## Metros Aff

### \*\*\*Transit 1AC, OB. 1\*\*\*

#### Observation One. You get no disads.

#### A transportation bill that won’t solve the case just passed—Makes your DAs INEVITABLE

O'Keefe 6/29

 Ed, Washington Post, "Congress passes two-year transportation bill," 6/29/12 [www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/2chambers/post/congress-passes-two-year-transportation-bill/2012/06/29/gJQApmDtBW\_blog.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/2chambers/post/congress-passes-two-year-transportation-bill/2012/06/29/gJQApmDtBW_blog.html) AD 7/2/12

On the eve of the Fourth of July travel rush, Congress agreed Friday to a two-year plan to fund the nation’s transportation projects, as part of a broader package that included resolution of other long-simmering issues. The package passed the House 373 to 52 and later cleared the Senate 74 to 19, with one member voting present. Under the agreement, federal transportation funding will continue at roughly $54 billion a year, averting a crisis for the nation’s highway construction projects that could have occurred if Congress not agreed on the money before the expiration of a short-term measure Saturday night. The agreement does not include a provision launching construction of the Keystone XL oil pipeline, which Republicans had sought. But it also omits a $1.4 billion for conservation that Democrats favored, and dropped restrictions on how states use money once mandated for aesthetic transportation improvements. The measure marks the first time since 2005 that Congress has agreed to a long-term transportation bill. “I think everybody realized that tomorrow [Saturday], if we hadn’t acted, thousands of transportation projects across the nation would come to a halt and the potential for millions of people being laid off as opposed to the opposite,” said Rep. John Mica (R-Fla.), who chairs the House Transportation Committee. After weeks of debate, the House and Senate quickly passed a package that approved new federal transportation dollars and and agreement to freeze federally subsidized student loan rates at 3.4 percent, rather than allowing them to rise Saturday night to 6.8 percent — a cost increase that would have affected more than 7 million students. The package is now headed to the White House for President Obama’s signature.

#### AND, THE ECONOMY SUCKS, No Recovery coming

Alter 6/2

 Diane, Contributing Writer, Money Morning, "Are we headed straight for Recession 2013?" 6/2/12 moneymorning.com/2012/07/02/are-we-headed-straight-for-recession-2013/ AD 7/2/12

Fresh reports pointing to a slowdown in the struggling U.S. economy, coupled with worries of Europe's fiscal woes, have experts warning that Recession 2013 is inevitable. The dismal and downtrodden jobs numbers, the elevated long-term unemployment levels, the ailing housing market and the looming "fiscal cliff" are all fueling recession fears. Just last month, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office reported that unless lawmakers move to avert scheduled tax increases and spending cuts at the end of this year, a recession is likely. This marked the first time the CBO has forecast a recession resulting from the fiscal cliff. The CBO projected that gross domestic product (GDP) will contract by 1.3% in the first half of 2013 before growing 2.3% later in the year. Annualized, GDP would grow just 0.5% in 2013. That forecast is an about face from January when the CBO forecast a 1.1% GDP growth in 2013 (if policies are not dealt with). The report stated, "Given the pattern of past recessions as identified by the National Bureau of Economic Research, such a contraction in output in the first half of 2013 would probably be judged to be a recession." Now other economic experts are saying the same. Recession 2013: A Popular View Even Fed Chief Ben Bernanke has warned that shocks from the scheduled changes will most probably cause the economy to contract, resulting in a recession. "It's very important to say that, if no action were to be taken by the fiscal authorities, the size of the fiscal cliff is such that I think there's absolutely no chance that the Fed could or would have any ability to offset, whatsoever, that effect on the economy," said Bernanke. "I am concerned that if all the tax increases and spending cuts that are associated with current law would take, absent congressional actions...that'd be a significant risk to the recovery." Legendary investor and commodities guru Jim Rogers also chimed in and said the country's massive debt load will plunge the U.S. into a recession in 2013. Rogers added that the Fed is only making the situation worse. "Every four to six years since the beginning of the Republic, we've had economic slowdowns, we've had recessions. Always. It's coming again," Rogers said in an interview with Newsmax TV. "You can add as well as I can-in 2013 or 2014, we've going to have another slowdown, whether it's caused by Europe or who knows what is going to cause it, but it's coming."

### \*\*\*1AC PLAN\*\*\*

#### The United States federal government should increase transportation infrastructure investment by investing nearly all federal JARC Program transit block grants in metropolitan planning organizations provided they meet the following requirements:

#### Transportation planners consider the spatial access needs of all workers,

#### Refocus funding to better serve transit dependent communities, and

#### Transit oriented development must meet the needs of low income families.

#### Conditions will be enforced by mandated evaluation of JARC and FTA data collection on grantee performance.

### \*\*\*1AC OB 2. SOLVENCY\*\*\*

#### OBSERVATION II. Automobile oriented transportation policy and subsequent land use developments disproportionately impact those living poverty, making income and social stability impossible—accountable federal funding of metro area projects is key

Blumenberg & Waller ‘5

Evelyn Blumenberg is Assistant Professor at UCLA's School of Public Policy and Social Research. Margy Waller is the senior fellow for Social Policy at the PPI and is affiliated with the Brookings Institution Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy. “The Long Journey to Work: A Federal Transportation Policy for Working Families,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 197-198

Evidence from the 2000 census and other sources indicates that realization of economic and residential life remains the dominant growth pattern in the United States. Suburban areas continue to capture the lion’s share of population and employment growth. America has rapidly become an exit ramp” economy with office, retail, and commercial facilities increasingly located on the suburban fringe.’ Consequently travel is increasing from suburb to suburb—a far cry from the stereotype of suburbs as simply bedroom communities for workers commuting to traditional downtowns. Across the 100 largest metropolitan areas, on average, about 22 percent of people work within three miles of the city center and more than 35 percent work more than ten miles from the center. In metropolitan areas such as Los Angeles, Detroit, Tampa and Chicago, the latter category exceeds 60 percent. Low-income families have also dispersed yet many remain concentrated in central-city neighborhoods. Families that live in dense urban neighborhoods can be within a short walk, drive, or bus ride to most destinations. However, for those who live in more isolated residential areas- whether in the central city, rural areas, or suburbs- jobs and services can be remote, particularly for families who do not have access to automobiles. Years of disinvestment in the inner city, the lack of affordable housing, and residential segregation have contributed to the geographic isolation of the urban poor. While the number of people living in high-poverty neighborhoods declined by 2.4 million in the 1990s, this was primarily due to the strong economic conditions that persisted throughout the decade rather than to changes in transportation policy.’ The concentration of poverty remains an important public policy concern, one exacerbated by the lack of viable transportation options to meet the changing structure of metropolitan areas. Meanwhile, suburban and rural employment is often many miles from dispersed suburban and rural populations. Thus the transportation challenges facing working families are numerous: —decentralization of jobs and low-income families away from the central city to low-density suburban neighborhoods reduces the effectiveness of traditional, fixed-route public transportation; —a high percentage of low-income families remains concentrated in central-city neighborhoods distant from suburban employment opportunities; —low-income adults without access to automobiles often face lengthy travel times, even within the central city —for the suburban and rural poor, access to employment may be the most difficult, especially for those families without automobiles; —for the suburban and rural poor, access to employment may be the most difficult, especially for those families without automobiles; —while access to automobiles is very high, even among low-income households, some low-income families have low levels of auto access and remain transit dependent; and —many low-income families own old and unreliable vehicles and therefore are saddled with the high costs of insurance, repair, maintenance, and other fees. Numerous studies suggest that improved transportation services can enhance economic outcomes among the poor. However, there is no one- size-fits-all transportation policy for working families. Metropolitan areas are diverse. So too are low-income families, who live in a wide array of neighborhoods and have varied transportation resources. Not surprisingly, therefore, meeting the transportation needs of working families requires a mix of transportation solutions and the federal funding flexibility to creatively pursue varied national, regional, and local policy strategies.

#### FEDERAL TRANSIT POVERTY REDUCTION BLOCK GRANTS ARE BEING SUBVERTED BY STATES AND NOT SENT TO URBAN CENTERS, CRUSHING TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT. GIVING AUTHORITY DIRECTLY TO METROPOLITAN PLANNING SOLVES

Puentes & Bailey ‘5

Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. Kevin O’Brien is a columnist at the Cleveland *Plain Dealer.* Linda Bailey is Senior Research Associate for Transportation at ICF International. “Increasing Funding and Accountability for Metropolitan Transportation Decisions,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 153

A second bias follows from the way states distribute transportation revenues. Some states have developed distribution formulas based on transportation related needs or on resident population registered motor vehicle and highway miles. However, others (such Tennessee, Ohio, Arkansas, and Alabama) allocate a portion of funds evenly among their counties, regardless of their size, needs, and contribution to state funding pools. This holdover from the states’ past years of active rural highway construction ensures that built-out urban counties fail to receive a sensible share of funding. A third reason to increase the decisionmaking authority and ability of MPOs is that many states continue to penalize metropolitan areas in the distribution of transportation funds The current system of planning and programming, which is dominated by the states, has been criticized as undermining metropolitan areas. Federal funds are allocated in such a way that they favor rural areas over urban areas. In addition, state DOTs’ traditional focus on highway maintenance and construction fosters metropolitan decentralization that negatively impacts cities and older suburbs. This penalty arises from several biases. The first bias follows from the fact that federal law allocates the vast majority of federal money directly to state DOTs. As mentioned, federal law directly suballocates less than 7 percent of program funds directly to MPOs and, even then, only to MPOs serving populations of over 200,000. In fact, while federal transportation spending increased from ISTEA to TEA-21, the share of funds suballocated to MPOs actually declined as a share of total highway spending.

#### Lack of QPQS means States are subverting federal grant programs transit reform for those in poverty but CONDITIONING LEADS TO ROBUST TRANSIT REFORM

Blumenberg & Waller ‘5

Evelyn Blumenberg is Assistant Professor at UCLA's School of Public Policy and Social Research. Margy Waller is the senior fellow for Social Policy at the PPI and is affiliated with the Brookings Institution Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy. “A Long Journey to Work: A Federal Transportation Policy for Working Families,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 213-215

Retain Competitive Grant Process. In addition, President Bush’s proposal to reauthorize TEA-2 I devolves administration of the JARC program to states, eliminating the national competition for funds. Turning the program into a formula grant to states will not increase the number of people served. Unless Congress significantly increases the funding level and provides clarification that states must distribute the funds using a formula that considers local needs, state administration may not work. Furthermore, the president’s proposal would also require state administration of transportation funds for disabled and elderly persons. This programmatic approach could lead to consolidated state block grants for transportation assistance, blending the funding for targeted needy populations. Since all of these underserved populations need more assistance to overcome transportation barriers, pitting them against one another in the state budget process may result in underfunding one group as a result of the political Popularity, or lobbying strength, of another. Analysis of the federal block grants enacted in 1982 shows that states substituted other criteria for income eligibility, reallocated funds that had been targeted to urban areas, and reduced costs by eliminating service components and standards.’’ Require that Transportation Planners Consider the Spatial Access Needs of All Workers. Statewide and metropolitan transportation planning is conducted in a manner that does not explicitly consider the job access and spatial mismatch problems within metropolitan areas. Furthermore, the, transportation systems that currently exist are not designed to alleviate this mismatch. As such, Congress should mandate, as a requirement to receive federal transportation funds, that metropolitan and statewide transportation plans include job access needs assessment and strategies in order to provide maximum region wide accessibility for low-income workers. Enforce Mandated Evaluation of JARC and Ensure FTA Systematically Collects Date on Grantee Performance Although the JARC program has, resulted in many new transportation programs, without evaluating these services, it is impossible to examine whether they both meet the transportation needs of the working poor and are cost effective. Through TEA-21, Congress required the DOT to evaluate the JARC program and submit its findings by June 2000. However, the department has not completed this evaluation nor has it announced a date for release. Refocus Funding to Better Serve Transit-Dependent Communities and Individual. Previous federal transportation reform efforts underscored the importance of multimodal transportation networks in metropolitan areas. Despite earlier reforms, federal policy and programs continue to place transit projects at a disadvantage. This has profound implications for welfare recipients and low-income workers-particularly those who rely on buses for their mobility and job access needs. Congress should take steps to ensure that federally funded transit projects specifically and explicitly serve the objective of providing job access to low-income workers and welfare recipients. Ensure that Transit-Oriented Development Meets the Needs of Low Income Families. With the reauthorization of TEA-21, the federal government has a unique opportunity to leverage the billions of dollars already invested in light rail and other rail projects in a way that serves low-income workers. A key criterion for allocating transit funding should be the consistency of local land use plans and zoning codes with transit-supportive land uses and provisions for affordable housing.

#### Devolving transit planning authority to metropolitan planning organizations with accountability quid pro quos for poverty focus compliance solve poverty and transit efficiency

Blumenberg & Waller ‘5

Evelyn Blumenberg is Assistant Professor at UCLA's School of Public Policy and Social Research. Margy Waller is the senior fellow for Social Policy at the PPI and is affiliated with the Brookings Institution Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy. “A Long Journey to Work: A Federal Transportation Policy for Working Families,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 214-215

Require that Transportation Planners Consider the Spatial Access Needs of All Workers. Statewide and metropolitan transportation planning is conducted in a manner that does not explicitly consider the job access and spatial mismatch problems within metropolitan areas. Furthermore, the transportation systems that currently exist are not designed to alleviate this mismatch. As such, Congress should mandate, as a requirement to receive federal transportation funds, that metropolitan and statewide transportation plans include job access needs assessment and strategies in order to provide maximum region wide accessibility for low-income workers. Enforce Mandated Evaluation of JARC and Ensure FTA Systematically Collects Data on Grantee Performance Although the JARC program has resulted in many new transportation programs, without evaluating these services, it is impossible to examine whether they both meet the transportation needs of the working poor and are cost effective. Through TEA-2 1 Congress required the DOT to evaluate the JARC program and submit findings by June 2000. However, the department has not completed this evaluation nor has it announced a date for release.’ Refocus Funding to Better Serve Transit-Dependent Communities and Individuals Previous federal transportation reform efforts underscored the importance of multimodal transportation networks in metropolitan areas. Despite earlier reforms, federal policy and programs continue to place transit protects at a disadvantage. This has profound implications for welfare recipients and low-income workers- particularly those who rely on buses for their mobility and job access needs. Congress should take steps to ensure that federally funded transit projects specifically and explicitly serve the objective of providing access to low-income workers and welfare recipients. Ensure that Transit-Oriented Development Meets the Needs of Low Income Families. With the reauthorization of TEA-2l, the federal government has a unique opportunity to leverage the billions of dollars already invested in light rail and other rail projects in a way that serves low-income workers. A key criterion for allocating transit funding should be the consistency of local land use plans and zoning codes with transit-supportive land uses and provisions for affordable housing.

#### putting poverty performance objectives on federally funded transit projects with regulatory incentives and punishments solves robust transit reform

Katz et al. ‘5

Bruce Katz is vice president, director of the Metropolitan Policy Progam, and Adeline M. and Alfred I. Johnson Chair in Urban and Metropolitan Studies at the Brookings Institution. Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. Scott Bernstein is at the Center for Neighborhood Technology. “Getting Transportation Right for Metropolitan America,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 36-37

Second, the federal government should require states and local metropolitan transportation agencies to maintain information systems that annually measure progress on indicators of national significance. These indicators might include mitigating congestion, improving public health, improving air quality, lowering transportation costs, and expanding transportation options for target groups (such as the elderly or low-income workers). The law should also require transportation agencies to set annual performance objectives in each of these critical areas. As with disclosure of spending decisions, agency performance objectives (and progress toward meeting those goals) should be shared with the general public in an accessible manner. Finally, federal law should establish consequences for both excellent and poor performance. Congress, in this regard, should allow the DOT to maintain a small incentive pool to reward states and metropolitan areas that consistently perform at an exceptional level. The department should also give high performers relief from regulatory and administrative requirements. By the same token, the federal DOT should consider possible intervention strategies for consistent low performers. (In designating high and low performers, DOT should take into account the difficult challenges facing state agencies and MPOs in large metropolitan areas.)

#### offering metro areas more power in transit planning in exchange for greater accountability on poverty issues solves a slew of issues

Katz et al. ‘5

Bruce Katz is vice president, director of the Metropolitan Policy Progam, and Adeline M. and Alfred I. Johnson Chair in Urban and Metropolitan Studies at the Brookings Institution. Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. Scott Bernstein is at the Center for Neighborhood Technology. “Getting Transportation Right for Metropolitan America,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 38

Congress should make no mistake: great potential exists to build on the gains of previous reform efforts and help improve the economic vitality and environmental quality of metropolitan areas. Yet this potential will only be realized if congressional leaders confront the metropolitan realities of the twenty-first century and understand that yesterday’s solutions cannot address tomorrow’s challenges. In that vein, (AH faces a two-step challenge. It should, first and foremost, do all it can to retain the date of federal reforms that began in the early 1990s. These reforms have unleashed a wave of energy and innovation across the country that is beginning to fashion winning solutions to the pressing transportation challenges that face our metropolitan communities. But Crimp should go further. Metropolitan transportation challenges will only be fully addressed if metropolitan areas are given more powers, greater tools, and higher capacity to get transportation policy right for their places. Yet these reforms must come with a quid pro quo: the federal government must demand greater performance and accountability from its stale and metropolitan partners. This federalist exchange—of greater flexibility in exchange for more responsibility—lies at the heart of other mayor federal reforms over the past decade, and ii will be critical to the success of transportation policy over the coming decades. The stage is set, therefore, to take federal transportation policy to a new level of effectiveness and impact. The stakes are very high: metropolitan (and national) competitiveness, environmental and community quality, and fiscal efficiency all depend on such progress. Metropolitan political, business, and civic leaders are ready to go the next step. Is Congress up to the task?

####  Robust transit reform radically reorganizes land use patterns to cause massive secondary reductions in fuel consumption

Bailey, Mokhtarian, & Little ‘8

Linda Bailey is Senior Associate for Transportation at ICF International. Patricia Lyon MokhtarianProfessor, Civil and Environmental Engineering, Chair, Transportation Technology and Policy Graduate Program, and Associate Director for Education, Institute of Transportation Studies at University of California, Davis. Andrew Little is president of Urban Policy Research Institute. “The Broader Connection between Public Transportation, Energy Conservation and Greenhouse Gas Reduction,” <http://www.apta.com/research/info/online/documents/land_use.pdf>, February.

Transit systems are likely to achieve a higher return on investment when more potential riders live and work close to their routes. We hypothesize here that the reverse is also true – that transit systems enable more efficient development in general, where in addition to those taking transit, those who drive have shorter distances to go, and walking or bicycling to destinations is made possible through short distance trips and complete streets. This paper describes these “second-order” effects of public transit availability. For example, without public transit, downtown Washington, DC would look very different. According to the 2006 American Community Survey, approximately 39 percent of DC residents commute by public transportation. If each person used a car instead, space constraints would increase the cost of driving due to congestion and constrained parking, which would in turn induce businesses and government offices to reduce the total number of workers in the downtown area. This would reduce the clientele for shops and restaurants, forcing them to spread out to bring in enough customers. This positive feedback loop between public transit availability and more efficient land use patterns is captured by creating a model that can tease out the effects of public transportation availability on driving via the built environment. This model also accounts for the direct effects which had been measured in the 2007 APTA paper.

#### OUR TRANSIT-LAND USE CLAIMS ARE SUPPORTED by THE BEST EVIDENCE—YOUR METHODS ARE FLAWED

Bailey, Mokhtarian, & Little ‘8

Linda Bailey is Senior Associate for Transportation at ICF International. Patricia Lyon MokhtarianProfessor, Civil and Environmental Engineering, Chair, Transportation Technology and Policy Graduate Program, and Associate Director for Education, Institute of Transportation Studies at University of California, Davis. Andrew Little is president of Urban Policy Research Institute. “The Broader Connection between Public Transportation, Energy Conservation and Greenhouse Gas Reduction,” <http://www.apta.com/research/info/online/documents/land_use.pdf>, February.

The data used in this study are from a national survey of travel patterns conducted in 2001, the most recent year available. The National Household Travel Survey 2001 (NHTS 2001) is a representative sample of the entire U.S., including cities, suburbs, and rural areas. Participants were asked to answer some survey questions about their household, then to record their travel in a diary for one day. The variables used were based on household travel patterns and household characteristics. This created a better model for effects based on residential location, although it restricted the ability of the model to show effects of certain personal characteristics, such as gender and age. See the appendix for a more detailed discussion of the variables. In order to capture the effect of public transportation availability on VMT as mediated through the built environment, we used Structural Equations Modeling (SEM). This methodology allows us to tease apart these historically intertwined variables and estimate the effect of each component on VMT, as well as their interrelationship. The model has two types of variables, “endogenous,” which are the product of other variables in the model, and “exogenous,” which exert an effect on the endogenous variables. Among the exogenous variables is a set of instrumental variables which are related to population density, but not public transportation availability. This type of variable is a modeling requirement for correctly identifying the SEM equations.

### \*\*\*1AC OB.3 ADVS\*\*\*

#### OBSERVATION 3. THIS IS A GOOD IDEA

#### A. ECONOMY

#### IT’S TANKING BECAUSE OF LACK OF EMPLOYMENT

Plumer 6/1

Brad, Washington Post, "May Jobs report: The Labor Market takes a big step backward," 6/1/12 [www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/ezra-klein/post/may-jobs-report-the-labor-market-takes-a-big-step-backward/2012/06/01/gJQAntHn6U\_blog.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/ezra-klein/post/may-jobs-report-the-labor-market-takes-a-big-step-backward/2012/06/01/gJQAntHn6U_blog.html) AD 7/3/12

Anyone hoping for a healthy labor-market recovery is going to be sorely disappointed by the May jobs report. The U.S. economy added just 69,000 jobs last month — far below expectations. The unemployment rose to 8.2 percent. And the details of the report are even more dire. Out of luck. (Damian Dovarganes - AP) The Bureau of Labor Statistics revised down its job estimates for previous months, too. Remember when everyone gulped in April because the economy added only 115,000 new jobs? Turns out that was actually just 77,000 new jobs. March also got bumped down, from 154,000 to 143,000. For the past two years, BLS revisions have frequently been upward. That streak appears to be broken. Much of the job carnage seems to be driven by the construction sector, which lost 28,000 jobs last month. As Jed Kolko of the housing research firm Trulia notes, construction jobs now make up just 4.1 percent of all employment — the lowest level since 1946. And the United States hasn’t added any new construction jobs, on net, since the beginning of last year. There’s still a massive hangover from the housing bubble. Meanwhile, the number of long-term unemployed — workers who have been out of the job for 27 weeks or more — rose from 5.1 million to 5.4 million in May. Why is that troubling? There’s a growing body of research suggesting that people who are out of work for extended periods of time suffer all sorts of adverse health affects and have more trouble reentering the workforce. All told, the U.S. job market appears to be sputtering out. In the past four months, the economy has added an average of 137,000 jobs per month. That’s barely enough to keep up with new entrants into the labor force. At that rate, according to this calculator from the Hamilton Project, we won’t get back to full employment until 2025. So, what now? Will the Federal Reserve step in? Plenty of economic commentators, like Fed Watch’s Tim Duy, have been wondering if more stimulus and quantitative easing might be on the way. Friday’s jobs report will certainly stoke those rumors. One point to note here: Core inflation was up just 1.8 percent in April and has been unchanged over the past year. The central bank is more than succeeding in whipping inflation. But as for the the other part of its dual mandate — bringing the unemployment rate down — the Fed hasn’t been anywhere near as successful.

#### THAT’s global WAR

Royal 10

Jedediah Royal, Director of Cooperative Threat Reduction at the U.S. Department of Defense, 2010, “Economic Integration, Economic Signaling and the Problem of Economic Crises,” in Economics of War and Peace: Economic, Legal and Political Perspectives, ed. Goldsmith and Brauer, p. 213-215

Less intuitive is how periods of economic decline may increase the likelihood of external conflict. Political science literature has contributed a moderate degree of attention to the impact of economic decline and the security and defence behaviour of interdependent states. Research in this vein has been considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow. First, on the systemic level, Pollins (2008) advances Modclski and Thompson's (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, finding that rhythms in the global economy are associated with the rise and fall of a pre-eminent power and the often bloody transition from one pre-eminent leader to the next. As such, exogenous shocks such as economic crises could usher in a redistribution of relative power (see also Gilpin, 1981) that leads to uncertainty about power balances, increasing the risk of miscalculation (Fearon. 1995). Alternatively, even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflict as a rising power may seek to challenge a declining power (Werner, 1999). Separately, Pollins (1996) also shows that global economic cycles combined with parallel leadership cycles impact the likelihood of conflict among major, medium and small powers, although he suggests that the causes and connections between global economic conditions and security conditions remain unknown. Second, on a dyadic level, Copeland's (1996. 2000) theory of trade expectations suggests that 'future expectation of trade' is a significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behaviour of states. He argues that interdependent states are likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations. However, if the expectations of future trade decline, particularly for difficult to replace items such as energy resources, the likelihood for conflict increases, as states will be inclined to use force to gain access to those resources. Crises could potentially be the trigger for decreased trade expectations either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states.4 Third, others have considered the link between economic decline and external armed conflict at a national level. Blomberg and Hess (2002) find a strong correlation between internal conflict and external conflict, particularly during periods of economic downturn. They write: The linkages between internal and external conflict and prosperity are strong and mutually reinforcing. Economic conflict tends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn returns the favour. Moreover, the presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which international and external conflicts self-reinforce each other. (Blomberg & Hess, 2002. p. 89) Economic decline has also been linked with an increase in the likelihood of terrorism (Blomberg. Hess. & Weerapana. 2004). which has the capacity to spill across borders and lead to external tensions. Furthermore, crises generally reduce the popularity of a sitting government. 'Diversionary theory' suggests that, when facing unpopularity arising from economic decline, sitting governments have increased incentives to fabricate external military conflicts to create a 'rally around the flag' effect. Wang (1990, DeRouen (1995). and Blomberg, Hess, and Thacker (2006) find supporting evidence showing that economic decline and use of force are at least indirectly correlated. Gelpi (1997), Miller (1999), and Kisangani and Pickering (2009) suggest that the tendency towards diversionary tactics are greater for democratic states than autocratic states, due to the fact that democratic leaders are generally more susceptible to being removed from office due to lack of domestic support. DeRouen (2000) has provided evidence showing that periods of weak economic performance in the United States, and thus weak Presidential popularity, are statistically linked to an increase in the use of force. In summary, recent economic scholarship positively correlates economic integration with an increase in the frequency of economic crises, whereas political science scholarship links economic decline with external conflict at systemic, dyadic and national levels.' This implied connection between integration, crises and armed conflict has not featured prominently in the economic-security debate and deserves more attention.

#### Transit reform solves critical to ensure access to employment

Berube and Puentes et all '11

Robert Puentes, senior fellow with the Brookings Institution’s Metropolitan Policy Program, Alan Berube,senior fellow and research director at the Brookings Institution Metropolitan Policy Program, Adie Tomer, Senior Research Analyst at the Brookings Institution Metropolitan Policy Program and a member of the Metropolitan Infrastructure Initiative., Elizabeth Kneebone, senior research associate and associate fellow at the Brookings Institution Metropolitan Policy Program., "Missed Opportunity: Transit and Jobs in Metropolitan America," May 2011, Brookings, [www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/reports/2011/5/12 jobs and transit/0512\_jobs\_transit.pdf](http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/reports/2011/5/12%20jobs%20and%20transit/0512_jobs_transit.pdf) AD 7/1/12

More immediately, transportation matters for establishing a broad-based economic recovery.

Improving transportation connections to jobs enhances the efficiency of labor markets for both workers and employers.3 Years of study, research, and practice have tried to address the vexing logistical problems stemming from lack of access to transportation in major metropolitan areas.4 Today, transportation analysts increasingly consider accessibility to be a better measure of system performance than traditional mobility.5 It is at least as important for metropolitan residents to be able to access a range of activities, such as jobs, via the transportation system, than it is for systems to simply move vehicles faster and reduce travel times.6 One important way workers get to work is via public transit. While three out of four commutes occur alone in a car, recent statistics show that the share of Americans commuting to work via public transit grew during the 2000s for the first time in decades.7 Each of the nation’s 100 largest metropolitan areas offers some form of public transit service. Many of the places with the largest recent increases in transit usage, such as New York and Washington, offer extensive rail networks. Other metro areas that recently opened light rail lines such as Charlotte and Phoenix also saw upticks, as did others that rely almost exclusively on buses for transit commuting, such as Colorado Springs and Albuquerque. A high quality public transit network can allow employers to benefit from the clustering and agglomeration of people and businesses, and thereby raise productivity in metro areas. One recent analysis recommends using access to jobs and labor as a measure of the economic benefit of transportation to metropolitan areas.8 Transit also supplies travel choices for workers, and is thus especially important to populations who depend on such service because they are too old or poor, or otherwise choose not to own a car. Metro areas with a high number of transit commuters, such as Los Angeles, Honolulu, and Philadelphia, also stand out for having small per capita carbon emissions due to transportation compared with more car-dependent areas such as Nashville and Oklahoma City.9 In some metropolitan areas, transit can help workers avoid severe rush hour traffic congestion, and reduce the costs of their commutes relative to driving a car. Moreover, as gasoline prices continue to rise, transit use is predicted to increase as well.10

#### B. WAR

#### Shocks Coming Now: High Risk in Producers Leading to Speculation

The Economist ‘12

High drama Iranian threats are only one of many scares facing oil markets Feb 25th 2012 http://www.economist.com/node/21548272?zid=298&ah=0bc99f9da8f185b2964b6cef412227be

So what then is spooking oil traders? Temporarily, at least, some Iranian oil is off the market—reducing supply to Europe and China by perhaps 550,000 b/d in total. But markets would not be so concerned if Iran were an isolated black spot. The trouble is that oil has also stopped flowing at full tilt from South Sudan, over a pipeline dispute; Syria, because of embargoes; and Yemen, where oil workers are on strike. Even the North Sea, where old rigs are closed for repair, is causing problems. All this could account for more than 700,000 b/d in missing output. In all the world may have lost over 1.25m b/d of late. On top of actual disruptions, fears abound over supplies from Nigeria, Iraq and Bahrain (not to mention what may yet happen in Iran). Estimates of OPEC’s spare capacity, the oil market’s security blanket, vary. The organisation claims it can call upon about 2.5m b/d. Some analysts say the figure is far lower. Amrita Sen of Barclays Capital puts it at 1.7m b/d. Most of that spare capacity is in Saudi Arabia: it will be largely up to the Saudis to cope with disruptions as well as supplying another 1m b/d or so this year to meet growing Asian demand. But according to Goldman Sachs, the country’s production is already at a 30-year high. The bank says the world faces a trough in OPEC spare capacity just as the world economy is recovering, an unprecedented combination. Tight oil markets mean prices are unlikely to fall. Worse, with so little spare capacity future supply shocks could lead to sharp increases. As in horror flicks, danger lurks at almost every turn.

#### **Oil dependency creates US-China competition- war inevitable without** alternative energy

Reynolds 10 (Lewis, energy consultant and author of “America the Prisoner: The Implications of Foreign Oil Addiction and a Realistic Plan to End It”, “Seven Dangerous Side Effects of the U.S. Dependency on Foreign Oil”, 8-8-10, http://peakoil.com/production/seven-dangerous-side-effects-of-the-u-s-dependency-on-foreign-oil/)

It creates strained foreign relations and sets the stage for an unstable future. The entire U.S.-Middle East foreign policy has been structured around the obvious importance of the region for the world’s oil supply. Policy makers don’t like to discuss it openly, but oil is always the elephant in the room when it comes to U.S. foreign relations—even with nations outside the Middle East. One of the great questions in the context of geopolitical struggle for oil is whether the great oil consuming nations—which will soon include the U.S., China, Russia—will view one another as allies, competitors, or some combination of both. The U.S. has love-hate relationships with both countries. There is historic rivalry between the U.S. and Russia leading back generations. The relationship with China is murky at best. Events are already in motion that could set the stage for a U.S.-Chinese confrontation. Oil consumption continues to grow modestly in the U.S., but in China it is exploding. On a global scale, oil consumption will certainly continue to grow into the foreseeable future, yet there are considerable questions as to whether global production can be increased much beyond current levels if at all. With both the U.S. and China needing oil, competition is inevitable. Responsibility lies with both sides to take actions to avoid the long progression toward a conflict. A Sino-American energy war is far too likely if both countries continue on their present courses without developing substantial alternative energy sources.

#### Conflict with China will escalate to global nuclear war

Hunkovic, 09 **–** American Military University [Lee J, 2009, “The Chinese-Taiwanese Conflict

Possible Futures of a Confrontation between China, Taiwan and the United States of America”, <http://www.lamp-method.org/eCommons/Hunkovic.pdf>]

A war between China, Taiwan and the United States has the potential to escalate into a nuclear conflict and a third world war, therefore, many countries other than the primary actors could be affected by such a conflict, including Japan, both Koreas, Russia, Australia, India and Great Britain, if they were drawn into the war, as well as all other countries in the world that participate in the global economy, in which the United States and China are the two most dominant members. If China were able to successfully annex Taiwan, the possibility exists that they could then plan to attack Japan and begin a policy of aggressive expansionism in East and Southeast Asia, as well as the Pacific and even into India, which could in turn create an international standoff and deployment of military forces to contain the threat. In any case, if China and the United States engage in a full-scale conflict, there are few countries in the world that will not be economically and/or militarily affected by it. However, China, Taiwan and United States are the primary actors in this scenario, whose actions will determine its eventual outcome, therefore, other countries will not be considered in this study.

#### Even if they are no shocks, oil dependence creates entangling alliances that draw the US into major power wars in the Caspian and with Russia

Glaser ‘11

Reframing Energy Security: How Oil Dependence Influences U.S. National Security Charles L. Glaser cglaser@gwu.edu Professor of Political Science and International Relations Elliot School of International Affairs The George Washington University August 2011, epts.washington.edu/.../Glaser\_-\_EnergySecurity-AUGUST-2011.doc

When a state’s economy depends heavily on oil, severe supply disruptions might do sufficiently large economic damage that the state would use military force to protect its prosperity. A state this suffers this vulnerability risks not only suffering the damage that could be inflicted by a supply disruption, which might be the by-product of unrelated domestic or international events, but also risks being coerced by an adversary. Consequently, states will want to be confident that their ability to import oil will be uninterrupted and will pursue policies to ensure secure access. I am using access broadly, to include at least three different features of secure oil supply: 1) uninterrupted transport, which is probably the most common usage; 2) oil suppliers that are willing to sell oil at market prices; and 3) suppliers whose oil facilities are secure from crippling attack by opposing states and local insurgents. Each type of access identifies different requirements and different potential dangers; all of them suggest scenarios in which the United States could need to use military force to protect the flow of oil. Concern about secure transport can take a variety of forms—a state may need to protect its sea lanes of communication, to defend choke points that make oil traffic relatively easy to disrupt, or to control territory across which oil is piped. For example, China needs to worry about the vulnerability of its SLOCs from the Persian Gulf to northeast Asia; the United States has to be prepared to protect the Strait of Hormuz, most likely from Iranian attack; and numerous states have contested the location of pipelines in the Caspian Sea region because they want to control the territory they cross. Potential security dangers generated by concern about secure transport could also occur via less direct mechanisms. One important possibility is energy-driven alliances. If the United States enters into an alliance that is designed to protect access to oil and protecting that ally then draws the United States into a war, this should be considered an energy-driven conflict, even if the actual war is not fought over oil. As I sketch below, a current example here is America’s interest in the Caspian Region and, more specifically, its desire to include Georgia in NATO, a move that increases the risk of conflict with Russia.

#### most likely scenario for a major power nuclear war

Blank in 2000

Steven J. Blank is the Douglas MacArthur Professor of Research at the U.S. Army War College and has been an Associate Professor of Russia/Soviet Affairs at the Strategic Studies Institutes. “US Military Engagement with Trancaucasia and Central Asia,” Strategic Studies Institute, June, <http://carlisle-www.army.mil/usassi/welcome.htm>.

Russia’s drive for hegemony over the Transcaucasus and Central Asia therefore led those states and interested foreign powers to an equal and opposing reaction that has blunted the Russian drive. Baku, Erevan, Tashkent, Astana, and Tbilisi, to a greater or lesser degree, are seeking a Western counterbalance to Moscow, which the West, especially Ankara and Washington, are all too happy to provide.68 Central Asia has also turned to China, the United States, and Iran in energy and economics, is exploring forms of regional cooperation, and has begun to build its own national militaries to escape from Russia’s shadow. Apart from expanded trade and commercial relations and support for infrastructural projects beyond the energy and pipeline business, Turkey trains Azerbaijani troops and provides economic-political assistance to Georgia and Azerbaijan. Other Western powers, especially France and Great Britain, also display a rising regional profile. Washington’s burgeoning military-political-economic involvement seeks, inter alia, to demonstrate the U.S. ability to project military power even into this region or for that matter, into Ukraine where NATO recently held exercises that clearly originated as an anti-Russian scenario. Secretary of Defense William Cohen has discussed strengthening U.S.-Azerbaijani military cooperation and even training the Azerbaijani army, certainly alarming Armenia and Russia.69 And Washington is also training Georgia’s new Coast Guard. 70 However, Washington’s well-known ambivalence about committing force to Third World ethnopolitical conflicts suggests that U.S. military power will not be easily committed to saving its economic investment. But this ambivalence about committing forces and the dangerous situation, where Turkey is allied to Azerbaijan and Armenia is bound to Russia, create the potential for wider and more protracted regional conflicts among local forces. In that connection, Azerbaijan and Georgia’s growing efforts to secure NATO’s lasting involvement in the region, coupled with Russia’s determination to exclude other rivals, foster a polarization along very traditional lines.71 In 1993 Moscow even threatened World War III to deter Turkish intervention on behalf of Azerbaijan. Yet the new Russo-Armenian Treaty and Azeri-Turkish treaty suggest that Russia and Turkey could be dragged into a confrontation to rescue their allies from defeat. 72 Thus many of the conditions for conventional war or protracted ethnic conflict in which third parties intervene are present in the Transcaucasus. For example, many Third World conflicts generated by local structural factors have a great potential for unintended escalation. Big powers often feel obliged to rescue their lesser proteges and proxies. One or another big power may fail to grasp the other side’s stakes since interests here are not as clear as in Europe. Hence commitments involving the use of nuclear weapons to prevent a client’s defeat are not as well established or apparent. Clarity about the nature of the threat could prevent the kind of rapid and almost uncontrolled escalation we saw in 1993 when Turkish noises about intervening on behalf of Azerbaijan led Russian leaders to threaten a nuclear war in that case. 73 Precisely because Turkey is a NATO ally, Russian nuclear threats could trigger a potential nuclear blow (not a small possibility given the erratic nature of Russia’s declared nuclear strategies). The real threat of a Russian nuclear strike against Turkey to defend Moscow’s interests and forces in the Transcaucasus makes the danger of major war there higher than almost everywhere else. As Richard Betts has observed, The greatest danger lies in areas where (1) the potential for serious instability is high; (2) both superpowers perceive vital interests; (3) neither recognizes that the other’s perceived interest or commitment is as great as its own; (4) both have the capability to inject conventional forces; and, (5) neither has willing proxies capable of settling the situation.74 Russian perceptions of the Transcaspian’s criticality to its interests is tied to its continuing efforts to perpetuate and extend the vast disproportion in power it possesses relative to other CIS states. This power and resource disproportion between Russia and the smaller states of the Transcaspian region means that no natural equilibrium is possible there. Russia neither can be restrained nor will it accept restraint by any local institution or power in its pursuit of unilateral advantage and reintegration.

#### Oil Dependence motivates terrorism

Glaser ‘11

Reframing Energy Security: How Oil Dependence Influences U.S. National Security Charles L. Glaser cglaser@gwu.edu Professor of Political Science and International Relations Elliot School of International Affairs The George Washington University August 2011, epts.washington.edu/.../Glaser\_-\_EnergySecurity-AUGUST-2011.doc

The previous mechanisms identified paths via which a state’s efforts to protect, deny and/or acquire oil resources could bring it into conflict with other states. In addition, there is the possibility that the foreign and security policies that a state adopts to protect its oil interests could fuel support for terrorist organizations. Most obviously, this possibility comes to mind because al Qaeda attributes its attacks against the United States and U.S. interests to America’s involvement in the Middle East, probably most importantly its support for the Saudi regime and deployment of troops on Saudi soil. The extent of this danger depends on assessments of the sources of terrorism and the magnitude of the danger posed by terrorist groups, both of which are hotly debated.

#### Terrorism causes extinction

Speice 6

Speice, Patrick F., Jr. "Negligence and nuclear nonproliferation: eliminating the current liability barrier to bilateral U.S.-Russian nonproliferation assistance programs." William and Mary Law Review 47.4 (Feb 2006): 1427(59). Expanded Academic ASAP.

With the end of the Cold War in 1991, the states of the former Soviet Union were thrown into economic and political disarray." Perhaps the greatest risk that accompanied this collapse was the threat of 'loose nuclear weapons. '29 The end of the Cold War largely eliminated the risk of global nuclear conflict between states, but the threat of terrorist attacks became the primary challenge to the United States' national security, as demonstrated by a number of incidents during the last decade. 30 Although no terrorist acts directed against the population or interests of the United States or other states have been launched with nuclear weapons yet, this failure "must be assumed to be due to lack of means rather than lack of motivation."'" Attempts by al-Qaeda to acquire nuclear material are well documented,32 and several other attempted thefts of nuclear material indicates that there is a demand for nuclear material among terrorist groups, many of which are hostile to the United States. 33 The collapse of the Soviet Union dramatically increased the risk that terrorist organizations will succeed in acquiring fissile material from Russia for several reasons. First, the end of the Soviet state marked the end of state control over every aspect of life in the Soviet Union.34 One by-product of stringent centralized control was heavy regulation and intense security measures for military facilities and nuclear installations. 5 Second, the economic decline that accompanied the transition to a market economy" exacerbated the problem, as the fiscal situation in the former Soviet states, most notably Russia, made security programs impossible to fund.37 Graham Allison summarizes the implications of post-Soviet disorder in Russia: The dramatic changes ... have produced political uncertainty, economic distress, and social dislocation. For tens of millions of Russians, hardship and deprivation are inescapable facts of life.... [H]arsh economic conditions can create incentives for nuclear theft and smuggling. For people who are poorly housed, poorly fed, and poorly paid (when paid at all), there will be a temptation to do what they can to improve their lives and secure their futures. Russia's nuclear custodians face these pressures as they preside over weapons and materials that are immensely valuable to any state or group that covets nuclear weapons. It is not hard to imagine that people leading bleak, uncertain, and difficult lives might find irresistible the prospect of wealth and security via the nuclear black market.... Organizations such as the Russian military and Minatom are now operating in circumstances of great stress. Money is in short supply, paychecks are irregular, living conditions unpleasant.... [D]isorder within Russia and the resulting strains within the military could easily cause a lapse or a breakdown in the Russian military's guardianship of nuclear weapons." Accordingly, there is a significant and ever-present risk that terrorists could acquire a nuclear device or fissile material from Russia as a result of the confluence of Russian economic decline and the end of stringent Soviet-era nuclear security measures."9 Terrorist groups could acquire a nuclear weapon by a number of methods, including "steal[ing] one intact from the stockpile of a country possessing such weapons, or ... [being] sold or given one by such a country, or [buying or stealing] one from another subnational group that had obtained it in one of these ways.'' 4 ' Equally threatening, however, is the risk that terrorists will steal or purchase fissile material and construct a nuclear device on their own. Very little material is necessary to construct a highly destructive nuclear weapon. 41 Although nuclear devices are extraordinarily complex, the technical barriers to constructing a workable weapon are not significant.42 Moreover, the sheer number of methods that could be used to deliver a nuclear device into the United States makes it incredibly likely that terrorists could successfully employ a nuclear weapon once it was built.4 ' Accordingly, supply-side controls that are aimed at preventing terrorists from acquiring nuclear material in the first place are the most effective means of countering the risk of nuclear terrorism. 44 Moreover, the end of the Cold War eliminated the rationale for maintaining a large military-industrial complex in Russia, and the nuclear cities were closed. 45 This resulted in at least 35,000 nuclear scientists becoming unemployed in an economy that was collapsing.4 Although the economy has stabilized somewhat, there are still at least 20,000 former scientists who are unemployed or underpaid and who are too young to retire, 47 raising the chilling prospect that these scientists will be tempted to sell their nuclear knowledge, or steal nuclear material to sell, to states or terrorist organizations with nuclear ambitions.4" The potential consequences of the unchecked spread of nuclear knowledge and material to terrorist groups that seek to cause mass destruction in the United States are truly horrifying. A terrorist attack with a nuclear weapon would be devastating in terms of immediate human and economic losses.49 Moreover, there would be immense political pressure in the United States to discover the perpetrators and retaliate with nuclear weapons, massively increasing the number of casualties and potentially triggering a full-scale nuclear conflict.' In addition to the threat posed by terrorists, leakage of nuclear knowledge and material from Russia will reduce the barriers that states with nuclear ambitions face and may trigger widespread proliferation of nuclear weapons.5' This proliferation will increase the risk of nuclear attacks against the United States or its allies by hostile states,5 2 as well as increase the likelihood that regional conflicts will draw in the United States and escalate to the use of nuclear weapons.53

#### Robust transit reform reduces fuel consumption even for those who never use it—its key to solve oil dependence and emissions

Bailey, Mokhtarian, & Little ‘8

Linda Bailey is Senior Associate for Transportation at ICF International. Patricia Lyon Mokhtarian, Professor, Civil and Environmental Engineering, Chair, Transportation Technology and Policy Graduate Program, and Associate Director for Education, Institute of Transportation Studies at University of California, Davis. Andrew Little is president of Urban Policy Research Institute. “The Broader Connection between Public Transportation, Energy Conservation and Greenhouse Gas Reduction,” <http://www.apta.com/research/info/online/documents/land_use.pdf>, February.

This study found a significant correlation between transit availability and reduced automobile travel, independent of transit use. Transit reduces U.S. travel by an estimated 102.2 billion vehicle miles traveled (VMT) each year. This is equal to 3.4 percent of the annual VMT in the U.S. in 2007. An earlier study on public transportation fuel savings assessed the total number of automobile VMT required to replace transit trips in the U.S. (ICF 2007). This study calculated the direct petroleum savings attributable to public transportation to be 1.4 billion gallons a year. Under the current study, however, the secondary effects of transit availability on travel were also taken into account. In order to calculate this, we created a statistical model that accounts for the effects of public transportation on land use patterns, and the magnitude of those effects as carried through to travel patterns. The total effect then shows savings from people who simply live near transit (without necessarily using it). By reducing vehicle miles traveled, public transportation reduces energy use in the transportation sector and emissions. The total energy saved, less the energy used by public transportation and adding fuel savings from reduced congestion, is equivalent to 4.2 billion gallons of gasoline. The total effects reduce greenhouse gas emissions from automobile travel by 37 million metric tons. This consists of 30.1 million metric tonnes reduced from secondary effects and a net savings of 6.9 million metric tonnes from primary effects and the effects of transit induced congestion reduction. To put the CO2 reductions in perspective, to achieve parallel savings by planting new forests, one would have to plant a forest larger than the state of Indiana. Total CO2 emission reductions from public transportation are shown, for primary and total effects, in Figure 1, above.

#### C. THE ENVIROMENT

#### Air pollution kills millions and collapses the economy and the health care system- public transit is key to solve

Fischlowitz-Roberts ‘2 (Bernie, "Air Pollution Fatalities Now Exceed Traffic Fatalities by 3 to 1," Earth Policy Institute, 9/17, http://www.earth-policy.org/Updates/Update17.htm)

The World Health Organization reports that 3 million people now die each year from the effects of air pollution. This is three times the 1 million who die each year in automobile accidents. A study published in *The Lancet* in 2000 concluded that air pollution in France, Austria, and Switzerland is responsible for more than 40,000 deaths annually in those three countries. About half of these deaths can be traced to air pollution from vehicle emissions. In the United States, traffic fatalities total just over 40,000 per year, while air pollution claims 70,000 lives annually. U.S. air pollution deaths are equal to deaths from breast cancer and prostate cancer combined. This scourge of cities in industrial and developing countries alike threatens the health of billions of people. Governments go to great lengths to reduce traffic accidents by fining those who drive at dangerous speeds, arresting those who drive under the influence of alcohol, and even sometimes revoking drivers' licenses. But they pay much less attention to the deaths people cause by simply driving the cars. While deaths from heart disease and respiratory illness from breathing polluted air may lack the drama of deaths from an automobile crash, with flashing lights and sirens, they are no less real. Air pollutants include carbon monoxide, ozone, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, and particulates. These pollutants come primarily from the combustion of fossil fuels, principally coal-fired power plants and gasoline-powered automobiles. Nitrogen oxides can lead to the formation of ground-level ozone. Particulates are emitted from a variety of sources, primarily diesel engines. "Smog"-a hybrid word used to describe the mixture of smoke and fog that blankets some cities-is primarily composed of ozone and particulates. The air in most urban areas typically contains a mixture of pollutants, each of which may increase a person's vulnerability to the effects of the others. Exposure to carbon monoxide slows reflexes and causes drowsiness, since carbon monoxide molecules bind to hemoglobin, reducing the amount of oxygen that red blood cells can carry. Nitrogen dioxide can aggravate asthma and reduce lung function, as well as making airways more sensitive to allergens. Ozone also causes lung inflammation and reduces lung function and exercise capacity. Smaller particulates, especially those 10 micrometers in diameter (1/2,400 of an inch) or smaller, can become lodged in the alveolar sacs of the lungs. They are associated with higher admissions to hospital for respiratory problems and with increased mortality, particularly from respiratory and cardiovascular diseases. As particulate concentrations in the air rise, so do death rates. When people inhale particulates and ozone at concentrations commonly found in urban areas, their arteries become more constricted, thus reducing blood flow and oxygen supply to the heart. This is why air pollution aggravates heart conditions and asthma. Unlike some pollutants that have threshold levels below which no health effects are seen, ozone and particulates have negative health effects even at very low levels. Thus no "safe" level of such pollutants exists. Research published in Science in 2001 noted that in industrial as well as developing countries, exposures to current levels of ozone and particulates "affect death rates, hospitalizations and medical visits, complications of asthma and bronchitis, days of work lost, restricted-activity days, and a variety of measures of lung damage." While these affect health care systems, they also take a toll on the economy. The increased monetary expenses related to air pollution induced illness include the costs of medication, absences from work, and child care expenses. In the Canadian province of Ontario, for example, which has a population of 11.9 million, air pollution costs citizens at least $1 billion annually in hospital admissions, emergency room visits, and worker absenteeism. According to the World Bank, the social costs of exposure to airborne dust and lead in Jakarta, Bangkok, and Manila approached 10 percent of average incomes in the early 1990s. In China, which has some of the world's worst urban air pollution, the illnesses and deaths of urban residents due to air pollution are estimated to cost 5 percent of the gross domestic product. The economic costs of air pollution argue for reducing income taxes and raising taxes on fossil fuels. This would encourage more efficient fuel use, a shift to clean energy sources, and the adoption of pollution controls. The alternative is to spend more on health insurance to treat air pollution-related ailments. Raising the costs of polluting fuels will reduce suffering and premature death. In response to traffic congestion and their notorious air pollution problems, Mexico City and São Paulo restrict people from driving on certain days of the week, based on the last digit on their license plates. And Bogotá, Colombia, has put in place a series of measures to reduce air pollution from transportation; in the process, it has become a more livable city. Since 1995, the city has reduced traffic during rush hours by 40 percent and increased the gasoline tax. Some 120 kilometers (75 miles) of main arteries are closed for seven hours each Sunday, which allows the streets to be used for walking, bicycling, and jogging. The solutions to urban air pollution are not difficult to discern. Individuals can reduce car usage in favor of cycling, walking, and mass transit and can use more fuel-efficient cars. Urban planning commissions and regional governments can redirect transportation funding toward mass transit options: light rail, heavy rail, or rapid bus transit. Zoning laws and other regulatory tools can be used to encourage the higher density development that is conducive to mass transit. And countries can shift electricity generation from coal and natural gas toward wind and solar power, using the lever of government subsidies and tax incentives for clean energy, rather than continuing to subsidize fossil fuels. When purchasing a new car, consumers typically consider price, extra features, safety, and sometimes fuel economy. The fact that air pollution fatalities substantially exceed traffic fatalities worldwide suggests the need to broadly redefine notions of safety to include the goal of decreasing air pollution. While only some motorists contribute to traffic fatalities, all motorists contribute to air pollution fatalities.

#### Pollution threats human survival

Zayed Prize 3 (PG. http://www.zayedprize.org.ae/en/display.aspx?type=news&id=1518)

Air pollution is a serious threat to human survival affecting all aspects of life on earth including its socio-economic development. Climatic changes have been on their upswing choking, many urban areas worldwide and theory effecting sustainable development. With Asian brown clouds becoming an important issue in this part of the world. It has been catching media headlines recently.

#### Robust transit solves massive amounts of c02 emissions

Bailey, Mokhtarian, & Little ‘8

Linda Bailey is Senior Associate for Transportation at ICF International. Patricia Lyon MokhtarianProfessor, Civil and Environmental Engineering, Chair, Transportation Technology and Policy Graduate Program, and Associate Director for Education, Institute of Transportation Studies at University of California, Davis. Andrew Little is president of Urban Policy Research Institute. “The Broader Connection between Public Transportation, Energy Conservation and Greenhouse Gas Reduction,” <http://www.apta.com/research/info/online/documents/land_use.pdf>, February.

The estimated savings in petroleum use from public transportation can also be expressed in terms of greenhouse gas emissions. Carbon dioxide (CO2) is by far the most prevalent greenhouse gas emitted from motor vehicles. Each gallon of gasoline burned releases 8.9 kg of CO2. The total effects of public transit availability reduce CO2 emissions by 37 million metric tonnes annually. We can consider these savings in terms of equivalent acres of forest. Planting new forest is one way to remove CO2 from the atmosphere. Trees sequester carbon as they grow; other effects such as cooling from reduced reflectivity and carbon emissions upon decay are omitted for the purpose of this comparison. Figure 3 below shows how much new forest plantings would be required to absorb the same amount of CO2 that bus and rail transit currently keep out of the atmosphere annually. To match the total effect of public transportation, the U.S. would have to plant 23.2 million acres of new forest. In other words, if the United States had no public transportation systems, it would need a new forest the size of Indiana to absorb the additional CO2 emissions from the transportation system.

#### Drastically reducing transportation emissions key to solve climate change

Winkelman et al ‘9

Steve Winkelman is director of the Transportation Program at the Center for Clean Air Policy (CCAP). Allison Bishins is a policy associate for transportation and climate change at CCAP. Chuck Kooshian is a Planner with the El Paso Department of Planning and Development. “Cost-Effective GHG Reductions through

Smart Growth & Improved Transportation Choices: An economic case for investment of cap-and-trade revenues,” <http://www.reconnectingamerica.org/public/display_asset/ccapsmartgrowthco2_june_2009_final_pdf?docid=306>, June 2009.

There is a growing consensus that industrialized nations need to reduce their GHG emissions 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050 to stave off the most severe impacts of climate change. Recent analysis suggests even deeper cuts may be necessary. 4 Meeting the 80 percent goal will require emissions reductions from all sectors of the economy, including the transportation sector. Nearly one third of GHG emissions in the U.S. come from the transportation sector, making it the nation’s largest end-use source of emissions. Moreover, transportation is the fastest growing source of U.S. emissions, accounting for almost half of the net increase in total U.S. emissions between 1990 and 2007.5

#### PLAN IS MODELLED GLOBALLY, SOLVES WARMING

Burwell ‘8, David for the Funders’ Network for Smart Growth and Livable Communities. January, The Role of US Transportation Policy Reform in Global Climate Protection, online 2009

U.S. leadership is required to win the climate fight. What the U.S, says and does still matters in the world—enormously. The U.S. transportation sector is largest and fastest-growing domestic, end-use source of carbon emissions (33%). This is due in large part to massive public subsidies to transportation (including the externalization of environmental costs) generally, and to highway travel in particular. These subsidies remain the basis of our national transportation policies. We are now exporting these policies to developing countries—just as the folly of reliance on such policies is becoming self-evident. If the US can’t reduce its own transportation carbon emissions when car ownership has reached the saturation point (857 vehicles/1000 population) why should China (at 15 vehicles/1000 on the way to 100 vehicles/1000 by 2020) be expected to do so when the country is still in the early stages of motorization?

