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## Topicality

### \*\*\*1NC T

#### A. Interpretation and violation – “Transportation infrastructure” is strictly defined as facilities of transport --- this excludes security, law enforcement, and military support

**Musick 10** (Nathan, Microeconomic and Financial Studies Division – United States Congressional Budget Office, Public Spending on Transportation and Water Infrastructure, p. 2)

**Although different definitions of "infrastructure" exist, this report focuses on** two types that claim a significant amount of federal resources: **transportation** and water. Those types of infrastructure share the economic characteristics of being relatively capital intensive and producing services under public management that facilitate private economic activity. They are typically the types examined by studies that attempt to calculate the payoff, in terms of benefits to the U.S. economy) of the public sector's funding of infrastructure.

For the purposes of CBO's analysis, **"transportation infrastructure" includes** the **systems and facilities that support** the following types of activities:

■ **Vehicular transportation: highways, roads, bridges, and tunnels**;

■ **Mass transit** subways, buses, and commuter rail;

■ **Rail transport** primarily the intercity service provided by Amtrak;\*

■ **Civil aviation**: airport terminals, runways, and taxi-ways, and facilities and navigational equipment for air traffic control: and

■ **Water transportation**: waterways, ports, vessel\*, and navigational systems.

The category "water infrastructure" includes facilities that provide the following:

■ Water resources: containment systems, such as dams, levees, reservoirs, and watersheds; and sources of fresh water such as lakes and rivers; and

■ Water utilities: supply systems for distributing potable water, and wastewater and sewage treatment systems and plants.

**Consistent with** CBO'% **previous reports on public spending for transportation** and water **infrastructure, this update excludes spending that is associated with such infrastructure but does not contribute directly to the provision of infrastructure facilities or certain strictly defined infrastructure services. Examples of excluded spending are federal outlays for homeland security** (which are especially pertinent to aviation), **law enforcement and military functions (such as** those carried out by **the Coast Guard), and cleanup operations (such as** those **conducted by the Army Corps of Engineers following** Hurricane **Katrina** in 2005).

#### B. Violation- the aff is support for transportation infrastructure- it does not directly improve one of the systems and it upgrades the function of an associated system for the purpose of military use, not civilian transit

#### C. Reasons to prefer ---

#### 1.) Limits- the aff allows anything that makes existing infrastructure more effective- that means they could increase the pay of construction workers, or any other related support- explodes the neg’s research burden

#### 2.) Ground- associated support eliminates core DA ground- its not perceived the same way as transit, it doesn’t include the same elements and it’s not in the same literature base- eliminates neg’s generics

#### 3.) Extra-topicality- even if GPS is topical, investing in military-grade GPS is not a transportation issue- transit is strictly civilian- allowing military and law enforcement upgrades gives the aff unique unpredictable advantage ground they could use to outweigh or turn the neg’s topical ground

### 2NC A2: “Important Element”/Adams ‘1

**FOR YOUR REFERENCE, HERE IS THEIR 2AC EVIDENCE- YOU DO NOT NEED TO REREAD IT**

**[Adams 2k1** (Bill, “U.S. COAST GUARD NAVIGATION CENTER”, U.S. Department of Transportation, Sept 1, <http://www.navcen.uscg.gov/?pageName=pressRelease>, CMR)

The U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) today released the results of a study assessing the vulnerability of the national **transportation infrastructure** that **relies on** the Global Positioning System (**GPS**) (Adobe Acrobat). The study notes that GPS is susceptible to unintentional disruption from such causes as atmospheric effects, signal blockage from buildings, and interference from communications equipment, as well as to potential deliberate disruption. It contains a number of recommendations to address the possibility of disruption and ensure the safety of the national transportation infrastructure. The report was mandated by a Presidential Decision Directive and prepared by the DOT Volpe National Transportation Systems Center. “This report provides a roadmap for addressing possible vulnerabilities in GPS so that we can continue maintaining the highest standards of transportation safety,” **said U.S. Transportation Secretary** Norman Y. **Mineta**. “The Department of Transportation takes this report’s findings very seriously, and **we will be working to ensure that GPS will fulfill its potential as a key element of the nation’s transportation infrastructure**.” Secretary Mineta charged the administrators of each DOT operating administration to thoroughly review this report and consider the adequacy of backup systems for each area of operation in which GPS is being used for critical transportation applications. The administrators are to report their findings back to the Secretary within 60 days. DOT, in consultation with the Department of Defense (DOD), sponsored the study to assure the continued safe operation of the U.S. transportation system. **All modes of transportation** are increasingly reliant on GPS and, according to the study, GPS is susceptible to various forms of interference. This study identified transportation operations that employ GPS, methods for GPS disruption, possible impacts to transportation safety, and approaches to ensure service reliability. ]

