### Solvency Frontline

#### First, several barriers exist to Next Gen implementation - no agency coordination, surveillance gaps, and network connectivity

JPOD 08 (Joint Planning and Development Office, plans and coordinates the development of the NGATS through multi-agency cooperation with the DoT, the DoD, the FAA, and the DHS, among others. Integrated Surveillance for the Next Generation Air Transportation System. <http://ntrs.nasa.gov/archive/nasa/casi.ntrs.nasa.gov/20090030052_2009016948.pdf>) cass

There are known organizational barriers to achieving NextGen surveillance objectives that must be addressed before any technical approaches can be successfully evaluated, selected, and implemented. There is no institutional mechanism to oversee and coordinate surveillance capabilities across all agencies, nor is there a mechanism in place to synchronize and arbitrate agency efforts to establish an Integrated Surveillance capability. There are gaps between NextGen needs and planned surveillance capabilities due to sensor coverage and detection characteristics; data correlation and fusion; network architecture and connectivity; interagency surveillance information sharing and collaboration; and ability to address the spectrum of multi-agency information needs. There is no consensus among the agencies that participated in this study regarding the degree to which these gaps cause near-term operational risks. No concept of operations exists that covers the scope of integrated surveillance. Surveillance is currently characterized by each individual agency focusing only on their operational mission needs. Limited capabilities exist for the timely sharing of surveillance information across all stakeholders, which also affects the coordination of responses to detected events. There are opportunities to leverage future technologies and other capabilities across agencies to achieve synergy in Integrated Surveillance.

#### And, airlines are not on board - plan does not solve for the costs that the airline industry will have to absorb

Bogdan 12(Jennifer, staff writer for Press of Atlantic City, “Uncertainty about benefits, funds hurting Next Generation Air Transportation System, think tank study says”, 04/15/12, AD: 07/09/12. <http://www.pressofatlanticcity.com/communities/eht/uncertainty-about-benefits-funds-hurting-next-generation-air-transportation-system/article_606a1c4a-86a1-11e1-9a37-001a4bcf887a.html> | Kushal/Lin)

