# BRAC Aff Updates- ARS Lab

## Plan 1

#### Thus the plan-

#### The United States federal government should provide necessary funding to the Defense Access Roads program for investing in transportation infrastructure, including local roads, around military bases in the United States.

## Plan 2

#### Thus the plan-

#### The United States federal government should substantially increase funding to the Defense Access Roads program for investing in transportation infrastructure, including local roads, around military bases in the United States.

## Plan 3

#### Thus the plan-

#### The United States federal government should substantially increase funding to the Defense Access Roads program for investing in transportation infrastructure around military bases in the United States, including those local roads without a fifty percent increase in traffic congestion.

## AT: Elections

### Virginia Turn

#### Military cuts killing Obamas chances in Virginia, DAR funding key

Jamieson 7/12 [Dave Jamieson](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/dave-jamieson)(Journalist for Huffingtonpost),”Romney Campaign Attacks Obama On Defense Cuts As President Heads To Virginia”,huffingtonpost.com,7/12/2012, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/07/12/defense-cuts_n_1668212.html>

As President Barack Obama embarks on several campaign stops in Virginia this week, the Mitt Romney campaign criticized the White House on Thursday for allowing [budget cuts](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/01/05/obama-defense-strategy-military-cuts_n_1186025.html) to hit the military, saying the belt-tightening would hurt American defense and the economy.¶ The attack, made by Romney surrogates on a call with reporters, is part of the campaign's strategy to make headway in Virginia through looming defense cuts that could hit the swing state hard. Obama won the state by six points in 2008, but the shrinking military budget means [layoff notices could hit thousands of defense contractors](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702303292204577515220443609642.html) in the weeks leading up to the November election.¶ "As he comes to Virginia, most Virginians are concerned about the economy and their jobs," Rep. Randy Forbes (R-Va.) said on the call, which was billed as an opportunity to "welcome" Obama to the state. "And what does the president bring with him? He has a huge box of pink slips that he's going to distribute across Virginia."¶ The defense cuts are the result of last year's [debt-ceiling fight](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/07/09/john-boehner-debt-ceiling_n_893952.html) between House Republicans and the White House. Under the deal, the Defense Department must trim its budget by about $500 billion over ten years, and the Pentagon will have to trim an extra $50 billion in the short term if Congress can't find savings elsewhere by year's end. Forbes said the impending cuts could cost Virginia 128,000 jobs.¶ The military cuts have put some GOP lawmakers in an awkward position, [testing their commitment](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/02/06/obama-defense-cuts-house-congress_n_1258237.html) to budget-trimming at a time when Republicans are broadly calling for austerity.¶ Former Sen. Jim Talent (R-Mo.) called Obama's approval of the budget plan "the most irresponsible thing a commander in chief has done" in Talent's time "in and around Washington."¶ "It's going to have a huge impact on jobs in the country," he said. "These are overwhelmingly high-paying jobs, often in the manufacturing industry."¶ In an email, Obama campaign spokesman Danny Kanner criticized Romney for embracing a House Republican budget that would cut Veterans Affairs funding. He also said Romney needs to call on Republicans in Congress to come up with a plan to avoid automatic budget cuts through the sequestration trigger.¶ "Mitt Romney and Congressional Republicans are so determined to provide massive tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires that they’d put middle class military families at risk," Kanner said. "The Administration has made it clear that sequestration would be disastrous for our national security, and that's why Mitt Romney needs to demonstrate leadership and press his congressional allies to avoid it from becoming a reality."¶ Obama will be joined by Sen. Mark Warner (D-Va.) and Democratic Senate hopeful Tim Kaine, a former Virginia governor, on the campaign trail Friday. According to recent polls, Obama holds a [slight lead](http://elections.huffingtonpost.com/pollster/2012-virginia-president-romney-vs-obama?gem) over Romney in Virginia.

