for HSR in the US and account for changes in vehicles, fuels, CO2 emissions from travel, and demand levels for the competing auto and air modes through 2050 under two alternative projections of future travel conditions and levels. One scenario assumes trends-extended and a second assumes a "green revolution" with considerably lower levels of travel and emissions. We conclude that under either scenario, **HSR would likely lead to a small (~1%) reduction of CO2 emissions in the transportation sector** compared with the original projections without HSR. **The primary reason why the reductions** in CO2 emissions **are small is the small share of overall travel that is between major metro regions slated to be connected by HSR and in a range likely to shift to HSR**.

#### HSR has minimal carbon offsets, even assuming the best models

Peterman, Analyst in Transportation Policy for Congressional Research Service, Frittelli, Specialist in transportation policy for CRS, and Mallet, specialist in transportation policy for CRS, 2009 (David Randall, John, William J, 12/8/9, Congressional Research Service, “High Speed Rail (HSR) in the United States“, <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R40973.pdf>, 7/10/12, CNW)

Completed as part of a wide-ranging review of transportation policy in the United Kingdom, an analysis of building a high speed rail system connecting London with Glasgow and Edinburgh (distances of approximately 350 miles and 330 miles, respectively), including its energy use and carbon emissions profile, concluded: high level analysis of the potential carbon benefits from modal shift from air to high speed rail suggests that these benefits would be small relative to the very high cost of constructing and operating such a scheme, and that under current assumptions a high speed line connecting London to Scotland is unlikely to be a cost-effective policy for achieving reductions in carbon emissions compared to other policy measures. 48 Because HSR will only capture a relatively small share of total passenger trips, it is also unlikely to make much difference in achieving greenhouse gas reduction targets, nor for that matter in the amount of oil imported. A critical analysis of HSR in California estimates that it might account for 1.5% of the state’s goal for reducing carbon emissions, and that would be at a very substantial cost. 49 A study of the potential benefits of HSR in Sweden concluded that investment in rail networks is not a cost-effective climate policy instrument; general policies, such as increased fuel taxes, would be more effective. 50 Similarly, in the UK’s analysis of a line from London to Scotland, they estimated the carbon savings would be 0.2% of the UK’s current carbon emissions, and this assumed that all flyers take the train and the HSR is zero-carbon. 51 As this suggests, another important factor in HSR’s impact on greenhouse gas reduction is the source of its electricity, as using electricity generated from coal will provide less benefit than electricity from nuclear, hydro-electric, or other renewable sources. 52

#### HSR does not produce any energy or emission savings

Samuelson, business columnist for Washington Post, 2010 (Robert J, 11/1/10, Washington Post, “Calif. rail project is high-speed pork”, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/10/31/AR2010103104260.html>, 7/10/12, CNW)

High-speed inter-city trains (not commuter lines) travel at up to 250 miles per hour and are most competitive with planes and cars over distances of fewer than 500 miles. In a report on high-speed rail, the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service examined the 12 corridors of 500 miles or fewer with the most daily air traffic in 2007. Los Angeles to San Francisco led the list with 13,838 passengers; altogether, daily air passengers in these 12 corridors totaled 52,934. If all of them switched to trains, the total number of daily airline passengers, about 2 million, would drop only 2.5 percent. Any fuel savings would be less than that; even trains need energy. Indeed, inter-city trains - at whatever speed - target such a small part of total travel that the changes in oil use, congestion or greenhouse gases must be microscopic. Every day, about 140 million Americans go to work, with about 85 percent driving an average of 25 minutes (three-quarters drive alone; 10 percent carpool). Even assuming 250,000 high-speed rail passengers, there would be no visible effect on routine commuting, let alone personal driving. In the Northeast Corridor, with about 45 million people, Amtrak's daily ridership is 28,500. If its trains shut down tomorrow, no one except the affected passengers would notice.

#### HSR doesn’t solve for Warming

Cox, principal of Demographia, a St. Louis region-based public policy firm, Vranich, as

President/CEO of the High Speed Rail Association in the early 1990s, 2008

 (Wendell, Joseph, September, The California High Speed Rail Proposal: A Due Diligence Report, <http://reason.org/files/1b544eba6f1d5f9e8012a8c36676ea7e.pdf>, date accessed 7/12/12, DD)

Claims about HSR’s environmental benefits have been greatly overstated. California HSR will do

little to reduce CO2 emissions (greenhouse gas emissions). Based upon California Air Resources

Board projections, HSR would ultimately remove CO2 emissions equal to only 1.5% of the current

state objective. This is a small fraction of the CHSRA’s exaggerated claims of “almost 50%” of the

state objective. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has indicated that for

8between $20 and $50 per ton of reduced greenhouse gases emissions, deep reversal of CO2

concentrations can be achieved between 2030 and 2050. A McKinsey report indicates that

substantial CO2 emission reductions can be achieved in the United States for less than $50 per ton.

Yet the cost per ton of CO2 emission removal by HSR is far higher—between 39 and 201 times the

international IPCC ceiling of $50. The reality is that HSR’s impact on CO2 would be

inconsequential while being exorbitantly costly

### A2 Enviro – Emissions – construction

#### Environmental costs for building HSR kills any advantage

Jaffe, The Atlantic Cities, 11

(Eric, The Atlantic Cities, 11/15/11, “How Green Is High-Speed Rail?”, <http://www.theatlanticcities.com/commute/2011/11/how-green-high-speed-rail/492/>, 7/9/12, ML)

Often that comparison overlooks one critical detail: the environmental damage caused by building high-speed rail lines in the first place. Unless high-speed rail travel reduces emissions by more than what it generates during construction, the project may not be worthwhile from an environmental perspective. Indeed, some researchers have their doubts. A recent British study suggests that high-speed construction emissions may be significant enough to call entire projects into question, writes Eric Morris, who described the work a couple years back at the Freakonomics blog: When the emissions spewed by all those earth movers, tunnel boring machines, bulldozers, trucks, cranes, etc. are taken into account, the carbon advantage for HSR vis a vis air travel largely evaporates.

#### HSR causes environmental damage during construction – no guarantee of high use for environmental solvency

Lindamood, The Libusters Line, 12

(Bob, The Libusters Line, 5/30/12, “High-Speed Rail: Fiction vs Reality”, <http://www.libusters.com/blog/archives/6598>, 7/9/12, ML)

High-speed trains “might be green, [but] don’t take it for granted,” said Germà Bel, a professor of political economics at the University of Barcelona and a former deputy in the Spanish parliament. “Because there is a lot of environmental damage while the construction is on. “The story does not begin the day that high-speed lines begin service: The story with the environment begins the day on which the first work began.” Disregarding the construction effects “gives the environmental effects of high-speed rail a kind of mythological value,” he said. “If you have medium use of such a line, you take about 30 years to recover the environmental damage done because of construction. If the usage is low, you actually have a very bad effect on the environment.”

#### HSR won’t lower emissions

Moore, vice president of research at Reason Foundation, Cox, principal of Wendell Cox Consultancy/Demographia, Vranich, Irvine, Calif.-based business consultant, 2012 (Adrian, Wendell, &Joseph,07-02-2012, Reason, 5 Reasons the California High-Speed Rail Project Shouldn’t Get More Money,http://reason.com/archives/2012/07/02/5-reasons-the-california-high-speed-rail/1, date accessed 7-3-2012,DD)

Proponents often say the high-speed rail system is needed to reduce the state’s greenhouse gas emissions. The United Nations has estimated that effective greenhouse gas reduction efforts should cost $20 to $50 per ton. The California high-speed rail system’s emission reductions would come at a monstrous cost of $1,800 a ton. Just as troubling, research at UC Berkeley concluded that if rail ridership met HSRA’s mid-level estimates, it would take 70 years for the rail system just to negate the emissions created by its own construction. If rail suffers lower ridership the system would “never” negate its construction emissions. California is drowning in debt and deficits. State leaders like Gov. Brown are calling for major tax increases. The California High-Speed Rail Authority keeps raising costs, lowering rider estimates, and lengthening travel times. Its current business plan reneges on promises made to voters in Proposition 1A. It would be a major mistake for California legislators to borrow billions of dollars to start building a train system that is far inferior and far more expensive than the one voters were promised when they approved Proposition 1A in November 2008.

### Solvency – Enviro – Oil

#### HSR only has a minimal effect on US oil dependency

Druce, part-time independent researcher, 2011

(Paul, 6/29, “Reason and Rail: Bad arguments for high speed rail: Oil consumption,” blogspot, <http://reasonrail.blogspot.com/2011/06/bad-arguments-for-high-speed-rail-oil.html>, 7/10/12, MDRJ)

One of the ancillary benefits which is often inappropriately highlighted as a primary benefit by high speed rail proponents is that of reducing American oil consumption. Often, our reliance upon foreign oil, including some from Middle East nations such as Saudi Arabia, is seized upon by such proponents and the defense costs added to the price of oil. This, however, is a flawed notion that ignores the interconnected nature of global trade. Even if we were completely independent from foreign oil, or at least oil not from North America and Europe, including our shipping, we would still fund foreign militaries and place troops in these areas. A sudden lack of oil shipments from Saudi Arabia would cause major oil price shocks globally, not merely to those depending on oil from Saudi Arabia. Even if we were, by perhaps some magical free energy device, completely free from oil use except in raw industrial processes, we would still be gravely damaged economically because our economy depends on foreign trade. Major economic recessions or depressions in our trading partners will cause the same problems here as well. Now, for the actual matter at hand, that of high speed rail's role in reducing our dependence on oil. The California High Speed Rail Authority estimates that, by 2030, the high speed rail system will be saving 12.7 million barrels of oil per year. This, however, represents only sixteen hours worth of US consumption in 2009 and only 1.9% of California's annual consumption (one week's worth). Clearly it would have minimal, if any, effect on oil prices or oil dependence.

### Solvency – Enviro – timeframe

#### Any benefits won’t start for decades

Sheehan, The Fresno Bee, 12

(Tim, The Fresno Bee, 5/26/12, “High-speed rail construction will give Valley's bad air a big bump before reductions take hold”, <http://www.fresnobee.com/2012/05/26/v-print/2851875/high-speed-rail-secret-construction.html>, 7/9/12, ML)

Backers of California's proposed high-speed rail system frequently tout the long-term air-quality benefits of getting people out of cars and planes and onto electric-powered trains. But any reductions in air pollution won't start for at least a decade, when the trains would start carrying passengers between Merced and the Los Angeles Basin. Meanwhile, building the system in the San Joaquin Valley is expected to pump tons of dust, greenhouse gases and other pollutants into the air. International experts warn it could take years for the benefits of train ridership to make up for the harm caused during construction. The California High-Speed Rail Authority expects to pay millions of dollars to make up for construction emissions in the Valley. "Building in an emissions-free manner is not possible, of course," said Lisa Marie Burcar, a spokeswoman for the rail authority. "But offsetting those emissions to result in the same outcome is." In its environmental impact report for the Merced-to-Fresno section -- one of the first portions of the statewide train system planned to be built -- the rail authority allows that "construction ... has the potential to cause temporary and significant localized air quality impacts" on the Valley's air between 2013 and 2022. Work would include demolition, land grading, earthmoving, pouring concrete, building stations and laying tracks. All that work, and the equipment used to do it, are expected to produce reactive organic compounds and nitrogen oxides -- two chemicals that mix in the atmosphere to create ozone -- as well as dust and carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases. The pollution anticipated from high-speed rail construction would be a small fraction of emissions already generated in the region. But in the Valley, already struggling to meet state and federal air-quality standards, any extra pollution is a major worry, said David Barber, of the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. Construction pollution not only has "dire consequences" for healthy air, but it threatens the San Joaquin Valley's ability to comply with federal mandates under the federal Clean Air Act, Barber told rail-authority board members this month in Fresno.

