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## HSR Grid Turn - Shell

### The US power grid is stable now

Robert Lamb has a Bachelors from the University of Tennessee, “How the smart grid will work” 2009, http://science.howstuffworks.com/environmental/green-science/smart-grid.htm

It is the largest machine in the world -- an electric behemoth built on a skeleton of early 20th century engineering. The rest is a hodgepodge, a century's worth of innovations grafted onto an outdated framework. Yet, for the longest time, the U.S. power grid has slogged on unchanged and rarely challenged, with a growing population shackled to its hide by every electrical gadget and appliance imaginable. More than 300,000 miles (482,803 kilometers) of sprawling transmission lines twist and weave through the [United States](http://geography.howstuffworks.com/united-states/geography-of-united-states.htm) and, for the most part, the power grid performs its job very well. In fact, the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) gives it a 99.97 percent reliability rating. Yet despite the sheer size of the system, a few outages are enough to bleed Americans of at least $150 billion dollars annually.

### There’s No Power Grid Able to Sustain HSR

Tim Sheehan “High-speed rail would test state's power grid” Sacramento Bee, September 25 2011

But renewable energy still has to be fed to the trains through the power grid. And each summer, utility companies warn residents to conserve electricity to avoid power shortages. Powering the trains "represents an electricity usage even larger than that of the more moderately sized public utilities in the state," according to a 2008 consultant's report to the authority. And the environmental impact reports, which remain open for public comment through Oct. 13, state that "although the authority adopted a goal to power the system with clean, renewable energy, any potential impacts on electrical production [from the high-speed trains] would affect statewide electricity reserves and, to a lesser degree, transmission capacity

### The immediate impact is millions of deaths within days and a collapse of the economy

**Brooks**, English scientist and author, Ph.D. in Quantum Physics, **2009** (Michael, “Space storm alert: 90 seconds from catastrophe,” *New Scientist*, March 23, http://www.newscientist.com/article/mg20127001.300-space-storm-alert-90-seconds-from-catastrophe.html?DCMP=OTC-rss&nsref=online-news)

**With no power for heating, cooling or refrigeration systems, people could begin to die within days**. There is immediate danger for those who rely on medication. **Lose power to New Jersey**, for instance, **and you have lost a major center of production of pharmaceuticals** for the entire US. Perishable medications such as **insulin will** soon **be in short supply. "In the US alone there are a million people with diabetes**," Kappenman says. "Shut down production, distribution and storage and you put all those lives at risk in very short order."

Help is not coming any time soon, either. If it is dark from the eastern seaboard to Chicago, some affected areas are hundreds, maybe thousands of miles away from anyone who might help. And those willing to help are likely to be ill-equipped to deal with the sheer scale of the disaster. "If a Carrington event happened now, it would be like a hurricane Katrina, but 10 times worse," says Paul Kintner, a plasma physicist at Cornell University in Ithaca, New York.

In reality, it would be much worse than that. Hurricane Katrina's societal and economic impact has been measured at $81 billion to $125 billion. According to the NAS report, **the impact of** what it terms **a "severe geomagnetic storm scenario" could be as high as $2 trillion. And that's just the first year after the storm**. The NAS puts the recovery time at four to 10 years. **It is questionable whether the US would ever bounce back**.

"I don't think the NAS report is scaremongering," says Mike Hapgood, who chairs the European Space Agency's space weather team. Green agrees. "Scientists are conservative by nature and this group is really thoughtful," he says. "This is a fair and balanced report."

.

## Uniqueness Ext – Grid stable now

### Current Grids Only Collapse .1% of the time

The Energy Collective, July 5th, 2010**,** “The Smart Grid Improves the Reliability of the Electric Grid” http://theenergycollective.com/christine-hertzog/39187/smart-grid-improves-reliability-electric-grid

My mother is writing a book.  She learned how to use a computer, and has been diligently crafting her story chapter by chapter.  If only the local electric grid would cooperate.  A single power disruption of a few seconds wiped out an entire chapter of her book.  Now she is reworking a previous version and trying to remember all the changes she made as she reconstructs the file.  This is an illustration of one of the great problems that the Smart Grid can solve.  Our current electrical grid is unreliable.  **According to the** [**Galvin Electricity Initiative**](http://galvinpower.org/)**, the existing system is built to “three nines” reliability, which means that it is up and running 99.9 percent of the time.**   However, that .1 percent of the time when the system is not reliably delivering power means wasted time, lost productivity, negative impacts to business bottom lines, and compromises to societal health and safety. **These outages are not a result of cyber attacks** – although such attacks would be equally or more devastating to affected consumers and businesses.  These are a result of aging infrastructure, insufficient intelligent monitoring and control of transmission and distribution equipment, and a reliance on highly centralized generation that leaves end users vulnerable to breaks anywhere along the line.  There are many resolutions to these problems using Smart Grid technologies, but most importantly, distributing power generation facilities at many points within the electrical grid, and creating **microgrids within larger grids will improve overall reliability.**   Distributed energy storage is another Smart Grid technology that promises to improve reliable delivery of electricity.

### United States Energy Grid Stable Now

D.O.E., United States Department of Energy, Office of Electric Transmission and Distribution, July 2003, “’GRID 2030’ A NATIONAL VISION FOR ELECTRICITY’S SECOND 100 YEARS”, <http://www.ferc.gov/eventcalendar/files/20050608125055-grid-2030.pdf>

Workably competitive markets are in place at wholesale levels and customers widely acknowledge the resulting benefits. Effective public oversight and well-designed markets ensure that market power problems are kept to a minimum. Electric transmission and distribution operates under a consistent and stable set of regulations, which rely on performance-based principles and involve Federal and state agencies, multi-state entities, voluntary industry associations, and public interest groups to enforce proper business practices and ensure consumer protection. […] The backbone system consists of a variety of technologies. These include controllable, very-low-impedance superconducting cables and transformers operating within the synchronous AC environment; high voltage direct current devices forming connections between regions; and other types of advanced electricity conductors, as well as information, communications, and controls technologies for supporting real-time operations and national electricity transactions. Superconducting systems reduce line losses, assure stable voltage, and expand current carrying capacities in dense urbanized areas with a minimal physical footprint. They are seamlessly integrated with high voltage direct current systems and other advanced conductors for transporting electric power over long distances.

## Link Ext – Not enough energy for HSR

### HSR can’t make the transition to alternative energy – there isn’t enough energy.

Katy Grimes, April 5 2012. CalWatchdog news reporter and is a longtime political analyst. “New High-Speed Rail Plan Runs Over Prop. 1A Mandates.” < <http://www.capoliticalreview.com/top-stories/new-high-speed-rail-plan-runs-over-prop-1a-mandates/>> //jt

One need not look any further than the utility bills that come in the mail. Pacific Gas &Electric and Southern California Edison will be providing the electricity for high-speed rail, with estimates of additional demands for electricity already coming in at 1 percent to 5 percent of the state’s total energy usage, according to a Capitol staffer who asked to remain anonymous. “Even[Cal ISO](http://www.caiso.com/Pages/default.aspx) doesn’t have any estimates for the cost,” the staffer said. “High-speed rail has got to consume a great deal of power. Where will the power come from?” Surprisingly, the California Independent System Operator has no estimates for energy usage about high-speed rail on its website, as would be expected given the size and scope of the project. But according to a July 2011 energy usage [analysis](http://www.cahighspeedrail.ca.gov/WorkArea/DownloadAsset.aspx?id=10846) prepared for the California High-Speed Rail Program Management Team, total electricity usage for the proposed rail system would be “8.32 million kilowatt-hours (kWh) per day,” and more than 3 billion kWh per year. The average three-person household in California is about 6,000 kWh per year, or a little more than 2,000 KWh per person. [According to the California Public Utilities Commission](http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/PUC/energy/Electric%2BRates/ENGRD/ratesNCharts_elect.htm), electricity customers in the state paid an average rate of about 15.2 cents per kWh. At 15.2 cents per kWh, the total utility bill for high-speed rail would be nearly $1.26 million per day, and more than $460 million per year. And that’s probably a very conservative estimate. Show me the money Along with every imaginable labor union in the state, a report from “Follow the Money” shows that PG&E [spent $20,000 in support](http://www.followthemoney.org/database/StateGlance/contributor_details.phtml?c=3409&t=1&i=36) of Prop. 1A in 2008. Both PG&E and SCE also have given large campaign contributions to Gov. Jerry Brown, who actively campaigned on the high-speed rail issue when he ran for governor in 2010. Brown received [$31,580 from PG&E](http://www.followthemoney.org/database/StateGlance/contributor.phtml?d=604026738) during his gubernatorial campaign, and[$25,000 from SCE](http://www.followthemoney.org/database/StateGlance/contributor_details.phtml?c=116678&d=604027045). While those investments seem relatively small for a $460 million per year payout, how many clients of PG&E and SCE currently use up to 5 percent of the state’s total electricity? And who could forget the other big PG&E connection? Brown recently appointed High-Speed Rail Authority Chairman Dan Richard, a [former senior vice president of public policy and governmental relations at PG&E](http://www.cahighspeedrail.ca.gov/Dan_Richard.aspx). Where will the power come from? With California’s climate-change mantra of “no dirty coal,” “no natural gas,” no hydroelectricity” and “no nuclear power,” many wonder if the high-speed trains will be powered by windmills, solar panels and algae. Remember that California passed the climate change law, [AB 32](http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/ab32/ab32.htm), in 2006, and the [Renewable Portfolio Standards](http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/PUC/energy/Renewables/index.htm) mandate in 2011. Both greatly restrict energy usage, and force energy producers to get 33 percent of their electricity from renewable resources. There isn’t enough wind, sun or algae in the Western Hemisphere to power a 200mph train up and down the state. With the state taking the Klamath hydroelectric dam offline, cutting coal reliance, refusing to reinvest in nuclear power and essentially creating an energy shortage, when California has another inevitable blackout, what will be powered — our homes, or the high-speed train? Hospitals, or the high-speed train? Schools, or the high-speed train? Businesses, or the high-speed train?