#### Adams evidence proves the violation- the bottom of the underlining says “all modes of transportation are relant on GPS,” which makes it a key element of the nation’s transportation infrastructure. That just proves that GPS supports transportation infrastructure, like highways, ports, etc, but it is not in and of itself transportation infrastructure. GPS is an element of support upon which the nation’s transportation systems is reliant.

### 2NC A2: GSN ‘2

**FOR YOUR REFERENCE, HERE IS THEIR 2AC EVIDENCE- YOU DO NOT NEED TO REREAD IT**

**GSN ‘2** (Global Security Newswire, “Transportation pledges to secure Global Positioning System”, March8, <http://www.govexec.com/defense/2002/03/transportation-pledges-to-secure-global-positioning-system/11207/>, CMR)

The Transportation Department will implement an action plan to secure the **G**lobal **P**ositioning **S**ystem, Transportation Secretary Norman Mineta announced Thursday. Emergency teams responding to an attack with weapons of mass destruction would use the system, which **supports U.S. transportation infrastructure.** The department's decision followed a September report by the Volpe National Transportation System Center that determined GPS is vulnerable to unintentional and intentional disruptions. The report offered several recommendations, and the department has concurred with all of them, according to a Transportation press release. "The action plan we are announcing today will ensure that the vulnerabilities identified in the report do not affect the safety and security of our transportation system as we work to ensure that **GPS fulfills** its potential as **a key element of the nation's transportation infrastructure**," Mineta said.

#### GSN evidence makes the same argument as Adams- GPS “supports US transportation infrastructure”- the example in the evidence proves that it is not in and of itself infrastructure- it says if an emergency team were responding to a WMD threat, they would use the GPS systems to make their navigation of infrastructure easier. Proves its associated support, rather than infrastructure itself.

### 2NC Violation

#### Extend the two 1NC violations-

#### 1.) Supporting infrastructure is not investment in the infrastructure itself- the aff improves a support technology that makes existing physical infrastructure like highway systems more effective

#### 2.) Infrastructure investments are only civilian- the aff includes military GPS investment or it doesn’t have any advantages and you can vote neg on presumption- that’s Musick

#### And, “Infrastructure” must be physical- the aff only alters the security of information and effectiveness of information beaming

**Garvin 7** (Michael J., Professor of Construction – Virginia Tech University, et al., “America’s Infrastructure Strategy: Drawing on History to Guide the Future”, http://crgp.stanford.edu/events/presentations/CA/CRGP\_KPMG\_whitepaper.pdf)

Inspection of these definitions suggests that **infrastructure is broadly defined as the physical assets that facilitate the delivery of both social and economic services**. Interestingly, the definitions have evolved from an emphasis upon public works and their adequacy to critical infrastructures and their security (Moteff and Parfomak 2004). In addition, the characterization of infrastructure as purely public systems has clearly diminished with time. The significance of the characterization will become very evident later in the paper when discussion regarding the contemporary role of private participants is more fully examined. **Whichever way the term is defined, infrastructure is “physical” – society can see and usually come in contact with it** – and “deliberate” – society develops and uses it for some purpose; it is not arbitrary. Thus, it requires creation, operation, and maintenance, which involves a number of production activities throughout its lifecycle – most of which are interdependent. Figure 1 broadly depicts these activities.2

**And, Communication systems are regulated utilities, not “transportation infrastructure”- they let anything from telephone services to public internet access into the topic- links to our limits and ground DA’s**

**Quadrant 7** (Real Estate Investors, “Global Diversified Infrastructure Fund of Funds”, http://www.quadrantrealestateadvisors.com/investments/public/uploads/documents%5CGlobal%20Diversified%20Infrastructure%20Fund%20of%20Funds.pdf)