### Solvency – Enviro – displacement

#### HSR will not create jobs and only displaces the pollution

Brenman, Senior Policy Advisor for The City Project, 2011

(Marc, Senior Policy Advisor for The City Project, 7/17/11, “HIGH SPEED RAIL AND SOCIAL EQUITY”, <http://equity.lsnc.net/high-speed-rail-and-social-equity/>, 7/5/12, ML)

What will the environmental benefits be? This isn’t certain, since most of the electricity to run HSR will come from coal-fired plants which simply displaces the source of pollution from the place of use to the place of generation. And, the coal-fired plants are largely located near low income communities. The manufacturing of parts and rolling stock for HSR will be highly polluting too, since the rails are placed on concrete ties the manufacturing of which is one of the most greenhouse gas producing manufacturing processes. Moreover, the “green jobs” that were supposed to have been generated have not materialized for a variety of HSR projects.

### Solvency – Enviro – Mode Shift

#### No solvency on warming - little intercity travelers will switch to HSR

Peterman, Analyst in Transportation Policy, 2009

(David Randall, December 8, High Speed Rail (HSR) in the United States, www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R40973.pdf)

In heavily traveled and congested corridors, proponents contend that HSR will relieve highway and air traffic congestion, and, if on a separate right-of-way, may also benefit freight rail and commuter rail movements where such services share track with existing intercity passenger rail service.34 By alleviating congestion, the notion is that HSR potentially reduces the need to pay for capacity expansions in other modes. On the question of highway congestion relief, many studies estimate that HSR will have little positive effect because most highway traffic is local and the diversion of intercity trips from highway to rail will be small. In a study of HSR published in 1997, the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) estimated that in most cases rail improvements would divert only 3%-6% of intercity automobile trips. FRA noted that corridors with short average trip lengths, those under 150 miles, showed the lowest diversion rates.35 The U.S. Department of Transportation’s Inspector General (IG) found much the same thing in a more recent analysis of HSR in the Northeast Corridor. The IG examined two scenarios: Scenario 1 involved cutting rail trip times from Boston to New York from 3 ½ hours to 3 hours and from New York to Washington from 3 hours to 2 ½; Scenario 2 involved cutting trip times on both legs by another ½ hour over scenario 1. In both scenarios, the IG found that the improvements reduced automobile ridership along the NEC by less than 1%. The IG noted “automobile travel differs from air or rail travel in that it generally involves door-to-door service, offers greater flexibility in time of departure, and does not require travelers to share space with strangers. Consequently, rail travel must be extremely competitive in other dimensions, such as speed or cost, to attract automobile travelers.”

#### HSR won’t be environmentally friendly because few will use HSR

Peterman, Analyst in Transportation Policy, 2009

(David Randall, December 8, High Speed Rail (HSR) in the United States, www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R40973.pdf)

Another major benefit of HSR according to supporters is that it uses less energy and is relatively less polluting than other modes of intercity transportation.45 For example, the California High Speed Rail Authority contends that HSR uses one-third the energy of air travel and one-fifth the energy of automobile travel.46 While the physics of rail do generally provide favorable energy intensity and carbon emission attributes in comparison with highway and air travel, such claims tend to rest heavily on assumed high passenger loads. Moreover, they also tend to ignore the energy and carbon emission of building, maintaining, and rebuilding the infrastructure that supports each mode. Some argue that this omission tends to bias the analysis in favor of high speed rail, whereas in reality, these critics contend, the relatively small ridership of intercity rail will result in relatively high energy and emissions per passenger mile traveled.47 Another problem with these comparisons, according to critics, is that they tend to assume automotive and airplane engine technology will not become more energy efficient in the future.

#### HSR provides minimal highway congestion relief

Peterman, Analyst in Transportation Policy for Congressional Research Service, Frittelli, Specialist in transportation policy for CRS, and Mallet, specialist in transportation policy for CRS, 2009 (David Randall, John, William J, 12/8/9, Congressional Research Service, “High Speed Rail (HSR) in the United States“, <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R40973.pdf>, 7/10/12, CNW)

In heavily traveled and congested corridors, proponents contend that HSR will relieve highway and air traffic congestion, and, if on a separate right-of-way, may also benefit freight rail and commuter rail movements where such services share track with existing intercity passenger rail service. 34 By alleviating congestion, the notion is that HSR potentially reduces the need to pay for capacity expansions in other modes. On the question of highway congestion relief, many studies estimate that HSR will have little positive effect because most highway traffic is local and the diversion of intercity trips from highway to rail will be small. In a study of HSR published in 1997, the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) estimated that in most cases rail improvements would divert only 3%-6% of intercity automobile trips. FRA noted that corridors with short average trip lengths, those under 150 miles, showed the lowest diversion rates. 35 The U.S. Department of Transportation’s Inspector General (IG) found much the same thing in a more recent analysis of HSR in the Northeast Corridor. The IG examined two scenarios: Scenario 1 involved cutting rail trip times from Boston to New York from 3 ½ hours to 3 hours and from New York to Washington from 3 hours to 2 ½; Scenario 2 involved cutting trip times on both legs by another ½ hour over scenario 1. In both scenarios, the IG found that the improvements reduced automobile ridership along the NEC by less than 1%. 36 The IG noted “automobile travel differs from air or rail travel in that it generally involves door-to-door service, offers greater flexibility in time of departure, and does not require travelers to share space with strangers. Consequently, rail travel must be extremely competitive in other dimensions, such as speed or cost, to attract automobile travelers.” 37 Planners of a high speed rail link in Florida between Orlando and Tampa, a distance of about 84 miles, estimated that it would shift 11% of those driving between the two cities to the train, as well as 9% of those driving from Lakeland to either Orlando (54 miles) or Tampa (33 miles). However, because most of the traffic on the main highway linking the two cities, I-4, is not travelling between these cities, it was estimated that HSR would reduce traffic on the busiest sections of I-4 by less than 2%. 38 The final environmental impact statement for the project states that the reduction in the number of vehicles resulting from the HSR system “would not be sufficient to significantly improve the LOS [level of service] on I-4, as many segments of the roadway would still be over capacity.” 39 The estimated cost of the HSR line was $2.0 billion to $2.5 billion, 40 or $22 million to $27 million per mile.

#### SQ solves warming – Obama encouraging mode shifts already

Prum & Catz, 11

 [Darren A. Prum and Sarah L. Catz, Assistant Professor, The Florida State University Director, Center for Urban Infrastructure; Research Associate, Institute of Transportation Studies, University of California, Irvine, Article: “Greenhouse gas emission targets and mass transit: Can the government successfully accomplish both without a conflict?”, <http://digitalcommons.law.scu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1027&context=lawreview>, accessed 7-3-12 BLE)

In a swift change in public policy and to comply with a United States Supreme Court mandate, the Obama Administration altered the course of the federal government by addressing climate change and greenhouse gas emissions quickly after taking office. In looking to the transportation sector to return meaningful and rapid results, one of the components that could create a dual impact arises out of dependable, affordable, and convenient public transit alternatives. By encouraging the public to reduce their driving habits and to switch modes for their various transportation needs, the government could accomplish many different goals, such as reducing greenhouse gases, reducing congestion, and improving our national security by depending less on foreign oil. Transportation agencies across the country, however, are sharply cutting services in the face of harsh fiscal constraints from all levels. These measures are the latest sign of the fiscal woes in many state and local agencies across the country that threaten to derail the Obama Administration's policy change. At the same time, decades-old policies that create vicious cycles for more highways and greenhouse gas emissions require revamping to meet the new paradigm of today's reality.' Much of our current transportation policy originates from decisions made over a half century ago.6 Congress revisits and adjusts these plans every six years, but the current policy fails to account for modern environmental issues like global warming and neglects many parts of the country that need assistance in reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Recognizing the threat from climate change and seeking solutions of their own, several states individually and collectively have begun searching for short and long term solutions. Some states, like Florida, directly mandate that local governments evaluate the impact of transportation on greenhouse gases,' while California uses an environmental agency to develop specific targets for emission reductions based on pollution sources.

### I! Turn – Oil – Econ

#### Oil shocks help the economy

Rasmussen and Roitman, writers and researchers for the International Monetary Fund, 2011

(Tobias and Agustin, August, “Oil Shocks in a Global Perspective: Are they really that bad?” The International Monetary Fund, <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/wp/2011/wp11194.pdf>, 7/10/12, MDRJ)

The results dispel any notion of oil shocks always having an immediate and widespread negative impact on output. On the contrary: these episodes have generally been associated with GDP growth increasing in the same year, with the median volume increase ranging from 0.2 percentage points for oil-importing OECD countries to 1.5 percentage points for oil exporters. This positive impact is seen in a majority of cases, with the share of episodes with above-median GDP volume growth ranging from 58 percent for oil-importing OECD countries, possible reflecting relatively low fuel taxes and higher energy intensity in the US. From these results, we conclude that oil shock episodes have typically been associated with widespread contemporaneous increases in international trade and, surprisingly, in economic output as well. The increases in trade likely reflect that the oil exporters’ higher export earnings during periods with large oil price increases are partially recycled as higher imports from the rest of the world. With petrodollars also creating activity in other counties via the flow of remittances and investments, these offsetting effects help explain the lack of negative GDP impact. Surprising as it is, it is important to stress that these are only the contemporaneous effects in the year of the oil price shock. Indeed, results in the literature suggest that the negative impact on output for advanced economies only really materializes after four quarters.

#### Oil shocks boost economic growth

Kilian, Ph. D in Economics University of Michigan and CEPR, Park, Professor of Economics at the National University of Singapore, 2007

(Lutz and Cheolbeom, 12/31, “The Impact of Oil Price Shocks on the U.S. Stock Market” University of Michigan, <http://www-personal.umich.edu/~lkilian/ier22166r1.pdf>, 7/10/12, MDRJ)

In this paper, we address both of these limitations by relating U.S. stock returns to measures of demand and supply shocks in the global crude oil market, building on a structural decomposition of fluctuations in the real price of oil. We find that the response of aggregate stock returns may differ greatly depending on the cause of the oil price shock. The negative response of stock prices to oil price shocks, often referred to in the financial press, is found only when the oil price rises due to an oil-market specific demand shock such as an increase in precautionary demand driven by concerns about future crude oil supply shortfalls. In contrast, shocks to crude oil production have no significant effect on cumulative stock returns. Finally, higher oil prices driven by an unanticipated global economic expansion have persistent positive effects on cumulative stock returns within the first year of the expansionary shock. This result arises because a positive innovation to the global business cycle will stimulate the U.S. economy directly, while at the same time driving up the price of oil, thereby indirectly slowing U.S. economic activity. Since the stimulating effect dominates in the short run, the U.S. stock market may indeed thrive despite unexpectedly high oil prices. Given that recent increases in the price of crude oil have been driven primarily by strong global demand for industrial commodities, as shown below, this fact helps explain why the U.S. stock market so far has proved resilient to higher oil prices. In contrast, conventional VAR model based on unanticipated oil price changes 3 would have predicted a significant stock market correction in response to the recent oil price surge.

### I! D – Oil – Econ

#### Oil shocks don’t affect the economy. Empirics prove.

Van Doren and Taylor, writers and editors for The National Review, 2007

(Peter and Jerry, 9/28, “Be Not Afraid” The National Review, <http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/222286/be-not-afraid-peter-van-doren>, 7/10/12, MDRJ)

During the last week of September, 2003, oil was selling in U.S. spot markets for $23.86 a barrel. If one asked economists back then what would happen to the economy if oil prices were to hit $80 four years hence, they would have almost certainly predicted economic ruin. But the inflation, unemployment, and recession that supposedly follow oil price shocks are nowhere on the macroeconomic radar screen. If the economy goes into a tailspin, it will be in response to bad news in the housing market, not the oil market. The lesson to be derived from this is pretty clear: While oil-price spirals are certainly nothing for consumers to celebrate, the widespread belief that the health of the American economy is held hostage to oil markets is, for the most part, incorrect. The orthodox view that governed our understanding of oil-price shocks until recently was that the economic damage associated with those shocks was not the result of oil-price increases per se. Higher oil prices, after all, simply make oil producers richer, and everyone else poorer. Over the long run, more money spent on oil equals less money spent on everything else. This reduces the demand for, and thus the price of, everything (including labor!) save for oil. As long as oil producers are spending and/or investing their increased profits, the net effect of all this — from a macroeconomic perspective — is zero.