## Impact Ext – Blackouts & Meltdowns

### Additionally, blackouts collapse the global financial system

**Marusek**, nuclear physicist and engineer, **2007** (James A., “Solar Storm Threat Analysis,” *Impact*, http://www.breadandbutterscience.com/SSTA.pdf)

**A major electrical blackout can produce a loss of access to funds. Credit card processing, bank transactions, ATM withdrawals**, check validation, payroll disbursement and even cash registers **are dependent on the availability of electrical power. This problem can be compounded by the loss of key satellites that form part of the conduit for transmitting financial data**.

### Additionally, blackouts lead to meltdowns at nuclear reactors

**Earth Issues, 2011** (“Experts: Move to protect nuke plants from solar flare damage,” March 5, http://www.earth-issues.com/2011/03/experts-move-to-protect-nuke-plants-from-solar-flare-damage/)

**Nuclear power plants are not** themselves **self-powered and require a tie-in to the electric power grid to operate**. They are also required to have back-up alternatives, such as diesel generators, and the ability to operate their safety systems off the grid for at least 30 days. “The agency is well aware of a lot of scenarios that can cause what we call a loss of offsite power — in other words, the grid goes down and you don’t have any more electricity coming into the plant,” Burnell said. “Even **if you lose power at the plant, you still have an extended period of time** before you even get to the point that you’re losing enough water from the pool to be concerned.” Popik’s petition says **that extended period is not long enough. Replacing the 350** high-voltage **transformers that could fail** and bring down the grid east of the Mississippi and in the Pacific Northwest, **as envisioned by a recent report by the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, could take two years**. He proposes regulations requiring back-up safety procedures so that spent fuel pools could operate unattended until grid power is restored. The Oak Ridge Lab report, released last October, said, “should a storm of this (Carrington) magnitude strike today, **it could interrupt power to as many as 130 million people in the United states alone, requiring several years to recover**.” Right now, the kind of high-voltage transformers that might fail with a solar pulse aren’t manufactured in the U.S. That will change in April 2013 when a Mitsubishi Electric plant begins operations in Memphis. Its general manager, Kenneth Badaracco, said the plant will turn out “something less than 100″ transformers a year costing between $3 million and $5 million each.

### This causes dozens of meltdowns – there will be 30 Chernobyls in the US alone

**Popular Science, June 30**, 2011 (Damon Tabor, “Are We Prepared for a Catastrophic Solar Storm?,” http://www.popsci.com/science/article/2011-05/are-we-prepared-catastrophic-solar-storm)

One of the biggest disasters we face would begin about 18 hours after the sun spit out a 10-billion-ton ball of plasma--something it has done before and is sure to do again. When the ball, a charged cloud of particles called a coronal mass ejection (CME), struck the Earth, **electrical currents would spike through the power grid. Transformers would be destroyed**. Lights would go out. Food would spoil and--since the entire transportation system would also be shut down--go unrestocked.

**Within weeks, backup generators at nuclear power plants would have run down, and the electric pumps that supply water to cooling ponds**, where radioactive spent fuel rods are stored, **would shut off. Multiple meltdowns would ensue. “Imagine 30 Chernobyls across the U.S.,” says** electrical engineer John **Kappenman, an expert on the grid’s vulnerability** to space weather. A CME big enough to take out a chunk of the grid is what scientists and insurers call a high-consequence, low-frequency event. Many space-weather scientists say the Earth is due for one soon. Although CMEs can strike anytime, they are closely correlated to highs in the 11-year sunspot cycle. The current cycle will peak in July 2013.

## Impact Ext – Blackouts & Meltdowns

### The impact is hundreds of millions of deaths globally – this outweighs nuclear war

**Lendman**, Research Associate of the Center for Research on Globalization, **2011** (Stephen, “Nuclear Meltdown in Japan,” http://www.opednews.com/articles/Nuclear-Meltdown-in-Japan-by-Stephen-Lendman-110313-843.html)

Fukushima Daiichi "nuclear power plant in Okuma, Japan, appears to have caused a reactor meltdown." Stratfor downplayed its seriousness, adding that such an event "does not necessarily mean a nuclear disaster," that already may have happened - the ultimate nightmare short of nuclear winter. According to Stratfor, "(A)s long as the reactor core, which is specifically designed to contain high levels of heat, pressure and radiation, remains intact, the melted fuel can be dealt with. If the (core's) breached but the containment facility built around (it) remains intact, the melted fuel can be....entombed within specialized concrete" as at **Chernobyl** in 1986. In fact, that disaster **killed nearly one million people worldwide from nuclear radiation exposure**. In their book titled, "Chernobyl: Consequences of the Catastrophe for People and the Environment," Alexey Yablokov, Vassily Nesterenko and Alexey Nesterenko said: "For the past 23 years, it has been clear that **there is a danger greater than nuclear weapons concealed within nuclear power. Emissions from** this **one reactor exceeded a hundred-fold the radioactive contamination of the bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki**." "No citizen of any country can be assured that he or she can be protected from radioactive contamination. **One nuclear reactor can pollute half the globe**. Chernobyl fallout covers the entire Northern Hemisphere." Stratfor explained that **if Fukushima's floor cracked**, "it is highly likely that **the melting fuel will burn through (its) containment system and enter the ground**. This has never happened before," at least not reported. If now occurring, "**containment goes from** being **merely dangerous**, time consuming and expensive **to nearly impossible," making** the quake, aftershocks, and **tsunamis seem mild by comparison**. Potentially, **millions** of lives **will be jeopardized**.

### All of these impacts are compounded globally – means the end of civilization

**Marusek**, nuclear physicist and engineer, **2007** (James A., “Solar Storm Threat Analysis,” *Impact*, http://www.breadandbutterscience.com/SSTA.pdf)

There is a singular aspect present in the very largest solar storms that has the potential for creating a global disaster, **potentially knocking civilization to its knees**. The very largest solar storms have the potential for simultaneously destroying key elements of the electrical power grid infrastructure. These elements are unique, expensive and have long lead times (greater than 1 year) for replacement. The Great Solar Storm of September 1859, if it were to reoccur today, has the potential of simultaneously damaging our electrical infrastructure in the East and West Coast of the United States and the power grids along the northern tier of States. This could produce an unexpected long duration electrical power blackout affecting approximately 50% of the U.S. population. This type of massive storm would also affect high latitude and mid-latitude countries in both the northern and southern hemisphere, such as Europe, Central Asia, Russia, Canada, China, New Zealand, and South America (Southern Argentina & Chile). **As the crisis evolves, partial restoration will likely occur and hard blackouts will transition to rolling blackouts and brownouts**. This is the primary nature of the global threat. Herein lies the danger! Our society is technology driven and technology dependent. **Without electrical power, the modern world will come crashing down**.

