# HSR Updates

# \*\*\*NEG\*\*\*

# Elections DA (Obama Bad)

## 2NC Link—Generic

### The public likes transportation infrastructure investment

Department of the Treasury, 3/23 (The Department of the Treasury with the Council of Economic Advisers, "A New Economic Analysis of Infrastructure Investment" on March 23, 2012 from www.treasury.gov/resource-center/economic-policy/Documents/20120323InfrastructureReport.pdf AK)

After years of underinvestment in our transportation system, Americans’ satisfaction with our public transit system is middling when compared to public satisfaction with highways and public transit systems around the world. We rank 15th out of 32 OECD nations with respect to our satisfaction with our roads and highways. We are tied with four other countries at rank 13 (out of 32 OECD nations) with respect to our satisfaction with public transit. One study found that four out of every five Americans agree with the statement that: “In order for the United States to remain the world’s top economic superpower, we need to modernize our transportation infrastructure and keep it up to date.” Another study found that almost 19 out of 20 Americans are concerned about America’s infrastructure and 84 percent support greater investment to address infrastructure problems.

### The voting public LOVES transportation infrastructure

Department of the Treasury, 3/23 (The Department of the Treasury with the Council of Economic Advisers, "A New Economic Analysis of Infrastructure Investment" on March 23, 2012 from www.treasury.gov/resource-center/economic-policy/Documents/20120323InfrastructureReport.pdf AK)

American workers, families, and businesses are demanding more infrastructure investment. Americans have voted repeatedly for increased investment in transportation infrastructure with over 98 percent of the funds requested for transportation projects approved by the voting public in 2008. A study by the Rockefeller Foundation found that four out of every five Americans agree with the statement that: “In order for the United States to remain the world’s top economic superpower we need to modernize our transportation infrastructure and keep it up to date.” That study also found that the same proportion, 80 percent, agree that federal investment in infrastructure, “will boost local economics and create millions of jobs from construction to manufacturing to engineering.” Another survey found that almost 19 out of 20 Americans are concerned about America’s infrastructure and 84 percent support greater investment to address infrastructure problems. Evidence of this demand for greater transportation infrastructure and increased choice for alternatives forms of transportation is apparent in the sharp increase in transit ridership. Over the last 15 years transit ridership has grown by over 30 percent, reaching levels not seen since the 1950s. This renaissance of transit ridership is in some ways a return to the past (see Figure 4).

# Agenda DA

## 2NC Link—Mica

### Mica hates HSR

House Transportation Committee 11 (The House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, internally quoting John L. Mica, House Transportation Committee Chairman, the US Representative for Florida’s 7th District since 1993, has been a businessman, was a member of the Florida House of Representatives for two terms, text taken from press release titled, “Mica & Shuster Skeptical of New Obama Rail Spending,” published February 8th, 2011. Text found at [http://transportation.house.gov/news/PRArticle.aspx?NewsID=1065] by Hirsh)

Washington, DC – House Transportation Committee Chairman John L. Mica (R-FL) and Railroads Subcommittee Chairman Bill Shuster (R-PA) today expressed extreme reservations regarding the Obama Administration’s plan to spend $53 billion over the next six years on rail infrastructure projects. “This is like giving Bernie Madoff another chance at handling your investment portfolio,” Mica said. “With the first $10.5 billion in Administration rail grants, we found that 1) the Federal Railroad Administration is neither a capable grant agency, nor should it be involved in the selection of projects, 2) what the Administration touted as high-speed rail ended up as embarrassing snail-speed trains to nowhere, and 3) Amtrak hijacked 76 of the 78 projects, most of them costly and some already rejected by state agencies,” Mica added. “Amtrak’s Soviet-style train system is not the way to provide modern and efficient passenger rail service.

### [Insert Mica important]

## 2NC Link—Shuster

### Shuster hates HSR

House Transportation Committee 11 (The House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, internally quoting Bill Shuster, Railroads Subcommittee Chairman, the US Representative for Pennsylvania’s 9th District, B.A. in Political Science and History, text taken from press release titled, “Mica & Shuster Skeptical of New Obama Rail Spending,” published February 8th, 2011. Text found at [http://transportation.house.gov/news/PRArticle.aspx?NewsID=1065] by Hirsh)

“The Committee plans to investigate how previous funding decisions were made. I have no problem with sound investments in alternative transportation projects, but selecting routes behind closed doors runs counter to the Administration’s pledges of transparency. I am concerned that without appropriate controls to ensure the most worthy projects are the ones that receive funding, high-speed rail funding could become another political grab bag for the President.” Shuster continued, “The definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over again expecting a different result and that is exactly what Vice President Biden offered today. If the Obama Administration is serious about high-speed rail, they should stop throwing money at projects in the same failed manner.

“Rail projects that are not economically sound will not ‘win the future.’ It just prolongs the inevitable by subsidizing a failed Amtrak monopoly that has never made a profit or even broken even. Government won’t develop American high-speed rail. Private investment and a competitive market will,” Shuster said.