II. Defining Infrastructure Assets

Starting with the failure of the levy systems in New Orleans, followed by the collapse of the Mississippi River Bridge in Minneapolis, Minnesota on August 1, 2007, American infrastructure capital needs were brought to the forefront of America. The aging stock of infrastructure continues to deteriorate and the demand for public and private investment continues to grow. The question now becomes, which entity is going to address this growing need? However, an even more fundamental question also exists, **what are infrastructure assets?** According to the American Heritage Dictionary, infrastructure comprises the “basic facilities, services and installations needed for the functioning of a community or society, such as transportation and communication systems, water and power lines, and public institutions including schools, post offices and prisons.” The dictionary also notes that the term infrastructure has been used since 1927 to refer to the public works required for an industrial economy to function or the installations necessary for the defence of a country. The expectation most have is that infrastructure assets primarily involve government regulated monopolies and governmentally maintained assets. Unfortunately, classification is not that simple. **When defining infrastructure investments, the common definition accepted in the institutional investment management community is** “the **physical assets** that are **needed to provide essential** **services** to society,” which has lead managers to have highly different interpretations of the definition of “essential.” **In general,** the **infrastructure** market **is divided into two general sectors—economic** infrastructure **and social** infrastructure. **Economic infrastructure includes transportation assets and regulated utilities, which includes communication, water, and energy systems. Social infrastructure** is more vaguely defined and may include any asset in which the government maintains control or assets that are necessary for the longevity of the population. Such assets **include schools, prisons, hospitals, parks, and others**.

### 2NC Limits DA

**The aff explodes limits- they allow anything that supports existing infrastructure in order to increase its efficacy to be topical- that means they can change the labor force composition at ports, increase the pay of mass transit workers or increase civil liability associated with hitting a construction employee on the highway- any of those plans makes transit more effective, but does not actually create additional means of transportation.**

**The impact is a massively expanded neg research burden- that slants side bais negative because the aff is always more prepared on a large resolution and forces the neg to resort to generics**

**“Transportation” is the core limiting term --- maintaining its integrity is critical to check limits explosion**

**Averback 87** (Jonathan C., Citations Editor, “Comparing The Old And The New Pollution Exclusion Clauses In General Liability Insurance Policies: New Language -- Same Results?”, Boston College Environmental Affairs Law Review, Summer, 14 B.C. Envtl. Aff. L. Rev. 601, Lexis)

Courts will not honor the insurer's intention to limit coverage of certain risks if this intention is ambiguously expressed. 86 Instead, courts look for both parties' objectively-manifested intent, as implied by the words of the contract. 87 One principle of contract interpretation that courts will use to imply the parties' intent is that of ejusdem generis. 88 This principle allows a court to infer that specific words restrict the meaning of general terms when the specific terms precede the general terms in a particular phrase. 89 Thus, in a phrase "cattle, hogs and other animals," "animals" may not refer to much more than farm animals, because the specific animals mentioned before the general word are hogs and cattle. 90 **Ejusdem generis is** only **one aspect of a broader doctrine holding that general phrases** [\*613] **may be restricted in meaning by being grouped with specific terms regardless of the ordering**. 91 **Thus**, as in the above example, **the term "animals" in the phrase "animals, cattle and hogs" may be limited to farm animals under this broader doctrine. In applying construction doctrines, courts look to** the **ordinary meanings of** the **words** used in a phrase **to discern** the **intent** of the parties. 92.

#### No other phrase fills in- substantially is too nebulous and nobody votes on it, literature can’t check because you only need one article to write an aff

### 2NC Ground DA

#### The aff creates a two-part resolution- there is a clear division between investments in physical infrastructure and support services for that infrastructure. Splitting the topic doubles aff advantage ground, while eliminating core generics like spending and trade-off DA’s. Lack of predictable core neg ground magnifies the relevance of aff’s infinite prep advantage and means more specific evidence on support services always wins.

### 2NC Extra T DA

#### Extra topicality is an independent reason to vote neg- allowing any military or security aff doubles the size of the topic and lets the aff use the advantages based on upgrading military GPS to outweigh or turn all our DA’s- any reason that adding extra ground to the resolution is tuned by the unpredictable nature of the addition- it only benefits the aff and crushes the neg.

### 2NC A2: Reasonability

#### Topicality is a question of competing interpretations- anything else leads to judge intervention that undermines clash and doesn’t account for non-visible decisions debaters make pre-round, like not to read a specific DA or CP because of the aff’s lack of topicality.

#### Reasonability is impossible to determine- all our standards arguments serve as proof that the aff is reasonably untopical, so err neg.

## Counterplan

### \*\*\*1NC Executive CP

#### Text: The President of the United States should issue an executive order moving all authority over the United States’ GPS systems to the Department of Homeland security and elevating the importance of GPS to our critical infrastructure, including highlighting the necessity of additional attention to interference with GPS systems (specifically the importance of augmenting existing GPS systems to protect against spoofing).