## **Politics links – Plan is controversial**

Plan costs capital

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 – February 6th, 2012 – http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2012/02/06/time-to-fight/)

With a House like this, what advances can American transportation policy make? Actions by members of the U.S. House over the past week suggest that Republican opposition to the funding of alternative transportation has developed into an all-out ideological battle. Though their efforts are unlikely to advance much past the doors of their chamber, the policy recklessness they have displayed speaks truly poorly of the future of the nation’s mobility systems. By Friday last week, the following measures were brought to the attention of the GOP-led body: The Ways and Means Committee acted to eliminate the Mass Transit Account of the Highway Trust Fund, destroying public transportation’s source of steady federal financing for capital projects, first established in the 1980s. The members of the committee determined that to remedy the fact that gas taxes have not been increased since 1993,\* the most appropriate course was not to raise the tax (as would make sense considering inflation, more efficient vehicles, and the negative environmental and congestion-related effects of gas consumption) but rather to transfer all of its revenues to the construction of highways. Public transit, on the other hand, would have to fight for an appropriation from the general fund, losing its traditional guarantee of funding and forcing any spending on it to be offset by reductions in other government programs.\*\* This as the GOP has made evident its intention to reduce funding for that same general fund through a continued push for income tax reductions, even for the highest earners. The House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee approved a transportation reauthorization bill on partisan lines (with the exception of one Republican who voted against it, Tom Petri of Wisconsin) that would do nothing to increase funding for transportation infrastructure in the United States over the next five years despite the fact that there is considerable demand for a large improvement in the nation’s road, rail, and transit networks just to keep them in a state of good repair, let alone expand them to meet the needs of a growing population. The committee voted to eliminate all federal requirements that states and localities spend 10% of their highway funding on alternative transportation projects (CMAQ), such as Safe Routes to School, sidewalks, or cycling infrastructure, despite the fact the those mandated investments are often the only ones of their sort that are actually made by many states. The committee eliminated the Obama Administration’s trademark TIGER program, which has funded dozens of medium-scale projects throughout the country with a innovative merit-based approach. Instead, virtually all decisions on project funding would be made by state DOTs, which not unjustly have acquired a reputation as only interested in highways. Meanwhile, members couldn’t resist suggesting that only “true” high-speed rail projects (over 150 mph top speed) be financed by the government — even as they conveniently defunded the only such scheme in the country, the California High-Speed Rail program. The same committee added provisions to federal law that would provide special incentives for privatization of new transportation projects — despite the fact that there is no overwhelming evidence that such mechanisms save the public any money at all. And under the committee’s legislation, the government would provide extra money to localities that contract out their transit services to private operators, simply as a reward for being profit-motivated. Meanwhile, House leadership recommended funding any gaps in highway spending not covered by the Trust Fund through a massive expansion in domestic energy production that would destroy thousands of acres of pristine wilderness, do little for decreasing the American reliance on foreign oil, and reaffirm the nation’s addiction to carbon-heavy energy sources and ecological devastation. New energy production of this sort is highly speculative in nature and would produce very few revenues in the first years of implementation. As a special treat, the same leadership proposed overruling President Obama’s decision to cancel the Keystone XL pipeline by bundling an approval for it into the transportation bill. This litany of disastrous policies were endorsed by the large majority of Republicans on each committee, with the exception of two GOP members in House Ways and Means\*\*\* and one in the Transportation Committee who voted against the bill, though the vote was entirely along party lines for an amendment attempting to reverse course on the elimination of the Mass Transit Account. Fortunately, these ideas are unlikely to make it into the code thanks to the Senate, whose members, both Democratic and Republican, have different ideas about what makes an acceptable transportation bill. I’ll get back to that in a bit. The House’s effort to move forward on a new multiyear federal transportation bill — eagerly awaited by policy wonks for three years — follows intense and repeated Republican obstructions of the Obama Administration’s most pioneering efforts to alter the nation’s transportation policy in favor of investments that improve daily life for inhabitants of American metropolitan areas. As part of that process, federally funded high-speed rail, streetcar, and transit center projects have been shot down by local politicians as a waste of money, even as road construction has continued apace. The Tea Party’s zany obsession with the supposed U.N. plot to take over American land use decisions through Agenda 21 seems to have infected GOP House members and even presidential contenders. Michele Bachmann’s claim in 2008 that Democrats are attempting to force people onto light rail lines to travel between their housing “tenements” and government jobs may have made it into the mind of Newt Gingrich, who recently made the claim that the “elite” in New York City who ride the subway and live in high-rise condos don’t understand “normal” Americans. What kind of language is this? In the Senate, there is clear evidence that the hard-core proposals of the House will not become law. The upper body’s Environment and Public Works Committee unanimously endorsed a different type of transportation reauthorization, one that would last only two years but that would reform and simplify the grants provided by the Department of Transportation so that they are more based on merit in such matters as ecological sensitivity and the creation of livable communities. Similarly, in the Senate Banking Committee, the transit portion of the proposed bill (approved unanimously) would maintain funding guarantees and allow transit agencies to use federal dollars for operations spending during periods of high unemployment, which would be an excellent policy if pushed into law. How the Senate will be able to compromise with the House in time for the

## **Politics links – Plan is controversial**

March 31st deadline set by the current legislation is up in the air. The strange and laudable part of the Senate side of the story — at least as compared to the House — is the bipartisan nature of decision-making there. Why are Republicans in the Senate promoting a transportation bill that explicitly would promote multimodalism as a goal, in a contrast to the highway focus of their peers in the House? Why are they accepting environmental criteria as appropriate measures of quality in transportation policy? Perhaps the Democratic Party’s control of the Senate makes fighting such ideas a waste of time. Or perhaps longer Senate terms in office allow clearer, more reasonable thinking. Whatever the reason, in the long-term, it is hard to envision reversing the continued growth of the GOP’s strident opposition to sustainable transportation investments in the House. As I have documented, density of population correlates strongly and positively with the Democratic Party vote share in Congressional elections; the result has been that the House Republicans have few electoral reasons to articulate policies that benefit cities. Those who believe in the importance of a sane transportation policy need to make more of an effort to advance a sane transportation politics to residents of suburban and rural areas, who also benefit from efforts to improve environmental quality, mobility alternatives, and congestion relief, but perhaps are not yet convinced of that fact. Doing so would encourage politicians hoping for votes outside of the city core — Democratic or Republican — to promote alternatives to the all-highways meme that currently rules the GOP in the House.

### **HSR Costs Political Capital**

Yonah Freemark is an urbanist and journalist who has worked in architecture, planning, and transportation, Founder and writer of The Transport Politic, Master of Science in Transportation (MST); Department of Urban Studies and Planning, Master of City Planning (MCP) Bachelor of Arts in Architecture, with Distinction. “The White House Stakes Its Political Capital on a Massive Intercity Rail Plan.” 2/8/11. http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2011/02/08/the-white-house-stakes-its-political-capital-on-a-massive-intercity-rail-plan/