#### Oil shocks don’t have an economic effect – studies prove

Gómez-Loscos, Department of Applied Economics Universidad de Zaragoza, 2011

(Ana, 9/10, “Economic growth, inflation and oil shocks: Are the 1970s coming back?” Department of Applied Economics. University of Oviedo, <http://www.unizar.es/lgadea/documents/DPAE_09_10_rev.pdf>, 7/9/12, MDRJ)

The aim of this paper is to analyse the relationship between oil price shocks and the macroeconomic evolution of the G7 countries. By way of the use of the very recent Qu and Perron (2007) methodology, we provide evidence in favour of a non-linear relationship across the 1970-2008 sample. Our results show that the response of output and inflation to oil price shocks becomes weaker from 1970 until the late 1990s. We further observe the impact of oil price shocks on inflation to recover some of its initial importance in the 2000s, whilst we cannot find robust evidence of an influence of oil price shocks on GDP. Nevertheless, the transmission of oil price shocks to the economy is weaker than in the 1970s, which allows us to conclude that oil price shocks have lost some of their explanatory power. Consequently, the causes of the slight rise of inflation in the G7 countries during the 2000s should be looked for in other factors.

### L Turn – Enviro – Construction

#### Construction will damage property and air quality – current transportation better

McGirr, The Stanford Daily, 10

(Samantha, The Stanford Daily, 11/4/10, “Management professor says high-speed rail not smart investment”, <http://www.stanforddaily.com/2010/11/04/management-professor-says-high-speed-rail-not-smart-investment/>, 7/10/12, ML)

Enthoven further questions the environmental implications of the project, pointing out that the construction alone will damage property and release large amounts of carbon into the air. Rather than building an entire high-speed rail system, Enthoven believes California legislators should direct funds toward the expansion of current public transportation in the state’s large cities. “We ought to use that money to subsidize public transportation within metro areas,” Enthoven said. “[We should] put resources into improving Caltrain and [funding] buses to help people get to Caltrain. We ought to continue to expand BART, improve parking at stations, add another airport or two.”

### L Turn – Enviro – CO2

#### HSR produces twice as much CO2 per passenger

Whitelegg, The Guardian, 9

(John, The Guardian, 4/28/09, “On the wrong track: Why high-speed trains are not such a green alternative”, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2009/apr/29/high-speed-rail-travel-europe-uk>, 7/10/12, ML)

HSR does not reduce the fuel consumption of domestic aviation or reduce annual carbon emissions from aircraft. And it produces twice as much CO2 per passenger kilometre as a non-high speed train. If we are serious about reducing our carbon emissions by 80% by 2050, we should not move towards higher speed, more carbon intensive forms of transport and a policy of increasing the mass of travel. Supporters of HSR talk about a total bill of £11bn from public funds. This is likely to be a considerable underestimate, but even if correct it is a huge commitment to something regressive. HSR is used by high-income passengers, and the £11bn would be a public investment from all taxpayers to encourage wealthy individuals to travel to and from London more often and at a higher speed. This is far less important than sorting out local travel in all cities, commuter travel around all cities, and inter-regional travel.

#### HSR produces 20% more emmisions

Bliss, The Quiet Road, 12

(Jim, The Quiet Road, 1/12/12, “Against High Speed Rail”, <http://numero57.net/2012/01/12/against-high-speed-rail/>, 7/11/12, ML)

And that’s what it is. A vanity project. Railways are a great idea. High Speed Rail is a terrible one. A recent US study (High Speed Rail and Greenhouse Gas Emissions in the U.S.\*) of the carbon emissions of various modes of transport suggests that travelling on HSR produces 20% more emissions than going by conventional rail, and almost double that of coaches. And that’s without factoring in the environmental costs of the actual infrastructure (which are high thanks to the large amounts of concrete and steel used).

### L Turn – Enviro – NO

#### **HSR hurts environment – nitrogen oxide emissions**

**O’Toole, 10**

(Randal, Experiences writer for the CATO Institute, 6/10, “High Speed Rail”, <http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/high-speed-rail>, accessed 7-3-12, BLE)

The environmental benefits of high-speed rail would be negligible at best. President Obama's moderate-speed trains are expected to be powered by diesel locomotives, which burn petroleum and emit pollutants and greenhouse gases. Even electrically powered, true high-speed rail is unlikely to be clean. California rated its proposal as environmentally sound only by projecting impossibly high ridership numbers and unrealistically assuming that future automobiles and airplanes would be no more energy-efficient than they are today. In 2005, Florida's High-Speed Rail Authority proposed a 125-mph rail line between Tampa and Orlando. The environmental impact statement for the proposal estimated that the trains would produce more nitrogen oxide pollution and volatile organic compounds than would be saved by the automobiles taken off the road. It also calculated that operating and maintaining the gas-turbine locomotives would consume 3.5 to 6.0 times as much energy as would be saved by the cars replaced.36 The statement concluded that "the environmentally preferred alternative is the No Build Alternative" because it "would result in less direct and indirect impact to the environment."37 The Tampa-Orlando proposal was subsequently killed, only to be revived by the Obama administration. In January, the Department of Transportation announced that Florida will receive $1.25 billion of the $8 billion in high-speed rail stimulus funding for the route.

### L Turn – Enviro – land use

#### HSR not feasible due to land area & lack of use when created

**Schenone, 12**

(Ron, writer for LockerGnome, 2-10-12, “Should Maglev Trains Replace the Airplane?”, <http://www.lockergnome.com/blade/2012/02/10/should-maglev-trains-replace-the-airplane/>, accessed 7-10-12 BLE)

There are several considerations why maglev trains may not work in the US: From coast to coast, the US covers over 3,000 miles, while most European countries are much smaller. The federal government would need to subsidize such a venture; the cost would be enormous at a time when we are deep in debt. Airplane travel offers a fast and reliable system that most travelers would not want to give up. Despite the advantages, one issue that could sabotage the introduction of any form of rapid transport — besides the enormous cost — is the American attitude toward motor vehicles. We are in love with our cars and are of the opinion that owning one is a non-statutory right of our constitution.

#### HSR harms air quality, wetlands, and endangered species

Vartabedian, Los Angeles Times, 12

(Ralph, Los Angeles Times, 6/11/12, “High-Speed Rail Faces Environmental Objections”, <http://www.governing.com/news/state/mct-californias-high-speed-rail-faces-environmental-objections.html>, 7/10/12, ML)

The California bullet train is promoted as an important environmental investment for the future, but over the next decade the heavy construction project would potentially harm air quality, aquatic life and endangered species across the state's Central Valley. Eleven endangered species, including the San Joaquin kit fox, would be affected, according to federal biologists. Massive emissions from diesel-powered heavy equipment could foul the already filthy air. Dozens of rivers, canals and wetlands fed from the rugged peaks of the Sierra Nevada would be crossed, creating other knotty issues. A wide array of state and federal agencies is examining those effects and, over the next several months, will issue scientific findings that could affect the cost and schedule of construction. Beyond the regulators, environmental lawsuits brought by the powerful California agriculture industry are threatening to further delay work. The state rail authority is trying to push ahead with an urgent plan to start construction of a 130-mile segment from Madera to Bakersfield as early as December, arguing that any delays could put more than $2 billion of federal funding at risk. Even if the Legislature appropriates the state's share of money this summer, the construction schedule will depend on friendly and quick decisions by often tough regulators. "We make an independent decision here," Paul Maniccia, a biologist for the Army Corps of Engineers. "We don't willy-nilly say that's OK." The $68 billion bullet train would be the largest infrastructure project in the nation, projected to carry at least 20 million passengers annually with clean electrical power. If it draws motorists off the highway, it would reduce vehicle emissions. But those long-term benefits have to be weighed against heavy immediate effects. Among the most difficult issues will be air quality, which is regulated across eight counties by the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. The district worries that the construction project would exacerbate already problematic levels of nitrogen oxides, particulates and volatile compounds. The district already bears an annual $29 million federal fine for violating the Clean Air Act, a burden levied on businesses and motorists, who must pay higher annual vehicle fees. Without its approval, the California High-Speed Rail Authority cannot sink a shovel into the ground, said Samir Sheikh, the district's director of strategies and incentives. "We have an air quality problem that cannot tolerate an increase in emissions," he said.

#### HSR will harm endangered species

Vartabedian, Los Angeles Times, 12

(Ralph, Los Angeles Times, 6/11/12, “High-Speed Rail Faces Environmental Objections”, <http://www.governing.com/news/state/mct-californias-high-speed-rail-faces-environmental-objections.html>, 7/10/12, ML)

The rail authority and its partners at the Federal Railroad Administration also need clearance from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, which is preparing a biological opinion on the project's effects on endangered and threatened species, said Daniel Russell, a deputy assistant field supervisor at the service. So far, the service has identified six animal and five plant species listed as endangered or threatened that would be affected by the Merced-to-Fresno section of the rail project. It has yet to determine whether the project would harm those species or could jeopardize their survival or have effects that could be mitigated, Russell said. The animals include the San Joaquin kit fox, the California tiger salamander, two types of fairy shrimp, a tadpole shrimp and the valley elderberry longhorn beetle. Kathryn Phillips, director of the Sierra Club California, said a lot of public and private money has been invested into preserving those species. "The kit fox is pretty charismatic," she said. By choosing to go up the eastern side of the Central Valley rather than the drier western side, the rail authority will cross up to 100 bodies of water controlled by the Army Corps of Engineers. "We anticipate there to be unavoidable impacts, given the sheer magnitude of the project," said Susan Meyer, a senior project manager at the Army Corps of Engineers. The law requires that any impacts be avoided or minimized. The Army could require "compensatory mitigation" under its permits, Meyer said.

# Offcase Links

## Link: PTX Unpopular

### Link – PTX – Republicans

#### **Republicans hate the plan**

Longman 11

(Philip, Schwartz Senior Fellow at the New America Foundation, former senior writer and deputy assistant managing editor at U.S. News & World Report, Jul/Aug, Washington Monthly, “The Case for Not-Quite-So-High-Speed Rail”, 7/3/12, BR)

Meanwhile, especially since the elections of 2010, conservatives have been rallying their troops in full-throated opposition to any and all government spending to improve passenger rail service, often portraying it as another step on the road to serfdom. Though many Republicans, such as Kay Bailey Hutchinson of Texas, have strongly supported Amtrak over the years (especially for service in their own backyards), we now see a new breed of Republican governors in Florida, Ohio, and Wisconsin all making a big show of waving away billions in federal stimulus dollar for rail improvements in their states.

#### GOP opposes HSR

Doyle 12

(Jun. 30, Michael Bee Washington Bureau, House Republicans take stand against high-speed rail spending, <http://www.fresnobee.com/2012/06/29/2893074/house-republicans-take-stand-against.html>) CL

The Republican-controlled House on Friday reiterated its intention not to spend new federal dollars next year on California's controversial high-speed rail project. By a 239-185 vote, cast nearly entirely along party lines, the House approved language authored by Rep. Jeff Denham, R-Turlock, meant to block the high-speed rail spending. The amendment was added to a Fiscal 2013 transportation spending bill. "We've got highways that are falling apart. We've got bridges that are falling apart," Denham said Friday. "We need to ensure our gas tax dollars get used for their intended purpose -- of actually improving our roads." Denham's amendment sent a signal, in part, as the $51 billion transportation and housing bill did not include any funds for the Obama administration's high-speed rail initiative. California officials have indicated they do not need a new infusion of federal dollars during Fiscal 2013, which starts Oct. 1. In a similar vein, Rep. Tom McClintock, R-Elk Grove, won House approval Friday for an amendment blocking new federal spending for a subway system in San Francisco

#### Republicans hate high speed rail; at odds with Obama

PBS 11

(Public Broadcasting System: Washington; April 25th 2011, “Building the next America: Ed Rendell makes the case for spending on high-speed rail”, 7/12/12, BR)

Much like last year’s debate over health care reform, Republicans and President Obama once again find themselves at odds, this time over whether or not to build a nationwide high-speed rail system. Already, Republican governors from Wisconsin, Ohio and Florida have rejected over a combined $3 billion for building high-speed rail, stalling the Obama plan, at least for now.