Airline carriers are reluctant to take on the costs associated with upgrading planes to accommodate the Next Generation Air Transportation System because there is no clear funding stream for the project and there is disagreement about its benefits, according to a study by a Washington, D.C., think tank. The study by the Eno Center for Transportation, a nonpartisan group that leads professional development in the transportation industry, found four key barriers to implementing the federal program known as NextGen: n Uncertainty about the program’s benefits; n Uncertainty about the Federal Aviation Administration’s ability to deliver the program; n Lack of a clear source of funds for NextGen; n And operators’ reluctance to invest in NextGen equipment .NextGen refers to a series of initiatives that will modernize the air traffic control system, transforming it from a radar-based system to a more-efficient satellite-based program. The cost of the upgrades is projected at about $40 billion — with half shouldered by the federal government and half by the airlines — and they are not expected to be complete before 2025. Much is riding on the federal program for South Jersey. NextGen concepts must be tested at the FAA’s William J. Hughes Technical Center in Egg Harbor Township, which employs 1,500 FAA workers and 1,500 contractors. Plans have existed since 2005 to develop a NextGen Aviation Research and Technology Park on the tech center’s grounds in the hope that major aviation companies would take up residence there. Progress on the park, however, has been slowed by gaffes made by the South Jersey Economic Development District, which leases the park’s land from the FAA. Slow progress also is attributed to problems with federal funding for the initiative. The FAA has released only $442 million of $7 billion in NextGen funding, and when the rest will come is unknown. “Operators are unlikely to invest until, at a minimum, the (FAA) is ready to deliver the promised benefits. This leads to a stalemate: Operators are uncertain whether investing in NextGen is worthwhile. When the infrastructure is not yet fully in place and without equipage, the infrastructure by itself is ineffective,” the report reads. Joshua Schank, president and CEO of the Eno Center, said he couldn’t speak specifically about the prospects of the Egg Harbor Township park. However, he said, given his firm’s research, he would move cautiously if involved in the project. “To be frank, basing any development of any kind on federal money is pretty risky,” Schank said. “Things like transportation are often the first things to be cut in a federal budget because people take them for granted. If you say, ‘We’re going to cut funding for NextGen,’ what constituency is going to step up and fight that? The aviation industry? Maybe. But probably no one.” However, the park’s board has said it is now in negotiations with high-profile tenants and firmly believes the project will see momentum this year despite the problems the park has had with the SJEDD. In a watchdog report earlier this year, The Press of Atlantic City reported that SJEDD incurred hundreds of thousands of dollars in debt while leading the park’s infrastructure installation and is unable to pay $495,000 to its contractors. Gordon Dahl, the district’s executive director, has since been removed from his position, and he’s threatened to sue the district and representatives of the park’s board. “We have met with serious, serious players. We’d love to be able to tell you who,” Atlantic County Executive Dennis Levinson, a member of the NextGen park’s board, said recently at a meeting with the editorial board of The Press of Atlantic City. “We do believe that once that major player comes in, the others will want to be here also.” New Vistas, the park’s newly designated conditional developer, also has secured one letter of intent from World Wide Technology, a St. Louis-based technology services firm interested in locating in the park. Aside from World Wide Technology, the park’s only other committed tenant is the FAA, which plans to have a federal lab in the first of seven buildings, none of which have been constructed. Despite that, a sign at the park’s entrance on Amelia Earhart Boulevard states that limited research space is available. “Do I think that park is going to be filled with those seven buildings? I think you’re going to be surprised how that park gets filled. I really believe within the year we’ll have a groundbreaking for the first building,” said Ed Salmon, the park board’s president. “I also believe within five to 10 years, we’ll have that park filled. Out of that ... it is going to expand so many aviation opportunities for Atlantic County.” Ron Esposito, the park’s executive director, said despite the obstacles listed, he was encouraged by the report. “I think it gave an independent look at NextGen. What it points to is that NextGen benefits — even at low levels — can be significant and tangible,” Esposito said. The Eno study commenced in summer 2011 and is based on a mix of first-hand interviews, standing research from the FAA, congressional hearings and other private studies. Eno’s work was reviewed by the FAA, former Department of Transportation officials and academics, Schank said. The study shows that implementing NextGen will reduce fuel consumption and congestion, but calculations of the savings vary. One of the major obstacles to implementing NextGen is that as the program stands now, airline operators are expected to shoulder the cost of equipping their aircrafts with the technology. Those costs are estimated to amount to $100,000 per jet aircraft and $10,000 per small aircraft, affecting as many as 240,000 planes. Airlines are reluctant to invest in the technology because it provides no benefit to them unless the FAA puts infrastructure in place that makes it useable, the report states. “If I go first, I’ll have to bear the cost of updating the software, and when NextGen is turned on, I’ll have the oldest, most obsolete systems out there,” is the general concern from operators, said Russell Chew, of Nexa Capital, a private financing firm for NextGen equipment. Schank said the Eno Center embarked on its research in part because of concerns relayed through connections in aviation’s private sector. “The more we talked to them about NextGen, the more this would come up. They’d say, ‘We don’t want to be out there investing tons of money in this technology when we don’t know what the technology is going to be at the end of the day,’” Schank said. Some of those doubts are the result of a lack of a dedicated funding stream for the program. Recent reports by the Government Accountability Office and the Congressional Budget Office show that revenues from the FAA’s Airport and Airway Trust Fund, which is expected to finance the upgrades, are inadequate to fund NextGen. Earlier this year, Congress came to a resolution over an FAA reauthorization bill that will fund the authority into 2015. Long-term authority for the FAA previously expired in 2007, leaving the agency to depend on a series of 23 short-term financing extensions and leading to a partial shutdown of the FAA that put 650 William J. Hughes Technical Center employees temporarily out of work last summer. “Despite recent resolution over the long overdue FAA reauthorization bill, little progress has been (made) regarding securing a full-fledged modernization funding plan. The current bill authorizes a flat amount of $2.731 billion over four years for NextGen, and funding is still subject to annual appropriation,” the report states. “A project that is already endangered by uncertainties regarding its worth would benefit from a stable and adequate funding source.” US. Rep. Frank LoBiondo, R-2nd, championed the long-term reauthorization bill in February, saying it would bring stability to the FAA and ensure that substantial work on NextGen will be completed. Jason Galanes, a spokesman for LoBiondo, said the congressman stands by those statements and believes a reliable funding stream is critical to advancing the program. “He believes the passage of the FAA authorization and the bipartisan commitment to NextGen should give the airlines reassurance about the future of the project and encourage their active participation and investment,” Galanes said. “Locally, as NextGen development continues, business and aviation industry leaders who are or will be involved are right to realize that our FAA Technical Center in South Jersey will be the hub of that research, development and implementation.” Schank, of the Eno Center, said even if money is available, that alone will not crush the obstacles. “The problem is there has not been the leadership necessary to bring the private sector along effectively and to move forward with the technology from the FAA’s perspective,” he said. “You need someone who will say, ‘Here’s the promises we’re going to make to the private sector. This is how we’re going to meet the deadlines and performance objectives.’ The private sector does not want to invest when it’s not clear who’s in charge or how it’s going to get done.”