Vice President Joe Biden [spoke in Philadelphia this morning](http://www.whitehouse.gov/photos-and-video/video/2011/02/08/building-21st-century-infrastructure) to announce that the Obama Administration intends to request from Congress $8 billion in federal funds for the advancement of a national high-speed rail system as part of a six-year transportation reauthorization bill. The White House’s commitment to fast trains has been evident throughout the Administration’s two-year lifespan, beginning with the addition of $8 billion for the mode in the 2009 stimulus bill and continued with $2.5 billion included in the Fiscal Year 2010 budget. Yet this new funding, which would add up to $53 billion over the six-year period, is remarkable for its ambition. It is clear that President Obama’s 2012 re-election campaign, already being framed in terms of “winning the future,” will hinge partially on whether voters agree with his assessment of the importance of investing in the nation’s rail transport infrastructure. In his speech, Mr. Biden argued that American wealth was founded on “*out-building*” the competition. Infrastructure, he noted, is the “*veins and the arteries of commerce*.” The President and his team will be making this case to the American people the next two years, hoping that the public comes to endorse this message of national advancement through construction. Whether [the proposal](http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2011/02/08/vice-president-biden-announces-six-year-plan-build-national-high-speed-r) — to be laid out in more detail with next week’s introduction the President’s full proposed FY 2012 budget — has any chance of success is undoubtedly worth questioning. Republicans have campaigned wholeheartedly against rail improvement projects in Iowa, Ohio, and Wisconsin; even Florida’s project, which would require no operating subsidies once in service, [hangs in the balance](http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2011/01/07/a-fiscally-conservative-approach-is-the-right-one-for-florida-high-speed-rail/). But as part of the larger transportation reauthorization legislation, which is apparently slated to move forward by this summer, a real expansion in high-speed rail funding seems possible, especially if Mr. Obama pressures the Democratic-controlled Senate to push hard for it. Of course, as has become typical whenever anyone has announced new transportation investments, it is not yet clear what specific revenue sources would fund high-speed rail. The $53 billion down-payment on intercity rail would be the first step in the White House’s goal to connect 80% of the country’s population to the mode in 25 years. Funding would be allocated through two accounts: One would essentially be a New Starts capital expansion fund that would construct new lines and stations; the other would renew the existing system to bring it within a state of good repair. Importantly, the latter fund would also “*provide temporary operating support to crucial state corridors while the full system is being built and developed*.” This implies that the Obama Administration believes that states will continue to be skeptical of funding train operations — so the federal government must step in until self-financing high-speed lines can pay for themselves. The plan does not specify which corridors would receive funds if the money were awarded. This implies that spending would be distributed in the same manner that have been the U.S. DOT’s grants over the past year: Through merit-based awards ultimately allocated by the Secretary of Transportation. Big projects — such as California’s High-Speed Rail line and [Amtrak’s just-announced Gateway Tunnel](http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2011/02/07/arc-revived-as-the-amtrak-gateway-project/) between New Jersey and Manhattan — would undoubtedly move forward, but Mr. Biden sketched out a vision of a high-speed network that is “*modern, efficient, environmentally friendly, and truly national*.” This suggests that the Administration will seek to invest in rail infrastructure across the country, not just in the densest areas. This stance is likely to attract some Republican support, especially from people representing rural districts that rely on even once-daily trains: It is worth remembering that despite being put on the chopping block year after year by the Bush Administration, Amtrak managed to hang on to its federal support even when Republicans controlled both the House and Senate between 2002 and 2007. Nonetheless, the Republicans at the helm of the House’s Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and its Subcommittee on Railroads, John Mica (R-FL) and Bill Shuster (R-PA), respectively, [immediately denounced the plan](http://republicans.transportation.house.gov/News/PRArticle.aspx?NewsID=1065), suggesting that the Administration was supporting “snail-speed trains to nowhere.” It is not clear to me whether most Republican Party House members will feel this way about needed infrastructure investments in their districts, however, especially if they are combined with the highway funding also to be included in the six-year reauthorization bill.

## **Politics links – Plan is controversial**

### HSR unpopular – budget constraints

Brian Koenig, (Staff writer) June 07, 2012, The New American, “California Voters Turn on High-Speed Rail Project,” http://www.thenewamerican.com/usnews/politics/item/11646-california-voters-turn-on-high-speed-rail-project

After enduring a series of financial and logistical hiccups, California’s landmark high-speed rail project has become increasingly unpopular among voters, as the project’s enormous price tag continues to inflate and as the state’s budgetary woes grow more severe.

### HSR is NOT Bipartisan

Michael Doyle covers the U.S. Supreme Court for McClatchy, He's a graduate of Oberlin College, and earned a master of studies in law from Yale Law School, where he was a Knight Journalism Fellow. He also earned a masters in government from The Johns Hopkins University. “Partisan split widens on California high-speed rail plan” 3/17/11 http://www.mcclatchydc.com/2011/03/17/110623/partisan-split-widens-on-california.html

Still, other Republicans have been jumping off-board the expensive public works project now closely identified as an Obama administration priority. Republicans unanimously opposed the $787 billion economic stimulus bill passed in 2009, which has funded most of the federal rail grants. Republicans now control the House, empowering positions that include a recent bid to slash Obama's high-speed rail funding. Even Republicans who previously have been sympathetic, including House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Chairman John Mica of Florida, must be attuned to concerns of tea party conservatives. "It makes it more difficult, certainly," said Costa, who is again serving as the high-speed rail caucus co-chair this year. Some Sacramento-area lawmakers have joined, including Rep. John Garamendi, D-Elk Grove. But one freshman San Joaquin Valley lawmaker approached about joining the caucus, Rep. Jeff Denham, R-Atwater, turned down the invitation. Others have modified their overall position on the project, or suggested it's the Democrats who've turned high-speed rail into high-impact politics. Last year, for instance, Rep. Devin Nunes, R-Visalia, denounced the Obama administration for using rail funding to "provide last-minute re-election assistance to struggling Democrats" including Costa. The administration announced the funding, including nearly $1 billion for California, eight days before the election. In a 2007 letter, Nunes and Rep. Kevin McCarthy, R-Bakersfield, joined other House members in voicing support for California's high-speed rail program. Now, McCarthy and Nunes are among the most vocal skeptics. The two GOP colleagues back long-shot legislation that would steer California's share of federal high-speed rail funding into highway improvements along State Route 99. Both question the cost and viability of the rail plan's initial route, a 123-mile line connecting Bakersfield to rural Madera County. "In today's world, is that the best place to put the money? The answer is no," McCarthy told reporters recently. "I don't think it's a smart investment." The Republican distancing from high-speed rail isn't just happening in California, as three GOP governors have rejected the Obama administration's offer of federal rail funds. Other states and regions, including the Pacific Northwest, the Midwest, the Northeast and California, have until April 4 to compete for a share of the $2.4 billion rejected by Florida.

### HSR costs Obama massive amounts of Political Capital.

Val Zavala, Roger Rudick, Luke Mines, Robert O'Geen, February 10, 2012, KCET, “Split Rail: Calif. Bullet Train Still Proves Divisive,” http://www.kcet.org/shows/socal\_connected/content/transportation/split-rail.html

Zavala: But the prospects for high-speed rail have dimmed in recent months. At a recent rail authority meeting, CEO Roelof van Ark announced he will resign. Tom Umberg also announced that he was stepping down as chairman, though he will remain on the board. Thomas Umberg / Calif. High-Speed Rail Authority: This project is bigger than any one person. It's going to be a project that's going to require courage, vision and leadership over the course of at least the next two decades. So there's giong to be a number of different chairs and there's going to be a number of different CEO's. Zavala: Gov. Jerry Brown and President Obama have expended a lot of political capital on high-speed rail in California. Gov. Jerry Brown [stock footage]: President Obama strongly supports the project and has provided the majority of the funds for the first phase. It is now your decision to evaluate the plan and decide what action to take. Without hesitation, I urge your approval.

## **Politics links – Plan is controversial**

### Obama has already spent too much capital on HSR-anymore would tank his agenda.

Jonathan Nettler, (member of the American Institute of Certified Planners (AICP) and serves on the Board of Directors for the Los Angeles section of the American Planning Association (APA) as the Vice Director for Professional Development), January 19, 2012, Planetizen, “Whatever Happened to Obama's Urban Agenda?,” http://www.planetizen.com/node/53896

He cites the failure to pass a new transportation bill as Obama's major failing. “That’s a lack of leadership coming out of White House,” [Christopher] Leinberger, [President of Locus] says. “President Obama spent too much political capital on high-speed rail instead of looking at light rail, street cars, and the entire range of transportation alternatives.”

### HSR would tank Political Capital- California and polarizing politics prove.

The Economist, June 5, 2012, Bussiness Insider, “California's Failing Project Could Spell The End Of High-Speed Rail For The Whole Country,” http://www.businessinsider.com/economist.online.21556467.xml#ixzz1zaDiodcB

All this makes sense. Mr Obama made high-speed-rail funding a big part of his 2008 stimulus package, and political scientists generally believe that a president weighing in on an issue polarizes people's opinions about it. In California, 76% of Republicans now oppose the high-speed-rail project, compared to just 47% of Democrats. The other problem, of course, is that powerful local and regional interests are threatened by the high-speed-rail plans. Airlines, freight transporters and not-in-my-backyard activists all have problems with the project. High-speed rail's opponents smell blood and are not going to fall in line, and the train plan is many years from completion. Unless California's leaders are truly committed to pushing high-speed rail forward and spending political capital to do so this plan is probably doomed. And when it comes to high-speed rail, as goes California, so goes the nation.