#### Republicans hate hsr: want to cut down Obama

Jaffe 11

(Sarah, staff writer for AlterNet, “Why Do Conservatives Hate High-Speed Rail? 5 Reasons Right-Wingers Are Sabotaging Public Transportation Projects”, July 22, 2011, AlterNet, 7/12/12 BR)

So what's the problem? Why do conservatives hate high-speed rail so much? They claim it's all about money, but handing back billions in federal dollars while claiming to be broke doesn't seem to make much fiscal sense. We did a little research, and here's what we found:¶ 1. Big infrastructure projects leave a big legacy--and this one would belong to President Obama.¶ It's no secret that the GOP's number one goal is to shoot down anything that Obama wants, even at the expense of their own constituents. It's also no secret that they hate government spending ideologically, and hate it even more when it actually accomplishes something positive--and visible.

### Link – PTX – taxpayers

#### HSR unpopular with the public

Koenig 12

(Brian, staff writer for The New American: US NEWS, “California Voters Turn on High Speed Rail Project”, June 7th 2012, accessed 7/12/12, BR)

While labor unions have been staunch supporters of the project, a sizable 56 percent of union households now oppose the funding plan, the poll added. Even Democrats, the project’s most prominent supporters, have become skeptical, as 47 percent now reject the bond issue. The Times explained that revenue projections and overall use of the high-speed rail are also in question: The poll found that most voters don't expect to use it. Sixty-nine percent said they would never or hardly ever ride it. Zero percent said they would use it more than once a week. Public opinion surveys cannot predict the revenues and ridership a rail service might generate. The poll results raise questions about whether the system would serve as a robust commuter network, allowing people to live in small towns and work in big cities or vice versa. On the other hand, 33% of respondents said they would prefer a bullet train over an airplane or car on trips between L.A. and the Bay Area.

#### HSR is unpopular and democrats get all the blame for deficit spending

LaMalfa 12 (Doug LaMalfa; State Senator California’s 4th district; “The Economic & Political Impact of High Speed Rail”; 7/5/2012; <http://www.cssrc.us/web/4/publications.aspx?id=12447>; accessed July 11, 2012) Kristof

In less than 4 months **Democrats are going to ask the people** of California **for billions of dollars in** news **taxes**, yet today, you **also want to charge up the state’s credit** card **by another $3.7 billion for a high speed rail project with an estimated price tag of at least $68 billion**. Moving forward with this project will surely doom the tax measures and negatively impact those who cast an “aye” vote - **Why should the people** of California **trust the** Governor and **Democrats with more of their hard earned money**, when they’re already willing to spend far beyond what’s available? **Rather than dealing with the issues before us, the legislative Democrats are just piling on the debt**, without any regard for those who will have to pay back this money and how it will impact schools, health care programs, and public safety.

#### Taxpayers hate HSR

O’Toole 8

(Randal, Senior Fellow at the CATO Institute & public policy analyst, “High-Speed Rail: The Wrong Road for America”, Oct. 31, CATO Institute, <http://www.cato.org/publications/policy-analysis/highspeed-rail-wrong-road-america>, 7/10/12, BR)

As megaprojects—the California high-speed rail is projected to cost $33 to $37 billion—high-speed rail plans pose serious risks for taxpayers. Costs of recent rail projects in Denver and Seattle are running 60 to 100 percent above projections. Once construction begins, politicians will feel obligated to throw good taxpayers' money after bad. Once projects are completed , most plans call for them to be turned over to private companies that will keep any operational profits,while taxpayers will remain vulnerable if the trains lose money.

#### Americans want controlled spending

LaHood, U.S Transportation Secretary,2011

 (Ray, 2/17/11, Washington Post, High-Speed Rail: Essential or a waste of money?, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2011/02/17/AR2011021706441.html>, date accessed 7/12/12, DD)

Robert J. Samuelson's Feb. 14 op-ed column, "Government gone wrong," is a perfect summary of why Americans are losing faith in the ability of government to control spending. President Obama is not listening to what the American people are saying about the deficit. In a year when the government estimates that it will incur a $1.6 trillion deficit, he announces $58 billion in new discretionary spending, plus billions in future obligations to support a high-speed rail system. It makes no sense to propose costly new programs that are not critical to the near - or long - term. It is obvious that Mr. Obama is incapable of leading this nation toward fiscal responsibility.

#### Public doesn’t support HSR

Cox, principal of Demographia, a St. Louis region-based public policy firm, Vranich, as

President/CEO of the High Speed Rail Association in the early 1990s, 2008

 (Wendell, Joseph, September, The California High Speed Rail Proposal: A Due Diligence Report, <http://reason.org/files/1b544eba6f1d5f9e8012a8c36676ea7e.pdf>, date accessed 7/12/12, DD)

Emerging public opposition will likely spread as site-specific urban, suburban and rural impacts

become better understood. It is unlikely that the California HSR program will find smooth sailing

among impacted communities. This finding is based in part on nascent opposition to the project.

Opposition to prior HSR projects has been based on underestimated costs, overestimated ridership, eminent domain and environmental impacts. Also, the credibility of HSR promoters has waned as pledges of “no subsidy” or “only low subsidies” turned into calls for high subsidies. This Due Diligence Report identifies such factors as weaknesses in the CHSRA planning process.

### Link – PTX – Cost

#### HSR wastes tax-payers money with no benefit

Barone, Reporter, 2011

(Michael, 1/20/11, RealClearPolitics, High Speed Rail is a Fast Way to Waste Taxpayer Money, <http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2011/01/20/high-speed_rail_is_a_fast_way_to_waste_taxpayer_money_108596.html>, date accessed 7/12/2012, DD)

Where can the new Congress start cutting spending? Here's one obvious answer: high-speed rail. The Obama administration is sending billions of stimulus dollars around the country for rail projects that make no sense and that, if they are ever built, will be a drag on taxpayers indefinitely. A look at some proposed projects gives the answer. Take the $2.7 billion, 84-mile line connecting Orlando and Tampa that incoming Florida Gov. Rick Scott is mulling over. It would connect two highly decentralized metro areas that are already connected by Interstate 4. Urban scholar Wendell Cox, writing for the Reason Foundation, found that just about any door-to-door trip between the two metro areas would actually take longer by train than by auto -- and would cost more. Why would any business traveler take the train?Moreover, to achieve the speed of French and Japanese high-speed rail, you need dedicated track so you don't have to slow down for freight trains. To get dedicated track, you need a central government that is willing and able to ignore environmental protests and not-in-my-backyard activists. Japan and France have such governments. We don't. So we are spending billions on high-speed rail that isn't really high speed, that will serve largely affluent business travelers and that will need taxpayer subsidies forever. This should be a no-brainer for a Congress bent on cutting spending.

#### Critics don’t like it and the money and the FRA can’t handle a big project like HSR

Todorovich, director of America 2050 and assistant visiting professor at the Pratt institute Graduate center for planning and Environment. Schned, associate planner for America 2050 and part-time lecturer at the Edward J. Bloustein, School of Planning and Public Policy at Rutgers university, and Lane, Senior fellow for urban design at Regional Plan association 2011

(Pertra, Daniel, and Robert, September 16, Lincoln Istitute of Land Policy, “High-Speed Rail: nternational Lessons for US Policymakers, <http://www.midwesthsr.org/sites/default/files/pdf/Lincoln_Policy_Institute_HSR_2011.pdf> July 1st, MDRJ)

Broad support for the program across the country is evident in the 39 states that applied for funding since 2009, yet that support is not universal. Some critics have labeled it wasteful, lacking focus, or failing to aim for “true” high-speed technology (Laing 2011a). The ﬂedging program has experienced its share of growing pains because the recent $10.1 billion infusion has required simultaneous planning, policy making, and grant administration by the U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Railroad Administration (FRA). The agency has adapted quickly, but these tasks are far outside FRA’s traditional role of enforcing safety regulations on America’s railroads.

**HSR is vastly unpopular – cost escalation**

**The Economist, 12**

**(The Economist, July 9 2012, “High – Speed Rail Still on Track”,** [**http://www.economist.com/blogs/gulliver/2012/07/high-speed-rail**](http://www.economist.com/blogs/gulliver/2012/07/high-speed-rail)**, accessed 7/10/12, TRH)**

**California is the last remaining proponent of Barack Obama's vision of a modern railroad network in America, an idea that has grown increasingly unpopular as projected costs have risen**. Rail has become, like many of the president's priorities, an issue of political identity, and **opposition to rail projects is a great way for GOP governors to thumb their nose at the federal government**—and, by extension, Mr. Obama himself. **The vote was close, with 21 senators, the bare majority** **needed to pass**, voting in favour. **Four Democratic senators joined the GOP in opposition.** The money is a tiny fraction of the estimated $68 billion the scheme will cost in total–enough just to begin work in California's Central Valley region and perform some preliminary environmental studies. **High-speed rail supporters and detractors alike worry that the Central Valley line, between the cities of Bakersfield and Madera, will end up a train to nowhere, cut off from bigger cities such as Los Angeles, Sacramento and San Francisco.** Governor Jerry Brown, a Democrat, supports the plan, and California's legislature is likely to remain under Democratic control for some time. **But if four Democratic senators were willing to oppose the project on Friday, how many more might turn against it if costs continue to escalate?** Building brand-new infrastructure is politically difficult. Although Friday's vote was a milestone, the battle to bring fast trains to America is far from over.

#### HSR costs are higher than they appear.

Peterman, Analyst in Transportation Policy, Frittelli , Specialist in Transportation Policy, Mallett, Specialist in Transportation Policy, 2009

(David, John, William, December 8th, Congressional Research Service, “High Speed Rail (HSR) in the United States“ http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA511142 July 3rd MDRJ)

In addition, at least one study suggests that transportation project cost estimates, especially those authored by project sponsors, should be rigorously scrutinized. 65 This study examined 258 transportation infrastructure projects around the world and found that in almost 90% of the cases costs were underestimated, that actual costs on average were 28% higher than estimated, and that rail projects in particular were the most severely underestimated, costing on average 45% more than estimated

#### **HSR is too costly – geography**

Congressional Digest 11

(4/1, “High-Speed Rail Overview: System Components, Potential, and Cost Issues” , 7/3/12, BR)

Some believe, therefore, that future intercity passenger mobility will be dependent on fully utilizing all of the available options; however, much of the criticism of HSR is based on concerns about its cost-effectiveness in the near to medium term. This is of particular concern since HSR is likely to rely more heavily than other modes (automobile, air, and intercity bus) on general tax revenues, as opposed to user fees/taxes, although the user fees/taxes that support those other modes may not cover their so-called externality costs (that is, costs that those modes impose on other people, such as environmental pollution and deaths and injuries due to crashes). The poor cost effectiveness of HSR, according to critics, rests in large part on the Nation’s geography, with lower-density urban areas that are much more widely spaced than are urban areas in much of Europe and Asia.

### Link – PTX – Agriculture lobby

#### High Speed Rail Not Popular – Unpopular with Agriculture Lobby

Dreir, Associated Press, 2012 (Hannah, 7-10-12, The Daily Journal: San Mateo County’s Homepage, “Challenges Remain for High-Speed Rail,” <http://www.smdailyjournal.com/article_preview.php?id=1750903&title=Challenges%20remain%20for%20high-speed%20rail>, 7-10-12, GHK)

Supporters applauded Friday when the state Legislature narrowly approved $4.5 billion in state funds for rail improvements and to begin construction of the first segment of high-speed track in the agricultural Central Valley. The move enabled the state to tap $3.2 billion in federal bond money. Critics, however, are redoubling their efforts to derail the project that could eventually link Los Angeles and San Francisco with trains traveling up to 220 mph. Among those gearing up for a fight are the farmers whose land lies in the path of the massive infrastructure project. The Madera and Merced county farm bureaus have filed a lawsuit to halt the project on grounds that the state has not done enough environmental vetting. The plaintiffs say the train would render 1,500 acres of fertile land unfarmable and disrupt 500 agricultural businesses. More suits are expected in the coming months.

## Link: PTX Popular

### GOP loves HSR

#### GOP supports HSR – political consequences caused by opposition

Hart, director of government relations at Quarles & Brady, and vice president of government affairs for the US High Speed Rail Association, 12

 (Thomas, Politico, 5/23/12, “High-speed rail's many benefits”, <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0512/76682.html>, 7/12/12, ML)

The political winds are beginning to shift, and some elected officials see that there can be political consequences from strongly opposing high-speed rail. The governors on record as opposing projects are among the least popular — including Rick Scott in Florida, who rejected federal money. A new political group is now forming Republicans for Rail. There is also talk of starting a rail super PAC to generate money and grass-roots support for additional rail transit investments. If this political shift continues in the crucial 2012 elections, prospects for U.S. high-speed rail, particularly along the East and West Coasts, could finally brighten.