#### Virginia is key to Obama’s over all election, it’s a must needed win

Hester 2012 Wesley P. Hester(Journalist for Richmond-Times Dispath),”Political panel agrees Virginia a key swing state”,timesdispatch.com,6/23/2012, <http://www2.timesdispatch.com/news/virginia-politics/2012/jun/23/tdmet02-political-panel-agrees-virginia-a-key-swin-ar-2008285/>

A panel of political prognosticators — including journalists and a former congressman — convened at the state Capitol on Friday to talk about presidential elections past and present and agreed on something: Virginia could be the key in 2012.¶ "It's increasingly the new bellwether. It's the new Ohio," said Politico senior reporter Jonathan Martin at the University of Virginia Center for Politics' 14th annual Virginia Political History Project.¶ "It's hard to see a path for President Obama to win back the presidency if he doesn't carry Virginia," Martin added.¶ Jill Lawrence, managing editor for politics for National Journal, said the state's transformation from a red state to a purple one has been unique.¶ She said that while immigrants and moderates have made the transition, "you also have this very culturally conservative contingent that's making life very difficult for the governor and may have deep-sixed his chances of getting on the Romney ticket."¶ Lawrence was referring to a series of social issues pushed by Republicans in the state legislature, most notably a measure to require ultrasounds before abortions, which will become law July 1.¶ Gov. Bob McDonnell backed the legislation, though he amended the original proposal, which would have required invasive transvaginal ultrasounds for women in early pregnancy.¶ Perhaps as a result of that and other social issues, Republican Mitt Romney is polling well behind the president in the state among women, trailing by 16 percentage points as of the latest survey of the presidential race.¶ "I don't know what it's going to be, but he's got to find a way to make that up," said Martin.¶ Former U.S. Rep. Thomas M. Davis III, R-11th, disagreed.¶ "I think this whole women's thing is way overblown in terms of the gender gap," Davis said, before being gently booed by the crowd.¶ Davis said Medicare and Social Security "are the best issues the Democrats have," adding that he thought the president's attacks on Romney's record with private equity firm Bain Capital were feeble.¶ "Obama can talk rich and poor all he wants, but he's a non-starter with so many working-class whites. They aren't even giving him a look. He can go Bain Capital till the cows come home," Davis said.

### Jobs Turn

#### Middle class employment holds Obama’s fate, he needs to do something about jobs to win another term

Sielicki 7/8 Jim Sielicki(Blade Staff Writer),“Dem, GOP leaders call jobs key to Obama fate”,toledoblade.com,7/8/2012, <http://www.toledoblade.com/Politics/2012/07/08/Dem-GOP-leaders-call-jobs-key-to-Obama-fate.html>

President Obama's political test begins after Labor Day, when voters focus on the election, and more important, on the economy. If Americans perceive that the economy is improving and unemployment is falling, the President stands a good chance of being re-elected. If not, he won't get a second term.¶ That's the assessment of Robert Reich, secretary of labor under President Bill Clinton and an expert on work and the economy. Writing in his blog RobertReich.org Friday, Mr. Reich said the President's future will be decided on jobs and unemployment.¶ "The real political test comes after Labor Day. … After Labor Day, they focus like a laser. If the economy is moving in the right direction then — if unemployment is dropping and jobs are increasing — Obama has a good chance of being re-elected. If the jobs doldrums continue — or worse — he won't be."¶ Mr. Reich, who is chancellor's professor of public policy at the Goldman School of Public Policy at the University of California at Berkeley, didn't cut the President any slack on Mr. Obama's statement in Ohio Thursday when he blamed the economy on the recession he inherited.¶ "That's true. But the excuse is wearing thin," Mr. Reich wrote. "It's his economy now."¶ Jim Ruvolo, former Lucas County and Ohio Democratic chairman, agreed, saying perception matters. "If people think they are not getting better, then Obama will struggle."¶ Mr. Ruvolo, who's now a political and business consultant, said Saturday that it's not the unemployment numbers that matter so much as the fear of unemployment.¶ His remarks were echoed by Chris Redfern, chairman of the Ohio Democratic Party and a former state legislator.¶ He agreed that the next four monthly jobs reports will have a major effect on the President's re-election chances.¶ But Mr. Redfern said the President will benefit from the steady growth in jobs and sales from the automotive industry, thanks to the bailout Mr. Obama pushed to keep it from collapsing.¶ While agreeing with the premise that the economy will play a major role in Mr. Obama's re-election, U.S. Rep. Marcy Kaptur (D., Toledo), cautioned that Mr. Reich's credibility on jobs and the economy was something that should be taken with a grain of salt.