#### And, the Aff can't control major parts of their internal links - they don't solve for poor personnel and ineffective FAA management

Edwards 11. (Chris, expert on federal and state tax and budget policies, “Air Traffic Control: Too Important for Government”, Cato @ Liberty, 04/20/11, http://www.cato-at-liberty.org/air-traffic-control-too-important-for-government/, 07/10/12, Chin)

The government’s air traffic controllers have been sleeping on the job, watching movies rather than guiding planes, and misdirecting the First Lady’s plane over Washington. There have been soaring numbers of airplane near misses caused by ATC errors over the last year.¶ Yesterday, the president said that federal government technology systems are “horrible” “across-the-board,” which isn’t good news for citizens hoping that the Federal Aviation Administration’s computers will land them safely.¶ The government’s air traffic controllers are very highly compensated, but they are unionized and they work for a mismanaged bureaucracy. The federal ATC system has had serious labor and management problems since the 1960s. And the president’s comment on technology rings true with regard to ATC — the FAA has had huge troubles for decades efficiently implementing new technologies. And things could get worse as air traffic volumes rise and the FAA struggles to implement next generation ATC systems.¶ The solution is privatization, as discussed in this essay and these blogs. Privatization promises better management, a more disciplined workforce, more efficient financing, better technology, and safer skies.

#### And - NextGen’s GPS base prone to interference - rise in jamming create a huge solvency deficit

Sheridan 12(John, staff writer for Aviation Online, “Rise of GPS Interference Raises Concerns for NextGen”, 04/02/112, AD: 07/14/12, <http://www.ainonline.com/aviation-news/aviation-international-news/2012-04-02/rise-gps-interference-raises-concerns-nextgen> | Kushal/Sehee