### HSR would tank Political Capital- Opposition and costs.

EITH KOFFLER, (veteran reporter), Feb. 15, 2012, White House Dossier, “Obama Spends $47B on Fast Train to Nowhere,” http://www.whitehousedossier.com/2012/02/15/obama-spends-47b-fast-train/

Spiraling cost estimates and eroding political and public support now threaten a project crucial to a 21st-century vision of train travel that President Obama promised would transform U.S. transportation much as interstate highways did more than a half-century ago. The estimated cost of the rail network has tripled from earlier estimates, to nearly $100 billion. Planners are at a loss to say where they will get the bulk of the money needed to complete it. And the completion date for the 800-mile system has been pushed back from 2020 to 2033. Obama set a goal of providing 80 percent of Americans access to high-speed rail within 25 years. But that lofty vision is yielding to the political gravity generated by high costs, determined opponents and a public that has grown dubious of government’s ability to do big things.

## HSR solves oil dependence

### High Speed Rail solves oil dependence

US High Speed Rail Association “A national high speed rail system ends our oil dependency quickly & permanently” 2012 http://www.ushsr.com/benefits/energysecurity.html

Building an electrically-powered national high speed rail network across America is the single most powerful thing we can do to get the nation off oil and into a secure, sustainable form of mobility. A national network of high speed trains can be powered by a combination of renewable energy sources including wind, solar, geothermal, and ocean/tidal energy. America's dependency on oil is the most severe in the world, and inevitably pulls us into costly resource wars. It also pushes us into exploring for oil in extreme locations such as 10,000 feet deep below the Gulf of Mexico. We use 25% of the entire world's oil supply, yet we only have 5% of the world's population. We use 8-10 times more oil per person per day than Europeans, and they have faster, easier and better mobility than we do. The extremely high daily oil consumption of Americans is not due to a higher standard of living, but because of the extremely inefficient nature of our national transportation system – based on individual vehicles powered by internal combustion engines, combined with our sprawling community designs that force people into cars for every trip. As the world oil supply begins to peak and then irreversibly declines, prices will rise faster, and the situation will get far worse for America if we don't quickly reduce our national oil dependency. This dependency cuts across our entire society and affects our daily survival. Oil provides 95% of the energy to grow, process and deliver food to the nation. Our entire national transportation system is powered mostly by oil. Numerous daily products we use are made from oil. We use 20 million barrels of oil every day - just in America - 70% of it for transportation. Of the 20 million barrels we consume, we import 2/3 of this oil (13 million barrels per day) from foreign sources, many in unstable places. No combination of drilling off our coasts, hydrogen fuel cells, natural gas, biofuels, and used french fry oil will solve this and carry 300 million Americans into the future. None of these fuels can be scaled up to anywhere near the amount of liquid fuel we use daily in any practical, economical, or sustainable way.

## States CP solvency

### States solve best. They can coordinate and, once in charge, would improve HSR efficiency.

Chicago Tribune ‘1

(“Let states drive high-speed train,” Dec 24, http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2001-12-24/news/0112240192\_1\_high-speed-rail-investment-high-speed-train-high-speed-rail)

Amtrak--the money-losing operation that poses as a national passenger railroad in the U.S.--is taking the lead in the development of a high-speed train network in the Midwest, comparable to the European trains that zoom by at more than 150 m.p.h. High-speed rail service in the Midwest is an interesting prospect--the market, as well as environmental, energy conservation and other concerns, may justify it. But putting Amtrak in charge and expecting the feds to pay for most of it certainly is a recipe for waste and bad planning. For the Midwest, at least, a frequent, comfortable and reliable high-speed rail system would be a new concept. It ought to be designed and operated as such, according to market demand, with a rigorous bottom-line approach. In other words, everything Amtrak is not. According to plans being circulated in Congress and promoted by several local groups, Chicago would be the hub of a series of high-speed rail lines zipping out to Minneapolis-St. Paul, Detroit, Cincinnati, St. Louis, Cleveland and other major urban areas, with stops at some smaller cities like Springfield, Ill., and Madison, Wis. New trains would run on upgraded freight tracks at estimated speeds of 110 m.p.h. The initial phase would be funded by approximately $4 billion, the Midwest's share of the $12 billion High Speed Rail Investment initiative, under consideration by Congress. Individual states have pledged smaller amounts to the effort, including Illinois' $50 million. A reverse logic animates this project: Instead of determining there is urgent demand--and then seeking funding--Midwestern supporters seem to be saying, "The pot of money is there, so we might as well get our share." That's not the way to build a new railroad, but to extend Amtrak domain which, torn by the incompatible demands of politics, public service and profitability, has evolved into anything but an efficient train system. States ought to take the lead in the high-speed rail effort, and contribute a substantial amount of the money. Perhaps the federal government could pay for the start-up infrastructure improvements, as it did to build the original interstate highway system in the 1950s. Then an independent multi-state agency could purchase the trains and turn over operations to a private concern. Such high stakes and strong participation by the states would lead to a far tougher analysis of what service is needed than the pinata-style planning at play here. Built modestly and incrementally, high-speed rail could work and even make money, at which time full privatization would be the next step. A Chicago-to-St. Louis line, running on relatively underutilized freight tracks through Normal and Springfield, could be a key test. Run efficiently, it could compete favorably with airlines on speed of downtown-to-downtown service, and certainly on roominess and comfort. Regional high-speed service has caught on in California and in the Northwest, and it may well do so here. Although Amtrak's math is complicated, the agency projects that, when fully operational, its high-speed Acela line on the Northeast will make about $180 million in annual profit Are there enough commuters and are they willing to give up their cars or airline seats in favor of high-speed trains? If it's their own money on the line, state officials, planners--and taxpayers--would make sure the project makes sense before any money is invested. High-speed train service in the Midwest is a prospect worth investigating, on the right terms.

## States CP solvency

### Multi-State compacts specifically solve for HSR.

OPA ‘3

(Office of Public Affairs – US Department of Transportation – FACT SHEET , The Passenger Rail Investment Reform Act of 2003 – http://www.dot.gov/affairs/Passenger%20Rail%20Fact%20Sheet.htm)

\* The Administration believes that states, not Amtrak, are best equipped to decide where rail service is important. States should be empowered to choose the rail service provider of their choice, whether it's Amtrak, a private company or a public transit agency. Following a transition, the Administration's proposal would allow states to submit proposals for passenger rail capital investment to the U.S. Department of Transportation, as they have successfully done for highway and transit capital investments. \* Amtrak would transition into three companies: \* A private passenger rail company that would operate trains under contract to states and multi-state compacts - just as the current Amtrak operates trains under contract to commuter rail agencies; \* A private rail infrastructure company that would maintain and operate the infrastructure on the Northeast Corridor under contract to a multi-state Northeast Corridor Compact. Title to Amtrak's current tracks, stations and other infrastructure on the Northeast Corridor will be held by the federal government and leased to the Northeast Corridor Compact; and \* The National Passenger Rail Corporation, which would continue as a government corporation that would retain Amtrak's current right to use the tracks of the freight railroads, and the Amtrak corporate name. Both the track-access rights and the Amtrak brand would be provided under contract to states and multi-state compacts for qualifying passenger rail service they sponsor. \* Separating train operations and infrastructure ownership is not a new concept. Train operations and infrastructure ownership have for decades been split in the United States. Amtrak operates trains over more than 22,000 miles of track in the United States, but owns only 730 miles of track (mostly on the Northeast Corridor between Washington, D.C. and Boston, and in Michigan). All other tracks are owned either by freight railroads or by the states. \* Multi-state compacts are not new. Multi-state coalitions are already operating intercity rail services, and some are planning for future high-speed rail operations. The Administration believes these cooperative partnerships between the states, the federal government and freight railroads, will improve the efficiency of intercity passenger rail service as a viable alternative to air and highway travel in some corridors.

These Multi-State compacts already exist and can create dedicated funding pools.

Puentes ‘10

(Robert Puentes is a senior fellow with the Brookings Institution’s Metropolitan Policy Program where he also directs the Program's Metropolitan Infrastructure Initiative. “Intermetropolitan Passenger Rail: Considerations for State Legislatures” – April 9th – http://www.brookings.edu/research/speeches/2010/04/09-rail-transportation-puentes)

The next point is that if a particular corridor extends beyond individual state borders, close coordination—both formal and informal—with your neighbors is essential. More than just backroom deals, these are lengthy relationships that bear real fruit in the form of finalized plans, environmental reviews, and dedicated shared funding agreements. This appeared to have been a significant advantage for those who received ARRA funding and a hindrance for those who did not as, by design, several of the award-winning corridors involved multi-state compacts. For example, the eight-state Midwest Regional Rail Initiative was established as far back as the mid-1990s. In consultation with the federal government, the states worked to develop a rail plan that was released in 1998 and updated in 2004. Last summer, the eight governors, along with the mayor of Chicago, signed a Memorandum of Understanding in anticipation of joint applications for ARRA funding that laid out plans for collective high-speed rail priorities and planning. Partly as a result, the projects in and around the Chicago hub received nearly as much funding ($2.16 billion) as did California ($2.34 billion.) Similarly, the Virginia-North Carolina Interstate High-Speed Rail Commission, created in 2001, agreed to recommend to its respective parent legislatures the enactment of an interstate rail compact. Both state legislatures passed laws establishing the Compact in 2004. The North Carolina—Virginia corridor received a total of $620 million spread among three investments.