#### Warming is real and human induced – consensus is on our side – numerous studies prove

Rahmstorf 8 – Professor of Physics of the Oceans

Richard, of Physics of the Oceans at Potsdam University, Global Warming: Looking Beyond Kyoto, Edited by Ernesto Zedillo, “Anthropogenic Climate Change?,” pg. 42-4

It is time to turn to statement B: human activities are altering the climate. This can be broken into two parts. The first is as follows: global climate is warming. This is by now a generally undisputed point (except by novelist Michael Crichton), so we deal with it only briefly. The two leading compilations of data measured with thermometers are shown in figure 3-3, that of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and that of the British Hadley Centre for Climate Change. Although they differ in the details, due to the inclusion of different data sets and use of different spatial averaging and quality control procedures, they both show a consistent picture, with a global mean warming of 0.8°C since the late nineteenth century. Temperatures over the past ten years clearly were the warmest since measured records have been available. The year 1998 sticks out well above the longterm trend due to the occurrence of a major El Nino event that year (the last El Nino so far and one of the strongest on record). These events are examples of the largest natural climate variations on multiyear time scales and, by releasing heat from the ocean, generally cause positive anomalies in global mean temperature. It is remarkable that the year 2005 rivaled the heat of 1998 even though no El Nino event occurred that year. (A bizarre curiosity, perhaps worth mentioning, is that several prominent "climate skeptics" recently used the extreme year 1998 to claim in the media that global warming had ended. In Lindzen's words, "Indeed, the absence of any record breakers during the past seven years is statistical evidence that temperatures are not increasing.")33 In addition to the surface measurements, the more recent portion of the global warming trend (since 1979) is also documented by satellite data. It is not straightforward to derive a reliable surface temperature trend from satellites, as they measure radiation coming from throughout the atmosphere (not just near the surface), including the stratosphere, which has strongly cooled, and the records are not homogeneous' due to the short life span of individual satellites, the problem of orbital decay, observations at different times of day, and drifts in instrument calibration.' Current analyses of these satellite data show trends that are fully consistent with surface measurements and model simulations." If no reliable temperature measurements existed, could we be sure that the climate is warming? The "canaries in the coal mine" of climate change (as glaciologist Lonnie Thompson puts it) ~are mountain glaciers. We know, both from old photographs and from the position of the terminal moraines heaped up by the flowing ice, that mountain glaciers have been in retreat all over the world during the past century. There are precious few exceptions, and they are associated with a strong increase in precipitation or local cooling.36 I have inspected examples of shrinking glaciers myself in field trips to Switzerland, Norway, and New Zealand. As glaciers respond sensitively to temperature changes, data on the extent of glaciers have been used to reconstruct a history of Northern Hemisphere temperature over the past four centuries (see figure 3-4). Cores drilled in tropical glaciers show signs of recent melting that is unprecedented at least throughout the Holocene-the past 10,000 years. Another powerful sign of warming, visible clearly from satellites, is the shrinking Arctic sea ice cover (figure 3-5), which has declined 20 percent since satellite observations began in 1979. While climate clearly became warmer in the twentieth century, much discussion particularly in the popular media has focused on the question of how "unusual" this warming is in a longer-term context. While this is an interesting question, it has often been mixed incorrectly with the question of causation. Scientifically, how unusual recent warming is-say, compared to the past millennium-in itself contains little information about its cause. Even a highly unusual warming could have a natural cause (for example, an exceptional increase in solar activity). And even a warming within the bounds of past natural variations could have a predominantly anthropogenic cause. I come to the question of causation shortly, after briefly visiting the evidence for past natural climate variations. Records from the time before systematic temperature measurements were collected are based on "proxy data," coming from tree rings, ice cores, corals, and other sources. These proxy data are generally linked to local temperatures in some way, but they may be influenced by other parameters as well (for example, precipitation), they may have a seasonal bias (for example, the growth season for tree rings), and high-quality long records are difficult to obtain and therefore few in number and geographic coverage. Therefore, there is still substantial uncertainty in the evolution of past global or hemispheric temperatures. (Comparing only local or regional temperature; as in Europe, is of limited value for our purposes,' as regional variations can be much larger than global ones and can have many regional causes, unrelated to global-scale forcing and climate change.) The first quantitative reconstruction for the Northern Hemisphere temperature of the past millennium, including an error estimation, was presented by Mann, Bradley, and Hughes and rightly highlighted in the 2001 IPCC report as one of the major new findings since its 1995 report; it is shown in figure 3\_6.39 The analysis suggests that, despite the large error bars, twentieth-century warming is indeed highly unusual and probably was unprecedented during the past millennium. This result, presumably because of its symbolic power, has attracted much criticism, to some extent in scientific journals, but even more so in the popular media. The hockey stick-shaped curve became a symbol for the IPCC, .and criticizing this particular data analysis became an avenue for some to question the credibility of the IPCC. Three important things have been overlooked in much of the media coverage. First, even if the scientific critics had been right, this would not have called into question the very cautious conclusion drawn by the IPCC from the reconstruction by Mann, Bradley, and Hughes: "New analyses of proxy data for the Northern Hemisphere indicate that the increase in temperature in the twentieth century is likely to have been the largest of any century during the past 1,000 years." This conclusion has since been supported further by every single one of close to a dozen new reconstructions (two of which are shown in figure 3-6).Second, by far the most serious scientific criticism raised against Mann, Hughes, and Bradley was simply based on a mistake. 40 The prominent paper of von Storch and others, which claimed (based on a model test) that the method of Mann, Bradley, and Hughes systematically underestimated variability, "was [itself] based on incorrect implementation of the reconstruction procedure."41 With correct implementation, climate field reconstruction procedures such as the one used by Mann, Bradley, and Hughes have been shown to perform well in similar model tests. Third, whether their reconstruction is accurate or not has no bearing on policy. If their analysis underestimated past natural climate variability, this would certainly not argue for a smaller climate sensitivity and thus a lesser concern about the consequences of our emissions. Some have argued that, in contrast, it would point to a larger climate sensitivity. While this is a valid point in principle, it does not apply in practice to the climate sensitivity estimates discussed herein or to the range given by IPCC, since these did not use the reconstruction of Mann, Hughes, and Bradley or any other proxy records of the past millennium. Media claims that "a pillar of the Kyoto Protocol" had been called into question were therefore misinformed. As an aside, the protocol was agreed in 1997, before the reconstruction in question even existed. The overheated public debate on this topic has, at least, helped to attract more researchers and funding to this area of paleoclimatology; its methodology has advanced significantly, and a number of new reconstructions have been presented in recent years. While the science has moved forward, the first seminal reconstruction by Mann, Hughes, and Bradley has held up remarkably well, with its main features reproduced by more recent work. Further progress probably will require substantial amounts of new proxy data, rather than further refinement of the statistical techniques pioneered by Mann, Hughes, and Bradley. Developing these data sets will require time and substantial effort. It is time to address the final statement: most of the observed warming over the past fifty years is anthropogenic. A large number of studies exist that have taken different approaches to analyze this issue, which is generally called the "attribution problem." I do not discuss the exact share of the anthropogenic contribution (although this is an interesting question). By "most" I imply mean "more than 50 percent.”The first and crucial piece of evidence is, of course, that the magnitude of the warming is what is expected from the anthropogenic perturbation of the radiation balance, so anthropogenic forcing is able to explain all of the temperature rise. As discussed here, the rise in greenhouse gases alone corresponds to 2.6 W/tn2 of forcing. This by itself, after subtraction of the observed 0'.6 W/m2 of ocean heat uptake, would Cause 1.6°C of warming since preindustrial times for medium climate sensitivity (3"C). With a current "best guess'; aerosol forcing of 1 W/m2, the expected warming is O.8°c. The point here is not that it is possible to obtain the 'exact observed number-this is fortuitous because the amount of aerosol' forcing is still very' uncertain-but that the expected magnitude is roughly right. There can be little doubt that the anthropogenic forcing is large enough to explain most of the warming. Depending on aerosol forcing and climate sensitivity, it could explain a large fraction of the warming, or all of it, or even more warming than has been observed (leaving room for natural processes to counteract some of the warming). The second important piece of evidence is clear: there is no viable alternative explanation. In the scientific literature, no serious alternative hypothesis has been proposed to explain the observed global warming. Other possible causes, such as solar activity, volcanic activity, cosmic rays, or orbital cycles, are well observed, but they do not show trends capable of explaining the observed warming. Since 1978, solar irradiance has been measured directly from satellites and shows the well-known eleven-year solar cycle, but no trend. There are various estimates of solar variability before this time, based on sunspot numbers, solar cycle length, the geomagnetic AA index, neutron monitor data, and, carbon-14 data. These indicate that solar activity probably increased somewhat up to 1940. While there is disagreement about the variation in previous centuries, different authors agree that solar activity did not significantly increase during the last sixty-five years. Therefore, this cannot explain the warming, and neither can any of the other factors mentioned. Models driven by natural factors only, leaving the anthropogenic forcing aside, show a cooling in the second half of the twentieth century (for an example, See figure 2-2, panel a, in chapter 2 of this volume). The trend in the sum of natural forcings is downward.The only way out would be either some as yet undiscovered unknown forcing or a warming trend that arises by chance from an unforced internal variability in the climate system. The latter cannot be completely ruled out, but has to be considered highly unlikely. No evidence in the observed record, proxy data, or current models suggest that such internal variability could cause a sustained trend of global warming of the observed magnitude. As discussed, twentieth century warming is unprecedented over the past 1,000 years (or even 2,000 years, as the few longer reconstructions available now suggest), which does not 'support the idea of large internal fluctuations. Also, those past variations correlate well with past forcing (solar variability, volcanic activity) and thus appear to be largely forced rather than due to unforced internal variability." And indeed, it would be difficult for a large and sustained unforced variability to satisfy the fundamental physical law of energy conservation. Natural internal variability generally shifts heat around different parts of the climate system-for example, the large El Nino event of 1998, which warmed, the atmosphere by releasing heat stored in the ocean. This mechanism implies that the ocean heat content drops as the atmosphere warms. For past decades, as discussed, we observed the atmosphere warming and the ocean heat content increasing, which rules out heat release from the ocean as a cause of surface warming. The heat content of the whole climate system is increasing, and there is no plausible source of this heat other than the heat trapped by greenhouse gases. ' A completely different approach to attribution is to analyze the spatial patterns of climate change. This is done in so-called fingerprint studies, which associate particular patterns or "fingerprints" with different forcings. It is plausible that the pattern of a solar-forced climate change differs from the pattern of a change caused by greenhouse gases. For example, a characteristic of greenhouse gases is that heat is trapped closer to the Earth's surface and that, unlike solar variability, greenhouse gases tend to warm more in winter, and at night. Such studies have used different data sets and have been performed by different groups of researchers with different statistical methods. They consistently conclude that the observed spatial pattern of warming can only be explained by greenhouse gases.49 Overall, it has to be considered, highly likely' that the observed warming is indeed predominantly due to the human-caused increase in greenhouse gases. ' This paper discussed the evidence for the anthropogenic increase in atmospheric CO2 concentration and the effect of CO2 on climate, finding that this anthropogenic increase is proven beyond reasonable doubt and that a mass of evidence points to a CO2 effect on climate of 3C ± 1.59C global-warming for a doubling of concentration. (This is, the classic IPCC range; my personal assessment is that, in-the light of new studies since the IPCC Third Assessment Report, the uncertainty range can now be narrowed somewhat to 3°C ± 1.0C) This is based on consistent results from theory, models, and data analysis, and, even in the absence-of any computer models, the same result would still hold based on physics and on data from climate history alone. Considering the plethora of consistent evidence, the chance that these conclusions are wrong has to be considered minute. If the preceding is accepted, then it follows logically and incontrovertibly that a further increase in CO2 concentration will lead to further warming. The magnitude of our emissions depends on human behavior, but the climatic response to various emissions scenarios can be computed from the information presented here. The result is the famous range of future global temperature scenarios shown in figure 3\_6.50 Two additional steps are involved in these computations: the consideration of anthropogenic forcings other than CO2 (for example, other greenhouse gases and aerosols) and the computation of concentrations from the emissions. Other gases are not discussed here, although they are important to get quantitatively accurate results. CO2 is the largest and most important forcing. Concerning concentrations, the scenarios shown basically assume that ocean and biosphere take up a similar share of our emitted CO2 as in the past. This could turn out to be an optimistic assumption; some models indicate the possibility of a positive feedback, with the biosphere turning into a carbon source rather than a sink under growing climatic stress. It is clear that even in the more optimistic of the shown (non-mitigation) scenarios, global temperature would rise by 2-3°C above its preindustrial level by the end of this century. Even for a paleoclimatologist like myself, this is an extraordinarily high temperature, which is very likely unprecedented in at least the past 100,000 years. As far as the data show, we would have to go back about 3 million years, to the Pliocene, for comparable temperatures. The rate of this warming (which is important for the ability of ecosystems to cope) is also highly unusual and unprecedented probably for an even longer time. The last major global warming trend occurred when the last great Ice Age ended between 15,000 and 10,000 years ago: this was a warming of about 5°C over 5,000 years, that is, a rate of only 0.1 °C per century. 52 The expected magnitude and rate of planetary warming is highly likely to come with major risk and impacts in terms of sea level rise (Pliocene sea level was 25-35 meters higher than now due to smaller Greenland and Antarctic ice sheets), extreme events (for example, hurricane activity is expected to increase in a warmer climate), and ecosystem loss. The second part of this paper examined the evidence for the current warming of the planet and discussed what is known about its causes. This part showed that global warming is already a measured and-well-established fact, not a theory. Many different lines of evidence consistently show that most of the observed warming of the past fifty years was caused by human activity. Above all, this warming is exactly what would be expected given the anthropogenic rise in greenhouse gases, and no viable alternative explanation for this warming has been proposed in the scientific literature. Taken together., the very strong evidence accumulated from thousands of independent studies, has over the past decades convinced virtually every climatologist around the world (many of whom were initially quite skeptical, including myself) that anthropogenic global warming is a reality with which we need to deal.

#### WARMING CAUSES CLIMATE SWITCH, FAST EXTINCTION

Fagan 2k

Brian Fagan is Brian Murray Fagan is being emeritus professor of Anthropology at the University of California, Santa Barbara. *The Little Ice Age,* p. 213-4

What form will this change talk? One school of thought, popular with energy companies, is serenely unfazed by global warming. Gradual climate change will bring more benign temperatures. Sea levels will rise slightly, there may be some extreme weather events, bus within a few centuries we will emerge into a more uniform, warmer regimen of shrunken ice sheets milder winters, and more predictable weather- much like earth in the time of the dinosaurs. Humanity will adjust effortlessly to its new circumstances, just as it has adjusted to more extreme changes in ancient times. The record of history shows us that this is an illusion. Climate change is almost always abrupt, shifting rapidly within decades, even years, and entirely capricious. The Link Ice Age climate was remarkable for its rapid changes. Decades of relatively stable conditions were followed by a sudden shift to much colder weather, as in the late seventeenth century. 1740/41, or even the 1960g. The same pattern of sudden change extends hack as far as the Great Ice Age of 15.000 years ago, and probably to the very beginnings of geological time. Given this history we would be rash to assume that sudden climate change will miraculously give way so a more uniform warming trend. The exact opposite seems more likely. In all probability the dinosaurs lived through short term climatic shifts that were just as unpredictable as those of the past 10,000 years, if for no other reason than that large-scale volcanic activity was just as prevalent then as it as today. The Little Ice Age reminds us that climate change as inevitable, unpredictable, and sometimes vicious. The future promises exactly the same kinds of violent change on a local and global scale. If the present unusually prolonged high mode of the North Atlantic Oscillation is indeed due to anthropogenic forcing, then we must also assume that global warming will accentuate the natural cycles of global climate on the largest and smallest scales. Some of these potential cycles of change are frightening to contemplate in an overpopulated and heavily industrialized world. This concern has ample historical precedent. Eleven thousand years ago, long before the Industrial Revolution, humanity experienced a fast climate change that came as a complete shock. After some three millennia of global warming, rising levels, and shrinking ace sheets at the end of the Great Ice Age, a massive influx of flesh glacial meltwater into Arctic waters shut down the downwelling that carried salt water into the deep ocean. The warm conveyor belt that had nourished natural global warming in the north abruptly stopped. The warming itself ceased perhaps within a few generations, plunging Europe into near-glacial cold for a thousand years. Glaciers advanced, pack ice spread far south for much of the year, and forests retreated southward. Rainfall zones shifted, and intense drought settled over southwestern Asia, causing many Stone Age hands to turn from foraging to farming. The millennium-long "Younger Dryas" event, named after a polar flower, ended as rapidly as it began, when the downwelling switch abruptly turned on again and warming resumed.

#### Warming also collapses oxygen levels and leads to extinction

Brandenburg & Paxson ’00, (Both PhDs, Dead Mars, Dying Earth, pg. 246-247)

A terrible synergism of disaster is already at work. The complex system called climate is running amok because of increasing carbon dioxide, while at the same time, oxygen, the “other gas” involved in the combustion of fossil fuels, is losing concentration levels in our atmosphere. We are talking oxygen, the gas that we breathe in to fire out every cell in our bodies – not carbon dioxide that we breathe out as waste, but the stuff we need to sustain the process called life. The decline of oxygen is tiny, but easily measurable. Its decline may have been noted years ago, but its significance was immediately minimized. In a bow to its emotional implications, the data was suppressed – or, given the human ability to distance or deny – maybe even repressed. The decline in oxygen concentration means the beginning of the end for fossil fuels. To continue to burn them at the present rate, to contemplate that we will industrialize the Third World based on fossil fuel use, to consider that the world’s rainforests are just idle land to be burned and farmed, is to participate in an act of environmental genocide and self-immolation. Some will insist that even though the world’s supply of oxygen is going down, the amount is too small to be important. That is nonsense. It is important. On the course we are on, it will continue to fall. Finally, it will plummet like a stone. The decline in oxygen is important because it shows where we are going. It is akin to the canary falling off its perch in the coal mine, or the frantic call from the crow’s nest that an iceberg is dead ahead.

## \*\*\*Topicality\*\*\*

### Block Grants = T

#### Block grants are fixed sum grants to states and local governments for narrowly defined purposes

Finegold et al '04

Kenneth, Laura Wherry, Stephanie Schardin, "Block Grants: Historical Overview and Lessons Learned," The Urban Institute Program to Assess Changing Social Policies, published in New Federalism, Series A, No. A-63, April 2004 <http://www.urban.org/uploadedPDF/310991_A-63.pdf> AD 7/3/12

Between President Bush’s FY 2005 budget and pending congressional legislation, at least 10 different block grant proposals are up for consideration by national policymakers. Block grants are fixed-sum federal grants to state and local governments that give them broad flexibility to design and implement designated programs. Federal oversight and requirements are light, and funds are allocated among recipient governments by formula. Most federal aid is currently distributed to state and local governments as categorical grants, which may also be allocated by formula but can only be used for rather narrowly defined purposes.

## \*\*\*STATUS QUO GENERALLY UNCOOL\*\*\*

### SQ Programs Fail

#### Ridership and low-income need both on the rise but cuts coming now that will debilitate the national bus system

**Criollo & Porchas ‘9**,

(Manuel, Lead Organizer for the Bus Riders Union, Francisca, Transit Riders for Public Transportation, National Campaign Launch: Transit Riders for Public Transportation, 4/8/2009, http://www.thestrategycenter.org/news/pr/2009/04/08/national-campaign-launch-transit-riders-public-transportation)

**Currently transit agencies** from New York City to St. Louis Missouri **are being hit with operating deficits** of anywhere from $50 million to $2 billion. **Agencies are cutting service and raising fares at a time when ridership is on the rise, when masses of people, especially low-income people** of color, **are losing their jobs**, Section 8, and other public assistance. **TRPT demands the prioritization of operating funds in order to increase transit service and lower fares.**

#### Transit agencies cutting back services now; state budgets can’t support existing infrastructure

Berube and Puentes et all '11

Robert Puentes, senior fellow with the Brookings Institution’s Metropolitan Policy Program, Alan Berube,senior fellow and research director at the Brookings Institution Metropolitan Policy Program, Adie Tomer, Senior Research Analyst at the Brookings Institution Metropolitan Policy Program and a member of the Metropolitan Infrastructure Initiative., Elizabeth Kneebone, senior research associate and associate fellow at the Brookings Institution Metropolitan Policy Program., "Missed Opportunity: Transit and Jobs in Metropolitan America," May 2011, Brookings, [www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/reports/2011/5/12 jobs and transit/0512\_jobs\_transit.pdf](http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/reports/2011/5/12%20jobs%20and%20transit/0512_jobs_transit.pdf) AD 7/1/12

Now, however, severe budget constraints and rapidly fluctuating energy prices and transportation costs complicate the route to broader economic recovery. In the short run, transit agencies face real threats of service cuts, delayed investments in both new capital projects and vehicles, and deferred maintenance. Revenue declines are widespread and many agencies are already planning fare increases and operating cuts to close yawning budget gaps. In some cases, these go along with numerous other cuts made in recent years. Only one of 64 transit agencies surveyed recently reported that it has not had to reduce service or increase fares in response to larger fiscal challenges.66 Belt tightening at the state level further exacerbates these agency-level challenges. In Wisconsin, for example, the state’s two major metro areas, Milwaukee and Madison, rank 14th and 15th on our combined score of transit coverage and job accessibility. The average neighborhood in these metros can reach 49 and 58 percent of the metro areas’ jobs, respectively, via transit. Both metro areas rank in the top 20 nationwide for the share of their commuters using public transportation. 67 Yet the program cuts proposed statewide are expected to lead to increased fares and the reduction or elimination of certain transit services in these places. One analysis shows that the funding reductions to the Milwaukee County system alone would make 25,000 currently served jobs “inaccessible by transit” and would be directly burdensome to low-income workers. This would be on top of the estimated 40,000 jobs made inaccessible in that metro due to transit cuts from 2001 to 2007.68 Similar debates are ongoing in metro areas across the country. Given the nation’s economic turmoil, states, metro areas, and local governments will have to make hard choices about their budgets. In several cases, reductions in transit funding are probably inevitable, particularly as federal stimulus dollars run out. But these decisions must be made intelligently. Across-the-board cuts are politically appealing because they spread the pain, but they lack a strategic sense of which existing investments are most important for enhancing job access. As states and regions strive to put Americans back to work, policymakers should be careful not to sever the transportation lifelines between workers and jobs.

### No Reform Now

#### No federal reform now

Frankel et al 09

 Emil, Director of Transportation Policy, Joshua Schank, Director of Transportation Research Daniel Lewis, Policy Analyst JayEtta Hecker, Senior Advisor, "Performance Driven: A New Vision for U.S. Transportation Policy," National Transportation Policy Project," 6/9/09 <http://bipartisanpolicy.org/events/2009/06/performance-drivena-new-vision-us-transportation-policy>, AD 7/2/12

Unfortunately, the latest renewal (and the one under which we are currently operating) has further confused and obscured the federal role. The Safe Accountable Flexible Transportation Equity Act—A Legacy for Users(SAFETEA—LU, enacted in 2005) made virtually no major changes to existing programs. It did, however, reconfigure the Minimum Guarantee program as an “Equity Bonus” program and increased to 92 percent the minimum share of fuel tax revenues returned to all states by the last year of the bill. SAFETEA—LU also added several new programs, many of which were fully earmarked—indeed, this bill shattered the record number of earmarks included in previous surface transportation bills by a large margin. The result is a federal program that is larger than ever in terms of size, legislative complexity, and regulation, but still lacks a clear and distinct purpose.

### No Funds Now

#### Transit funding low- new jersey proves

Nurin ‘12

Funding Not Keeping Up With Transit in NJ Trenton | 04/23/2012 10:16am | [1](http://americancity.org/daily/entry/funding-not-keeping-up-with-transit-in-nj#disqus_thread) [Tara Nurin | NJ Spotlight](http://www.njspotlight.com/) [via NJ Spotlight](http://www.njspotlight.com/) Public transportation is riding high, with nearly record-breaking ridership that reflects the shifting economy, the high price of gas and the lifestyle of the young and creative classes. Last year, passenger traffic across the United States rose to its second-highest level since 1957, and in New Jersey, all four public and private rail transit systems are witnessing a steady increase. But the growing importance of public transportation in New Jersey is not matched by an equally accelerated growth in public funding. In fact, state funding has been more or less flat for the past few years — with the exception of the [cancellation of the ARC tunnel](http://www.njspotlight.com/stories/12/0410/2334/), which would have built a third rail tunnel between New Jersey and New York City. New projects are on the boards. There has been an increased call for transit hubs, villages and other smart-growth staples. Indeed the state plan strongly recommends investment in transit-related projects. But whether any, or all, of these will translate into more funds for public transportation remains to be seen. What can be seen is the hive of activity that is New Jersey’s mass transit sector. Amtrak has reached its ninth ridership record in ten years. Although the company is in the midst of planning enhanced New Jersey service, including building a tunnel across the Hudson River, it is expected to take at least 10 years before it’s in service. New Jersey trails only New York in percentage of commuters who use public transportation (and boasts the third-longest average auto commute in the nation). [PATH](http://www.panynj.gov/path/) ridership broke its all-time record in 2011. In South Jersey, [PATCO](http://www.ridepatco.org/) carried more passengers than at any time since 2000, and NJ Transit’s fourth quarter numbers grew 6 percent over the year before. But conventional commuters don’t tell the whole story. “A lot of our increase in ridership is the non-traditional commuter,” said John Rink, general manager of the PATCO system between Jersey and Philadelphia. “More young folks are using public transportation, and they’re using it for social purposes: To go out in the city for nightlife and attractions. When you consider the cost of driving, paying the bridge toll and parking, they’re finding public transportation to have more value,” he said. Indeed, an AAA automobile club survey found that steep gas prices are compelling 14 percent of drivers to use public transportation more often, and 23 percent said they would continue to do so if prices remain high. And while gas prices may seem like the most obvious driver for using public transportation, the state’s transit officials are also pointing to rising employment; a stronger economic climate overall; increased marketing efforts at NJ Transit; a new fleet of PATH cars and upgrades to its stations; and even mild winter weather. Transportation and land-use planners predict that favoring public transit is a phenomenon that’s much less fleeting than the fluctuation in gas prices or employment trends. Instead, they largely credit young and creative workers for choosing to live in walkable municipalities with a variety of leisure activities and available transit options for easy access to other, often larger municipalities. What they expect is a future transit-oriented developments (TODs), which are communities that cluster living, working and shopping spaces within one-quarter mile of a transit hub. Lucy Vandenberg, executive director of [PlanSmart NJ](http://www.plansmartnj.org/), said the creative class, which makes up 35 percent of America’s workforce, “will move to a place first then look for a job second.” “They want to be with other people who are interesting, where things are happening, and transportation is a big part of it,” she said. New Jersey is ahead of most other states in terms of its network of public transit routes and the layout of the communities that host its stations, said Tim Evans, research director for New Jersey Future. Thanks to its relatively compact size and history as an older industrialized state anchored on both ends by well-established, major commercial centers, New Jersey is crisscrossed by rail and bus lines, and its population is familiar with the concept of living and working near transit hubs. With some inexpensive rehabbing of older properties and some targeted new development, he said, “I feel like New Jersey in general is reawakening to a resource bequeathed to us from the pre-highway era.” In a [Monmouth University poll released last fall](http://www.njfuture.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/10/SmartGrowth_NJPollAug2011_REPORT.pdf), researchers found two-thirds of New Jerseyans support more of these communities, and almost three-quarters say they would want to live in one, with the same number stating that TOD will facilitate getting around. Evans feels developers, too, are taking an interest. His own research has shown that throughout the recession, the number of building permit applications has remained more stable in towns where transit stations are conveniently located within walkable reach of housing and retail. “The market crash of 2008 has caused a lot of people, including developers, to question the wisdom of building so far out and relying on long-distance driving. Some of those outlying residential areas are taking a nose dive,” Evans said. But just how solid is New Jersey’s public transit future? There’s some cause for optimism on the public funding level. The state Department of Transportation is seeking to restore funding of its [Transit Village program](http://www.nj.gov/transportation/community/village/) to FY 2011 levels, after receiving no funding in FY 2012. There are currently two dozen of these state-authorized TOD communities throughout New Jersey. And the proposed [State Strategic Plan for Development and Redevelopment](http://nj.gov/state/planning/docs/dfplan_proposed.pdf), which is up for review by the State Planning Commission, emphatically prioritizes such smart growth, noting that “When considering a home purchase, Americans…would like to see improvements to existing public transportation rather than initiatives to build new roads and developments.” In advance of the plan’s adoption, Gov. Chris Christie has ordered the creation of a steering committee to align state agencies’ investments and funds to support these trends. At the same time, the state’s 13 northernmost counties have received a $5 million grant from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development to plan sustainable communities. Their work will likely include provisions for new and improved train stations, light rail stops and bus facilities. As for the transit systems themselves, officials are investing in improvements and expansions they hope will encourage use. NJ Transit is spending $40 million to [construct the Pennsauken Transit Center](http://www.njtransit.com/tm/tm_servlet.srv?hdnPageAction=Project099To), which will allow passengers to transfer from the River Line light rail — which runs from Camden to Trenton — to the Atlantic City commuter rail service and local bus service. The agency is also studying bus rapid transit alternatives to ease congestion where routes 42, 55 and 676 converge on the border of Camden and Gloucester counties. Also planned is a strategic light rail expansion in Hudson County to connect with proposed residential and commercial development in the Route 440 corridor. The Port Authority of New York & New Jersey has just completed a four-year, $1 billion project to replace and upgrade PATH cars and stations and is now spending $400 million to finish the installation of a computerized signal system designed to minimize delays and increase the number of trains that can run at one time. And PATCO is participating in a pilot project to test the viability of replacing tickets or passes with “contactless” credit cards that can be simply waved over a payment reader placed at the entrance to each turnstile. PATCO is also refurbishing their fleet with air conditioning, digital monitors and cameras. As chair of the Senate Surface Transportation and Merchant Marine Infrastructure, Safety and Security Committee, Sen. Frank Lautenberg (D-NJ) has more invested than most in fostering a healthy transportation system across the state and nation. He summed up his view of the needs of New Jersey’s public transportation riders: “Public transit use is on the rise, and every indicator points to continued growth. The existing trans-Hudson tunnel is more than a century old and is not capable of adequately servicing New Jersey’s growing number of transit riders. I will continue working to advance the Gateway Tunnel project (a trans-Hudson railway initiative proposed by Amtrak) so that our public transit system can meet the demands of the future.”

#### High gas prices strain transit systems while increasing ridership

Berube and Puentes et all '11

Robert Puentes, senior fellow with the Brookings Institution’s Metropolitan Policy Program, Alan Berube,senior fellow and research director at the Brookings Institution Metropolitan Policy Program, Adie Tomer, Senior Research Analyst at the Brookings Institution Metropolitan Policy Program and a member of the Metropolitan Infrastructure Initiative., Elizabeth Kneebone, senior research associate and associate fellow at the Brookings Institution Metropolitan Policy Program., "Missed Opportunity: Transit and Jobs in Metropolitan America," May 2011, Brookings, [www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/reports/2011/5/12 jobs and transit/0512\_jobs\_transit.pdf](http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/reports/2011/5/12%20jobs%20and%20transit/0512_jobs_transit.pdf) AD 7/1/12

At the same time, transit agencies and commuters alike are struggling with the budgetary impacts of higher gasoline prices. While most rail service is electrically powered (99 percent of total consumption), America’s bus fleet still largely depends on diesel fuel for its operations (71 percent).69 When gasoline prices spike, as they did in 2008, the effect on transit’s bottom line is significant. In that year, fuel and power made up, on average, about 11 percent of transit agencies’ operating budgets—up from just 6 percent in 2004.70 The U.S. Energy Information Administration predicts average retail gasoline prices of nearly $4 per gallon for summer 2011, further squeezing transit budgets.71 These pressures might be coupled with a surge in demand if higher gasoline prices drive commuters to transit as they seek to reduce their travel costs. Brookings’ analysis of federal data shows drops in driving when gasoline prices spike.72 These declines probably owe to a combination of rising transportation costs, economic instability, housing relocation, and increasing unemployment. Although research on the relationship between gas prices and commuting behavior is limited, a 2008 Congressional Budget Office (CBO) examination of driving trends in a dozen metropolitan highway locations in California found that rising gas prices reduce driving on metropolitan highways adjacent to rail systems, but have little impact in those places without. Further, they found that the increase in ridership on those transit systems is just about the same as the decline in the number of vehicles on the roadways, suggesting that commuters will switch to transit if service is available that is convenient to employment destinations.73 Another study of the Philadelphia region shows that gas price fluctuations play a significant role in explaining transit ridership over the 2000s.74

#### Funding for transit no sufficient-Mississippi proves

AP ‘12

City’s transit system shuts down for lack of funding by Associated Press Published: March 4,2012 Tags: [budget](http://msbusiness.com/tag/budget/), [funding](http://msbusiness.com/tag/funding/), [funds](http://msbusiness.com/tag/funds/), [municipal government](http://msbusiness.com/tag/municipal-government/), [public transportation](http://msbusiness.com/tag/public-transportation/), [transit systems](http://msbusiness.com/tag/transit-systems/), [transportation](http://msbusiness.com/tag/transportation/), [travel](http://msbusiness.com/tag/travel/) MERIDIAN —

Meridian’s transmit system has shut down leaving the city scurrying to meet the needs of people who relied on the buses to get around. Kirk Thompson, executive adviser to Mayor Cheri Barry, said the city hopes to get some bus service in Meridian. Meridian Transit System board president Bo Hawkins said the decision to cease operations was the result of a lack of funding from the city. The system shut down Wednesday. The system employed 12 people. Thompson said the city council has cut the contribution to MTS’ budget every fiscal year since 2008. The council has made cuts to the city’s contributions and to city departments in many of its recent budgets. MTS also gets federal funding through the Mississippi Department of Transportation, but the amount is determined based on the city’s contribution — the less money the city puts into MTS, Hawkins said, the less federal funding MTS gets through MDOT. MTS received $47,500 from the city for the 2012 fiscal year, according to Hawkins. He said he could not remember how much MDOT had contributed. “Over the last two and half years, the city has cut our funding over 60 percent, and that cuts our federal match, so we just didn’t have the money to operate,” Hawkins said. Hawkins said MTS is in talks with an entity that may be interested in funding the bus service. He would not say what entity it was, saying that, “they asked us not to release the details.” “We are working on a plan now to let this interruption in service be as short as possible,” Hawkins said. “It’s not definite, but we’re very optimistic that we will be able to continue service.” This is not the first time the Meridian Transit System has closed. In 1996 it shut down for five months. Then again in 2005, it temporarily closed.

#### Transit plans lack necessary funding- Florida proves

Nielsen ‘12

Transit plan lacks funding By J. NIELSEN Correspondent Published: Thursday, May 17, 2012 at 10:08 a.m. Last Modified: Thursday, May 17, 2012 at 10:08 a.m.

Bus service from Tampa to Bradenton will not happen any time soon, according to Amy Ellis of the Tampa Bay Area Regional Transportation Authority. Speaking Monday at a free program sponsored by Manatee County League of Women Voters at the Bradenton Woman's Club, she addressed both long- and short-term goals for mass transit, including car pool lanes, express toll lanes, bus operations and carpooling. Created in 2007 through an initial allocation from the state, TBARTA is supported with federal, state and local money as well as donations from businesses. Required by the state to be updated every two years, the most recent 2011 plan added new elements to the overall scheme to include expansion of service to Tampa International Airport as well as local ports and an Interstate 75 regional corridor express bus. "If you're not planning on a regional basis, you're not planning," Ellis said. Citing the need for community feedback and money to support a transit service, Ellis said the transportation authority's mandate is to increase coordination among the seven counties comprising the Tampa Bay region and to create a world-class transportation network of bus, train, light rail, express bus and a possible ferry service. Not a government agency and not a private entity, she said the goal of TBARTA is three-fold: Plan, develop and finance multimodal transit. Noting the failure two win voter approval of a 1-cent sales tax increase for light rail in Tampa, the question is how to pay for mass transportation, Ellis said. With several projects still in the planning stages, she stressed the need for community feedback.

### SQ = Weak Transit

#### Current development patterns prioritize automobile transportation, locking people out of public transit options

Bailey, Mokhtarian, & Little ‘8

Linda Bailey is Senior Associate for Transportation at ICF International. Patricia Lyon MokhtarianProfessor, Civil and Environmental Engineering, Chair, Transportation Technology and Policy Graduate Program, and Associate Director for Education, Institute of Transportation Studies at University of California, Davis. Andrew Little is president of Urban Policy Research Institute. “The Broader Connection between Public Transportation, Energy Conservation and Greenhouse Gas Reduction,” <http://www.apta.com/research/info/online/documents/land_use.pdf>, February.

Transportation is the fastest growing sector for greenhouse gas production in the U.S., and how people travel determines this growth rate. Choices about driving, walking, or taking transit to get from A to B are determined partly by individual preference, and partly by the options available (see literature review below). Since the mid-20th century, the automobile has been the mode of choice for developers and their urban designers as they built new neighborhoods in the U.S., creating an environment where trips are typically too far to walk, and difficult to serve with public transportation. In contrast, this analysis and others show that high quality public transportation and walkable, humanscale development often go hand in hand.

### Weak Transit 🡪 Many Impacts

#### Transportation inefficiency is causing oil dependence, air pollution, climate change

Bailey, Mokhtarian, & Little ‘8

Linda Bailey is Senior Associate for Transportation at ICF International. Patricia Lyon MokhtarianProfessor, Civil and Environmental Engineering, Chair, Transportation Technology and Policy Graduate Program, and Associate Director for Education, Institute of Transportation Studies at University of California, Davis. Andrew Little is president of Urban Policy Research Institute. “The Broader Connection between Public Transportation, Energy Conservation and Greenhouse Gas Reduction,” <http://www.apta.com/research/info/online/documents/land_use.pdf>, February.

The way that Americans travel on a daily basis is a major determinant of our use of energy, our impacts on the environment, and, more broadly, our quality of life. The quantity of petroleum that we consume in transportation is a significant indicator of our habits—in cities which are built more efficiently, personal energy consumption can be significantly lower than in cities with few travel choices and long distances between destinations. Petroleum is the primary fuel used in transportation, and transportation uses 28% of our national energy budget (EIA, 2006, Table 2.1a). Since 1982, driving vehicle miles traveled (VMT) has increased by 47 percent per person, from an average of 6,800 miles per year for every man, woman and child to almost 10,000 miles per year (FHWA Traffic Volume Trends, August 2007). National consumption of oil for all purposes rose from 3.4 to 5.1 billion barrels per year (EIA 2006, Tables 5.13c and D1). Every additional barrel consumed results in more fuel imports, more money spent by consumers on fuel, and more carbon dioxide and other pollutants emitted into the air.

### SQ Won’t Solve: Accountability

#### Simply re-upping transportation reform won’t solve—The federal government needs Metro areas need control but require more accountability

Katz et al. ‘5

Bruce Katz is vice president, director of the Metropolitan Policy Progam, and Adeline M. and Alfred I. Johnson Chair in Urban and Metropolitan Studies at the Brookings Institution. Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. Scott Bernstein is at the Center for Neighborhood Technology. “Getting Transportation Right for Metropolitan America,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 31-31

In keeping with that, the first order of business for Congress must be to retain the existing transportation reforms- specifically those initiated in ISTEA and TEA-21. The earlier reforms provide a solid foundation for a national transportation policy that is fiscally prudent, competitively wise, environmentally sound, and responsive to the changing demands of business and citizens. Congress, therefore, should continue to resist efforts to undermine the "flexible funding: provisions that allow decisonmakers at the state and local level to shift funds between highway and transit initiatives. It should reject bids to roll back environmental regulations in the name of project streamlining. And it should maintain in federal law provisions that favor system rehabilitation and maintenance , improved operations, and alternative transportation development, rather than expansion of new highway capacity. Yet Congress must also go beyond preserving past reforms. In many places, practice has not followed policy, so that implementation of the law has fallen far short of congressional intent. The reasons for this are many: recalcitrant state bureaucracies that continued to operate "business as usual," insufficient tools and ill-designed programs, and a stunning lack of accountability and performance. The second challenge to Congress, therefore, is to build on the foundation of ISTEA and TEA-21 in a way that works to give metropolitan areas greater powers and more tools in exchange for enhanced accountability.

### SQ Matching Funds Biased

#### ANTI-URBAN BIAS IN THE RULES FOR TRANSPORTATION MATCHING FUNDING UNDERMINE TRANSIT PROJECTS

Katz et al. ‘5

Bruce Katz is vice president, director of the Metropolitan Policy Progam, and Adeline M. and Alfred I. Johnson Chair in Urban and Metropolitan Studies at the Brookings Institution. Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. Scott Bernstein is at the Center for Neighborhood Technology Institute. “Getting Transportation Right for Metropolitan America,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 23

Another flaw in recent transportation reform that adversely affects metropolitan areas is that the rules governing transportation policy continue to favor roads over transit and other alternatives to traditional highway building. The federal government typically contributes 80 percent of the cost of road and new transit projects. However, Congress recently directed the Federal Transit Administration not to approve projects with more than a 60 percent federal share. In addition, the Bush administration’s fiscal year 2004 budget reaffirmed an earlier recommendation to reduce the federal match for transit projects to 50 percent beginning in 2004. No such provisions burden roadway projects. This inequality between roads and transit is complicated by the fact that thirty states, unlike the federal government, prohibit the use of gas tax revenues for purposes other than road construct ion and maintenance.’ Such rules make it inordinately difficult for transit projects to obtain additional funding, which they often must pursue through local ballot referenda or general revenue sources at the state and local level.

#### Anti-Urban in current transportation

Katz et al. ‘5

Bruce Katz is vice president, director of the Metropolitan Policy Progam, and Adeline M. and Alfred I. Johnson Chair in Urban and Metropolitan Studies at the Brookings Institution. Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. Scott Bernstein is at the Center for Neighborhood Technology. “Getting Transportation Right for Metropolitan America,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 28

Each of these challenges shares a common origin. Despite the good intentions of ISTEA and TEA-21, a fundamentally antimetroplotian bias still pervades state and federal transportation policies and practices. Transportation reform matters because it offers out best opportunity to shape different growth patterns and manage these problems and so improve the next generation's metropolitan transportation network.

#### Infrastructure funding is massively slanted in favor of highways- the transit system is screwed in the squo

**Avent ‘9** (Ryan, Freelance economic writer, “How the Stimulus Screws Commuters”, The American Prospect) February 5, 2009<http://www.prospect.org/cs/articles?article=how_the_stimulus_screws_commuters>

The initial breakdown of transportation funds in the Senate version of the bill was unhelpfully unbalanced, allotting $27 billion to highways compared to $8.4 billion for transit and $3.1 billion for rail. In part, this pro-road tilt was unavoidable. **The automobile-oriented nature of our current transportation network means that there are more shovel-ready highway projects available than transit projects.** But subsequent amendments have defied reason. Attempting to address calls for greater infrastructure spending, Sens. Patty Murray and Dianne Feinstein sought to add $40 billion to the plan, divided between highways, transit, and other projects, but the amendment fell two votes shy of passage. **Subsequent activity has been exclusively highway oriented.** Sen. Barbara Boxer has inexplicably partnered with climate-change denier James Inhofe to prepare an amendment increasing highway funding by $50 billion. And Missouri's Kit Bond is seeking to redirect $2 billion in money for high-speed rail and $5.5 billion from a pool potentially available for transit (as well as highways) to highways alone. **This is a setback for green interests.** Capital spending on highways above and beyond the initial $27 billion is unlikely to go to projects that can quickly be brought on line, which will limit its effectiveness as stimulus. We might be able to tolerate this if such spending advanced our long-term goals, but this balance of funding clearly does not. **Spending to repair existing road infrastructure should be balanced with investments in greener transit, rail, and bus systems if we're to efficiently reduce fossil-fuel consumption and carbon emissions.** Perhaps worst of all, **the Senate**, like the House, **declined to specifically direct funding toward operating costs for transit systems.** While capital spending to repair and enlarge transit systems is absolutely necessary to meet long-term environmental (and economic goals), those investments do nothing to keep trains and buses running right now. With gas tax and general budget revenues plummeting, systems nationwide are cutting service, increasing fares, and sacking employees. And while grants to state governments may be used to cover some of the shortfall, state officials will face strong pressure to plug other holes first, stimulus concerns aside. Multi-jurisdictional systems in particular may be out of luck, as governments prove reluctant to devote money to systems that serve non-constituents.

### State Program Authority Blocks Reform

#### State Program Authority is crushing urban robust transit reform

Katz et al. ‘5

Bruce Katz is vice president, director of the Metropolitan Policy Progam, and Adeline M. and Alfred I. Johnson Chair in Urban and Metropolitan Studies at the Brookings Institution. Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. Scott Bernstein is at the Center for Neighborhood Technology. “Getting Transportation Right for Metropolitan America,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 23-24

Another flaw in recent transportation reform that adversely affects metropolitan areas is that the rules governing transportation policy continue in favor roads over transit and other alternatives to traditional highway building. The federal government typically contributes 80 percent of the cost of road and new transit projects. However, Congress recently directed the Federal Transit Administration not to approve projects with more than a 60 percent federal share. In addition, the Bush administration’s fiscal year 2004 budget reaffirmed an earlier recommendation to reduce the federal match for transit projects to 50 percent beginning in 2004. No such provisions burden roadway projects. This inequality between roads and transit is complicated by the fact that thirty states, unlike the federal government prohibit the use of gas tax revenues for purposes other than road construction and maintenance. Such rules make it inordinately difficult for transit projects to obtain additional funding, which they often must pursue through local ballot referenda or general revenue sources at the state and local level. Other federal rules further tilt the playing field against transit. For example, strict project justification requirements and a demonstration of long-term financial commitment apply to new rail projects. Such oversight- while perhaps appropriate—far exceeds that applied to roadway projects. This, too hampers development of the multidimensional transportation systems that businesses and workers require.” As a result of these biases, states rarely utilize the funding flexibility allowed them by ISTEA and TEA-21. Data from the Federal Transit Administration illustrates that from fiscal years 1992 to 1997, only California, the District of Columbia, Massachusetts, New York, and Oregon transferred more than one-third of available funds from highways to transit—and six states transferred none. Nationally, of the $50 billion available for innovation, only 6.6 percent ($3.3 billion) was spent on transit and other alternatives during the 1990s—and most of that shifting occurred in states with transit-intensive metropolitan areas, such as New York and California. Taken together, these biases ensure that state transportation policy pursued under federal law works against many metropolitan areas’ efforts to maintain modern and integrated transportation networks.

#### State control of transportation crushes robust transit

Katz et al. ‘5

Bruce Katz is vice president, director of the Metropolitan Policy Progam, and Adeline M. and Alfred I. Johnson Chair in Urban and Metropolitan Studies at the Brookings Institution. Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. Scott Bernstein is at the Center for Neighborhood Technology. “Getting Transportation Right for Metropolitan America,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 22

Many states continue to penalize metropolitan areas in the allocation of transportation money. This penalty results from several biases. The first bias arises from the fact that federal law allocates the vast majority of federal money directly to state DOTs. Only about 6 percent of federal program funds are directly suballocated to MPOs and, even then, only to MPOs serving populations of over 200,000. In fact, while federal transportation spending increased from ISTEA to TEA-2 1. the share of funds suballocated to MPOs actually declined as a share of total highway spending. All told, metropolitan areas make decisions on only about 10 cents of every dollar they generate even though local governments within metropolitan areas own and maintain the vast majority of the transportation infrastructure.

#### States do a poor job of funding allocation—ignore urban areas

Katz et al. ‘5

Bruce Katz is vice president, director of the Metropolitan Policy Progam, and Adeline M. and Alfred I. Johnson Chair in Urban and Metropolitan Studies at the Brookings Institution. Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. Scott Bernstein is at the Center for Neighborhood Technology. “Getting Transportation Right for Metropolitan America,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 22

A second bias follows from the way stales distribute transportation revenues. Some states have developed distribution formulas based on transportation related needs or on resident population, registered motor vehicles, and highway miles. However, others (such as Tennessee, Ohio, Arkansas, and Alabama) allocate a portion of funds evenly among their counties, regardless of their size needs, and contribution to state funding pools. This holdover from the sates’ past years active rural highway construction ensures that built-out urban counties fail to receive a sensible share of funding.

#### State control over federal funding distribution results in bias against urban areas

Katz et al. ‘5

Bruce Katz is vice president, director of the Metropolitan Policy Progam, and Adeline M. and Alfred I. Johnson Chair in Urban and Metropolitan Studies at the Brookings Institution. Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. Scott Bernstein is at the Center for Neighborhood Technology. “Getting Transportation Right for Metropolitan America,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 22-23

Another bias owes to the simple fact that the states own a substantial port ion of the roads in rural areas; by contrast, local governments generally own many of the roads and the transit systems located in metropolitan areas. This arrangement saddles local municipalities with responsibility for the roads in incorporated (more urban) places while states take care of roads in rural or otherwise unincorporated places on the suburban fringe. Funding analyses in Ohio, Colorado. and Washington show how these biases affect metropolitan areas. In Ohio. rural counties receive much higher distributions of transportation revenues than do suburban and urban counties when allocations are compared to indicators of need such as population, vehicle registrations, vehicle miles traveled, and retail sales at gasoline stat ions. In Colorado, the Denver Regional Council of Governments found that from 1998 to 2003, the share of transportation dollars allocated to the Denver metropolitan area had declined from 46 to 28 percent. The decline in proportionate allocation destined for the metropolitan area occurred despite the fact that Denver boasted more job growth, people, and gasoline consumption than other jurisdictions in the state. The Denver metropolitan area receives only 69 cents in revenues for each $1 of tax revenue contributed. Projections of transportation spending in Washington State found that from 1994 to 2013, the Seattle metropolitan area would raise $1 percent of the state’s total revenues and receive 39 percent in return. In other Words, Seattle serves as a net exporter of transportation (and gas tax) revenue, despite the critical role the metropolitan area plays in the states economy. An expanding set of emerging research and commentary is beginning to illustrate and explore these inequities in many other metropolitan areas, as well.

#### States allocation systems are biased against metropolitan areas

Puentes & Bailey ‘5

Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. Kevin O’Brien is a columnist at the Cleveland *Plain Dealer.* Linda Bailey is Senior Research Associate for Transportation at ICF International. “Increasing Funding and Accountability for Metropolitan Transportation Decisions,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 153

A second bias follows from the way states distribute transportation revenues. Some states have developed distribution formulas based on transportation related needs or on resident population registered motor vehicle and highway miles. However, others (such as Tennessee, Ohio, Arkansas, and Alabama) allocate a portion of funds evenly among their counties, regardless of their size, needs, and contribution to state funding pools. This holdover from the states’ past years of active rural highway construction ensures that built-out urban counties fail to receive a sensible share of funding.

### States/Cities Crushing Transit Now

#### current federal transit reform bogged down in state and muncipal mismanagement

Katz et al. ‘5

Bruce Katz is vice president, director of the Metropolitan Policy Progam, and Adeline M. and Alfred I. Johnson Chair in Urban and Metropolitan Studies at the Brookings Institution. Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. Scott Bernstein is at the Center for Neighborhood Technology. “Getting Transportation Right for Metropolitan America,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 20-21

In sum, ISTEA and TEA-21 embedded in law, for the first time, the principle that America’s metropolitan reality required an integrated, balanced, and regionally designed transportation system. As a framework, the laws are sound. And yet the laws themselves are only part of the picture. Unfortunately, implementation of the new federal statutes has been seriously flawed—and in basic ways unresponsive to metropolitan needs. Most notably, many states have failed to utilize the tools and discretion afforded them by ISTEA and TEA-21 to meaningfully address the worsening transportation problems bogging down their metropolitan regions.

### Block Grant Policy Biased Against Transit

#### squo federal Grant policy biased against transit policy in favor of highways

Katz and Puentes ‘5
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In chapter 10, Edward Beimborn and Robert Puentes address the issue of metropolitan mobility from a different angle. They investigate the rules and regulations that govern the individual modes and find that federal transportation policy is essentially an unfair competition between highways and transit that can potentially distort local and metropolitan decisionmaking. Despite a number of reforms in the past decade, the authors show that federal rules remain stacked against transit, while planning, funding, and implementing highway projects is far easier. For example, under current law new transit programs only receive a maximum 60 percent federal share of total project funding, while the latest reauthorization language proposes a 50 percent or less match. Highway projects, on the other hand, continue to enjoy an 80 to 90 percent federal share. In addition, transit programs are subject to strict project criteria and justification are required to address land use impacts, and are compared to and must compete with their peers before they can receive federal funding, whereas highway projects generally are not subject to such constraints.

### Metro Govts Failing

#### Metropolitan governments are ineffective—empirically fail to develop useful projects

Katz et al. ‘5
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Another problem is that MPO as well as state capacity remains uneven. In a very real sense, the profession of transportation planning failed to keep up with statutory and on-the-ground changes in the 1990s. Even in recent years, state transportation planning has largely remained the province of transportation professionals versed in engineering and concrete pouring rather than urban planning, environmental management, housing, or economic development—and that his hampered state and local implementation of ISTEA and TEA-21's vision. Nor have circumstances been markedly better at the MPOs. In places as diverse as Albany, Dallas, Hartford, Minneapolis, San Francisco and Seattle, MPOs are strong players in their regions and maximize their role in an effective way. These entities have built up the expertise of their staff to carry out the responsibilities of the new federal law. But other MPOs, particularly in smaller areas, struggle to fulfill their statutory responsibilities as well as implement local projects. Many lack adequate staff and financial resources. A recent analysis, for example, found that 58 percent of small MPOs (those representing populations of less than 200,000) cannot perform basic transportation modeling or forecasting. In addition, 16 percent of small MPOs do not even have a full-time transportation planner. Exacerbating these problems are state lines. Thirty-eight of the nation’s metropolitan areas encompass more than one state—including ten of the twenty- five largest— which significantly fragments local planning. The result is that for transportation very few effective metropolitan governance structures exist.

### Congestion Up

#### Traffic congestion increasing in status quo—can’t solve it by accomodating vehicles

Katz et al. ‘5
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In the past two decades, traffic congestion has become a way of life in nearly every major metropolitan area. Between 1992 and 2000, the amount of time that travelers were delayed in metropolitan traffic increased by eighteen hours, or 41.2 percent. No wonder drivers- stuck in traffic- increasingly demand relief. Even though neither ISTEA nor TEA-21 promised that, many naturally are looking to the federal government for help in addressing the mounting congestion problem. However, regardless of policy and market interventions, metropolitan congestion will continue to increase as the numbers of vehicles, drivers, miles traveled, and intercity trucks grow and as regional economies continue to decentralize along low-density settlement patterns. Fortunately, many are beginning to understand the fundamental connections between land use, housing, and transportation and to recognize that we cannot build our way out of congestion.

## \*\*\*SOLVENCY MECHS\*\*\*

### AT: Alt Causes to Impacts

#### Solvency supported by best statistical analysis—acounts for all your alt causes

Bailey, Mokhtarian, & Little ‘8

Linda Bailey is Senior Associate for Transportation at ICF International. Patricia Lyon MokhtarianProfessor, Civil and Environmental Engineering, Chair, Transportation Technology and Policy Graduate Program, and Associate Director for Education, Institute of Transportation Studies at University of California, Davis. Andrew Little is president of Urban Policy Research Institute. “The Broader Connection between Public Transportation, Energy Conservation and Greenhouse Gas Reduction,” <http://www.apta.com/research/info/online/documents/land_use.pdf>, February.

To account for the complex relationships between public transportation availability, land use, and travel behavior, this study uses Structural Equations Modeling (SEM). SEM allows for the simultaneous prediction of multiple variables in one model. With multiple equations, a variable can be dependent in one equation and explanatory in another equation. As a result, SEM can account for feedback loops between explanatory variables and can predict both the direct and indirect effects of one variable on another. This capability allows for a more realistic picture of the factors that affect travel behavior than does single-equation modeling, in which only one variable is impacted by other variables. In SEM, variables can affect one another in two ways: direct and indirect effects. Using one of the key relationships in this study as an example, the direct effect of rail availability on household VMT is the effect of putting rail availability in the equation for VMT. The indirect effects are the sum of all of the other paths linking rail availability to household VMT, most notably the path via population density. The direct effects in SEM terms are closely related to the first order effect of replacing driving miles with transit use, but not exactly the same: Since there are other potential indirect paths between availability and VMT not specified in our model, such as through increasing mixed use or reduced congestion, the direct effects likely incorporates some second order effects as well. This also implies that the indirect effects in our model capture the second-order effects of public transit via population density, but not necessarily all of the second-order effects. SEM can also help disentangle feedback loops between explanatory variables. For example, if public transit availability causes an increase in urban density, which in turn causes an increase in public transit availability, a positive feedback loop exists. SEM can estimate the magnitude of the influence of each variable on the other. This step is necessary in order to determine the total effect of any one variable on another. SEM analyzes the circular relationship between endogenous explanatory variables by allowing each variable to act as a predictor in the equation of the other along with other, purely exogenous, variables. In order to be able to separate out the effects in each direction, however, we needed some exogenous variables that would directly affect only one of the two endogenous variables but not the other. To provide this distinct “entry point” to the loop, we selected two natural population growth factors, birth and death rates. These variables (known as instrumental variables) directly affect only the population density variable of the feedback loop.

### Strong Oversight Key to Block Grants

#### The federal government needs oversight programs to ensure block grants are used properly. High and strict standards must be set.

Donella H. **Meadows**, 4/26/**00,** adjunct professor of environmental studies at Dartmouth College, “If We're Going to Have Block Grants, Let's Make Them Work” The Sustainability Institute, http://www.sustainer.org/dhm\_archive/index.php?display\_article=vn594blockgrantsed

**It must be possible to preserve the good aspects of block grants while preventing the bad.** The principle of solving problems near at hand is a sound one. **Specific solutions should be local. But standards have to be national, set high, and strictly enforced.** **If funding is to come from the feds, we need some mechanism to ensure that it will be commensurate with the size of the problems, so successful programs are not punished with bigger loads. A federal bureaucracy shouldn't micromanage state or local programs, but it can and should monitor, evaluate, and publicize local experiments, so we all learn from them. It can offer technical and logistic help. It must set up layers of protection against corruption, including federal appeal for citizens who are caught in corrupt or uncaring states**

### Transit Reform Solves Travel Behavior

#### Empirical evidence proves federal emphasis on transit changes transportation habits away from cars

Katz et al. ‘5
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Because of these shills in federal policy and state and metropolitan spending, our nation now has hundreds more miles of rail service as well as millions more route miles of bus service. Planning and programming have generally improved with the enhanced involvement of local governments and the general public in transportation dccisionmaking. As a result, metropolitan travel habits are changing. Since 1995 the number of transit passenger trips has increased by 20 percent. Transit ridership is now at its highest level since 1960. Even bicycle commuting grew by 5 percent during the 1990s according to the Census Bureau. More recent indicators are beginning to show that automobile driving may be leveling off. For example, annual vehicle miles traveled increased by only 2.0 percent since 1999. Compare this to the 2.5 percent average yearly increase in the 1990s, 3.2 percent in the 1980s, and 4.3 percent in the 1970s. While it is true that automobile travel still dominates in terms of absolute numbers, recent trends do indicate that the reforms on the federal level are having a substantial positive impact.

### Devolving to MPOs Key

#### States fail in transportation reform—the federal government must use statutory authority to give more funding control to cities

Katz et al. ‘5
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Metropolitan areas lace a daunting set of transportation challenges— increasing congestion, deteriorating air quality, crumbling infrastructure, spatial mismatches in the labor market—that threaten to undermine their competitive edge in the global economy. The lessons of the past decade, however, show that existing governance arrangements and structures are lot up to the task. MPOs and local officials have too little power; state transportation departments, too much. In many metropolitan areas, the proliferation of separate administrative bodies does not reflect the travel, environmental, and economic realities of twenty-first-century metropolitan America. If local transportation challenges are to be met, metropolitan areas need a greater say in the design and implementation of transportation policy. This means the devolution promoted by ISTEA and TEA-21 must go further. Several steps are needed: The responsibility and capacity of metropolitan planning organizations needs to be expanded. State decisions must be tied more closely to the demographic and market realities of metropolitan areas and the vision and priorities of metropolitan leaders. Collaboration across administrative borders and modes (air, rail, highway, and transit) should be required. And, finally, a new cadre of broad-minded transportation professionals needs to be nurtured and sustained.

#### Crucial to devolve decision on federal block grant projects away from states towards muncipal governments

Katz et al. ‘5
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A major disappointment is the fact that, after ten years, most states have still not embraced the intent of federal law and devolved sufficient powers and responsibilities to their metropolitan areas. ISTEA and TEA-21 sought through devolution to better align the geography of transportation decisionmaking with the geography of regional economies, commuting patterns, and social reality. Thus the laws undertook to enlarge the responsibility of the regional MPOs in terms of transportation decision-making. However, that federal intent has largely been subverted. Although ISTEA and TEA-21 were designed to move transportation decisionmaking out of the hack rooms and hoard rooms of the highway establishment, many state DOTs still wield considerable formal and informal power and retain authority over substantial slate transportation funds. The governor and state DOT still have veto authority over MPO-selected projects. Although large MPOs (in areas with populations over 200,000) also have authority to veto projects, the reality is that the state receives and manages all the federal transportation money, as well as large amounts of state transportation money, and the state’s political leverage is far greater than the MPO’s. In fact, a General Accounting Office report found that states often so dominate MPOs that in at least one case, the state DOT “was, in effect, the MPO.” The Illinois Dot, for example, is “heavily involved” in the metropolitan planning process in the Chicago region. MPOs in other areas, such as Boston and New York, actually remain state agencies. Such arrangements create an unfavorable climate for the flowering of federal policy reforms— and frequently cut against metropolitan interests.

### Regulatory QPQs Solve Robust Reform

#### Regulatory relief quid pro Quos ensure metro areas will implement directives

Puentes & Bailey ‘5
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In exchange for greater funding, Congress should subject MPOs to enhanced accountability measures. State and metropolitan transportation agencies should be required to maintain information systems that annually measure progress on indicators of national significance. These indicators might include slowing the growth in daily vehicle miles traveled, improving public health, improving air quality, lowering transportation costs, and expanding transportation options for target groups (such as the elderly or low-income workers). The law should also require transportation agencies to set annual performance objectives in each of these critical areas. These performance objectives (and progress toward meeting them) should be shared with the general public in an accessible manner. In this regard, the new federal law should establish consequences for excellent and poor performance. Congress should allow the DOT to maintain a small incentive pool to reward states and metropolitan areas that consistently perform at an exceptional level. The department could also improve project delivery by giving high performers relief from regulatory and administrative requirements. By the same token, the federal DOT should consider possible intervention strategies for consistent low performers. (In designating high and low performers, DOT should take into account the difficult challenges facing state agencies and MPOs in large metropolitan areas).

#### federal-state QPQ accountability frameworks are empirically succesful on poverty policy

Katz et al. ‘5

Bruce Katz is vice president, director of the Metropolitan Policy Progam, and Adeline M. and Alfred I. Johnson Chair in Urban and Metropolitan Studies at the Brookings Institution. Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. Scott Bernstein is at the Center for Neighborhood Technology. “Getting Transportation Right for Metropolitan America,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 37

There is substantial federal precedent for such an accountability framework. Congress, for example, established a management assessment system for public housing agencies and created a performance measurement and reward system in the 1996 welfare reform law. The transportation system of governance and finance shares many similarities with these other areas of domestic policy—and should operate under similar accountability.

### Devolving to MPOs Requires QPQs

#### Congress grant more power to metro planning organization but must increase preformance and accountability requirements

Katz et al. ‘5

Bruce Katz is vice president, director of the Metropolitan Policy Progam, and Adeline M. and Alfred I. Johnson Chair in Urban and Metropolitan Studies at the Brookings Institution. Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. Scott Bernstein is at the Center for Neighborhood Technology. “Getting Transportation Right for Metropolitan America,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 27

Expand the responsibility and capacity of MPOs. The roles and responsibilities of MPOs must be augmented. To that end, Congress should allocate substantial resources directly to MPOs (see discussion below). Congress should also preserve and strengthen the metropolitan role in transportation planning and spending; the existing TEA-21 set-aside for metropolitan transportation planning should be increased from 1 to 2 percent. In addition, generous support should be provided to build the capacity of MPOs through technical assistance, professional training, and the sharing of best practices. To facilitate this, a special research program should be created at the national level to identify and evaluate innovative approaches to metropolitan transportation challenges. Finally, as described below, MPOs should be subject to heightened performance and accountability requirements.