#### DAR investment directly results in middle-class jobs

DOT 2012 Department of Treasury(Department of Treasury for The U.S.),“A NEW ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT”,treasury.gov,3/23/2012, <http://www.treasury.gov/resource-center/economic-policy/Documents/20120323InfrastructureReport.pdf>

Investing in transportation infrastructure creates middle-class jobs. Our analysis suggests ¶ that 61 percent of the jobs directly created by investing in infrastructure would be in the ¶ construction sector, 12 percent would be in the manufacturing sector, and 7 percent ¶ would be in the retail and wholesale trade sectors, for a total of 80 percent in these three ¶ sectors. Nearly 90 percent of the jobs in these three sectors most affected by ¶ infrastructure spending are middle-class jobs, defined as those paying between percentile of the national distribution of wages. The President’s proposal emphasizes transportation choices, including mass transit and ¶ high-speed rail, to deliver the greatest long-term benefits to those who need it most: ¶ middle-class families. The average American family spends more than $7,600 a year on ¶ transportation, which is more than they spend on food and more than twice what they ¶ spend on out-of-pocket health care costs. For 90 percent of Americans, transportation ¶ costs absorb one out of every seven dollars of income. This burden is due in large part to ¶ the lack of alternatives to expensive and often congested automobile travel. Multi-modal ¶ transportation investments are critical to making sure that American families can travel ¶ without wasting time and money stuck in traffic. ¶ A more efficient transportation infrastructure system will reduce our dependence on oil, ¶ saving families time and money. Traffic congestion on our roads results in 1.9 billion ¶ gallons of gas wasted per year, and costs drivers over $100 billion in wasted fuel and lost ¶ time. More efficient air traffic control systems would save three billion gallons of jet fuel ¶ a year, translating into lower costs for consumers. Finally, new research indicates that ¶ Americans who were able to live in “location efficient” housing were able to save $200 ¶ per month in lower costs, including paying less at the pump, over the past decade.

### States CP doesn’t solve our turns

#### States are begging for federal infrastructure investment

Walters 2012 Patrick Walters(Writer for Huffington Post),“U.S Conference Of Mayors Calls For Infrastructure Investment”,huffingtonpost.com,7/19/2012, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/07/19/us-conference-of-mayors-infrastructure-investment_n_1687193.html>

The economies of the nation's cities are starting to bounce back from the recession and grow again, but the state and federal governments need to increase their spending on infrastructure to help that growth continue, according to the U.S. Conference of Mayors, which released an economic report Thursday.¶ The report, prepared by HIS Global Insight, forecasts that 300 of the country's 363 metropolitan areas will experience real economic growth by the end of the year. The total gross metropolitan product grew by 1.7 percent last year and expanded in 267 metropolitan areas; this year, the report predicts, the average growth of all 363 areas will be just below 1.8 percent.¶ Fifty metropolitan areas are expected to have growth rates of 3 percent or more, led by Austin, Texas, and Houston. More than 100 areas are expected to see growth of 2 percent or more, including Phoenix, Denver, Boston and San Francisco, according to the report.¶ But mayors attending the conference's summer meeting in Philadelphia pleaded with federal and state governments, as well as both presidential candidates, to increase the amount of funding for infrastructure – including roads, bridges, water and sewer systems and other transportation investments. Public spending on infrastructure in the United States has fallen to 2.4 percent of the gross domestic product, the group said, something that needs to be increased in order for growth to continue.¶ Philadelphia Mayor Michael Nutter, president of the conference, noted that infrastructure spending had been at 3 percent of the GDP not long ago. "It's going in the wrong direction," the Democrat said, adding that the change was due to the "ineffectiveness of many members of Congress."¶ Frank C. Ortis, mayor of Pembroke Pines, Fla., and Scott Smith, mayor of Mesa, Ariz., also called on state and federal governments to increase infrastructure spending to help city economies.¶ "Our cities need help," said Ortis, a Democrat. "We want action."¶ Said Smith, a Republican: "We believe we are falling behind."¶ The nonpartisan conference pointed out that metropolitan areas are home to 90.7 percent of the real gross domestic product, 89.9 percent of wage and salary income, 85.8 percent of jobs and 83.7 percent of the population.