#### The Department of Transportation does the plan- they manage GPS systems

National Executive Committee for Space-Based PNT, 2004

U.S. Space-Based Positioning, Navigation, and Timing Policy, December 15, 2004, <http://www.pnt.gov/policy/2004-policy.shtml>

The Secretary of Transportation shall: Have lead responsibility for the development of requirements for civil applications from all United States Government civil Departments and Agencies; Ensure, in cooperation with the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Homeland Security, the performance monitoring of U.S. civil space-based positioning, navigation, and timing services; Consistent with the guidance in Section V of this policy, and in coordination with the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of State, facilitate: (1) foreign development of civil positioning, navigation, and timing services and systems based on the Global Positioning System; and (2) international participation in the development of civil applications for U.S. space-based positioning, navigation, and timing services; Ensure, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, that space-based positioning, navigation, and timing public safety services meet or exceed international performance standards, including but not limited to those used for these services in aviation and/or maritime applications; In cooperation with other Departments and Agencies, promote the use of U.S. civil space-based positioning, navigation, and timing services and capabilities for transportation safety; Represent the civil Departments and Agencies in the development, acquisition, management, and operations of the Global Positioning System; Develop, acquire, operate, and maintain Global Positioning System space or terrestrial augmentations for civil transportation applications; Ensure the earliest operational availability for modernized civil signals and services on the Global Positioning System and its augmentations,

#### The executive should shift GPS authority to the DHS- it solves the case and doesn’t require increased funding- it would lead to change in funding to resolve

**National PNT Advisory Board**, November 4**, 2010**, Jamming the Global Positioning System -

A National Security Threat: Recent Events and Potential Cures

**GPS is absolutely critical US National Infrastructure**. This has not been formally recognized. GPS should be formally declared critical infrastructure by Executive Branch and managed as such by DHS. **This is necessary to elevate the importance of GPS to our critical infrastructure and bring the needed attention to the interference problem.** The various existing national interference programs must be coordinated and gaps must be filled with additional funded efforts (see later recommendations**). Senior leadership must recognize the vulnerabilities of the current critical infrastructure and give high priority to budgets and solutions.**

#### GAPS Act proves that DHS security upgrades are popular- frames GPS as a national security issue

HS Today 7-2-12 (Homeland Security Today, Aviation, Port Security Bills Enjoy Bipartisan Support from House Lawmakers, http://www.hstoday.us/briefings/today-s-news-analysis/single-article/aviation-port-security-bills-enjoy-bipartisan-support-from-house-lawmakers/8774d00b80793d7b125324dc9dad3510.html)

Finally, the GAPS Act would require the Department of Homeland Security to examine gaps in port security and report to Congress with a plan to address those gaps. Rep. Janice Hahn (D-Calif.), who sponsored the bill, hailed its passage, 411-9, Thursday. In a statement, Hahn said, "The loopholes that continue to exist in port security keep me up at night. My first question as a member of the Homeland Security Committee was to Lee Hamilton, vice chair of the 9/11 Commission, on what Congress should be doing to protect our ports. Mr. Hamilton's response that Congress wasn't focused enough on our ports meant we needed to act." US ports receive roughly 50,000 calls from ships annually, with 2 billion tons of freight and 134 million passengers, Hahn reported. The contribution of this cargo to the US economy is staggeringly significant, but only 3 percent or less of cargo undergoes scanning. That low amount opens up opportunities for terrorists to smuggle people or weapons into the United States, she argued. A terrorist attack on the Port of Los Angeles/Long Beach would cost billions to the economy of California and displace thousands of port workers, Hahn warned. Geraldine Knatz, executive director of the Port of Los Angeles, praised the GAPS Act as an effort to prevent such a catastrophe. "It's a tribute to both the importance of the issue and Representative Hahn's tenacity that Congress passed her legislation a mere four months after she introduced the bill," Knatz said in a statement. "Trade gateways, like the Port of Los Angeles, are critical pieces of our nation's economic infrastructure. Keeping these gateways safe is a national priority."

#### Plan drains political capital because it’s seen as a transportation issue and increases funding

Freemark ‘12

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

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

### 2NC Solvency O/V

#### The counterplan moves GPS from the Department of Transportation to the Department of Homeland Security and reprioritizes funding for GPS programs to increase focus on GPS security. The counterplan does not increase overall funding; it only shifts existing funding.