#### Key Republicans embrace high speed rail

O’Brien, The Hill, 11

(Michael, The Hill, 1/29/11, “Republicans embrace Obama rail initiative”, <http://thehill.com/blogs/blog-briefing-room/news/141071-republicans-embrace-obama-rail-initiative>, 7/12/12, ML)

Key Republicans are embracing a major spending initiative outlined in President Obama's State of the Union address. Two top members of the House Transportation Committee said they will push the president's initiative seeking to give 80 percent of Americans access to high-speed rail over te course of the next 25 years. "I believe it's good for America to develop a high-speed rail corridor in the Northeast corridor," Rep. Bill Shuster (R-Pa.), the chairman of the railroad subcommittee, said according to the Connecticut Post. "It's a place we have to start, we have to accomplish it, because then I believe all of America, in the various corridors around the country, will want high-speed rail if they see success here." Rep. John Mica (R-Fla.), the chairman of the whole committee, also said Friday he was "pleased that President Obama has helped to launch a system for improved passenger rail service for our nation."

#### Powerful Republicans back HSR – Schuster and Mica

Hartford Courant, 11

(Hartford Courant, 1/28/11, “Key GOP Congressman Backs High-Speed Rail Line In Connecticut”, <http://articles.courant.com/2011-01-28/news/hc-northeast-high-speed-rail-0129-20110128_1_high-speed-train-high-speed-rail-national-rail-plan>, 7/12/12, ML)

HARTFORD — — Despite growing tea party opposition to high-speed train proposals, a powerful Republican congressman on Friday publicly endorsed building Connecticut's high-speed line as part of a larger Amtrak initiative. U.S. Rep. Bill Shuster, the newly appointed chairman of the House railroad subcommittee, told a group of New England political leaders that he supports the proposed $1 billion New Haven-to-Springfield line, envisioning it as part of a high-speed rail network that would link Boston, Montreal, Manhattan, Albany and Washington, D.CSchuster cited many points of dispute with the Obama administration's national rail plan, but said Republicans ought to get behind a vast upgrade of Amtrak's heavily used Boston-to-Washington line. "It's important to the whole nation. I'm here in support of the Northeast Corridor. I believe it's good for America," Schuster told a crowd of dignitaries at a high-speed train summit at Hartford's Union Station. He said he endorses the proposed 62-mile spur through Connecticut into western Massachusetts, the first leg of a network that eventually could link New England cities with Amtrak's main line. "This is the most congested region in the country. High-speed rail here could be profitable," Schuster told an audience of Connecticut's top political leaders, including Gov. Dannel P. Malloy, Sen. Richard Blumenthal and most of the congressional delegation. Schuster's support could go a long way in determining whether Connecticut's $1 billion project gets built. The Pennsylvania congressman last week replaced a Democrat as chairman of the House subcommittee on rail, and he'll have a significant role in drafting the next transportation funding reauthorization bill. Schuster emphasized that he wants New England to seek out private partners for its rail network, but didn't rule out endorsing more federal grants, either. President Barack Obama had the backing of a Democratic Congress when he first handed out $8 billion in seed money for high-speed train systems throughout the country. But that all changed with the November election. To get much further, the president now needs cooperation from Republicans such as Schuster and Rep. John Mica, R-Florida, the new chairman of the transportation committee. Both say they back high-speed rail along the Northeast Corridor because the region is so densely populated

### HSR = Bipartisan

#### HSR has bipartisan support in Congress

IMCL, International Making Cities Livable, 11

(International Making Cities Livable, 3/12/11, “Bipartisan Support for High-Speed Rail Mostly on Track”, <http://www.livablecities.org/blog/bipartisan-support-high-speed-rail-mostly-track>, 7/12/12, ML)

Despite the (likely underestimated) price tag, concerns over budget shortfalls, and the emphasis on public transit, the plan is receiving bipartisan support in Congress and at the state level. At a time when gas prices are set to reach $5 per gallon, you’d hope that common sense and the desire for energy independence would make support for high-speed rail a sure thing—a nonpartisan issue. But the usual skeptics remain, of course, including republican governors from Ohio and Wisconsin, who rejected federal money for the project. The biggest upset has been Florida governor, Rick Scott’s refusal of more than $2 billion for a section between Tampa and Orlando that was set to become a shining example of intercity rail, job creation (more than 24,000 projected), and improved livability. Despite a swift backlash, Florida’s state Supreme Court upheld the governor’s decision and the money will now be available to other states including Vermont, Rhode Island, Virginia, Delaware, New York, and California. In an effort to support disheartened high-speed rail supporters in Florida, U.S. Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood has agreed to let a regional rail authority in central Florida compete for the funding.

#### HSR is Bipartisan

USHSR, US High Speed Rail Association, 10

(US High Speed Rail Association, 11/3/10, “Bipartisan Support for High Speed Rail”, <http://www.ushsr.com/info.html>, 7/12/12, ML)

Republicans and Democrats alike see the great value in this project, and have been working across party lines to get new rail projects going in states all across the country. There is bipartisan support for high speed rail in Congress, the Department of Transportation, state houses, and among mayors. States Respond Overwhelmingly to More High Speed Rail Funding With 77 Applications The Federal Railroad Administration has received 77 applications from 25 states recently totaling more than $8.5 billion. Secretary of Transportation Ray LaHood said "We have received strong bi-partisan support for President Obama's bold initiative that will enhance regional mobility, reduce our dependence on foreign oil, ease highway and airport congestion and reduce our carbon footprint."

#### Plan creates jobs – popular in Congress

Cooper, Senior Fellow with the Center for American Progress, 11

(Donna, Center for American Progress, 7/8/11, “Employment Weakness Calls for Stronger Transportation Bill”, <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2011/07/transportation_bill.html>, 7/12/12, ML)

Democrats and Republicans agree on few things, but one of them is that public investments in infrastructure create jobs—more so than any other public spending. That’s why Mica’s cuts to infrastructure spending are so misguided. They will particularly hurt America’s small businesses, who are the biggest players in infrastructure work. Small firms deliver the concrete and asphalt needed for construction, as well as labor. Pennsylvania officials tracked the impact of federal stimulus to roads and found that nearly $7 out of every $10 went to purchase materials, labor, and services of small businesses.

#### HSR popular among GOP and Democrats in Congress

Hart, director of government relations at Quarles & Brady, and vice president of government affairs for the US High Speed Rail Association, 12

(Thomas, Politico, 5/23/12, “High-speed rail's many benefits”, <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0512/76682.html>, 7/12/12, ML)

Even as Congress looks into a new surface transportation bill, U.S. transportation systems confront daunting challenges of overcrowding and disrepair. Delays and waste cost the nation more than $100 billion per year in lost time, productivity and energy. The U.S. needs modern public transportation not dependent on oil or traffic patterns. Most developed nations now have high-speed rail, sleek trains that reach more than 200 mph. Here, this option would be most viable in two distinct corridors on the East and West Coasts – the Northeast Corridor, from Boston to Washington, and California. The Northeast Corridor is already one of most valuable U.S. transportation assets. With I-95, it’s the only continuous link between the major population centers of Washington, Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York and Boston. This is the nation’s most densely populated region with 18 percent of the U.S. population living in just 2 percent of its land area. The NEC region alone would be the world’s sixth-largest economy, with a gross domestic product of $2.59 trillion. The NEC is already a mature rail corridor — Amtrak and regional rail services show ridership spikes whenever gas prices increase. Amtrak’s Acela service, however, averages only 80 mph. True high-speed rail in this corridor could prove competitive with air travel, particularly because rail can easily connect to other local and regional transit networks. There is growing consensus among Democrats and Republicans in Congress that the NEC is ideally suited for high-speed rail development. Differences remain, however, on the best path for development.

### Public loves HSR

#### Job programs a popular with the public

Cooper, Senior fellow @ the Center for American Progress, 2011 (Donna, 11/9/12, Center for American Progress, Not Fixing Our Infrastructure, Not Creating Jobs: Conservatives in Congress Are to Blame for Both Dismal Outcomes, <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2011/11/infrastructure_jobs.html>, 7/12/12, CNW)

If Congress has any hope of getting above its current 15 percent approval rating with the American public, then they need to be singularly focused on the crying need to grow jobs and enhance our standing in the global economy. The main thing that matters to Americans is Congress taking bipartisan action to create jobs and economic growth now, and they know that it’s all that matters for our nation’s prospects in the future. The members of Congress who voted against these reasonable measures out of pure partisanship are out of step with the American people and tragically they are putting the common good of Americans at great risk.

#### The public perceives benefits to high speed rail and would make use of it

American Public transportation Association, 2012 (January 2012, American Public Transportation Association, “An Inventory of the Criticisms of High-Speed Rail With Suggested Responses and Counterpoints”, <http://www.apta.com/resources/reportsandpublications/Documents/HSR-Defense.pdf>, 7/12/12, CNW)

Probably one of the most telling measures of public support for passenger rail lies in the fact that Amtrak is enjoying the highest levels of ridership in its history. Additionally, the BizTimes Daily on December 1, 2010 reported a poll commissioned by the American Public Transportation Association (APTA) showing that: “Nearly two-thirds of American adults (62 percent) said they would definitely or probably use high-speed rail service for leisure or business travel if it were an option. The survey, taken among 24,711 adults, also asked how important various factors would be in choosing high-speed rail service. Ninety-one percent of respondents said high-speed rail should offer shorter travel times compared to driving to their destinations; 91 percent said the rail service should be less expensive than flying; 89 percent said it should be less expensive than driving; and 85 percent said the rail service should integrate with local public transit so they could avoid using rental cars and cabs, and paying parking fees.”

#### Vast bipartisan public support for HSR- responsibility to the future

Rockefeller Foundation, 2011 (2/14/11, Rockefeller Institute, “The Rockefeller Foundation Infrastructure Survey”, <http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/uploads/files/80e28432-0790-4d42-91ec-afb6d11febee.pdf>, 7/12/12, CNW)

In fact, voters are in strong agreement with President Obama’s ideas on investment in transportation. Survey respondents were read excerpts from the president’s State of the Union address related to transportation and asked their reaction. “The American Dream has required each generation to sacrifice and meet the demands of a new age. We know what it takes to compete for the jobs and industries of our time. We need the fastest, most reliable ways to move people, goods, and information—from high-speed rail to high-speed Internet. So over the last two years, we've begun rebuilding for the 21st century, a project that has meant thousands of good jobs for the hard-hit construction industry. We should redouble those efforts. We'll put more Americans to work repairing crumbling roads and bridges. We'll make sure this is fully paid for, attract private investment, and pick projects based on what's best for the economy, not what's best for politicians.” Fully 80% of voters agree with this statement, including 46% who strongly agree, while 19% say they disagree. Agreement is nearly unanimous among Democrats (95%) and is exceptionally high among independents (75%) and Republicans (66%). Indeed, 91% agree with the specific idea that “our generation has a responsibility to the future to invest in America's infrastructure--just as our parents and grandparents did”; only 8% disagree with this.

#### Majority of Americans support PPP’s for HSR

Ekins, Director of Polling for Reason Foundation, 2012 (Emily, 1/5/12, Reason Foundation, “55 Percent of Americans Want Private Enterprise to Build High Speed Rail”, <http://reason.com/poll/2012/01/05/55-percent-of-american-want-private-ente>, 7/12/12, CNW)

With states bringing in lower tax revenues, strapped budgets, and increasing transportation usage, governments are looking to partner with private firms to provide transportation improvements and expansions. According to the recent Reason-Rupe poll, 55% of Americans favor these kinds of partnerships. In fact, a majority of all political groups favor government working with private companies to further transportation projects.