## AT: States CP

### Doesn’t Solve- Taxes

#### States cannot fund BRAC improvements- they have huge transportation budget deficits and raising taxes is politically unpopular.

Transportation Research Board of the National Academies 11 (Joseph M. Sussman, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Chair, “Federal Funding of Transportation Improvements in BRAC Cases: Special Report 302”, Feb, http://alexandriava.gov/uploadedFiles/tes/BRAC/Federal%20Funding%20of%20Transportation%20Improvements%20in%20BRAC%20cases.pdf)

STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS Along with funding some capital improvements, state and local governments fund transportation infrastructure operational and maintenance expenses, which account for most transportation spending. From a state and local finance perspective, the BRAC 2005 round could hardly have come at a more difficult time. The year-over-year growth rate in state tax revenues began to slow in late 2005, well before the recent recession, but then went sharply negative in late 2008 (Rockefeller Institute of Government 2010, Figure 2). Although stale revenues have begun to rebound, 2010 revenues are forecast to be 14.9% lower in 2010 than in 2008. Federal aid through USDOT programs discussed above almost exclusively fund capital improvements. Most states have a highway trust fund that is funded through motor fuels and other user fees, while local governments rely on a wide variety of taxes to support their transportation assets, particularly property and sales taxes. The states rely on their trust funds for both highway capital and operating expenses. The sales tax on motor fuels provides an index of motor fuel tax revenues; the year-over-year growth rate in this tax went negative in 2006 and has remained so in 15 of the last 16 quarters (Rockefeller Institute of Government 2010, Table 5), which caused many states to suspend or cancel proposed capital spending. Local property taxes have been less severely affected by the economic downturn in the near term because they depend on reevaluations that lag swings in market values. Many jurisdictions will experience Iess revenue from this source over the next 3 to 5 years as jurisdictions reevaluate. Sales taxes, which many jurisdictions use to support transit, are still well below 2008 levels (Rockefeller Institute of Government 2010, Figure 3.) State and local agencies, particularly in the current economy, are experiencing demand for available transportation funds that far exceeds supply. Trends affecting the federal trust fund are also affecting sources of state and local transportation funds. In addition, many states are facing large budget deficits, which have forced state and local agencies to reprioritize their transportation projects and eliminate many of them (AASHTO 2010, NCSL 2010. Ybarra 2006). State infrastructure Banks: Many of the states with BRAC actions have state infrastructure banks that could be a source of upfront capital to improve transportation facilities at low or no interest if a revenue source could be found to repay the loan. In the case of Fort Bliss, the state is dedicating a share of future federal surface transportation revenues to pay a developer who financed the project. Another possibility is for a local jurisdiction or state to dedicate some portion of existing tax revenues, or raise taxes, to repay a loan from a state infrastructure bank. Some complexities with this approach are obvious. Most of the facilities adversely affected by base expansion are state highways, and local property or business taxes would not apply. The state could dedicate a share of future highway user taxes to repay the loan, but, as indicated above, most state transportation trust funds are inadequate to meet current needs. Given the current status of state and local finances, the concept of diverting existing tax revenues to a new purpose, or raising taxes, would be politically unpopular, but such an approach might be possible in the future for some projects.