#### **It’s sufficient to solve-**

#### A.) Reprioritization of focus- PNT Advisory Board says that a presidential announcement that the DHS should focus its GPS funding on anti-spoofing spurs quick tech upgrades and immediate compliance with heightened standards for GPS security- national security issues get more attention

#### B.) Security not civilian focus- the plan uses a civilian organization, the DoT, to improve GPS security- the counterplan puts security professionals in charge of counter-terror, which also allows the DHS to coordinate GPS security with its broader counter-terror strategy- increases efficiency of response and intelligence coordination

#### Evaluate counterplan solvency through the lens of sufficiency- the plan may solve better, but if the counterplan is enough to resolve the internal links, then any risk of a net benefit means you vote neg.

#### Both advantages are based on spoofing or GPS security failures- if we win either of these solvency args, you should treat the risk of a solvency deficit as 0%, since either would prove the counterplan’s sufficiency for addressing GPS security

### 2NC A2: New Funding Key

#### New funding unnecessary- assimilator equipment just requires augmentation, not replacement of existing systems, so it’s cheap- that means you should hold them to a high standard on the solvency deficit

Humphreys ‘11

Assimilating GNSS Signals to Improve Accuracy, Robustness, and Resistance to Signal Interference -Todd E. Humphreys **“**Professor of Orbital Mechanics University of Texas Austin” 3/24/11, http://www.faqs.org/patents/app/20110068973#b

The Assimilator is a cost-effective alternative to replacing existing user equipment for users who want a PVT solution that is robust against GNSS signal obstruction, jamming, and spoofing, or who want access to the benefits of GNSS modernization. Thus, the GNSS Assimilator provides for augmenting instead of replacing legacy equipment. The augmentation need not require hardware or software modification to the existing equipment--the Assimilator can simply attach to a GNSS receiver's radio frequency (RF) input port and inject a consistent set of synthesized GNSS signals defining a PVT solution that is robust, accurate, and spoof-free.

#### And, upgrades are inevitable- funding the Assimilator costs less than replacement, so no new funding required

Humphreys ‘11

Assimilating GNSS Signals to Improve Accuracy, Robustness, and Resistance to Signal Interference -Todd E. Humphreys **“**Professor of Orbital Mechanics University of Texas Austin” 3/24/11, http://www.faqs.org/patents/app/20110068973#b

Augmentation with the Assimilator is particularly cost-effective where the Assimilator itself is less expensive than replacing existing user equipment with a new model as capable as the Assimilator-receiver pair. The details of one or more embodiments of the invention are set forth in the accompanying drawings and the description below. Other features, objects, and advantages of the invention will be apparent from the description and drawings, and from the claims.

### 2NC A2: DoT Best

#### **Civilian organizations aren’t good at counter-terror- no evidence proves their argument in the context of GPS either**

#### **Strong DHS role is necessary – failure to include them undermines US anti-terrorism measures- even if they say DHS bad, the DHS will inevitably be involved- the only question is whether it takes a primary or secondary role**

Berrick 3-8-12 – Managing Director, Homeland Security and Justice Issues, Government Accountability Office (Cathleen, House Homeland Security Subcommittee on Oversight, Investigations, and Management Hearing; "Eliminating Waste, Fraud, Abuse, and Duplication in the Department of Homeland Security." Congressional Documents and Publications, Lexis)