## Public-Private partnerships CP

### L shield – PPP – Politics

#### Public-Private Partnerships Solve Without Politics

Schmitt, Master’s Degree in Urban Planning, 2011 (Angie, 7-20-11, StreetsBlog, “The Public Interest and Private-Sector Involvement in High-Speed Rail,” <http://dc.streetsblog.org/2011/07/20/the-public-interest-and-private-sector-involvement-in-high-speed-rail/>, 7-10-12, GHK)

“It’s attractive to politicians who may want to be champs for high-speed rail but who at the same time want to be against spending any new money for it,” said Baxandall. “Public-private partnerships have been a way to wave a magic wand to say ‘we’re going to build it, we’re just not going to pay for it. Somebody else is.’” What this report shows, he said, is that the public sector has to be the “anchor” in these projects. “Public-private partnership isn’t just an easy way to make something happen without effort,” he said. “It takes a lot of planning.”

#### Republican lawmakers support private engagement in HSR

Cahn, reporter for The Hill, 2011 (Emily, 5/23/11, The Hill, “GOP pushes private rail investment”, <http://thehill.com/business-a-lobbying/162817-gop-makes-case-for-private-bids-on-117b-rail-project>, 7/12/12, CNW)

Republicans on the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee will press the Obama administration this week to rely more on private investment for a high-speed rail project in the Northeast. Committee leaders noted the benefits high-speed rail would provide to cities in the Northeast in a memo distributed by Republican staff, stressing that the corridor between Boston and Washington is an ideal location for the investment. Still, the memo says, a future project must be supported by private investors and not rely too heavily on federal funds.

### Solvency – PPP – generic

#### CP solves--Public-private partnerships key to successful and efficient HSR building

**Dutzik & Schneider, 11**

(Tony & Jordan, Frontier Group Phineas Baxandall, U.S. PIRG Education Fund, “High-Speed Rail:

Public, Private or Both?”, <http://www.masspirg.org/sites/pirg/files/reports/MASSPIRGHigh-Speed-Rail.pdf>, accessed 7-10-12 BLE)

Private sector companies are likely to play a major role in the construction of high-speed rail lines in the United States. Even as California nears construction of the nation’s first high-speed rail line, however, it remains unclear just how the private sector will participate in building out the nation’s high-speed rail network. Public-private partner ships—or “PPPs”—have come to play an important role in the construction of high-speed rail lines around the world. In a PPP, the public and private sectors are supposed to share the risks, responsibilities and rewards of infrastructure development. Public-private partnerships will likely be part of the development of high-speed rail in the United States. High-speed rail systems require billions of dollars in financial capital, which cash-strapped state and federal governments are likely to seek through partnerships with the private sector. California is moving forward with the creation of the nation’s first true highspeed rail system, and it is required by ballot initiative to obtain private investment in the project. Amtrak is seeking to involve private investors in its plan to bring true high-speed rail service to the busy Northeast Corridor.

#### CP solves—Cooperation between public and private sector key for US HSR

**Dutzik & Schneider, 11**

(Tony & Jordan, Frontier Group Phineas Baxandall, U.S. PIRG Education Fund, “High-Speed Rail:

Public, Private or Both?”, <http://www.masspirg.org/sites/pirg/files/reports/MASSPIRGHigh-Speed-Rail.pdf>, accessed 7-10-12 BLE)

PPPs are distinguished from traditional government contracting in that the private sector partner is more integrally involved in a project’s development and execution than as a “contractor for hire.” Private-sector firms might be involved in helping to design a piece of infrastructure, finance it, or operate it once construction is complete. These partnerships—while critical to the development of an effective passenger rail network for America—are not the focus of this report. Instead, we focus here on the use of public-private partnerships for the construction of high-speed rail lines on new rights of way. These projects—which include the California high-speed rail network, the proposed construction of a true highspeed rail system in the Northeast, and the previously proposed Florida network—are likely to be the most expensive projects in the development of the nation’s high-speed rail system, but also the projects with the greatest impact. It is critical—both for the protection of the public purse and for the future of the nation’s high-speed rail program—that these projects be managed and executed effectively. As a result, it is important that the nation approach the use of PPPs in the realization of these projects with care.

#### Public-private partnerships best for HSR

**Todorovich, director of America 2050 and assistant visiting professor at the Pratt Institute Graduate Center for Planning and the Environment, Schned, Associate planner for America 2050 and part-time lecturer for planning at the Edward J. Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy at Rutgers University, and Lane, Senior fellow for urban design at Regional Plan Association, 2011**

(Petra, Daniel, and Robert, September, 16, Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, “High-Speed Rail: International Lessons for US Policymakers

<https://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/dl/1948_1268_High-Speed%20Rail%20PFR_Webster.pdf>, July 1, BLE)

Public-private partnerships (sometimes referred to as P3s) generally constitute any arrangement between a government sponsor and a private sector entity in which the private entity provides one or more stages of the project delivery process—designing, building, operating, owning or leasing, maintaining, and financing parts of the infrastructure. These partnerships offer the benefit of flexibility to suit the specific needs of the public sector while encouraging different models of private involvement and investment (Geddes 2011). Public-private partnerships are considered an especially attractive solution for financing infrastructure projects. For example, the Florida Department of Transportation was already in the process of finding a private partner to design, build, operate, maintain, and finance the state’s high-speed rail line before the project was cancelled in February 2011 (Haddad 2010). While public-private partnerships are likely to increase in popularity as an option for cash-strapped governments, applying this approach to high-speed rail must be done carefully, with a realistic understanding of the benefits and challenges.

#### Public-private partnerships key to effectiveness of HSR

**Dutzik & Schneider, 11**

(Tony & Jordan, Frontier Group Phineas Baxandall, U.S. PIRG Education Fund, “High-Speed Rail:

Public, Private or Both?”, <http://www.masspirg.org/sites/pirg/files/reports/MASSPIRGHigh-Speed-Rail.pdf>, accessed 7-10-12 BLE)

But the American people aren’t the only ones enthusiastic about high-speed rail. Businesses from around the globe are eager to compete for the billions of dollars in infrastructure spending that will accompany the nation’s investment in high-speed rail. In 2009, 30 companies from around the world committed to establish a presence or expand their existing presence in the United States if they are chosen to supply components for high-speed rail. Prior to its cancellation, the Florida high-speed rail line attracted interest from seven teams including dozens of firms from around the globe. In California, a request for expressions of interest from private firms drew more than 1,000 responses, while 22 funds have expressed interest in financing part of the system’s construction. The construction of high-speed rail in the United States will inevitably involve both the public and the private sector. Effective “partnerships” between the public and private sectors are critical if the nation is to get the high-speed rail network it deserves at a price it can afford.

#### Public-private cooperation solves - empirics

Zaidi 7

(Kamaal, Doctor of Law, Temple Journal of Science, Technology & Environmental Law, “High Speed Rail Transit: Developing the Case for Alternative Transportation Schemes in the Context of Innovative and Sustainable Global Transportation Law and Policy”, 7/3/12, BR)

In several countries that use high-speed rail transit, the initial operating or capital costs come from government subsidies. 46 By qualifying for these government subsidies under various technical and market criteria, a joint partnership between local authorities and the private sector would receive the necessary funding to begin construction of any high-speed project. Technology companies have emerged as a means to stimulate the development of high-speed rail transit technology. In particular, the corporate sector is working closely with government agencies by allowing several companies to apply for government grants towards research and development of train technology. Typically, corporations would compete with one another by placing bids on large or small projects. Thereafter, the company with the winning bid would be awarded with a grant. Later that company would begin construction of the project in close cooperation with local transportation authorities and government agencies. In several nations, this public-private partnership includes a public consultation process, whereby communities that are directly affected by high-speed train development would have an opportunity to be heard at public meetings. Much of this public consultative process addresses environmental issues that high-speed rail transit may trigger.

#### Public-private partnerships key to successful and efficient HSR building

**Dutzik & Schneider, 11**

(Tony & Jordan, Frontier Group Phineas Baxandall, U.S. PIRG Education Fund, “High-Speed Rail:

Public, Private or Both?”, <http://www.masspirg.org/sites/pirg/files/reports/MASSPIRGHigh-Speed-Rail.pdf>, accessed 7-10-12 BLE)

Private sector companies are likely to play a major role in the construction of high-speed rail lines in the United States. Even as California nears construction of the nation’s first high-speed rail line, however, it remains unclear just how the private sector will participate in building out the nation’s high-speed rail network. Public-private partner ships—or “PPPs”—have come to play an important role in the construction of high-speed rail lines around the world. In a PPP, the public and private sectors are supposed to share the risks, responsibilities and rewards of infrastructure development. Public-private partnerships will likely be part of the development of high-speed rail in the United States. High-speed rail systems require billions of dollars in financial capital, which cash-strapped state and federal governments are likely to seek through partnerships with the private sector. California is moving forward with the creation of the nation’s first true highspeed rail system, and it is required by ballot initiative to obtain private investment in the project. Amtrak is seeking to involve private investors in its plan to bring true high-speed rail service to the busy Northeast Corridor.

#### Cooperation between public and private sector key for US HSR

**Dutzik & Schneider, 11**

(Tony & Jordan, Frontier Group Phineas Baxandall, U.S. PIRG Education Fund, “High-Speed Rail:

Public, Private or Both?”, <http://www.masspirg.org/sites/pirg/files/reports/MASSPIRGHigh-Speed-Rail.pdf>, accessed 7-10-12 BLE)

PPPs are distinguished from traditional government contracting in that the private sector partner is more integrally involved in a project’s development and execution than as a “contractor for hire.” Private-sector firms might be involved in helping to design a piece of infrastructure, finance it, or operate it once construction is complete. These partnerships—while critical to the development of an effective passenger rail network for America—are not the focus of this report. Instead, we focus here on the use of public-private partnerships for the construction of high-speed rail lines on new rights of way. These projects—which include the California high-speed rail network, the proposed construction of a true highspeed rail system in the Northeast, and the previously proposed Florida network—are likely to be the most expensive projects in the development of the nation’s high-speed rail system, but also the projects with the greatest impact. It is critical—both for the protection of the public purse and for the future of the nation’s high-speed rail program—that these projects be managed and executed effectively. As a result, it is important that the nation approach the use of PPPs in the realization of these projects with care.

### PPP solves, avoids federal $ links

#### Public-private partnerships for HSR solve best and avoids the link to spending/politics

Todorovich, Schned and Lane 11

 (Petra Todorovich, Daniel Schned, and Robert Lane; Todorovich and Schned work in leading positions at America 2050, Lane is a senior fellow at Regional Plan Association; 09/16/2011; “High-Speed Rail International Lessons for U.S. Policy Makers”; <https://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/dl/1948_1268_High-Speed%20Rail%20PFR_Webster.pdf>)

**Public-private partnerships** (sometimes referred to as P3s) generally **constitute any arrangement between a government sponsor and a private sector** entity in which the private entity provides one or more stages of the project delivery process—designing, building, operating, owning or leasing, maintaining, and financing parts of the infrastructure. **These partnerships offer the benefit of flexibility to suit the specific needs of the public sector while encouraging different models of private** involvement and **investment** (Geddes 2011). **Public-private partnerships are considered an** especially **attractive solution for financing infrastructure projects**. For example, the Florida Department of Transportation was already in the process of finding a private partner to design, build, operate, maintain, and finance the state’s high-speed rail line before the project was cancelled in February 2011 (Haddad 2010). While public-private partnerships are likely to increase in popularity as an option for cash-strapped governments, applying this approach to high-speed rail must be done carefully, with a realistic understanding of the benefits and challenges. Sharing risk: **Partnerships allow the public sector to share project risks** related to construction, environmental review, system performance, and ridership **with their private partner**. **Properly assigning risk** to the party best able to manage it **is critical to a successful project**. In general, **private partners are better able to control construction and financing risk, and public partners are better able to manage political and entitlement risk**. Ridership risk is shared by both parties, with the opportunity for both to benefit when ridership exceeds expectations. Attention to the private entity’s susceptibility to market downturns is also important. **The private entity should not shoulder so much risk that it could endanger its ability to live up to the terms of the contract**. Leveraging public investment: **Leveraging public investment with private capital,** either through the use of federal financing tools or availability payments, **can help pay for high-speed rail’s** large upfront **costs**. **These mechanisms make large projects feasible** without the need for the government to provide 100 percent public funding in advance. Federal financing tools include qualified tax credit bonds such as Build America Bonds, which can draw a wide variety of investors to contribute to transportation projects. Availability payments allow teams of construction and finance firms to begin construction of infrastructure projects through their own debt and equity. They later receive reimbursements from the government as particular milestones are reached. Faster project delivery: Private entities can draw on experience to deliver projects on time and on budget. They are also motivated by financial incentives for performance (including availability payments), which can be written into the structure of the deal.