### Doesn’t Solve- Military-Local Coop

#### The CP does solve solve our military-local cooperation advantage-- States are pissed that they have to pick up the slack- they are unwilling to fund BRAC improvements.

Transportation Research Board of the National Academies 11 (Joseph M. Sussman, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Chair, “Federal Funding of Transportation Improvements in BRAC Cases: Special Report 302”, Feb, http://alexandriava.gov/uploadedFiles/tes/BRAC/Federal%20Funding%20of%20Transportation%20Improvements%20in%20BRAC%20cases.pdf)

Other than the DAR program, the military traditionally accepts no responsibility for transportation congestion and transportation related environmental impacts outside the gates of its bases. As indicated above, in some cases military personnel are adversely affected through the potential consequences for retention of valued workers and disruption of training for soldiers. The normal way to address the impact of large­scale private developments in communities is to require them to pay some form of an impact fee in addition to the fuel and other taxes they pay. Communi­ ties have increasingly required new private developments to pay their share of the public infrastructure required to serve them. These fees are assessed over and above the user fees that fund transportation programs and other taxes businesses are required to pay. Absent these payments, communities can prevent the development from being built (which is not an option when DoD is the developer). As the cost of new infrastructure and the difficulties and delay associated with building new infrastructure have increased, many communities have become less willing to ask exist­ ing residents to fund the costs of transportation improvements necessi­ tated by major new developments.

### XT- raising taxes unpopular w/ states

#### States cannot politically sell payment of the CP- the DOD must take more responsibility.

Transportation Research Board of the National Academies Press ’11 [Joseph M. Sussman, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Chair; Thera Black, Thurston Regional Planning Council, Olympia, Washington; Thomas B. Deen, Transportation Consultant, Stevensville, Maryland; James R. Gosnell, West Coast Corridor Coalition, Los Angeles, California; Max I. Inman, Mercator Advisors, Fairfax, Virginia; Ashby Johnson, Houston–Galveston Area Council, Houston, Texas; Fred Meurer, City of Monterey, California; Kevin Neels, Brattle Group, Washington, D.C.; George E. Schoener, I-95 Corridor Coalition, Celebration, Florida; Randall Yim, Independent Consultant, Scottsville, Virginia. Staff: Edward Weiner, Consultant; Stephen R. Godwin, Transportation Research Board, Transportation Research Board of the National Academies Press, “Federal Funding of Transportation Improvements in BRAC Cases: Special Report 302”, Alexandria.gov, February 2011, http://alexandriava.gov/uploadedFiles/tes/BRAC/Federal%20Funding%20of%20Transportation%20Improvements%20in%20BRAC%20cases.pdf AD]

The fundamental question posed in the committee’s statement of task concerns the responsibility of the Department of Defense (DoD) to pay for off-base transportation impacts. The first section of this chapter reviews existing DoD programs for assisting communities whose transportation facilities are affected by military base growth. The second section reviews traditional non-DoD government programs to fund surface transportation infrastructure. These programs include those administered by the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT), for which national defense is an eligibility criterion. State and local government transportation sources are also reviewed in this section, including how local governments normally work with private developers who propose major projects that will affect the localities’ transportation networks. Alternatives to construction funding for capital improvement to increase infrastructure capacity, such as operations and maintenance (O&M) funding for ongoing congestion management, are also discussed. The committee is also charged with assessing current federal programs that could be of assistance in BRAC cases. The committee’s treatment of traditional federal, state, and local programs for funding transportation is influenced by the current fiscal context. In the aftermath of the “great recession,” governments are under the most demanding fiscal pressure experienced in recent decades and face a public unsympathetic to tax increases to fund transportation. Even as the military budget has grown dramatically to wage wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, governments have seen their revenues decline because of the recent recession, particularly tax revenues they typically rely on for transportation.

## AT: Devolution CP

#### Devolution of transportation infrastructure investment to the states can’t ensure national coordination and sufficient funding. The signal of the CP destroys federal transportation revenue and causes a race to the bottom.