Our work at DHS has identified three key themes--leading and coordinating the homeland security enterprise, implementing and integrating management functions for results, and strategically managing risks and assessing homeland security efforts--that have impacted the department's progress since it began operations. n4 As these themes have contributed to challenges in the department's management and operations, addressing them can result in increased efficiencies and effectiveness. For example, DHS can help reduce cost overruns and performance shortfalls by strengthening the management of its acquisitions, and reduce inefficiencies and costs for homeland security by improving its RandD management. These themes provide insights that can inform DHS's efforts, moving forward, as it works to implement its missions within a dynamic and evolving homeland security environment. DHS made progress and has had successes in all of these areas, but our work found that these themes have been at the foundation of DHS's implementation challenges, and need to be addressed from a department wide perspective to effectively and efficiently position DHS for the future and enable it to satisfy the expectations set forth by the Congress, the administration, and the country. Leading and coordinating the homeland security enterprise. While DHS is one of a number of entities with a role in securing the homeland, it has significant leadership and coordination responsibilities for managing efforts across the homeland security enterprise. To satisfy these responsibilities, it is critically important that DHS develop, maintain, and leverage effective partnerships with its stakeholders, while at the same time addressing DHS-specific responsibilities in satisfying its missions. Before DHS began operations, we reported that the quality and continuity of the new department's leadership would be critical to building and sustaining the long-term effectiveness of DHS and achieving homeland security goals and objectives. n5 We further reported that to secure the nation, DHS must form effective and sustained partnerships between components and also with a range of other entities, including federal agencies, state and local governments, the private and nonprofit sectors, and international partners. n6 DHS has made important strides in providing leadership and coordinating efforts. For example, it has improved coordination and clarified roles with state and local governments for emergency management. DHS also strengthened its partnerships and collaboration with foreign governments to coordinate and standardize security practices for aviation security. However, DHS needs to take additional action to forge effective partnerships and strengthen the sharing and utilization of information, which has affected its ability to effectively satisfy its missions. For example, in July 2010, we reported that the expectations of private-sector stakeholders have not been met by DHS and its federal partners in areas related to sharing information about cyber-based threats to critical infrastructure. n7 In 2005, we designated information-sharing for homeland security as high risk because the federal government faced serious challenges in analyzing information and sharing it among partners in a timely, accurate, and useful way. n8 Gaps in sharing, such as agencies' failure to link information about the individual who attempted to conduct the December 25, 2009, airline bombing, prevented the individual from being included on the federal government's consolidated terrorist watchlist, a tool used by DHS to screen for persons who pose risks to the country. The federal government and DHS have made progress, but more work remains for DHS to streamline its information sharing mechanisms and better meet partners' needs. Moving forward, it will be important that DHS continue to enhance its focus and efforts to strengthen and leverage the broader homeland security enterprise, and build off the important progress that it has made thus far. In addressing ever-changing and complex threats, and with the vast array of partners with whom DHS must coordinate, continued leadership and stewardship will be critical in achieving this end.

### 2NC A2: Timeframe Solvency Deficit

#### Perceptual change is immediate- changing authority for the express purpose of boosting GPS’s contribution to national security

### 2NC A2: Politics Links or Doesn’t Solve

#### Politics doesn’t link and the counterplan solves- GPS isn’t specifically unpopular, but it will be embroiled in a fight over broader DoT funding packages- the counterplan allows it to be separated and labeled a security issue- that solves the link

#### And, funding GPS is the main source of opposition- the counterplan doesn’t require new allocations, which means that it doesn’t link- no 1AC evidence says new funding streams are required

### 2NC Politics Yes NB

#### Politics is a net benefit to the counterplan:

#### A.) DHS/DoT Distinction- Port security funding proves that Republicans can get behind funding for DHS programs to address perceived security gaps- they backlash against the plan because it’s grouped in with policies like the highway bill in the general debate about DoT funding, and the GoP doesn’t have any constituents that benefit from those projects- that’s Freemark and HS Today

#### Transportation spending specifically drains capital – election magnifies the link

Szakonyi ‘12

(Mark Szakonyi is an Associate Editor for the Journal of Commerce – focusing on the reporting of rail and intermodal issues, regulation and policy out of the JOC's Washington, D.C., bureau. Journal of Commerce – March 20, 2012 – lexis)

House Republicans are considering a short-term extension of the surface transportation bill instead of adopting the Senate's two-year plan. The decision to seek an extension as the March 31 deadline nears signals that the fight over transportation spending could become even more partisan as the presidential election nears. House Republicans are looking to push an extension of current spending for the ninth time, House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Chairman John Mica, R.-Fla., told attendees of an American Association of Port Authorities conference, where he was honored as Port Person of the Year. His statement on Tuesday was a clear sign that Republicans won't heed Senate leaders' and President Obama's call to adopt the Senate's $109 billion plan. Mica said he hoped the extension would be exempt from riders, which helped lead to a shutdown of the Federal Aviation Administration last summer .