### **Solvency – PPP - Econ**

#### CP solves—Public-private partnerships necessary for economy

Schmitt, 11

(Angie, a newspaper reporter who joined Streetsblog in 2009. She has a master's degree in urban planning, 7-20-11, “The Public Interest and Private-Sector Involvement in High-Speed Rail”, <http://dc.streetsblog.org/2011/07/20/the-public-interest-and-private-sector-involvement-in-high-speed-rail/>, accessed 7-11-12 BLE)

“Private financing can be a supplement but not a substitute for public support of high-speed rail,” said Phineas Baxandall of U.S. PIRG. Indeed, it is clear that public and private actors are going to have to cooperate in order for the U.S. to realize its high-speed rail ambitions in California and elsewhere. But the government agencies negotiating the terms of these agreements will have to be very diligent to avoid compromising the interests of public-sector investors (taxpayers) and the purpose of the project overall, says PIRG. “It’s attractive to politicians who may want to be champs for high-speed rail but who at the same time want to be against spending any new money for it,” said Baxandall. “Public-private partnerships have been a way to wave a magic wand to say ‘we’re going to build it, we’re just not going to pay for it. Somebody else is.’” What this report shows, he said, is that the public sector has to be the “anchor” in these projects. “Public-private partnership isn’t just an easy way to make something happen without effort,” he said. “It takes a lot of planning.”

#### Public-private coop key to modernization and economic integration

Zaidi 7

(Kamaal, Doctor of Law, Temple Journal of Science, Technology & Environmental Law, “High Speed Rail Transit: Developing the Case for Alternative Transportation Schemes in the Context of Innovative and Sustainable Global Transportation Law and Policy”, 7/3/12, BR)

The evolution of high-speed trains has involved growing partnerships between federal and local transportation authorities, along with technology companies, to help establish newer high-speed rail projects to modernize the transportation sector. This public-private partnership allows funding for various projects, but also helps create economic integration among various regions.

#### Public-private partnerships key to sustainable economic growth

**Cooper, 11**

(Donna, Senior Fellow with the Economic Policy team at American Progress--Formerly the deputy mayor for policy for Philadelphia and secretary of policy and planning for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 2-9-11, “Our Infrastructure Challenge--Investment Is Needed to Remain Globally Competitive”, <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2011/02/infrastructure_challenge.html>, accessed 7-12-12 BLE)

Just as the launching of Sputnik required more of our nation than simply building a space ship, the upgrade of our infrastructure requires that in addition to roads and rail we improve each critical pieces of our public assets, including: Transit systems, Freight rail networks, Ports, Airports, Drinking and waste water systems, Broadband, Energy transmission. These are all key parts of our economy that need additional investments, but the federal government does not need to foot the bill to rebuild our infrastructure alone. We can replicate the innovative public-private partnership models already common place in Europe and Australia. These partnerships use private investment capital and private-sector approaches to improve assets where users are able to pay for the cost of those improvements over time through tolls or reasonable usage charges. The benefits of these partnerships is that they take advantage of competition to both lower the price of the improvements and to maximize the amount up from capital that can be used from private-sector investors. Almost every one of our economic competitors boasts a quasi-public financing institution that ensures the quality of viability of large-scale infrastructure projects. These financial institutions work in partnership with large banks and investors, offering efficient and reliable projects for investment and predictable reasonable returns. As a result, our competitors are experiencing a much higher rate of investment in their infrastructure than is occurring now in the United States, boosting the potential for the long-term, sustainable growth of their economies.

### Solvency – Private companies will invest

#### Partnerships will spur private investment, will be modeled

Geddes, PhD, economics, University of Chicago MA, economics, University of Chicago BS, economics and finance, Towson State University and writer for the New York Times, 2011

(Richard, 4/29, The New York Times, “High Speed Rail” <http://www.aei.org/article/economics/high-speed-rail/> 7/3/12, MDRJ)

Investing in high-speed rail in the Northeast corridor may make sense because it has a population density sufficient to generate enough riders to sustain the billions of dollars required to build, maintain and operate the system. Given the current federal spending freeze on high-speed rail, I believe that the time is right to consider seeking private capital to help shoulder the substantial investment needed to achieve true high-speed rail along the corridor. Under this kind of a public-private partnership, high-speed rail projects would be evaluated by private investors based on the full costs of installation, maintenance and operation, as well as on economic benefits to riders--rather than blithely following the costly "build it and they will come" philosophy. If we're able to achieve this partnership in the Northeast corridor, it could serve as a model for how to modernize our nation's crumbling infrastructure.

#### Private companies ready for high speed rail

**Jaffe, 11**

 (Eric, Contributing writer to The Atlantic Cities and the author of The King's Best Highway: The Lost History of the Boston Post Road, the Route That Made America “The Future of California's High-Speed Rail Is in Private Sector Hands” 9-19-11, http://www.theatlanticcities.com/politics/2011/09/future-california-hsr-private-sector-hands/146/) accessed 7-11-12 BLE)

This summer Californians heard two kinds of news about their proposed high-speed rail line from Los Angeles to San Francisco: bad and worse. First questions arose about the forecasting model used to determine ridership and revenue estimates. Then the cost estimate for the first segment of construction, in the state's central valley, jumped from $43 billion to at least $63 billion after a review. Then the Los Angeles Times, which has supported the project in the past, wondered if the line will become a "crushing financial burden" on state taxpayers. But the news may be turning with the fall leaves. Earlier this month, on the same day President Obama urged Congress to pass a jobs bill aimed at America's small businesses, the California High-Speed Rail Authority promised to dedicate 30 percent of the line's construction work to the state's own small businesses. The work in the central valley, which is supposed to begin next year, is expected to generate tens of thousands of jobs for the region. And a peer review panel of global high-speed rail experts recently gave the authority's ridership estimates a vote of confidence. The approved ridership figures are particularly encouraging as the state shifts its attention to attracting private investments. The authority's updated business plan — which it will use to solicit bids for the central valley segment — won't be released until next month, but a sneak peek of the plan [PDF] shows a clear emphasis on raising private capital. Doing that successfully will require public seed money, which the project has in the form of $6 billion in federal funding, and strong ridership estimates, which just got a bit stronger with the new peer review. By now the authority surely recognizes that the future of the project rests on its ability to recruit private money. A commitment of additional state funds seems all but impossible, especially with the rising cost estimates. The House is intent on keeping rail funding low and recently set the 2012 budget discussion for rail at $7 billion less [PDF] than Obama would like. The president's jobs bill proposes $4 billion in high-speed rail funding, and a strong case can be made for giving it all to California. Still, there's zero certainty the plan will pass, and California can't afford to wait long to find out: the state must spend its federal funding by 2017 or forfeit it, which means construction needs to start in 2012. This push for private capital brings good and bad news of its own. On one hand there appears to be a substantial amount of private money out there ready to be invested in infrastructure — upwards of $250 billion [PDF], according to one recent analysis. On the other, private-public partnerships carry risks and must be approached with caution. Two reports on PPPs released this July, one by U.S. PIRG and one by the Department of Transportation, make these risks perfectly clear.

## States

### Solvency – funding

#### States Solve, US Government Funding doesn’t Work

Holland, 2012

(Andrew Holland, Senior Fellow for Energy and Climate Policy at the American Security Project, July 11, 2012, Consumer Energy Report, “The Logic of High Speed Rail in America”, <http://www.consumerenergyreport.com/2012/07/11/the-logic-of-high-speed-rail-in-america/>, accessed 7/11/12, TRH)

**Although the best business and efficiency case can be made for investment in those areas, the nature of political funding is to spread the funding around to many interest groups**. I’m convinced that’s why we ended up with large amounts of funding initially being sent to states like Florida, Wisconsin, and Ohio. What these states have in common is not a strong potential for HSR, but that they are electoral swing-states. **As someone usually skeptical of government, the way we’re doing it — with government funding to government-sponsored companies** (Amtrak or the California High Speed Rail Authority) — **may not be the most efficient or effective method, but it’s the only one on the table right now.** A credible conservative response would be to give tax credits or preferred financing to private companies to build and operate the lines, but the Republican party right now is more interested in shutting down rail altogether rather than building a real transportation system. Fortunately, when their Republican governors decided to turn down the funding, that freed it up to be concentrated on where it could be most useful: the Northeast corridor and California, which I will talk about in tomorrow’s post.

### States Support for HRS

#### States Want the Government Funding, HRS Highly Supported By the States

Post et al, 10

(Nadine M, Mike Larson, Debra Wood, J. T. Long, Scott Judy, Tom Ichniowski, staff writers for Engineering News, 11/22, “Rail Plans Hit Bumps”, http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/detail?sid=1e6d33fe-2c3e-4479-b822-574492a43902%40sessionmgr14&vid=3&hid=21&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#db=a9h&AN=56631853, 7/5/12, TRH)

Despite those developments, rail plans are rolling ahead in more than two dozen other states, thanks partly to infusions of federal aid. Some of those states are hungry for any federal rail money that Wisconsin, Ohio or Florida may return. U.S. Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood said on Nov 15 he will make an announcement "very soon" about reallocating the more than $1.2 billion that governors-to-be in Wisconsin and Ohio plan to give back to Uncle Sam. "We are still compiling a list of states in a position to spend the money," LaHood told attendees at a U.S. High Speed Rail Association conference in New York City. "A lot of states would like to have access to that money." If issues arise about state costs of operations and meeting federal requirements, "we will work through them," LaHood added. Karen J. Rae, deputy administrator of DOT's Federal Railroad Administration, says, "Many of the other governors-elect have gone on the record and said, 'We'll take it.' … There is a huge amount of interest, and though we have some educating to do nationally, the momentum is continuing." California swam against the tide on Nov. 2, electing Democrat Jerry Brown, whose campaign plan included support for high-speed rail. The state has won nearly $3.2 billion so far for its rail plan from U.S. DOT and has $9 billion in bonds to complement the federal dollars.Rachel Wall, a California High Speed Rail Authority spokeswoman, says, "If other states are giving the money back, we will use it and use it well."

## Other links

### Airline tradeoff link

#### HSR trades off With Airlines

Chou, Assistant Professor of Aviation and Maritime Management, Jung Christian University, Taiwan Fu, Graduate Student of Urban Planning, National Cheng Kung University, Taiwan, 2007(Hung-Yen, Chang, Chiang, “A Study of Domestic Air Passengers’ Preference for High-Speed

Rail Mode in Taiwan”, <http://www.jgbm.org/page/19%20%20Chiang%20Fu.pdf>, accessed 7/3/12)

Taking the current domestic airline of Taipei-Tainan flight line for example, the service difference provided by air carriers is not large; under consideration of the participation of high-speed rail travel mode, ticket price and travel time are important service level factors with impact on passengers’ taking intent. Concerning the passenger connection method variable, the passengers driving cars themselves for connection have high intent of taking high-speed rail. Besides, by means of the good result of ordinal number data model in evaluating ordinal number data preference information, the variables under consideration of the ordinal number data preference model are mostly the same as

#### HSR Hold the potential for large passenger tradeoff With bot Airplanes and Cars

Todorovich, Director of America 2050, Schned, associate planner for America 2050, Lane, Senior Fellow for urban designat Regional plan Association, 2011

(Petra, Daniel, Robert, September 16, 2011, Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, “High-Speed Rail international lessons for U.S. Policy Makers”, <http://www.midwesthsr.org/sites/default/files/pdf/Lincoln_Policy_Institute_HSR_2011.pdf>, TRH)

Mode shift: Where it is competitive with other intercity transportation modes, high-speed rail can capture a large share of passenger volume. International experience suggests that high-speed rail usually captures 80 percent of air or rail trips, if the travel time by high-speed train is less than two and a half hours (UIC 2010a). **Mode** shift to rail provides the greatest benefit in regions where road and air capacity is constrained.Safety: High-speed rail systems around the world have experienced excellent safety records. Until a deadly accident in China in July 2011, high-speed rail operations on dedicated tracks had never experienced a single injury or fatality (UIC 2010b). If high-speed rail is built in the United States and meets historic safety standards, one result could be fewer transport-related deaths as more passengers choose rail for intercity travel. Reliability: Dedicated high-speed rail services usually operate at greater frequencies than conventional rail, and have fewer delays and better on-time performance than cars and airplanes**.** The average delay of a Shinkansen train on the Tokaido line is only 30 seconds (JR Central 2011b). Spain’s AVE provides a full refund to passengers if their train is more than five minutes late (RENFE 2011).