NSTIF 09 (National Surface Transportation Infrastructure Financing Commission, “Paying our Way: A New Framework for Transportation Finance,” Feb 26, http://financecommission.dot.gov/Documents/NSTIF\_Commission\_Final\_Report\_Advance%20Copy\_Feb09.pdf)

Considering an “Opt Out” Program for the States

Congress asked the Commission to consider the potential viability of a program that effectively would exempt a state from all or part of the federal surface transportation program. It has been contemplated that, under such a program, a state could “opt out” of the federal fuel taxes and the spending programs funded by them—in exchange for increasing its own state-level taxes and committing to maintaining and improving the transportation system within its borders to certain standards. The stated goal of such proposals is to shift much of the funding responsibility to the state so that it can determine its own transportation spending priorities. The underlying premise is that much of the current federal-level spending is misallocated by an inefficient process that dispenses funds according to outdated formulas and wasteful earmarks—and that the states are more flexible, closer to the transportation challenges that need to be met, and more accountable to transportation system users and taxpayers.

While sympathetic to frustrations about some of the federal funding decisions and program requirements associated with the current system, the Commission has serious reservations about any potential opt out program. These concerns stem from consideration of the appropriate federal role, required infrastructure investments, potential program mechanics, and the question of “devolution” of funding responsibility to the state level. The common theme of these interrelated issues, which are discussed in more detail below, is ensuring the integrity of the national highway and transit network.

The purpose of the federal program is to make sure that investments critical to the national network are made across the country, regardless of how or where revenues are generated. Our economic competitiveness as a nation relies on an effective and integrated surface transportation system. Federal involvement helps ensure that sufficient resources are allocated to meet the mobility needs of all citizens. Effective improvements to the national system require a national perspective, national coordination, and national funding.

Attempting to support the national system at the state level would be highly problematic— especially in light of the growing funding gap. Although it is desirable to develop performance standards guiding the operation and maintenance of existing assets by the states, that alone would not guarantee that necessary enhancements are made to the national network. In any given time frame, individual states may or may not have the resources available to make critical investments. And they likely would have conflicting priorities over time for making those enhancements to the network—both for highways and for transit. Furthermore, as summarized in Chapter 2, the levels of investment needed to maintain and improve the conditions and performance of the nation’s highways and transit systems are significantly higher than current levels. It is not clear that states, absent federal support and acting on their own, could maintain existing levels of investment, much less close the gap and make necessary improvements to the national system.

The Commission recognizes that the specific definition of the federal role in surface transportation that Congress chooses to maintain or set in the future will drive the level of resources that must be generated at the federal level. But it also emphasizes that reducing the federal role would not mean that investment needs are reduced; the burden of meeting those needs would simply be shifted to individual states. In light of the serious performance crisis facing the nation’s transportation system and the associated investment shortfall, the Commission has concluded that any attempt to implement an opt out program is inadvisable. Moreover, the proposed transition to a mileage-based fee system presents a real opportunity to address many of the concerns that lead to calls for states to opt out of the current program.

Federal Role

Most opt out proposals start with an assumption that the federal role in supporting the surface transportation system should be much smaller. Under this assumption, with virtual completion of the Interstate Highway System and the National Highway System, the federal role can be reduced to promulgating safety and supporting certain research and development efforts. Under this view, supporting interstate commerce can be accomplished (perhaps more efficiently and fairly) by requiring the states to maintain or improve the national system to certain standards rather than collecting and redistributing funds at the national level.

As part of its assessment of funding options and investment needs, the Commission examined the range of potential federal funding roles from minimal (“devolution”) to expansive (enhanced beyond the current role). The Commission does not make any recommendation about the future federal role, but it used this exercise to inform its investigations and illustrate some of the analyses contained in this report. Acknowledging a more than minimal federal role means recognizing that there is a national network of some kind that broadly benefits the general public. And the central issue concerning the federal role is the distribution of resources to support that national network. Through its deliberations about surface transportation policies and programs, Congress must address the future federal role in this post-Interstate era. Authorizing any state to opt out of the current federal program would first require addressing the ramifications of such action on the overall national system and therefore is not an advisable course of action.