## States CP solvency

### States and Compacts solve best for HSR

Utah Foundation ‘10

The Utah Foundation is a private, non-profit public service agency established to study state and local government –“High-Speed Rail Around the World: A Survey and Comparison of Existing Systems” – Report Number 694, August 2010 – http://utahfoundation.org/img/pdfs/rr694.pdf

Ad hoc arrangements of states working together to build, fund and govern inter-state HSR are a possibility, assuming the states have the collective capital necessary to secure financing and the collective will to create inter-state compacts that regulate HSR and create governance structures that serve the interests of all those involved. If state transit authorities were able to get the funding necessary, they could effectively act as the national railway companies do in the cases of Eurostar and Thalys, with stakes in the ownership and governance of the system. Arrangements like this would also not preclude the ability to receive any federal funds that are directed towards HSR. In deed, among those HSR projects that have secured funding in the U.S., a few are such inter-state arrangements. In this way, coalitions of states could overcome some of the limitations of having a less-centralized national government compared to other HSR countries.

### States can coordinate to develop national high speed rail

E.N.S. 9

(Environmental News Service, “Midwest Governors Coordinate to Seek High Speed Rail Funding,” July 27, http://www.ens-newswire.com/ens/jul2009/2009-07-27-095.html)

At the Midwest High Speed Rail Summit today in Chicago, an agreement was struck between eight states to work cooperatively to achieve Recovery Act funding to develop the Chicago Hub High Speed Rail Corridor - also called the Midwest corridor. Midwest governors and rail executives were hosted by Illinois Governor Pat Quinn, U.S. Senator Dick Durbin of Illinois and Chicago Mayor Richard Daley. "We are stronger working as a region than we are individually, and I want to thank the other Midwest governors for their cooperation and commitment," said Governor Quinn. "We are determined to take full advantage of federal recovery funds and bring high speed rail to Illinois and the Midwest. Today's agreement will help make our vision a reality." The governors envision a nationwide network including a Chicago hub that would connect trains traveling up to 110 miles per hour serving cities across the region, along with connections to adjoining regional corridors. This plan reflects the proposals advanced earlier this year by President Barack Obama and U.S. Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood. Under the Recovery Act, President Obama has made $8 billion available nationwide for high speed passenger rail, the largest investment that the federal government has made in over a decade. Five governors attended the summit - Iowa Governor Chet Culver; Wisconsin Governor Jim Doyle; Michigan Governor Jennifer Granholm and Ohio Governor Ted Strickland, as well as Illinois Governor Quinn. Eight Midwest states signed the Memorandum of Understanding including Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Ohio and Wisconsin. The agreement signed today establishes a Midwest steering group to provide a single voice in support of the region's collective high speed rail priorities. The steering group will coordinate each state's individual applications and advocacy to the Federal Railroad Administration for Recovery Act funding.

## States CP solvency

### No logical solvency deficit – states have to do the construction anyway and states say no to the plan

Cooper ‘10

(Michael, writer for the New York Times, “Rail Service Expansion Imperiled at State Level,” Oct 4, http://www.nytimes.com/2010/10/05/us/05rail.html)

Republicans running for governor in a handful of states could block, or significantly delay, one of President Obama’s signature initiatives: his plan to expand the passenger rail system and to develop the nation’s first bullet-train service. Enlarge This Image In his State of the Union address this year, the president called for building high-speed rail, and backed up his words with $8 billion in stimulus money, distributed to various states, for rail projects. But Republican candidates for governor in some of the states that won the biggest stimulus rail awards are reaching for the emergency brake. In Wisconsin, which got more than $810 million in federal stimulus money to build a train line between Milwaukee and Madison, Scott Walker, the Milwaukee County executive and Republican candidate for governor, has made his opposition to the project central to his campaign. Mr. Walker, who worries that the state could be required to spend $7 million to $10 million a year to operate the trains once the line is built, started a Web site, NoTrain.com, and has run a television advertisement in which he calls the rail project a boondoggle. “I’m Scott Walker,” he says in the advertisement, “and if I’m elected as your next governor, we’ll stop this train.” Similar concerns are threatening to stall many of the nation’s biggest train projects. In Ohio, the Republican candidate for governor, John Kasich, is vowing to kill a $400 million federal stimulus project to link Cleveland, Columbus and Cincinnati by rail. In Florida, Rick Scott, the Republican candidate for governor, has questioned whether the state should invest in the planned rail line from Orlando to Tampa. The state got $1.25 billion in federal stimulus money for the project, but it will cost at least twice that much to complete. And the nation’s most ambitious high-speed rail project, California’s $45 billion plan to link Los Angeles and San Francisco with trains that would go up to 220 miles per hour, could be delayed if Meg Whitman, a Republican, is elected governor. “In the face of the state’s current fiscal crisis, Meg doesn’t believe we can afford the costs associated with new high-speed rail at this time,” said Tucker Bounds, a campaign spokesman. Ms. Whitman’s desire to delay the project, which has already received $2.25 billion in stimulus money, drew a rebuke from the administration of Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger, a Republican who champions high-speed rail. “To say ‘now is not the time’ shows a very narrow vision,” said Matt David, the governor’s communications director. The state-level opposition is a reminder of the challenge of building a national transportation project in the United States: while the federal government can set priorities, the construction is up to the states. With recent polls showing all of the anti-rail Republican candidates leading or within striking distance of their pro-rail Democratic rivals, it is possible they could be elected and try to stop the train projects. Federal officials, meanwhile, are incredulous that candidates are threatening to spurn stimulus money that their states competed ferociously to win just a year ago. “The bottom line is that high-speed rail is a national program that will connect the country, spur economic development and bring manufacturing jobs to the U.S.,” Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood, a former Republican congressman, said in a statement. “It will also transform transportation in America, much like the Interstate highway system did under President Eisenhower. It’s hard to imagine what would have happened to states like Ohio and Wisconsin if their leaders had decided they didn’t want to be connected to the rest of the country back then.” Several candidates said they wanted to spend the stimulus rail money on roads and bridges, but it is unlikely they would be able to do so without changing the law: the stimulus, which included $28 billion for roads and bridges, required that the $8 billion for rail projects be spent on rail projects. Federal officials declined to speculate on what would happen if anti-rail candidates were to win. But states that turn down rail money would probably have to return it to the federal government, which could then award it to states that want it. Building a real high-speed rail network, like the ones expanding in Europe and Asia, is costly.

### Federal actions fails – State remedies solve better

A.G.C. ‘11

(“THE CASE FOR INFRASTRUCTURE & REFORM: Why and How the Federal Government Should Continue to Fund Vital Infrastructure in the New Age of Public Austerity” – THE ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA – AGC’s Case for Infrastructure & Reform in based in large part on comments from leaders, including those who participated in a March 2, 2011 panel discussion hosted by the association and The Weekly Standard, including Reason Foundation’s Robert Poole, Virginia Secretary of Transportation Sean Connaughton, Oklahoma Congressman James Lankford and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce’s Bruce Josten. May 19th – http://www.agc.org/galleries/news/Case-for-Infrastructure-Reform.pdf)

Give State and Local Officials More Flexibility Federal infrastructure programs have become overly prescriptive and insistent on one-size fits-all solutions. This limits the ability of state and local officials to create projects that meet federal needs while accommodating often unique situations. Aside from setting minimum safety standards and ensuring high levels of design and construction quality, federal infrastructure programs should eliminate the high cost of accepting federal funds by eliminating uniform requirements, including Buy America provisions, and the tremendous amount of paperwork that comes with those requirements.