### MPOs Devolution 🡪 Transit Reform

#### Giving authority to Mpos key to robust transit

Puentes & Bailey ‘5

Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. Kevin O’Brien is a columnist at the Cleveland *Plain Dealer.* Linda Bailey is Senior Research Associate for Transportation at ICF International. “Increasing Funding and Accountability for Metropolitan Transportation Decisions,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 162-163

Local and metropolitan leaders throughout the nation are demanding more decisionmaking authority and more direct control over federal dollars in order to address a wide range of transportation challenges. Although major federal reform efforts of the 1990s did take steps to strengthen local authority, there is much more to be done. In most states, MPOs are well positioned to fulfill the metropolitan role that is necessary in transportation governance and finance. Yet to do that, states must allow MPOs to complete the transition from advisory bodies to fully empowered, functioning authorities. It has been said that America is neither an urban nor rural nations but rather a metropolitan nation, where the majority of the population lives and works in large metropolitan areas that include both historic central cities and dispersed suburban development. The debate around the transportation legislation must reflect this reality.

#### local Program authority and accountability checks over federal block grants key to robust transit

Blumenberg & Waller ‘5

Evelyn Blumenberg is Assistant Professor at UCLA's School of Public Policy and Social Research. Margy Waller is the senior fellow for Social Policy at the PPI and is affiliated with the Brookings Institution Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy. “A Long Journey to Work: A Federal Transportation Policy for Working Families,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 201-202

Additional funds are necessary to meet the transportation needs of the disadvantaged. But the funds will do little good unless they can be flexibly deployed to address the diverse transportation needs of working-poor families whose access to employment and services varies significantly by metropolitan area, neighborhood, and transportation resources. The most effective plans likely will evolve through regional and local planning and coordination followed by rigorous program evaluation.

#### USFG should allocate transit grants directly to metro areas

Puentes & Bailey ‘5

Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. Kevin O’Brien is a columnist at the Cleveland *Plain Dealer.* Linda Bailey is Senior Research Associate for Transportation at ICF International. “Increasing Funding and Accountability for Metropolitan Transportation Decisions,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 159-160

This chapter highlights the importance of metropolitan areas and the genuine need to ensure that they have the appropriate ability to make import ant decisions about transportation investments. As Congress reevaluates transportation reform, and as states attempt to grow their own economies in the current bleak fiscal environment, it is critical that there be greater focus on the transportation needs and challenges of our metropolitan areas. If the federal government is serious about making transportation investment decisions that reflect local needs, there must be real money on the table. When the MPO has more discretionary funding for local projects, local officials are more likely to participate in the process. The availability of these funds not only provides financing for vital local projects but also encourages local officials to get involved in the transportation decisionmaking for their region. To ensure metropolitan areas remain strong and economically viable, Congress should consider the following measures.

#### states are the problem—must devolve planning power to metro areas

Puentes & Bailey ‘5

Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. Kevin O’Brien is a columnist at the Cleveland *Plain Dealer.* Linda Bailey is Senior Research Associate for Transportation at ICF International. “Increasing Funding and Accountability for Metropolitan Transportation Decisions,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 140

In a 1996 policy brief, Anthony Downs argued that federal efforts to devolve certain powers were going to the wrong levels they were shifting to states and localities. His argument was not that devolution itself was inappropriate but rather that many of the major problems in urban arms were regional in scope, and therefore they could not be solved by local jurisdictions acting independently. He also maintained that states were too far from local communities to be effective in addressing such regional issues as housing, air quality, schools and education, and transportation. Devolution efforts need to focus on the metropolitan level.

### MPO Key, Own Transit Systems

#### Empowering local governments is key because they own most urban transportation systems

Puentes & Bailey ‘5

Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. Kevin O’Brien is a columnist at the Cleveland *Plain Dealer.* Linda Bailey is Senior Research Associate for Transportation at ICF International. “Increasing Funding and Accountability for Metropolitan Transportation Decisions,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 152

The coalition further contends that since local officials actually own and have direct responsibility over a large amount of the roadway miles, an argument can be made for a more proportional amount of funding. Of course, owning the network does not necessarily translate into greater expenses. Costs depend, generally, on degree of urbanization, terrain, complexity, and classification. But typical urban roads cost up to five times as much as a typical rural road, and in many instances, the costs are far greater. As Martin Wachs points out in chapter 4, an analysis of federal highway data shows that in 2002 local governments owned about 3 million of the 4 million miles of roads in the nation. Local governments also own over half of all the nation’s bridges and about 90 percent of the nation’s transit systems.

### Plan = Model of Poverty Reform

#### The expired Transportation equity act provides a model for developing transit reform as a social service for those living poverty—the legislative and historical recond supports this approach

Blumenberg & Waller ‘5

Evelyn Blumenberg is Assistant Professor at UCLA's School of Public Policy and Social Research. Margy Waller is the senior fellow for Social Policy at the PPI and is affiliated with the Brookings Institution Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy. “The Long Journey to Work: A Federal Transportation Policy for Working Families,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 199-200

The work-based welfare law passed by Congress and signed by former president Bill Clinton in 1996 created Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) block grants to states. States use the $16.5 billion per year in block grant funds to provide cash assistance, child care, training, and other welfare-to-work services to welfare recipients and low-income working fami1ies. The 1996 law created work participation requirements for states and welfare recipients, as well as a time limit on receipt of federally funded assistance. These changes in welfare policy motivated policymakers and researchers to focus on the transportation barriers faced by welfare recipients and low- income workers. After signing the historic welfare Law in 1996, former president Clinton proposed several new transportation initiatives to assist low-income families in getting and keeping jobs As part of the proposal for reauthorization of the federal surface transportation act (the Transportation Equity Act for the Twenty-First Century, or TEA-21), the Clinton administration recommended the creation of a new transportation program that would target additional funds to agencies providing transit services to welfare recipients and other low-income workers. Elected officials of both parties, especially local leaders, advocated for the proposed new transportation funds because they were concerned that low- income residents would have difficulty finding work unless they had better access to suburban jobs. Pennsylvania senators Arlen Specter and Rick Santorum cosponsored an amendment to the transportation bill in 1998 to create what became known as the Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) program. At an event announcing the amendment, then mayor 0 Philadelphia Ed Rendell said, "The jobs that are available for which welfare recipients qualify are out in the suburbs. The people who need these jobs are located so far away and do not own automobiles. Our transportation system is inadequate to get them out to the suburbs."

### Plan could be Buses

#### New transit programs are likely to be focused on busing

Berube and Puentes et all '11

Robert Puentes, senior fellow with the Brookings Institution’s Metropolitan Policy Program, Alan Berube,senior fellow and research director at the Brookings Institution Metropolitan Policy Program, Adie Tomer, Senior Research Analyst at the Brookings Institution Metropolitan Policy Program and a member of the Metropolitan Infrastructure Initiative., Elizabeth Kneebone, senior research associate and associate fellow at the Brookings Institution Metropolitan Policy Program., "Missed Opportunity: Transit and Jobs in Metropolitan America," May 2011, Brookings, [www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/reports/2011/5/12 jobs and transit/0512\_jobs\_transit.pdf](http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/reports/2011/5/12%20jobs%20and%20transit/0512_jobs_transit.pdf) AD 7/1/12

Transportation: Make job access part of total transportation decision making Transportation agencies and providers must do more to address the coverage gaps revealed in this report. Some metropolitan areas will forge ahead with investments in fixed-route systems. Denver, Houston, Los Angeles, and Washington each have major rail transit projects underway designed to move workers and to accommodate future and planned growth. Yet given the expense of these types of investments, smaller metro areas such as Jacksonville, Fresno, Austin, Grand Rapids, and Hartford are seeking instead to expand their systems in lower-cost, flexible ways such as bus rapid transit (BRT). Perhaps once viewed as a “second best option” and an alternative to rail investments, BRT is the subject of considerable attention due to its potentially lower costs, increased flexibility, ridership potential, and, if done correctly, job access.75 In all but seven metro areas, more commuters use standard municipal buses than trains to get to work.76 This is largely due to the fact that fewer than one-third of large metro areas even have rail service. Given the severe fiscal constraints under which most agencies are operating and the dynamics of metropolitan growth, buses will remain the primary option for dealing with complicated mismatches between people and jobs, especially in low-income neighborhoods. Indeed, metro areas such as Philadelphia, Dayton, and Seattle are moving ahead with plans to introduce new bus routes to serve job-rich areas.

### Federal Action Key

#### Federal oversight is key because the federal government pays most costs and because of state biased and refusals to enforce rules

Hill et al. ‘5

Edward Hill is the Vice President of Economic Development at Cleveland State University. Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. Kevin O’Brien is a columnist at the Cleveland *Plain Dealer.* Claudette Robey is the Assistant Director with the Center for Public Management and the Great Lakes Environmental Finance Center. There are other authors of this chapter. “Slanted Pavement: How Ohio’s Highway Spending Shortchanges Cities and Suburbs,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 124

Why should anyone except Ohioans care about the status of highway funding in Ohio? First, many, if not most, states have an anti-urban bias in highway distribution formulas. Ohio is an example, not an exception. In the congressional debate over the federal transportation law, members from donor states clamor to ensure that their state receives an equitable share of the gas tax dollars. These elected leaders should not lose sight of the donor-donee issue within their own states. Second, federal transportation law should address the distribution formulas that omit major arterial city streets. This is a federal issue because Highway Trust Fund money supports this pattern of spending. Third, highway spending formulas that favor new construction in rural areas contribute to the spread of low-density development through de facto development subsidies. Low-density development is not necessarily objectionable, and Ohio, with an economy that specializes in manufacturing and distribution, depends on truck transportation and a well-functioning interstate highway system. However, highways have distorted the pattern of property values within the state.

### International Modelling

#### Transportation policy is modeled globally and is the most important internal link for solving developing nation climate change- policy change is key

**Sperling and Salon ‘2**, ed., Transportation in Developing Countries: An Overview of Greenhouse Gas Reductions Strategies, Pew Center for Global Climate Change, online 2009

**The importance of institutional reform** (regional planning) and compact development **is even more important in countries with immature transportation systems**, **far exceeding the benefits of technology and alternative fuels**, including hydrogen fuel-cell commercialization. According to a recent study by the Pew Center for Global Climate Change, “(transportation) technologies that work in developed countries may not work in developing countries due to their expense, maintenance needs, fuel availability, or need for high levels of institutional support.”[[21]](http://www.transact.org/library/factsheets/climate.asp%22%20%5Cl%20%22_ftn21%22%20%5Co%20%22) The report goes on to state “**other types of initiatives**, not based on technology, **are potentially more significant** (for greenhouse gas reduction). The authors conclude, based on the four case studies prepared as part of this series of reports on transportation in developing countries, that **initiatives based on institutional reform are more likely to revolutionize transportation.** An enhanced level of coordination between transportation agencies and governments with land use control could lead to dramatic improvements in transportation efficiency and reductions in vehicle usage in ways that have rarely been seen in the past.”[[22]](http://www.transact.org/library/factsheets/climate.asp%22%20%5Cl%20%22_ftn22%22%20%5Co%20%22) Despite this conclusion, **U.S. international transportation policy is largely based on exporting highway planning processes and road technologies to other countries.** **U.S. export credits largely support new highway construction as a way to promote U.S. business interests, not sustainable transportation systems.** No known U.S.-funded program promotes integrated transportation and land use planning, or institutional reform, as an element of our international transportation assistance programs.

### \*\*\*METHODS INSULATORS \*\*\*

### AT: Studies Flawed

#### ICF/Bailey study very conservative

Bailey ‘7

Linda Bailey is Senior Associate for Transportation at ICF International. “Public Transportation and Petroleum Savings in the U.S.: Reducing Dependence on Oil, <http://www.icfi.com/Markets/Transportation/doc_files/public-transportation.pdf>, January, Prepared for:

American Public Transportation Association.

Our assumption about housing density near public transportation services was quite conservative here. The standard of practice in public transportation planning, and Federal Transit Administration requirements, dictate that land use plans in the areas served by public transportation be molded to provide more housing units near stations, and more development in general around those stations. The standards of “transitoriented development” are not set in stone, but building housing in a more efficient way near public transportation stations could dramatically change the number of households with access to public transportation under this scenario.

### Methods Boosters/Indicts—Land Use

#### All past studies on land use are flawed—most advanced empirical techniques demonstrate transit reform radically alters land use patterns

Bailey, Mokhtarian, & Little ‘8

Linda Bailey is Senior Associate for Transportation at ICF International. Patricia Lyon MokhtarianProfessor, Civil and Environmental Engineering, Chair, Transportation Technology and Policy Graduate Program, and Associate Director for Education, Institute of Transportation Studies at University of California, Davis. Andrew Little is president of Urban Policy Research Institute. “The Broader Connection between Public Transportation, Energy Conservation and Greenhouse Gas Reduction,” <http://www.apta.com/research/info/online/documents/land_use.pdf>, February.

In order to test this hypothesis, we began with a survey of the literature on the interaction of land use and travel patterns. The literature focuses on three major categories of influences on travel: land use/urban environment, socio-demographic factors, and cost of travel. For the purposes of this study, land use/urban environment variables were further broken down to include a separate category for transportation infrastructure. Many past studies have found a significant correlation between land use variables and travel behavior, though results vary depending on how the problem and the variables are defined. Boarnet and Crane (2001) emphasized that without accounting for social characteristics, like age and education, land use-transportation models are incomplete. They also discussed the importance of economic measures, such as household or personal income, as a measure of the cost of travel time. Other studies evaluated the relative importance of these and other variables, informing this model. After evaluating possible variables for this model, we formed a statistical model that would allow us to tease apart the relationship between land use, transit availability, and travel behavior.

### Bailey (sole author) Methods FYI

#### FYI-METHODOLOGY OF BAILEY STUDY

Bailey ‘7

Linda Bailey is Senior Associate for Transportation at ICF International. “Public Transportation and Petroleum Savings in the U.S.: Reducing Dependence on Oil, <http://www.icfi.com/Markets/Transportation/doc_files/public-transportation.pdf>, January, Prepared for:

American Public Transportation Association.

In estimating household expenditures for gasoline, the average fuel economy of personal vehicles was taken from Highway Statistics, published by the Federal Highway Administration. While automobiles vary in their fuel economy, this is an average estimate of the fuel cost associated with driving an automobile. We also assumed that average fuel economy remained the same across different driving terrains, although individual automobile performance differs significantly between high-speed conditions, low-speed conditions, and stop-and-go conditions. This is a conservative measure since fuel economy is generally worse on city and suburban streets than on the interstate, and public transportation is generally used in cities and suburbs. Household savings from public transportation are calculated primarily by using a multivariate regression on vehicle miles. This statistical procedure controls for other factors on vehicle miles traveled per household besides public transportation, such as income, working status of adults in the household, vehicles available in the household, and residential building patterns around each household. The regressions are conducted to control for the complex sample structure of the data, and weighted to be representative of the population. The statistical analysis is presented in its raw form, but also in the form of real-world examples of how much fuel households use based on their mode choices and proximity to public transportation. Because household-level behavior is tracked using a 2001 survey, estimates of the extent of public transportation use in the groups described are conservative relative to current public transportation use, which has increased since 2001, very significantly in some metropolitan areas.

## \*\*\*FUEL CONSUMPTION\*\*\*

### Transit Reform Solves Oil Consumption

#### robust public transit results in massive reductions in oil consumption

Bailey ‘7

Linda Bailey is Senior Associate for Transportation at ICF International. “Public Transportation and Petroleum Savings in the U.S.: Reducing Dependence on Oil, <http://www.icfi.com/Markets/Transportation/doc_files/public-transportation.pdf>, January, Prepared for:

American Public Transportation Association.

The dramatic increase in ridership over the past decade demonstrates Americans’ clear desire for more public transportation options. So what would happen if public transportation services were expanded so that ridership doubled? Total national fuel savings from public transportation would double to 2.8 billion gallons per year, or more if improved coordination between land use plans and public transportation could replace even more car travel.

#### current fuel consumption is inelastic—robust public transit solves

Bailey ‘7

Linda Bailey is Senior Associate for Transportation at ICF International. “Public Transportation and Petroleum Savings in the U.S.: Reducing Dependence on Oil, <http://www.icfi.com/Markets/Transportation/doc_files/public-transportation.pdf>, January, Prepared for:

American Public Transportation Association.

Adjusting for the elasticity of gasoline consumption is key here, despite the fact that the lay understanding of gasoline consumption is that it is almost completely inelastic, or unresponsive to fuel prices. This comes from the belief that every trip a household makes by automobile is necessary and inevitable. The response of households to fuel prices has been documented in many studies, however. Households are able to reduce trips to some extent, for example by replacing multiple trips to the grocery store each week with one trip, by carpooling with friends to school or class, and by taking public transportation. These are short-term responses. In the longer term, people may move closer to work, move to a place with public transportation access, or buy a new vehicle with better gas mileage. However, public transportation, which would be an efficient short-term way for a household to save on fuel expenditures, is often unavailable for the trips that a household makes every day because of the limited network and service levels in the U.S. The analysis below examines the effects of public transportation availability and use on household driving patterns, and thus on fuel expenditures.

#### Robust transit solves oil dependence, saves families $6200 per year

ICF ‘7

ICF International Analysis Shows Public Transportation Can Save U.S. 1.4 Billion Gallons of Gasoline and Thousands of Dollars Per Household

Study Reveals Role of Public Transportation for Energy Independence in America, http://www.icfi.com/Newsroom/News.asp?ID=27

ICF International (Nasdaq: ICFI) released an innovative study on the link between public transportation and petroleum consumption in the United States. The study estimated that public transportation currently conserves 1.4 billion gallons of gasoline every year. At the household level, the study found that two-worker households using public transportation save $6,200 on average annually. The study was compiled by ICF for the American Public Transportation Association (APTA). Public transportation creates energy efficiencies by carrying multiple passengers in each vehicle, reducing traffic congestion, and using non-petroleum energy sources. “Our independent analysis shows that public transportation is reducing national petroleum consumption significantly,” said Linda Bailey, author of the study and an expert in transportation policy at ICF. “The study also found actual savings at the household level, where public transportation provides a cushion against the ups and downs of fuel prices.” The study found that U.S. households that use public transportation drive 16 fewer miles per day on average, a $1,400 savings in annual fuel costs. Two-worker households where one worker uses public transportation have the opportunity to save substantially more if they have only one car. These families can save an estimated $6,200 per year. Households across the country have already discovered the cost savings – ridership on public transportation is up 25.1 percent since 1995, with double-digit increases on some systems in the last year. “ICF is at the forefront of developing new approaches to transportation with studies such as this, working to more effectively integrate community and environmental goals into end-to-end transportation solutions,” said Janet D’Ignazio, head of transportation at ICF.

#### REduction in VMT Solves oil dependence

Winkelman et al ‘9

Steve Winkelman is director of the Transportation Program at the Center for Clean Air Policy (CCAP). Allison Bishins is a policy associate for transportation and climate change at CCAP. Chuck Kooshian is a Planner with the El Paso Department of Planning and Development. “Cost-Effective GHG Reductions through

Smart Growth & Improved Transportation Choices: An economic case for investment of cap-and-trade revenues,” <http://www.reconnectingamerica.org/public/display_asset/ccapsmartgrowthco2_june_2009_final_pdf?docid=306>, June 2009.

U.S. dependence on foreign oil exacerbates economic volatility and costs the U.S. billions of dollars annually to remain ready to intervene militarily to protect oil resources. In fact, the annual cost of oil dependence in the U.S. in 2005 was estimated to be $150-250 billion (at $35- 45 per barrel).46 Smart growth, by reducing VMT, can reduce our dependence on foreign oil, and directly and indirectly free up billions of dollars annually for other uses.

## \*\*\*POVERTY\*\*\*

### Lack of Transit 🡪 Poverty

#### Lack of effective public transit feeds cycles of unemployment and poverty

Blumenberg & Waller ‘5

Evelyn Blumenberg is Assistant Professor at UCLA's School of Public Policy and Social Research. Margy Waller is the senior fellow for Social Policy at the PPI and is affiliated with the Brookings Institution Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy. “A Long Journey to Work: A Federal Transportation Policy for Working Families,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 201-202

Many low-income adults, welfare administrators, and employers identify transportation issues as significant barriers to employment. Low-income adults frequently mention the importance of transportation in their work lives. In a study conducted in Illinois, over 25 percent of former welfare recipients interviewed reported problems in getting or paying for transportation to work. A similar study of welfare leavers in North Carolina found that 22 percent of unemployed respondents believed that transportation would be a problem if they were to find employment. An overwhelming 61 percent of long-term welfare recipients in Iowa reported transportation barriers to work. Welfare administrators and employers also acknowledge the importance of transportation to the success of welfare-to-work programs. In Indiana and California, more than three-quarters of county welfare administrator, surveyed reported that transportation is a significant barrier to the self sufficiency of their clients. In a Minnesota survey, 28 percent of employers identified transportation as the main barrier to hiring and retaining welfare recipients, with rural employers more likely than urban employers to identify transportation as a problem for their workforce. Finally, many employers report that their entry-level jobs are not accessible by public transit. In 1997 the Economic and Social Research Institute conducted a nationwide survey of employer attitudes toward entry-level workers. The survey included 500 employers in industries that hired a greater than average number of entry-level workers, as well as two smaller samples of 100 each in Los Angeles and Milwaukee. Overall, 36 percent of employers reported entry-level jobs inaccessible by public transit. The sub- samples, however, showed substantial variation across metropolitan areas. Only 13 percent of employers in Los Angeles were not accessible by public transit compared to 30 percent in Milwaukee.

#### Lack of transit ensures high unemployment rates and solely low income jobs for those living in urban cores

Blumenberg & Waller ‘5

Evelyn Blumenberg is Assistant Professor at UCLA's School of Public Policy and Social Research. Margy Waller is the senior fellow for Social Policy at the PPI and is affiliated with the Brookings Institution Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy. “A Long Journey to Work: A Federal Transportation Policy for Working Families,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 202-203

The structure of metropolitan areas has gradually changed over time so that a majority of employment and residents are dispersed in suburban neighborhood distant from the urban core. In 1910 the vast majority of metropolitan residents lived in the central city and only one quarter in the suburbs. Today, nearly two out of three metropolitan residents (62 percent) live in the suburbs. Similarly, employment has also shifted outward toward suburban areas that, as of 1997, were home to 57 percent of metropolitan employment. These trends are also reflected in metropolitan transportation patterns where, since the 1970s, the dominant commute flow has been from suburb to suburb. In 1960 travel within suburbs constituted only 10 percent of commutes. This is far less than the 46-plus percent of all commutes that now begin and end in the suburbs. As economies and opportunity decentralize and the working poor remain disproportionately centralized, a “spatial mismatch” arises between jobs and people in metropolitan areas. In suburbs entry-level jobs abound in manufacturing, wholesale trade, and retailing—and hold out opportunities for people with basic education and skills. However, the absence of viable transportation options- combined with persistent residential racial segregation and a lack of affordable suburban housing- effectively cuts off many inner-city workers from regional labor markets. Quite literally, low rates of car ownership and inadequate public transit keep job seekers in the urban core or central city from reaching many suburban jobs. Often, innercity workers, hobbled by distance and poor information networks are unaware of job openings outside of their neighborhoods.

#### Lack of robust transit reform keeps people from getting to jobs and crushing competitiveness

Katz et al. ‘5

Bruce Katz is vice president, director of the Metropolitan Policy Progam, and Adeline M. and Alfred I. Johnson Chair in Urban and Metropolitan Studies at the Brookings Institution. Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. Scott Bernstein is at the Center for Neighborhood Technology. “Getting Transportation Right for Metropolitan America,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 27

As economies and opportunities decentralize and working poverty concentrates, a spatial mismatch has arisen between jobs and people in the nation’s urban regions. In suburbs entry-level jobs abound in manufacturing, wholesale trade, and retailing—and hold out opportunities for people with basic education and skills. However, the absence of viable transportation options—combined with persistent residential racial segregation and a lack of affordable suburban housing—effectively cuts mans inner-city workers off from regional labor markets. Quite literally, low rates of car ownership and inadequate public transit keep job seekers in the core from reaching many suburban jobs. Often, inner-city workers, hobbled by poor information networks, do not even know these jobs exist. This, too, undermines the competitiveness of metropolitan regions by reducing employers’ ability to attract needed workers.

### Spatial Mismatch

#### Outdated US transportation design creates a spatial mismatch between jobs and workers

Berube and Puentes et all '11

Robert Puentes, senior fellow with the Brookings Institution’s Metropolitan Policy Program, Alan Berube,senior fellow and research director at the Brookings Institution Metropolitan Policy Program, Adie Tomer, Senior Research Analyst at the Brookings Institution Metropolitan Policy Program and a member of the Metropolitan Infrastructure Initiative., Elizabeth Kneebone, senior research associate and associate fellow at the Brookings Institution Metropolitan Policy Program., "Missed Opportunity: Transit and Jobs in Metropolitan America," May 2011, Brookings, [www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/reports/2011/5/12 jobs and transit/0512\_jobs\_transit.pdf](http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/reports/2011/5/12%20jobs%20and%20transit/0512_jobs_transit.pdf) AD 7/1/12

These trends have enormous implications for how workers access a range of activities and opportunities in metropolitan America: education, shopping, health care, and recreation. Most importantly,these challenges bring a new sense of urgency to metropolitan job access, particularly for the working poor. However, many cities and older communities have inherited a road and rail infrastructure geared more to the commuting and travel patterns of prior decades. Several problems emerge: • Old hubs and spokes. Although nearly half of work commutes still originate from, or terminate in, central cities, 39 percent of work trips are entirely suburban.17 Some older rail transit systems— which still move millions of daily commuters—capture little of this market because they were laid out when the dominant travel pattern was still into and out of cities, before business and commercial development began rapid decentralization. These hub-and-spoke patterns provide dense metropolitan cores with large supplies of suburban workers, but may not serve other parts of metropolitan areas well.18 • Serving low-density areas. As metropolitan areas decentralize in low-density forms of development— where residential and commercial uses are kept separate—it becomes increasingly difficult to connect people to jobs with public transit in a cost-effective manner. From 2002 to 2007, the amount of developed land in the United States increased by 8.4 percent, nearly twice the rate of population growth (4.5 percent).19 Indeed, an estimated 55 percent of large metropolitan residents live under traditional or exclusionary zoning regimes that separate uses and/or emphasize lowdensity development.20 • Spatial mismatch and the costs of transportation. As economies and opportunity decentralize, a “spatial mismatch” has arisen between jobs and people in metropolitan America.21 In some metro areas, inner-city workers are cut off from suburban labor market opportunities. In others, low- and moderate-income suburban residents spend large shares of their incomes owning and operating cars.22 While owning a car improves chances of employment, a growing body of work quantifies the large combined impact of housing and transportation costs on households’ economic bottom lines.23

#### Transit shortcomings prevent full employment, especially in low income neighborhoods

Berube and Puentes et all '11

Robert Puentes, senior fellow with the Brookings Institution’s Metropolitan Policy Program, Alan Berube,senior fellow and research director at the Brookings Institution Metropolitan Policy Program, Adie Tomer, Senior Research Analyst at the Brookings Institution Metropolitan Policy Program and a member of the Metropolitan Infrastructure Initiative., Elizabeth Kneebone, senior research associate and associate fellow at the Brookings Institution Metropolitan Policy Program., "Missed Opportunity: Transit and Jobs in Metropolitan America," May 2011, Brookings, [www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/reports/2011/5/12 jobs and transit/0512\_jobs\_transit.pdf](http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/reports/2011/5/12%20jobs%20and%20transit/0512_jobs_transit.pdf) AD 7/1/12

Fortunately, most metropolitan area workers do live in places where transit is indeed available. More than two-thirds of residents in the 100 largest metro areas live in neighborhoods served by transit. Of course, these figures vary widely among metro areas: 19 provide service to more than 80 percent of the population, while 30 serve fewer than half of their residents with transit. However, across these metro areas, the typical commuter can access only 30 percent of metropolitan jobs within 90 minutes by transit. This varies greatly too, with seven metro areas providing access to more than half of all metropolitan jobs, but 13 providing access to less than 20 percent. So while transit may be available it is not always convenient to employment, least of all to jobs in lower-skill industries. To be sure, there is no agreement about the optimum level of transit job access. Certainly 100 percent coverage is not a realistic or desirable public policy goal. The transportation network has different components (e.g., highway, transit, and passenger rail) that should ideally work together to form a balanced multimodal system. Access to jobs by transit should not be the only policy goal; rather, accessibility to employment overall should be a focus of policymakers at all levels. With the average commuter in major metro areas such as Atlanta, Chicago, Dallas, and Houston unable to reach 800,000 metropolitan jobs via transit, however, rising energy prices and transit cuts in low-income neighborhoods raise significant concerns for those labor markets.

#### Current transportation infrastructure doesn’t connect workers to jobs

Berube and Puentes et all '11

Robert Puentes, senior fellow with the Brookings Institution’s Metropolitan Policy Program, Alan Berube,senior fellow and research director at the Brookings Institution Metropolitan Policy Program, Adie Tomer, Senior Research Analyst at the Brookings Institution Metropolitan Policy Program and a member of the Metropolitan Infrastructure Initiative., Elizabeth Kneebone, senior research associate and associate fellow at the Brookings Institution Metropolitan Policy Program., "Missed Opportunity: Transit and Jobs in Metropolitan America," May 2011, Brookings, [www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/reports/2011/5/12 jobs and transit/0512\_jobs\_transit.pdf](http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/reports/2011/5/12%20jobs%20and%20transit/0512_jobs_transit.pdf) AD 7/1/12

Getting commuters to jobs is only one of the functions of a transit system, but it is arguably its most important. Commutes make up the largest share of transit trips nationwide.47 Moreover, as those trips occur during the busiest travel periods of the day, they help reduce congestion on road networks in metropolitan areas.48 Transit can compete with other modes of transportation if it connects workers with a significant number of jobs in what they regard to be a reasonable and reliable amount of time. Thus, the share of a metropolitan area’s jobs that commuters can reach via transit represents a critical measure of transit quality and workers’ access to labor market opportunity. This section measures the share of metropolitan jobs accessible to the typical working-age resident within 90 minutes of travel time via transit from his/her neighborhood. This is longer than the typical commute by car or transit. As such, it represents an upper bound on the time and distance that one should travel in order to reach work, rather than the average commuter experience. The measure is designed to offer an inclusive portrait of job access via transit in metropolitan areas. (See Box 2 for a more detailed explanation of the 90-minute threshold and results under alternative thresholds.) Across all neighborhoods served by some form of transit in the 100 largest metro areas, the typical working-age resident can reach about 30 percent of metropolitan jobs within 90 minutes of travel time.49 Put differently, for this typical commuter, more than two-thirds of jobs in the nation’s largest metro areas are inaccessible within an hour and a half by way of existing transit systems. This result reflects more than just the size and reach of metropolitan transit networks. The location of jobs and population within metropolitan areas, and the extent to which transit systems align with both, play significant roles in determining access to jobs via transit. Over the past several decades, including the 2000s, jobs and people have moved farther outward in metropolitan areas.50 By 2010, suburbs in the 100 largest metro areas housed almost 63 percent of metropolitan jobs and 69 percent of working-age people.51 Yet the previous two findings underscore the extent to which transit in most metro areas still concentrates primarily in cities, and provides hub-and-spoke rail service misaligned with the suburbanization of employment and people. Clear regional patterns emerge across and within the 100 largest metro areas, indicating differences not only in transit coverage and service frequency, but also in alignment (or lack thereof) between transit systems and the location of people and jobs (Figure 5). Metro areas in the West (33 percent) and Northeast (32 percent) demonstrate above-average median job accessibility rates. Midwestern metro areas (28 percent) lag the 100-metro average, while the typical resident of a Southern metro area can access only about one-quarter of metropolitan jobs within 90 minutes via transit (26 percent).

#### Lack of transportation to employment exacerbates spatial mismatch for the suburban poor

Raphael and Stoll '10

Steven, prof of public policy at UCBerkeley, Michael, Nonresident Senior Fellow at Brookings Metropolitan Policy Program, "Job Sprawl andthe Suburbanizationof Poverty," March 30, 2010www.brookings.edu/research/reports/2010/03/30-job-sprawl-stoll-raphael AD 7/2/12

Several results stand out. First, population and employment decentralization go hand-in-hand. At the metropolitan level, the degree of employment decentralization is strongly associated with the degree of suburbanization, although this relationship varies by demographic and economic group. Second, minorities and the poor are the least suburbanized, with poor blacks the least likely to reside in the suburbs. They also demonstrate the weakest association between suburbanization and employment decentralization. Third, changes in employment decentralization over time associate strongly with changes in suburbanization patterns. However, the poor appear considerably less likely to suburbanize in response to continued decentralization of employment (although the relationship is still positive). Finally, the poor are somewhat less likely to reside in jobs-rich suburbs, although the magnitude of this difference depends greatly on race and ethnicity and metro area characteristics. Together, these findings strongly suggest that employment decentralization is helping to drive the suburbanization of poverty. However, the responsiveness of the poor to job sprawl is not as strong as it is for the population as a whole. Furthermore, when the poor reach the suburbs, they are more likely to live in jobs-poor areas that are frequently lower income and more disadvantaged—and potentially indistinguishable from disadvantaged central city areas. These patterns are sharpest for the black and Latino poor, and they are consistent with prior research documenting that racial and ethnic minorities have driven population growth in lower-income suburban areas characterized by weaker employment growth and lower access to good-paying jobs.34 The demographic and economic disparities in the relationship between poverty suburbanization and job decentralization further suggest that frictions in housing markets limit the ability of the poor to follow jobs. These frictions may include the limited availability of affordable housing in jobs-rich, higher-income suburbs. This in turn may reflect zoning laws favoring single-family housing, the effect of development impact fees on affordable housing, and disproportionate location of low-income housing projects in central city or poor areas.35 At the same time, racial segregation in housing markets, including racial discrimination by banks in lending, by landlords or rental agents, or even resulting from racial preferences of residents, may drive these patterns as well. Moreover, zoning laws and development impact fees that limit low-income housing in suburban areas may themselves partly reflect racial preferences. Policies designed to minimize these frictions, such as providing more incentives for multifamily housing, reevaluating existing zoning laws and development impact fees, facilitating the use of housing vouchers in new suburban locations, and enforcing fair housing laws in suburban areas could go a long way toward easing mobility for the poor. These findings raise a question, however. Are the poor hurt by their inability to readily follow jobs? Research would suggest yes, at least as measured by earnings and employment. These problems are compounded by low car ownership rates and limited information about distant job opportunities. Weaker informal networks, through which most lower-income workers seek jobs, limit their access to jobs outside their neighborhoods. For the poor in suburban areas, their access to homes in jobs-rich suburbs might be constrained by some combination of high housing costs, limited familiarity, and few social contacts in these areas. Moreover, the potentially higher commuting costs could be a disincentive to obtaining jobs in these areas. These costs are further compounded for those dependent on public transit because of sparse coverage of transit systems there. These findings thus strongly suggest that housing and labor market policies should seek to maximize access to job opportunities for the poor, and low-income workers more broadly, throughout metropolitan areas, regardless of where the workers and the jobs are located.

### Transit Reform Saves Poor $

#### Robust Transit would save working Poor 40% of transportation costs

Bailey ‘7

Linda Bailey is Senior Associate for Transportation at ICF International. “Public Transportation and Petroleum Savings in the U.S.: Reducing Dependence on Oil, <http://www.icfi.com/Markets/Transportation/doc_files/public-transportation.pdf>, January, Prepared for:

American Public Transportation Association.

Average household savings based on reduced vehicle miles traveled are one part of the picture. Public transportation also charges a fare, which does increase overall cost. Conversely, reducing the need to own a car significantly reduces household expenditures on vehicles. This is discussed in more detail below. A 2003 study conducted by the Bureau of Transportation Statistics found that those who use public transportation save approximately 40 percent of the expenditures made by those who commuted by automobile, just for the commute (BTS Issue Brief 1, 2003, “Commuting Expenses: Disparity for the Working Poor”). The results found here are similar in magnitude.

#### Robust public transit saves each household $6200 per year

Bailey ‘7

Linda Bailey is Senior Associate for Transportation at ICF International. “Public Transportation and Petroleum Savings in the U.S.: Reducing Dependence on Oil, <http://www.icfi.com/Markets/Transportation/doc_files/public-transportation.pdf>, January, Prepared for:

American Public Transportation Association.

Households who use public transportation save a significant amount of money. A two adult “public transportation household” saves an average $6,251 every year, compared to an equivalent household with two cars and no access to public transportation service. We define “public transportation household” as a household located within ¾ mile of public transportation, with two adults and one car. To put these household savings in perspective, we compared them to other household expenditures: • The average U.S. household spent $5,781 on food in 2004. • The average U.S. homeowner with a mortgage spent $6,848 on mortgage interest and fees in 2004, and paid off $3,925 in mortgage principal. These savings are attributable to three factors: • Driving less. The average household in which at least one member uses public transportation on a given day drives 16 fewer miles per day compared to a household with similar income, residential location and vehicle ownership that do not use public transit – a savings of hundreds of dollars a year. • Walking more. The 2001 National Household Transportation Survey reveals that households living near public transportation facilities tend to drive less in general, independent of their own public transportation use. That is because these areas tend to have characteristics allowing people to walk more, drive shorter distances when they do drive, and walk between destinations such as stores and workplaces. • Owning fewer cars. The American Automobile Association (AAA) estimated the annual average cost of operating a vehicle in 2006 was $5,586, including vehicle depreciation, insurance, finance fees and standard maintenance.

### Transit Solves Poverty

#### Public transit reform is key to solve poverty- gas prices act as a regressive tax that disproportionately impact the poor, creating a massive rich-poor gap

**Reich ‘8**, [Robert, NY Times, June 29, Section WK; Column 0; Editorial Desk; OP-ED CONTRIBUTOR; Pg. 11, lexisnexis, DB]

AS if the widening wage gap weren't bad enough, **the bottom half of the American work force** -- everyone who will earn less than about $42,000 this year -- **is getting hit by** the equivalent of **a whopping regressive tax in the form of soaring gas prices.** And fuel isn't a discretionary item like cable TV that can be cut from the family budget. On average, Americans now spend 4 percent of their income on gas. But this figure varies significantly. People who live in impoverished Wilcox County in Alabama, for example, spend 16 percent of their income on gas, while residents of affluent Hunterdon County in New Jersey spend 2 percent. **Poorer Americans also tend to drive older cars that get lousy mileage.** They don't trade them in as often as wealthier people do, and can't afford hybrids or new models that use gas more efficiently. And **it's not unusual for their jobs to require them to haul stuff from one place to another in pickup trucks or vans that guzzle even more gas.** Low-wage workers in rural areas are taking the biggest hit, but those who work in cities aren't faring much better. It used to be that the very poor inhabited central cities and the working class lived in the inner suburbs, but now that the rich are moving back into town, the poor are being pushed outward. Retail, restaurant, hospital and hotel **employees who work in upscale cities often must look 30 to 50 miles** from their jobs **for affordable housing.** **Their longer commutes mean they need to spend more on gas.** It's true that **those on the bottom half of the economic ladder make greater use of public transportation, but they're having a harder time finding it.** Budget constraints are causing states and cities to reduce rail and bus services. A survey of the nation's public transit agencies released last month showed that 21 percent of rail operators and 19 percent of bus operators are cutting service. **The wage gap in America continues to widen. And the gas gap is giving it additional fuel.**

### Transit is Poverty Issue

#### The Lack of effective public transit disproporionately impacts the working poor and unemployed

Katz et al. ‘5

Bruce Katz is vice president, director of the Metropolitan Policy Progam, and Adeline M. and Alfred I. Johnson Chair in Urban and Metropolitan Studies at the Brookings Institution. Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. Scott Bernstein is at the Center for Neighborhood Technology. “Getting Transportation Right for Metropolitan America,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 27

Congestion and automobile dependence also affect the pocketbooks of citizens and commuters. The dominant pattern of suburban growth— low-density housing, a sprawling job base—has made residents and commuters completely dependent on the car for all travel needs. Partly as a result, household spending on transportation has risen across the country. Transportation is now the second largest expense for most American households, consuming on average 19 cents out of every dollar. Only housing-related costs eat up a larger chunk of expenditures (33 cents), with food a distant third (13 cents). The transportation burden disproportionately affects the poor and working poor, moreover. For example, those in the lowest income brackets spent nearly 10 percent of their personal income on commuting in 1999—more than double the national average. The working poor who used their own vehicle to commute spent a larger share of their income (as do all workers) than those who are able to use transit

#### Transit access is a core poverty issue equivalent to welfare programs

Blumenberg & Waller ‘5

Evelyn Blumenberg is Assistant Professor at UCLA's School of Public Policy and Social Research. Margy Waller is the senior fellow for Social Policy at the PPI and is affiliated with the Brookings Institution Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy. “A Long Journey to Work: A Federal Transportation Policy for Working Families,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 203-204

The spatial mismatch is frequently cited as a primary explanation for the transportation barriers faced by poor families. Many scholars, beginning with Kain in 1968, have provided compelling evidence that the spatial separation of housing and employment exacerbates the poverty of inner-city blacks. Low-wage jobs are increasingly located further out in the urban periphery, and competition for the remaining central-city jobs can be fierce. Although the spatial mismatch hypothesis has been put to the test by a host of skeptical scholars, empirical support for the concept remains. For this reason, the spatial mismatch hypothesis has become the chief framework for understanding the transportation needs of all low-income, central-city residents, including welfare recipients. In fact, Congress cited the spatial mismatch hypothesis to justify funding of JARC, declaring that “Congress finds that.., two-thirds of all new jobs are in the suburbs, whereas three quarters of welfare recipients live in rural areas or central cities.” Work-based welfare policy has also prompted many scholars and transportation planners to examine the spatial location of welfare recipients and potential low-wage employment opportunities. These studies use maps to illustrate the high concentrations of welfare recipients residing in central cities, the growth in low-wage suburban employment, and, frequently, the weak public transit linkages between central cities and suburbs. In other words, these studies, once again, underscore the relevance of the spatial mismatch hypothesis to low-income, central-city residents including, but not limited to, blacks.

#### The transportation system is the lynchpin for ensuring all other social services get to the poor- it’s a fundamental human right

**Clarke & Criollo ‘9**, (Jesse, Urban Habitat, Manuel, Lead organizer for Bus Riders Union, Bus Rider Rights, *Urban Habitat Journal*, Volume 16, #1 Spring 2009, June 2, 2009 http://www.thestrategycenter.org/news/clip/2009/06/03/bus-rider-rights)

Clarke: **How is transportation an issue of human rights** for the people you work with?Criollo: “We are the BRU and this is our fight. Mass transportation is a human right. We want 50-cent fares and $20 passes, because mass transportation belongs to the masses!” This was one of our breakout chants from the early 1990s. Transportation access is a critical human rights issue. **If someone doesn’t have access to public transit, the system is in essence denying them** basic human rights: **access to education and healthy food; access to jobs; access to healthcare; and the pursuit of goals beyond mere survival.** In a city like Los Angeles, with its many social and economic extremes, **transportation denial further en-trenches neighborhood and racial segregation.** Clarke: How does lack of access to public transit affect working class people, communities of color, and low income people?Criollo: **For the poorest of the poor to have mobility—I mean literal mobility as well as economic and educational mobility—we must have quality public transit.** The over 500,000 primarily African American, Latino, Asian, and white working class bus riders of Los Angeles have had to negotiate their lives on a third-tier transit system that has historically failed them and systematically denies them access to quality jobs, schools, and hospitals.We believe that **transportation should meet the needs of those who are most dependent on it.** We are not asking for “equity,” but true transformative change that can transfer wealth from political elites and transnational corporations to working class communities of color.

#### Public transit support is prima facie a social service for the poor- gas use demanded by private cars functions as a regressive tax that decreases the earnings of the poor

**Reich ‘8**, [Robert, NY Times, June 29, Section WK; Column 0; Editorial Desk; OP-ED CONTRIBUTOR; Pg. 11, lexisnexis, DB]

AS if the widening wage gap weren't bad enough, **the bottom half of the American work force** -- everyone who will earn less than about $42,000 this year -- **is getting hit by** the equivalent of **a whopping regressive tax** in the form of soaring gas prices. And fuel isn't a discretionary item like cable TV that can be cut from the family budget. On average, Americans now spend 4 percent of their income on gas. But this figure varies significantly. People who live in impoverished Wilcox County in Alabama, for example, spend 16 percent of their income on gas, while residents of affluent Hunterdon County in New Jersey spend 2 percent. **Poorer Americans also tend to drive older cars that get lousy mileage.** They don't trade them in as often as wealthier people do, and can't afford hybrids or new models that use gas more efficiently. And it's not unusual for their jobs to require them to haul stuff from one place to another in pickup trucks or vans that guzzle even more gas. **Low-wage workers** in rural areas **are taking the biggest hit**, but those who work in cities aren't faring much better. It used to be that the very poor inhabited central cities and the working class lived in the inner suburbs, but now that the rich are moving back into town, the poor are being pushed outward. Retail, restaurant, hospital and hotel employees who work in upscale cities often must look 30 to 50 miles from their jobs for affordable housing. Their longer commutes mean they need to spend more on gas. It's true that **those on the bottom half of the economic ladder make greater use of public transportation**, but they're having a harder time finding it. **Budget constraints are causing states and cities to reduce rail and bus services.** A survey of the nation's public transit agencies released last month showed that 21 percent of rail operators and 19 percent of bus operators are cutting service. **The wage gap in America continues to widen. And the gas gap is giving it additional fuel.**

### State/Local Govt Excluding Poor

#### STates and metropolitan governments refuse to allow citizen input and hide spending data to ensure the poor can’t influence decision making

Katz et al. ‘5

Bruce Katz is vice president, director of the Metropolitan Policy Progam, and Adeline M. and Alfred I. Johnson Chair in Urban and Metropolitan Studies at the Brookings Institution. Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. Scott Bernstein is at the Center for Neighborhood Technology. “Getting Transportation Right for Metropolitan America,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 24-25

Another disappointment is that many slates and metropolitan areas alike undercut reform by flouting the spirit and intent of the new federal rules governing citizen participation. A number of states (such as Washington and Maryland) do include citizens on advisory committees that advise on selection of enhancement projects such as pedestrian and bicycle access or landscaping. In Denver and Albany, New York, MPOs have made public involvement central to their development of long-range vision plans. Yet, for the most part, states and metropolitan areas do not involve citizens in an “early and continuing” way in their transportation decisions, despite existing federal regulations requiring them to do so.In addition, citizens rarely have ready access to transparent information on how and where their state and metropolitan bureaucracies spend federal transportation dollars. Incredibly, it is easier for citizens to discern where private banks and thrifts lend (thanks to the federal Home Mortgage Disclosure Act) than to determine where public transportation agencies spend. Ultimately this lack of transparency reduces the ability of employers, workers, and citizens in general to influence the regional transportation systems that so strongly shape economic competitiveness, development trends, environmental quality, and the nation’s quality of life.

### Current Transit Discriminates Against Poor

#### Current Public transit is almost totally unavailable to the poor

Margy **Waller**, December 20**05,** “High Cost or High Opportunity Cost? Transportation and Family Economic Success” The Brookings Institution, http://www.brookings.edu/papers/2005/12poverty\_waller.aspx **Making do without a reliable car requires poor households to rely on others or on the local public transit system.** Public transit can work well for poor workers in dense urban areas, and its advocates proclaim that transit reduces sprawl and congestion and leads to better air quality. Yet, **in 2000, fewer than 5 percent of workers took public transportation to work, while nearly 88 percent commuted by car.** **Despite significant public investment in public transit, usage continues to decline as a percentage of urban travel.** Nevertheless, poor workers are more likely to commute by public transit—especially bus—than are higher income workers. **Transit-dependent low-income households often pay a high price for going without a personal vehicle as transit often fails to meet their needs.**

#### It’s Status quo transit that isn’t for the poor—we alter that

Love and Cox, 91, consultants specializing in transportation, privatization, and the economics of the public sector, “False dreams and Broken promises: The Wasteful Federal investment in mass transit,” The Cato Institute, 10/17/91, http://www.cato.org/pubs/pas/pa-162.html, accessed 6/28/09

Transit provides essential mobility to many of the poor, but transit accounted for less than 7 percent of trips made by low-income people in 1983.(62) The most pressing need of the inner-city poor is transportation from the city to suburban jobs for which they are qualified. Yet only 5 percent of the total "reverse commute" market is served by public transit. From 1970 to 1980 transit's reverse commute market share declined by 50 percent. [A federal program to encourage entrepreneurs to provide reverse commute services to the inner-city poor has encountered resistance and delay as a result of transit unions' using their power under section 13(c). Many proposals have been abandoned; new proposals have been discouraged; and the poor continue to go unserved.] The increasingly dispersed nature of inner-cityto-suburb trips renders conventional mass transit service (large buses) unsuitable for that market in terms of both travel time and financial feasibility.(63) If public transit subsidies benefit anyone, they benefit affluent suburbanites, not the poor. A Los Angeles study determined that inner-city service, patronized largely by the poor, received less than 22 cents in total operating subsidy per passenger boarding, while express service, patronized largely by the affluent, received more than $1.18 per boarding.(64) A 1986 study showed that riders with incomes exceeding $50,000 per year received 50 percent more in federal operating subsidies per transit trip than did low-income users of transit.(65) The difference would have been greater if capital figures had been included.

### Transit Reform 🡪 Jobs for Poor

#### Public transit boosts employment opportunities for low income families

Blumenberg & Waller ‘5

Evelyn Blumenberg is Assistant Professor at UCLA's School of Public Policy and Social Research. Margy Waller is the senior fellow for Social Policy at the PPI and is affiliated with the Brookings Institution Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy. “A Long Journey to Work: A Federal Transportation Policy for Working Families,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 206

The evidence on the relationship between public transit and employment outcomes is more varied. Some studies show that access to public transit has a positive effect on overall employment rates and, more specifically, a moderate effect on transit use and employment rates among welfare recipients. The evidence also suggests that black welfare recipients are much less likely than other recipients to be hired in jobs that are located distant from public transit stops, once again underscoring the negative effect of spatial isolation.

#### Robust transit solves poverty, employment, oil dependence, and land use patterns

Bailey ‘7

Linda Bailey is Senior Associate for Transportation at ICF International. “Public Transportation and Petroleum Savings in the U.S.: Reducing Dependence on Oil, <http://www.icfi.com/Markets/Transportation/doc_files/public-transportation.pdf>, January, Prepared for:

American Public Transportation Association.

The new growth scenario is estimated here to roughly double the total national fuel savings from public transportation, to 2.8 billion gallons per year. However, as has been shown above, improved coordination between land use plans and public transportation services could improve the ratio between services provided (and the fuel they use) and the amount of personal automobile travel replaced. An important note is that in terms of fiscal management, operations costs relative to frequency of service for public transportation agencies will generally rise relative to fuel prices. Therefore, if public transportation provides some measure of fiscal relief for households during times of high fuel prices, operations costs must account for the increased need at a time when their existing services also cost more for each unit of service provided to customers. Households may also save fuel costs because of land use plans that accommodate public transportation service. As shown in the regressions in the previous section above on household savings, many households living within ¾ mile of public transportation services spend less on fuel independent of their own use of public transportation. These fuel savings may overshadow direct savings on replaced mileage on public transportation in reality, since only a portion of the households living within the threequarter mile buffer around public transportation services use them. The building patterns that likely enable lower household mileage include proximity of stores and services to one another, increased walking access to commercial services and even office districts from homes, and shorter distances between destinations because of the increased footprint of each structure in areas with high parking space requirements for commercial buildings.

#### Lack of transit options ALSO LOCKS suburban and rural poor out of employment

Blumenberg & Waller ‘5

Evelyn Blumenberg is Assistant Professor at UCLA's School of Public Policy and Social Research. Margy Waller is the senior fellow for Social Policy at the PPI and is affiliated with the Brookings Institution Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy. “A Long Journey to Work: A Federal Transportation Policy for Working Families,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 205

For the suburban and rural poor, access to employment may be most difficult, especially for those families without automobiles. While most jobs are in the suburbs, they tend to be dispersed over large areas and can be accessible to low-income residential neighborhoods. Similarly, rural employment is often many miles from a dispersed rural population. Lower densities in these areas typically do not support the extensive transit networks found in many central cities, forcing most rural and suburban low-income commuters to rely on personal vehicles. Those without cars, however, can be the most isolated from employment.

#### People in poverty lack transportation options—they lack transit and reliable car. that prevents regular employment

Blumenberg & Waller ‘5

Evelyn Blumenberg is Assistant Professor at UCLA's School of Public Policy and Social Research. Margy Waller is the senior fellow for Social Policy at the PPI and is affiliated with the Brookings Institution Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy. “A Long Journey to Work: A Federal Transportation Policy for Working Families,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 204-205

For transportation policy purposes, however, it is important to look beyond the spatial mismatch. While many low-income adults live far from employment opportunities, many others live closer to jobs yet still face transportation barriers. Again, 44 percent of the metropolitan poor live in the suburbs. In addition, for low-income adults who remain in the inner city, there are still high concentrations of employment in some places. Although some metropolitan areas—particularly in the Northeast and Midwest- have experienced a dramatic hollowing out of the urban core, this experience is far from universal. The decline in central-city Cleveland or St. Louis looks vastly different from that of Boston, San Francisco, New York, or Minneapolis. Not surprisingly, studies find metropolitan variation in the extent and effects of the spatial mismatch. However, living and working in the same part of the city, whether in the suburbs or the central city, does not necessarily reduce or eliminate transportation problems. Low-income workers tend to commute relatively short distances, far shorter, on average, than higher-income commuters. Still, most low-income workers find employment outside of their immediate neighborhoods and require some form of reliable transportation by which to commute. Contrary to popular perception, most low-income adults commute by car (see table 8-1). Those workers fortunate to have access to automobiles can reach many employment opportunities within a reasonable commute time, regardless of where they live. But not all low-wage workers have access to automobiles. Auto ownership rates vary substantially by income and race or ethnicity. Data from the 2000 census show that 10 percent of all households do not have vehicles, and those without vehicles are more likely to be in the lowest income brackets. Households with incomes below $25,000 make up 65 percent of households without vehicles. In addition, blacks are overrepresented among zero- vehicle household: they constitute 12 percent of all households but 35 percent of households without cars. Poor workers who are dependent on public transit.—even when traveling within the central city—may live close to bus stops but often face lengthy commutes resulting from long waits at transit stops, cumbersome and time-consuming transfers, and infrequent service during off-peak hours.

### Suburban Poverty

#### Cities are growing while poverty in the suburbs is increasing

Bube and Puentes et all '11

Robert Puentes, senior fellow with the Brookings Institution’s Metropolitan Policy Program, Alan Berube,senior fellow and research director at the Brookings Institution Metropolitan Policy Program, Adie Tomer, Senior Research Analyst at the Brookings Institution Metropolitan Policy Program and a member of the Metropolitan Infrastructure Initiative., Elizabeth Kneebone, senior research associate and associate fellow at the Brookings Institution Metropolitan Policy Program., "Missed Opportunity: Transit and Jobs in Metropolitan America," May 2011, Brookings, [www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/reports/2011/5/12 jobs and transit/0512\_jobs\_transit.pdf](http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/reports/2011/5/12%20jobs%20and%20transit/0512_jobs_transit.pdf) AD 7/1/12

Of course, the success of a transit network in reaching workers and helping them to access jobs rises and falls on much more than the transit system itself. Transportation networks interact with the location of employment and housing in complex ways that influence the metrics analyzed in this report: • Metro growth and expansion. In the 2000s, America’s central cities continued their growth trend from the 1990s. In fact, from 2006 to 2009, their growth accelerated at the same time that suburban population growth slowed, largely due to the housing crisis and deepening recession. Nevertheless, much of the decade saw low-density exurban parts of metropolitan America grow at rates several times those of cities and high-density suburban counties. Today, about 40 percent of the metropolitan population lives in these spread-out areas.11 Several metro areas are experiencing dual trends of growth in the urban core as well as outward expansion. • Employment decentralization. Suburbs are no longer just bedroom communities for workers commuting to traditional downtowns. Rather, many are strong employment centers serving a variety of functions in their regional economies. An investigation into the location of jobs in the nation’s largest metropolitan areas finds that nearly half are located more than 10 miles outside of downtowns.12 Only about one in five metropolitan jobs is located near the urban core, within 3 miles of downtown. Some suburban job growth is undoubtedly occurring in city-like settings, yet a significant share continues to take shape in low density, “edgeless” forms.13 • Suburbanization of poverty. Poverty, once overwhelmingly concentrated in cities, has likewise drifted into the suburbs. By 2008, large metropolitan suburbs were home to a larger share—about one-third—of America’s poor than big cities, small metropolitan areas, or rural areas. During the 2000s, poverty in suburbs grew five times faster than in cities.14 While poor suburban families are not yet geographically concentrated in the extreme degrees traditionally seen in some central cities, there are alarming trends in this direction.15 Furthermore, poor suburban residents tend to reside in less jobs-rich communities than their non-poor counterparts.16

#### The suburban poor typically live in jobs-poor areas

Raphael and Stoll '10

Steven, prof of public policy at UCBerkeley, Michael, Nonresident Senior Fellow at Brookings Metropolitan Policy Program, "Job Sprawl andthe Suburbanizationof Poverty," March 30, 2010www.brookings.edu/research/reports/2010/03/30-job-sprawl-stoll-raphael AD 7/2/12

D. Within suburbs, the poor generally live in communities that have somewhat belowaverage numbers of jobs. Moving to the suburbs is a good thing if the poor gain greater access to employment opportunities. However, if they are not relocating to the suburbs where jobs are shifting, the trend could exacerbate access problems if, for instance, their new suburban residential locations lack transportation connections to suburban job centers. To investigate these proximity questions we tabulate the ratio of jobs-to-people for each metropolitan area as a whole and for each U.S. Census-defined Public Use Microdata Areas (PUMA) within metropolitan areas. Jobs-rich suburbs are those with a jobs-to-people ratio greater than the metropolitan area as a whole. Jobs-poor suburbs are those with a ratio below this average.32 The measure thus characterizes job density in suburban areas of roughly 100,000 people, which are much larger than neighborhoods, but much smaller than the entire metropolitan labor market. Overall, 68 percent of the suburban population, and 62 percent of the suburban poor, lives in jobs-rich suburbs (Table 6). These high shares reflect the fact that there are more jobs-rich PUMAs in suburbs than central cities. Large racial disparities are also evident in the likelihood of living in a jobs-rich PUMA among suburban residents. While 72 percent of white suburbanites reside in jobs-rich areas, only 63 percent of blacks do and only 54 percent of Latinos do. Racial disparities among the

poor follow similar patterns.