### [Insert Shuster important]

# PPP Counterplan

## 2NC Solvency—PPPs Solve HSR

### Public private partnerships solve HSR

CTI, 11 (Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, "Oversight Plan for the 112th Congress" on January 26, 2011 from transportation.house.gov/Media/File/112th/112th\_Oversight\_Plan.pdf AK)

A clear omission in the two passenger rail grant programs established under PRIIA is the role of the private sector in providing financing and project management expertise. Under PRIIA, only States and Amtrak are eligible to receive Federal grants to develop high-speed and intercity passenger rail. However, other passenger rail lines around the world are built and operated through public-private partnerships, and this model should be incorporated into the U.S. passenger rail network and development of high-speed rail. PRIIA created a process for DOT to issue a request for proposals for private interests to finance design, construct, operate, and maintain high-speed service in dedicated corridors or the Northeast Corridors. According to the DOT, eight private interest proposals were submitted. The Subcommittee will conduct oversight of these passenger rail programs, and will hold hearings to determine how best to reform and improve these capital grants and loan programs in order to ensure that cost-effective and successful rail projects are selected, funded and implemented. Benefits to the Taxpayer: Effective oversight of the rail infrastructure programs will focus federal funds on projects that make sense, are strongly supported by the States they serve, and generate important benefits such as congestion relief on the highways and in the air and economic development around stations; save taxpayer money by encouraging private sector participation in financing, building and operating high-speed and passenger rail projects; and create jobs through construction of freight and passenger rail projects, operating new rail services, building equipment and rail cars, and improving capacity for more effective freight and passenger transportation on a national basis.

# \*\*\*AFF\*\*\*

# Agenda DA

## 2AC Link Turn—Biz Lobbies

### Business and labor lobbies, Chamber of Congress and Council on Jobs and Competitiveness all like infrastructure spending

Department of the Treasury, 3/23 (The Department of the Treasury with the Council of Economic Advisers, "A New Economic Analysis of Infrastructure Investment" on March 23, 2012 from www.treasury.gov/resource-center/economic-policy/Documents/20120323InfrastructureReport.pdf AK)

The business and labor communities have also expressed a desire for more transportation infrastructure investment. Proposals from the American Public Transport Association (APTA), the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, AFL-CIO, and the President’s Council on Jobs and Competitiveness all call for greater infrastructure investment. APTA advocates for nearly $15 billion of investment for federal public transportation programs, and at least $2.5 billion to be put towards high-speed and intercity rail systems. AASHTO reported in 2009 that between $132 billion and $166 billion of investment is necessary to rebuild and repair America’s highways.The view that more transportation infrastructure is necessary is consistent with other research, including the recently issued bipartisan report by two former Secretaries of Transportation, Norman Mineta and Samuel Skinner. Their report estimated that an additional investment of $134 billion to $194 billion per year is needed to maintain our transportation system, and an even larger sum, from $189 billion to $262 billion, would be needed to improve it. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce has stated that “to have a transportation system that supports a 21st century economy, the United States needs a high level of investment targeted at improving performance across all modes and geographies. There can be no more business as usual.”

# Solvency

## A2 No Ridership

### Ridership has been steadily increasing for a litany of reasons- city connectivity, congestion and cheap tickets

Department of the Treasury, 3/23 (The Department of the Treasury with the Council of Economic Advisers, "A New Economic Analysis of Infrastructure Investment" on March 23, 2012 from [www.treasury.gov/resource-center/economic-policy/Documents/20120323InfrastructureReport.pdf](http://www.treasury.gov/resource-center/economic-policy/Documents/20120323InfrastructureReport.pdf) AK)

During the first half of the 20th century, transit systems were responsible for an astoundingly large number of total trips taken by Americans. Over 17 billion trips were taken annually on mass transit from 1926-1929 (U.S. population averaged approximately 120 million) and despite a sharp decline during the Great Depression, transit trips rose to record levels during the 1940s, peaking at over 23 billion trips in 1946 (U.S. population was 141 million). After the Second World War a series of structural changes took place, including a significant increase in the average wealth of American families, the vast expansion of the American automotive industry, the building of new roads and highways, including the Eisenhower Interstate System, and the removal of street car systems (a form of light rail) in cities throughout the country. Transit ridership fell sharply. However, during the last fifteen years there has been a sharp and sustained increase in transit ridership, with total trips rising from just under 8 billion in 1996 to 10.4 billion in 2011, an increase of over 30 percent. A large driver of this growth has been increased ridership in heavy and light rail, which combined have experienced ridership growth of over 70 percent. There are many factors driving this increase, including the creation and expansion of transit systems in many cities throughout the nation, increasing congestion on roadways, and consumer responses to rising oil prices. While it is difficult to untangle each of these factors, it is clear that Americans today are taking more trips on public transit and demanding more alternative forms of transportation than they have in the past fifty years.