## States CP solvency

States will find funding for HSR

Puentes ‘9

(et al, Robert Puentes – Senior Fellow @ Brooking’s Metropolitan Policy Program – Innovative State Transportation:

Funding and Financing Policy Options for States – – January 05, 2009 – http://www.nga.org/files/live/sites/NGA/files/pdf/0901TRANSPORTATIONFUNDING.PDF)

Each state is facing the challenges of rising demand and inadequate revenue to some degree. However, they each have unique needs and strategic goals and objectives. In states with less population and traffic density, certain user-fee solutions may not be as feasible as they would be in more densely populated states and regions. Governors are pursuing varied options to address these challenges, and states are pioneering new means of planning for and funding and financing transportation. Some states have worked to increase or index their motor fuel taxes to overcome purchasing power declines and to increase revenue for transportation projects. Some states also are increasing vehicle registration fees and looking to general fund revenues to fund transportation. More broadly, states are pursuing a number of innovative funding and financing options that also can help to reduce demand. Options that are discussed in this report include: • Debt financing strategies, including state infrastructure banks; • Tolling, vehicle miles traveled fees, congestion pricing, and other user fees; • Public-private partnerships that leverage private capital and expertise; and • Freight-specific strategies.

### States can attract private partners – gaining huge short-term revenue boosts

Puentes ‘9

(et al, Robert Puentes – Senior Fellow @ Brooking’s Metropolitan Policy Program – Innovative State Transportation:

Funding and Financing Policy Options for States – – January 05, 2009 – http://www.nga.org/files/live/sites/NGA/files/pdf/0901TRANSPORTATIONFUNDING.PDF)

Next, states can seek to increase investment in the system in the near-term. States and the federal government have long-relied on the motor fuel tax, and are likely to continue to do so. However, states have several options to supplement motor fuel tax revenue. Some states have looked to public-private partnerships to attract private sector capital and project expertise in order to move forward on priority projects. One type of public-private partnership, an asset lease, has the potential to provide states with significant upfront capital which can be used to fund a number of transportation priorities. However, these partnerships often require either new user fees or private collection of existing user fees (such as tolls), that provide a return on investment to the private partner. A public-private partnership strategy alone will not solve all of a state’s transportation challenges, but carefully managed partnerships can complement existing revenue, accelerate project delivery, and attract private capital and expertise.

## HSR not possible - Lawsuits

### Property owners will charge lawsuits on property access

Tim **Sheehan**,(editor and writer for the Fresno Bee), 02/13/**2012,** "High Speed Rail Leaders Hope To Make Things Right with Farmers, Property Values"

http://www.fresnobee.com/2012/02/13/2721149/new-rail-leaders-hope-to-make.html

Monday was Richard's third visit to the Valley in the past month. He met recently with **farmers and property owners** in Kings County, **where frustration with the authority has resulted in lawsuits by residents against the agency and votes of opposition** by the Kings County Board of Supervisors and the city councils in Hanford and Corcoran. "One of the **main problems that the High-Speed Rail Authority has had in the past is that it's been mainly focused on building a train**," Richard said. "And **when all you're focused on is building a train, you tend to tell people to get out** of the way because you're coming through with the train."

## HSR destroys property values

**H**igh Speed Rail takes decades to build and destroys property values

Aaron **Selvester**(Writer and Editor for Palo Alto Patch) **and** Mirian **Finder**(Editor and Writer for Palo Alto Patch**), "**Peninsula Cities Fear Property Value Crash During High Speed Rail"

http://paloalto.patch.com/articles/peninsula-cities-fear-property-value-crash-during-wait-for-high-speed-rail

"If the EIR goes through and is approved," Mayor Burt said, "then **we would have an approval process for aerial structures that would be sitting there diminishing the value of all the properties along the Peninsula. And we could have a decade or more before anything ever gets built, but the property values have already been diminished for that period**." A local realtor, Leannah Hunt, **said the concern is not hypothetical: Declining property values can be seen today.** "Obviously it is a great concern, absolutely," said Hunt. She said she has already seen one property deal fall through because **an appraiser noted a property along the rail corridor as being in an "area of diminishing value,"** and that the buyer was subsequently unable to secure a loan for that reason. "It's the first time I've seen an appraiser in conjunction with an application for a loan for a property in the rail corridor area ... that the appraiser stated that it was an area of diminishing value," she said. Hunt would not provide specifics about the property in question in order to protect the privacy of the buyer and real estate agent. Nadia Naik, **co-founder of Californians Advocating Responsible Rail Design, agreed that if an EIR is adopted in December but construction is delayed for years, property values would be jeopardized.** "Any plan that is hammered out and is not likely to be implemented anytime soon is a concern," said Naik. "**You don't want to be told you're living next to the Great Wall of China for the next 30 years and it never gets built."** These concerns come on the heels of a public meeting last week in which an eminent domain attorney detailed [how property owners will be affected](http://paloalto.patch.com/articles/eminent-domain-an-imminent-threat-to-homeowners-along-high-speed-rail-corridor) as the high-speed rail project moves forward.

### High speed Rail will separate communities, steal properties, and decrease their values

**Jenny & Jenny**(Property, Real Estate, ,domain and land use Law Firm) **No Date** "High Speed Train Issues" http://www.jjjllp.com/High-Speed-Train-Issues.shtml

The California **High-Speed Rail Train Environmental Impact Reports list adverse consequences to commercial, residential and agricultural property** because of the High-Speed Train: **Properties will be taken through eminent domain. Eviction and relocation of residents and businesses Demolition of homes and businesses Noise, vibrations, dust, fumes and other problems during construction and once the train is in operation Loss of privacy due to raised tracks Impaired views and decreased property value** Construction zones for years Creation of physical barriers which **will separate communities — preventing community members from easy access to restaurants, shopping centers, schools and parks.** "A potential impact on a community or neighborhood was identified if an alignment alternative **would create a new physical barrier, isolating one part of an established community from another and potentially resulting in a physical disruption to community cohesion**." - The California High-Speed Rail Train Environmental Impact Report "Community cohesion" is a fancy way of saying that you will be separated from your own neighbors, businesses, and services. **Subdivisions could be divided**. Businesses could be separated from freeway access. Farms will be separated which will make farming difficult and more expensive due to difficulties in using tractors, water access and harvesting. Additionally, the economics of scale will decrease the farmers' profit margins.

## MAGLEV trains bad

### MAGLEV trains hurt the environment / cause pollution

Marie balesteriere and John Hollenberger, April 9, 2005, “fitch annuasl freshman Congress Congerence, paper #107, “MagLev: Transportation of the future?” <http://www.askmar.com/Inductrack/2005-04-09%20Maglev%20Transportation%20of%20Future.pdf> Secondly, the tracks. Maglev train tracks need lots of magnets to make. These magnets need to be made in factories. During the process of making magnets, the factory lets our many very polluting fumes into the air. Normal trains do use steel, that is also manufactured in factories, but they don’t have to use as much, which means that the tracks of the Maglev is more polluting than the normal train.

### EDS and EMS trains are expensive and unproven in transportation.

Carl Nave, 2010, Professor of Physics, “Superconductivity”, <http://asr.menloschool.org/2ndSemester/Papers/MagLev_Catherine.pdf>

Getting something to levitate is relatively easy, and has been done many times. Once a superconductor is lowered to its critical temperature, the point at which the material becomes superconducting, it exhibits the Meissner Effect, [6] in which the superconductor excludes magnetic fields, causing it to “float” above magnets. While the levitation of a superconductor is easily shown, using superconductors for transportation is somewhat trickier, as they must stay cooler longer, and need some horizontal propulsion system. Another setback in the real-world feasibility of superconductor maglev trains is the cost of superconductors, which are currently very expensive. While one can’t predict the future, it is very likely the cost of superconductors will eventually go down, as more is learned about them and their seemingly magical properties.

## Plan boosts political capital

### HSR would boost political capital

Baruch Feigenbaum, (Transportation Policy Analyst), June 15, 2012, Reason Foundation, “Interview with University of California Los Angeles Professor of Urban Planning and Department Chair Dr. Brian Taylor,” http://reason.org/news/show/interview-with-university-of-califo

\*\*Sites: Professor Brian Taylor, Chair UCLA Department of Urban Planning\*\*

Taylor: There are many factors that affect the type of transit. Los Angeles has tended to use a mix of technologies to create services that will have some level of permanence and are also locally attractive. Major capital projects are sexy ribbon-cutting events that also attract media attention. However, from a media standpoint increasing service quality or reducing headways are non-events. Elected leaders are often more concerned with building political capital than with implementing the most cost effective transit service and new rail service raises political capital. Taxpayers see a tangible product from their tax dollars, even if it is often not the best use of those tax-dollars.Each of the six Los Angeles lines has a different context. For example, the Blue Line is a rail line similar to the early Interurbans. The line runs mostly in a grade separated urban way. The Green line resulted from a consent decree as a result of the Century Freeway and is completely grade separated. Although the Green Line is light-rail, in some ways it operates as heavy-rail. The Orange Busway was envisioned as a railway with all the preliminary engineering completed for rail. Project supporters visited Brazil that is known for its BRT lines and saw the effectiveness of BRT. This visit plus the opposition to rail by San Fernando Valley corridor residents led to the Orange line's development as a busway. All of L.A.'s transit lines were envisioned as a method of solving congestion issues.