#### Spatial mismatch between workers and suitable jobs prevents employment, especially for the suburban poor

Berube and Puentes et all '11

Robert Puentes, senior fellow with the Brookings Institution’s Metropolitan Policy Program, Alan Berube,senior fellow and research director at the Brookings Institution Metropolitan Policy Program, Adie Tomer, Senior Research Analyst at the Brookings Institution Metropolitan Policy Program and a member of the Metropolitan Infrastructure Initiative., Elizabeth Kneebone, senior research associate and associate fellow at the Brookings Institution Metropolitan Policy Program., "Missed Opportunity: Transit and Jobs in Metropolitan America," May 2011, Brookings, [www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/reports/2011/5/12 jobs and transit/0512\_jobs\_transit.pdf](http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/reports/2011/5/12%20jobs%20and%20transit/0512_jobs_transit.pdf) AD 7/1/12

D. About one-quarter of jobs in low- and middle-skill industries are accessible via transit within 90 minutes for the typical metropolitan commuter, compared to one-third of jobs in high-skill industries. Where jobs lie within a metropolitan area shapes how many of them are accessible via transit. Similarly, the spatial distribution of different types of industries within a region may affect the kinds of jobs residents can reach via transit. While almost every major industry decentralized within metropolitan areas over the last several years, some remain more concentrated in the urban core than others.60 Consequently, the degree to which transit systems “match” workers and the jobs for which they are most qualified depends on a range of factors that vary significantly across metro areas. As described in the methodology, this report classifies major industries by the average educational attainment of their workers. In the 100 largest metro areas, almost half of total jobs are in industries defined as high-skill, such as finance, business and legal services, and public administration. The remaining jobs include those in middle-skill industries (19 percent) like wholesale trade and manufacturing, and low-skill sectors (33 percent) like construction, personal services, and hospitality. More than half of jobs in cities of the 100 largest metro areas are in high-skill industries, while more than half of suburban jobs are middle- or low-skill (Figure 8).61 Stated another way, across these metro areas, 43 percent of metropolitan high-skill industry jobs are in cities, and 69 percent of low-skill industry jobs are in suburbs. This reflects the greater “demand for density” among high-skill sectors, and the larger physical footprint of middle- and low-skill sectors like manufacturing and retail.62 Because transit generally provides better access to employment in cities than suburbs, metropolitan commuters can reach relatively more high-skill industry jobs via transit than other jobs. Across the 100 largest metro areas, the typical working-age person in neighborhoods served by transit can reach onethird of metro area jobs in high-skill industries within 90 minutes of travel time, compared to just over one-quarter of metro area jobs in middle- or low-skill industries (Figure 9). This pattern holds across metropolitan areas in all census regions, but some regions exhibit more pronounced disparities than others. In Western metro areas, the typical commuter can access 31 percent of low-skill industry jobs, and 35 percent of high-skill industry jobs, within 90 minutes via transit. In the Midwest, commuters can reach a similar share of high-skill industry jobs (34 percent), but only 23 percent of low- and middle-skill industry jobs. Disparities are also high, and access levels lower at every skill level, in the South, where the typical working-age person can reach only 29 percent of highskill industry jobs and 22 percent of low-skill industry jobs via transit. Among the 100 metro areas, 94 provide access to greater shares of their high-skill industry jobs via transit than their low- and middle-skill industry jobs. Las Vegas, McAllen, Colorado Springs, Virginia Beach, Palm Bay, and Tampa are the only exceptions, reflecting their above-average concentrations of low- and middle-skill jobs and the decentralization of those jobs across cities and suburbs. Metro areas in which transit and jobs are better aligned overall exhibit higher levels of job access across employment skill types. Metropolitan San Jose, Honolulu, Fresno, Salt Lake City, and Tucson, which rank among the top 10 metro areas for total share of metropolitan jobs accessible via transit, each place among the top 10 for job access at all three industry skill levels. In each of these metro areas, the typical working-age resident can reach roughly two-thirds of high-skill jobs, and more than half of low-skill jobs, in 90 minutes. Residents of cities can access higher shares of jobs across all industry skill categories via transit than their suburban counterparts, another result of transit’s traditional hub-and-spoke design. The typical city resident can reach 46 percent of high-skill metropolitan jobs within 90 minutes, compared to 36 percent of middle- and low-skill jobs. And while low- and middle-skill jobs make up the bulk of suburban employment, suburban residents still reach greater shares of metropolitan high-skill jobs via transit. The typical suburban resident can reach 24 percent of metro-wide high-skill industry jobs within 90 minutes, compared to just 19 percent of middle- and low-skill industry jobs. Notably, this disparity between high- and low-skill industry job access via transit is most pronounced for residents of the low-income neighborhoods who depend most on the service. As revealed in the last section, these commuters generally enjoy greater levels of access to all metropolitan jobs than their counterparts in higher-income communities. The typical commuter from a low-income neighborhood in the 100 largest metro areas can reach over 40 percent of metropolitan high-skill industry employment, but only about 32 percent of low- and middle-skill industry jobs, 8 percentage points lower. Taken together, the findings for low-income and suburban neighborhoods raise concerns about the ability of a suburbanizing poor population to connect to employment opportunities via transit. Residents of low-income suburban neighborhoods can reach just over one-in-five middle- or low-skill industry jobs in their metropolitan areas (23 and 22 percent, respectively)—the types of jobs for which they may be most likely to qualify. A metro area like Riverside, where 81 percent of low-income community residents are suburban, and residents of these neighborhoods can reach less than 7 percent of low- and middle-skill metropolitan jobs via transit, exemplifies the lack of viable options for this growing segment of the population. Although both low-income people and jobs have suburbanized over time, poor suburban residents are already less likely to live in a jobs-rich area than their higherincome counterparts, and as a result may have to commute farther to find work. This only serves to underscore the challenges facing these residents as they try to connect with employment opportunities throughout the wider metropolitan region.63

#### Jobs are becoming increasingly suburbanized—transportation key to provide low-income workers access

Raphael and Stoll '10

Steven, prof of public policy at UCBerkeley, Michael, Nonresident Senior Fellow at Brookings Metropolitan Policy Program, "Job Sprawl andthe Suburbanizationof Poverty," March 30, 2010www.brookings.edu/research/reports/2010/03/30-job-sprawl-stoll-raphael AD 7/2/12

In nearly all U.S. metropolitan areas, jobs have been moving to the suburbs for several decades.2 In the largest metropolitan areas between 1998 and 2006, jobs shifted away from the city center to the suburbs in virtually all industries.3 As the U.S. population also continues to suburbanize, larger proportions of metropolitan area employment and population are locating beyond the traditional central business districts along the nation’s suburban beltways and the more distant fringes.4 For city residents whose low incomes restrict their housing choices, job decentralization may make it more difficult to find and maintain employment.5 Understanding the association between employment decentralization and the suburbanization of poverty is important because of the continued growth of the suburban poor. In 2005, the suburban poor outnumbered their city counterparts by almost one million.6 And during the first year of the recession that began in 2007, suburbs added more than twice as many poor people as did their cities.7 The suburban poor face unique disadvantages. These include concentration in inner-ring, disadvantaged, and jobs-poor suburbs; overreliance on public transportation, which often provides inferior access to and within suburban areas; and spatial mismatch between where the suburban poor live and the locations of important social services.8

### Transit Key to QOL

#### Transit access Key to increasing quality of life for low income households

Blumenberg & Waller ‘5

Evelyn Blumenberg is Assistant Professor at UCLA's School of Public Policy and Social Research. Margy Waller is the senior fellow for Social Policy at the PPI and is affiliated with the Brookings Institution Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy. “A Long Journey to Work: A Federal Transportation Policy for Working Families,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 205

Numerous scholars find that reliable transportation leads to increased access to employment, higher earnings, and greater employment stability among the poor. The most compelling evidence centers on the positive relationship between access to automobiles and employment rates, hours worked, and mean monthly earnings. Low-income households without cars are also more likely to experience unmet food and housing needs and have greater difficulty traveling for medical care.

#### Current automobile emissions disproportionately effect low income minorities- must pass stricter regulations to reduce greenhouse gas emissions

**Criollo & Porchas ‘9**, (Manuel, Lead Organizer for the Bus Riders Union, Francisca, Transit Riders for Public Transportation, National Campaign Launch: Transit Riders for Public Transportation, 4/8/2009, http://www.thestrategycenter.org/news/pr/2009/04/08/national-campaign-launch-transit-riders-public-transportation)

The U.S. has 5% of the world's population, 30% of the world's automobiles, and emits 45% of the world's automotive greenhouse gas emissions, adding to rising seas in Tuvalu and monster hurricanes in New Orleans. **The EPA estimates that particulate pollution**-much of it **from autos-kills more than 60,000 people per year, especially low-income Black and Latino people who live in the most polluted areas in the country.** In addition to flipping the FSTA's 80/20 funding formula in favor of public transit, **TRPT proposes to add a strict requirement for all FSTA-funded projects to inventory air toxins and** greenhouse gas (**GHG**) **emissions generated and to reduce these emissions by at least 25%.**

## \*\*\*LAND USE PATTERNS\*\*\*

### Transit Reform Solves Land Use

#### Robust transit reform would radically change land use pattern and alter the organization of cities to reduce petroleum and emissions

Bailey, Mokhtarian, & Little ‘8

Linda Bailey is Senior Associate for Transportation at ICF International. Patricia Lyon MokhtarianProfessor, Civil and Environmental Engineering, Chair, Transportation Technology and Policy Graduate Program, and Associate Director for Education, Institute of Transportation Studies at University of California, Davis. Andrew Little is president of Urban Policy Research Institute. “The Broader Connection between Public Transportation, Energy Conservation and Greenhouse Gas Reduction,” <http://www.apta.com/research/info/online/documents/land_use.pdf>, February.

This study began with the hypothesis that public transportation interacts with land use patterns, changing travel patterns in neighborhoods served by transit. Importantly, this effect would apply not just to transit riders, who make an exchange of automobile use for transit, but also for people who do not use transit. These people, who live in places shaped by transit, would tend to drive less, reducing their overall petroleum use and their carbon footprint.

#### Robust transit reforms dictates new development patterns, solves

Bailey, Mokhtarian, & Little ‘8

Linda Bailey is Senior Associate for Transportation at ICF International. Patricia Lyon MokhtarianProfessor, Civil and Environmental Engineering, Chair, Transportation Technology and Policy Graduate Program, and Associate Director for Education, Institute of Transportation Studies at University of California, Davis. Andrew Little is president of Urban Policy Research Institute. “The Broader Connection between Public Transportation, Energy Conservation and Greenhouse Gas Reduction,” <http://www.apta.com/research/info/online/documents/land_use.pdf>, February.

Some recent land use plans (and developments, on a smaller scale) have been predicated on the theory that public transportation is part of a distinct development pattern. The fulfillment of these plans has provided an opportunity to test the theory of interdependence in real time. The county of Arlington, VA, initiated a new land use and transportation development strategy in the 1970s, built on the principle of focusing higher-density development near the new Metro stations that were built in the same time period. The county has also developed bus routes for key corridors and promoted walking and biking. As a result, Arlington has very high rates of public transit usage. Twenty-three percent of residents, ten times the national average, use public transit to get to work. In addition, six percent of residents walk to work (2000 Census), and automobile traffic has grown slower than predicted (Ewing et al, 2007). Recently, transit-oriented development, or TOD, has become a term used for development projects similar to that in Arlington, though typically on a smaller scale. A 2002 paper defined TOD as “mixed-use, walkable, location-efficient development that balances the need for sufficient density to support convenient transit service with the scale of the adjacent community” (Belzer and Autler, 2002). Developers have built TOD projects in recent years in places as diverse as Oakland, CA; Charlotte, NC; Evanston, IL; and Atlanta, GA. Various studies have examined the travel behavior of TOD residents. One study found that residents in TOD areas are five times more likely to commute to work by rail than residents of other places (Boarnet and Compin, 1999). Cervero also found higher public transit ridership among residents of TODs in California (Cervero, 2007). Some studies have found that many residents of TODs in fact moved to the areas out of a desire to use public transit (Bagley and Mokhtarian, 2002; Lund, 2006; Cervero, 2007).

### Plan 🡪 Land Use Reform Solves Oil Dep.

#### Unique Consumption models prove robust transit reform reduces oil dependence by metropolitan reorganization

Bailey, Mokhtarian, & Little ‘8

Linda Bailey is Senior Associate for Transportation at ICF International. Patricia Lyon MokhtarianProfessor, Civil and Environmental Engineering, Chair, Transportation Technology and Policy Graduate Program, and Associate Director for Education, Institute of Transportation Studies at University of California, Davis. Andrew Little is president of Urban Policy Research Institute. “The Broader Connection between Public Transportation, Energy Conservation and Greenhouse Gas Reduction,” <http://www.apta.com/research/info/online/documents/land_use.pdf>, February.

We use Structural Equations Modeling (SEM) to determine the impact of transit availability on travel behavior in the U.S. Our model accounts for the relationships of three broad categories of variables on household travel behavior: land use characteristics, characteristics of the transportation system, and socioeconomic characteristics. By including a comprehensive range of variables, the model provides a reliable estimate of the total effect (both direct and indirect) of public transit availability on travel behavior. Our thesis is that public transportation enables more efficient land use patterns, thereby shortening overall trip distances. Shorter trip distances allow people to drive less or to walk or bike. Thus even people who do not use public transportation benefit from it. Our results have implications for the importance of transportation and land use policy to reducing our dependence on petroleum both now and in the future.

### Plan 🡪 Land Use, Boosts Employment

#### Transit reform alters land use and boosts employment

Bailey, Mokhtarian, & Little ‘8

Linda Bailey is Senior Associate for Transportation at ICF International. Patricia Lyon MokhtarianProfessor, Civil and Environmental Engineering, Chair, Transportation Technology and Policy Graduate Program, and Associate Director for Education, Institute of Transportation Studies at University of California, Davis. Andrew Little is president of Urban Policy Research Institute. “The Broader Connection between Public Transportation, Energy Conservation and Greenhouse Gas Reduction,” <http://www.apta.com/research/info/online/documents/land_use.pdf>, February.

As stated above in the introduction, this paper hypothesizes that transportation systems and land use are interdependent. Two surveys of the literature, by Polzin in 2004 and by Ewing and Cervero in 2001, describe numerous studies working on the transportation – land use connection, and the results were generally compelling and consistent. This same body of research has also found that areas with higher population and employment density typically have good public transportation systems (Polzin, 2004). Although this basic relationship is readily observable, the causal link between public transit systems and travel patterns is less clear.

#### tRANSIT oRIENTED dEVELOPMENT INCREASES EMPLOYMENT, DECREASES FUEL CONSUMPTION

Bailey, Mokhtarian, & Little ‘8

Linda Bailey is Senior Associate for Transportation at ICF International. Patricia Lyon MokhtarianProfessor, Civil and Environmental Engineering, Chair, Transportation Technology and Policy Graduate Program, and Associate Director for Education, Institute of Transportation Studies at University of California, Davis. Andrew Little is president of Urban Policy Research Institute. “The Broader Connection between Public Transportation, Energy Conservation and Greenhouse Gas Reduction,” <http://www.apta.com/research/info/online/documents/land_use.pdf>, February.

Comparisons of TOD with other types of developments broadly represent the difference between compact areas with good public transportation and less compact areas that are more dependent on cars. The former tend to be more conducive to walking and biking and provide a wider range of jobs, shops, and services within a given distance of homes. Cervero (2007) compared the commute experiences of people in California before and after moving to a TOD. (Here a TOD is defined as an area within one half mile of a rail station). After moving, residents tend to have access to a greater number of jobs, shorter commute times, and lower commute costs. Residents also drive fewer miles on average to get to work after moving to these areas (Cervero 2007).

### Plan 🡪 Land Use Reform, Solves Consump.

#### making transit availability alters land-use patterns, triples fuel savings

Bailey, Mokhtarian, & Little ‘8

Linda Bailey is Senior Associate for Transportation at ICF International. Patricia Lyon MokhtarianProfessor, Civil and Environmental Engineering, Chair, Transportation Technology and Policy Graduate Program, and Associate Director for Education, Institute of Transportation Studies at University of California, Davis. Andrew Little is president of Urban Policy Research Institute. “The Broader Connection between Public Transportation, Energy Conservation and Greenhouse Gas Reduction,” <http://www.apta.com/research/info/online/documents/land_use.pdf>, February.

In a 2007 report, ICF estimated the savings from public transportation for U.S. households at 1.4 billion gallons of gasoline per year, after adjusting for gasoline use by public transit and congestion effects (ICF 2007). This figure represents the direct substitution of public transit passenger miles with private automobile travel, considering average rates of vehicle occupancy. If transit systems across the country were to shut down, households would have to drive 35 billion more miles per year to meet their transportation needs. With average fuel economy of personal vehicles at 19.7 miles per gallon (Highway Statistics 2005), households would use an extra 1.8 billion gallons of gasoline. This figure assumes that population behaviors are constant, residential patterns are constant, and also that land use patterns are fixed. That is, it does not take into account the interaction of public transit and urban form. The model in the current paper confirms the hypothesis that public transportation availability has a significant secondary effect on VMT beyond the primary effect of using transit. The secondary effect is mainly generated through land use patterns. The magnitude of the secondary effect is approximately twice as large as the primary effect of actual public transit trips. This result suggests that public transit is a significant enabler of an efficient built environment. These effects are seen both through the relationship between availability of public transit and VMT and the same relationship mediated by land use patterns.

#### Flawed transportation and land use policies mean consumption will continue to increase—Boosting transit solves consumption and economic crisis

Winkelman et al ‘9

Steve Winkelman is director of the Transportation Program at the Center for Clean Air Policy (CCAP). Allison Bishins is a policy associate for transportation and climate change at CCAP. Chuck Kooshian is a Planner with the El Paso Department of Planning and Development. “Cost-Effective GHG Reductions through

Smart Growth & Improved Transportation Choices: An economic case for investment of cap-and-trade revenues,” <http://www.reconnectingamerica.org/public/display_asset/ccapsmartgrowthco2_june_2009_final_pdf?docid=306>, June 2009.

However, in the last few years, Americans have started to drive less. For the first time since the oil shocks of the 1970s, the number of miles we drive, measured on an aggregate basis and percapita basis, began to flatten in 2004, and actually decreased in 2008.8 From January 2002 to January 2008 the real price of gasoline more than doubled — the sharpest rise in almost 50 years – which likely played a major role in flattening VMT growth. Nevertheless, VMT has continued to decline — even after fuel prices plummeted in late 2008 — most likely due to the deep economic recession. Still, the latest national forecast projects continued growth in driving, with a 15 percent increase in per-capita VMT through 2030, assuming business-as-usual transportation and land use policies.9 It is unclear whether we have reached saturation or crossed a tipping point for driving, and while people are currently driving less, the future is unknown. Unchecked VMT growth is a policy choice, not a foregone conclusion. Recent studies make it clear that where and how we invest in our transportation infrastructure matters make a difference — people drive less in areas with greater walkability and transportation choices. Wise transportation investments that reduce the growth of travel demand are smart not only environmentally, but also economically. Developers are seeing significant market and demographic trends indicating growing demand for walkable communities and public transportation. Studies indicate that the decline in housing values nationally have been most pronounced in areas with little walkability and few transportation choices. And, communities cannot afford to keep building infrastructure to keep up with development ever expanding into greenfields and hinterlands.

### MPO Devolution Solves Land Use Patterns

#### Granting planning authority to local governments allows coordinated transit/land use planning

Puentes & Bailey ‘5

Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. Kevin O’Brien is a columnist at the Cleveland *Plain Dealer.* Linda Bailey is Senior Research Associate for Transportation at ICF International. “Increasing Funding and Accountability for Metropolitan Transportation Decisions,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 153

Last, there is a growing recognition that it takes more than transportation solutions to address transportation problems. Whether or not we can build our way out of our transportation problems, it is becoming increasingly clear that solutions that depend solely on increasing or managing transportation capacity are not an adequate strategy. As renowned transportation expert Wilfred Owen observed back in 1956, the best way to address transportation problems must be through land use strategies that establish the growth and development patterns to which transportation issues are inexorably linked. The recognition of this link is even stronger today. The DOT has stressed tighter coordination among land use, zoning, and housing authorities in order to address transportation challenges. Without such coordination, the DOT points out that transportation improvements “often lead to urban sprawl, which increases the amount of developed land and also the demand for transportation.” However, as a recent Transportation Research Board paper articulated, consideration of these effects on the statewide level has been “superficial at best.” The correct level for addressing these land use and transportation issues is at the metropolitan level, through the MPO structure. MPOs consist primarily of local elected officials that have direct control over local land use. Although MPOs themselves most often do not have authority over land use decisions, they are well situated to help review development applications, transportation elements of local comprehensive plans, and general land use issues in order to implement the best transportation strategies.

## \*\*\*ECONOMY/COMP\*\*\*

### Pump Priming Good

#### Economists agree- pump priming key to the economy

**Hoffman ‘9** ([NICHOLAS VON HOFFMAN](http://www.thenation.com/directory/bios/nicholas_von_hoffman), January 8, 2009, <http://www.thenation.com/doc/20090126/howl?rel=hp_currently>)

**Economists** who a couple of years ago disagreed about almost everything **have come together to buy into** the [central part of the Obama stimulus approach](http://www.nytimes.com/2009/01/07/business/economy/07spend.html) that is putting lots of government money into anybody's hands who will spend it and get business rolling again. Overnight, after decades of being ignored and discarded, the ideas of John Maynard Keynes and Alvin Hansen, the two major economists of the 1930s New Deal era, make sense again. In the seventy years since the Depression loosened its grip on America, economists and historians have argued over whether or not Keynes-Hansen deficit spending, or **pump-priming**, as it was called, succeeded. The jury is still out on that one, but the Keynes-Hansen approach has been dusted off and **even the stiffest opponents of deficit spending have abandoned the closely held principles of their professional lifetimes.** **One such** **former** **opponent is** [Harvard's Martin **Feldstein**](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/10/29/AR2008102903198.html), chair of the Council of Economic Advisors in the Reagan administration and someone whose career has been spent in antipodean opposition to anything that smacked of Keynesianism. Things are so bad, in Feldstein's opinion, that he has put himself on record as saying **there is no choice but to** grab the buckets and **pour water into the pump until America's** distressed **economy starts to chug again.**

#### Deficit spending stabilizes the economy

Thoma, CBSnews.com ‘11

May 22, 2011 7:59 PM Government Deficits By Mark Thoma, contributer to CBSNEWS

The deficit is at the top of the political agenda, and cuts to spending are certain to come, but how urgent is the deficit problem in reality? Is it important that we cut as much as we can as soon as we can, or is there time for a more patient and deliberative approach? The first thing to recognize is that deficits are not always bad. When the economy goes into recession, deficit spending through tax cuts or the purchase of goods and services by the government can stop the downward spiral and help to turn the economy back around. Thus, deficits can help us to stabilize the economy. In addition, as the economy improves due to the deficit spending the outlook for businesses also improves, and this can lead to increased investment, an effect known as [crowding in](http://economistsview.typepad.com/economistsview/2008/12/crowding-out-an.html). Deficits also allow us to purchase infrastructure and spread the bills across time similar to the way households finance the purchase of a car or house, or the way local governments finance schools with bond issues. This allows us to purchase infrastructure that we might not be able to afford if it had to be financed all at once (this can also force future generations who benefit from the spending to share the construction costs). Finally, deficits can be used to finance wars, but whether this is a good or a bad depends upon your view of whether the war is just…

### AT: Pump Priming Bad

#### Their pump priming bad args merely put us on a collision course with disaster- the economy has not yet recovered, and empirical evidence suggests that their claims of inflation, rising unemployment, and expanding interest rates are all hype

**Krugman 09** (Paul, Nobel Prize winning economist, Stay the Course, The New York Times. <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/06/15/opinion/15krugman.html?_r=1>)

**The debate over economic policy has taken a predictable yet ominous turn**: the crisis seems to be easing, and **a chorus of critics is already demanding that the Fed**eral Reserve and the Obama administration **abandon** their **rescue efforts.** For those who know their history, it’s déjà vu all over again — literally. Skip to next paragraph Fred R. Conrad/The New York Times Paul Krugman Go to Columnist Page » Blog: The Conscience of a Liberal Readers' Comments Readers shared their thoughts on this article. Read All Comments (235) » For **this is the third time in history that a major economy has found itself in a liquidity trap**, **a situation in which interest-rate cuts**, the conventional way to perk up the economy, **have reached their limit.** When this happens, unconventional measures are the only way to fight recession. Yet such **unconventional measures make the conventionally minded uncomfortable, and they keep pushing for a return to normalcy.** In previous liquidity-trap episodes, policy makers gave in to these pressures far too soon, plunging the economy back into crisis. And if the critics have their way, we’ll do the same thing this time. The first example of policy in a liquidity trap comes from the 1930s. **The U.S. economy grew rapidly from 1933 to 1937, helped** along **by New Deal policies.** **America**, however, **remained well short of full employment.**  **Yet policy makers stopped worrying about depression and started worrying about inflation.** The Federal Reserve tightened monetary policy, while F.D.R. tried to balance the federal budget. **Sure enough, the economy slumped again**, and full recovery had to wait for World War II. The second example is Japan in the 1990s. After slumping early in the decade, Japan experienced a partial recovery, with the economy growing almost 3 percent in 1996. Policy makers responded by shifting their focus to the budget deficit, raising taxes and cutting spending. Japan proceeded to slide back into recession. And here we go again. On one side, the inflation worriers are harassing the Fed. The latest example: Arthur **Laffer**, he of the curve, **warns that the Fed’s policies will cause devastating inflation.** **He recommends**, among other things, possibly **raising banks’ reserve requirements, which happens to be exactly what the Fed did in 1936 and 1937** — a move that none other than Milton Friedman condemned as helping to strangle economic recovery. Meanwhile, there are demands from several directions that President Obama’s fiscal stimulus plan be canceled. **Some**, especially in Europe, **argue that stimulus isn’t needed, because the economy is already turning around.** Others claim that government borrowing is driving up interest rates, and that this will derail recovery. And **Republicans**, providing a bit of comic relief, **are saying that the stimulus has failed, because the enabling legislation was passed four months ago** — wow, four whole months! — **yet unemployment is still rising.** This suggests an interesting comparison with the economic record of Ronald Reagan, whose 1981 tax cut was followed by no less than 16 months of rising unemployment. O.K., **time for some reality checks.** First of all, **while stock markets have been celebrating the economy’s “green shoots**,” the fact is that **unemployment is very high and still rising.** That is, we’re not even experiencing the kind of growth that led to the big mistakes of 1937 and 1997. It’s way too soon to declare victory. **What about the claim that the Fed is risking inflation? It isn’t.** Mr. Laffer seems panicked by a rapid rise in the monetary base, the sum of currency in circulation and the reserves of banks. But **a rising monetary base isn’t inflationary when you’re in a liquidity trap.** **America’s monetary base doubled between 1929 and 1939; prices fell 19 percent.** Japan’s monetary base rose 85 percent between 1997 and 2003; deflation continued apace. Well then, **what about all that government borrowing? All it’s doing is offsetting a plunge in private borrowing** — total borrowing is down, not up. Indeed, if the government weren’t running a big deficit right now, the economy would probably be well on its way to a full-fledged depression. Oh, and investors’ growing confidence that we’ll manage to avoid a full-fledged depression — not the pressure of government borrowing — explains the recent rise in long-term interest rates. These rates, by the way, are still low by historical standards. They’re just not as low as they were at the peak of the panic, earlier this year. To sum up: **A few months ago the U.S. economy was in danger of falling into depression.** **Aggressive monetary policy and deficit spending have**, for the time being, **averted that danger.** And **suddenly critics are demanding that we call the whole thing off**, and revert to business as usual. **Those demands should be ignored. It’s much too soon to give up on policies that have**, at most, **pulled us a few inches back from the edge of the abyss.**

### US Econ Down- Jobs

#### Unemployment high now, specifically in metropolitan areas

AP ‘12

Unemployment rates rose in two-thirds of US cities By CHRISTOPHER S. RUGABER AP Economics Writer By CHRISTOPHER S. RUGABER Updated: 2012-06-27T21:38:36Z WASHINGTON – washingtonpost.com

Unemployment rates rose in more than two-thirds of U.S. cities last month, evidence that the slowdown in hiring last month was felt nationwide. The Labor Department says unemployment rates increased in 255 of the nation's 372 largest metro areas. They fell in 87 and were unchanged in 30. That's worse than in April when rates fell in 356 areas. Many of the cities with the biggest changes are home to colleges and universities, where students likely began searching for summer jobs. Unlike the national figures, the local unemployment data aren't seasonally adjusted to account for such trends. Nationwide, the rate rose last month to 8.2 percent from 8.1 percent in April. Job growth nationwide has slowed sharply in recent months, raising concerns about the strength of the economic recovery.

#### Unemployment particularly bad in metropolitan areas

AP ‘11

Unemployment rises in nearly all metro areas Posted 3/21/2011 11:38:45 AM WASHINGTON (AP) — [www.washingtonpost.com](http://www.washingtonpost.com) Courtesy of Associated Press Staff Writer

Unemployment rose in nearly all of the 372 largest U.S. cities in January compared to the previous month, mostly because of seasonal changes such as the layoff of temporary retail employees hired for the holidays. The Labor Department said Friday that the unemployment rate rose in 351 metro areas, fell in only 16, and was unchanged in 5. That’s worse than December, when the rate fell in 207 areas and increased in 122. Other seasonal trends, such as the layoff of construction workers due to winter weather, also contributed to the widespread increase. Nationwide, the unemployment rate dropped to 9% in January from 9.4% the previous month. It ticked down to 8.9% in February. But the national data is seasonally adjusted, while the metro data isn’t, which makes it more volatile. The metro data also lags the national report by one month. The report shows that metro areas hit hard by the housing crisis are still struggling with high unemployment. At the same time, a strong recovery in the manufacturing sector, particularly among U.S. auto companies, has bolstered many smaller cities in the Midwest. “The areas that have had very severe housing market corrections have shown the least improvement,” said Sophia Koropeckyj, managing director at Moody’s Analytics. That’s particularly true for states such as California, Florida, Arizona and Nevada. Twelve of the 16 cities with unemployment rates above 15% in January were in California. A high foreclosure rate and falling home prices are contributing to sky-high unemployment in the Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, Calif. metro area. Its unemployment rate of 14.2% was highest in the nation among cities with populations of 1 million or more. The second-highest was Las Vegas, with 13.7%. The number of homes in foreclosure in Riverside is double the national rate, Koropeckyj said. And Moody’s forecasts that home prices in the city will drop 60% from peak levels before the recession by the middle of this year. Meanwhile, several smaller cities that rely heavily on manufacturing have shown significant improvement since last January. The unemployment rate in Rockford, Ill., fell 5.3 percentage points in the past year, to 13.7% from 19%. That was the steepest drop in the nation. Year-to-year comparisons help filter out seasonal changes. [Chrysler](http://content.usatoday.com/topics/topic/Organizations/Companies/Manufacturing%2C%2BConstruction/Chrysler%2BLLC) is investing $600 million in an auto plant near Rockford, which will start building smaller [Fiat](http://content.usatoday.com/topics/topic/Organizations/Companies/Manufacturing%2C%2BConstruction/Fiat) models in 2012. That’s giving a boost to construction jobs, though it isn’t clear if the expanded plant will add permanent workers. And Kokomo, Ind., reported a 7.1% increase in jobs in January compared to a year earlier, one of the biggest gains in the country. It’s also the site of a Chrysler plant that is expanding.

### AT: Biz Con DA

#### Public transit is key to biz con- raises property value and produces massive returns

**Millar ‘9**, [Bob, President of APTA, <http://www.publictransportation.org/facts/#hw07>, online 2009, DB]

Every $1 invested in public transportation projects generates approximately $6 in local economic activity. **Every $10 million in** capital **investment in public transportation yields $30 million in increased business sales.** Every $10 million in operating investment in public transportation yields $32 million in increased business sales. **Real estate** -- residential, commercial or business -- **that is served by public transportation is valued more highly by the public than similar properties** not as well served by transit. **Public transportation enhances local rural economic growth in many ways, increasing the local customer base** for a range of services -- shopping malls, restaurants, medical facilities and other transportation services.

### AT: Consumer Confidence DA

#### Public transit investment creates green jobs and generates billions in business sales

**Millar ‘9**, [Bob, President of APTA, <http://www.publictransportation.org/facts/#hw07>, online 2009, DB]

**The U**nited **S**tates **can** create and **support 1.3 million new green jobs** within the next two years by implementing $47.8 billion in supplemental transit capital projects, according to a transit needs estimate by the American Public Transportation Association. **Public transportation ridership has increased by 30% since 1995**, with more than 10.3 billion trips taken annually. **Every $1.25 billion investment in the nation’s transportation infrastructure supports approximately 35,000 jobs. Every $10 million in capital investment in public transportation can return up to $30 million in business sales alone.**

#### Public transit generates increased purchasing power by decreasing transportation costs

**Millar ‘9**, [Bob, President of APTA, <http://www.publictransportation.org/facts/#hw07>, online 2009, DB]

**For every dollar** spent, **the average household spends 18 cents on transportation**, and **94 percent of this goes to** buying, maintaining and operating **cars. Public transportation provides an affordable**, and for many, necessary **alternative to driving.** Americans living in areas served by public transportation save $18 billion annually in congestion costs. **Each year an individual can achieve an average annual savings of over $8,000 by taking public transportation** instead of driving and by living with one less car.

### No Transit = Econ. Collapse, Infrastructure

#### crumbling auto based infrastructure destroying local and state economies

Katz et al. ‘5

Bruce Katz is vice president, director of the Metropolitan Policy Progam, and Adeline M. and Alfred I. Johnson Chair in Urban and Metropolitan Studies at the Brookings Institution. Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. Scott Bernstein is at the Center for Neighborhood Technology. “Getting Transportation Right for Metropolitan America,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 27

The transportation network is aging. Potholes, rough surfaces, rusting bridges: these are the realities of a deteriorating system. Recent analysis, moreover, estimates that the nation's aging infrastructure costs American drivers $5.8 billion in repairs each year. Such costs subvert regional competitiveness and productivity by impeding the flow of people, goods, and services between America’s cities and suburbs. Furthermore, the very design of this aging infrastructure is becoming obsolete. Most cities and older communities now make do with a road and transit network that fits commuting patterns of the 1950s, when cities still functioned as regional hubs. Today, however, commute trips represent only 15 percent of all trips taken. This fact—and the general obsolescence of much transportation infrastructure—undermine urban and metropolitan economics. In some cities, freeways block access to waterfronts and other assets and generally take up some of the most valuable real estate in the urban area (usually land either near or in the midst of the central business district).

### MPO Devolution Key to Competitiveness

#### Granting Metropolitan areas more autonomy key to economic competitiveness

Puentes & Bailey ‘5

Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. Kevin O’Brien is a columnist at the Cleveland *Plain Dealer.* Linda Bailey is Senior Research Associate for Transportation at ICF International. “Increasing Funding and Accountability for Metropolitan Transportation Decisions,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 139-140

Metropolitan areas matter. They are the engines of the new global economy. Supplier networks and customer relationships are regional rather than local in nature. Labor markets and commuting patterns cross jurisdictional and state lines. Firms make decisions on location and expansion based on regional advantages and amenities. Metropolitan areas are where most Americans live, work, and produce the majority of the nation's economic output. The services and revenues they generate drive state economies. When metropolitan America thrives, the nation thrives. Threatening to undermine metropolitan areas' competitive edge in the global economy, however, is a daunting set of transportation challenges - crumbling infrastructure, deteriorating air quality, growing distances between jobs and workers, and increasing congestion and vehicle miles traveled. The lessons of the past decade show that existing transportation governance arrangements and structures are inadequate to meet the needs of metropolitan areas. If local and regional transportation challenges are to be effectively addressed, metropolitan areas need a greater say in the design and implementation of transportation policy. Fortunately, as Congress considers the future of federal transportation law, there is a burgeoning interest in increasing the decisionmaking ability of metropolitan areas. Organizations such as the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials have called for increasing certain funding for metropolitan areas, and political leaders such as King County (Washington) executive Ron Sims and Baltimore mayor Martin O'Malley have called for the creation of additional metropolitan-focused programs. In November 2003, Representative Eddie Bernice Johnson (Texas) introduced the Metropolitan Congestion Relief Act, which would address challenges in metropolitan areas. As the debate around transportation continues, increased metropolitan decisionmaking and its benefits are indeed being advocated by many.

### Robust Transit Key to Competitiveness

#### Robust transit key to U.s. Competitiveness and global economy

Puentes & Bailey ‘5

Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. Kevin O’Brien is a columnist at the Cleveland *Plain Dealer.* Linda Bailey is Senior Research Associate for Transportation at ICF International. “Increasing Funding and Accountability for Metropolitan Transportation Decisions,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 150-151

Not only are metropolitan areas where America lives, but they also drive the economy. Together, all metropolitan areas combined produce more than 85 percent of the nation’s economic output; they also generate 84 percent of America’s jobs. In California, 97 percent of employment and output is generated within metropolitan areas. More and more, metropolitan areas are where the business of American life is carried out. The transportation infrastructure is absolutely essential to literally keeping these metropolitan economies moving. Metropolitan leaders from coast to coast are calling attention to a daunting set of transportation challenges that continue to be unmet. As mentioned earlier, these challenges threaten to undermine metropolitan regions’ competitiveness. They are particularly important issues given the growing importance of metropolitan areas as competitive units of the world economy. Goods and services are continuously moving at speeds and scales that heretofore were without precedence. Metropolitan areas are the hubs of our nation’s network of production and consumption with multimodal and intermodal facilities that no longer adhere to the policy prescriptions of the interstate era. Transportation planning and programming must reflect the new dominant model, while placing an even greater emphasis on meeting local challenges.

#### Federal guidance needed to reduce state intragience and build up metropolitan planning effectiveness

Puentes & Bailey ‘5

Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. Kevin O’Brien is a columnist at the Cleveland *Plain Dealer.* Linda Bailey is Senior Research Associate for Transportation at ICF International. “Increasing Funding and Accountability for Metropolitan Transportation Decisions,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 140

Although ISTEA and TEA-21 were designed to move transportation decision-making out of the back rooms and boardrooms of the highway establishment, many state DOTs still wield considerable formal and informal power, retaining authority over substantial state transportation funds. The governors and some state DOTs still have veto authority over MPO-selected projects. Although large MPOs (in areas with populations over 200,000) also have authority to veto projects, the reality is that the state receives and manages all the federal transportation money, as well as large amounts of state transportation money, and the state’s political leverage far exceeds that of the MPOs. Furthermore, some states simply ignore local decisions and needs. Such arrangements create an unfavorable climate for the flowering of federal policy reforms-and frequently cut against metropolitan interests. There are several important reasons why some opposition to increased metropolitan decision-making remains. First, state governments and agencies are loath to relinquish control over any amount of funding or decision-making responsibility. A General Accounting Office report found that this was a particular problem after ISTEA was passed. Although state opposition to greater MPO authority is beginning to wane, several states continue to oppose greater roles and responsibilities for MPOs. Second, unlike state DOTs, MPOs are not operational organizations. With few exceptions they are not equipped, nor do they intend, to make the jump from planning organization to operators of the system. Third, many MPOs are still struggling between parochial local interests and regional ones that are more "interlocal” in nature. Within many regions, local governments continue to compete with one another for their share of the metropolitan pie. In still other metropolitan areas, center cities, older suburbs, and minorities are under- represented on MP0 boards. Finally, MP0 as well as state capacity remains uneven. In a very real sense, the profession of transportation planning has failed to keep up with statutory and on-the-ground change in the 1990s. Even in recent years, state transportation planning has largely remained the province of transportation professionals versed in engineering and concrete pouring rather than in urban planning, environmental management, or economic development—and that has hampered state and local implementation of the vision outlined in ISTEA and TEA-2l.

### Plan Solves Housing Crisis

#### Robust transit reform solves housing Crisis

Winkelman et al ‘9

Steve Winkelman is director of the Transportation Program at the Center for Clean Air Policy (CCAP). Allison Bishins is a policy associate for transportation and climate change at CCAP. Chuck Kooshian is a Planner with the El Paso Department of Planning and Development. “Cost-Effective GHG Reductions through

Smart Growth & Improved Transportation Choices: An economic case for investment of cap-and-trade revenues,” <http://www.reconnectingamerica.org/public/display_asset/ccapsmartgrowthco2_june_2009_final_pdf?docid=306>, June 2009.

Living in a central city means living closer to work, shopping, recreation, schools, and other amenities, and working families living closer to their daily needs can reduce their transportation cost from as much as 37 percent to as little as 22 percent of their income, without a corresponding increase in housing costs.32 The chart above illustrates how the location of “working family” homes affects their annual housing and transportation expenditures. Studies have shown that households with one car and access to public transportation annually save an average of $6,251, when compared to an equivalent household with two cars and no access to public transportation.33 The savings from living in an accessible area therefore represents additional disposable income. As land-use density increases, household VMT decreases, insulating households in denser communities from rising fuel prices and other transportation costs.34 Indeed, there is growing consensus that more compact, walkable neighborhoods have had substantially less price change since the housing bubble burst in 2007 and 2008 than those located in more sprawling neighborhoods.35,36

### Plan Solves Jobs

#### RObust Transit Solves Unemployment

Winkelman et al ‘9

Steve Winkelman is director of the Transportation Program at the Center for Clean Air Policy (CCAP). Allison Bishins is a policy associate for transportation and climate change at CCAP. Chuck Kooshian is a Planner with the El Paso Department of Planning and Development. “Cost-Effective GHG Reductions through

Smart Growth & Improved Transportation Choices: An economic case for investment of cap-and-trade revenues,” <http://www.reconnectingamerica.org/public/display_asset/ccapsmartgrowthco2_june_2009_final_pdf?docid=306>, June 2009.

In addition to lowering overall household costs, smart growth can positively impact vulnerable communities by improving access to jobs for workers without a car.37 Research has shown that low income workers without cars have very limited job opportunities and have reduced access to the regional economy. Investments in smart growth, particularly transit improvements, can provide high levels of benefits per taxpayer dollar, based on studies of the efficacy of different kinds of programs (e.g., reverse commute programs vs. traditional welfare programs).

#### Solving transportation crisis is VITAL to increased employment and improving employment

Katz and Puentes ‘5

Bruce Katz is vice president, director of the Metropolitan Policy Progam, and Adeline M. and Alfred I. Johnson Chair in Urban and Metropolitan Studies at the Brookings Institution. Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. “Transportation Reform: An Overview,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 11-12

Of course, transportation policy and spending is not just about building projects and moving vehicles. One of the most serious problems with the transportation debate so far has been the lack of focused and sustained attention to two of the nation’s most pressing transportation challenges: Transportation access for working families and mobility for the elderly. To work, low- income adults need to get to work. However, traveling to jobs is frequently easier said than done, particularly for those without access to fast, reliable transportation. In almost every city, automobiles remain the fastest and most reliable way to get around. Moreover, the continuing decentralization of population and employment has exacerbated the isolation of many low-income families who lack reliable auto access. In chapter 8, Evelyn Blumenberg and Margy Wailer examine the serious transportation challenges facing low- income workers as they seek employment. Central to the argument is research evidence showing that the working poor require a range of transportation services to enhance their economic outcomes. Transportation is an essential link between low- income workers and jobs. They show how other strategies are important. too, such as urban reinvestment to bring lobs closer to low-income communities and housing strategies that help move low-income families closer to jobs. Rut, in the end, it is the transportation strategies that have the potential to immediately enhance geographic access to employment.

### Jobs k to Economy

#### Lack of jobs undercutting consumer spending, prevents recovery

WSJ 7/2

"Consumers Unlikely to Rekindle the Recovery," 7/2/12 online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304058404577497140744006400.html

Don't count on consumers to rescue the faltering U.S. economic recovery. When job growth picked up late last year, many experts saw the seeds of a consumer-driven economic rebound. Ben Casselman has details on The News Hub. Photo: Bloomberg. When job growth picked up late last year, many experts saw the seeds of a consumer-driven economic rebound. As Americans returned to work, the theory went, they would have more money to spend on everything from clothes to vacations to houses. As demand rose for products and services, businesses would be forced to hire more workers, leading to even more spending. This virtuous circle would boost confidence around boardroom and kitchen tables alike, finally giving the U.S. economy the momentum it needed to ride out the inevitable storms to come. Shopping carts outside a Dollar General store in Creve Coeur, Ill. Economists began to talk of a "passing of the torch" to consumers from the sectors such as manufacturing that had driven the recovery in its early years. The fresh legs couldn't come quickly enough—by early this year, manufacturing was losing steam, business investment was slowing, and government spending was falling sharply, with even bigger cuts looming. At first, the transfer seemed to go smoothly. Consumer sentiment, which tanked during a summer dominated by headlines of debt downgrades and Washington gridlock, rebounded to levels not seen since the recession. Retailers reported strong holiday sales. Cars began flying off lots. And in April, when the government released its first look at economic growth during the first three months of the year, it showed total spending growing at 2.9%, its fastest rate in close to two years. Even rising oil prices didn't seem to faze consumers. Then job growth fizzled, turning the virtuous circle into a vicious cycle. After adding more than 250,000 jobs a month from December through February, U.S. employers have added an average of less than 100,000 jobs for the past three months. As hiring slowed, so did spending. Retail sales have fallen for two consecutive months. Overall consumer spending fell slightly in May, the Commerce Department said Friday, the first drop in nearly a year. Consumer sentiment tumbled in June to its lowest level since December, wiping out nearly all the recent gains. Beneath the weak May and June numbers lies a deeper problem: The consumer recovery was never as robust as it first appeared. In May, the Commerce Department revised down its estimate of first-quarter spending growth to 2.7% from 2.9%. Last week, the figure was revised down yet again, to 2.5%. That still represents the fastest growth since late 2010, but it isn't enough to shift the recovery into a higher gear. What's worse, the first quarter's lackluster spending growth came despite a historically warm winter that likely gave at least a modest boost to restaurants and retailers. That boost has since reversed. Inflation-adjusted spending fell in March and barely rose in April and May. Economists had hoped that newly confident shoppers could offset weakness elsewhere in the economy; instead, the same factors slowing the rest of the economy—chief among them the turmoil in Europe and the resulting caution among businesses at home—ended up dragging down consumers, too. "It's finally catching up with consumers," said Chris Christopher, an economist with the forecasting firm IHS Global Insight. Coming into April, IHS expected consumer spending to grow at a rate of 2.5% in the second quarter; now it expects sub-2% growth. "Things are not as good as we thought," Mr. Christopher said.

#### Weak job recovery holding back US economy

AP 6/21

"Weak U.S. job market weighing down economic recovery" 6/21/12www.thenorthwestern.com/viewart/20120622/OSH0101/206220399/Weak-U-S-job-market-weighing-down-economic-recovery

WASHINGTON — The sluggish job market is weighing on the U.S. economy three years after the Great Recession ended. And the signs suggest hiring may not strengthen any time soon. A measure of the number of people applying for unemployment benefits over the past month has reached a six-month high, the government said Thursday. The increase suggests that layoffs are rising and June will be another tepid month for hiring. Sales of previously occupied homes fell in May. And manufacturing activity in the Philadelphia region contracted for the second straight month in June. The gloomy economic data echoed a more pessimistic outlook from the Federal Reserve issued Wednesday. The reports also contributed to a sharp decline in stock prices. The Dow Jones industrial average fell 251 points to close at 12,574. The Standard & Poor's 500 index and the Nasdaq composite both ended the day down more than 2 percent. "It appears the slow-growth expansion will be slower," said John Silvia, chief economist at Wells Fargo Securities, in a note to clients. Thursday's raft of economic reports showed: »Applications for unemployment benefits dipped last week to 387,000, from an upwardly revised 389,000 the previous week, the Labor Department said. The four-week average, a less volatile measure, rose to 386,250. That is the highest level since December. When applications for unemployment benefits top 375,000, hiring generally remains too weak to rapidly lower the unemployment rate.

#### Jobs key to consumer spending recovery

WSJ 7/2

"Consumers Unlikely to Rekindle the Recovery," 7/2/12 online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304058404577497140744006400.html

Still, consumer spending isn't likely to enjoy a sustained recovery until the job market improves. Three years into the recovery, the U.S. still employs nearly five million fewer people than when the recession began and 12.7 million Americans remain out of work. That's millions of consumers whose spending is, at best, limited. The impact goes beyond the unemployed. With so much slack in the labor market, there is little upward pressure on wages. Adjusted for inflation, hourly earnings are lower now than they were when the recession ended in June 2009. Weekly earnings have risen barely 1%. After-tax income, which takes into account investment returns, government benefits, and other sources of income, is up a still-modest 4% in that time. Spending is "likely to level off without real income growth," Robert Hull, chief financial officer of home-improvement retailer Lowe's, told investors at a conference last week. "Jobs create opportunity to spend." Unfortunately, there aren't many signs of a quick turnaround in the job market. Many economists expect the government's monthly jobs report, which will be released Friday, to show that U.S. employers added 100,000 jobs in June. That would represent a modest improvement from the 69,000 jobs added in May, but it wouldn't be enough to bring down the unemployment rate. Nor, in all likelihood, would it be enough to send consumers back to the mall.

#### Unemployment kills the economy—creates negative feedback loops

Zeiler '11

David, Associate editor, Money Morning, "Layoffs at U.S. Companies Portend Poorly for 2012 Prospects," 10/26/11 moneymorning.com/2011/10/26/layoffs-at-u-s-companies-portend-poorly-for-2012-prospects/

Anticipating a sluggish economy for the rest of this year and into 2012, several major U.S. companies have set aside money to pay for possible layoffs and plant closures. Such moves will help corporations maintain earnings growth, but will add pressure to the U.S. unemployment rate, which for more than two years has been stuck around 9%. Some analysts worry that the talk of layoffs at some U.S. companies could trigger others to consider cutting positions, which in turn would cause further damage to an already stagnant economy. "In many ways, this is part of the negative feedback loop," Deane Dray, an analyst at Citigroup [Global Markets](http://moneymorning.com), [told The Wall Street Journal](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970203911804576649093203840446.html?mod=googlenews_wsj). "Once you start head-count reductions and plant closures, you are adding to the unemployment, you are adding to the anxiety in the market." Of course, it's not the job of chief executives to worry about what impact their decisions have on the overall economy. And having lived with an economy that just can't seem to climb very far out of recession, many CEOs feel it necessary to prepare for a challenging future. "We all read the headlines," Danaher Corp. (NYSE: [DHR](http://www.google.com/finance?q=NYSE%3ADHR)) Chief Executive Larry Culp said last week during an earnings conference call. "It's better to be prepared and ready for what may come than to postpone what we think is a very prudent action." Danaher said it would increase its fourth-quarter restructuring budget to $100 million - twice its previous amount. Likewise, United Technologies Corp. (NYSE: [UTX](http://www.google.com/finance?q=NYSE%3AUTX)) raised its restructuring budget by a third to $300 million, and Honeywell International Inc. (NYSE: [HON](http://www.google.com/finance?q=HON)) said it would use $300 million it gained from a divestiture for restructuring. United Technologies, which has already cut $188 million so far this year, says it is determined to hit its 10% earnings growth target for 2012. "We're going to continue to push them to get toward 10%, and we're doing the restructuring now," United Technologies Chief Financial Officer Greg Hayes said on his earnings conference call last week. "We're doing whatever we can to try and make sure that that happens." Jobs Under Siege Many job cuts already were in the works well before the latest talk of restructuring. As recently as this past summer, Merck & Co. Inc. (NYSE: [MRK](http://www.google.com/finance?q=NYSE%3AMRK)) announced that it planned to shed 13,000 workers by 2015; Lockheed Martin Corp. (NYSE: [LMT](http://www.google.com/finance?q=NYSE%3ALMT)) announced plans to cut 6,500; Cisco Systems Inc. (Nasdaq: [CSCO](http://www.google.com/finance?q=CSCO)) 6,500; Research in Motion Limited (Nasdaq: [RIMM](http://www.google.com/finance?q=rimm)) 2,000; and Goldman Sachs Group Inc. (NYSE: [GS](http://www.google.com/finance?q=GS)) 1,000. "These layoffs were very broad-based. Many of these companies are iconic companies, well known, big names," John Challenger, CEO of[Challenger Gray & Christmas Inc](http://www.challengergray.com/press/PressRelease.aspx?PressUid=193). [told CNBC](http://www.cnbc.com/id/43977352/Corporate_Layoffs_Increase_as_Economy_Sputters). "This is what precipitates out when you have an economy that is stalling." According to Challenger, September was the worst month for announced layoffs in the United States in over two years, with both private and public sector employers slashing 115,730 workers -- more than double the number let go in Sept. 2010. Dim Outlook Even companies not talking about layoffs have lowered their expectations for the fourth quarter, and in many cases, for 2012 as well.  For example, 3M Company (NYSE: [MMM](http://www.google.com/finance?q=mmm)), which reported disappointing earnings yesterday (Tuesday), lowered its full-year 2011 forecast to $5.85 to $5.95 per share from $6.10 to $6.25 per share. 3M added that it would respond to expectations for slower growth with "aggressive cost management." And Delta Air Lines Inc. (NYSE:[DAL](http://www.google.com/finance?q=NYSE%3ADAL)), which is dealing with high fuel costs, said it expects the "uncertain economy will continue into 2012." To cope, Delta has offered buyouts, consolidated facilities and reduced flights by 1%. The airline said it would cut flights another 5% in the current quarter, and a further 2% to 3% in 2012. Such companies may not be considering layoffs, but they aren't looking to hire, either. "I think people are in the process of dialing back 2012 expectations and that will bleed into whatever they were planning," Michael Neal, a General Electric Co. (NYSE: [GE](http://www.google.com/finance?q=GE)) vice chairman who heads the company's GE Capital financearm, [told Reuters](http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/10/13/us-usa-economy-jobs-corporate-idUSTRE79C3VV20111013). "My view is they continue to stay with a tight belt and I think it means less hiring than they would have done otherwise." With few U.S. companies hiring, and others looking at more layoffs, concern that the economy will continue to languish well into 2012 could easily become self-fulfilling prophecy. "We certainly are on a cusp here and it does feel as though the economy has downshifted," CEO Challenger, told Reuters. "A lot of companies are coming into this last quarter cautious and they're not optimistic ... It feels like the economy could turn either way."

#### High unemployment destroys the economy

Investopedia ‘11

The Cost Of Unemployment To The Economy August 09, 2011 | Read more: <http://www.investopedia.com/financial-edge/0811/The-Cost-Of-Unemployment-To-The-Economy.aspx#ixzz1zPJFOoxu>Unemployment is universally recognized as a bad thing.

While economists and academics make convincing arguments that there is a certain [natural](http://www.investopedia.com/terms/n/naturalunemployment.asp) level of unemployment that cannot be erased, elevated unemployment imposes significant [costs](http://www.investopedia.com/financial-edge/0811/The-Cost-Of-Unemployment-To-The-Economy.aspx) on the individual, the society and the country. Worse yet, most of the costs are of the dead loss variety where there are no offsetting gains to the costs that everyone must bear. The Costs to the Individual The costs of unemployment to the individual are not hard to imagine. When a person loses his or her job, there is often an immediate impact to that person's standard of living. Prior to the Great Recession, the average savings rate in the U.S. had been drifting down towards zero (and sometimes below), and there are anecdotal reports that the average person is only a few weeks away from serious [financial](http://www.investopedia.com/financial-edge/0811/The-Cost-Of-Unemployment-To-The-Economy.aspx) trouble without a paying job. Even for those eligible for unemployment benefits and other forms of government assistance (like food assistance), it is often the case that these benefits replace 50% or less of their regular income. That means these people are consuming far less than usual. The economic consequences can go beyond just less consumption, though. Many people will turn to [retirement savings](http://www.investopedia.com/financial-edge/0811/The-Cost-Of-Unemployment-To-The-Economy.aspx) in a pinch and draining these savings has long-term ramifications. Prolonged unemployment can lead to an erosion of skills, basically robbing the economy of otherwise useful talents. At the same time, the experience of unemployment (either direct or indirect) can alter how workers plan for their futures - prolonged unemployment can lead to greater skepticism and pessimism about the value of education and training and lead to workers being less willing to [invest](http://www.investopedia.com/financial-edge/0811/The-Cost-Of-Unemployment-To-The-Economy.aspx) in the long years of training some jobs require. On a similar note, the absence of income created by unemployment can force families to deny educational opportunities to their children and deprive the economy of those future skills. Last but not least, there are other costs to the individual. Studies have shown that prolonged unemployment harms the mental health of workers, and can actually worsen physical health and shorten lifespans. Costs to Society The social costs of unemployment are difficult to calculate, but no less real. When unemployment becomes a pervasive problem, there are often increased calls for protectionism and severe restrictions on immigration. Protectionism can not only lead to destructive tit-for-tat retaliation among countries, but reductions in trade harm the economic well-being of all [trading](http://www.investopedia.com/financial-edge/0811/The-Cost-Of-Unemployment-To-The-Economy.aspx) partners. Other social costs include how people interact with each other. Studies have shown that times of elevated unemployment often correlate both with less volunteerism and higher crime. Elevated crime makes sense because absent a wage-paying job people may turn to crime to meet their economic needs or simply to alleviate boredom. The volunteerism decline does not have an obvious explanation, but could perhaps be tied to the negative psychological impacts of being jobless or perhaps even resentment at those who do not have a job. Costs to the Country The economic costs of unemployment are probably more obvious when viewed through the lens of the national checkbook. Unemployment leads to higher payments from state and federal governments for unemployment benefits (in excess of $320 billion through the end of 2010), food assistance, and [Medicaid](http://www.investopedia.com/terms/m/medicaid.asp). At the same time, those governments are no longer collecting the same levels of [income](http://www.investopedia.com/financial-edge/0811/The-Cost-Of-Unemployment-To-The-Economy.aspx) tax as before - forcing the government to borrow money (which defers the costs and impacts of unemployment into the future) or cut back on other spending (perhaps exacerbating the bad economic situation). Unemployment is also a dangerous state for the U.S. economy. Over 70% of what the U.S. economy produces goes to [personal consumption](http://www.investopedia.com/terms/p/pce.asp) and unemployed workers. Even those getting government support cannot spend at prior levels. The production of those workers leaves the economy which reduces the [GDP](http://www.investopedia.com/financial-edge/0811/The-Cost-Of-Unemployment-To-The-Economy.aspx) and moves the country away from the efficient allocation of its resources. For those who subscribe to [Jean-Baptiste Say's](http://www.investopedia.com/terms/j/jean-baptiste-say.asp) theory that "products are paid for by products," that is a serious issue. It is also worth noting that companies pay a price for high unemployment as well. Unemployment benefits are financed largely by taxes assessed on businesses. When unemployment is high, states will often look to replenish their coffers by increasing their taxation on businesses - counter-intuitively discouraging companies from hiring more workers. Not only do companies face less demand for their products, it is also more expensive for them to retain or hire workers. The Bottom Line Governments rightly fret about the consequences of inflation, but unemployment is likewise a serious issue. Apart from the social unrest and disgruntlement that unemployment can produce in the electorate, high unemployment can have a self-perpetuating negative impact on businesses and the economic health of the country. Worse still, some of the worst effects of unemployment are both subtle and very long-lasting - consumer and business confidence are key to economic recoveries and workers must feel confident in their future to invest in developing the skills (and building the savings) that the economy needs to grow in the future. The costs of unemployment go far beyond the accumulated sums handed out as unemployment insurance benefits. (Preparation can help you land on your feet after getting the "old heave-ho." See [Planning For Unemployment](http://www.investopedia.com/articles/pf/09/planning-for-unemployment.asp).)

### Metro k to Economy

#### Federal government needs to focus on metro areas—key to economy

Frankel et al 09

 Emil, Director of Transportation Policy, Joshua Schank, Director of Transportation Research Daniel Lewis, Policy Analyst JayEtta Hecker, Senior Advisor, "Performance Driven: A New Vision for U.S. Transportation Policy," National Transportation Policy Project," 6/9/09 <http://bipartisanpolicy.org/events/2009/06/performance-drivena-new-vision-us-transportation-policy>, AD 7/2/12

Given the importance of metropolitan areas to the nation’s overall economic competitiveness and longterm prosperity, a clear national policy for meeting their changing transportation needs is essential. Federal spending patterns still reflect the priorities of an earlier era when the focus on connecting far-flung parts of the country via the interstate highway system led to high levels of per capita spending in areas with relatively low population density.56 A half century ago, federal policy was focused on the process of “decentralization” as large industrial cities gradually lost population.57 What eventually emerged, however, was a nation in which suburbs and cities became parts of larger economic units that differed from traditional urban centers in that they spanned broad areas and often crossed state lines. The next 50 years will see the U.S. population increase by another 150 million people. Much of this growth will be concentrated in the nation’s major metropolitan areas, which are increasingly functioning as the centers of economic mega-regions (see Figure 5). These mega-regions and the clusters of cities withinthem constitute national and global trade blocs, competing and cooperating with one another for resources, knowledge, population, and investment.60 These agglomerations of economic activity have steadily swelled in population and importance in recent decades but transportation spending has continued to focus on areas with lower densities.1 As a result, the most economically productive and populated areas of the country tend, if anything, to receive a relatively smaller share of federal transportation dollars compared to other areas.61 Despite the critical importance of major metropolitan regions to the national economy, environmental quality, and energy security, national transportation policies and programs have not been particularly designed to strengthen these areas. This is understandable because metropolitan regions are economic, rather than political units. Federal transportation programs that have been disproportionately directed to urban areas (such as most transit programs) are directed to specific projects and are fragmented by modal and jurisdictional lines. Rarely do federal transportation programs look to the performance or to the results of integrated multi-modal metropolitan transportation networks.