#### B.) No Funding Increase- the counterplan just reprioritizes existing GPS funding- that means no funding battles and lets the GoP save face on fiscal discipline- resolves their major concerns- that’s Freemark

#### Fights over how to fund the plan will cost political capital- new spending requires new revenue streams

White 6/27

(It's Make Or Break For Infrastructure Money As Transportation Bill Deadline Looms By [Jeremy B. White](http://www.ibtimes.com/archives/articles/reporters/jeremy-b-white/): Subscribe to Jeremy's [RSS feed](http://www.ibtimes.com/rss/articles/reporters/jeremy-b-white.rss) 6/27, 2012 12:25 PM EDT)

[Congress](http://www.ibtimes.com/topics/detail/920/congress/) is running out of time to pass a transportation bill. If lawmakers cannot forge an agreement, they will need to fund projects on the nation's roads and bridges with a stopgap measure. [Congress](http://www.ibtimes.com/topics/detail/920/congress/) last passed a surface transportation bill in 2005, and since that bill expired in 2009 lawmakers have enacted nine straight short-term extensions. They now have until June 30th to avert a scenario in which construction projects come to a halt as money for them dries up -- something neither party wants to happen. Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, Democrat of Nevada, upped the pressure on Tuesday, saying a deal needed to happen on Wednesday in order to leave enough time to get the bill to President Obama before the current pot of funding evaporates. "We have to have an agreement by tomorrow," Reid said on Tuesday. "Otherwise, we can't get the bill done." Congress' failure to pass a long-term surface transportation bill at a time when the nation's deteriorating infrastructure [earned](http://www.infrastructurereportcard.org/" \t "_blank) a "D" grade from the American Society of Civil Engineers has emerged as a symbol of dysfunction on Capitol Hill. President Obama has repeatedly stressed investments in infrastructure as a means to stimulate the economy and produce jobs, but to no avail. Disagreements about how to pay for the bill have been part of the problem. Last time around, House Republicans rejected a Senate bill in part because they said that federal gasoline tax revenue, the traditional source of funding for surface transportation projects, was insufficient. They pushed to have new offshore drilling included, saying the royalties from new projects would help cover the shortfall. The Keystone XL pipeline also continues to be a sticking point -- Obama has put the project on hold pending an environmental review, but Republicans want transportation legislation to include a mechanism that would accelerate the natural gas pipeline. They also want to ease restrictions on coal-ash pollution. Another possibility is that the transportation bill gets rolled into separate legislation that would prevent interest rates on student loans from doubling. Senate leaders said on Tuesday that they had completed work on the student loan bill and kept alive the possibility that transportation language could be included.

### 2NC A2: CP Link to Politics- Still Transit

#### Counterplan isn’t perceived as transit spending, even if the end-result is similar to the plan- it’s a question of packaging- that’s our DHS/DoT distinction above

#### And, that’s enough to prove no link to the counterplan- Republicans can sell security to their constituents, they can’t sell costly transit projects- means the election magnifies both the no link to the counterplan and the link to the aff

### 2NC A2: Perm Do Both

#### **Perm do both links to the net benefit or its severance- the plan increases transportation infrastructure investment which is handled by the DoT, not the DHS**

The Free Library ‘09

"It's Important to Plan Ahead: So Our Communities Can Grow Sustainably." *The Free Library*. N.p., 2009. Web. 2 July 2012. <http://www.thefreelibrary.com/It%27s+important+to+plan+ahead%3a+so+our+communities+can+grow+sustainably-a0199193909>.

But smart growth choices can be made; these choices need to start with **the Department of Transportation**  **where most of the planning for transportation infrastructure**  **is done.** If the Department of Transportation starts prioritizing transit and sustainable planning, we can see a reversal in the trend that until now has heavily supported the highway and road systems that so often pave over our forests. If you want to take a stand, write to your elected state and federal leaders and tell them that they need to direct **the Department of Transportation** **to focus on** transit, rail, greenways and bike lanes as priorities over auto-oriented transportation. Tell them that we need to start planning now for a sustainable **transportation infrastructure** so that the next time we have a large stimulus package, more transit projects will be through the planning stages in "shovel ready" mode. Let's let our elected leaders know that there is a large smart growth community that is pushing for a change of priorities.