#### HSR trades off with commuter rail and airlines

Sonnenberg, civil enginerring @ Georgia Institute of Technology, 2010

 (Anthony H., 2010, “TRANSPORTATION ENERGY AND CARBON FOOTPRINTS FOR U.S. CORRIDORS”, <http://smartech.gatech.edu/jspui/bitstream/1853/37316/1/Sonnenberg_Anthony_H_201012_phd.pdf>, 7/5/12, CNW)

As can be seen from Figure 4.18 the largest relative shift to HSR came from existing rail. This is an expected result since rather than shifting modes, existing rail travelers just shift to a faster version of the same mode. For HSR150 and HSR200 shifts from Air to HSR are relatively large as well, especially for the Pacific Northwest. This higher share for the Pacific Northwest compared to the other corridors can be explained by the smaller distances for each city pair which results in HSR travel times comparable to those for Air. In addition, the flight connections and frequencies for Eugene have a negative effect on the Air utility compared to other city pairs. For Bus and especially Auto shifts are very low. This was expected especially since the utility of the HSR mode (like Air, Rail, and Bus) is much lower mainly due to Access and Egress transportation, frequency and the need of a car at the destination.

#### Other modes particularly High Speed Rail are competitive to the Airline Industry

Peterson 2010

(Steve, 12-2010, IBM Global Business Services: IBM Institute for Business Value, “Airlines 2020: Sustitution and Commoditization,” <http://theinformationdj.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/airline-2020-susbtitution-and-commoditization.pdf>, 7-11-12, GHK)

As the industry looks forward to the next ten years, many of these same challenges – increasing competition, economic volatility, heightened customer expectations – will remain. But two other issues, which currently fly beneath the radar of many carriers, threaten to have an adverse and potentially longlasting impact on the future state of the industry: substitution and commoditization. With the prevalence of alternative modes of transportation, particularly high-speed rail, customers often have the choice of substituting air travel with less costly modes of travel that require less of a personal time sacrifice. And with commoditization, consumers often find few differences among the product offerings of different airlines – or are unwilling to pay for the differences they do perceive. Substitution has been around since the advent of mechanized transportation. From covered wagons to steam-driven locomotives, from horse and buggies to automobiles, from steamships to airliners, passenger transportation has been shaped by the immutable desire to travel farther and faster. Travelers have accepted new modes of transportation when reliability, cost and convenience combine to make the competing alternatives viable. For most of the past 75 years, air travel has enjoyed a substantial advantage over alternative modes in speed and convenience. But in today’s world of heightened security and congested skies, the hassles and complications of booking, boarding and departure have stolen much of the time advantage conferred by higher point-to-point speeds. Customer dissatisfaction with the increasing difficulties of flying has made many travelers eager to try new or different alternatives.

#### High Speed Rail is More Cost Effective than Air Travel

Peterson 2010

(Steve, 12-2010, IBM Global Business Services: IBM Institute for Business Value, “Airlines 2020: Sustitution and Commoditization,” <http://theinformationdj.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/airline-2020-susbtitution-and-commoditization.pdf>, 7-11-12, GHK)

The increasing complexity and time involved in air travel comes at a time when government-subsidized high-speed rail in many nations has negated some of air travel’s speed advantage, at least over short-to-moderate distances. Combined with ease of booking and boarding, the usually lower cost of high-speed rail, where available, has made it an attractive option for travelers. Further, many companies now substitute telepresence in place of meetings that would previously have required in-person attendance. Travel management companies often work to integrate telepresence into their corporate travel solutions.

#### **HSR trades gets ridership from flights**

Building America’s Future Educational Fund, 2011

(2011, Building America’s Future Educational Fund, “Building America’s Future: Falling Apart and Falling Behind: Transportation Infrastructure Report 2011”, <http://www.bafuture.org/sites/default/files/Report_0.pdf>, 7/7/12, CNW)

The experience of other countries provides proof that high-speed rail can turn shorthaul air passengers into train travelers. In its first full year of service, the Madrid-Barcelona high-speed rail cut air travel by one-third (1.5 million passengers) in what used to be Europe’s busiest passenger air route. By early 2010, the number of train travelers between the two cities exceeded the number of air travelers. Trains between Rome and Bologna (222 miles in 2 hours 44 minutes), Tokyo and Osaka (320 miles in 2 hours 24 minutes), and Paris and Lyon (267 miles in 85 minutes), for example, have captured between 75 and 95% of the air/rail market. Thanks to the success of the bullet train, planes no longer fly the 227-mile route between Tokyo and Nagoya. We can also look to other countries for assurance that high-speed rail is a sound investment. Two towns with high-speed rail stations on the Cologne-Frankfurt line in Germany experienced a 2.7% greater increase in overall economic activity as compared to the rest of the region. 39 Office buildings near high-speed rail stations in France and northern Europe generally charge higher rents than in other parts of the same cities, and property values near Shinkansen stations in Japan are 67% higher than property values farther away. 40 And high-speed rail has been shown to increase tourism in France and England. 41 The number of air passengers around the world is projected to more than double to 4.5 billion a year by 2025, which our airports simply cannot handle. If nothing is done, delays at airports around the country will continue to grow worse.

#### HSR substantially trades - off with air

Peterman, Analyst in Transportation Policy, 2009

(David Randall, December 8, High Speed Rail (HSR) in the United States, www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R40973.pdf)

The effect of HSR on air traffic congestion is less clear. Since HSR is more comparable to commercial air travel than it is to automobile travel, it is likely that in the right circumstances a significant share of air travelers would switch to HSR. In its 1997 study, FRA estimated that generally between 20% and 50% might be expected to divert from air to HSR, with higher diversion rates associated with faster forms of HSR.41 The IG’s study of the NEC estimated that 11% of flyers would take the train in scenario 1 and 20% would take the train in scenario 2, concluding, therefore, that “this would provide congestion relief at NEC airports and in NEC airspace.”

#### HSR Tradeoff with Motor Vehicles and Airplanes

APTA 2012

(American Public Transportation Association, January 2012, “An inventory of the Critucisms of High-Speed Rail”, <http://www.apta.com/resources/reportsandpublications/Documents/HSR-Defense.pdf>, accessed 7/5/12, TRH)

Of the 33 million air trips forecast to be made in the year 2030, over a third or 12 million would be attracted to high-speed trains, bringing the level of air traffic in the state back to the levels of 2000, slightly higher than it is today. In other words, most of the growth in air traffic would be diverted, leaving airport capacity for international and out-of-state flights. Of the 911 million auto travelers forecast in 2030 to make trips between the 14 proposed California regions, about 6% or 50 million would be attracted to high-speed trains. Within the regions that have several stations (Los Angeles Basin, the Bay Area, and San Diego County) high-speed trains will attract another 25 million auto trips, less than 1% of the local urban area auto travel.

#### HSR cuts travel by other modes significantly

CALPIRG, a consumer group that researches public issues about health and safety. ,2010 (June, CALPIRG, “Next Stop: California The Benefits of High-Speed Rail Around the World and What’s in Store for California,” http://cdn.publicinterestnetwork.org/assets/ff178505134e5feffbd9dc8faf2ece7d/Next-Stop-California.pdf 7/4/12, MDRJ)

. High-speed rail service has virtually eliminated short-haul air service on several corridors in Europe, such as between Paris and Lyon, France, and between Cologne and Frankfurt, Germany. • The number of air passengers between London and Paris has been cut in half since high-speed rail service was initiated between the two cities through the Channel Tunnel. • The recent launch of high-speed rail service between Madrid and Barcelona, Spain, has cut air travel on what was once one of the world’s busiest passenger air routes by one-third. • Even in the northeastern U.S., where Amtrak Acela Express service is slow by international standards, rail service accounts for 62 percent of the air/rail market on trips between New York and Washington, D.C., and 47 percent of the air/rail market on trips between Boston and New York

### Airlines perceive HSR as a threat

#### Airlines scared of HSR, Texas and Chicago

Shishir Urban and Regional Planning Department, San Jose State University, Srikalyani Metropolitan Transportation Commission, 2009

 (MATHUR, SRINIVASAN, November2009, CCASP Terum, “HIGH-SPEED RAIL IN THE MIDWEST UNITED STATES: POTENTIAL FOR SUCCESS”, <http://um.ase.ro/no13/4.pdf>, accessed 7/3/12, TRH)

HSR and the airline industry have been the traditional adversariesbecause over the medium distances of 500 to 1,000 kilometers, HSR and air travel compete for the same ridership. For example, fears from Southwest Airlines halted the HSR effort in Texas. In fact, Southwest Airlines was initially an investor and an advocate of HSR in Texas. However, when travel times became comparable, it felt threatened and withdrewsupport**.** In the case of Midwestern HSR, fortunately, the fear of the major airport of the region – Chicago O’Hare Airport – loosing its business to HSR is minimal because a large majority of passengers that use Chicago O’ hare Airport travel from one part of the country to another, not from one Midwestern city to another. Hence the HSR would not directly compete with the traditional customer base of the O’Hare airport. Furthermore, the airport is presently heavily congested. Any plans to reduce its congestion should be welcomed by the City of Chicago which owns and operates the airport. Moreover, there are opportunities to develop synergistic relationships between the two modes.

### Terrorism Link

#### HSR links to terroism

Cox, principal of Demographia, a St. Louis region-based public policy firm, Vranich, as

President/CEO of the High Speed Rail Association in the early 1990s, 2008

 (Wendell, Joseph, September, The California High Speed Rail Proposal: A Due Diligence Report, <http://reason.org/files/1b544eba6f1d5f9e8012a8c36676ea7e.pdf>, date accessed 7/12/12, DD)

Terrorism against rail targets is a concern considering the extent of attacks that continue to occur

on rail systems around the world. The Authority appears to be have given insufficient attention to

this issue notwithstanding the RAND recommendation to industry and government regarding

improvements to domestic rail security. The CHSRA documentation provides virtually no evidence

that a proper security assessment of the proposed HSR system has been undertaken, nor does it

appear that security applications and methodologies elsewhere have been reviewed. The Authority

assumes minimal security at HSR train stations and concludes passengers will be spared airportlike security screening and delays. However, should more stringent security measures become

necessary, the CHSRA’s ridership demand forecasts would be even further undermined. The

CHSRA has not issued a low-end ridership forecast based on such a circumstance.

### Capitalism Link

#### HSR encourages spatial advantage and segregation for the privileged upper-class using taxpayer dollars – clearly an example of exploitation

O’Toole 9

(Randal, September 9, senior fellow with the Cato Institute, Cato, High-Speed Rail Is Not “Interstate 2.0”, <http://www.cato.org/pubs/bp/bp113.pdf>) CL

At the time of this writing, $99 will get you from Washington to New York in 2 hours and 50 minutes on Amtrak’s high-speed train, while $49 pays for a moderate-speed train ride that takes 3 hours and 15 minutes. Meanwhile, relatively unsubsidized and energy-efficient buses with leather seats and free Wi-Fi cost $20 for a trip that takes 4 hours and 15-minutes between the two cities. Airfares start at $119 for a 1-hour flight. High-speed rail plans in other parts of the country propose similar fare premiums. Midwest high-speed rail fares “will be competitive with air travel,” says the Midwest High Speed Rail Initiative, and will be “up to 50 percent higher than current Amtrak fares to reflect improved services.”36 Few who pay their own way will spend five times as much for a high-speed train ticket to save less than 90 minutes of their time—and those who value their time that highly would spend another $20 for a plane ticket that would save them an additional hour. Rail advocates respond that high-speed trains have an advantage over flying when adding the time it takes to get between downtowns and airports. Yet less than 8 percent of Americans work in downtowns.37 Who are they? Bankers, lawyers, government officials, and other high-income people who hardly need taxpayer-subsidized transportation.