#### Metropolitan focus vital to economic growht

Frankel et al 09

 Emil, Director of Transportation Policy, Joshua Schank, Director of Transportation Research Daniel Lewis, Policy Analyst JayEtta Hecker, Senior Advisor, "Performance Driven: A New Vision for U.S. Transportation Policy," National Transportation Policy Project," 6/9/09 <http://bipartisanpolicy.org/events/2009/06/performance-drivena-new-vision-us-transportation-policy>, AD 7/2/12

 Goal: Metropolitan Accessibility Metropolitan areas are so important to national economic growth that it is essential that they be recognized with a specific national transportation policy goal. As we noted in the previous section, much of the nation’s future growth, both in terms of economic activity and population, is expected to be concentrated in major metropolitan areas. Today, 84 percent of Americans live in a metropolitan area, which is defined as a countybased agglomeration that includes an urban area with at least 50,000 people. Some 163 million people, or 54 percent of the U.S. population, live in a metropolitan area that has a population above one million. There are some 51 metropolitan areas of this size around the nation; together they not only generate an estimated 70 percent of all wage income and 65 percent of GDP, but they particularly dominate the high-wage, highgrowth sectors of the economy. Industries that require high human capital inputs are particularly likely to locate in metropolitan areas, in part because these areas offer dense labor markets, and patents are also clustered in metropolitan areas.100 As centers of innovation and knowledge transfer, the importance of metropolitan areas is expected to continue to grow in coming decades. While there is considerable data showing how metropolitan regions are the “economic engines” of the country and thus worthy of direct federal support, a major challenge of such assistance is recognizing that there are distinct local benefits of increased performance and quality of life as well. Thus efforts to devise efficient strategies for supporting metropolitan regions must separate returns on federal investment in achieving national goals from direct locally-based benefits and costs. America’s economy is overwhelmingly located in metropolitan areas, and the future success of our economy will itself be tied to the economic vitality of these areas. Therefore, at the very least, spending should not discriminate against metropolitan regions. The trending economic reality that agglomeration economies cause productivity to be higher in urban areas makes it appropriate to structure transportation investments to assure that they do not disadvantage urban centers. As the country evaluates a nation-wide transportation strategy, it should not seek artificially to boost particular metropolitan areas. However, it should try to ensure that investments are balanced between rural and urban America. Many analysts and legislators have characterized the problem as one of metropolitan “mobility,” a term that tends to emphasize traditional measures of traffic congestion.101 Mobility implies simply the ability to move more, a concept that does not necessarily capture the economic benefits we seek. NTPP prefers to categorize the issue as one of accessibility. Accessibility is best defined as the potential for interaction and links to the notion of being able to complete an economic or social interaction in a timely manner. More choices, both in terms of available destinations and modes of travel, mean greater accessibility by most definitions.102 For our purposes, reliable access to services, employment opportunities, recreational activities, and social networks, among many other destinations is more critical than simply “being mobile.” Framing the challenge in these terms, rather than in terms of a narrow focus on congestion or decrepit transit infrastructure, is a critical first step toward developing effective solutions that maximize long-term benefits to the economy and to people’s quality of life. Reforming national transportation policies and programs to be more attuned to the needs and critical importance of major metropolitan regions will be challenging, especially given that past programs have not been particularly designed to strengthen these areas.103 Part of the difficulty is that these regions function as economic, rather than political units. By contrast, federal transportation programs targeted to urban areas (such as most transit programs) have usually been directed to specific projects and are typically fragmented along modal and jurisdictional lines. These programs offer useful lessons, but they have rarely looked to the performance or results of large, integrated multi-modal metropolitan transportation networks. A further complexity in designing a performance-based federal program to support metropolitan areas will be the need to distinguish local costs and benefits from the return on public investment with respect to national goals. Nevertheless these difficulties and complexities are well worth tackling given the many long-term benefits that would come with improved metropolitan accessibility.

### Transit k to Economy- AT: Alt Causes

#### Public transit is key to revitalizing the econ- investment travels through entire economy

**The National Business Coalition for Rapid Transit ‘3** (November 3, 2003, The National Business Coalition for Rapid Transit, The Economic Importance of Public Transport, <http://www.apta.com/research/info/online/documents/economic_importance.pdf>)

In project after project, **a capital investment in public transport**ation **sparks a chain reaction in business activity that far exceeds the initial investment.** **The dollars flow to**  **hundreds of industries**, from specialized rail or bus construction firms to maintenance and software suppliers. **Every $1 billion invested in public transit capital projects generates 30,000 jobs**, and the same amount invested in transit operations generates 60,000 jobs. **The return on investment could be as high as 9 to 1.6.**

#### Public transit accesses multiple internal links to the economy

**APTA ‘2** (American Public Transportation Association, cited 2002, Essetntial Support for a Strong Economy, <http://www.apta.com/research/info/online/essential.cfm>)

The evidence is clear: To maintain a sound and vibrant national economy and to enhance Americans’ quality of life, the US must increase its investment in public transportation. **Providing a broad and sustainable economic stimulus to local communities, metropolitan regions, states and the nation, public transport**ation: **Boosts business revenues and profits** **Creates jobs and expands the labor pool** Stimulates development and redevelopment **Expands local and state tax revenues and reduces expenditures required for other essential public services** Reduces household and business costs and enhances worker and business productivity Public transportation contributes to the nation’s economic strength in two fundamental ways: Direct dollar investment, multiplied throughout the economy Improved transportation options, which create economic benefits for individuals, households, businesses and governments **Dollars invested in public transportation flow through all sectors of the economy** and a cross section of American communities, large and small, urban and rural. **Through increased jobs, income, profit and tax revenue, they provide an economic stimulus far exceeding the original investment** — as much as six dollars for every dollar invested.\*1 In addition to directly stimulating the economy, investment in public transportation enhances mobility for businesses and households, thereby: Protecting personal freedom, choice and mobility Enhancing access to opportunity Enabling economic prosperity Protecting our communities and the natural environment Every $10 million capital investment in public transportation can return up to $30 million in business sales alone. 1 \* Under different scenarios, **the overall economic benefits of public transport**ation **investment may be as high as nine to one.**

### Transit k to Economy- Biz Costs

#### Transit system key to reducing business costs- solves global competitiveness

**American Public Transit Association ‘99.** “Public Transportation and the Nation’s Economy.” Cambridge Systematics. http://74.125.95.132/search?q=cache:1vkDmwCSpjUJ:www.apta.com/research/info/online/documents/vary.pdf+%22public+transportation%22+and+%22economy%22&cd=1&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us

Intuitively, the fact that businesses and workers have a limited budget of time and dollars is the driving fact behind understanding the economic impacts of transit investment. **A well-functioning transit system** whose operations are well maintained or improved, and in a fully functioning state, **saves time and reduces costs related to travel for the millions of transit and highway users daily.** **Businesses benefit by devoting less of their resources to logistic costs and having access to a relatively larger work force.** **Lower costs mean these businesses can offer more competitive products** and services in the long run and grow to benefit themselves and supporting businesses. Figure E.2 presents the flow of travel benefits to transportation system users resulting from transit capital investment.

### Transit k to Economy- Green Jobs

#### Transit system key to green jobs

**Gowland ‘9**, Tara, Seattle Job’s Examiner, June 15 2009 <http://www.examiner.com/x-1495-Seattle-Jobs-Examiner~y2009m6d15-252000-green-jobs-created-by-investment-in-public-transit>

A new study shows that **investing in public transportation provides jobs to the American workers who may need them the most.** Job Impacts of Spending on Public Transportation: an Update shows that two-thirds (**67 percent) of the jobs created by capital investment in the public transit industry replaces lost blue-collar jobs with “green jobs”** in the public transit sector. The Economic Development Research Group prepared the study for the American Public Transportation Association (APTA). Overall, **the study shows an investment of one billion dollars in public transportation supports and creates 30,000 jobs in a variety of sectors.** Based on these projections, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA), which provides $8.4 billion for public transportation projects, will create approximately 252,000 jobs for Americans and help transit systems meet the steadily growing demand for public transit services. APTA released the study at the U.S. House of Representatives Transportation and Infrastructure Committee hearing Recovery Act: 10-Week Progress Report for Transportation and Infrastructure Programs.

### AT: Highway Job Tradeoff DA

#### Mass transit creates comparatively more and better jobs than highway expansion- prefer our internal link

Hagerbaumer ‘8, Chris Dec 01, 2008, <http://www.oeconline.org/community/blog/which-creates-more-jobs>

In the face of a serious recession, lawmakers at both the state and federal level are calling for investment in infrastructure projects, such as roads, that will bring the unemployment rate down while addressing what’s seen as an infrastructure crisis. And they’re absolutely right. Such jobs pay well, and our infrastructure needs are large. But let’s invest strategically. Real world experience points to two things. First, “fix it first” types of projects – such as resurfacing, rehabilitating and reconstructing roads – are generally more labor intensive than new highway construction (after adjusting for land costs, which are necessary when building an entirely new road but are not relevant when upgrading an existing one). “[The Jobs Are Back in Town](http://www.goodjobsfirst.org/pdf/backintown.pdf),” [PDF] a 2003 study by Good Jobs First, found that “for every $1 billion spent on federally-aided highway resurfacing projects, some 10,421 person-years of construction labor were generated, while with new highway construction (after adjusting for land costs) only 9,316 person-years were created.” And “fix it first” benefits drivers’ pocketbooks; cracked and bumpy roads increase car maintenance costs and reduce fuel efficiency. Second, investing in new public transportation infrastructure generally creates more jobs than investing in new highway and bridge infrastructure. A 2004 study by the Surface Transportation Policy Project, “[Setting the Record Straight: Transit, Fixing Roads and Bridges Offer Greatest Job Gains](http://www.transact.org/library/decoder/jobs_decoder.pdf)”, SRS found that for every $1.25 billion spent on new public transportation projects, nearly 51,300 people are employed. In contrast, only 43,200 are employed per $1.25 billion spent on new roads and bridges. In other words, investment in public transportation creates approximately 19% more jobs than new road or bridge projects. And during an economic downturn, we need public transportation more than ever. Growing numbers of Oregonians have no choice other than to take transit.

## \*\*\*RAIL\*\*\*

### Rail Capacity Crisis Now

#### Rail capacity is at the breaking point and will only get worst- solving highway congestion and fuel prices is key to decreasing traffic and saving the rail system

**Hamberger ‘8**, (Ed: President and CEO Association of American Railroads. April 23, 2008. [“Rail Capacity” Technology Wire. <http://www.allbusiness.com/government/public-policy/10593398-1.html>] WGB)

Capacity is a Challenge Everywhere in Transportation, Including on Railroads. As the National Surface Transportation Policy and Revenue Study Commission noted in a recent report, ``**Congestion [is affecting] every mode of surface transportation for ever lengthening periods each day**, as a result of the mismatch between demand and supply of limited capacity.`` To be sure, there is a tremendous amount of strength and flexibility in our nation's transportation systems, and the freight is still being delivered by all of the modes. But it is clear that **all freight transportation modes are facing capacity challenges today.** Freight railroads face capacity challenges thanks largely to substantial and sustained increases in rail traffic. From 1990 to 2006, Class I tons originated rose 33 percent, carloads originated rose 47 percent, car miles rose 49 percent, and revenue ton-miles rose 84 percent. In each successive year from 1998 through 2006, Class I railroads originated more tons than ever before. Beginning in 2002, they moved more carloads in each year than ever before. Growth in intermodal traffic has been especially rapid. Beginning with the second quarter of 2002, U.S. rail intermodal traffic rose for 20 consecutive quarters, sometimes by double- digit amounts compared with the same period in the previous year. There was a slight decline in rail traffic in 2007, due mainly to the severe problems in the housing and automotive sectors. Even so, **railroads operating in the U**nited **S**tates **moved more freight in 2007 than in any previous year except 2006.** **As a result of these substantial traffic increases, average freight rail traffic density has increased sharply.** Just from 1990 to 2007, Class I car-miles per mile of track owned rose approximately 82 percent; revenue ton-miles per mile of road owned rose some 118 percent. The increase in traffic and traffic density have led to capacity constraints on some rail corridors and points on the rail network. Railroads may differ in the degree to which their capacity is constrained, but **there is no question** **that there is much less room on the U.S. rail network today** than there was even a few years ago. In recent years, solid growth in the economy (the current slowdown notwithstanding) and population, improved rail service offerings, **expanding international trade, increasingly-congested highways, sharply higher fuel prices, and other factors have pushed more and more freight to railroads.** Even when taking into account the current lessened traffic demand due to the present economic conditions, **analysts** generally **expect market forces to continue to encourage more freight to move by rail** in the years ahead. As a result, the long-term forecast is for freight rail traffic to trend steadily higher. For example, Global Insight recently projected a 28 percent increase in U.S. freight rail tonnage from 2006 through 2018. The U.S. Department of Transportation recently forecast that freight railroad demand will rise 88 percent by 2035. If the increase in rail traffic in the 15 years following 2006 simply matches the rate of growth over the 15 years prior to 2006, by 2021 Class I carriers will be originating approximately 41 million carloads - up from 32 million in 2006. The magnitude of the looming freight rail capacity issue was also borne out by a recent study by Cambridge Systematics, a prominent economic and transportation consulting firm. The purpose of the study, which focused on 52,000 miles of primary rail corridors, was to estimate the cost of the expansion in capacity necessary for U.S. freight railroads to handle the 88 percent increase in freight rail traffic forecast by the DOT for 2035, assuming no gain in rail's market share of intercity freight movements. The study found that **if rail capacity needs are not properly addressed**, by 2035 some 16,000 miles of primary rail corridors - **nearly one-third of the** 52,000 **miles covered in the study - will be so congested that train flows would be unstable and congestion and service delays would be persistent and substantial.** Because the rail system is so interconnected, **this outcome would mean that the entire U.S. freight rail system would become**, in effect, **disabled.**

### Rail Capacity Crisis Now

#### Railroads Lack infrastructure repair and extension now

Northeast Midwest Institute ‘8

(Northeast Midwest Institute, research organization dedicated to economic vitality, environmental quality, and regional equity for Northeast and Midwest states, January 18, 2008, Federal Funding for Railroads,http://www.nemw.org/fedfundrail.htm)

Funding for railroad expansion and maintenance is a perennial problem, partially rooted in the fact that the track the trains run on is shared among multiple owners, and used both for freight and passenger service. In principle, there is general public and legislative support for the expansion of rail networks. However, the investment costs for these networks is astounding relative to the amount of money available. Highways get approximately $30 billion from the federal government in the Highway Trust Fund alone, while railway funding at best is $1 billion from all sources, for all purposes. Further, there is often debate concerning private vs. public management of rail systems for both practical and philosophical reasons. Amtrak, the U.S.'s semi-public rail company, is under pressure to cut costs while maintaining, improving, and expanding service. Generally, passenger and freight rail companies in the United States manage to run without direct federal intervention. Since the privately-owned freight companies were [deregulated](http://www.nemw.org/raildereg.htm) over 20 years ago, many people believe that Amtrak ought to be run as a for-profit, unsubsidized corporation, but it is uncertain whether this is actually possible. As a consequence, the overhaul of the nation's rail networks is incomplete, although there is much evidence indicating that this is necessary. Part of the problem with funding railroads is the interaction -- or lack thereof -- between the trust funds and appropriations spending limits. The Highway and Transit divisions in TEA-21 are "firewalled" -- no transfers of funding are allowed from one to the other, and programs outside the trust funds cannot be paid for by these trust funds, even though they may actually pay for the same thing. In the case of railroads, Amtrak cannot be funded from the trust fund. However, the annual appropriation for Amtrak's operating costs of approximately $500 million cannot begin to address the backlog in maintenance, and the need for additional construction on the existing infrastructure, or upgrade the tracks to carry high-speed trains such as Acela. The annual appropriation for Safety and Operations within the Federal Railroad Administration is only about $100 million, similarly inadequate for the purposes of infrastructure overhauls.

### Food Prices Mod

#### Railroads key to food prices- disruptions cause shocks

**Weinstein 98** (THE IMPACTS OF THE UNION PACIFIC SERVICE DISRUPTIONS ON THE TEXAS AND NATIONAL ECONOMIES: AN UNFINISHED STORY Prepared for the Railroad Commission of Texas by Bernard L. Weinstein, Ph.D. and Terry L. Clower, Ph.D. Center for Economic Development and Research The University of North Texas Denton, Texas February 9, 1998)

In 1996, the value of U.S. crop production totaled $86.3 billion, and the cost of transporting these crops to food processors was approximately $4 billion. For the state of Texas, cash receipts to farmers totaled $5.3 billion in 1996 and transportation costs came to about $250 million. As with chemicals, **the nation's farmers** and grain shippers **depend** largely **on the railroads to get their crops to markets, both domestic and foreign. Agricultural shippers** and receivers generally **have limited access to alternative providers of transportation services because many are located beyond effective trucking distances from these markets.** In addition, western growers and shippers have little access to waterway transportation, with the result that **up to 80 percent of grains and cereals are shipped by rail** in some states. Grain shipments by the Union Pacific have slowed markedly in recent months. According to Association of American Railroads, the UP loaded 6,104 rail cars with grain during the first week of November-- 41 percent less than the 10,343 for the same week a year ago. The Burlington Northern, partly because of the UP tie-ups, has also seen a drop-off in grain shipments-- 8,475 cars per week versus 10,892 a year ago. Some elevator operators report waiting 30 to 60 days to receive rail cars. During the STB's October 27 hearing, the National Grain and Feed Association reported that grain elevators were filled to capacity, particularly in Kansas, Oklahoma and Texas, and that local cash prices were declining because of a lack of storage. At both the STB and RRC hearings, some shippers cited numerous instances of rail cars that had been loaded with grain and billed but were sitting idle on their tracks for weeks because the Union Pacific was unable to provide locomotive power (see testimony of David Swinford, Ft. Worth hearing, pp. 7-9). Members from the Texas Panhandle reported that some customers were refusing to buy Texas-origin grain for fear of not receiving timely shipments (see testimony of Art Smith, El Paso hearing, pp. 2-3). **Disruptions of agricultural shipments have also been felt in South Texas, where delays of two to four weeks for hopper cars have been common** (see testimony of William Lock, Corpus Christi hearing, pp. 1-2). Movements of rice, corn, milo, soybeans and cotton have been slowed, imposing additional pressures on farmers and co-ops in the face of bumper crops and low prices. As of mid-December, **grain deliveries** by the Union Pacific **were falling further behind schedule**. These increasing delays prompted the Surface Transportation Board to order UP and the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Corporation to set up a system to minimize spoilage and get 1997's record grain harvests moving. During the late fall, more than 50,000 carloads of grain typically flow through Texas Gulf Cost ports on their way to foreign markets. Undoubtedly, exports through these ports will be lower in 1998 because of the cumulative impacts of UP's service disruptions (see discussion of international trade below). **A conservative estimate of the losses incurred by** Texas' **farmers** and grain shippers from lower prices, foregone sales opportunities and higher freight costs **is $150 million** to date. **These higher costs** may **eventually show up at the dinner table**, not only for households in Texas but **in all** other **parts of the U.S.** as well.

#### That kills billions

**Tampa Tribune 96** (January 20, LN)

"Even if they are merely blips, **higher international prices can hurt poor countries that import a significant portion of their food**," he said. "**Rising prices** can also **quickly put food out of reach of the 1.1 billion people in the developing world** who live on a dollar a day or less." He also said **many people in low-income countries already spend more than half of their income on food.**

### Economy Mod

#### Railroad congestion makes shipping impossible and collapses global trade- destroys the economy

**AAR ‘4** (Association of American Railroads) July 2004. [“Overview of US Freight Railroads” National Atlas. <http://nationalatlas.gov/articles/transportation/a_freightrr.html>] WGB

**Freight railroads are critical to the economic well-being and global competitiveness of the U**nited **S**tates. **They move 42 percent of our nation's freight** (measured in ton-miles) - everything from lumber to vegetables, coal to orange juice, grain to automobiles, and chemicals to scrap iron - **and connect businesses with each other across the country and with markets overseas.** **They also contribute billions** of dollars each year **to the economy through investments, wages, purchases, and taxes.** Class I railroads are those with operating revenue of at least $272 million in 2002. Class I carriers comprise only 1 percent of the number of U.S. freight railroads, but they account for 70 percent of the industry's mileage operated, 89 percent of its employees, and 92 percent of its freight revenue. Class I carriers typically operate in many different states and concentrate largely (though not exclusively) on long-haul, high-density intercity traffic lanes. There are seven Class I railroads <note 1 see below> ranging in size from just over 3,000 to more than 33,000 miles operated and from 2,600 to more than 46,000 employees.

#### Econ collapse leads to extinction

**Mead ‘92** [Walter Russel Mead, Senior Fellow in American FoPo @ the Council on Foreign Relations, World Policy Institute, 1992]

Hundreds of millions, billions, of people have pinned their hopes on the international market . They and their leaders have embraced market principles and drawn closer to the west because they believe the system can work for them? But what if it can’t? **What if the global economy stagnates** or even shrinks? In that case, **we will face a new period of international conflict**: North against South, rich against poor. Russia, China India, these **countries with their** billions of people and their **nuclear weapons will pose a much greater danger to the world than Germany and Japan did in the 30s.**

### Trade Mod

#### Railroad congestion collapses US transcontinental shipping and destroys trade credibility

**Gallagher ‘5** (Traffic World March 14, 2005, Monday SECTION: RAIL; Pg. WPLENGTH: 1530 words HEADLINE: Derailing the Economy BYLINE: JOHN GALLAGHER - ASSOCIATE EDITOR)

**Rail service shortfalls**, high rates are hindering shippers' ability to expand reach, scope of products, businesses. **The inability of the** North American **rail system to meet the demands of a growing number of customers is nearing a critical point**, **threatening to put the brakes on an economic engine** hungry for more fuel and limit growth. With rail capacity stretched to never-before-seen limits, shippers across the United States and Canada said in a series of interviews that **rail service shortfalls are having an unprecedented impact on** their **planning and their ability to meet their business forecasts.** They are increasingly frustrated, they said, by the lack of rail cars to ship their products and rate hikes and accessorial charges they say are accelerating out of control. Captive rail shippers are especially hindered by the lack of transportation service, to the point where some are throttling back production and delaying expansion plans. **When combined with congestion in nearly all segments of the supply chain, it's only a matter of time**, some say, **before consumers feel the effects at the checkout counter.** "Transportation as a whole is under a lot of stress right now, and additional money from Congress to address infrastructure issues is not forthcoming," said Erik Autor, vice president and international trade counsel for the National Retail Federation. "It's affecting anyone involved in transportation, beyond imports and exports, but domestically as well. The system is really starting to crumble, and it's eventually going to find a way into consumer prices." The issue is percolating even within the federal government, which is more accustomed to tracking general trends than keeping tabs on short-term events. Maritime congestion is "masking congestion on the rails and roads," raising costs for shippers and consumers, Jeffrey Shane, undersecretary for policy at the Department of Transportation, told a recent American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials legislative conference. **As the heavy-lifter for both international and domestic trade, the North American rail system may be under the most stress.** Railroads hit record volume levels last year, up almost 5 percent from 2003, driven largely by waves of imports that show no signs of subsiding in 2005. But even as the railroads have been hustling to keep up with demand on the intermodal side, domestic carload shippers are struggling to keep inventory moving through the supply chain. "It's an aggravation, and **it has hindered us from initiatives designed to improve service and ship more rail**," said Howard Bacon, director of transportation and global supply chain for $26 billion International Paper.

#### That leads to extinction

**Bergsten ‘1** (C. Fred, director of the institute for international economics, foreign affairs, march/april, LN)

The United States' initial refusal in 1997 to contribute to the IMF support package for Thailand for fear of further riling Congress, for example, earned lasting enmity throughout Asia. The main reason for the debacle at Seattle was the United States' inability to propose a new round of trade negotiations that would meet the legitimate interests of other major players. Lacking the domestic authority to lower its own trade barriers, Washington was forced to offer an agenda that sought to reduce protection only in other countries -- a prospect that was understandably unappealing to the rest of the world. Similarly, in 1997 -- 98 APEC negotiations, the United States unsuccessfully pushed a program of sector-specific liberalization that focused almost wholly on U.S. export interests. And six years after the idea of the FTAA was launched in Miami, little progress has been made toward hemispheric trade liberalization. This international leadership vacuum has had two subtle but profound effects on the world economy. Like a bicycle on a hill, the global trading system tends to slip backwards in the absence of continual progress forward. Now, with no serious multilateral trade negotiations taking place anywhere in the world, the backsliding has come in the form of intensified regionalism (which is inherently discriminatory), as well as mercantilist and protectionist disputes across the Atlantic. An East Asian free trade area -- and along with it, a three-bloc world -- will likely emerge if the United States remains on the sidelines of international trade for another five years. Such U.S. impotence would also mean that the traditionally positive impact of regional liberalization on the multilateral process would give way to increasing antagonism and even hostility between the regional blocs. The other chief effect of the leadership vacuum is increased international disregard of, or even hostility toward, the United States on the economic front. Because of its weight in the world economy, its dynamic growth, and its traditional leadership role, **the U**nited **S**tates **remains the most important player in the global economic system**. The other economic powers generally seek to avoid confronting it directly. The EU, for example, has tried to avoid overt battles, despite its escalating range of disputes with the United States. East Asian governments are careful to assure Washington that their new regional initiatives are fully consistent with existing global norms and institutions -- a conciliatory stance that is in sharp contrast to Mahathir's shrill rhetoric of a decade ago and Japanese Vice Minister of Finance Eisuke Sakakibara's aggressive 1997 promotion of the AMF. In reality, however, the United States is perceived as wanting to call the shots without putting up much of its own money or making changes in its own laws and practices. These specific economic complaints fuse with and feed on more general anti-American sentiments throughout the world. Hence, the two other economic superpowers are proceeding on their own. The EU has launched the euro, a new association agreement with Mexico, and negotiations with Mercosur (the trade bloc comprising Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, and Uruguay); East Asia is pursuing the AMF and the East Asian free trade area. **The result is a clear and steady erosion of both the United** **S**tate**s' position on the global economic scene and the multilateral rules and institutions that it has traditionally championed. If not checked soon, this erosion could deteriorate into severe international conflicts and the disintegration of global economic links.**

### Altering Grants Key to Rail

#### FEDERAL TRANSIT FUNDING REFORM KEY TO nEW RAIL PROJECTS

Katz et al. ‘5

Bruce Katz is vice president, director of the Metropolitan Policy Progam, and Adeline M. and Alfred I. Johnson Chair in Urban and Metropolitan Studies at the Brookings Institution. Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. Scott Bernstein is at the Center for Neighborhood Technology. “Getting Transportation Right for Metropolitan America,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 23

Other federal rules further tilt the playing field against transit. For example, strict project justification requirements and a demonstration of long- term financial commitment apply to new rail projects. Such oversight—while perhaps appropriate--far exceeds that applied to roadway projects. This, too, hampers development of the multidimensional transportation systems that businesses and workers require.

### QPQs Solve Rail

#### tying current funding to robust transit reform projects stabilizes collapsing rail infrastructure

Katz et al. ‘5

Bruce Katz is vice president, director of the Metropolitan Policy Progam, and Adeline M. and Alfred I. Johnson Chair in Urban and Metropolitan Studies at the Brookings Institution. Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. Scott Bernstein is at the Center for Neighborhood Technology. “Getting Transportation Right for Metropolitan America,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 35

Facilitate Transit-Oriented Development. The federal government has a special chance to leverage the billions that have already been invested in rail and other fixed-route transit projects. Two key opportunities exist. First, metropolitan long- range planning requirements should contain a provision requiring the consideration of alternative regional Land use scenarios incorporating policy goals or regional visions rather than simply extrapolating from past trends. Second, a key criterion for allocating transit funding should be the consistency of local land use plans and zoning codes with transit-supportive land uses. Beyond that, federal law should also require that federal funds for the provision of key infrastructure (such as transit facilities or bridges) be tied to requirements for transit -supportive design and should provide guidelines on the functional integration of transit and the surrounding uses. Finally, Congress should direct the DOT to work with the Department of Housing and Urban Development on a special effort to realize the real estate potential of transit stations. This initiative could involve a range of activities (such as research. technical assistance, and joint agency planning) and could provide a helpful forum for local government officials, transit operators, private sector developers, financial institutions, and secondary mortgage market entities.

### MPO Devolution Solves Competitiveness/Rail

#### metro control of transit key to competitiveness and national rail infrastructure

Puentes & Bailey ‘5

Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. Kevin O’Brien is a columnist at the Cleveland *Plain Dealer.* Linda Bailey is Senior Research Associate for Transportation at ICF International. “Increasing Funding and Accountability for Metropolitan Transportation Decisions,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 149-150

These four programs have given MPOs and metropolitan leaders important abilities to plan and make decisions about transportation investments. In the end, however, the degree of control they have acquired is relatively minor. Taken together, the four programs make up only 15.2 percent of the total road and bridge funding under TEA-21. Furthermore, metropolitan areas still do not have authority over all these funds. The federal law only gives metropolitan areas direct control over metropolitan STP and PL funds—less than 7 percent of the total. This represents a modest commitment to regions that collectively account for a substantial share of the nation’s economic output and a large majority of all transit use, aviation passengers, and port tonnage, as well as being critical to the national rail and passenger rail capacities. In the light of this, the next section discusses some of the challenges facing metropolitan areas and outlines the case for greater enhancement of metropolitan decisionmaking in transportation.

## \*\*\*Racism Adv\*\*\*

### Public Transit System Racist Now

**(A) Funding Distribution- Transportation funding is a proxy for white supremacy and entrenches minority immobility**

**Paterson ‘6** (Eve, President of the Equal Justice Society, “”End Race Discrimination in Public Transit Today”, Urban Habitat) Winter 05/06. <http://www.urbanhabitat.org/files/4.Eva.Paterson.pdf>

**The lack of transportation for the poorest victims of** Hurricane **Katrina is a stark reminder of this nation’s racist inequity.** Over one-third of New Orleans’ African Americans do not own a car. In cities across the nation, African Americans and Latinos comprise over 54 percent of transit users. **Nationally, African Americans are almost six times as likely as whites to use public transit.** **Not surprisingly, public transport**ation **receives a fraction of the government funding spent on highways and roads.** And **this difference in funding is systematic, class-based, and race-based.** Fifty years after the Montgomery Bus Boycott, the Alabama Department of Transportation, with a transportation budget of $1.3 billion, provides no public transit funding. Bus service in Montgomery has been cut by 70 per cent; fares have doubled and student and senior discounts have been eliminated. In Alabama and 23 other states, it has actually been made illegal to use state gas taxes for transit. **Cities across the country have slashed the transit systems that serve minority neighborhoods.**

**(B) Vehicle Quality/Environmental Racism- Minority public transit is of overwhelmingly poorer quality and environmental impacts of transit are passed off onto minorities**

**Bullard ‘4** (Robert Doyle, Highway Robbery: Transportation Racism & new Routes to Equity, P. 8, Google Books) 2004<http://books.google.com/books?id=NB_lJoyiF2cC&pg=PA15&dq=%22public+transportation%22+%2B+racism&lr>=

While most of the overt cases of transportation racism may have faded into history, the last **vestiges of racial discrimination in transport**ation **planning have not been totally eradicated.** When I travel back to Montgomery and Birmingham, across the South, and to other regions of the country, it is clear that remnants of transportation racism linger. **People of color still do not have equal access to transportation benefits, but receive more than their fair share of transport**ation **externalities with “dirty” diesel buses, bus barns, refueling stations, railroad tracks, and highways disrupting and dividing their communities.**

### Public Transit Reform Solves Racism

#### Public transit system is organized around racial exclusion in the squo- reform and development are key

**Bullard ‘4**, [Robert, Ware Distinguished Professor of Sociology and Director of the Environmental Justice Resource Center, Sept 23, 2004, <http://www.blackcommentator.com/106/106_transportation_racism.html>, online 2009]

**Inadequate public transit services** in many of the nation’s metropolitan regions, **which have high proportions of "captive" transit dependents**, **has exacerbated** social, economic, and racial **isolation and aided in institutionalizing transportation apartheid.** Today, **no** other **group is more physically isolated from jobs than African Americans.** Suburbs are increasing their share of office space, while central cities see their share declining. In 2000, **the "spatial mismatch" between jobs and residence meant that more than 50 percent of the nation’s blacks would have to relocate to achieve an even distribution of blacks relative to jobs**; the comparable figures for whites are 20 to 24 percentage points lower. The suburban share of the metropolitan office space is 69.5 percent in Detroit, 65.8 percent in Atlanta, 57.7 percent in Washington, DC, 57.4 percent in Miami, and 55.2 percent in Philadelphia. **Getting to** these **suburban jobs without a car is next to impossible.** It is no accident that Detroit leads in suburban "office sprawl." Detroit is also the most segregated big city in the United States and the only major metropolitan area without a regional transit system. Only about 2.4 percent of metropolitan Detroiters use transit to get to work.

### AT: Biopower Link/Racism DA

#### The link goes only one way- racism, poverty, and immobility structure the status quo- only a reorganization of the transportation system can act as a transition to the reorganization of American national identity

**Bullard ‘9**, Robert Ware Distinguished Professor of Sociology and Director of the Environmental Justice Resource Center, Race, Place, and Environmental Justice After Hurricane Katrina, online 2009

Generally, **public transit in the U**nited **S**tates **is considered to be transportation of last resort** of a novelty for tourists – **resulting in dramatic differences in convenience**, comfort, **and safety between motorists and non-motorists, and therefore between wealthy and poor, white and black, and able and disabled.** Nevertheless, without a car, **millions of jobs are unreachable** – thereby **locking many families into a permanent poverty**, unemployment and underemployment. In 2006, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) released the National Plan Review, a comprehensive, nationwide assessment of the adequacy of emergency plans for each state and the 75 largest urban areas (DHS 2006). DHS found these plans particularly insufficient with regard to evacuation planning for the carless and special-needs populations – individuals who cannot simply jump into their cars and drive away. Evacuation of low-mobility and special-needs groups, while included in most state emergency operation plans, has been largely un-addressed by state DOTs. The DHS notes that large swaths of the population have special needs that must be addressed in evacuation plans, including the carless (8% of US Households), those with a physical or mental disability (13 percent of residents) or language barrier (8 percent) the elderly (40 percent have a disability), and those living in group quarters such as nursing homes and assisted-living facilities (2 percent of residents). In urban areas, African Americans and Latinos comprise over 54 percent of transit users (62 percent of Bus Riders, 35 percent subway, and 29 percent commuter rail riders). Nationally, **only about 5.3 percent of all Americans use public transit to get to work. African Americans are almost six time as likely as whites to use transit to get around. Urban transit is especially important to African Americans** where over 88 percent live in metropolitan areas and 53.1 percent live inside central cities. Nearly 60 percent of transit riders are served by the ten largest urban transit systems and the remaining 40 percent by the other 5,000 transit systems (Sanchez, Stolz, and Ma 2003).

## \*\*\*CLIMATE\*\*\*

### Transit Reform Solves GHG Emissions

#### giving states and localities incentives for robust transit reform solves climate

Winkelman et al ‘9

Steve Winkelman is director of the Transportation Program at the Center for Clean Air Policy (CCAP). Allison Bishins is a policy associate for transportation and climate change at CCAP. Chuck Kooshian is a Planner with the El Paso Department of Planning and Development. “Cost-Effective GHG Reductions through

Smart Growth & Improved Transportation Choices: An economic case for investment of cap-and-trade revenues,” <http://www.reconnectingamerica.org/public/display_asset/ccapsmartgrowthco2_june_2009_final_pdf?docid=306>, June 2009.

Giving states, MPOs and the local governments a set of tools and incentives to expand and improve low-carbon travel choices, enhance system efficiency, reduce congestion, and encourage compact growth patterns is an effective way to help achieve local, state and national GHG reduction goals. Directing 10 percent of cap-and-trade allocation values toward smart planning and low-carbon transportation investments would not only provide long-term economic benefits, but would strengthen our communities and help build the foundation for a healthy, vibrant and equitable future.

#### Public transit effects massive reductions in carbon emissions

**Millar ‘9**, [Bob, President of APTA, <http://www.publictransportation.org/facts/#hw07>, online 2009, DB]

**Public transport**ation **reduces the nation’s carbon emissions by 37 million metric tons annually** – equivalent to the electricity used by 4.9 million households. To achieve similar reduction in carbon emissions, every household in New York City, Washington, DC, Atlanta, Denver and Los Angeles combined would have to completely stop using electricity. **If an individual switches a 20-mile round-trip commute to public transport**ation **his or her annual CO2 emissions will fall by** 4,800 pounds per year, equal to **a 10 percent reduction in a two-car household’s carbon footprint.**

#### Public transit solves warming- higher occupancy vehicles

**Davis ‘7**, (Todd- Energy Solutions Operation, September 2007 <http://www.apta.com/research/info/online/documents/climate_change.pdf>)

**Traveling by public transportation is less carbon intensive than traveling in a single occupant vehicle.** Partially or more fully **loaded buses and rail coaches are more environmentally friendly than lower occupancy single vehicles.** A single person automobile traveling one mile emits on average 1.0 pounds of CO2. Assuming in 2005, if all travel that occurred on public transportation were to be completed instead in private vehicles, this would have resulted in an additional 16.2 million metric tons of carbon dioxide. **Public transportation’s carbon emissions were** 12.3 million metric tons, or **4.0 million metric tons less than would have been used by personal vehicles.** In addition, **the use of public transportation reduced congestion levels to the effect of saving an additional** 340 million gallons of gasoline, which equated to another **3.0 million metric tons of CO2 reduction.** This results in a net CO2 emission reduction of 6.9 million metric tons when the avoided congestion fuel consumption due is included. An additional 400,000 metric tons of additional GHGs were also saved, including sulfur hexafluoride, HFCs, per fluorocarbons, and chlorofluorocarbons.

### Transit Reform Solves Future Climate Costs

#### robust transit reform prevents massive future spending on climate change policy

Winkelman et al ‘9

Steve Winkelman is director of the Transportation Program at the Center for Clean Air Policy (CCAP). Allison Bishins is a policy associate for transportation and climate change at CCAP. Chuck Kooshian is a Planner with the El Paso Department of Planning and Development. “Cost-Effective GHG Reductions through

Smart Growth & Improved Transportation Choices: An economic case for investment of cap-and-trade revenues,” <http://www.reconnectingamerica.org/public/display_asset/ccapsmartgrowthco2_june_2009_final_pdf?docid=306>, June 2009.

If we fail to pursue cost-effective GHG reductions from the transportation sector, other sectors of the economy will need to implement more expensive solutions, ultimately costing the public more money. There is compelling evidence that we can achieve significant, and inexpensive, transportation GHG reductions. The landmark 2008 study, Growing Cooler: The Evidence on Urban Development & Climate Change, surveyed decades worth of empirical studies and analyses and demonstrated that coordinated transportation and land-use policies can have a significant impact on transportation-sector GHG emissions.19 With improved transportation options, supportive land use and travel demand management policies, Americans will choose to drive less, and therefore emit less — and can save money in the process. Federal climate change policy should help provide the necessary tools and incentives, while also leveraging significant additional federal, state, local, and private resources, to harness the cost-effective GHG reductions possible from the transportation sector. Moreover, these benefits will continue to accrue well into the future, helping to meet the nation’s long-term GHG reduction goals.

#### Robust transit reform solves cost of climate change policy, Lowers compliance costs

Winkelman et al ‘9

Steve Winkelman is director of the Transportation Program at the Center for Clean Air Policy (CCAP). Allison Bishins is a policy associate for transportation and climate change at CCAP. Chuck Kooshian is a Planner with the El Paso Department of Planning and Development. “Cost-Effective GHG Reductions through

Smart Growth & Improved Transportation Choices: An economic case for investment of cap-and-trade revenues,” <http://www.reconnectingamerica.org/public/display_asset/ccapsmartgrowthco2_june_2009_final_pdf?docid=306>, June 2009.

In this report, the Center for Clean Air Policy (CCAP) analyzes the benefits of reducing GHG emissions through smart growth, improved transportation choices, and transportation pricing. With input from Transportation for America, Smart Growth America, Natural Resources Defense Council, Environmental Defense Fund, and HDR Inc., we estimate that comprehensive application of best practices could reduce VMT per capita by 10 percent and reduce annual GHG emissions 145 MMTCO2 in 2030 — equivalent to the annual emissions of some 30 million cars or 35 large coal plants.3 These GHG reductions total approximately 6 percent of the 2030 GHG reduction goal proposed in the American Clean Energy and Security Act.4 Our analysis indicates that these reductions can be achieved profitably, when factoring in avoided infrastructure costs, consumer savings and projected tax revenue growth. When viewed holistically, many transportation-related emissions reductions are not only cheaper than reductions in the utility and petroleum sectors, but also would help ease the cost of compliance on those sectors.

#### Robust transit reform solves high cost of emission reduction—previous studies flawed

Winkelman et al ‘9

Steve Winkelman is director of the Transportation Program at the Center for Clean Air Policy (CCAP). Allison Bishins is a policy associate for transportation and climate change at CCAP. Chuck Kooshian is a Planner with the El Paso Department of Planning and Development. “Cost-Effective GHG Reductions through

Smart Growth & Improved Transportation Choices: An economic case for investment of cap-and-trade revenues,” <http://www.reconnectingamerica.org/public/display_asset/ccapsmartgrowthco2_june_2009_final_pdf?docid=306>, June 2009.

Moreover, typical GHG reduction analyses often miss the emissions reductions and economic benefits of improved transportation choices and assume a high cost per ton for these reductions. For example, EIA’s analysis, which assumes substantial growth in VMT from today’s levels, projected that only 3 percent of national emissions reductions would come from transportation, with 92 percent of reductions from the electricity sector.

#### Robust transit reform reduces costs of all other climate change policy

Winkelman et al ‘9

Steve Winkelman is director of the Transportation Program at the Center for Clean Air Policy (CCAP). Allison Bishins is a policy associate for transportation and climate change at CCAP. Chuck Kooshian is a Planner with the El Paso Department of Planning and Development. “Cost-Effective GHG Reductions through

Smart Growth & Improved Transportation Choices: An economic case for investment of cap-and-trade revenues,” <http://www.reconnectingamerica.org/public/display_asset/ccapsmartgrowthco2_june_2009_final_pdf?docid=306>, June 2009.

Burchell and Mukherji updated this analysis and applied it nationally to estimate costs under smart growth scenarios compared to trend development over the period 2000–2025. They found that sprawl produces a 21 percent increase in amount of undeveloped land converted to developed land. This increases water and sewer costs by 6.6 percent and increases local road costs by 9.2 percent. Altogether, the costs of sprawl increase the cost of housing by 8 percent, or $13,000 per dwelling unit.27 Burchell and Mukherji did not estimate a VMT savings or concomitant CO2 reductions for the managed growth scenario. Many other studies of managed growth scenarios, including those cited elsewhere in this paper, find substantial VMT savings. The combination of reduced VMT and reduced public and private costs will create cost savings for each ton of CO2 reduced.

#### robust transit reform shields economy from damage from climate policy

Winkelman et al ‘9

Steve Winkelman is director of the Transportation Program at the Center for Clean Air Policy (CCAP). Allison Bishins is a policy associate for transportation and climate change at CCAP. Chuck Kooshian is a Planner with the El Paso Department of Planning and Development. “Cost-Effective GHG Reductions through

Smart Growth & Improved Transportation Choices: An economic case for investment of cap-and-trade revenues,” <http://www.reconnectingamerica.org/public/display_asset/ccapsmartgrowthco2_june_2009_final_pdf?docid=306>, June 2009.

Reducing per-capita VMT by 10 percent would relieve some of the abatement burden from other sectors of the economy. The total value of emissions allowances that would be needed by other sectors to cover the same number of tons is $8.8 billion per year in the 2030 carbon market ($61 per ton in 2006 dollars x 145 million tons). This savings actually understates the improvement in the overall cost effectiveness of the legislation, however, as VMT reductions would reduce the price of remaining allowances for all regulated entities.

### Modelling I/L

#### US emissions policy modeled globally- our reductions must come first

**Brown 2**, Donald, Phillip R. Allen Professor of Economics, American Heat, pg. 239

The past four chapters examined the ethical dimensions of four arguments frequently made in opposition to global warming programs in the United States. However, **the most important ethical question entailed by global warming that the U**nited **S**tates **needs to face is most probably the issue of what is its fair share of total global emissions that will maintain atmosphere levels of greenhouse gases at safe levels.** The reason why this question is so consequential is that **this unresolved issue is the largest barrier currently blocking an international consenseus on how to approach global warming.** This is so because the questions of what is a fair share of greenhouse gas emissions for each nation – although it has not been directly on the negotiation table – is at the very center of a number of recent impasses in climate negotiations. For instance, **the developing nations have strongly resisted making commitments to reduce emissions pushed by the U**nited **S**tates **until** the developed nations and **the United States** in particular, **agree to reduce emissions to an equitable level.** The poorer nations are afraid that if they agree to cut back on carbon emissions now, the developed nations will demand that the poorer nations cut back further in the future rather than agree to a fair allocation for all nations. Because those rich nations that are most responsible for the greenhouse emergency have shown little interest in acknowledging their proportional responsibility for the existing problem, the poorer nations are often refusing to compromise on other issues.

### AT: CAP/TRADE or CAFÉ SOLVES

#### Failure to invest in mass transit leads to massive consumption increases that will swamp cap-and-Trade and café improvements

Winkelman et al ‘9

Steve Winkelman is director of the Transportation Program at the Center for Clean Air Policy (CCAP). Allison Bishins is a policy associate for transportation and climate change at CCAP. Chuck Kooshian is a Planner with the El Paso Department of Planning and Development. “Cost-Effective GHG Reductions through

Smart Growth & Improved Transportation Choices: An economic case for investment of cap-and-trade revenues,” <http://www.reconnectingamerica.org/public/display_asset/ccapsmartgrowthco2_june_2009_final_pdf?docid=306>, June 2009.

Nearly one third of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in the U.S. come from the transportation sector, making it the nation’s largest end-use source of emissions. Moreover, transportation is the fastest growing source of U.S. emissions, accounting for almost half of the net increase in total U.S. emissions between 1990 and 2007.1 Transportation GHG emissions are a result of three drivers — vehicle fuel efficiency, fuel emissions and how much people drive, as measured in vehicle miles traveled (VMT). In 2007, Congress addressed the first two drivers by improving Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) standards and mandating reduced GHG intensity of motor fuels. However, Congress has not put the same effort into improving travel choices to address how much people drive. Historically, U.S. transportation policy and infrastructure investments tend to encourage more driving. If we do not change how we invest in transportation, driving will continue to increase, effectively offsetting the emissions savings expected from the recently improved fuel efficiency and low carbon fuels requirements.

#### cap-and-trade can’t solve transportation emissions, Plan solves, boosts economy

Winkelman et al ‘9

Steve Winkelman is director of the Transportation Program at the Center for Clean Air Policy (CCAP). Allison Bishins is a policy associate for transportation and climate change at CCAP. Chuck Kooshian is a Planner with the El Paso Department of Planning and Development. “Cost-Effective GHG Reductions through

Smart Growth & Improved Transportation Choices: An economic case for investment of cap-and-trade revenues,” <http://www.reconnectingamerica.org/public/display_asset/ccapsmartgrowthco2_june_2009_final_pdf?docid=306>, June 2009.

The price signal from a cap-and-trade system, alone, will be insufficient to yield significant GHG reductions in the transportation sector, regardless of their cost-effectiveness. A narrow focus on consumer price response leaves cost-effective tons ‘on the table’ by ignoring broader economic benefits that can be achieved with changes in transportation and land use policies and practices. Real-estate developers and municipal economic development agencies departments fully appreciate these benefits. Federal climate and transportation policy should also account for such economic benefits and actively promote efficient land use patterns, improved travel choices and increased system efficiency that can reduce GHGs and bolster the U.S. economy.

### AT: Transit Doesn’t Solve Emissions

#### Previous low estimates for emission reductions flawed

Winkelman et al ‘9

Steve Winkelman is director of the Transportation Program at the Center for Clean Air Policy (CCAP). Allison Bishins is a policy associate for transportation and climate change at CCAP. Chuck Kooshian is a Planner with the El Paso Department of Planning and Development. “Cost-Effective GHG Reductions through

Smart Growth & Improved Transportation Choices: An economic case for investment of cap-and-trade revenues,” <http://www.reconnectingamerica.org/public/display_asset/ccapsmartgrowthco2_june_2009_final_pdf?docid=306>, June 2009.

Such analysis typically overlooks, for example, the evidence that transit-oriented development fosters more walk trips and shorter vehicle trips, yielding up to four times the CO2 benefit resulting just from transit ridership, which is what the models typically include.13 They also miss broader benefits of smart growth, which we document in this paper, including lower infrastructure costs, consumer fuel cost savings and increased local tax revenues. While not all of these benefits can be quantified on a dollar-per-ton basis, many can. Similarly, many GHG studies have not considered how pricing strategies, like pay-as-you-drive insurance and congestion pricing, can cut GHGs while producing significant consumer cost and time savings.

### Plan = Prereq to Solve Climate

#### Robust transit reform and investment is a prerequisite to all Emission/consumption reduction policies

Winkelman et al ‘9

Steve Winkelman is director of the Transportation Program at the Center for Clean Air Policy (CCAP). Allison Bishins is a policy associate for transportation and climate change at CCAP. Chuck Kooshian is a Planner with the El Paso Department of Planning and Development. “Cost-Effective GHG Reductions through

Smart Growth & Improved Transportation Choices: An economic case for investment of cap-and-trade revenues,” <http://www.reconnectingamerica.org/public/display_asset/ccapsmartgrowthco2_june_2009_final_pdf?docid=306>, June 2009.

The price signal from a cap-and-trade system will not be effective in reducing VMT, due to market imperfections and limited transportation choices in many parts of the country.2 Typical GHG reduction analyses miss the emissions reductions and economic benefits of improved transportation choices and assume a high “cost per ton” for these reductions. They also overlook broader benefits of smart growth and transportation pricing including lower infrastructure costs, consumer fuel cost savings, time saved, lower insurance costs and increased local tax revenues.

#### ALl Current and future emissions and dependence reductions are being swamped by vehicle emissions—transit improvement are prerequisite to solving climate

Winkelman et al ‘9

Steve Winkelman is director of the Transportation Program at the Center for Clean Air Policy (CCAP). Allison Bishins is a policy associate for transportation and climate change at CCAP. Chuck Kooshian is a Planner with the El Paso Department of Planning and Development. “Cost-Effective GHG Reductions through

Smart Growth & Improved Transportation Choices: An economic case for investment of cap-and-trade revenues,” <http://www.reconnectingamerica.org/public/display_asset/ccapsmartgrowthco2_june_2009_final_pdf?docid=306>, June 2009.

Congress recognized the important role of transportation in the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (EISA 2007), in which it mandated 35 mile per gallon Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) standards by 2035 and a roughly 10 percent reduction in the GHG intensity of motor fuels by 2020. However, it did not address the third important factor for transportation emissions — how much people drive. Existing U.S. transportation laws and the transportation infrastructure investments they support tend to encourage more driving, increased overall transportation sector GHG emissions and are undercutting our ability to reduce GHG emissions reductions in the transportation sector. Between 1977 and 2007, driving, measured in vehicle miles traveled (VMT), grew by 110 percent, even though U.S. population increased only 37 percent.6 If we do not change how we invest in transportation, driving will continue to increase, effectively offsetting the emissions savings expected from the recently improved fuel efficiency and low carbon fuels requirements in EISA 2007,7 and even the new vehicle standards proposed by the Administration (35.5 mpg by 2016).

### Climate 🡪 Extinction: NAC

#### Warming causes rapid climate switch and near term ice age

Fagan 2k

Brian Fagan is Brian Murray Fagan is being emeritus professor of Anthropology at the University of California, Santa Barbara. *The Little Ice Age,* p. 213-4

Younger Dryas Europe was sparsely populated by hunter-gatherer groups that were mobile enough to adapt to rapidly changing environmental conditions. What would happen today if northern downwelling were to slow down or cease and plunge Europe into near-glacial cold? Anthropogenic global warming could easily flip the switch. Models of ocean circulation patterns hint that even a modest increase in fresh meltwater inflow into arctic seas could choke off downwelling in the North Atlantic. The pulse of fresh water would float atop the dense, salty Gulf Stream, just as it did 11.000 years ago forming a temporary "lid" that would effectively prevent the Gulf Stream water from cooling and sinking. A sea ice cap could form in short order, preventing the Gulf Stream from starting up again, and trigger an intensely cold regimen in Europe within perhaps a few years. No one can predict how long such a cold snap would last. A few unusually warm summers might melt the ice and expose the Gulf Stream, allowing downwelling to resume and milder climate to return. Or evaporation of water vapor in the tropical Atlantic Far from the ice sheets could cause such a buildup of salt water that down- welling would begin at the edges of the ice zone, far from the traditional spots, and causing a rapid warmup of European climate.

### AT: Warming Doesn’t 🡪War

#### Warming makes multiple scenarios for war possible- prefer our internal link magnitude

**Schwartz and Randall ‘3**, [Peter and Douglas, Members of the National Science Foundation, Oct 2003, <http://www.climate.org/PDF/clim_change_scenario.pdf>, online 2009]

The report explores how such **an abrupt climate change scenario could potentially de-stabilize the geo-political environment**, **leading to** skirmishes, battles, and even **war due to resource constraints such as**: 1) **Food shortages due to decreases in** net global **ag**ricultural **production**  2) **Decreased availability** and quality **of fresh water in key regions** due to shifted precipitation patters, causing more frequent floods and droughts 3) **Disrupted access to energy supplies** due to extensive sea ice and storminess As global and local carrying capacities are reduced, **tensions could mount** around the world, leading to two fundamental strategies: defensive and offensive. **Nations with the resources to do so may build virtual fortresses around their countries**, preserving resources for themselves. **Less fortunate nations** especially those with ancient enmities with their neighbors, **may initiate in struggles for access to food, clean water, or energy.** Unlikely alliances could be formed as defense priorities shift and the goal is resources for survival rather than religion, ideology, or national honor.

## \*\*\*OIL DEPENDENCE\*\*\*

### Oil Dependence Inherency

#### lack of robust public transit is increasing us oil dependence

Bailey ‘7

Linda Bailey is Senior Associate for Transportation at ICF International. “Public Transportation and Petroleum Savings in the U.S.: Reducing Dependence on Oil, <http://www.icfi.com/Markets/Transportation/doc_files/public-transportation.pdf>, January, Prepared for:

American Public Transportation Association.

This section explores the effects of a dramatic expansion of public transportation service and usage across the U.S. Public transportation currently provides a significant opportunity for households in the U.S. to reduce their petroleum consumption, and for the nation to reduce its dependence on petroleum as a fuel source. However, that opportunity is limited by the lack of public transportation services in many areas of cities, suburbs, and rural regions. The figure below shows the current distribution of households in terms of proximity to public transportation (defined as within threequarters of a mile), within the larger area (defined as within 30 miles), and far from any public transportation (beyond 30 miles).

### Transit Solves Oil Dependence

#### Robust Transit key point where to solve domestic issues and foreign oil dependence

Bailey ‘7

Linda Bailey is Senior Associate for Transportation at ICF International. “Public Transportation and Petroleum Savings in the U.S.: Reducing Dependence on Oil, <http://www.icfi.com/Markets/Transportation/doc_files/public-transportation.pdf>, January, Prepared for:

American Public Transportation Association.

Petroleum consumption is a major issue for the household budget, and for our nation. Our dependence on petroleum imported from the Middle East makes fuel consumption a national security issue; our stores and manufacturers depend on diesel-powered freight movement, making it an economic issue; and individuals who have no other means to get to work must pay the market price for gasoline, making it a household budget issue. Public transportation is an important part of reducing oil dependence, and this report quantifies the role that public transportation is playing for households and the nation, and what role it could play. The average price of gasoline in the U.S. was $2.73 per gallon for the year through September, including taxes (EIA, September 4, 2006). The majority of Americans continue to have few choices but to pay at the pump to get where they need to go. According to the 2001 National Household Transportation Survey (NHTS 2001), only half of all households have access to public transportation. Of those residents, not all have service that can deliver them to their destinations for work, school, shopping, and socializing. Of those who can, many have seized the opportunity to save money on fuel consumption by taking public transportation.

#### Direct correlation between robust transit reform and reduced oil dependence

Bailey, Mokhtarian, & Little ‘8

Linda Bailey is Senior Associate for Transportation at ICF International. Patricia Lyon MokhtarianProfessor, Civil and Environmental Engineering, Chair, Transportation Technology and Policy Graduate Program, and Associate Director for Education, Institute of Transportation Studies at University of California, Davis. Andrew Little is president of Urban Policy Research Institute. “The Broader Connection between Public Transportation, Energy Conservation and Greenhouse Gas Reduction,” <http://www.apta.com/research/info/online/documents/land_use.pdf>, February.

In January 2007, APTA released an ICF International analysis that quantified the direct relationship between public transportation use and petroleum conservation in the United States. That study quantified the amount of petroleum that households are saving by taking public transportation in a direct, one-for-one analysis.

#### Public transit massively reduces reliance on oil

**Millar ‘9**, [Bob, President of APTA, <http://www.publictransportation.org/facts/#hw07>, online 2009, DB]

Each year, **public transport**ation **use in the U.S. saves 1.4 billion gallons of gasoline.** This represents almost 4 million gallons of gasoline per day. **The “leverage effect” of public transport**ation**, supporting transport**ation **efficient land use patterns, saves 4.2 billion gallons of gasoline.** Each year, public transportation use saves the equivalent of 34 supertankers of oil, or a supertanker leaving the Middle East every 11 days. Each year, public transportation use save the equivalent of 140,769 service station tanker truck trips clogging our streets each year. Public transportation use saves the equivalent of 300,000 fewer automobile fill-ups every day. **The typical public transit rider consumes on average one half of the oil consumed by an automobile rider.**

### AT: No Oil Dependence

#### Yes we are

Harris 4-3

David, Executive Director, AJC, and Senior Associate, St. Antony's College, Oxford University, “America's Achilles' Heel,” http://www.huffingtonpost.com/david-harris/americas-achilles-heel\_b\_844135.html

Ever since 1973, when the Arab Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (AOPEC) first imposed a crippling oil boycott, one president after another has promised to wean us off our dependence on unstable sources of oil. With great solemnity, our leaders have spoken of the dangers of our vulnerability, while pledging to usher in a new energy era. Yet, nearly four decades after the first oil shock, startlingly, our dependence on imported oil has jumped from one-third of total consumption to nearly two-thirds. So much for pledges and promises. Meanwhile, take a country like Brazil, nearly the size of our own. In 1973, it imported approximately 80 percent of its oil needs. Today, by contrast, the country is self-sufficient. The difference between the United States and Brazil? Above all, national will. Brazil's leaders didn't just talk up a good game. They acted with determination. They shifted vehicles to flex fuel, drawing on domestically-grown sugar cane to produce ethanol. They focused on renewable energy sources and made great strides. They explored for offshore oil and found vast deposits. The results speak for themselves. How tragic that we haven't quite followed suit! Take sugar-based ethanol as one telling example of the mess we're in. It's been tough to import for our vehicles. Why? Thanks to corn-growing states fearful of the competition, we've put in place high tariffs that make it prohibitively expensive to import from Brazil. That leaves us with corn-based ethanol, whose energy yield is approximately one-seventh -- yes, one-seventh -- of its sugar-based counterpart. We've had one chance after another to get serious, but to no avail. Think back to President Jimmy Carter's efforts to set an example of energy efficiency in the White House. Rather than emulate him, many Americans derided the chief executive. How dare we Americans be asked to drive less, drive slower, drive smaller, stay cooler in winter, or warmer in summer! Aren't these all violations of our birthright? Perhaps our best chance to get off the dime came right after 9/11. President Bush had the American people in the palm of his hand. He could have asked for just about anything he billed as serving America's vital interests, and he would have gotten it. At AJC, we urged the White House to seize the moment. We even had the chutzpah to draft a speech we hoped the president might deliver on the need to get serious -- and fast -- on energy security, and shared it with top White House advisers. But, in the end, the president didn't seize the moment and, within a short time, we were back to the all-too-familiar pattern of partisan and interest-group squabbling when it comes to energy. The result is that today we're on tenterhooks as Middle East crises unfold one after another, fearful of where the oil will come from, how much more prices will rise, and whether more costly oil will damage the chances for a sustained economic recovery.