#### And, DHS programs are security infrastructure, which means that any perm that shifts the plan’s funding to the DHS is severance of “transportation infrastructure” from the plan

Reese 2009 – Analyst in Emergency Management and Homeland Security Policy (Shawn, Department of Homeland Security Assistance to States and Localities: A Summary and Issues for the 111th Congress, CRS Report for Congress)

In light of lessons learned from the September 2001 terrorist attacks and other catastrophes such as Hurricanes Katrina and Gustav, the second session of the 111th Congress is expected to consider questions and issues associated with federal homeland security assistance. Federal homeland security assistance, for the purpose of this report, is defined as U.S. Department of Homeland Security programs that provide funding, training, or technical assistance to states, localities, tribes, and other entities to prepare for, respond to, and recover from man-made and natural disasters. Since the nation is still threatened by terrorist attacks and natural disasters, the 111th Congress may wish to consider questions and challenges about whether, or how, federal homeland security assistance policy should be revisited. Policy solutions could affect, and be constrained by, existing law and regulations, and constitutional considerations. Since FY2002, Congress has appropriated over $34 billion for homeland security assistance to states, specified urban areas and critical infrastructures (such as ports and rail systems), the District of Columbia, and U.S. insular areas. Originally, in FY2002, there were eight programs; in FY2010 there are 15 programs. This expansion and scope of homeland security assistance programs are the result of congressional and executive branch actions. The Grant Programs Directorate, within the Federal Emergency Management Agency, administers these programs for the Department of Homeland Security. Each assistance program has either an all-hazards purpose or a terrorism preparedness purpose. However, in FY2010, 60% of funding has been appropriated for terrorism preparedness programs, a decision that has been criticized by some grant recipients, Members of Congress, and others.

#### And, even if that’s not true, the aff increases funding for GPS’s transportation infrastructure element, which means it links to politics, while the counterplan doesn’t- excluding that element would be severance and a voter because it eliminates DA and counterplan ground

### 2NC A2: Perm Do CP

#### Perm do the counteplan is severance-

#### **A.) ASPEC- the aff’s failure to specify the branch that enacts the plan in the plan makes any agent cp competitive- any alternative is aff conditionality which eliminates critical counterplan and politics DA ground**

#### B.) Increase infrastructure investment-

**“Increase” means the plan must certainly make greater the level of government spending over the squo**

Words and Phrases, 5 (Cummulative Supplementary Pamphlet, v. 20a, p.295) cmr

Cal.App.2 Dist. 1991. Term “increase,” as used in statute giving the Energy Commission modification jurisdiction over any alteration, replacement, or improvement of equipment that results in “increase” of 50 megawatts or more in electric generating capacity of existing thermal power plant, refers to **“net increase”** in power plant’s total generating capacity; in deciding whether there has been the requisite 50-megawatt increase as a result of new units being incorporated into a plant, Energy Commission cannot ignore decreases in capacity caused by retirement or deactivation of other units at plant. West’s Ann.Cal.Pub.Res.Code § 25123.

#### And, the aff must mandate government spending on infrastructure- investments of time are insufficient

**Jimenez 95** (Immanuel, Appointed Director of Public Sector Evaluations – Independent Evaluation Group of the World Bank Group, “Human and Physical Infrastructure: Public Investment and Pricing Policies in Developing Countries”, Handbook of Development Economics, Vol. III, Ed. Behrman and Srinivasan, p. 2774)

1. Introduction and overview

**Almost by definition, infrastructure is the basis for development**. 1 For an economy, it is the foundation on which the factors of production interact in order to produce output. This has been long recognized by development analysts, and infrastructure, often termed "social overhead capital," is considered to include:

•.. those services without which primary, secondary and tertiary production activities cannot function. In its wider sense **it includes** all **public services from law and order through education and public health to transportation**, communications, power and water supply, as well as such agricultural overhead capital as irrigation and drainage systems [Hirschman (1958) p. 83].

These seemingly diverse services share some common traits that are important in economic analysis. They are generally not tradeable. Although they may affect final consumption directly, their role in enhancing output and household welfare can also be indirect - in facilitating market transactions or in making other economic inputs more productive. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the many infrastructure services share characteristics, such as scale economies in production, consumption externalities and non-exclusivity, that have been used to justify a large role for public policy in their provision and financing.

This chapter will focus not only on what has traditionally been considered the "core" infrastructure sectors, which enhance the productivity of physical capital and land (mainly transportation and power). It will also include human infrastructure- or those services that raise the productivity of labor (health, education, nutrition). This is a broadening of the definition that was given great prominence by Schultz (1963) and Becker (1964) and that has since been widely accepted by both scholars and practitioners.

**Public investment will be defined broadly to include all** government spending **in these sectors, rather than just capital expenditures as traditionally defined in official statistics**. This is to ensure that the economic issues regarding recurrent as well as capital spending are covered, since both have been the focus of the recent iiterature. Moreover, the chapter will emphasize recent policy debates, but will not present in detail the basic theoretical concepts underlying them.