Investment Needs

Closely tied to perspectives on the federal role are assessments of required investments. As summarized in Chapter 2, the levels of investment needed to maintain and improve the conditions and performance of the nation’s highways and transit systems are immense— far larger than current spending levels. Even if policies and programs were significantly reformed to greatly improve the allocation of resources, the Commission has concluded that more revenue is still needed. In light of this fundamental underinvestment problem, any scheme to reduce current federal fuel taxes in exchange for increases in state-level taxes would be problematic. Using the Commission’s Baseline Revenue Forecast and Base Case Investment Scenario, the average annual investment shortfall relative to spending needed to maintain and improve the nation’s highway and transit systems is $138 billion. Closing that annual gap with fuel taxes alone would require an increase of about 76¢ per gallon (that would be on top of the existing federal and state gas taxes that combined average about 40¢ per gallon today). Thus, according to the most recent assessment, the nation (at all levels of government) is spending only about 35 percent of what is needed to maintain and improve the surface transportation system. Quantifying the funding gap in this manner shows that any opt out program involving federal fuel tax reductions that roughly offset state fuel tax increases would not address the underlying national investment shortfall (even if policy makers agreed with reducing the federal funding role relative to the states).

A related issue concerns the ability of individual states to maintain higher fuel taxes in the face of cross-border competition. If fuel taxes are much higher in one state than another, there is an incentive for some of the residents of that state, particularly those living near the border, to purchase their fuel where the tax is lower. These pressures may work to keep state taxes lower than they would be absent such competition and therefore may result in less overall fuel tax revenue if an opt out program were to be implemented.

Another aspect of investment needs, beyond their aggregate amount, is their relationship to the national network. As mentioned earlier, while it may be possible (indeed desirable) to develop performance standards guiding the operation and maintenance of existing assets, it can be difficult to ensure that necessary enhancements are made to the national network. To the extent direct users are willing to pay for certain improvements (i.e., user fees can be monetized to generate the upfront capital required to undertake the improvements), those signals can be used to guide appropriate investments. But not all critical improvements can be funded this way. A major challenge to supporting the national network is identifying those improvements that generate broad public benefits that cannot be easily monetized directly. Such system improvements require a national perspective, national coordination, and national funding (as opposed to state-by-state determinations).

## AT: NEPA

### NEPA = Normal Means

#### NEPA is normal means for federal transportation projects like BRAC.

Transportation Research Board of the National Academies 11 (Joseph M. Sussman, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Chair, “Federal Funding of Transportation Improvements in BRAC Cases: Special Report 302”, Feb, http://alexandriava.gov/uploadedFiles/tes/BRAC/Federal%20Funding%20of%20Transportation%20Improvements%20in%20BRAC%20cases.pdf)

The development of transportation projects depends as much on meeting state and federal environmental requirements as it does on funding. The Safe, Accountable, Flexible Efficient, Transportation Equity Act of 2005 includes a number of provisions designed to expedite the environmental review of transportation projects mandated by NEPA.1 These provisions are designed to improve interagency communication and analysis in order to meet NEPA requirements in a more timely way than they have been met in the past. Executive Order 13274 (September 18, 2002), among other things, empowered the Secretary of Transportation to identify high-priority projects that deserve special attention by resource agencies required to conduct NEPA reviews and analyses in order to expedite their review. Streamlining does not bypass NEPA or other federal requirements; instead, it attempts to resolve complex interagency reviews and enhance communication so that determinations can be made regarding compliance with NEPA and other requirements. FHWA maintains a website with extensive information about environmental stewardship and streamlining, including case examples, guidance, and performance reports.2

## Medical Readiness XT

#### The San Antonio Military Health System is one of the best in the world – it’s the only military level one trauma center in the US.