### Supply Shocks

#### Oil Market Stretched Thin Now—Hormuz Shutdown Create Massive Shocks

The Economist ‘12

The new grease? How to assess the risks of a 2012 oil shock Mar 10th 2012 http://www.economist.com/node/21549949

But slightly rosier growth prospects are only part of the story. A more important driver of dearer oil has been disruptions in supply. All told, the oil market has probably lost more than 1m barrels a day (b/d) of supply in recent months. A variety of non-Iranian troubles, from a pipeline dispute with South Sudan to mechanical problems in the North Sea, have knocked some 700,000 b/d off supply. Another 500,000 b/d or so of Iranian oil is temporarily off the market thanks both to the effects of European sanctions and a payment dispute with China. The cushion of spare supply is thin. Oil stocks in rich countries are at a five-year low. The extent of OPEC’s spare capacity is uncertain. Saudi Arabia is pumping some 10m b/d, a near-record high (see chart 1). And there is the threat of far bigger supply disruptions if Iran were ever to carry out its threat to close the Strait of Hormuz, through which 17m barrels of oil pass every day, some 20% of global supply. Even a temporary closure would imply a disruption to dwarf any previous oil shock. The 1973 Arab oil embargo, for instance, involved less than 5m b/d.

#### Supply Disruptions Coming—Drilling Empirically Can’t Solve

Lacey ‘12

[Stephen Lacey](http://thinkprogress.org/author/stephen/) is a reporter/blogger for Climate Progress, where he writes on clean energy policy, technologies, and finance. on May 10, 2012 [CBO Report: Boosting Oil Production Won’t Protect Americans From Gasoline Price Shocks](http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2012/05/10/481523/cbo-report-boosting-oil-production-wont-protect-americans-from-gasoline-price-shocks/) http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2012/05/10/481523/cbo-report-boosting-oil-production-wont-protect-americans-from-gasoline-price-shocks/

More domestic drilling does not make America less susceptible to global supply disruptions or protect consumers from gasoline price volatility, according to [a new analysis](http://www.cbo.gov/sites/default/files/cbofiles/attachments/05-09-EnergySecurity.pdf) from the Congressional Budget Office. The CBO report reviewed different policies intended to make the country more energy secure, concluding that the only effective tool for shielding businesses and consumers from price spikes is to use less oil. Because oil is sold on the global market, CBO concludes that increasing domestic oil production would do little to influence rising gas prices in the U.S. These findings back up historical experience. According to [**an analysis**](http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/46822698/ns/us_news-life/t/more-us-drilling-didnt-drop-gas-prices-data-show/#.T6vQ01J_CU4) of 36 years of gasoline prices and domestic oil production conducted by the Associated Press, there is zero statistical correlation between increased drilling and lower prices at the gas pump. The CBO report creates a dilemma for drilling proponents. Even if increased drilling did substantially lower gas prices — which it has not – the agency says those lower prices would actually make the country less secure from price shocks: Policies that promoted greater production of oil in the United States would probably not protect U.S. consumers from sudden worldwide increases in oil prices stemming from supply disruptions elsewhere in the world, even if increased production lowered the world price of oil on an ongoing basis. In fact, such lower prices would encourage greater use of oil, thus making consumers more vulnerable to increases in oil prices. Even if the United States increased production and became a net exporter of oil, U.S. consumers would still be exposed to gasoline prices that rose and fell in response to disruptions around the world.

#### Oil markets on the brink now –ready for huge shock

Levine ‘12

Author Steve LeVine is a contributing editor at Foreign Policy, a Schwartz Fellow at the New America Foundation, and author of The Oil and the Glory, a history of oil told through the 1990s-2000s oil rush on the Caspian Sea. He is also an adjunct professor at the Georgetown University School of Foreign Service, where he teaches energy and security in the Security Studies Program. , "The Weekly Wrap - March 2, 2012," 3/2/12oilandglory.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/03/02/the\_weekly\_wrap\_march\_2\_2012, AD 3/20/12

This does not mean that oil's pivotal role in economic robustness has vanished. The U.S. crude oil bill remains "a primary concern for the sustainability of economic growth," Ahn writes. The oil market is in an ultra-jittery state. There is the worry of Iran shutting the Strait of Hormuz in addition to a cascade of unpredictable additional events should Israel attack Iran. There is only a sliver of spare production capacity since Saudi Arabia has raised oil production to 11 million barrels a day, just shy of its claimed 12.5 million-barrel-a-day capacity. When there is little spare capacity, any unplanned event such as bad weather or a skirmish can incite oil traders to bid up oil prices. Just yesterday, oil prices soared to their highest level since the summer of 2008 -- European-traded Brent rose by 5 percent, surpassing $128 a barrel -- on a rumor of a pipeline explosion in Saudi Arabia (the price is down today now that this particular panic has subsided, Reuters reports.).

#### World oil market is tight – new supply disruptions collapse the global economy recovery.

Wolf ‘12

Martin Wolf, associate editor and chief economics commentator at the Financial Times, widely considered to be one of the world's most influential writers on economics. “Prepare for a new era of oil shocks”. The Financial Times. March 27, 2012. http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/41ba759a-7730-11e1-baf3-00144feab49a.html#axzz1qNuyqGNk

Yet, despite the absurd politicking, we should be concerned about the economic impact of high oil prices: a rise of $10 in the price of oil shifts $320bn a year from higher-spending consumers to lower-spending producers, within and across countries. The 15 per cent rise since December 2011 would shift close to $500bn. The real price of oil is also very high, by historical standards (see chart). Further rises would take the world into uncharted territory. In short, higher oil prices are a threat. So what is going to happen? In a recent note, Goldman Sachs argues that a 10 per cent rise in oil prices tends to lower US gross domestic product by 0.2 percentage points after one year and by 0.4 percentage points after two. In the European Union, the impact is smaller: a reduction of 0.2 percentage points in the first year, but no further reduction thereafter. Since the actual rise has been 15 per cent since December, the impact on US and EU GDP would be a reduction of 0.3 percentage points over the first year – appreciable, but not calamitous. Such a price rise would lower US household incomes by about 0.5 per cent. Moreover, crossing the threshold of $4 a gallon might be significant when confidence is fragile, as it is now. Goldman also suggests the factors that would determine the size of any adverse impact. The first is whether the rise in prices is caused by demand or a shock to supply, with the latter being more disruptive. The answer, it suggests, is that demand is now the principal cause of higher prices, though the tightening of sanctions on Iran would be more important. The Paris-based International Energy Agency, in its latest monthly report, even qualifies this view. It agrees that “there may be no actual physical supply disruption at present deriving from the Iranian ‘issue’. But there are ongoing non-OPEC outages totalling around 750,000 barrels a day”. The second factor is how much spare capacity exists. The answer: not much. Inventories in high-income oil markets are low (see chart). Saudi Arabian production is now at 30-year highs, which suggests limited spare capacity. Moreover, the growth of world oil supply has been persistently slow, at just below 1 per cent a year over the past decade, despite generally high oil prices. Thus, capacity is structurally tight. That explains the level and the volatility of prices over the past decade. With potential global economic growth at 4 per cent a year, oil supply growing at 1 per cent and the lack of easy alternatives to oil as a transport fuel, supply is likely to become tighter. A third factor is what is happening in other commodity markets. Here the news is good: natural gas prices have been falling, while agricultural prices have not been so much of a problem this year. This should limit the inflationary impact. A final consideration is the monetary response. Here the news remains favourable. Central banks are likely to ignore movements in commodity prices, particularly ones whose impact is contractionary, provided they see no pass-through into wages. They are right to do so. In all, Goldman concludes, the price increase is a “brake”, not a “break”, in growth. But Fatih Birol, the IEA’s chief economist, warns against too much complacency. He notes that the EU’s net imports of oil will cost 2.8 per cent of GDP at present prices, against an average of 1.7 per cent between 2000 and 2010. Given the frailties of the EU economy, the dangers are evident. Furthermore, in this stressed oil market, further spikes in prices are quite possible. A war with Iran may be the most frightening possibility. But danger is always present, given the political instabilities in places where oil is produced. Moreover, the world is going to remain stuck in this danger zone, given the soaring demand for oil from rapidly growing emerging countries. The IEA suggests that Chinese sales of private light-duty vehicles will reach 50m a year by 2035, even under an energy-efficient scenario. The implications of such growth in vehicle fleets are quite obvious. The world will be vulnerable to high oil prices and repeated shocks, so long as supply is stagnant, demand buoyant and unrest likely – in short, so long as it remains as it now is. For the US, the best response would be to lower the oil-intensity of its economy, to reduce vulnerability to these shocks. Higher prices would help deliver this. But why does it let all the revenue go to foreigners? It makes far more sense to tax imports and keep some of it, instead.

#### Supply Crunch Coming: Emerging Demand

The Economist ‘12

Feeling peaky Apr 21st 2012 The economic impact of high oil prices http://www.economist.com/node/21553034?zid=298&ah=0bc99f9da8f185b2964b6cef412227be

A number of countries (including Britain, Egypt and Indonesia) have turned from net oil exporters into importers in recent years. And although rich countries have curbed their energy-guzzling a little, demand continues to surge in emerging markets.

This has left the oil market very vulnerable to temporary supply disruptions, such as the war in Libya. Speaking at a conference in Dublin this week, organised by the Institute of International and European Affairs and the Association for the Study of Peak Oil and Gas, Chris Skrebowski, a consulting editor of Petroleum Review, argued that spare capacity in the oil market could be eroded by 2015.

#### Different from previous rises, independent from demand-driven growth, crashes the economy

Annunziata ‘12

 Marco, Chief Economist of General Electric Co, PhD in Economics from Princeton, "Shock 'n' oil," www.voxeu.org/index.php?q=node/7736, AD 3/20/12

Oil prices (Brent) are up 14% since the beginning of the year. How bad is this, and how bad can it get? The consensus so far is that this is mostly a demand-driven move rather than a supply shock: after the gloom of Q4, data and news flow have been encouraging, with better than expected activity figures in the US, progress on the Eurozone-crisis front, and resilience in China’s economy. The rise in oil prices has been led and accompanied by a 16% surge in stock prices since late-November (S&P500). And the mini-correction of the last couple of days has preserved the correlation: equities inched down 2.2% and oil prices lost 3%. If oil prices had been driven up by a supply shock, or fears of a supply shock, this should be reflected in a more pessimistic growth outlook and a weaker performance of equities. A demand-driven price move is more benign, so in principle the oil price rise should act as a gentle brake on the global recovery and be still consistent with an outlook of moderate but resilient growth. There is a disturbing feeling of déjà vu, however. At the beginning of last year we also saw a sharp demand-driven rise in oil prices, but the accompanying greater optimism on global growth was soon replaced by dismay as the recovery lost momentum. Are we in for the same disappointment? Last year’s price rise was sharper. Over the same period Brent prices climbed 22% compared to this year’s 14%. But last year we had started from a lower level, whereas today, at about $125pb Brent, we are already at the peak reached in April 2011. The only time we have seen higher levels was in the 2008 oil price spike that preceded the Great Recession. While prices are now higher, last year’s oil price rise was compounded by two additional shocks, the tsunami in Japan and a sudden worsening of the Eurozone crisis – so an oil price rise alone should not have the same adverse impact on growth. Moreover, this year food price dynamics have been much more subdued, whereas last year they exacerbated the rise in fuel prices pushing inflation rates up and eroding consumer purchasing power, especially in emerging markets. Overall therefore, the rise in oil prices so far does not pose an excessive threat to growth. There are three caveats, however. First, equities and oil prices have something else in common besides the correlation with global growth. They are both higher-yield assets in a world of yield-free risk-free assets and ample liquidity (the ECB’s balance sheet just breached the €3 trillion mark, 60% higher than last spring). Global liquidity is probably amplifying fluctuations in the prices of risky assets. That implies a greater risk of oil prices running ahead off supply/demand fundamentals, with adverse effects on global growth. Second, a further sustained rise in oil prices, even if demand-driven, would take us into uncharted territory. We have never before seen a period of ‘normal’ global growth with oil prices in excess of $120 a barrel, and it is hard to say with full confidence that it would be sustainable. Third, if the price increase so far is mostly demand-driven, then by definition we are fully exposed to the impact of a supply shock, which would hit us when oil prices are already very high. Given the tensions surrounding Iran’s nuclear programme, this is not good news. Spare capacity in oil is limited, and inadequate to offset a sudden disruption of shipments transiting through the Strait of Hormuz. Oil prices would jump well above $150 a barrel (Brent); if they stayed at those levels for a prolonged period they could lower global growth by about one percentage point.

### Supply Shocks – Saudi Arabia

#### Supply Crunch Coming—Saudis Are Running Out

Krane ‘12

Krane researches Gulf energy policy at Cambridge University's Judge Business School. [Wall Street Journal](http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/03/26/us-iran-usa-idUSBRE82P07120120326),

26 April, 2012 The End of the Saudi Oil Reserve Margin http://robinwestenra.blogspot.com/2012/04/saudis-unable-to-cushion-oil-supply.html

With domestic electricity demand rising 10% per year in Saudi Arabia, the kingdom now devours more than a quarter of its oil production—nearly three million barrels per day. International Energy Agency figures show that Saudi Arabia now consumes more oil than Germany, an industrialized country with triple the population and an economy nearly five times as large.

In the medium-term, Saudi Arabia is in danger of losing its all-important "reserve margin" of oil production that so often calms market volatility. Loss of this spare capacity would remove a crucial safety mechanism from the global economy, to say nothing of tying America's hands when it comes to future moves against oil states.

Longer-term, the kingdom's very exports are at risk. A projection by Jadwa Investment of Riyadh shows that, at current rates of consumption growth, the Saudi reserve margin will dwindle until it disappears sometime before 2020. At that point, the Saudis would begin diverting oil destined for export into the domestic market.

Following the trend further, Jadwa finds that Saudi Arabia will consume its entire production capacity of 12.5 million barrels per day at home by 2043. London's Chatham House finds that the kingdom will become a net oil importer even earlier, by 2038.

#### GCC spare capacity doesn’t solve shocks—means no cushion for future disruptions

Houser and Mohan '12

Trevor, partner at RHG, visiting fellow at the Peterson Institute for International Economics in DC, adjunct lecturer at the City College of New York, member of CFR; Shashank, leads the development and management of RHG's eocnomic models and quantitative tools, MPA from School of International and Public Affairs at Columbia University , "Can the Saudis Save the Oil Market?" 1/17/12rhgroup.net/notes/can-the-saudis-save-the-oil-market, AD 3/29/12

With more GCC spare capacity than total Iranian supply, what’s the problem? First, while there is a high degree of market confidence that Saudi Arabia’s can increase and sustain production from the current 9.8 million to 11-11.5 million barrels per day, there is considerable doubt about the Kingdom’s ability to effectively tap the remaining 500,000-1,000,000 bpd of capacity. The Kingdom is already testing historic highs in terms of overall oil output, and reaching the upper end of current production capacity will likely yield heavier and higher sulfur crudes that are poor substitutes for Iranian supply. More important, however, is the impact a significant increase in GCC output on the oil market’s ability to weather additional supply shocks. There is an inverse correlation between GCC spare capacity and global oil prices (Figure 2). In the short-term, non-OPEC supply is relatively fixed. So the market balances either through an increase in OPEC output, a reduction in demand through higher prices (demand rationing), or some combination of both. If the GCC pumps more oil to replace Iranian supply the market will have to rely on demand rationing should any number of other supply disruptions occur during the coming year. And with increased security concerns in Iraq, continued civil strife in Nigeria, oil transit disputes in Sudan and production problems in the North Sea, there is no shortage of potential supply-side risks on the horizon. Lower GCC spare capacity leaves the market more exposed to demand shocks as well. In their last oil market report, the IEA marked down their global demand estimates for 2012 by 200,000 bpd, primarily on the back of economic weakness in the Eurozone. OPEC followed suit in their January report out yesterday. Should EU growth surprise on the upside, or Chinese growth not slow as quickly as expected, there would be little room to increase OPEC output.

#### OPEC spare capacity insufficient –Saudi Arabia can’t increase production

McNally '12

Robert McNally is the founder and president of the Rapidan Group, a consulting group specializing in energy markets and policymaking. He has previously served as an oil market analyst with Energy Security Analysis, a market and policy analyst for Tudor Investment Corporation, special assistant to the president on the National Economic Council, and senior director for international energy on the National Security Council, MA in economics from Johns Hopkins, "Managing Oil Market Disruption in a Confrontation with Iran," CFR, Jan 2012, http://www.cfr.org/iran/managing-oil-market-disruption-confrontation-iran/p27171, AD 3/21/12

There is currently little margin for error in the global oil market. As an informal rule of thumb, oil market analysts believe that OPEC needs to hold at least 5 percent of global oil demand in “spare”— production capacity that is not normally used but that can be brought online quickly—in order to maintain stable prices. In today’s 90 mb/d market, that desirable spare capacity cushion is about 4.5 mb/d. According to the U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA), OPEC’s spare capacity is 2.8 mb/d and will climb to about 3.9 mb/d this summer, which is deeply inadequate given the geopolitical landscape in 2012. Moreover, official estimates of OPEC’s spare capacity are probably inflated, and inescapably dependent on untested assumptions of Saudi total production capacity. Nearly all of OPEC’s spare capacity is held in Saudi Arabia; consequently, estimates of OPEC’s spare capacity hinge on how much Riyadh can produce relative to how much it is already producing. Saudi oil minister Ali Naimi has recently said Saudi Arabia holds roughly 2.5 mb/d in spare and that the Kingdom can produce a total of 12.5 mb/d.2 Many market participants, however, doubt that Saudi Arabia can produce that much oil. On an annual basis, Saudi Arabia has not produced more than 10 mb/d since 1981.3 Goldman Sachs estimates total Saudi capacity to be around 10.5 mb/d and other reports indicate Saudi Arabia could produce 11 mb/d only “if pushed.”4 In terms of current production levels, Saudi Arabia’s oil minister announced recently Saudi crude production is over 10 mb/d, similar to EIA’s estimate.5 If true, and considered alongside Goldman Sachs’ estimate of 10.5 mb/d in total Saudi production capacity, this would suggest Saudi spare capacity is just 0.5 mb/d (see Figure 1). Although EIA projects spare capacity will rise by over 1 mb/d by summer, a paucity of excess capacity leaves the oil market with precious little margin for error should Iranian supplies be disrupted. Moreover, the 5 percent spare capacity rule of thumb applies best when geopolitical conditions are calm, as they were through most of the 1990s, when OPEC’s spare capacity was about 5 percent and oil prices were relatively stable. Since 2003, however, OPEC’s spare capacity has been low and geopolitical disruption risks (including Iraq, Nigeria, Venezuela, Yemen, and Libya) have been high. Consequently, oil prices have been high and volatile. Given current and threatened disruptions, OPEC will need to hold more than 5 percent to reassure traders and stabilize prices. Achieving that comfort margin, however, is unlikely in the foreseeable future.

#### Reserves and fill-in ability questionable

Rizvi 2/28

M. Mahtab Alam Rizvi is Associate Fellow at the Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses, New Delhi, "Tougher US Sanctions against Iran: Global Reactions and Implications," 2/28/12 Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses, http://idsa.in/backgrounder/TougherUSSanctionsagainstIran\_mmarizvi\_28022012, AD 2/29/12

Saudi Arabia immediately offered its services to fill any supply gap that will emerge from the fall in Iranian oil exports due to the sanctions. It had similarly shored up oil supplies when Libyan oil became unavailable during military operations in 2011. The Saudi Oil Minister, Ali al-Naimi, said on January 7 that Saudi Arabia, the world’s largest oil exporter and the only one in OPEC with significant reserves to spare, was ready to meet any increase in demand.15 However, the Saudi claim to fill any supply gap is questionable. It is reported that nine out of the 21 oil fields in Saudi Arabia are declining. The largest oil field of Saudi Arabia and currently the largest conventional oil field in the world, Ghawar, which produced half of Saudi Arabia’s total oil production over the last 50 years, is declining.16 Yet, the IEA director for energy markets and security, Didier Houssin, has stated that “there are alternative supplies that can make up for any loss of Iranian oil exports,”17 given increased oil production by both the OPEC and non-OPEC countries in the second half of 2012. However, the IEA also warned that the growing tension between Iran and the West was causing the burden of rising oil prices on the global economy.

### AT: Domestic Drilling Solves

#### Oil Shocks Coming—High Risk of Supply Disruption and Peak Oil

McKillop ‘11

[Andrew\_McKillop](http://www.marketoracle.co.uk/UserInfo-Andrew_McKillop.html) is a former in-house policy and programming expert, DG XVII Energy, European Commission Oil Crisis In 2012 http://www.marketoracle.co.uk/Article32312.html

In fact, physical supply cuts are in 2012 more possible or rational than at any time for the last 15-20 years, and perhaps even since 1973. Taking only a 15-20 year horizon, but looking the other way, the next 15-20 years will massively change world oil supply, and not for political reasons. Probably by 2017 if there is any recovery of the global economy, world oil supply will certainly "Peak Out". Like physicists trying to find Higgs bosons we can't give an exact number for the final and absolute peak: it might possibly be 95 million barrels a day, or about 6% - 7% above current production. Total's CEO Christophe de Margerie has gone on record saying he thinks even sustaining 90 Mbd is not possible under the best of scenarios - no supply cuts, no major stress in large producer countries, continued high investment in oil E&P at rates similar to the most recent record year of 2007 when $400 billion was spent - and so on. Without recession, world oil demand would have easily hit 90 Mbd in 2012. Getting an idea on how prices might move even with "moderate only" economic recovery and no supply cuts, more than 3 months back (on Sept 15) Goldman Sachs set a price of $130 a barrel as likely in 2012, with the famous spread or premium for Brent against WTI shrunk to almost nothing. The reason is this: Oil supply is short in both hemispheres. Any large outage of supply will destroy the price mechanism and physical rationing will be the only possible end result. Despite Libya coming back fast towards its pre-war output of 1.5 million barrels a day, the Arab world outlook is sombre - the Jasmine revolution and semi peaceful sit-ins were a long way back. Civil war is now the operating mode in the Arab revolt, and this makes worst-case scenarios possible. Revolt in the Middle East presently focusing Syria's civil war, the long simmering Iran nuclear crisis, rising sunni-shia struggle in Iraq now that the US has quit, and the latent threats to Saudi and other Gulf Arab producers are all able to impact oil supply security. Even the rising threats to Putin's total power in his version of "democratic" Russia, with fast rising potentials for long-winded internal power struggles, can affect Russian gas and oil production, supply policies and pricing action.

### Peak Oil

#### Peak Oil Now

McKay ‘12

By Andrew McKay Seven Myths Used To Debunk Peak Oil, Debunked 06 May, 2012 http://www.countercurrents.org/mckay060512.htm
Similar to the phony global warming “debate,” many, but not all of [the most vocal deniers](http://transitionvoice.com/2011/11/peak-oil-gets-pepper-sprayed/) are politically conservative, pro-business. And, by their refusal to take into account basic statistics, they’re anti-science. In terms of reduced energy use per capita, and the inevitable downsizing of the global economy, deniers are ideologically opposed to what happens now that we’re living in a post-peak world. So what are their arguments, and why are they so wrong? The top seven are listed below: 1. Peak oilers say oil is running out, it’s not At best this is a misunderstanding; at worst it’s a straw-man fabricated to cast doubt on the assertions of those concerned with the realities of peak oil. No peak oiler worth their salt has ever argued that we’re running out of oil. Sure, there may have been a couple of fringe bloggers arguing the case alongside conspiracy theories about alien abduction cover-ups and laser guided death unicorns, but no one takes them seriously. The issue isn’t when oil will run out. It’s about when conventional oil extraction peaks, which happened in 2006 according to the [IEA’s 2010 World Energy Outlook](http://transitionvoice.com/2010/12/top-10-peak-oil-stories-of-2010/). Unconventional oil has filled the gap for now (along with decreased use), but there’s much skepticism as to how long this can last. 2. Fracking will save us from peak oil While it’s certainly true that the massive increase in hydraulic fracturing of natural gas was largely unforeseen by the peak oil-aware, it’s merely a game extender, not a game changer. The small amount of oil that arises as a byproduct of fracking accounted for less than 5 percent of daily US consumption last year. This is even after a 750 percent increase in tight oil production since 2003. Clearly there would need to be an unprecedented increase in exploration and drilling for oil from fracking to even begin making a dent in the wider scale of things. But that’s before we consider damage to the environmental commons — land, air, and water — from the fracking process. The other trouble with fracking is that production figures for individual wells [commonly decline 60-80 percent](http://transitionvoice.com/2010/11/great-white-shale/) in the first year followed by a more gradual decline. This means new wells must constantly be drilled to avoid production for a whole area dropping off very quickly. The [US Energy Information Administration](http://www.eia.gov/) (EIA) forecasts that domestic production of tight oil will max out at 1,325,000 barrels a day by 2030. This is only 7 percent of the current US daily consumption. No one seriously believes that the US economy can grow without increasing oil consumption. The numbers don’t stack up, it’s as simple as that. 3. The US is now, or will soon be, a net oil exporter The rise of tight oil extracted through fracking has been hailed as a new era for US energy independence. Some have even gone as far as saying that the US is now a “net oil exporter.” [The devil is in the details](http://transitionvoice.com/2012/04/love-and-money-why-chrisitianity-is-incompatible-with-capitalism/) however. On a Btu basis the US imported 58 percent of the oil it consumed in 2011. Now, it’s true that the US became a net “oil product” exporter in 2011 for the first time in over sixty years. This is, however, very different from being a net oil exporter proper. Gasoline, diesel, and heating oil made up the majority of these products. But much of this oil was initially imported as crude from overseas, refined in the US and then exported back out. This doesn’t make the US a net oil exporter. Total net crude and product imports did fall 11 percent in 2011 to 8.436 million barrels a day, the lowest point since 2005. And domestic oil output did rise 3.6 percent to 5.673 million barrels a day. But this still leaves a 48.7% difference between imports and domestic oil output, a huge gap that the IEA forecasts will not be closed as far out as 2035. Observant analysts don’t think it will happen ever. 4. Oil production is still increasing annually Like many peak oil denier myths this old gem is true up to a point. But only if you include unconventional oil, natural gas liquids, and biofuels. Which means that when you take those figures away you get…that’s right…a peak in the production of oil from conventional sources. And as we see from [the example in the US](http://ourfiniteworld.com/2012/04/09/what-the-new-2011-eia-oil-supply-data-shows/), it’s highly unlikely that unconventional plays will be able to take up much of the slack. 5. Saudia Arabia will ramp up production to ease prices soon Uh, no. Crude oil prices have been over US $100 a barrel since February 2011. This is after steadily climbing from a low of US $42 a barrel in December 2008, after the last recession killed demand. The question is, With oil prices so high for so long, why hasn’t Saudi Arabia stepped in already to ease prices? Saudi Arabia produced the highest amount in thirty years in November 2011 and then actually decreased output and exports the following month. The increased November output dropped prices by $3.00 per barrel to $107.97 for December 2011. The easing was short lived however, with average March 2012 prices sitting at $126.4 per barrel, the highest price since July 2008. Production capacity figures for OPEC countries are notorious for being inflated and there’s increasing skepticism that Saudi Arabia couldn’t produce any more oil even if it wanted to. 6. East Africa is the new Middle East [Madagascar](http://news.mongabay.com/2005/0930-madagascar_oil.html) has been targeted by Exxon and Norway’s [Statoil](http://www.statoil.com/en/Pages/default.aspx) since 2005. Statoil found a billion barrels of oil equivalent. That may seem like a huge find but consider these points. First, world oil consumption is about 80 million barrels a day, give or take, making it the equivalent of about 12 days of oil. Then compare the Madagascar finding to the largest conventional oil field in the world, Ghawar, in Saudi Arabia. It’s extracted 65 billion barrels of oil since 1951 from initial reserves of over 100 billion barrels. The Madagascar field extends down to Mozambique where Anadarko have found 1.3 billion barrels of oil. Further inland Tallow has found 1 billion barrels of proven reserves in the Ugandan Albert basin. Plenty of other African countries are now being explored by a number of interests but they have yet to show any major finds. Oil pundits might be saying “game on” but really all there is to show is a lot of wishful thinking which, at the end of the day, won’t fill the gas tank. I should know, I tried that plenty of times in my student days. The truth is that most of the new oil finds throughout the world are less than 2 billion barrels each. The global annual consumption is currently a little less than 33 billion barrels per year. There is a huge disconnect between the size of the fields currently being discovered and the predicted future demand for oil. 7. There’s always a new frontier The question is, Why do we need new frontiers if oil production isn’t peaking? It’s an odd concept that oil companies would spend millions of dollars in politically unstable countries and areas where the physical barriers are immense — such as the Arctic — just for the hell of it. The truth is the low hanging fruit has been picked. All the easy to access oil has been found and developed. What we’re seeing now is increased exploration in increasingly economically dubious areas such as the Canadian tar sands, [deepwater drilling](http://transitionvoice.com/2012/04/deepwater-what/), and fracking and horizontal drilling in tight oil plays. It ‘s as if the pundits pushing this line have never seen a globe before. The world is round. There is a finite amount of land and ocean that can realistically be developed to economically extract and refine oil. From all the evidence collated over the last few years it appears that we’re pushing up against these limits right now. The biggest oil find since the 1960s, the Kashagan oilfield in the Caspian Sea, has 13 billion barrels of proven reserves. Development of the field has, however, been plagued with funding problems after Shell shut its Caspian office in May last year. At this stage it’s unlikely this field will produce anything close to the original estimates due to ongoing delays with development. After denial, acceptance You have to give the deniers credit for being so tenacious about drumming up new magical thinking on how to outsmart Mother Nature. But in the end, their denial, especially as the lackeys of industry with their plutocratic ties to government, puts us at risk in terms of smart transitions to other ways to live and do business. At some point, the “peak oil debate” needs to go the way of the phony “global warming debate.” Into the dustbin of history, where it belongs, so the rest of us can get on with civilization 2.0.

### Oil Impact—China War

#### Global Energy Shortages and Shocks Spark Japan-China Escalation, Draws U.S. Into Major Power War

Glaser ‘11

Reframing Energy Security: How Oil Dependence Influences U.S. National Security Charles L. Glaser cglaser@gwu.edu Professor of Political Science and International Relations Elliot School of International Affairs The George Washington University August 2011, epts.washington.edu/.../Glaser\_-\_EnergySecurity-AUGUST-2011.doc

The combination of the increased value of territory and alliance commitments could draw the United States into a conflict between Japan and China. In this case, energy’s effect is indirect—energy is not the rationale for the U.S.-Japan alliance, but could contribute to the outbreak of war between China and Japan. China and Japan have an ongoing dispute over their maritime boundary in the East China Sea and, related, over the Senkaku/Diaoyu Islands. The East China Sea contains potentially large oil and gas reserves; estimates of their size vary substantially, with the high end around 100 billion barrels. China and Japan’s divergent views on their maritime boundary, which reflect self-serving interpretations of ambiguities in the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea, significantly influence how much of the East China Sea falls under their control and, more specifically, which petroleum reserves they own. One particular oil and gas field—Chunxiao—has been the focus of much controversy, among other reasons because China is drilling close to the line that Japan claims divides this field and Japan worries that China’s operations could siphon resources from its side of the divide. The maritime boundary dispute is intertwined with the countries’ dispute over the Senkaku/Diaoyu Islands, which are located in the South China Sea. This dispute is important not only because there may be substantial amounts of oil near the islands, but also because Japan’s territorial claim significantly influences the location of the line that it believes divides the South China Sea and increases the size of its exclusive economic zone. Energy has played a central role in fueling controversy in the East China Sea. Neither Japan nor China focused much attention on their claims to the Senkaku/Diaoyu islands until a 1968 UN survey found there could be significant amounts of petroleum near them. The related dispute over the maritime border is long standing, but did not become the focus of intense political disputes and military interactions until Japan reacted to China’s growing oil and gas exploration in areas that Japan maintains are contested. In 2008 China and Japan reached an agreement on joint development of East China Sea petroleum resources, but since then have failed to work out specific issues required for its implementation. Over the past couple of decades, low-level confrontations between China and Japan have resulted over both the island and maritime border disputes, with some increase in their frequency in recent years. Although the stakes do not appear to justify the risk of a large war, experts believe that these disputes are the most likely flash point between Japan and China and warn about the possibility of conflict. A conflict in the South China Sea war could draw in the United States. Although the United States does not take a position on these competing sovereignty claims, the U.S.-Japan security treaty commits it to Japan’s defense if conflict breaks out over these islands, because they are under Japanese administration and are therefore covered by the treaty. The United States reiterated this position in the fall of 2010, as controversy raged following the collision of Chinese and Japanese boats in the vicinity of the Senkaku/Diaoyo Islands

#### Dependence Leads Security Complexes that Create Escalation of China-Japan Conflicts and US Draw In to Major Power War

Glaser ‘11

Reframing Energy Security: How Oil Dependence Influences U.S. National Security Charles L. Glaser cglaser@gwu.edu Professor of Political Science and International Relations Elliot School of International Affairs The George Washington University August 2011, epts.washington.edu/.../Glaser\_-\_EnergySecurity-AUGUST-2011.doc

Energy dependence might be most dangerous if it brings the United States into conflict with another major power. A key path along which this could occur is an energy-driven security dilemma between China and the United States. As noted above, U.S. oil supplies are not vulnerable to interruption by China, but China’s are vulnerable to the U.S. navy. Consequently, China faces this type of security dilemma, which has the potential to generate a variety of peacetime and crisis dangers. China began importing oil in the early 1990s and its imports have grown significantly since then. Chinese oil consumption doubled from 1995-2005 and is expected to double again by 2020. During this period Chinese domestic production is expected to remain flat; the amount of oil that it imports will grow rapidly, making up somewhere between 60 and 80 percent of Chinese demand. The vast majority of this imported oil—more than 85% —will cross the Indian Ocean and pass through the Strait of Malacca. The problem that China faces is that its sea lanes of communication for transporting this oil are dominated by the U.S. navy. Chinese experts are well aware of the potential implications of this vulnerability. The following statement by a Chinese scholar succinctly captures the situation: China cannot have control over development goals without corresponding control over the resources to fuel the economy. The simple fact is that China does not possess that control. More than half of U.S. oil imports are shipped via the sea lanes. The crucial difference is that China is almost helpless to protect its overseas oil import routes. This is an Achilles heel to contemporary China, as it has forced China to entrust its fate (stable markets and access to resources) to others. Therefore, it is imperative that China, as a nation, pay attention to its maritime security and the means to defend its interests through sea power (a critical capability in which China currently lags behind). In fact, the key danger facing China is likely not during peacetime, but instead during a severe crisis or war. Another Chinese scholar observes, “In the scenario of war across the Taiwan Straits, there is no guarantee that the United States would not enlist the assistance of its principal ally in northeast Asia (Japan) and other lesser allies (Singapore, the Philippines, and South Korea) to participate in another oil blockade against China.” Although China has been modernizing its navy for a couple of decades, it not only remains quite far from having the ability to challenge U.S. control of the SLOCs from the Persian Gulf to the Strait of Malacca, but the programs it could build in the medium term (10-15 years) would still leave this mission beyond reach. The near-term focus and top priorities for China’s naval modernization have been improving its ability to blockade Taiwan, and to deny and deter U.S. intervention in a Taiwan conflict. Beyond these top priorities, acquiring the ability to protect its SLOCs to the Persian Gulf is among the rationales for China’s naval modernization. However, apparently China’s leaders are still deciding whether to devote massive resources to this mission. There is the possibility that China could start to challenge U.S. dominance in the Indian Ocean by developing a string of land-based capabilities from which it could both launch attacks and base naval forces; China has started to develop the type of base structure required for these capabilities. In addition, China could try to weaken U.S. naval dominance by deploying sea-based assets that threaten, but do not match, U.S. forces—for example, a large attack submarine force. In any event, well before China’s navy can reach effectively into the Indian Ocean, its efforts to protect Taiwan and its territorial claims in the East China and South China Seas will pose a threat to U.S. allies, including Japan.Increased value of territory and alliance entrapment—Japan-China conflict in the East China Sea The combination of the increased value of territory and alliance commitments could draw the United States into a conflict between Japan and China. In this case, energy’s effect is indirect—energy is not the rationale for the U.S.-Japan alliance, but could contribute to the outbreak of war between China and Japan. China and Japan have an ongoing dispute over their maritime boundary in the East China Sea and, related, over the Senkaku/Diaoyu Islands. The East China Sea contains potentially large oil and gas reserves; estimates of their size vary substantially, with the high end around 100 billion barrels. China and Japan’s divergent views on their maritime boundary, which reflect self-serving interpretations of ambiguities in the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea, significantly influence how much of the East China Sea falls under their control and, more specifically, which petroleum reserves they own. One particular oil and gas field—Chunxiao—has been the focus of much controversy, among other reasons because China is drilling close to the line that Japan claims divides this field and Japan worries that China’s operations could siphon resources from its side of the divide. The maritime boundary dispute is intertwined with the countries’ dispute over the Senkaku/Diaoyu Islands, which are located in the South China Sea. This dispute is important not only because there may be substantial amounts of oil near the islands, but also because Japan’s territorial claim significantly influences the location of the line that it believes divides the South China Sea and increases the size of its exclusive economic zone. Energy has played a central role in fueling controversy in the East China Sea. Neither Japan nor China focused much attention on their claims to the Senkaku/Diaoyu islands until a 1968 UN survey found there could be significant amounts of petroleum near them. The related dispute over the maritime border is long standing, but did not become the focus of intense political disputes and military interactions until Japan reacted to China’s growing oil and gas exploration in areas that Japan maintains are contested. In 2008 China and Japan reached an agreement on joint development of East China Sea petroleum resources, but since then have failed to work out specific issues required for its implementation. Over the past couple of decades, low-level confrontations between China and Japan have resulted over both the island and maritime border disputes, with some increase in their frequency in recent years. Although the stakes do not appear to justify the risk of a large war, experts believe that these disputes are the most likely flash point between Japan and China and warn about the possibility of conflict. A conflict in the South China Sea war could draw in the United States. Although the United States does not take a position on these competing sovereignty claims, the U.S.-Japan security treaty commits it to Japan’s defense if conflict breaks out over these islands, because they are under Japanese administration and are therefore covered by the treaty. The United States reiterated this position in the fall of 2010, as controversy raged following the collision of Chinese and Japanese boats in the vicinity of the Senkaku/Diaoyo Islands. Others’ oil dependence decreases U.S. foreign policy leverage: China’s reluctance to sanction Iran A country’s oil dependence could reduce its willingness to adopt policies that would increase U.S. security, because those policies would damage the country’s energy interests. The clearest example may be the disagreement between the United States and China over sanctions targeted at stopping Iran’s nuclear weapons program. China has invested in large energy deals with Iran and now relies heavily on Iran for oil, which may be reducing its willingness to support sanctions. The United States favors harsh sanctions to convince Iran to shut down programs that will enable it to build nuclear weapons. China has consistently required that U.N. sanctions against Iran be significantly less severe than favored by the United States and its European allies. In addition, China has criticized unilateral U.S. sanctions that go beyond the most recent round of U.N. sanctions. Energy interests are not China’s only reason for opposing severe sanctions—others include the priority it places on respecting states’ sovereignty and possibly the lower priority that China places on nonproliferation, reflecting its lack of global power projection capabilities. But energy interests appear to be a key factor. A significant and growing fraction of China’s imported oil comes from Iran and Chinese oil companies have demonstrated a continuing interest in investing in Iran’s oil and natural gas industries. China worries that support for sanctions will reduce its access to Iran’s energy resources and, therefore, has worked to moderate the severity of U.N. sanctions. Of course, this raises the question of why China does not entirely oppose sanctions. A number of factors push China toward supporting them, including the increasing importance it places on stability in the Middle East, which could be jeopardized by nuclear proliferation, and the importance of preserving good relations with the United States, with which it shares much larger economic stakes. The result of these countervailing factors is China’s seemingly reluctant support for relatively modest sanctions. The security cost to the United States of China’s limited support for sanctions depends on two further debates that I merely flag here. First, there is an on-going debate about the effectiveness of economic sanctions: if sanctions are generally ineffective, or if they tend to be ineffective when the stakes for the state being coerced are very high, as is the case with Iran, then the limits that China’s has imposed on U.N. sanctions are less costly, because even more severe sanctions would have been unlikely to succeed. Second, there is the whole debate over the danger posed by nuclear proliferation: if proliferation in general is not dangerous, or if proliferation to Iran in particular is not very dangerous, then China’s obstructionism poses smaller security costs to the United States. NATIONAL SECURITY IMPLICATIONS AND POLICY CHALLENGES The preceding sections have laid out a variety of ways in which oil dependence could require the United States to use large-scale force to protect its interests. Oil’s influence can be direct—force is used to protect access to oil—but can also be indirect—concern about oil influences the formation of alliances, stains political relations, and constrains states’ foreign policies in ways that bring the United States into conflicts that are not over oil. These oil-fueled wars could be against a major power or a regional power. The final sections consider how oil-generated risks have changed over time and identify some key policy challenges. What is new and different? Because the United States has been concerned about energy security since at least the 1970s, we can gain some perspective by comparing current security dangers produced by oil dependence to earlier ones. Although identifying and exploring potential dangers is easier than estimating their magnitude, the preceding analysis does offer some useful comparisons. At least until the Arab Spring, the probability of U.S. involvement in energy-driven conflict in the Persian Gulf was arguably lower than over the past few decades. The clearest case for U.S. intervention would involve a cutoff of Saudi oil. A Saudi decision to embargo oil appears no more likely than in recent decades and less likely than in the 1970s; a key external threat—Saddam Hussein’s Iraq—has been eliminated; and Iran’s missile capabilities are as of yet incapable of crippling the Saudi oil complex. In addition, U.S. capabilities for intervening in a Persian Gulf conflict have grown, which should contribute to deterrence; and the U.S. need to intervene for all but the most severe oil interruptions has been reduced by enlargement of its strategic petroleum reserve and by its increased energy efficiency. Cutting in the other direction, increased demand for oil, largely reflecting economic growth in the developing world, is likely to outpace increasing supply, driving oil prices higher. Combined with reduced slack in the oil production system, the result could be greater price sensitivity to supply disruptions, which would increase U.S. incentives to intervene to restore the flow of oil. Given these countervailing trends, which do not clearly indicate a greater probability of severe disruptions, increased U.S. concern over the fast few years about energy security appears to reflect the higher price of oil and not an increased probability of conflict; that is, the fear here is more clearly about U.S. prosperity than U.S. national security. One exception to this otherwise positive assessment of the Persian Gulf reflects the future implications of Iranian nuclear weapons. A nuclear Iran would likely be more willing to use force to close the Strait of Hormuz and there are plausible scenarios in which this action leads to conventional, and possibly nuclear, conflict between the United States and Iran. This future possibility, however, has played virtually no role in the increased U.S. concern about energy security. The other key exception is the increased concern about the stability of the Saudi regime, which reflects the political upheaval that has swept across the Middle East. It seems clearer that the probability of energy-generated conflict has increased in Northeast Asia. China’s shift over the past two decades from oil exporter to substantial oil importer, combined with the vulnerability its SLOCs, creates the possibility of a security dilemma. China’s efforts to protect its sea lanes and/or to offset its new vulnerability by further increasing its ability to confront the United States in a Taiwan scenario could fuel negative political spirals that reduce both countries’ security. A very different logic could make conflict more likely between China and its neighbors. The growing value of oil and gas, combined with China’s increasing military capabilities and its increasing need for secure access to these energy resources, could make China more willing to use force to resolve island disputes in the East China Sea. The United States could get drawn into this conflict via its alliance commitment and concern for its credibility for protecting allies.

### Oil Impact—Economy

#### oIL DEPENDENCE IS DRAGGING DOWN US ECONOMY AND WILL ONLY INCREASE

Southern States Energy Board in 6

BUILDING A BRIDGE TO ENERGY INDEPENDENCEAND TO A SUSTAINABLE ENERGY FUTURE, http://www.americanenergysecurity.org/AES%20Report.pdf, July.

U.S. dependence on oil imports imposes a huge economic penalty that is not reflected in the retail price of gasoline. It is a penalty that costs jobs, drains investment capital, and increases the nation's defense burden, and it is a cost the U.S. cannot pay forever. Numerous analyses of these hidden costs have been conducted in recent years and the bottom line is that the economic penalty is enormous. There are at least three major elements that comprise this burden: Military expenditures specifically tied to defending Persian Gulf oil, the cost of lost employment and investment resulting from the diversion of financial resources, and the cost of the periodic "oil shocks" the nation has experienced – and will likely continue to experience. For example, these costs have been estimated to exceed $300 billion annually, and they are rising: • Expenditures associated with defending the flow of Persian Gulf oil exceed $50 billion annually.1 • The loss of economic activity resulting from the diversion of financial resources is even larger. Direct economic losses are estimated at nearly $40 billion annually and indirect losses at $125 billion, for an annual total of more than $160 billion. This loss of economic activity results in a loss of 830,000 jobs in the U.S. and a loss of $15 billion in tax revenues and royalty payments to the federal, state and local governments.

### Oil Impact—Iran War

#### Oil dependency causes war with Iran

Reynolds 10 (Lewis, energy consultant and author of “America the Prisoner: The Implications of Foreign Oil Addiction and a Realistic Plan to End It”, “Seven Dangerous Side Effects of the U.S. Dependency on Foreign Oil”, 8-8-10, http://peakoil.com/production/seven-dangerous-side-effects-of-the-u-s-dependency-on-foreign-oil/)

It gets us into wars. Oil has been at the center of many (indeed most) major military conflicts in the world, particularly those involving the West. From providing the impetus for Hitler’s invasion of the Soviet Union and Japan’s attack on Pearl Harbor in World War II to Saddam Hussein’s invasion of Kuwait, the resulting Gulf War, and, most would admit, the U.S. return to Iraq in 2003, oil has bred a century of conflict. To be sure, America has made some bad choices to guarantee the uninterrupted flow of oil, often acting in ways very much in conflict with our national identity. Although the costs of the wars we have fought, both in terms of blood and treasure, have been great, the compromise of American values is perhaps even more disturbing. It might be best to look at the war issue in the context of a war that hasn’t happened…yet. Take the U.S. relationship with Iran. For most of the 20th century, the U.S. and British governments supported dictators and manipulated the domestic political situation in Iran to ensure the continued flow of cheap oil, often at the expense of the nation’s people. Those policies backfired when the harsh rule of the U.S.-backed Shah was overthrown by a popular revolution. The Iranian population was left angry with the U.S., and the door was opened for the anti-American Islamic theocracy that followed. The path to power for the Iranian regime was laid, in no small part, by mistakes made by previous U.S. Administrations.

#### Oil Dependence Leads to Iran War, Escalates to Nuclear Conflict

Glaser ‘11
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Energy dependence could draw the United States into a conflict in which a regional power was interrupting, or threatening to interrupt, the flow of oil. The economic costs of a disruption would determine whether the costs of fighting were justified. Similarly, the potential economic costs of a disruption would determine whether U.S. foreign and military policy should be devoted to deterring states from interrupting the flow of oil; more precisely, these economic costs would determine how much the United States should invest in the policies required for deterrence. Given the geographical distribution of oil, such a conflict would likely occur in the Persian Gulf. The greatest danger is probably posed by Iran—the Iraq War has greatly increased Iran’s power relative to Iraq, and Iran is acquiring improved missile capabilities and making progress toward having the capability to build nuclear weapons. The most disruptive Iranian action would be closure of the Strait of Hormuz, through which the vast majority of Persian Gulf oil must pass. Having identified the danger posed by dependence on oil that transits this strait (as well as the Strait of Malacca), a recent Council on Foreign Relations study concluded that the “United States should take the lead in building an infrastructure protection program that would be based on practical steps by relevant countries and address critical infrastructures and transit routes. Initial efforts should focus on joint planning, technical assistance, and military exercises, especially involving naval units operating near ports or along critical sea-lanes.” Although difficult to estimate the probability that Iran would attempt to close the strait, analysts have offered reasons for expecting the probability to be quite low: Iran would lose the oil revenue from its own exports; and Iran would likely be deterred by the probable costs of U.S. intervention, which could include the destruction of key military bases and occupation of some of its territory. Because so much oil flows through the strait, the United States would almost certainly respond to keep it open. Nevertheless, there are plausible scenarios in which Iran blocks the strait, for example, as retaliation for an attack against is nuclear weapons program or as a coercive measure if losing a conventional war. Careful analysis suggests that the United States would prevail, but that a successful campaign could take many weeks or more, and that oil prices would increase significantly during this period. Iranian acquisition of nuclear weapons would increase the risk of this scenario in two basic ways. First, Iran might believe that the possibility of escalation to nuclear weapons would deter the United States from responding, making Iran more willing to interrupt tanker traffic. Although basic deterrence logic says this calculation points in the correct direction, the United States might nevertheless intervene. The United States would question Iran’s willingness to escalate to nuclear use because America’s far larger and more capable nuclear forces would pose a formidable retaliatory threat. In addition, the United States would have incentives to make clear that possession of a small number of nuclear weapons by a much weaker state would not deter the United States from using conventional weapons in a limited war. Being deterred by the Iranian nuclear force would suggest that small nuclear arsenals provide tremendous potential for launching conventional aggression. As Barry Posen argued in a related context (the counterfactual case in which Iraq possessed nuclear weapons before deciding to invade Kuwait), “If the Iraqi conquest of Kuwait is permitted to stand, nuclear weapons will come to be viewed as a shield that protects conventional conquests from *any* challenger, including a great power heavily armed with its own nuclear weapons.” Consequently, the United States would have incentives to respond to Iranian aggression both to preserve its ability to deter conventional aggression by small nuclear states and to support its nonproliferation policy. Second, once a conventional conflict occurred, there would be the danger that U.S. conventional operations could increase the probability nuclear war. A number of paths are possible. The U.S. mine clearing operation required to open the strait would likely be accompanied by attacks against land-based Iranian targets. The United States would want to destroy the land-based anti-ship cruise missiles that Iran could use to threaten U.S. mine clearing ships; in addition, the United States would want to destroy Iranian air defenses that could be used to protect these missiles. These U.S. strikes would require large numbers of carrier-based aircraft flying sorties over a period of a few weeks or more. If Iran lacked confidence that U.S. aims were limited, it could feel compelled to put its nuclear forces on alert to increase their survivability, which would increase the probability of accidental or unauthorized nuclear attack. The United States could then have incentives to attack Iran’s nuclear force, either preemptively because it believed Iran was preparing to launch an attack or preventively because it faced a closing window of opportunity after which Iran’s nuclear forces would be survivable. A more subtle danger is the possibility of inadvertent nuclear escalation resulting from a situation in which Iranian leaders decide to escalate because they believe, incorrectly, that the United States has decided to destroy their nuclear force (or ability to launch it). U.S. conventional operations could create this danger by destroying Iranian radars, and command and control systems, leaving Iranian leaders unable to assess the U.S. conventional campaign and fearing that the United States was preparing to launch a full-scale invasion or a conventional attack against their nuclear forces.

### Iran Impacts

#### No chance the conflict stays limited – escalates quickly

Kahl 1-17 – Professor @ Georgetown, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for the Middle East

Colin, “Not Time to Attack Iran,” Foreign Affairs, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/137031/colin-h-kahl/not-time-to-attack-iran?page=show

RIDING THE ESCALATOR Kroenig's discussion of timing is not the only misleading part of his article; so is his contention that the United States could mitigate the "potentially devastating consequences" of a strike on Iran by carefully managing the escalation that would ensue. His picture of a clean, calibrated conflict is a mirage. Any war with Iran would be a messy and extraordinarily violent affair, with significant casualties and consequences. According to Kroenig, Iran would not respond to a strike with its "worst forms of retaliation, such as closing the Strait of Hormuz or launching missiles at southern Europe" unless its leaders felt that the regime's "very existence was threatened." To mitigate this risk, he claims, the United States could "make clear that it is interested only in destroying Iran's nuclear program, not in overthrowing the government." But Iranian leaders have staked their domestic legitimacy on resisting inter-national pressure to halt the nuclear program, and so they would inevitably view an attack on that program as an attack on the regime itself. Decades of hostility and perceived U.S. efforts to undermine the regime would reinforce this perception. And when combined with the emphasis on anti-Americanism in the ideology of the supreme leader and his hard-line advisers, as well as their general ignorance about what drives U.S. decision-making, this perception means that there is little prospect that Iranian leaders would believe that a U.S. strike had limited aims. Assuming the worst about Washington's intentions, Tehran is likely to overreact to even a surgical strike against its nuclear facilities. Kroenig nevertheless believes that the United States could limit the prospects for escalation by warning Iran that crossing certain "redlines" would trigger a devastating U.S. counterresponse. Ironically, Kroenig believes that a nuclear-armed Iran would be deeply irrational and prone to miscalculation yet somehow maintains that under the same leaders, Iran would make clear-eyed decisions in the immediate aftermath of a U.S. strike. But the two countries share no direct and reliable channels for communication, and the inevitable confusion brought on by a crisis would make signaling difficult and miscalculation likely. To make matters worse, in the heat of battle, Iran would face powerful incentives to escalate. In the event of a conflict, both sides would come under significant pressure to stop the fighting due to the impact on international oil markets. Since this would limit the time the Iranians would have to reestablish deterrence, they might choose to launch a quick, all-out response, without care for redlines. Iranian fears that the United States could success-fully disrupt its command-and-control infrastructure or preemptively destroy its ballistic missile arsenal could also tempt Iran to launch as many missiles as possible early in the war. And the decentralized nature of Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, especially its navy, raises the prospect of unauthorized responses that could rapidly expand the fighting in the crowded waters of the Persian Gulf. Controlling escalation would be no easier on the U.S. side. In the face of reprisals by Iranian proxies, "token missile strikes against U.S. bases and ships," or "the harassment of commercial and U.S. naval vessels," Kroenig says that Washington should turn the other cheek and constrain its own response to Iranian counter-attacks. But this is much easier said than done. Just as Iran's likely expectation of a short war might encourage it to respond disproportionately early in the crisis, so the United States would also have incentives to move swiftly to destroy Iran's conventional forces and the infrastructure of the Revolutionary Guard Corps. And if the United States failed to do so, proxy attacks against U.S. civilian personnel in Lebanon or Iraq, the transfer of lethal rocket and portable air defense systems to Taliban fighters in Afghanistan, or missile strikes against U.S. facilities in the Gulf could cause significant U.S. casualties, creating irresistible political pressure in Washington to respond. Add to this the normal fog of war and the lack of reliable communications between the United States and Iran, and Washington would have a hard time determining whether Tehran's initial response to a strike was a one-off event or the prelude to a wider campaign. If it were the latter, a passive U.S. approach might motivate Iran to launch even more dangerous attacks -- and this is a risk Washington may choose not to take. The sum total of these dynamics would make staying within Kroenig's proscribed limits exceedingly difficult. Even if Iran did not escalate, purely defensive moves that would threaten U.S. personnel or international shipping in the Strait of Hormuz -- the maritime chokepoint through which nearly 20 per- -cent of the world's traded oil passes -- would also create powerful incentives for Washington to preemptively target Iran's military. Of particular concern would be Iran's "anti-access/area-denial" capabilities, which are designed to prevent advanced navies from operating in the shallow waters of the Persian Gulf. These systems integrate coastal air defenses, shore-based long-range artillery and antiship cruise missiles, Kilo-class and midget submarines, remote-controlled boats and unmanned kamikaze aerial vehicles, and more than 1,000 small attack craft equipped with machine guns, multiple-launch rockets, antiship missiles, torpedoes, and rapid-mine-laying capabilities. The entire 120-mile-long strait sits along the Iranian coastline, within short reach of these systems. In the midst of a conflict, the threat to U.S. forces and the global economy posed by Iran's activating its air defenses, dispersing its missiles or naval forces, or moving its mines out of storage would be too great for the United States to ignore; the logic of preemption would compel Washington to escalate. Some analysts, including Afshin Molavi and Michael Singh, believe that the Iranians are unlikely to attempt to close the strait due to the damage it would inflict on their own economy. But Tehran's saber rattling has already intensified in response to the prospect of Western sanctions on its oil industry. In the immediate aftermath of a U.S. strike on Iran's nuclear program, Iranian leaders might perceive that holding the strait at risk would encourage international pressure on Washington to end the fighting, possibly deterring U.S. escalation. In reality, it would more likely have the opposite effect, encouraging aggressive U.S. efforts to protect commercial shipping. The U.S. Navy is capable of keeping the strait open, but the mere threat of closure could send oil prices soaring, dealing a heavy blow to the fragile global economy. The measures that Kroenig advocates to mitigate this threat, such as opening up the U.S. Strategic Petroleum Reserve and urging Saudi Arabia to boost oil production, would be unlikely to suffice, especially since most Saudi crude passes through the strait.

#### Draws in other powers against the US

Kahl 1-17 – Professor @ Georgetown, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for the Middle East

Colin, “Not Time to Attack Iran,” Foreign Affairs, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/137031/colin-h-kahl/not-time-to-attack-iran?page=show

Keeping other states in the region out of the fight would also prove more difficult than Kroenig suggests. Iran would presume Israeli complicity in a U.S. raid and would seek to drag Israel into the conflict in order to undermine potential support for the U.S. war effort among key Arab regimes. And although it is true, as Kroenig notes, that Israel remained on the sidelines during the 1990-91 Gulf War, the threat posed by Iran's missiles and proxies today is considerably greater than that posed by Iraq two decades ago. If Iranian-allied Hezbollah responded to the fighting by firing rockets at Israeli cities, Israel could launch an all-out war against Lebanon. Syrian President Bashar al-Assad might also try to use the moment to divert attention from the uprising in his country, launching his own assault on the Jewish state. Either scenario, or their combination, could lead to a wider war in the Levant. Even in the Gulf, where U.S. partners are sometimes portrayed as passive, Iranian retaliation might draw Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates into the conflict. The Saudis have taken a much more confrontational posture toward Iran in the past year, and Riyadh is unlikely to tolerate Iranian attacks against critical energy infrastructure. For its part, the UAE, the most hawkish state in the Gulf, might respond to missiles raining down on U.S. forces at its Al Dhafra Air Base by attempting to seize Abu Musa, Greater Tunb, and Lesser Tunb, three disputed Gulf islands currently occupied by Iran. A strike could also set off wider destabilizing effects. Although Kroenig is right that some Arab leaders would privately applaud a U.S. strike, many on the Arab street would reject it. Both Islamist extremists and embattled elites could use this opportunity to transform the Arab Spring's populist antiregime narrative into a decidedly anti-American one. This would rebound to Iran's advantage just at the moment when political developments in the region, chief among them the resurgence of nationalism in the Arab world and the upheaval in Syria, are significantly undermining Iran's influence. A U.S. strike could easily shift regional sympathies back in Tehran's favor by allowing Iran to play the victim and, through its retaliation, resuscitate its status as the champion of the region's anti-Western resistance.

### Oil Impact— Readiness

#### US foreign oil depence crushes readiness, leads to SLOCS WARS, and leads to TERRORISM

Southern States Energy Board in 6

BUILDING A BRIDGE TO ENERGY INDEPENDENCEAND TO A SUSTAINABLE ENERGY FUTURE, <http://www.americanenergysecurity.org/AES%20Report.pdf>, July.

The U.S. military uses between 300,000 and 400,000 barrels of fuel each day to defend our nation (primarily jet fuel and some diesel). The dramatic run up in the cost of fuel, and the elevated risk of supply disruptions and shortages, threatens military readiness. Protecting oil shipping and transportation corridors and production facilities abroad requires a massive U.S. military presence in the Middle East, costing billions of taxpayer dollars and stretching military resources. As competition for oil intensifies, international confrontation and conflict will become more likely as nations attempt to secure needed oil supplies. Further, U.S. funds tendered to purchase imported oil are sometimes used to fund terrorist organizations.

#### HIgh OIL PRICES ARE CRushing REadiness

Statement of James J. Angel, Ph.D., CFA Associate Professor of Finance, McDonough School of Business Georgetown University. June 24, 2008. Committee on Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

The shocking increases in fuel prices are causing serious economic pain to American consumers right now. In addition, the explosion in commodity prices has a strong impact on our homeland security. The cost of imported fuel adds to our trade deficit and further weakens the dollar. The cost of fuel is a major element in fertilizing and harvesting crops, in fishing and logging operations, and in military readiness and operations. Our dependence on imported oil from unstable places is a direct threat to our security. The global political turmoil caused by high oil and food prices also impacts our homeland security.

#### continued oil dependence boosts revenues for hostile nations and challenges u.s. leadership

JAMES T. BARTIS. May 2007. Testimony presented before the Senate Energy and Natural Resources. “Policy Issues for Coal-to- Liquid Development”

This anticipated reduction in world oil prices associated with coal-to-liquids development also yields a major national security benefit. At present, OPEC revenues from oil exports are about $500 billion per year. Projections of future petroleum supply and demand published by the Department of Energy indicate that unless measures are taken to reduce the prices of, and demand for, OPEC petroleum, such revenues will grow considerably. These high revenues raise serious national security concerns, because some OPEC member nations are governed by regimes that are not supportive of U.S. foreign policy objectives. Income from petroleum exports has been used by unfriendly nations, such as Iran and Iraq under Saddam Hussein, to support weapons purchases, or to develop their own industrial base for munitions manufacture. Also, the higher prices rise, the greater the chances that oil-importing countries will pursue special relationships with oil exporters and defer joining the United States in multilateral diplomatic efforts.