### Spending Political Capital is necessary to regain it.

MARC PASCAL, October 5 2009, The Moderate Voice, “OBAMA’S ONLY PRIORITY: GET RE-ELECTED,” http://themoderatevoice.com/48571/obama%E2%80%99s-only-priority-get-re-elected/

Many political leaders incorrectly confuse political capital with financial capital. The first is a perpetually renewable commodity if used correctly and the latter is always finite no matter how much is amassed. One cannot hoard political capital for some future battle that may or may not come. It grows and shrinks directly as one uses it, and it directly mirrors political fights taken and avoided. Actually winning on certain core issues and major legislative battles helps increase political capital for future use. But not using political capital causes it to dissolve rapidly. Talking too much and never getting anything accomplished is a good recipe to dissipate valuable political capital.

## **Meltdowns defense**

No Impact– average death in all meltdowns is 400 deaths

Cohen, no date (Bernard L, Prof at the U of Pittsburgh. “Risks of Nuclear Power” http://physics.isu.edu/radinf/np-risk.htm)

Risks from reactor accidents are estimated by the rapidly developing science of "probabilistic risk analysis" (PRA). A PRA must be done separately for each power plant (at a cost of $5 million) but we give typical results here: A fuel melt-down might be expected once in 20,000 years of reactor operation. In 2 out of 3 melt-downs there would be no deaths, in 1 out of 5 there would be over 1000 deaths, and in 1 out of 100,000 there would be 50,000 deaths. The average for all meltdowns would be 400 deaths. Since air pollution from coal burning is estimated to be causing 10,000 deaths per year, there would have to be 25 melt-downs each year for nuclear power to be as dangerous as coal burning.

### Chernobyl was as bad as a meltdown could be – and it resulted in a very small death toll.

Zbigniew Jaworowski  Central Laboratory for Radiological Protection - CLOR, Warsaw, Poland Australasian Radiation Protection Society Newsletter, No.30, April 2004.   Lessons of Chernobyl - with particular reference to thyroid cancer<http://www.world-nuclear.org/info/chernobyl/jaworowski.html>

This was the worst possible catastrophe of a badly constructed nuclear reactor, with a complete meltdown of the reactor core, followed by the ten-days long completely free emission of radionuclides into the atmosphere. Nothing worse could happen. It resulted in a comparatively small occupational death toll, amounting to about half of that of each weekend's traffic in Poland, and tens or hundreds of times lower than that of many other industrial catastrophes, and it is unlikely that any fatalities were caused by radiation among the public. In the centuries to come, the Chernobyl catastrophe will be seen as a proof that nuclear power is a safe means of energy production.

New licenses, regulations solve

Francis ‘4 (David, March 29. Christian Science Monitor, “After nuclear’s meltdown, a cautious revival”. http://www.csmonitor.com/2004/0329/p12s02-usec.html)

Could a Three Mile Island happen again? The NRC blames that accident on "a combination of personnel error, design deficiencies, and component failures." The event, adds an NRC fact sheet, led to "permanent and sweeping changes in how NRC regulates its licensees - which, in turn, has reduced the risk to public health and safety."

More likely to die from an airplane crashing into your house. Yeah, really.

Cohen ’90 (Bernard, professor emeritus at Univ. of Pittsburgh. “Nuclear Energy Option” Published by Plenum Press. http://www.phyast.pitt.edu/~blc/book/index.html

The same reasoning applies to nuclear reactor accidents. Situations causing any number of deaths are possible, but the greater the consequences, the lower is the probability. The worst accident the RSS considered would cause about 50,000 deaths, with a probability of one occurrence in a billion years of reactor operation. A person's risk of being a victim of such an accident is 20,000 times less than the risk of being killed by lightning, and 1,000 times less than the risk of death from an airplane crashing into his or her house.7

## **Meltdowns defense**

One in 380 million chance that meltdown will occur- design solves

Cohen ’90 (Bernard, professor emeritus at Univ. of Pittsburgh. “Nuclear Energy Option” Published by Plenum Press. http://www.phyast.pitt.edu/~blc/book/index.html)

One sometimes hears statements to the effect that reactors are safe if everything goes right, but if any piece of equipment fails or if an operator makes a mistake, disaster will result. This statement is completely WRONG. In reactor design it is assumed that all sorts of things will go wrong — pipes will break, valves will stick, motors will fail, operators will push the wrong button, and so on, but there is "defense in depth" to cover these malfunctions or series of successive malfunctions. Of course the depth of the defense is not infinite. If each line of defense would crumble, one after the other, there could be a disaster. But as the depth of the defense is increased, the probability for this to happen is rapidly decreased. For example, if each line of defense has a chance of failure equal to that of drawing the ace of spades out of a deck of shuffled cards — one chance in 52, the probability for five successive lines of defense to fail is like the chance of drawing the ace of spades successively out of five decks of well-shuffled cards — one chance in 52 x 52 x 52 x 52 x 52, or one chance in 380 million! There have been cases where one of the lines of defense has failed in nuclear power plants. Utilities have been heavily fined by the NRC for such things as leaving a valve closed and thereby compromising the effectiveness of one of the emergency systems. These incidents are often given publicity as failures that could lead to a meltdown. But the media coverage rarely bothers to point out that there are several lines of defense remaining unbreached between these events and a meltdown — not to mention that there is still a major line of defense, the containment, remaining even if a meltdown occurs.

## **Blackouts defense**

Blackouts are inevitable- there is no way to stop them.

Fairley, no date (Peter, Spectrum magazine. “The Unruly Power Grid” http://www.spectrum.ieee.org/print/4195)

The 14 August 2003 blackout may have been the largest in history, zapping more total wattage and affecting more customers than any before, but if history is any guide, it won't be the last. "These kinds of outages are consistent with historical statistics, and they'll keep happening," says John Doyle, professor of control and dynamical systems, electrical engineering, and bioengineering at the California Institute of Technology in Pasadena. "I would have said this one was overdue." "We will have major failures," agrees IEEE Fellow Vijay Vittal, an electrical engineering professor at Iowa State University in Ames, who is an expert on power system dynamics and control. "There is no doubt about that."

New Tech solves- multiple responses available to grid collapse.

Business Wire ‘1 (Dec. 17. “Innovative technologies can improve national security; optimal technologies software able to make nation’s power grid more secure” written by business editors/high-tech and energy writers. http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_m0EIN/is\_2001\_Dec\_17/ai\_80858553)

Optimal Technologies announced this week the ability to improve national security with breakthrough electric power system technologies. If one part of a power grid were to fail due to intentional disruption -- or accident, operating error, or natural disaster -- Optimal's tools could allow multiple responses to avoid grid collapse, including automated recontrolling of key connections, rerouting of power flows, and precise management of loads. Optimal's new Aempfast(TM) (pronounced aim-fast) software, now being tested, has the unique ability to "see" the power grid as a whole and in great detail. Aempfast can swiftly find blockages in power flow, identify and direct system adjustments eliminating the congestion points, and reroute power -- in seconds, as opposed to hours -- thereby avoiding blackouts and brownouts. "This software is fundamental for electric power contingency planning and crisis management," said Roland Schoettle, founder and CEO of Optimal Technologies.

Blackouts inevitable

Apt and Lave ‘4 (Jay, Lester. August 10. “Blackouts are Inevitable” Washington Post. http://wpweb2.tepper.cmu.edu/ceic/pdfs\_other/Blackouts\_Washington\_Post\_8\_10\_04.pdf)

As we approach the first anniversary of the Blackout of '03, we're reminded of the many times that officials, from New York Gov. Nelson Rockefeller in 1977 to Gov. George Pataki now --along with a host of senators and representatives -- have assured us that they will take steps to prevent future blackouts. Yet roughly every four months, the United States experiences a blackout large enough to darken a half-million homes. Now the pressure is on Congress to enact an energy bill that will protect us from the lights going out. There's just one problem: It can't be done.