Air Force Medical Service 7/23 [Air Force News Service “San Antonio health system among best in wounded warrior, trauma care”, 7/23/12, <http://www.afms.af.mil/news/story.asp?id=123310969> AD]

2005 Base Realignment and Closure commission hearings, it was suggested that the military should consolidate all health facilities in San Antonio to create the San Antonio Military Health System. The SAMHS was established after both the Air Force and Army chiefs of staff signed a memorandum of agreement in September 2010. Maj. Gen. Byron C. Hepburn, SAMHS director, and Army Col. Mary Garr, chief operating officer, explained that the goal of the system is to increase efficiencies and effectiveness, while providing a cutting edge, and state-of-the art medical activity within the San Antonio Military Health system. "Being mindful of our readiness requirements, our education requirements and also our research requirements for the nation, we are doing all of that in a very synergistic coordinated manner here in San Antonio," said Hepburn, the first director of SAMHS and the 59th Medical Wing commander. The 59th Medical Wing, at Joint Base San Antonio-Lackland, is the largest medical wing in the Air Force. The Wilford Hall Ambulatory Surgical Center is a new facility currently under construction and when finished will be the largest ambulatory surgical center within the Department of Defense. The current building will be demolished after the new WHASC is fully operational. "One of the key things that we are doing here is research for enroute care for air evacuation for part of our Air Force and joint mission in the medical arena," said Hepburn. "We take great pride in what we are doing with our critical transport teams, where we're taking it to the next level." He said the center has installed partial heart lung bypass machines that can keep wounded warriors with lung injuries alive, with the ability to move them intercontinental distances. "We are also looking at how we are going to move an infectious patient safely across intercontinental distances, so we'll see a lot of really cutting edge, state of the art medical activity happening in San Antonio." According to Hepburn, SAMHS has the distinction of being the only military level one trauma center in the U.S. "We are caring for very high acuity patients, so our doctors, nurses and technicians are learning how to care for these trauma patients. Those skills will serve them well if they have to go forward in combat or serve the nation for a natural disaster here in the United States." Hepburn also explained that SAMHS has a unique partnership with the Veteran's Administration. "Secretary Shinseki, from the Veteran Affairs, has asked us to be a pilot site for an integrated electronic health record system," said Hepburn. "It'll really lend to an increased synergy of seamless transfer of care between our active duty force and those that go on to get their care in the veterans administration system." In addition to developing a reputation as a state-of-the-art health center and top level trauma hospital, SAMHS offers many facilities for wounded warriors injured in combat. The maxillofacial prosthetic department, laser treatment for wounded warriors, the Center for the Intrepid, and the aeromedical staging facility are just a few areas dedicated to providing top-notch care. "We saw tremendous change in the training, education and research areas in health care here in San Antonio," said Garr. "All of the enlisted medical training across the Department of Defense has now consolidated through BRAC here in San Antonio. "In addition to the research area, we opened the battlefield health and trauma center on Fort Sam (Houston), which consolidated some of our important research and development. The tri-service research lab, which was headquartered on Brooke City Base, stayed here in San Antonio as well and is able to continue to provide much needed research in areas that support healthcare." Hepburn added that this transformation in San Antonio has been a win-win, for not only the Air Force and the Army, but most importantly is a win-win for its patients. "We have an A+ system and it's only going to get stronger and better in the years ahead," said Hepburn. "Through collaboration and teamwork we have a clear focus on our patients and patients' safety and high quality outcomes. We are shifting from healthcare to health here in San Antonio in a very positive and proactive manner." Hepburn believes that it is an honor to serve in one of the military's premier health institutions and is excited about the future of military health care in San Antonio. "The new San Antonio Military Medical Center and the new Wilford Hall Ambulatory Surgical Center, which will be finished in 2015, are beautiful facilities but more importantly it's the men and women, officers, enlisted and civilians who really give it the A+ rating that it so well deserves."