### Oil Impact—Caspian/Russia War

#### Oil Dependence Leads to Entanglement of NATO in the Caspian and Escalating Conflicts with Russia

Glaser ‘11

Reframing Energy Security: How Oil Dependence Influences U.S. National Security Charles L. Glaser cglaser@gwu.edu Professor of Political Science and International Relations Elliot School of International Affairs The George Washington University August 2011, epts.washington.edu/.../Glaser\_-\_EnergySecurity-AUGUST-2011.doc

An alliance formed to protect access to energy can draw a state into a conflict that it would otherwise have avoided. Expanding NATO to include Georgia runs this risk, including increasing the probability of a conflict between NATO and Russia. The United States’ interest in including Georgia partially reflects its desire to maintain secure access to oil and gas resources that need to transit the Caspian Sea region. Following the dissolution of the Soviet Union, the United States initially showed little interest in the Caspian region, but started to pay greater attention as the extent of the region’s energy resources became clearer. Relatively quickly, the United States came to see the Caspian region playing an important role in helping diversify the sources of U.S. energy, reducing western reliance on the Persian Gulf. A key component of U.S. strategy focused on development of pipelines that could transport oil and gas from the region’s landlocked countries, while not crossing Russian territory. The United States became the leading proponent of a pipeline that ran from Baku to the Turkish city of Ceyhan by way of the Georgian capital, Tbilisi. The United States did not invest directly in these energy projects, but did devote diplomatic and institutional financial resources to help accomplish them. In addition, the United States made broader investments in the stability and security of the region, providing economic and military assistance, with Georgia being the largest recipient of these forms of U.S. aid. As a continuation of these policies, energy considerations have influenced what is likely to be among the most potentially consequential decision the United States is going to make concerning the security of the region—including Georgia in NATO. The debate over NATO expansion has been divisive from the outset and proponents have advanced a variety of arguments, including the value of spreading democracy, contributing to domestic stability and hedging against a resurgent Russia In addition, however, energy considerations are a significant factor in the case that is now being made for bringing Georgia into the alliance, as evidenced by the following quote from Ronald Asmus, who has been an influential and long-standing supporter of NATO expansion: many Europeans do not feel the same historical or moral commitment to them or see a compelling strategic need to integrate them. Thus, in addition to moral and political arguments, the United States and Europe need to articulate a strong strategic rationale for anchoring them to the West. That argument is straightforward. The challenge of securing Europe's eastern border from the Baltics to the Black Sea has been replaced by the need to extend peace and stability along the southern rim of the Euro-Atlantic community -- from the Balkans across the Black Sea and further into Eurasia, a region that connects Europe, Russia, and the Middle East and involves core security interests, including a critical energy corridor. Working to consolidate democratic change and build stability in this area is as important for Western security today as consolidating democracy in central and eastern Europe was in the 1990s. NATO agreed in 2008 that Georgia would become a member of the alliance and reconfirmed this decision 2010. Without entering into the entire debate over NATO expansion, a strong case can be made that including Georgia in NATO would likely increase the probability of war between the United States and Russia. Russia and Georgia fought a short war in August of 2008, Russia has recognized the separatist Georgian provinces of South Ossetia and Abkhazia as independent states, and Russia continues to play an active role in these provinces. Including Georgia in NATO would likely contribute to deterring Russia from launching another war against part of Georgia. At the same time, however, if deterrence fails, NATO’s security commitment would greatly increase the probability of its actually fighting against Russia. Among other factors, the prospects for deterrence are reduced by the complications created by Russia’s recognition of the provinces and the West’s rejection of this new status.

### Oil Impact—Caspian

#### Minor Dominance Conflicts in Central Asia over Energy will draw in Major Powers

Blank 2K

Douglas MacArthur Professor of Research at the US Army War College and has been an Associate Professor of Russia/Soviet Affairs at the Strategic Studies institute, Stephen J., "U.S. Military Engagement with Transcaucasia and Central Asia," Strategic Studies Institute, June, http://carlisle-www.army.mil/usassi/welcome.htm

The same objective applies with equal force to Iran, another regional competitor in Central Asia and the Transcaucasia. As the 1998 National Security Strategy says, “The United States will not allow a hostile power to dominate any region of critical importance to our interests.”11 But because precisely such a domination remains Moscow’s critical objective, the pursuit of U.S. objectives must entail a vigorous political confrontation with Russia over the CIS. That confrontation need not be violent, but, as Chechnya shows, it could become a contest of force. Therefore we would be deluding ourselves if we thought that internal conditions within these regions, plus their geopolitical contexts, make for smooth sailing for the next generation. We would also be deluding ourselves if we thought that Moscow will soon share the U.S. objective that it is only interested in a “win-win” situation in the CIS. Nevertheless many U.S. policymakers and elites continue or profess to believe that Russia shares our goals and will follow our agenda in world politics. 12 And apart from what Russia and the United States might do, there are enough internal dangers throughout the Transcaspian to trigger conflicts that could then force outside states with major regional interests to intervene. And those need not be only Russia and the United States. Turkey, Iran, and China all have substantial and growing interests in the Transcaspian and could see the need to intervene and defend them. Naturally those interventions could have an impact on our subsequent policies and actions.

#### foreign oil dependence will lead to us-russia-china oil conflicts in central asia and the caspian sea

Klare 8

(Micheal T. Klare, The Nation*’s defense correspondent, is professor of peace and world security studies at Hampshire College. “*The New Geopolitics of Energy*”* [The Nation](http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?RQT=318&pmid=29240&TS=1214343341&clientId=42567&VInst=PROD&VName=PQD&VType=PQD). New York: [May 19, 2008](http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?RQT=572&VType=PQD&VName=PQD&VInst=PROD&pmid=29240&pcid=39304061&SrchMode=3). Vol. 286, Iss. 19;  pg. 18)

No other major power is capable of matching the United States when it comes to the global deployment of military power in the pursuit or protection of vital raw materials. Nevertheless, other powers are beginning to challenge this country in various ways. In particular, China and Russia are providing arms to oil and gas producers in the developing world and beginning to enhance their military capacity in key energy-producing areas. Much the same process is under way in Central Asia, where China and Russia cooperate under the auspices of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) to provide arms and technical assistance to the military forces of the Central Asian "stans"--again competing with the United States to win the loyalty of local military elites. In the 1990s Russia was too preoccupied with Chechnya to pay much attention to this area, and China was likewise consumed with other priorities, so Washington enjoyed a temporary advantage; in the past five years, however, Moscow and Beijing have made concerted efforts to gain influence in the region. The result has been a far more competitive geopolitical environment, with Russia and China, linked through the SCO, gaining ground in their drive to diminish US influence. These and other efforts by Russia and China, combined with stepped-up US military aid to states in the region, are part of a larger, though often hidden, struggle to control the flow of oil and natural gas from the Caspian Sea basin to markets in Europe and Asia. And this struggle, in turn, is but part of a global struggle over energy.

#### foreign dependence leads to us efforts to push into the caspian sea region

Klare in 4

Michael Klare is a professor of peace and world security studies at Hampshire College in Amherst. “Bush-Cheney Energy Strategy: Procuring the Rest of the World’s Oil,” FPIF-Petro-Politics Special Report, January

Although the United States will remain dependent on oil from the Persian Gulf are for a long time to come, officials seek to minimize this dependency to the greatest degree possible by diversifying the nation’s sources of imported energy. “Diversity is important, not only for energy security but also for national security,” President Bush declared on May 17, 2001. “Over-dependence on any one source of energy, especially a foreign source, leaves us vulnerable to price shocks, supply interruptions, and in the worst case, blackmail.” To prevent this, the administration’s energy plan calls for a substantial U.S. effort to boost production in a number of non-Gulf areas, including the Caspian Sea basin, the West Coast of Africa, and Latin America. The one that is likely to receive the greatest attention from policy makers is the Caspian Sea basis, consisting of Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, and adjacent parts of Iran and Russia. According to the Department to Energy, this area houses proven reserves (defined as 90% probable) of 17 to 33 billion barrels (5). If the amounts were confirmed, they would constitute the second largest untapped reserves after the Persian Gulf area. To ensure that much of this oil will eventually flow to consumer in the West, the U.S. government has made strenuous efforts to develop the area’s petroleum infrastructure and distribution system. The United States first sough access to the Caspian’s oil supplies during the Clinton administration. Because the Caspian Sea is land-locked, its oil and natural gas must travel by pipeline to other areas. Tapping the resources requires the construction of long-distance export lines.

#### iNCREASED MILITARY commitment MAKES CONFLICT DRAW-IN A CERTAINTY

Blank in 2000

Steven J. Blank is the Douglas MacArthur Professor of Research at the U.S. Army War College and has been an Associate Professor of Russia/Soviet Affairs at the Strategic Studies Institutes. “US Military Engagement with Trancaucasia and Central Asia,” Strategic Studies Institute, June, <http://carlisle-www.army.mil/usassi/welcome.htm>.

Accordingly, the increasing interest of the United States in preserving the area as “zone of free competition” and denying Russian or Iranian influence in region makes Washington the arbiter or leader on virtually every interstate and international issue in the area. These include everything from the Minsk process to negotiate Nagorno-Karabakh, to the opening of a “new Silk Road” and/or East-West trade corridor, apart from energy and pipeline routes for oil and gas. The consuming interest in the pipeline routes has led the U.S. Government to take public positions as well on vital regional security issues like the international status of the Caspian Sea, to arbitrate or mediate competing claims between Azerbaijan and Turkmenistan, and to take the lead in organizing or guaranteeing regional investment projects. Contrary to the U.S. stated intention that NATO enlargement and associated trends would not lead it to become further embroiled in all kinds of local issues, the exact opposite is happening, placing Washington at the center of international adjudication and influence for those questions. This deepening political-economic-military involvement can only raise the region’s stakes for key U.S. constituencies, perhaps including the armed forces. Or else, the Transcaspian’s heightened importance could lead the U.S. Government to determine that in the event of a challenge to security there, that critical or even vital interests are threatened.

### Oil Impact—Russia War

#### Future efforts to secure our oil supply will lead to Russia-US war.

Klare 2008

(Micheal T. Klare, The Nation*’s defense correspondent, is professor of peace and world security studies at Hampshire College. “*The New Geopolitics of Energy*”* [The Nation](http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?RQT=318&pmid=29240&TS=1214343341&clientId=42567&VInst=PROD&VName=PQD&VType=PQD). New York: [May 19, 2008](http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?RQT=572&VType=PQD&VName=PQD&VInst=PROD&pmid=29240&pcid=39304061&SrchMode=3). Vol. 286, Iss. 19;  pg. 18)

The great risk is that this struggle will someday breach the boundaries of economic and diplomatic competition and enter the military realm. This will not be because any of the states involved make a deliberate decision to provoke a conflict with a competitor--the leaders of all these countries know that the price of violence is far too high to pay for any conceivable return. The problem, instead, is that all are engaging in behaviors that make the outbreak of inadvertent escalation ever more likely. These include, for example, the deployment of growing numbers of American, Russian and Chinese military instructors and advisers in areas of instability where there is every risk that these outsiders will someday be caught up in local conflicts on opposite sides. The danger, of course, is that the great powers will be sucked into these internal conflicts. This is not a far-fetched scenario; the United States, Russia and China are already providing arms and military-support services to factions in many of these disputes. The United States is arming government forces in Nigeria and Angola, China is aiding government forces in Sudan and Zimbabwe, and so on. An even more dangerous situation prevails in Georgia, where the United States is backing the pro-Western government of President Mikhail Saakashvili with arms and military support while Russia is backing the breakaway regions of Abkhazia and South Ossetia. Georgia plays an important strategic role for both countries because it harbors the Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan (BTC) pipeline, a US-backed conduit carrying Caspian Sea oil to markets in the West. There are US and Russian military advisers/instructors in both areas, in some cases within visual range of each other. It is not difficult, therefore, to conjure up scenarios in which a future blow-up between Georgian and separatist forces could lead, willy-nilly, to a clash between American and Russian soldiers, sparking a much greater crisis.

### Russia Impacts

#### Russia-US war outweighs everything else

Bostrom 2

Nick, PhD, Journal of Evolution and Technology, Vol. 9, March 2002, http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html

A much greater existential risk emerged with the build-up of nuclear arsenals in the US and the USSR. An all-out nuclear war was a possibility with both a substantial probability and with consequences that might have been persistent enough to qualify as global and terminal. There was a real worry among those best acquainted with the information available at the time that a nuclear Armageddon would occur and that it might annihilate our species or permanently destroy human civilization.[4] Russia and the US retain large nuclear arsenals that could be used in a future confrontation, either accidentally or deliberately. There is also a risk that other states may one day build up large nuclear arsenals. Note however that a smaller nuclear exchange, between India and Pakistan for instance, is not an existential risk, since it would not destroy or thwart humankind’s potential permanently. Such a war might however be a local terminal risk for the cities most likely to be targeted. Unfortunately, we shall see that nuclear Armageddon and comet or asteroid strikes are mere preludes to the existential risks that we will encounter in the 21st century.

#### US-Russian relations prevent environmental destruction, regional wars, proliferation, and several scenarios for US-Russian nuclear war.

Cohen 2k - professor of Russian studies at New York University

Stephen, Failed Crusade, p. 196-205

These assurances are manifestly untrue and, coming from U.S. officials, editorialists, an scholars, inexplica­bly myopic and irresponsible. Even leaving aside post­Soviet Russia's enormou stockpiles of chemical and biological weapons, “all of the major fault line of nuclear danger are growing," as we learn from a num­ber of largely unheeded experts, and U.S. policy "simply has not kept up with the expansion of nuclear dangers inside Russia."The truth may not be politically correct or palatable, but the breakup of the Soviet state and Russia's "transition" have made us immeasurably less safe than we have ever been. To understand how unsafe, we must explore more fully a generalization made earlier in this book: What does it mean for our security when a nuclear-laden nation state is, depending on how we choose to charac­terize Russia s condition today, disintegrating, collaps­ing, or merely "highly unstable"?40 The short answer is, no one fully knows, because it has never happened before, which itself means that compared with the rel­ative predictability of the Soviet system and the Cold War, we now live in an era of acute nuclear uncertain­ty. The longer answer is that any significant degree of disintegration, instability, or civil warfare, all of which exist in Russia today, creates not one but several unprecedented nuclear dangers. The most widely acknowledged, almost to the point of obscuring the others, is proliferation-the danger that some of Russia's vast accumulation of nuclear weapons, components, or knowledge might be acquired by non-nuclear states or terrorist groups through theft and black-market transactions, scientific brain drain, or a decision by a money-starved Moscow regime to sell them. The threat derives primarily from Russia's decade­ long economic collapse. The government has lacked suf­ficient funds to safeguard storehouses of nuclear materials properly or to pay maintenance personnel and scientists adequately, even regularly. (Nuclear workers actually went out on strike over unpaid wages several times in the 1990s and again in 2000, even though it is against Russian law.) Almost all of the existing U.S. programs to reduce nuclear threats inside Russia focus on proliferation. But even here, according to their official sponsors and other experts, the programs are "woefully inadequate" if we are "to prevent a catastrophe." By the end of 2000, for example, barely one-sixth of Russia's weapons-usable materials will be considered secure, and the "risks of `loose nukes' are larger today" than they were when the programs began. Moreover, Moscow seems to have no full inventory 0f such materials or perhaps even of its thousands of tactical nuclear weapons, and thus no sure way of knowing whether or not something is missing.\*' Proliferation is the pinup of Russia's nuclear dangers, the subject of Western novels and movies, but it may not be the most serious. If a nuclear explosion is wait­ing to happen, it is probably somewhere among Russia's scores of Soviet-era reactors at electrical power stations and on decommissioned submarines. Reactors, we are told, can be no less dangerous than nuclear weapons. And as the Senate's leading expert informed his col­leagues in 1999, Russia's "reactors suffer from defi­ciences in design, operator training, and safety procedures." Indeed, according to a Russian specialist, "none of our nuclear stations can be considered safe."42 The bell began tolling loudly on reactor catastrophes with the explosion at Chernobyl in 1986, the worst nuclear accident in history. Releasing more than a hun­dred times the radiation of the two atomic bombs dropped 0n Japan in 1945, its lethal consequences are still unfolding fourteen years later. Since the early 1990s, many reports. including one by the Russian gov­ernment itself in February 2000, have warned of the possibility of another "Chernobyl-type disaster" or, more exactly, of several accident-prone Russian power stations, even faulty research reactors.' (The world's most dangerous nuclear plants are said to be located in post-Communist Russia and other former Soviet republics.)' Scores of decommissioned but still not denuclearized Soviet-built submarines decaying in the far north great­ly worsen the odds in this new kind of Russian roulette. Here too firsthand reports of "a nuclear accident wait­ing to happen" are increasingly ominous. Ill-maintained floating reactors are highly vulnerable, and many sub­marines are already leaking or dumping radioactive materials into the seas "like little Chernobyls in slow motion. Active-duty Russian nuclear ships also pose a serious threat, their aging missiles susceptible to explosions, one likely to detonate others. If that happens Russian expert warns, "We can end up with hundreds of Chernobyls. Why, then, all the U.S. official and unofficial assur­ances that we are "immeasurably more secure" and ca stop worrying about "worst-case scenarios"? They clear­ly derived from the single, entirely ideological assump­tion that because the Soviet Union no longer exists, the threat of a Russian nuclear attack on the United States no longer exists and we need now worry only about rogue states." In truth, the possibility of such a Russ­ian attack grew throughout the 1990s and is still growing Leave aside the warning that "a Russian version of Milosevic . . . armed with thousands of nuclear war­ warheads" - might come to power and consider the pro­gressive disintegration of the country's nuclear-defense infrastructure. Russia still has some six thousand war­heads on hair-trigger alert. They are to be launched or not launched depending on information about activity at U.S. missile sites provided by an early-warning net­work of radars, satellites, and computers that now functions only partially and erratically. Russia's command-and-control personnel, who are hardly immune to the social hard­ships and pathologies sweeping the nation, have bare­ly a few minutes to evaluate any threatening information, which as already been false on occasion. (In 1995, a Norwegian weather rocket was briefly mistaken by Russian authorities for an incoming enemy mis­sile.) These new post-Soviet technological and human cir­cumstances of the nuclear age are, as American scien­tists have warned repeatedly, "increasing the danger of an accidental or unauthorized "attack on the United States" from Russian territory. It is "arguably already the greatest threat to U.S. national survival. Assurances to the contrary, scientists emphasize, are "a gross mis­representation of reality."' Readers may choose to believe that intentional nuclear war nonetheless remains unthinkable. In post- Soviet Russia, however, it has become not only increas­ingly thinkable but speakable. The Kremlin's new security doctrine expanding conditions in which it would use such weapons may be merely semantic and nothing really new. But Russia's ferocious civil war in Chechnya, which did not end with the destruction of Grozny in 2000, is, as I have pointed out before, the first ever in a nuclear country. It has not yet included nuclear warfare, but both sides have crossed a rhetorical Rubicon. Since '999, sev­eral Russian deputies and governors, and even a lead­ing "liberal" newspaper, have proposed using nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons against Chechnya. Said one, think nuclear weapons should stop being virtual." Russian military spokesmen, we are told, "do not exclude that a nuclear attack could be carried out against the bases of international terrorists in Chechnya."49 And with that tiny republic in mind, the military has officially adopted a new concept of "limited" nuclear warfare in a single region, a threat against the Chechen resistance still being discussed in May 2000. From the other side, there were persistent reports that terrorists serving the Chechen "holy war" might blow up Russian nuclear power plants or weapons sites. The reports were serious enough to cause Moscow to redouble security at its nuclear facilities and go percent of Russians surveyed to say they fear the possibility.' Such threats on both sides may also be merely rhetorical, but it is an exceedingly dangerous rhetoric never before heard. If nothing else, there has been more loose talk in Russia since 1999 about using nuclear weapons than measures to .prevent loose nukes. And it will likely increase if the Chechens expand their new guerrilla tactics farther into Russia itself, as they have promised to do. And so, post-Soviet Russia still matters to America in the most fateful of ways. The Clinton administration has worsened the dangers incalculably by taking step after step that pushes a Russia coming apart at the nuclear seams to rely more and more on its nuclear stockpiles and infrastructures-by making financial aid conditional on economic "reforms" that impoverished and destabilized the state; by expanding NATO's mili­tary might virtually to Russia's borders; by provocative­ly demonstrating during the bombing of Yugoslavia the overwhelming superiority of U.S. conventional weapons; and more recently by threatening to withdraw from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty in order to build a missile defense system. Rarely, if ever, has there been such a reckless official disregard for U.S. national security or leadership failure to tell the American people about growing threats to their well-being. The Clinton administration and its many supporters in the media, think tanks, and acade­mia never seem to connect the dots between their mis­sionary zeal in Russia and the grave dangers being compounded there. In early 2000, one of the crusade's leading policymakers suddenly told us, after seven years of "happy talk," that "disasters are inescapable in the short run." He neglected to say that the disaster is unfolding in a country laden with twentieth-century devices of mass destruction and regressing toward the nineteenth century." Russia's potential for lethal catastrophies is the most important but not the only reason it still matters. Even in crises and weakness, Russia remains a great power because of its sheer size, which stretches across eleven time zones from Finland and Poland (if we consider Belarus) to China and nearby Alaska; its large portions of the world's energy and mineral reserves; its long his­tory of world-class achievements and power; its highly educated present-day citizens; and, of course, its arse­nals. All this makes Russia inherently not only a major power but a semi-global one. A "world without Russia" would therefore be globalization, to take the concept du jour, without a large part of the globe. Nor can many large international problems and con­flicts be resolved without Russia, especially in a "post-Cold War order" that has at least as much inter­national anarchy as order. From the Balkans and the Caspian to China and Iraq, from nuclear proliferation to conventional-arms transfers, from the environment and terrorism to drug trafficking and money laundering, Russia retains a capacity to affect world affairs for better or worse. On the one hand, it was Moscow's diplo­matic intervention in Yugoslavia in 1999 that enabled a desperate Clinton administration to avoid sending American ground troops to Kosovo. On the other, the 1990s also brought the passage of narcotics westward across Russian territory, a flood of illegal Russian money into U.S. banks, and growing markets for Moscow's weapons and nuclear capabilities among states that already worry Washington." And then there are the vast geopolitical ramifications of developments in what is still the world's largest ter­ritorial country. Nearly a fourth of planet Earth's pop­ulation lives on the borders of the Russian Federation, including most of its major religions and many of its ethnic identities. Many, if not all, of these nations and peoples are likely to be directly or indirectly affected by what happens in post-Communist Russia, again for bet­ter or worse-first and foremost the "near abroad," as Moscow calls the other fourteen former Soviet republics, but not them alone. Finally, there is a crucial futuristic reason why U.S. policy toward Russia must be given the highest priori­ty and changed fundamentally. Contrary to those Amer­icans who have "rushed to relegate Russia to the archives," believing it will always be enfeebled and may even break into more pieces, that longtime superpower will eventually recover from its present time of troubles, as it did after the revolution and civil war of 1917-21, indeed as it always has. But what kind of political state will rise from its knees? One that is democratic or despotic? One open to the West and eager to play a cooperative role in world affairs--or one bent on revising an international order shaped during its weakness and at its expense? One  [safeguarding and reducing its nuclear stockpiles or one multiplying and proliferating them among states that want them?](http://s.eguar.mg) The outcome will depend very significantly on how Russia is treated during its present-day agony, particularly by the United States. Whether it is treated wisely and compassionately or is bullied and humiliated, as a growing number of Russians believe they have been since the early 1990s. The next American president may make that decision, but our children and grandchildren will reap the benefits or pay the price.

### Oil Impact: Saudi Invasion

#### Oil Dependence Means the U.S. Would Invade Saudi Arabia To Secure Supply

Glaser ‘11

Reframing Energy Security: How Oil Dependence Influences U.S. National Security Charles L. Glaser cglaser@gwu.edu Professor of Political Science and International Relations Elliot School of International Affairs The George Washington University August 2011, epts.washington.edu/.../Glaser\_-\_EnergySecurity-AUGUST-2011.doc

Regarding the willingness and capability of suppliers, the United States could need to use force to protect major suppliers from invasion, especially if the invader could gain a dominant role in the oil market; from attacks against their oil facilities; and from domestic upheaval that could cripple their ability to sell oil. The 1991 Gulf War is probably the clearest historical example. The U.S. decision to eject Iraqi forces from Kuwait was intended largely to insure that Iraq did not extend its offensive into Saudi Arabia. The fear was that Iraqi control of Saudi oil would provide Iraq with such a large fraction of Persian Gulf oil that it could manipulate oil markets, severely damaging the U.S. economy. A key future scenario in which the United States might need to use force to protect the flow of oil involves a collapse of the Saudi regime.

### Oil Impact—Terrorism

#### Oil Dependence Leads to Foreign Policy Choices that Fuel International Terrorism

Glaser ‘11

Reframing Energy Security: How Oil Dependence Influences U.S. National Security Charles L. Glaser cglaser@gwu.edu Professor of Political Science and International Relations Elliot School of International Affairs The George Washington University August 2011, epts.washington.edu/.../Glaser\_-\_EnergySecurity-AUGUST-2011.doc

A commonly voiced concern is that U.S. policies for maintaining a reliable flow of oil increase the terrorist threat facing the United States. Whether U.S. oil policy in fact plays a significant role in fueling these threats depends on a central debate about the causes of terrorism and, specifically, about al Qaeda’s objectives. And whether the United States can avoid these dangers while continuing to protect the flow of oil depends on a major debate over U.S. grand strategy. Likely the most significant debate over al Qaeda is captured in the overly stark question “why do they hate us?” One answer is that the al Qaeda is reacting to U.S. policy in the Middle East—including deployment of U.S. troops in the Persian Gulf, unwavering support for Israel, cooperation with corrupt regimes, control over the region’s oil resources, and invasion and occupation of Iraq. A related and more specific argument is that foreign occupation is the driving force behind suicide terrorism, and more specifically that U.S. forces deployed in the Persian Gulf are the driving force behind the al Qaeda threat to the United States. Robert Pape finds that “national resistance to foreign occupation, a democratic political system in the occupying power, and a religious difference between the occupied and occupying societies are the main causal factors leading to the rise of suicide terrorist campaigns.”

#### U.S. oil dependence hurts democracy promotion and fuels radicalism.

Rosen ‘10

Mark E. Rosen, Deputy General Counsel, CNA Corporation. LL.M., 1991, University of Virginia School of Law; J.D., 1978, University of Georgia School of Law; A.B., 1974, University of Georgia. Mr. Rosen has over thirty years of experience in the legal and national security fields, including positions with the U.S. Department of Homeland Security and a twenty-one year career as an international and maritime lawyer with United States Navy. Mr. Rosen holds adjunct teaching appointments at George Washington University School of Law and Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. “Energy Independence and Climate Change: The Economic and National Security Consequences of Failing to Act”. March 2010. 44 U. Rich. L. Rev. 977. Lexis.

Impacts on U.S. Sovereignty and the Sustainment of Its Policies to Promote Democracy The purchases of imported oil by the United States and other developed countries have resulted in a huge transfer of wealth to a relatively small number of countries in which there have been major shifts in economic and political power. n134 These shifts have caused some undesirable political and security problems for the United States and have negatively impacted the economies and political independence of other importers and, in some circumstances, the suppliers of oil. n135 These impacts are less readily observable than an attack on an oil rig or a tanker, yet, in the long run, these impacts may be more dangerous because they undermine the economic and political independence of developing and developed countries, producers and importers. n136 Iran's exports were estimated at $ 77 billion in 2008, helping it to become "the world's "most active state sponsor of terrorism,'" including funding Hezbollah and insurgent activities in Iraq. n137 Iran's oil wealth has also created a political wedge between the United States and its treaty allies, including South Korea, Japan, and Italy, because U.S. allies cannot afford to divorce themselves from this supply of oil that powers their respective economies. n138 In the 1980s, Saudi Arabia found itself suddenly flush with oil wealth and began promoting its Sunni fundamentalist interpretation of Islam - Wahhabism. n139 The Saudi government, always conscious of its duties as the custodian of Islams' holiest places, joined with wealthy Arabs from the Kingdom and other states bordering the Persian Gulf in donating [\*999] money to build mosques and religious schools [in the Gulf region] that could preach and teach their interpretation of Islamic doctrine. n140 This same oil wealth provided money for Osama Bin Laden and al Qaeda, which operated through a Saudi financial support network known as the Golden Chain. n141 Venezuela provides the United States with roughly eleven percent of its oil imports, and Venezuela has "partial or complete ownership of nine U.S.-based refineries." n142 The United States is Venezuela's largest oil customer, yet President Hugo Chavez seems to view these interdependencies as a grant of immunity and has taken license to promote "anti-American and anti-Western rhetoric both at home and ... in parts of Latin and South America through foreign aid (largely in the form of subsidized oil)... ." n143 That same oil wealth has enabled Chavez to squash his political opposition and censor the press in his country.

### Oil Shocks Impact—War

#### Shocks lead to wars

King 08

 Neil King Jr., Washington Reporter from the Wall Street Journal, Center for a New American Security, July 2008, "Peak Oil: A survey of security concerns," www.aspousa.org/aspousa4/proceedings/\_CNAS\_King\_Peak\_Oil\_WorkingPaper.pdf, AD 3/21/12

Many commentators in the United States and abroad have begun to wrestle with the question of whether soaring oil prices and market volatility could spark an outright oil war between major powers—possibly ignited not by China or Russia, but by the United States. In a particularly pointed speech on the topic in May, James Russell of the Naval Postgraduate School in California addressed what he called the increasing militarization of international energy security. “Energy security is now deemed so central to ‘national security’ that threats to the former are liable to be reflexively interpreted as threats to the latter,” he told a gathering at the James A. Baker Institute for Public Policy at Houston’s Rice University.6 The possibility that a large-scale war could break out over access to dwindling energy resources, he wrote, “is one of the most alarming prospects facing the current world system.”7 Mr. Russell figures among a growing pool of analysts who worry in particular about the psychological readiness of the United States to deal rationally with a sustained oil shock. Particularly troubling is the increasing perception within Congress that the financial side of the oil markets no longer functions rationally. It has either been taken over by speculators or is being manipulated, on the supply side, by producers who are holding back on pumping more oil in order to drive up the price. A breakdown in trust for the oil markets, these analysts fear, could spur calls for government action—even military intervention. “The perceptive chasm in the United States between new [oil] market realities and their impact on the global distribution of power will one day close,” Mr. Russell said. “And when it does, look out.”8 For years, skeptics scoffed at predictions that the United States would hit its own domestic oil production peak by sometime in the late 1960s. With its oil fields pumping full out, the U.S. in 1969 was providing an astonishing 25 percent of the world’s oil supply—a role no other country has ever come close to matching. U.S. production then peaked in December 1970, and has fallen steadily ever since, a shift that has dramatically altered America’s own sense of vulnerability and reordered its military priorities. During World War II, when its allies found their own oil supplies cut off by the war, the United States stepped in and made up the difference. Today it is able to meet less than a third of its own needs. A similar peak in worldwide production would have far more sweeping consequences. It would, for one, spell the end of the world’s unparalleled economic boom over the last century. It would also dramatically reorder the wobbly balance of power between nations as energy-challenged industrialized countries turn their sights on the oil-rich nations of the Middle East and Africa. In a peak oil future, the small, flattened, globalized world that has awed recent commentators would become decidedly round and very vast again. Oceans will reemerge as a hindrance to trade, instead of the conduit they have been for so long. An energy-born jolt to the world economy would leave no corner of the globe untouched. Unable to pay their own fuel bills, the tiny Marshall Islands this summer faced the possibility of going entirely without power. That is a reality that could sweep across many of the smallest and poorest countries in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, reversing many of the tentative gains in those regions and stirring deep social unrest. Large patches of the world rely almost entirely on diesel-powered generators for what skimpy electricity they now have. Those generators are the first to run empty as prices soar. A British parliamentary report released in June on “The Impact of Peak Oil on International Development” concluded that “the deepening energy crisis has the potential to make poverty a permanent state for a growing number of people, undoing the development efforts of a generation.”9 We are seeing some of the consequences already in Pakistan – a country of huge strategic importance, with its own stash of nuclear weapons – that is now in the grips of a severe energy crisis. By crippling the country’s economy, battering the stock market, and spurring mass protests, Pakistan’s power shortages could end up giving the country’s Islamic parties the leverage they have long needed to take power. It is not hard to imagine similar scenarios playing out in dozens of other developing countries. Deepening economic unrest will put an enormous strain on the United Nations and other international aid agencies. Anyone who has ever visited a major UN relief hub knows that their fleets of Land Rovers, jumbo jets and prop planes have a military-size thirst for fuel. Aid agency budgets will come under unprecedented pressure just as the need for international aid skyrockets and donor countries themselves feel pressed for cash. A peaking of oil supplies could also hasten the impact of global climate change by dramatically driving up the use of coal for power generation in much of the world. A weakened world economy would also put in jeopardy the massively expensive projects, such as carbon capture and storage, that many experts look to for a reduction in industrial emissions. So on top of the strains caused by scarce fossil fuels, the world may also have to grapple with the destabilizing effects of more rapid desertification, dwindling fisheries, and strained food supplies. An oil-constricted world will also stir perilous frictions between haves and have-nots. The vast majority of all the world’s known oil reserves is now in the hands of national oil companies, largely in countries with corrupt and autocratic governments. Many of these governments—Iran and Venezuela top the list—are now seen as antagonists of the United States. Tightened oil supplies will substantially boost these countries’ political leverage, but that enhanced power will carry its own peril. Playing the oil card when nations are scrambling for every barrel will be a far more serious matter that at any time in the past. The European continent could also undergo a profound shift as its needs—and sources of energy—diverge all the more from those of the United States. A conservation-oriented Europe (oil demand is on the decline in almost every EU country) will look all the more askance at what it sees as the gluttonous habits of the United States. At the same time, Europe’s governments may have little choice but to shy from any political confrontations with its principal energy supplier, Russia. An energy-restricted future will greatly enhance Russia’s clout within settings like the UN Security Council but also in its dealings with both Europe and China. Abundant oil and gas have fueled Russia’s return to power over the last decade, giving it renewed standing within the UN and increasing sway over European capitals. The peak oil threat is already sending shivers through the big developing countries of China and India, whose propulsive growth (and own internal stability) requires massive doses of energy. For Beijing, running low on fuel spells economic chaos and internal strife, which in turn spawns images of insurrection and a breaking up of the continent-sized country. Slumping oil supplies will automatically pit the two largest energy consumers—the United States and China—against one another in competition over supplies in South America, West Africa, the Middle East, and Central Asia. China is already taking this competition very seriously. It doesn’t require much of a leap to imagine a Cold War-style scramble between Washington and Beijing—not for like-minded allies this time but simply for reliable and tested suppliers of oil. One region that offers promise and peril in almost equal measure is the Artic, which many in the oil industry consider the last big basin of untapped hydrocarbon riches. But the Artic remains an ungoverned ocean whose legal status couldn’t be less clear, especially so long as the United States continues to remain outside the international Law of the Sea Treaty. As the ices there recede, the risk increases that a scramble for assets in the Artic could turn nasty. No country, finally, will face more varied and far-reaching strains in an oil-constrained future than the United States. Its global military posture will have to shoulder even greater policing responsibilities, from the Gulf of Guinea to the Strait of Hormuz, just as it faces unprecedented challenges in keeping its own fuel tanks full. The United States will also see its very status as the world’s lone superpower put into question as its oil-dependent economy faces rising unemployment, falling home values, and the reality of being ever deeper in hawk to countries halfway around the world. The gloomiest prognosticators envision a future in which America’s entire postwar boom—with its massive interstates and suburban sprawl—is thrown violently into reverse. A jolt of even a quarter that magnitude could still spark a period of angry victimization, when both the public and their elected officials seek out those who are to blame for the country’s travails.

### Oil Shocks Impact— Economy

#### US, EU, Indian economies all hit hard by a shock

Annunziata 3/18

 Marco, Chief Economist of General Electric Co, PhD in Economics from Princeton, "Shock 'n' oil," www.voxeu.org/index.php?q=node/7736, AD 3/20/12

Advanced economies have achieved a greater degree of energy efficiency than emerging markets, but they have no room left for policy stimulus, the US recovery is still fragile, and Europe is facing a potential credit crunch. The US would enjoy a limited cushion from the lower natural gas prices, given the limited substitutability of oil and gas in the short term. An oil shock would push Europe into a deeper and more protracted recession than what is now in the cards (and rising inflation would make for even livelier discussions at the European Central Bank…), while the US would decelerate again, halting the recent labour market improvement. Some of the most vulnerable emerging markets would include Turkey and India. Turkey’s growth is already slowing significantly as a consequence of its large current-account deficit, which would be made worse by even higher oil prices. India has substantial subsidies on domestic fuels prices, so that a further spike in international prices would force it to choose between a wider budget deficit (if it maintains domestic fuel prices close to current levels) and a higher inflation rate (if it raises domestic prices rather than giving a higher subsidy). Both options are unpalatable. Small open economies such as Korea and Thailand would suffer from the decline in global growth and trade.

#### $4 a gallon gasoline collapses the economy

Roubini 3/9

Nouriel Roubini, professor of economics at New York University's Stern School of Business, is co-founder and chairman of Roubini Global Economics. interview by Benjamin Pauker, "$200 Oil and the Moscow-Beijing Alliance," 3/9/12 www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/03/09/200\_oil\_roubini\_bremmer?page=full, AD 3/20/12

But even without an attack outright, there's a war of words between the U.S., Israel, and Iran, and this war of words has been escalating. There is also a covert war, because Israel and the U.S. allegedly have been killing some of the scientists, engaging in sabotage through cyberwarfare, and now Iran is reacting. They've tried to kill a bunch of Israeli diplomats around the world and, if sanctions become more binding, they could start making noises about other threats. Brent [Crude] that used to be $90 per barrel is already in the $120-125 range. But if that war of words and covert war escalates, there's a possibility that -- even short of a military confrontation -- oil prices could become high enough that it becomes material for the economy. I would not underestimate the effect of gasoline today, in a number of U.S. states, being already at $4.00 a gallon -- and it could be so in many other states. Psychologically, once you're above the $4 mark, it has an impact on consumer confidence. And in the summer, prices tend to go up another 20 or 30 cents. The higher those oil prices are, the higher the chance that has a negative effect on consumer confidence, on disposable income, and on the economy. And it's not just in the U.S. -- the price of oil is very high in Europe and in many other parts of the world. So I would let other people assess the risk of a conflict, but confidently I see oil prices from here going higher, rather than lower. The one thing I worry about more than the eurozone is oil.

#### Duplicate – Middle East oil shocks collapse the global economy

Roubini 3/9

Nouriel Roubini, professor of economics at New York University's Stern School of Business, is co-founder and chairman of Roubini Global Economics. interview by Benjamin Pauker, "$200 Oil and the Moscow-Beijing Alliance," 3/9/12 www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/03/09/200\_oil\_roubini\_bremmer?page=full, AD 3/20/12

The reality is that if you think about the last three major global recessions, there were all caused by a geopolitical shock in the Middle East that led to spike in oil prices. The Yom Kippur War in 1973 led to the global recession from 1974 to 1979; the Iranian revolution in 1979 led to spike in oil prices and the 1980-1982 recession; and even in 1990, the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait brought a temporary spike in oil prices that led, among other factors, to a U.S. and global recession. So if the conflict is severe and protracted and the increase in oil prices in significant, I would say we're talking about not just a U.S. recession but a global recession. And this time around, we're also coming out of a global financial crisis where now we have a huge amount of private and public debt in many advanced economies, like we did not have in 1973 or 1979 or 1990. So the global economy could not take a kind of protracted oil shock coming at a time where there's already a painful process of deleveraging, with fragility in the balance sheets of governments and the private sector as well.

#### High oil prices stop the US recovery –Bernanke

The Hill 2/7

Ben Geman, "Bernanke: Oil price spike could 'stop the recovery,'" 2/7/12 thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/209199-bernanke-big-oil-price-spike-could-stop-the-recovery, AD 3/20/12

Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke warned Tuesday that a major disruption in foreign oil supplies that sent prices skyward could thwart the economic recovery, but expressed optimism that the United States is becoming less vulnerable to such dislocations. “A major disruption that sent oil prices up very substantially could ... stop the recovery,” he told the Senate Budget Committee, noting that oil price spikes feed inflation and act as a “tax” on consumers. Turmoil in Libya helped send oil prices above $113 per barrel in late April and early May of 2011, pushing nationwide gasoline prices to almost $4 per gallon — a level exceeded in many areas — before falling back.

### War Makes Alt Fuel Transition Impossible

#### Overseas resource wars will permanently prevent alternative energy transitions. Klare 2008

(Micheal T. Klare, The Nation*’s defense correspondent, is professor of peace and world security studies at Hampshire College. “*The New Geopolitics of Energy*”* [The Nation](http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?RQT=318&pmid=29240&TS=1214343341&clientId=42567&VInst=PROD&VName=PQD&VType=PQD). New York: [May 19, 2008](http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?RQT=572&VType=PQD&VName=PQD&VInst=PROD&pmid=29240&pcid=39304061&SrchMode=3). Vol. 286, Iss. 19;  pg. 18)

The principal obstacle to this herculean task is the very reason for its necessity in the first place: massive spending on the military dimensions of overseas resource competition. I estimate that it costs approximately $100 billion to $150 billion per year to enforce the Carter Doctrine, not including the war in Iraq. Extending that doctrine to the Caspian Sea basin and Africa will add billions. A new cold war with China, with an accompanying naval arms race, will require trillions in additional military expenditures over the next few decades. This is sheer lunacy: it will not guarantee access to more sources of energy, lower the cost of gasoline at home or discourage China from seeking new energy resources. What it will do is sop up all the money we need to develop alternative energy sources and avert the worst effects of global climate change.

### US Not Key to Oil Prices

#### US not key to global oil prices—other nations will fill in

Avent ‘9

Ryan Avent is an economist, consultant, and writer living in Washington, D.C. In addition to this site, he is a regular contributor to The Economist’s Free Exchange, and a (somewhat less regular) contributor to Gristmill. <http://www.ryanavent.com/blog/?p=2073>, June 1

He’s explaining how absurd American levels of car ownership are, and he’s right. But check out that league table. Even a very progressive, transit friendly place like Denmark has 408 motor vehicles per thousand population — a low rate for a developed nation. Meanwhile, Brazil has 81 vehicles per thousand people. India has 12 per thousand people. And China has 10 per thousand people. Yes, American consumption rates are likely to approach the upper range of the other developed nations, but so what? If Brazil, Indian, and Chinese rates of vehicle ownership get anywhere near the lower end of the developed nation range, then we’re talking hundreds of millions of new automobile sales. This relates directly to the point I made earlier today concerning oil prices — it’s not about us. I’ve been known to worry about excess automobile capacity in the past, but I’d worry about it more if China weren’t so busy building highways.

### Plan Doesn’t Decrease Prices

#### Plan doesn’t decrease prices

Reich ‘8

Robert Reich is a professor of public policy at the University of California, Berkeley, http://marketplace.publicradio.org/display/web/2008/06/04/reich\_public\_transit/

Look, fuel costs aren't going down. Global demand is increasing faster than supplies. This is the perfect time to expand and modernize public transit systems. America hasn't been really serious about public transit for almost a century. Most of New York City's subway system was built over 100 years ago. Los Angeles ripped out its trams long ago. Boston's Big Dig, the most costly infrastructure project in memory, is entirely for cars. In recent years, only a few farsighted and ambitious cities, like Portland, Oregon, have invested in light rail. What better way to get the economy going and save energy and the environment in years to come, than to create a modern, efficient system of public transportation in America?

### Oil Price Link Turn

#### Weak US labor market drives down the price of oil

Kashelkar '12

 Ramkrishna, "Falling crude Prices will need policy support now," 5/24/12 articles.economictimes.indiatimes.com/2012-05-24/news/31840185\_1\_mbpd-oil-prices-asia-editorial-director

There have been a few other factors combining to exert a downward pressure on oil prices in recent days. These include disappointing US employment data, which renewed concerns over the health of the economic recovery of the world's largest consumer of oil, and euro zone joblessness rising to a 5-year high in April. While all these portend further weakening in oil demand in the developed world, supply-side indications are also adding a bearish pressure," mentioned Vandana Hari, Asia editorial director, Platts - a leading provider of energy information.

#### Low Oil Prices signal a weaker US economy

Alic '12

 Jen Alic is a geopolitical analyst, co-founder of ISA Intel in Sarajevo and Tel Aviv, and the former editor-in-chief of ISN Security Watch in Zurich., "Behind the Low Oil Prices Lurks a Struggling Economy," 5/30/12 oilprice.com/Energy/Oil-Prices/Behind-the-Low-Oil-Prices-Lurks-a-Struggling-Economy.html

As oil prices drop to below $90 a barrel this week, reaching a seven-month low, it’s fine to take heart in the accompanying dip in gas prices at the pump, but this is all relative in the larger picture of economic slowdown and possible recession. Last week closed with benchmark US crude at $90.86 per barrel and $106.83 per barrel for Brent crude, the lowest levels so far in 2012, and prices continued to fall this week, dropping to below $90 for the first time since the last quarter of 2011. Weaker demand, stronger supply, signs of slowing US and Chinese economies and a temporary cessation of simmering tensions over Iran have worked to lower prices. The possibility, and indeed probability, of a recession across the European Union is likely to drive prices down further. Prices have also lowered as a result of the strengthening of the US dollar. In the meantime, the Saudis continue to exert downward pressure on prices, not satisfied with the fact that oil has fallen by $15 a barrel over the past month alone. The trend is welcome at the pump in the US, where prices have fallen by 27 cents per gallon since early April. This, of course, ignores the drivers pushing oil prices down—drivers that some warn could lead to a recession in the US.

#### Jobs are the key internal link to the economy and oil prices

IST 09

6/6/09

"People are starting to wonder about the strength of the US economic recovery... This does not look good for oil demand because it means that consumer spending will remain weak." A closely watched US Labor Department report last week showed US job losses had surged worse than expected to 467,000 in June, pushing the unemployment rate to a new 26-year high of 9.5%. The report, seen as one of the best indicators of economic momentum, reversed the improvement seen the previous month when job losses fell to 322,000.

#### Unemployment empirically drives prices collapse

Kahn ‘9

Chris. Oil prices tumble as Europe and the US shed jobs, AP, July 2

NEW YORK (AP) — Oil prices tumbled to their lowest level in a month Thursday following the release of woeful job numbers in Europe and the U.S. Benchmark crude for August delivery fell $2.58, nearly 4 percent, to settle at $66.73 a barrel on the New York Mercantile Exchange. Crude hit an eight-month high in midday trading Tuesday, but prices have fallen at the close for five straight days now. Nymex is closed Friday for the July Fourth holiday. On Thursday, a Labor Department report showed the economy lost a larger-than-expected 467,000 jobs in June. The unemployment rate climbed to 9.5 percent from 9.4 percent in May, underscoring concerns about the pace of economic recovery. Since the recession began in December 2007, the economy has lost a net total of 6.5 million jobs. That has destroyed demand for energy on numerous levels. Employees who have lost jobs or are in fear of losing jobs are driving less and buying fewer goods, many of them petroleum based. Factories also have curbed production and are using less natural gas and electricity. U.S. stores of natural gas continue to grow as energy demand has weakened. The government reported that the nation's surplus grew more than expected last week, and it's now 21 percent above the five-year average.

## \*\*\*HIGHWAYS\*\*\*

### Public Transit Solves Congestion

**Public transit is key to resolving roadway congestion**

**The National Business Coalition for Rapid Transit ‘3** (November 3, 2003, The National Business Coalition for Rapid Transit, The Economic Importance of Public Transport, <http://www.apta.com/research/info/online/documents/economic_importance.pdf>)

The **tremendous** growth in **traffic congestion means extra costs for business** – higher wages and benefits to recruit workers, shorter workdays, increased absenteeism, and greater employee turnover and transportation assistance. Business is recognizing that **travel mobility is a key quality of life issue for its labor force.**4 **Transit provides another economic boost to business by removing autos** from the highway system, thereby **maintaining roadway capacity for the shipment of goods** and material.

#### Public transit vastly increasing carrying capacity per vehicle- reduces roadway congestion

**Semmens ‘5** [John, economist at the Laissez Faire Institute, June 2005 Does Light Rail Worsen Congestion and Air Quality?, online 2009]

**Advocates of government subsidies for public transit assert that this should help mitigate urban traffic congestion by replacing** many **automobile trips with** **a smaller number of high-occupancy-vehicle trips.** In terms of carrying capacity, **a bus can serve 15 times as many person-miles per vehicle-mile as a typical automobile.** **A light-rail train has a carrying capacity** about **100 times larger.** **The prospect of reducing urban traffic congestion by luring would-be automobile drivers onto public transit is thus tantalizing.**

### Congestion Impact Wall

#### Congestion leads to air pollution, economic collapse, and environmental collapse

**Peters ‘9** (Mary P., U.S. Secretary of Transportation, “Critical Relief for Traffic Congestion”, American Public Transportation Association) June 16, 2009<http://www.apta.com/research/info/online/congestion.cfm>)

As more and more vehicles crowd the nation’s roadways, **traffic congestion has an increasingly debilitating effect on our quality of life.** Across America, people, **business and industry, the economy and the environment pay a higher and higher price for mounting congestion** -- **through delays, lost opportunities, higher costs, increased accidents, reduced competitiveness, pollution**, frustration **and much more.** The data are clear: Providing fast, affordable, **reliable public transportation is essential in blunting the effects of crippling congestion**, and providing sustained relief that: Protects personal freedom, choice and mobility Enhances access to opportunity Enables economic prosperity Protects our communities and the natural environment. The longest-running study of traffic congestion in America -- the Urban Mobility Study conducted annually for 19 years by the Texas Transportation Institute (TTI) -- confirms the trend: on a daily basis, Americans are experiencing longer delays, longer periods of congestion, and the spread of congestion across more and more of the nation’s roadways. This study of 75 urban areas, ranging in size from New York City to areas with 100,000+ population, suggests that traffic congestion will continue to worsen as the number of vehicle miles traveled continues to grow. The data include the following: Each person traveling in peak periods wastes, on average, 62 hours a year -- nearly eight full working days -- in congestion delays.(\*1) Urban travelers can now expect to encounter congested roadways during seven hours of the day.(\*1) Congestion is becoming more widespread, experienced by nearly 60 percent of urban roadways in 2000.(\*1) **Congestion is no longer confined to our largest metropolitan areas.** As long ago as 1997, two-thirds of peak-period traffic was congested in areas of 500,000 or less. (\*2) “**Unless we manage highway congestion, our nation will continue to incur economic costs in foregone productivity, wasted fuel, and a reduced quality of life.”**

#### Environmental collapse leads to extinction

**Chakkaravarthy ‘3** (Ashoka, http://www.yorku.ca/bunchmj/ICEH/proceedings/Chakkaravarthy\_Q\_ICEH\_papers\_66to74.pdf)

**The very basis of human survival hinges on the sustainable inter-linkages with the environment.** The present day scenario however, tells a different story. **The ever-increasing problems due to pollution are leading to various environmental hazards that are detrimental to our survival.** In this context, this paper aims to address the various problems vis-a-vis human survival and the steps to be taken up in a concerted fashion towards sustainable development. **In future years the population increase will require that the environment of the world be reviewed as a closed system.** Consequently, it is necessary to take an ecological approach to environmental quality and consider the totality of the environment with ~~man~~ as part of an ecosystem.

#### Specifically, air pollution leads to extinction

**Zayed Prize ‘3** (PG. http://www.zayedprize.org.ae/en/display.aspx?type=news&id=1518)

**Air pollution is a serious threat to human survival affecting all aspects of life on earth** including its socio-economic development. **Climatic changes have been on their upswing choking, many urban areas worldwide and theory effecting sustainable development.** With Asian brown clouds becoming an important issue in this part of the world. It has been catching media headlines recently.

#### Econ collapse leads to extinction

**Mead ‘92** [Walter Russel Mead, Senior Fellow in American FoPo @ the Council on Foreign Relations, World Policy Institute, 1992]

Hundreds of millions, billions, of people have pinned their hopes on the international market . They and their leaders have embraced market principles and drawn closer to the west because they believe the system can work for them? But what if it can’t? **What if the global economy stagnates** or even shrinks? In that case, **we will face a new period of international conflict**: North against South, rich against poor. Russia, China India, these **countries with their** billions of people and their **nuclear weapons will pose a much greater danger to the world than Germany and Japan did in the 30s.**

### Congestion = Air Pollution

#### Traffic congestion leads to massive air pollution

Katz et al. ‘5

Bruce Katz is vice president, director of the Metropolitan Policy Progam, and Adeline M. and Alfred I. Johnson Chair in Urban and Metropolitan Studies at the Brookings Institution. Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. Scott Bernstein is at the Center for Neighborhood Technology. “Getting Transportation Right for Metropolitan America,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 26

As congestion increases, air quality continues to worsen in major metropolitan regions. Deteriorating air quality raises serious health concerns that are beginning to recieve a great deal attention. The Bush administration recently acted to modestly increase fuel economy standards for light-duty trucks and sport utility vehicles, and sent confusing signals about conformity with the Clean Air Act in cases scattered from California to Atlanta. At the same time, the Supreme Court, responding to scientific evidence, upheld new air quality standard measurements that better reflect the levels of air pollutants caused by car emissions. As a result, in April 2004, the Environmental Protection Agency designated 474 counties in 31 states out of compliance with the federal air quality standards of the 1990 Clean Air Act amendments for smog-causing ozone. Some 150 million people live in these counties.

### Public Transportation k to Solve Air Pollution

#### Public transport key to air quality- more than 50% reduction of all dangerous emissions

**Millar ‘9**, [Bob, President of APTA, <http://www.publictransportation.org/facts/#hw07>, online 2009, DB]

**Public transport**ation **reduces pollution and** helps promote cleaner air. Public transportation **produces 95 percent less carbon monoxide** (CO), **90 percent less in volatile organic compounds** (VOCs), **and about half as much carbon dioxide** (CO2) and nitrogen oxide (NOx), **per passenger mile**, as private vehicles. **Energy-related carbon dioxide emissions represent 82 percent of total US human-made greenhouse emissions. By reducing smog-producing pollutants**, greenhouse gases and by conserving ecologically sensitive lands and open spaces -- **public transportation is helping to meet national air quality standards.**

### Congestion kills econ

#### Congestion saps economic growth

Frankel et al 09

 Emil, Director of Transportation Policy, Joshua Schank, Director of Transportation Research Daniel Lewis, Policy Analyst JayEtta Hecker, Senior Advisor, "Performance Driven: A New Vision for U.S. Transportation Policy," National Transportation Policy Project," 6/9/09 <http://bipartisanpolicy.org/events/2009/06/performance-drivena-new-vision-us-transportation-policy>, AD 7/2/12

 The most salient indicator of an under-performing transport system in many large metropolitan areas is chronic traffic congestion. Congestion delays are a daily frustration for millions of Americans, the vast majority of whom (approximately 90 percent) commute to work by car.62 One study estimated that congestion delays in metropolitan areas add up to more than 4 billion person hours of lost time each year and cost the economy approximately $78 billion.63 Many Americans have no choice but to endure congestion because 45 percent have no available public transportation service options at all, and more still have poor ones.64 In addition to taking a toll on economic productivity and quality of life, congestion impedes the movement of goods in urban areas and drives up costs; it also causes excess fuel consumption and pollution emissions.

### Health Care Mod

#### Air pollution collapses the health care industry- massive health care costs

**Shoock ‘7**, [Corey, “Blowing in the Wind”, FORDHAM JOURNAL OF CORPORATE FINANCE AND LAW, http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_qa4048/is\_200707/ai\_n21032683/)

**Respiratory illness, cancer, neurological disorders, and birth defects caused by fossil fuels cost the country billions of dollars a year.**9 **These billions of dollars**, public health entitlements notwithstanding, **represent a mass siphoning of capital** that would otherwise, in the form of commerce or workforce participation, contribute to the domestic economy.10 The federal government is clearly complicit in allowing the status quo, for which individual policymakers ought to be ashamed. But more constructive is the fact that **the solution is cognizable and can be implemented in a way that solves the mutually reinforcing crises of** electricity demand,11 **infrastructural antiquation**,12 **rising energy costs**,13 **and soaring public and private health care expenses**,14 not to mention going a long way toward providing the environment an overdue respite.

#### Air pollution kills over two million people every year and causes respiratory infections, heart disease, and lung cancer

**ENS ‘6**, (ENS, Environmental News Service, <http://www.ens-newswire.com/ens/oct2006/2006-10-06-01.asp>, October 6, 2006.)

**Air pollution in cities across the world is causing** some **two million premature deaths every year**, the World Health Organization (WHO) said Thursday, urging nations to adopt stricter air pollution standards. The international health agency's new air quality guidelines call for nations to reduce the impact of air pollution by substantially cutting levels of particulate matter, ozone and sulfur dioxide. "**By reducing air pollution levels, we can help countries to reduce the global burden of disease from respiratory infections, heart disease, and lung cancer which they otherwise would be facing**," said Maria Neira, WHO director of public health and the environment. "Moreover, action to reduce the direct impact of air pollution will also cut emissions of gases which contribute to climate change and provide other health benefits." WHO cautioned that for some cities meeting the targets would require cutting current pollution levels more than three fold. The organization noted that many countries don't have any air pollution standards. **Existing standards vary** greatly, WHO said, and **most fail to ensure sufficient protection of human health.** Particulate matter is the major concern, WHO said, and cutting this type of air pollution can produce the greatest health benefits. Produced mainly by the burning of fossil fuels, particulate matter has been increasingly linked to respiratory illness and heart disease. Air pollution is a major concern for cities worldwide - none moreso than China's Beijing. (Photo by Edwin Ewing, Jr. courtesy [CDC](http://www.cdc.gov/))

### Acid Rain Mod

#### Air pollution causes global acid rain

**MSN Encarta ‘8**, (MSN Encarta, Acid Rain, 2006-2008, http://encarta.msn.com/encyclopedia\_761578185/acid\_rain.html)

Acid Rain, form of [air pollution](http://encarta.msn.com/encyclopedia_761577413/Air_Pollution.html) in which airborne acids produced by electric utility plants and other sources fall to Earth in distant regions. The corrosive nature of acid rain causes widespread damage to the environment. The problem begins with the production of sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxides from the burning of [fossil fuels](http://encarta.msn.com/encyclopedia_761586407/Fossil_Fuels.html), such as coal, natural gas, and oil, and from certain kinds of manufacturing. Sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxides react with water and other chemicals in the air to form sulfuric acid, nitric acid, and other pollutants. These acid pollutants reach high into the atmosphere, travel with the wind for hundreds of miles, and eventually return to the ground by way of rain, snow, or fog, and as invisible “dry” forms. Damage from acid rain has been widespread in eastern North America and throughout Europe, and in Japan, China, and Southeast Asia. Acid rain leaches nutrients from soils, slows the growth of trees, and makes lakes uninhabitable for fish and other wildlife. In cities, acid pollutants corrode almost everything they touch, accelerating natural wear and tear on structures such as buildings and statues. Acids combine with other chemicals to form urban [smog](http://encarta.msn.com/encyclopedia_761572991/Smog.html), which attacks the lungs, causing illness and premature deaths.

## \*\*\*TERRORISM\*\*\*

### Transit Vulnerable to Terror Strike

#### Transportation sector vunerable to terrorist strike

Katz and Puentes ‘5

Bruce Katz is vice president, director of the Metropolitan Policy Progam, and Adeline M. and Alfred I. Johnson Chair in Urban and Metropolitan Studies at the Brookings Institution. Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. “Transportation Reform: An Overview,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 13

The last chapter makes the connection between mobility and security. Arnold Howitt and Jonathan Makler argue that although a number of positive steps have been taken in the years since the September 11 terrorist attacks, surface transportation has been effectively placed in a secondary tier of public services in terms of protective actions. Policymakers and senior public managers see highway and transit systems as genuinely vulnerable to terrorist attack; but among the many potentially exposed elements of American society, they have not been given the highest funding priority. In the end, the authors explore a number of ways in which surface transportation security needs to be enhanced to protect the mobility of the nation.

### Transit Reform Solves Terrorism

#### integration of public transit to raIl and transport is key to prevent terror strike

Katz et al. ‘5

Bruce Katz is vice president, director of the Metropolitan Policy Progam, and Adeline M. and Alfred I. Johnson Chair in Urban and Metropolitan Studies at the Brookings Institution. Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. Scott Bernstein is at the Center for Neighborhood Technology. “Getting Transportation Right for Metropolitan America,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 27

Connect Rail,Air, and Surface Transportation In 2003,for the next time in U.S. history, the statutes governing surface transportation policy (TEA-21), aviation (Aviation lnvestment and Reform Act for the Twenty-First Century). and passenger rail were slated to be considered during the same Congress. This offered a superb opportunity for policymakers to transcend the nation's past and current separation of those modes and end the separate treatment of inter- and intrametropolitan policies. However, although the aviation law was reauthorized in 2003, passenger rail and surface transportation action languished. Thus the United States is still the only industrialized country in the world that has not pursued an integrated approach to transportation policy. This ignores both travel and political reality. For example, the focus of the new Transportation Security Administration (TSA) has revolved almost exclusively around aviation-oriented passenger screening and technology for package and luggage screening—and yet some 91 percent of intercity travel occurs by car or bus. That means the TSA’s efforts do not address the largest share of intercity passenger travel. Likewise, the dislocations caused by the September 11 terrorist attacks underscore that the nation’s economic well-being, as well as its strategic security, depends on metropolitan areas and the optimal functioning of our national travel system in an interconnected, redundant, and reliable fashion. Such links support our economy, preserve our basic freedom to travel, and provide for the strategic security of the nation. Our nation’s transportation modes should be boldly connected, and Congress should consider them as they are: as connected entities of the transportation network

## \*\*\*AT-DAS\*\*\*

### Plan Solves Federalism

#### should devolve power to the states and metropolitan regions

Katz et al. ‘5

Bruce Katz is vice president, director of the Metropolitan Policy Progam, and Adeline M. and Alfred I. Johnson Chair in Urban and Metropolitan Studies at the Brookings Institution. Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. Scott Bernstein is at the Center for Neighborhood Technology. “Getting Transportation Right for Metropolitan America,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 16-17

This chapter argues that Congress must strive to preserve the innovative framework of past reforms and go further to devolve power and decision- making on localities. In this respect, numerous encouraging examples of state, local, and metropolitan innovation provide a sound basis for retaining federal reforms that have worked. At the same time, the mixed record among states in implementing ISTEA and TlA-2l exposes the need for additional federal reform that gives metropolitan areas greater powers and more tools in exchange for enhanced accountability.

### Spending Turns

#### Plan prevents coming fiscal insolvency

Katz et al. ‘5

Bruce Katz is vice president, director of the Metropolitan Policy Progam, and Adeline M. and Alfred I. Johnson Chair in Urban and Metropolitan Studies at the Brookings Institution. Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. Scott Bernstein is at the Center for Neighborhood Technology. “Getting Transportation Right for Metropolitan America,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 27

At a time of economic uncertainty and fiscal stress, the nation needs to get the most out of its transportation investment. Despite delivering large funding increases to states and metropolitan areas, ISTEA and TEA-2I held state and metropolitan transportation bureaucracies to few standards of performance. Future transportation spending should be linked to a higher standard of managerial efficiency, programmatic effectiveness, and fiscal responsibility. To that end, transportation reform efforts should establish a new framework for accountability that includes tighter disclosure requirements, improved performance measures, and rewards for exceptional performance. Congress also needs to create a transportation system that is more responsive to citizens and business. The more citizens and businesses inform transportation decisions, the better those decisions will be.

#### Plan solves both federal and state spending das

Winkelman et al ‘9

Steve Winkelman is director of the Transportation Program at the Center for Clean Air Policy (CCAP). Allison Bishins is a policy associate for transportation and climate change at CCAP. Chuck Kooshian is a Planner with the El Paso Department of Planning and Development. “Cost-Effective GHG Reductions through

Smart Growth & Improved Transportation Choices: An economic case for investment of cap-and-trade revenues,” <http://www.reconnectingamerica.org/public/display_asset/ccapsmartgrowthco2_june_2009_final_pdf?docid=306>, June 2009.

A wide variety of literature finds that smart growth produces net savings on the sum total costs of buildings, land, infrastructure and transportation. While some categories of that cost may be higher, the preponderance of literature suggests net savings overall.25 A National Academy of Sciences and Transportation Research Board review found substantial regional and state-level infrastructure cost savings from compact development.

#### Allocation money directly to MPOS solves the case without increase cost

Puentes & Bailey ‘5

Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. Kevin O’Brien is a columnist at the Cleveland *Plain Dealer.* Linda Bailey is Senior Research Associate for Transportation at ICF International. “Increasing Funding and Accountability for Metropolitan Transportation Decisions,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 160

An expansion of local control through suballocation, combined with funding flexibility, would enable MPOs to meet the challenges of intermodalism, environmental enhancement, and inclusive decisionmaking processes. This chapter examined just one quintessentially local need—public transit service— and found that MPOs are much more responsive to local needs than are states. Congress should give MPOs greater resources and flexibility to tailor transportation solutions to the distinctive realities of individual metropolitan areas. Congress should substantially increase the funding that is suballocated to MPOs, where the majority of the transportation challenges remain and where the majority of funds are generated. Specifically, the entire portion of STP funds available for distribution after the takedowns for enhancements and safety should be distributed throughout the state by the population formula. Congress should also ensure that the STP funds that are fed by the Minimum Guarantee program are subject to the metropolitan suballocation requirement, as they were during the life of ISTEA. These funds were $2.8 billion per year during TEA-21. This does not necessarily require an increase in overall funding recommends a shift in decisionmaking authority over existing funds.

### Solves Your DA (Spending, Econ, Climate Costs)

#### Plan solves future spending, economic decline, and climate change

Winkelman et al ‘9

Steve Winkelman is director of the Transportation Program at the Center for Clean Air Policy (CCAP). Allison Bishins is a policy associate for transportation and climate change at CCAP. Chuck Kooshian is a Planner with the El Paso Department of Planning and Development. “Cost-Effective GHG Reductions through

Smart Growth & Improved Transportation Choices: An economic case for investment of cap-and-trade revenues,” <http://www.reconnectingamerica.org/public/display_asset/ccapsmartgrowthco2_june_2009_final_pdf?docid=306>, June 2009.

Past estimates of the cost of achieving GHG reductions from the transportation sector have not considered the full range of economic benefits that can accrue through changes in transportation policies. Numerous studies have documented that transportation related land-use patterns have distinct cost impacts on a wide range of private and government expenditures. By assessing the net economic costs and benefits of development and transportation investment, we can ensure that our decisions account for the full range of potential costs and benefits. CCAP will publish a report in Summer 2009 titled “Growing Wealthier: The Economic Benefits of Smart Growth” which examines these issues in greater depth. The report concludes that there is compelling evidence that smart growth provides significant net economic benefits via avoided infrastructure costs, increased economic activity, reduction in household travel costs, job creation, public health improvements, energy and water use efficiency.20 In addition, smart growth can reduce GHG emissions beyond transportation. Some of these conclusions are highlighted below.

### AT Auto Industry DA

#### Auto industry statistics are artificially high—weak US economy holding back growth

Read 7/2

Rirchard, High Gear Media," "June Auto Sales May Have Hit a Record High," 7/2/12 .thecarconnection.com/news/1077415\_june-auto-sales-may-have-hit-a-record-high

There is, however, some bad news, too: the seasonally adjusted annual rate (SAAR) for auto sales may have slipped below 14 million for the second month in a row. Analysts are at odds on the exact number, but figures range from 13.6 to 13.9 million. (FYI, General Motors sees the total much higher, between 14 and 14.2 million.) Why the dip? Many point the finger at Europe and the tremors its financial situation has sent through the U.S. markets. However, a very encouraging deal hammered out at the European Union Summit sent stocks soaring on Friday, so that -- combined with low gas prices and increasing access to consumer credit -- could put the SAAR over 14 million again by the end of July. Stay tuned....

#### Recent sales mask underlying auto problems—the industry is doomed

Choy 6/1

 Danny, iMotor Times, "May Car Sales Are In: Everything is Amazing and Nobody's Happy," 6/1/12 www.imotortimes.com/articles/1637/20120601/car-sales-everything-amazing-nobodys-happy.htm

Toyota and Honda finished the month of May with sales up by an incredible 88.9 and 46 percent, respectively. Chrysler Group also finishes up May with an improvement of over 30 percent from May 2011. General Motors posted a solid 10.9 percent bump and Ford performed likewise at 12.6 percent. Things are looking quite optimistic across the board but, for some reason, analysts are still concerned. This time last year, Japan faced epic devastation after an 8.9 magnitude earthquake struck the island followed by threatening tsunamis as well as a critical nuclear event at the Fukushima power plant. Suffering a halt to operations and a shortage of parts and supplies, industry analysts believed that anything would look pretty outstanding compared to 2011's unrelenting nosedive. 2011 sales for Toyota had fallen by 32 percent while Honda fell 22.4. Considering the damage, analysts are complaining that 2012 recovery numbers just aren't great enough to cover the losses. Just earlier this week, analysts were posting yearly sales estimates nearing 14.4 million units. Now, preliminary results have caused analysts to adjust these initial estimates and settle for a more modest 13.8 million unit sales for 2012 instead. A premature end to initial industry excitment, the buzzkill doesn't stop there. According to the Toronto Sun, General Motors announced the end to one of the lines at its Oshawa, Ontario plant, which is currently responsible for building the Chevrolet Equinox and outgoing Impala. Effectively putting 2,000 employees out of work, GM has yet to make an official announcment to its Canadian employees or to the worker union. Mazda is sharing similar news as well. According to Automotive News Europe, Mazda continues to struggle with losses stretching for four years. Both slow sales and a strengthening yen are partially to blame. Succumbing to the financial stress, the Japanese automaker is set to cut 250 jobs in both United States and Europe. Originating from reports by Nikkei, these job cuts represent 25 percent of the company's staff in both markets and are necessary sacrifices in the company's reorganization efforts. What's more, Mazda will also trim the workforce at its Germany subsidiary by 200 employees, while sales staff in California and Michigan will drop to around 550 employees as well. Not to mention, all these cuts are coming after the recent buyout that caused 107 U.S. employees to leave voluntarily. While some members in the industry deal with pressuring job cuts and a slow recovery, apparently Hyundai didn't receive the memo. Less than a month ago, Hyundai announced an expansion to its Alabama assembly plant, opening 877 additional jobs for its line. According to the Detroit Free Press, the applicant roster exceeded all expections in a matter of days - more than 18,500 applicants answered to Hyundai's call of duty. In fact, Hyundai's HR is so flooded with applications, the processing shut down as of May 18th, informing job seekers that only 6,000-7,000 applications will be reviewed. Displaying quite a divergence of fortunes, only time can tell whether the auto industry will boom

#### Robust mass transit means we can retool the auto industry and save the industrial base

Moore ‘9

Michael. “Retool the Auto Industry” http://www.sustainablecityblog.com/2009/06/retool-the-auto-industry/

But you and I and the rest of America now own a car company! I know, I know—who on earth wants to run a car company? Who among us wants $50 billion of our tax dollars thrown down the rat hole of still trying to save GM? Let’s be clear about this: The only way to save GM is to kill GM. Saving our precious industrial infrastructure, though, is another matter and must be a top priority. If we allow the shutting down and tearing down of our auto plants, we will sorely wish we still had them when we realize that those factories could have built the alternative energy systems we now desperately need. And when we realize that the best way to transport ourselves is on light rail and bullet trains and cleaner buses, how will we do this if we’ve allowed our industrial capacity and its skilled workforce to disappear?

#### Robust mass transit revitalizes auto industry as transit manufacturers

Bernton ‘9

Edward Bernton, Globalist Analysis > Global Business Retooling Detroit: Fixing a Failure of Finance or Imagination? Monday, March 16, 2009

A major hurdle for both light-rail systems and modern bus transit systems is the paucity of U.S. manufacturing capability for both light-rail cars and modern buses. This results in long waits for the new cars required to expand most rapid transit systems or even to replace aging cars. The bulk of light rail cars are either manufactured outside the United States or assembled at U.S. plants from components made by foreign companies. For example, for the San Francisco and Los Angeles systems, the cars are manufactured in Italy by Breda Costruzioni Ferroviarie in Italy — and shipped to San Francisco for assembly. The DC Metro system initially bought cars from Breda in Italy and CAF in Spain. Newer cars are assembled in New York from major components manufactured in Spain. Other major suppliers of light rail or commuter rail cars include Bombardier in Canada, Siemens in Germany, Rotem in Korea, and Kawasaki in Japan. While some light rail cars are assembled from foreign components, of the 10 current manufacturers of light rail cars, only one company claims to manufacture in the United States. United Streetcar in Oregon, assembles cars from designs and components from the Czech company Skoda. In addition, bottlenecks in foreign capacity often force long delays on U.S. transit systems which compete with expanding systems in Asia and Europe to take delivery of new equipment. Until its sale by General Motors in 2005, GM’s Electro-Motive Division was the second-largest supplier of railroad locomotives in the world. It still has the largest installed base of rail engines in the world. And if U.S. car companies are developing the technology for electric cars and hybrid vehicles, it is important to remember that light rail cars are also electrically driven. Is there any reason that the revitalization of the automotive manufacturing sector could not, with some government support, include the development of a U.S. manufacturing capability for light rail and commuter rail vehicles — a market now almost entirely met by imports? Demand for mass transit in the United States has never been greater, with ridership at its highest levels in 50 years and almost 400 new rail, streetcar and bus rapid transit projects proposed across the country. Does it take more imagination than the Congress or the U.S. automotive industry now possesses to envision a future where American workers and technology compete and succeed in a big market which they have never before entered?

#### US AUT INDUSTRY CAN BE RE-TOOLED TO BUILD MASS TRANSIT

Wasserman ‘8

Henry. Published on Sunday, November 16, 2008 by CommonDreams.org GM Must Re-Make the Mass Transit System it Murdered

GM has certainly proved itself unable to make cars that can compete while healing a global-warmed planet. So let's convert the company's infrastructure to churn out trolley cars, monorails, passenger trains, truly green buses. FDR forced Detroit to manufacture the tanks, planes and guns that won World War 2 (try buying a 1944 Chevrolet!). Now let a reinvented GM make the "weapons" to win the climate war and energy independence. It demands re-tooling and re-training. But GM's special role in history must now evolve into using its infrastructure to restore the mass transit system---and ecological balance---it has helped destroy.

#### Auto INdustry must be retooled to build mass transit

Wojcik ‘9

John. John Wojcik, People's Weekly World Newspaper, 03/31/09 16:16. <http://www.pww.org/article/articleview/15070/>

There is a way forward for the auto industry right now. Beyond turning out “green” cars and a variety of other fuel-efficient vehicles, the industry should re-tool to help meet the enormous mass transit needs of the country. Hopefully, this is the direction in which the Obama administration wants to move.

### AT: Politics/Economics

#### No politics or private confidence links—industry, government, and political consensus for the plan

Winkelman et al ‘9

Steve Winkelman is director of the Transportation Program at the Center for Clean Air Policy (CCAP). Allison Bishins is a policy associate for transportation and climate change at CCAP. Chuck Kooshian is a Planner with the El Paso Department of Planning and Development. “Cost-Effective GHG Reductions through

Smart Growth & Improved Transportation Choices: An economic case for investment of cap-and-trade revenues,” <http://www.reconnectingamerica.org/public/display_asset/ccapsmartgrowthco2_june_2009_final_pdf?docid=306>, June 2009.

A growing number of stakeholder groups recognize that reducing emissions from the transportation sector requires the three pronged approach. CAFE standards and incentives or requirements for low-carbon fuel production represent two such complementary policies, but more are needed. CCAP established the Climate Policy Initiative (CPI) to support development of an effective and efficient national climate policy in the United States that can win the necessary support for implementation.14 Participants include industry representatives, environmental organizations and government officials. During this process, clear support has evolved for the need to address all three ‘legs of the stool,’ recognizing that vehicle and fuel technology will not be enough to reach our climate goals without initiatives that address VMT as well. Similarly, the U.S. Climate Action Partnership (USCAP), representing dozens of large companies and environmental groups, has called for the transportation sector to take steps including reductions in VMT, greater use of less-carbon-intensive forms of transportation, improvements in the efficiency of the transportation system and planning and infrastructure to support these changes.15

### Plan Popular

#### Plan popular- people love public transit

**The National Business Coalition for Rapid Transit ‘3** (November 3, 2003, The National Business Coalition for Rapid Transit, The Economic Importance of Public Transport, <http://www.apta.com/research/info/online/documents/economic_importance.pdf>)

**The public clearly values public transit**: in the last five years, transit use has risen 21 percent. In 2000, Americans used public transportation 9.4 billion times, representing the highest transit ridership in 40 years.1 **81 percent of people** polled **link public transport**ation **to improved quality of life, believing that** increased public investment in **public transport**ation **strengthens the economy, creates jobs**, reduces traffic congestion and air pollution, **and saves energy.**

#### Plan popular- diverse group support, job growth, and empirical success of ACES bill

**Schreckengast 6/24/09** (Tom Schreckengast, Editor and writer for Pocono Record, “We need clean energy, green jobs now”, <http://www.poconorecord.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20090624/NEWS04/906240303>)

By passing ACES out of committee, Congress has cleared a major hurdle toward building America's clean energy future that will create jobs, cut our dependence on oil, and reduce the carbon pollution that causes global warming. As the ACES bill moves to the full House and the Senate, **it is important that Congress works to strengthen and pass comprehensive clean energy** and climate solutions **to unleash investment in clean energy sources** — like wind and solar — increase energy efficiency to save consumers money, boost the economy, strengthen national security, and limit global warming. **We need climate legislation now to create jobs and spur our economic recovery.** **There is growing support from** businesses, faith groups, labor and other **diverse groups that we need to produce more clean energy and reduce global warming pollution.** Delay is not an option — we need to act now to create jobs in manufacturing and whole new industries, and protect the health of people and the planet. **ACES is a strong foundation that we can build upon.** Over the next weeks **we can convince Congress to** provide more funding for renewable energy sources, **increase the emphasis on energy efficiency**, and create more clean energy jobs. The opposition is blocking progress for America. They are just stalling since they are out of ideas and have no plans besides protecting profits and lining the pockets of greedy companies. **We need to move to a clean energy future that will make America a global leader for the 21st century, not stuck with 19th century technologies and dirty fuel.** The ACES bill would establish a hard cap on global warming pollution that would reduce U.S. emissions by 17 percent below 2005 levels by 2020, by 42 percent by 2030, and by 83 percent by 2050.

### AT Highways DA

#### Highway trust fund broke now

Reuters ‘9

Government estimates $20 billion highway funding shortfall, http://www.reuters.com/article/domesticNews/idUSTRE55O57E20090625

WASHINGTON (Reuters) - The United States will need up to $20 billion through early 2011 to cover an emergency shortfall in funding for road construction projects, the Obama administration told Congress on Thursday. The federal trust that reimburses states for road work is nearly broke for the second time in a year as gasoline tax revenues -- its primary funding source -- have declined sharply as higher fuel prices have prompted less driving and more fuel-efficient cars. "The (Obama) administration has a difficult problem -- a system that can no longer pay for itself," Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood said at a Senate Environment and Public Works hearing. "There is simply not enough money to do what we need to do." As of now, the Highway Trust Fund will run dry in early September. But officials said the Transportation Department may slow payments to states to keep the account afloat longer.

#### Highways trust broke squo—crushes your da

Lowy ‘9

Joan. White House hunting for $20B for highways, transit, http://www.google.com/hostednews/ap/article/ALeqM5iSc7f9TH1lfUOLDpupOhF8VqobvwD991T0S00

WASHINGTON (AP) — The Obama administration is scrambling to find an extra $20 billion to keep highway and transit construction projects and the thousands of jobs they represent going for the next year and a half. Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood told a Senate panel Thursday that the White House's Office of Management and Budget estimates that is how much money will be needed to keep federal transportation aid flowing to states through March 2011. The problem is that the administration doesn't want to borrow the money from the federal treasury, but hasn't yet found another source for the funds, LaHood said. The federal Highway Trust Fund is expected to go broke by Aug. 21 due to declines in revenue from gas and truck sales taxes. Link: Mass Transit Means Less Cars

#### Highways fund broke now

Rogers ‘9

David, President Obama short of money on highway fund http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0609/24121.html#ixzz0KOeAef9Y&Chttp://www.politico.com/news/stories/0609/24121.html

Amid all its other budget woes, the Obama administration now estimates it will need $20 billion in new savings or revenues to shore up the finances for the highway trust fund until after the 2010 elections. Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood confirmed the $20 billion figure to POLITICO after meeting with senators at the Capitol on Monday evening. And with the trust fund running dangerously low by late August, its shaky finances can’t be ignored much longer by Congress. Read more: http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0609/24121.html#ixzz0KOdnRQPW&C

#### HIghway infrastructure collapsing in the squo

The Oregonian July 2, 2009

http://www.oregonlive.com/opinion/index.ssf/2009/07/dont\_delay\_transportation\_bill.html

Patchwork extensions of highway funding, of the sort that the Bush administration constantly indulged in, disrupt construction and cost the economy tens of thousands of jobs. And, finally, the backlog of highways, bridges, transit projects and railways in need of repair and replacement in this country is staggering. A transportation policy commission last year pegged the need at $225 billion a year.

#### Plan is popular—people want more mass transit

V1 Magazine ‘7

Americans Prefer to Spend More on Mass Transit and Highway Maintenance, Less on New Roads, Friday, 26 October 2007, http://www.vector1media.com/top-stories/projects/americans-prefer-to-spend-more-on-mass-transit-and-highway-maintenance,-less-on-new-roads/

Three-fourths of Americans surveyed believe that either being smarter about development or improving public transportation are both better long-term solutions for reducing traffic congestion than building new roads, according to a survey sponsored by the National Association of Realtors and Smart Growth America. The 2007 Growth and Transportation Survey details what Americans think about how development affects their immediate community, and traffic congestion was a top concern. Nearly half of those surveyed think improving public transit would be the best way to reduce congestion, and 26 percent believe developing communities that reduce the need to drive would be the better alternative. Only one in five said building new roads was the answer.

## \*\*\*AT-STATES\*\*\*

### Mass Transit Progams Broke

#### Mass transit systems are in financial binds, they are very expensive to operate

Alex **Kingsburg and** Bret **Schulte, 3/27/08**, “Mass Transit Systems Have a Hard Time Paying the Bills” US News and World Report, http://www.usnews.com/articles/news/national/2008/03/27/mass-transit-systems-have-a-hard-time-paying-the-bills.html

**Because mass transit systems are so expensive to operate, they rely heavily on subsidies from federal, state, and local coffers. But the flow of money has not kept pace with the ridership growth. And when demand is coupled with capital costs or deferred maintenance and bonds coming due, many transit systems now find themselves in a financial bind that promises to only get worse.**

### States Can’t Solve—Accountability

#### Only the federal government can hold states accountable and enforce a greater role for metropolitan areas in robust transit reform

Katz et al. ‘5

Bruce Katz is vice president, director of the Metropolitan Policy Progam, and Adeline M. and Alfred I. Johnson Chair in Urban and Metropolitan Studies at the Brookings Institution. Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. Scott Bernstein is at the Center for Neighborhood Technology. “Getting Transportation Right for Metropolitan America,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 32

Ensure State Decisions Reflect MetropoIitan Realities. Even with further reform, state departments of transportation will continue to oversee the largest share of federal transportation resources. For that reason, it is critical that statewide transportation policies and practices strengthen metropolitan economics and respond adequately to metropolitan transportation challenges. Congress should therefore require that state transportation-governing bodies include political, business, and citizen representation from every metropolitan area in the state. Congress should also require state transportation departments to allocate federal resources in a manner that is consistent with objective needs and reflects the proportional contribution of gas tax revenues from different parts of the state. Finally, Congress should require that financially constrained state transportation plans incorporate locally defined metropolitan priorities.

### States Can’t Solve: Patchwork

#### CP doesn’t solve the aff- leads to patchwork implementation and doesn’t integrate interstate transit system- 100% solvency deficit

Greenblatt ‘9

 (A Holistic Approach To Transportation Legislative analysis as of February 23, 2009 By Alan Greenblatt, CQ Staff, http://library.cqpress.com/cqpac/document.php?id=weeklyreport111-000003058029&type=query&num=public+transportation&

AT A CROSSROADS: A system designed decades ago cannot accommodate modern traffic patterns. Some experts, though, are concerned about putting more money into highways. (Source: GETTY IMAGES/LAMBERT / HAROLD M. LAMBERT.) But “**since the advent of the interstates**,” concludes the Urban Land Institute, **federal officials have had “no real infrastructure agenda beyond pushing off costs to the states.**” “**The interstate system, when it started, was a national program with a national purpose**,” says Richard G. Little, director of a University of Southern California infrastructure policy center. “**Now that we basically have that system in place, there are a lot of local kinds of projects that have a lot less value.**” **In place of a new national vision** that might reflect changing needs, **recent transportation debates have been “either/or” affairs**, said Miller, with members and lobbyists lined up in support for particular projects, or for highway funds, or for transit, **but not in favor of a multi-modal strategy that would cross state borders.** But she believes the time has come for road builders, transit advocates and state officials like her to put aside narrow interests in favor of taking a look at how transportation networks fit together. Miller goes so far as to suggest that the economy of Kansas, which is still heavily dependent on agricultural exports, benefits from investments made in other states — for instance, in increased capacity at the port of New Orleans — perhaps as much, or more, as it does from more roads built within the state. “**I’m sure it’s heresy within my world of state DOT heads**,” Miller said, “**but while I think we’re making good decisions within the borders of our own states, we’re not making better and broader decisions about how we’re going to deliver the transportation we need**.” Studies published over the past year by a number of groups, including the Brookings Institution, GAO and the National Surface Transportation Policy and Revenue Commission, which was established by the 2005 law, have differed in their details but been strikingly uniform in their conclusions, resulting in what Brookings calls “a collective ‘infrastructure epiphany.’” “**The underlying theme of all these reports is that we can’t just have federal highway and transit programs that collect money from states and spread it back around like peanut butter**,” Kavinoky said, “**but don’t generally address the things that have the biggest impact, like safety, congestion, energy and the environment.”**

#### States can’t solve transit reform- approach not integrated, our evidence is empirical

Greenblatt ‘9

(A Holistic Approach To Transportation Legislative analysis as of February 23, 2009 By Alan Greenblatt, CQ Staff, http://library.cqpress.com/cqpac/document.php?id=weeklyreport111-000003058029&type=query&num=public+transportation&

The advantage that proponents of changing transportation policy have is that no one is defending the status quo. It’s not like the debate over health coverage, in which the American medical system is routinely defended as “the best in the world.” Everyone engaged in transportation routinely talks about serious funding deficits. Negative comparisons with Europe and aspects of China’s infrastructure policy are increasingly common as well. But even if there’s broad agreement that a new approach is necessary, that won’t translate easily into new thinking in determining how dollars should be spent. **Transportation is supposed to be about moving goods and people from Point A to Point B, but often the federal discussion devolves into questions about whose jurisdiction Point A will be located in and about how many jobs Point B can create.** “**It really doesn’t matter what states programs are located in, but that’s the only way we keep track today**,” said Heminger, the San Francisco transportation official who also served on the national transportation policy commission. “**Improving a transportation program at various points along the network benefits the entire system**,” he said, “**but we have spent so many years thinking about this program as simply a return-to-source equation that the only thing we focus on is how much gas -ax money we send to Washington and what percentage of it we get back**.” States aren’t accustomed to thinking strategically about how their own highways and freight systems are integrated with their neighbors. “**The state DOTs really can’t do that**,” said Michael Pagano, dean of the University of Illinois at Chicago’s College of Urban Planning and Public Affairs. “**The incentive structure is not there.”**

### States Can’t Solve—Incompetent

#### States misallocate federal funds and ruin urban transit development

Puentes & Bailey ‘5

Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. Kevin O’Brien is a columnist at the Cleveland *Plain Dealer.* Linda Bailey is Senior Research Associate for Transportation at ICF International. “Increasing Funding and Accountability for Metropolitan Transportation Decisions,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 153

A third reason to increase the decisionmaking authority and ability of MPOs is that many states continue to penalize metropolitan areas in the distribution of transportation funds. The current system of planning and programming, which is dominated by the states, has been criticized as undermining metropolitan areas. Federal funds are allocated in such a way that they favor rural areas over urban areas. In addition, state DOT's traditional focus on highway maintenance and construction fosters metropolitan decentralization that negatively impacts cities and older suburbs. This penalty arises from several biases. The first bias follows from the fact that federal law allocates the vast majority of federal money directly to state DOT's. As mentioned, federal law directly suballocates less than 7 percent of program funds directly to MPOs and, even then, only to MPOs serving populations of over 200,000. In fact, while federal transportation spending increased from ISTEA to TEA-21, the share of funds suballocated to MPOs actually declined as a share of total highway spending.

### States Won’t Enforce Plan

#### States won’t enforce funding rules without federal oversight

Hill et al. ‘5

Edward Hill is the Vice President of Economic Development at Cleveland State University. Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. Kevin O’Brien is a columnist at the Cleveland *Plain Dealer.* Claudette Robey is the Assistant Director with the Center for Public Management and the Great Lakes Environmental Finance Center. There are other authors of this chapter. “Slanted Pavement: How Ohio’s Highway Spending Shortchanges Cities and Suburbs,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 122

As a result, the Transportation Equity Act for the Twenty-First Century (TEA-21, passed in June 1998) guaranteed each state a return of at least 90.5 percent of its contributions to the Highway Account of the HTF. Proponents of this policy were, naturally, from those states that paid more money into the trust fund than they received under the old distributional rules. They argued that the new formula in TEA-21 would maintain the system an poorer and rural states while ensuring that the demands of the donor states were met. The pure politics that motivated the passage of the minimum guarantee funding rule is understandable. The rule acknowledges that the interstate system is largely complete and that it is time to change the way funds are distributed. In the debate around reauthorization of TEA-21, several states have pushed for a 95 percent return of their Highway Account contributions. The Senate incorporated this provision in its reauthorization bill. Despite the embrace of this funding issue at the federal level, similar rules generally do not exist at the stale level. Our analysis shows that, in Ohio at least, urban counties are the donors of funds into state highway coffers, and rural areas are the donees. It is quite likely that the current system of highway taxes represents a fiscal drag on central cities and older suburbs because they have to maintain roads that are not part of the federal highway system and, in many cases, are not supported adequately by state funds. The rationale for the current system of highway finance may have made perfect sense when the highway system was constructed; however, it no longer makes sense as a way of maintaining that same system.

#### States won’t enforce the plan

Puentes & Bailey ‘5

Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. Kevin O’Brien is a columnist at the Cleveland *Plain Dealer.* Linda Bailey is Senior Research Associate for Transportation at ICF International. “Increasing Funding and Accountability for Metropolitan Transportation Decisions,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 153

Fourth, states are not fulfilling the promises of federal law. ISTEA and TEA-21 for the first time embedded in law the principle that America’s metropolitan reality required an integrated, balanced, and regionally designed transportation system. As a framework the federal laws are sound. And yet, the laws themselves are only part of the picture. Unfortunately, implementation of the new federal statutes has been seriously flawed—and in basic ways unresponsive to metropolitan needs. Most notably, most states have failed to utilize the tools and discretion afforded them by ISTEA and TEA-21 to meaningfully address the worsening transportation problems present throughout their metropolitan regions. One reason for this failure could be a lack of leadership and attention to these issues on the statewide level. As Anthony Downs mentioned in his seminal work Stuck in Traffic, “State agencies cannot act without regard for strong political forces. Even where a state agency provides a technically competent vehicle for achieving some policy, that policy will not be carried out unless significant and broad political support for it exists. Hence state agencies are poor vehicles for instituting new policies.

#### State level politics means they won’t enforce the plan

Puentes & Bailey ‘5

Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. Kevin O’Brien is a columnist at the Cleveland *Plain Dealer.* Linda Bailey is Senior Research Associate for Transportation at ICF International. “Increasing Funding and Accountability for Metropolitan Transportation Decisions,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 153

In some states, the legislature determines many of the transportation priorities, similar to how Congress earmarks projects in legislation without regard for the metropolitan planning process. This practice thwarts community involvement, raises the likelihood of unwanted projects, and may fail to meet the needs of disfavored districts.

#### States Will Refuse to enforce the plan

Downs & Puentes ‘5

Andrew Downs is with the Brooks Institution. Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. “The Need for Regional Anticongestion Policies,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 188

This does not mean states will never create effective regional anticongestion agencies, simply that such actions will be rare. Even when they occur, some resistance will persist within both state and local government. Underlying that resistance is the fundamental belief among many citizens that reducing traffic congestion is far less important than pursuing other social or personal goals. Therefore, if reducing congestion means they must change behavior they have cherished for other reasons, they may prefer to endure congestion-while, of course, still complaining loudly about it.

### States Can’t Solve: Jurisdiction

#### transportation reform rooted in feDeral rules, not states. RedistributioN requires federal action

Hill et al. ‘5

Edward Hill is the Vice President of Economic Development at Cleveland State University. Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. Kevin O’Brien is a columnist at the Cleveland *Plain Dealer.* Claudette Robey is the Assistant Director with the Center for Public Management and the Great Lakes Environmental Finance Center. There are other authors of this chapter. “Slanted Pavement: How Ohio’s Highway Spending Shortchanges Cities and Suburbs,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 124

Ongoing debates about federal transportation law present an opportunity to acknowledge that a historic event has taken place in American social and economic history the interstate highway system has been completed. This landmark event demonstrates that a half century of dedicated, consistent capital investment can result in a stronger and wealthier nation. Now the time has come to declare victory and move on—on to a more stable system of infrastructure finance (not just highway finance) that maintains this precious gift of the World War II generation. It is also time to recognize that it was the citizen-taxpayers of our older metropolitan areas who disproportionately paid for the construction of the highway system that made possible the economic miracle of the rural areas as well as the booming southern, western, and mountain states. Now is the time to level the playing field so that the donor metropolitan areas are not disconnected from the economy that they helped build.

### States Won’t Spoil Plan

#### Post-PLan Electoral politics ensure states won’t interfere with MPos

Downs & Puentes ‘5

cc Downs is with the Brooks Institution. Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. “The ,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 188

One reason is that such an agency would have to be given powers that are now partly exercised by other state agencies—particularly state DOTs. Officials in those other agencies would be reluctant to give up any of their present authority. In addition, no state legislature is willing to incur the wrath of most local governments unless the legislators have strong incentives to do so. State legislators are themselves elected from local districts, and they are often linked personally and politically to existing local governments. Moreover, since state representatives are seldom elected from districts large enough to encompass an entire metropolitan area, their viewpoints are also quite parochial.

### States: Political Capital Links

#### Plan at the state level would be a huge drain on political capital

Downs & Puentes ‘5

Andrew Downs is with the Brooks Institution. Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. “The ,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 188

In contrast, the potential loss of local sovereignty from the creation of such regional agencies would be seen by many local officials as a major threat to their welfare. So how each state legislator voted on this issue would heavily influence the amount of support he or she received from local officials at the next election. In the minds of most state legislators, the potential loss of support caused by their favoring creation of strong regional agencies would outweigh the gains from reducing traffic congestion.

### States Roll Back

#### State officials won’t implement plan—too politically costly

Downs & Puentes ‘5

Andrew Downs is with the Brooks Institution. Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. “The Need for Regional Anticongestion Policies,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 189

In a few metropolitan areas, peak-hour congestion is so bad that reducing it is widely perceived as the central issue facing local governments. Hence the governor and state legislators are strongly motivated to appear to be doing something about this problem in order to be reelected. Otherwise, they are unlikely to act effectively since the political leaders in a democracy fear asking the citizenry to make fundamental changes in established institutions or behavior. People can be induced to do so without enormous resistance only if they believe they must to alleviate a crisis that is either already present or imminent. Elected officials are, in turn, unwilling to ask the public to make basic changes unless they believe the public thinks itself threatened by such a crisis.

### States Don’t Solve: MPO Localism

#### WE turn your localism arguments—Empowering metro areas solves better than state action

Puentes & Bailey ‘5

Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. Kevin O’Brien is a columnist at the Cleveland *Plain Dealer.* Linda Bailey is Senior Research Associate for Transportation at ICF International. “Increasing Funding and Accountability for Metropolitan Transportation Decisions,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 152

First, local governments within metropolitan areas own the vast majority of the transportation network. In February 2003 a coalition of eleven national organizations, called Local Officials for Transportation, began pressing for a transportation agenda that, among other things, increases the role of local officials in transportation decisionmaking by suballocating greater resources to metropolitan areas. Reflecting the principle of subsidiary, they contend that local officials are closer to the problems and challenges of metropolitan America and are therefore able to make better transportation decisions. However, according to the coalition, metropolitan areas make decisions on only about 10 cents of every dollar they generate.

### States Can’t Solve Alone--Broke

#### States are broke and can’t pay for transit reform or security

Katz et al. ‘5

Bruce Katz is vice president, director of the Metropolitan Policy Progam, and Adeline M. and Alfred I. Johnson Chair in Urban and Metropolitan Studies at the Brookings Institution. Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. Scott Bernstein is at the Center for Neighborhood Technology. “Getting Transportation Right for Metropolitan America,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 16

—In addition, state governments—the major source of funding for local transportation needs—face unprecedented revenue shortfalls. At the same time, states and cities are being forced to spend millions to protect transportation hubs, such as ports and railways from terrorism. In this context, the ongoing debate about the federal laws and programs governing highway, transit, air, and rail systems could not come at a more critical time for the nation’s metropolitan areas. To put it bluntly, federal transportation programs return more money to state and local governments than any other federal initiative involving physical infrastructure, and they influence, as much as any cluster of programs, the spatial form and social fabric of our cities and suburbs.

#### States can’t solve—recession means they are broke

Katz et al. ‘5

Bruce Katz is vice president, director of the Metropolitan Policy Progam, and Adeline M. and Alfred I. Johnson Chair in Urban and Metropolitan Studies at the Brookings Institution. Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. Scott Bernstein is at the Center for Neighborhood Technology. “Getting Transportation Right for Metropolitan America,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 27

Despite these critical needs, states are not raising—or spending—enough revenue to meet the needs of metropolitan transportation networks. From the time the interstate highway system was originally authorized in 1956 to the present, increases in federal revenues have kept pace with inflation, but state revenues have not. Of the twenty-eight states that increased their gas tax since the passage of ISTEA, only one raised it as fast as or faster than inflation. Since TEA-21 was authorized in l998, two of the largest sources of new revenue for transportation projects are increases in federal revenues and increases in state debt. In fact, the percent increase in revenues from state borrowing in the form of bond proceeds outpaced the percent increase in revenues from new taxes and user fees by more than seven to one. In 1999 the Governmental Accounting Standards Board approved Statement 34 on capital asset accounting, requiring consistent bookkeeping by state and local government for infrastructure investments. This change requires state and local governments to account consistently for the depreciated value of their capital investments and to budget adequately to maintain their existing assets. The pressure to pay attention to these considerations has mounted in the wake of the recession and its effect on state finances. Forty states slashed their budgets by a combined total of nearly $12 billion in 2003—the largest amount since such records have been kept.

#### States Counterplan will bankrupt the states

Katz et al. ‘5

Bruce Katz is vice president, director of the Metropolitan Policy Progam, and Adeline M. and Alfred I. Johnson Chair in Urban and Metropolitan Studies at the Brookings Institution. Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. Scott Bernstein is at the Center for Neighborhood Technology. “Getting Transportation Right for Metropolitan America,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 27

Many of the urgings for additional federal spending are in response to the tremendous challenges outlined in this chapter. Coupled with that, states and localities are struggling under their own burdens of fiscal stress. Increased investments in transportation, the argument goes, illustrate the federal government's commitment to a range of issues, from safety and public health to jobs and economic growth to quality of life. The reauthorization debate around TEA-21 has made it clear that what matters more than the particular funding level of the reauthorization is how that money is spent and what impact it will have on most Americans.

## \*\*\*AT-METRO CP\*\*\*

### MPOs/Cities Can’t Solve

#### Metropolitan don’t have the means to fund transportation reform

Hill et al. ‘5

Edward Hill is the Vice President of Economic Development at Cleveland State University. Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. Kevin O’Brien is a columnist at the Cleveland *Plain Dealer.* Claudette Robey is the Assistant Director with the Center for Public Management and the Great Lakes Environmental Finance Center. There are other authors of this chapter. “Slanted Pavement: How Ohio’s Highway Spending Shortchanges Cities and Suburbs,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 122

This unequal treatment is further exacerbated by biased formulas that disproportionately distribute the local government portion of the state gas tax and vehicle registration lazes to rural areas. These revenues overlap with the project database given that there is a local share within many of the projects that may contain gas tax or vehicle registration tax revenues. However, the negative impact on urban and suburban areas is compounded because federal and some state programs can only be accessed with an adequate local match.

### Should Restore 80/20

#### the usfg should restore the 80-20 funding balance

Katz et al. ‘5

Bruce Katz is vice president, director of the Metropolitan Policy Progam, and Adeline M. and Alfred I. Johnson Chair in Urban and Metropolitan Studies at the Brookings Institution. Robert Puentes is a fellow in the Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. Scott Bernstein is at the Center for Neighborhood Technology. “Getting Transportation Right for Metropolitan America,” *Taking the High Road,* Brookings Institution Press, p. 31-32

Level the Playing Field between Highways and Transit. Metropolitan areas fully understand the importance of transit to their competitive future. Yet, despite earlier reforms, federal policy and practice continue to place transit projects at a disadvantage. Therefore several reforms should be made. Congress should continue the funding guarantees for transit and ensure that the federal share for transit projects equals the federal share for highways. Thus the 80-20 split between federal and state-local funds for new fixed-rail transit projects should be reinstated, and Congress should allow community assets, such as parks and other infrastructure, to count as part of the state-local match. In addition, the new law should require equal treatment of proposed highway and transit projects. Roadway projects using federal funds should face the same level of scrutiny as new rail projects, for example. Similarly, long-range financial requirements for highway projects should be disclosed at program level, as they now are for transit projects. Finally, Congress should give incentives to states to remove legal barriers that currently prohibit the use of state gas tax revenues for transit purposes.

### State Police Solve Terrorism

#### State police forces are key to stop terrorist attacks

Hughbank & Hughbank ‘7

Richard J. Hughbank and Robert D. Hughbank. Special Reaction Team:;Who Stops Those Who Stop at Nothing? The Journal of Counterterrororism & Homeland Security International, 2007 Winter

As the War on Terror continues to manifest itself in our cities and states, local and state police agencies must continue to find tactical methods to actively seek out, engage, and disrupt domestic and international terrorist operational cells and activities during any of the seven phases of a terrorist operation1 in order to prove ourselves victorious. "Our ability to achieve that victory will depend fundamentally on the ability of American strategy to adjust and adapt to changes we see in the nature and character of our adversaries."2 This course affords that extra tool in our kits to successfully seek that victory as we actively train for and execute aggressive counter-terrorism measures. Counter-terrorism is a proactive, offensive approach to fighting the terroristic style of guerilla warfare in our urban environments; an approach that definitely requires special skill sets such as those involved with a SRT/SWAT. The highly trained individuals who make up this specialized tactical assault team must seek out every opportunity to train as a collective unit. As a general guideline, the USAMPS SRT instructors recommended the following training "TRIAD" when configuring time utilization: Marksmanship - 20%, Physical Conditioning - 20%, and Tactics - 60%. The utilization of these training techniques no less than four hours a week should prove beneficial when needed in a time of crisis. Your departmental support will prove a critical component in the development, training, financial support, and overall success of this special unit.

## \*\*\*AT: Privatization\*\*\*

### Privatization fails

#### robust transit reform saves 5.2 billion gallons of gas per year but privatization leads to huge consumption leaps over the status quo—only the plan solves consumption

Bailey, Mokhtarian, & Little ‘8

Linda Bailey is Senior Associate for Transportation at ICF International. Patricia Lyon MokhtarianProfessor, Civil and Environmental Engineering, Chair, Transportation Technology and Policy Graduate Program, and Associate Director for Education, Institute of Transportation Studies at University of California, Davis. Andrew Little is president of Urban Policy Research Institute. “The Broader Connection between Public Transportation, Energy Conservation and Greenhouse Gas Reduction,” <http://www.apta.com/research/info/online/documents/land_use.pdf>, February.

If public transit systems had never existed in American cities and their effects on our urban landscapes were completely erased, American households would drive 102.2 billion more miles per year. The VMT reduction in this model can also be expressed as total estimated reduction in petroleum use. Assuming average mileage for each vehicle, we estimate the total effect of public transit on household fuel consumption to be a reduction of 5.2 billion gallons of gasoline per year.

### Privatization Links to Politics

#### Privatization deeply unpopular

V1 Magazine ‘7

Americans Prefer to Spend More on Mass Transit and Highway Maintenance, Less on New Roads, Friday, 26 October 2007, http://www.vector1media.com/top-stories/projects/americans-prefer-to-spend-more-on-mass-transit-and-highway-maintenance,-less-on-new-roads/

Americans are overwhelmingly opposed to the private ownership of roads; that is, selling key roads and highways to private companies who would charge a toll and give a portion of the toll money to the state. Eighty-four percent of respondents oppose private ownership of roads; only 14 percent support the concept. Similarly, 66 percent are opposed to allowing private companies to build, own and collect tolls for new roads - even if those companies gave a portion of the toll money to the state.

#### Mass transit and altered land use are popular but privatization isn’t

V1 Magazine ‘7

Americans Prefer to Spend More on Mass Transit and Highway Maintenance, Less on New Roads, Friday, 26 October 2007, http://www.vector1media.com/top-stories/projects/americans-prefer-to-spend-more-on-mass-transit-and-highway-maintenance,-less-on-new-roads/

Eight in 10 respondents prefer redeveloping older urban and suburban areas rather than building new housing and commercial developments on the edge of existing suburbs. More than half of those surveyed believe that businesses and homes should be built closer together to shorten commutes, limit traffic congestion and allow residents to walk to stores and shops instead of using their cars. Six in 10 also agree that new-home construction should be limited in outlying areas and encouraged in inner urban areas to shorten commutes and prevent more traffic congestion. With road building costs often exceeding revenues, many states are turning to tolls as a key funding source. Americans are divided on tolls, although 55 percent approve of charging tolls on more roads if that improves roads and decreases congestion. On the other hand, six in 10 are opposed to charging tolls on freeways during rush hour to reduce congestion. Respondents are evenly split on charging tolls during rush hour, even if the money is used to provide transportation alternatives to the freeway. When it comes to spending taxpayer dollars, respondents believe Congress should spend more money to maintain and repair roads, highways, freeways, and bridges and to expand and improve public transit than build new roads.

## \*\*\*AT: K\*\*\*

### Transit k Movement Intersection

#### Transportation movements are at the intersection of all major social justice movements- the aff strikes a blow against politics of domination and mobilizes new struggles

**Clarke & Criollo ‘9**, (Jesse, Urban Habitat, Manuel, Lead organizer for Bus Riders Union, Bus Rider Rights, *Urban Habitat Journal*, Volume 16, #1 Spring 2009, June 2, 2009 http://www.thestrategycenter.org/news/clip/2009/06/03/bus-rider-rights)

Clarke: How is transportation an issue of human rights for the people you work with? Criollo: “We are the BRU and this is our fight. Mass transportation is a human right. We want 50-cent fares and $20 passes, because mass transportation belongs to the masses!” This was one of our breakout chants from the early 1990s. Transportation access is a critical human rights issue. **If someone doesn’t have access to public transit, the system is in essence denying them basic human rights: access to education and healthy food; access to jobs; access to healthcare; and the pursuit of goals beyond mere survival.** In a city like Los Angeles, with its many social and economic extremes, transportation denial further en-trenches neighborhood and racial segregation. Clarke: How does lack of access to public transit affect working class people, communities of color, and low income people? Criollo: **For the poorest of the poor to have mobility**—I mean literal mobility as well as economic and educational mobility—**we must have quality public transit.** The over 500,000 primarily African American, Latino, Asian, and white working class bus riders of Los Angeles have had to negotiate their lives on a third-tier transit system that has historically failed them and systematically denies them access to quality jobs, schools, and hospitals. We believe that transportation should meet the needs of those who are most dependent on it. We are not asking for “equity,” but true transformative change that can transfer wealth from political elites and transnational corporations to working class communities of color. Clarke: **Why should transportation be a central organizing issue**? Criollo: **Transportation organizing is central** because **it’s a race, gender, economic justice, environmental, public health, and climate justice campaign all packed into one.** Transportation justice is at the intersection of civil rights, mass transit, and environmental justice. **In cities like Los Angeles, 90 percent of all bus riders are people of color, historically robbed of equitable funding by entrenched transit segregation policies** pursued by the leadership of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LA MTA). **Women**, more often than not, **are your typical bus riders. They not only have to negotiate discriminatory transit policy, but are also at the frontlines of having to deal with unbearable overcrowding** and often endure sexual harassment by their fellow passengers. Worst of all they have to juggle their lives from home to job to day care to groceries to doctors to schools for four to five hours a day on public transportation. Our organizing and political viewpoint has been shaped and influenced by the Black Liberation Movement in the United States. **The struggle for black people’s democratic and civil rights has been shaped by the transportation justice struggles—from the horrendous Plessey vs. Ferguson decision** that legalized “Jim Crow” **to the 1955 Montgomery Bus Boycott that was the first mass blow against it.** **Transportation justice campaigns can support the growth of a broader, re-invigorated civil rights movement, and help promote** the possibility of **a progressive future for the U**nited **S**tates.

## \*\*AT Nuke Power CP\*\*

### Nuclear Power Bad: List

#### Nuclear power takes a long time and leads terrorism, proliferation, and waste

PCEP ‘6

Public Citizen’s Energy Program ‘6 Climate Change: The Urgency, Impacts, and Solutions, <http://www.citizen.org/documents/ClimateChange.pdf>, Septembe

Likewise, the proposal for more than twenty new nuclear reactors in the U.S. – while releasing fewer greenhouse gas emissions than coal – would come with its own set of problems. Building new reactors requires polluting uranium mining, the generation of radioactive waste, and increased proliferation, accident, and terrorist risks. No country in the world has found a solution for these problems. Proposals for new reactors, licensing, and construction together also require long lead times, at best 10 years, and would be expensive. Already wind power at good sites in the U.S. is significantly cheaper than power would be from new nuclear power plants.23

### \*\*\*AT Nuclear Power: Prolif Mod\*\*\*

#### US Nuclear power leads to global nuclear proliferation

Slocum ‘6

Ty Slocum is the director of the Public Citizen Energy Program. “Factsheet #5: Proliferation Just the Facts: The Five Fatal Flaws of Nuclear Power,” <http://www.citizen.org/documents/JTF-Proliferation.pdf>

Non-nuclear weapons states that have been discouraged by Western states from developing fuel-cycle technologies such as uranium enrichment and spent fuel reprocessing may view renewed U.S. interest in such technology capacity as hypocritical—making them less likely to fully abide by the terms of the NPT. Iran, a party to the NPT, has recently been a subject of international concern, as it is suspected of developing nuclear weapons capabilities as part of its nuclear program. Yet Iran has defended its right to enrich uranium under the NPT, and it has returned American accusations with criticisms of the Bush administration’s own failure to hold up its end of the bargain by conducting research into new nuclear weapons, spurning the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty to prohibit explosive tests of nuclear devices, and unilaterally retreating from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty with Russia. The NPT requires weapons states to take steps towards total disarmament.

#### PRoliferation leads to extinction

#### Miller 2k2

(James D. Miller, (assistant professor of economics, Smith College), January 23, 2002, National Security First: Stopping the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction., <http://www.nationalreview.com/comment/comment-miller012302.shtml>

The U.S. should use whatever means necessary to stop our enemies from gaining the ability to kill millions of us. We should demand that countries like Iraq, Iran, Libya, and North Korea make no attempt to acquire weapons of mass destruction. We should further insist on the right to make surprise inspections of these countries to insure that they are complying with our proliferation policy. What if these nations refuse our demands? If they refuse we should destroy their industrial capacity and capture their leaders. Once a dictator has the ability to hit a U.S., or perhaps even a European city, with atomic weapons it will be too late for America to pressure him to give up his weapons. His ability to hurt us will effectively put him beyond our military reach. Our conventional forces might even be made impotent by a nuclear-armed foe. Had Iraq possessed atomic weapons, for example, we would probably have been unwilling to expel them from Kuwait. Even the short-term survival of humanity is in doubt. The greatest threat of extinction surely comes from the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. America should refocus her foreign policy to prioritize protecting us all from atomic, biological, and chemical weapons.

### Nuclear Power 🡪 Proliferation

#### Nuclear Power leads to proliferation

Slocum ‘6

Ty Slocum is the director of the Public Citizen Energy Program. “Factsheet #5: Proliferation Just the Facts: The Five Fatal Flaws of Nuclear Power,” <http://www.citizen.org/documents/JTF-Proliferation.pdf>

International treaties leave non-weapons states free to use and develop sensitive nuclear technology such as uranium enrichment and spent nuclear fuel reprocessing. While such technologies are ostensibly employed to create fuel in power reactors, they may be easily adjusted or redirected to produce weapons-grade fissile material. Moreover, power reactors themselves produce plutonium, which may be used in bombs. Once the nuclear genie is out of the bottle, it becomes impossible to restrict its use to “peaceful” purposes. In practice, there is no way to segregate nuclear technologies employed for “peaceful” purposes from technologies that may be employed in weapons—the former may be, and have been, transformed into the latter. The myth of the “peaceful atom” is belied by the easy modification of a nuclear energy infrastructure to create the material required for a nuclear bomb.

#### Fuel reprocessing leads to nuclear proliferation

Slocum ‘6

Ty Slocum is the director of the Public Citizen Energy Program. “Factsheet #5: Proliferation Just the Facts: The Five Fatal Flaws of Nuclear Power,” <http://www.citizen.org/documents/JTF-Proliferation.pdf>

Reprocessing—a technology that separates uranium and plutonium from irradiated fuel—runs counter to efforts to curtail the proliferation of nuclear weapons technologies and materials. Separated plutonium is easier to steal and employ in nuclear weapons than plutonium in highly radioactive irradiated fuel, because the intense radiation of the latter form prevents easy acquisition of the plutonium. It is widely recognized by nuclear power experts that the “once-through” fuel cycle—without reprocessing—is the only truly proliferation-resistant form of fuel production.[6] Since the mid-1970s, the U.S. has maintained an official policy against the reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel, due to proliferation concerns. But recent trends indicate an increasing interest by the U.S. in this risky technology as a “fuel management program.” Plutonium separated from irradiated fuel can be used in some nuclear reactors in a form called mixed oxide (or MOX) fuel. In the past three years, the DOE has received more than $190 million for research and development of new reprocessing technologies for commercial irradiated nuclear fuel, and President Bush’s fiscal year 2006 budget request to Congress for this program includes another $70 million. Further, the NRC has just licensed a MOX fuel fabrication facility and has authorized the use of such fuel in a nuclear plant in South Carolina.[7] While the initial source of fuel would come from dismantled weapons from the U.S. stockpile, the production and use of MOX fuel from dismantled weapons could lead to an institutional push to reprocess irradiated fuel from commercial reactors. Finally, the concern over the glut of easily-diverted, reprocessed MOX fuel is the fact that demand has not kept pace with supply, resulting in a surplus approximately 200 metric tons of separated commercial plutonium worldwide from reprocessing.[8]

### \*\*\*AT Nuclear Power: Terror Mod\*\*\*

#### Nuclear power leads to nuclear terorrism that kills half a million people

Slocum ‘6

Ty Slocum is the director of the Public Citizen Energy Program. “Factsheet # Nuclear’s Fatal Flaws: Security,” http://www.citizen.org/cmep/energy\_enviro\_nuclear/nuclear\_power\_plants/articles.cfm?ID=13451

Nuclear plants currently operate at 64 sites in 31 states. Considering the devastation that could result from a successful terrorist attack on a nuclear plant, ensuring their protection should be a priority in a post-September 11 environment. However, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) and nuclear industry are leaving plants vulnerable. What Could Happen? The 9/11 Commission noted in June 2004 that al Qaeda’s original plan for September 11 was to hijack 10 airplanes and crash two of them into nuclear plants.[1] A successful attack would release “large quantities of radioactive materials to tbhe environment.”[2] A September 2004 study by Dr. Ed Lyman of the Union of Concerned Scientists, using the NRC’s own analysis method, found that a worst-case accident or attack at the Indian Point nuclear plant 35 miles north of New York City could cause up to 43,700 immediate fatalities and up to 518,000 long-term cancer deaths. Such a release could cost up to $2.1 trillion, and would force the permanent relocation of 11.1 million people.[3]

#### Nuclear terorrism leads to extinction

Sid-Ahmed ‘4

Mohamed Sid-Ahmed is one of the leading commentators and writers on Middle East affairs in the Arab world and writes in Al-Ahram Weekly. “Extinction!” Al-Ahram Weekly, 26 August - 1 September 2004 Issue No. 705

What would be the consequences of a nuclear attack by terrorists? Even if it fails, it would further exacerbate the negative features of the new and frightening world in which we are now living. Societies would close in on themselves, police measures would be stepped up at the expense of human rights, tensions between civilisations and religions would rise and ethnic conflicts would proliferate. It would also speed up the arms race and develop the awareness that a different type of world order is imperative if humankind is to survive. But the still more critical scenario is if the attack succeeds. This could lead to a third world war, from which no one will emerge victorious. Unlike a conventional war which ends when one side triumphs over another, this war will be without winners and losers. When nuclear pollution infects the whole planet, we will all be losers.

### Nuclear Power Links to Oil DA

#### Nuclear energy results in less demand for oil

Marketwatch ‘6

October 20, http://www.marketwatch.com/story/uranium-a-hot-commodity-thats-getting-hotter

"Nuclear energy has become a very acceptable alternative to the fossil fuels that power the globe today and uranium is the commodity poised to shoulder this drive," said Wright. "Unlike many of the alternate energy plays out there, nuclear energy is proven to work on a mass scale," he said, pointing out that 16% of the world's electricity is generated from it. Nuclear power is "getting cheaper and safer," said Brodrick, and operating a nuclear plant produces zero greenhouse gases, compared with the average coal plant's release of 3.7 million tons of carbon dioxide every year. Read his recent report on nuclear energy. In addition, nuclear energy offers a means for countries to take control of their own destiny. "Right now, OPEC has us over a barrel," Brodrick said, referring to the Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries, whose members produce about 43% of the world's crude oil..

### Nuclear Power Doesn’t Lin to Oil DA

#### Nuclear Power Doesn’t link to OIL DA

Marketwatch ‘6

October 20, http://www.marketwatch.com/story/uranium-a-hot-commodity-thats-getting-hotter

While nuclear power can't replace oil, it can "be a much larger part of our energy picture," he said. The U.S. was once the world's largest producer of uranium and uranium mines in the nation are gearing up again, he said.

### Nuclear Takes A Long Time

#### NUCLEAR POWER WILL DO NOTHING—TO STOP USE OF OIL- IT’LL TAKE TOO LONG

SCHEMPF 2004

[F. Jay, Contributing Writer for the Petroleum News, “Simmons Hopes he’s Wrong”, August 2004,

<http://www.petroleumnews.com/pnads/238338932.shtml>]

Could the difference be made up from other world oil-producing areas? Again, Simmons is dubious. Not from West Africa, he said. Not from Russia, either. And currently, alternative fuels won’t do it, either. Not natural gas, the available global supply statistics on which are even murkier than those for oil. Not hydrogen fuels, since they require a basic energy feedstock. Not even nuclear power, which he said would take decades to add, with scarcely a clue as to how much uranium remains throughout the world.

#### Using nuclear to solve warming would take decades

Parenti 08

(Christian Parenti, What Nuclear Renaissance?, April 24, 2008, <http://www.thenation.com/doc/20080512/parenti>)

Even if a society were ready to absorb the high costs of nuclear power, it hardly makes the most sense as a tool to quickly combat climate change. These plants take too long to build. A 2004 analysis in *Science* by Stephen Pacala and Robert Socolow, of Princeton University's Carbon Mitigation Initiative, estimates that achieving just one-seventh of the carbon reductions necessary to stabilize atmospheric CO2 at 500 parts per billion would require "building about 700 new 1,000- megawatt nuclear plants around the world." That represents a huge wave of investment that few seem willing to undertake, and it would require decades to accomplish.