Today, most of us would probably rate cellphones, ATMs and the Internet as the three most useful modern gadgets we use regularly. We likely wouldn’t rank GPS up there, and maybe not even in the top 10. Yet without GPS, those three wouldn’t work too well, if at all, and neither would a host of other things that we depend on (reliable electrical power; banking systems; national and worldwide telecommunications, including air traffic control; and car navigation, to name a few). And with NextGen slowly approaching, aviation’s dependence on GPS will grow exponentially. But their dependability is not assured for the future. Considering their importance, the GPS satellite signals are improbably weak: someone compared them to detecting a Christmas tree light bulb in New York, when viewed from Los Angeles. The reason is that in the 1970s USAF developers had classified technology that could hide them from adversary detection deep in the atmospheric “noise.” But parallel civil technology eventually caught up and public GPS access was granted in 1983. On Sept. 10, 2001, the Department of Transportation warned that the weakness of the signals made them vulnerable to deliberate jamming. Events the very next day demonstrated the reality of ill intent.¶ Today, the worldwide GPS market and the system’s applications have expanded beyond anyone’s imagination, with the number of receivers in use estimated to be “close to half a billion.” Accompanying the rise in GPS usage have been ever increasing reports of signal interference and jamming. One UK report stated that over a six-month period in 2011, twenty dedicated GPS signal monitors spread across the country had recorded between 50 and 450 deliberate interference events every day. Of these, almost all were attributed to small, low-powered devices selling for around $50 on the Internet since, as in the U.S., GPS jammers are illegal in the UK. Nevertheless, several thousand are reportedly in use in Britain and more than100,000 in the U.S., their main purpose being to defeat GPS tracking systems installed in trucks by their company owners. But their numbers are said to be steadily increasing and, unfortunately, their low power levels make them difficult to detect, especially in moving traffic. Last November, the Department of Homeland Security reportedly introduced a U.S. nationwide GPS monitoring project called Patriot Watch, similar to the system in the UK.¶ What does GPS jamming mean for aviation? Because the most common jammers today are low powered, their main threat is to lower-altitude aircraft on a GPS, GPS/Waas or GPS/RNP approach and on the airport surface, where GPS-driven airport maps are being used. AIN reported last year on the collateral jamming of the ground-based augmentation system (GBAS) at Newark, which suffered random and unpredictable shutdowns that were eventually found to be caused by jammers in trucks travelling along the nearby New Jersey Turnpike. The only cure for the problem was to move the four GBAS antennas farther infield to a point out of range of the jammers.¶ But this is unlikely to be a permanent cure. Inevitably, under a “bigger is better” mindset, some buyers will feel more protected with a more powerful, longer-range jammer, and these too are now available on the Internet. This of course raises the threat level since, depending on their antenna configuration, they increase the likelihood of higher-altitude interference, with a consequent impact on ADS-B.¶ Is There Safety in Numbers?¶ Will other, more recently assembled GNSS constellations such as Europe’s Galileo be less affected by GPS jammers? The answer, unfortunately, is no. All GNSS satellites transmit in the same quite narrow set of frequencies, with each satellite assigned a unique coded ID. On the plus side, the DOD’s next-generation GPS III will transmit more powerful signals than at present, but jamming follows the military practice of escalating countermeasures as the adversary increases his.¶ It was also once felt that when Europe and China joined the U.S. and Russia with full worldwide GNSS constellations, along with smaller regional constellations over India and Japan, the 130 or more satellites would always provide superior performance by allowing user receivers to select the optimum satellite geometry, with maximum redundancy. That is still true, but with all those satellites continuously transmitting, initial recent research suggests that the ambient atmospheric noise “floor” also rises, potentially further weakening those already weak satellite signals, to the jammers’ advantage.¶ Spoofing¶ Spoofing is an essentially military technique that can allow control of a UAV to be taken over electronically in flight and directed elsewhere on false GPS data. Earlier this year, Iran claimed that it used spoofing to capture an unmanned U.S. RQ-170 Sentinel, a claim the USAF has challenged. However, the fact that it appears to have made a successful wheels-up landing with relatively little damage has created concern in the Pentagon and elsewhere, since both Russia and China are known to have conducted extensive spoofing research. Spoofing is a complex process and, as far as is known, has not been achieved with an unmanned aircraft in the West. If Iran’s claim is true, it would have a profound effect on future unmanned aircraft warfare strategies.¶ The Future of Aviation GPS¶ Unquestionably, GPS jamming will increase and, as we move further into a satellite-based NextGen environment, its interference will become more noticeable. This raises two key questions (not only for NextGen but also for all other critical GPS applications). For aviation, will GPS reach the point of no longer being totally dependable? Second, if so, are the backup systems proposed for NextGen adequate for the long-term future?

#### And, Legal issues over liability - hurts NextGen solvency

Barkowski 12 [Justin T. Barkowski is graduated from Pepperdine University School of Law and was admitted to the Bar. Mr. Barkowski received the Ronald Sorenson Award and, prior to attending Pepperdine, he graduated from the University of California, Berkeley, where he studied economics. Mr. Barkowski is an instrumentrated private pilot and is active in the firm’s business litigation and insurance law practices. “Managing Air Traffic Congestion Through the Next

Generation Air Transportation System: SatelliteBased Technology, Trajectories, and - Privatization?” <http://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1039&context=plr>, 2-2-2012] Lin

In one of the first cases of ATC negligence, courts rejected the government's argument that controller decisions were protected under this exception. Indeed, it has since been established that air traffic controllers can be held liable for negligent acts in their duties under the FTCA. But this liability is predicated on the scope of a controller's legally defined duty to aircraft in the airspace system. Air traffic controllers have generally been held to a "standard of ordinary care with respect to their duties."' This vague standard does nothing to create a practical and legally sufficient duty upon controllers because ATC functions are extremely complex. Unfortunately the question of ATC duties is a matter of law, and judges generally do not have detailed knowledge of the system's intricacies.'1 As a result, courts tend to rely on the Manual as a guide in weighing whether the controller had a duty in any given situation.' In light of this fact, debate has ensued over whether strict compliance with the Manual should defeat a negligence claim. But whether compliance should lead to prima facie negligence or negligence per se does not resolve the problem of judges relying on the Manual in one form or another in order to determine the controllers' duties.1 Also, while the FAA has immunity for procedures it prescribes in the Manual through the discretionary function exception, the judges' reliance naturally gives the FAA significant control over its own liability.1 These conflicting incentives are likely to cause problems under the NextGen system.'1

#### And, shortages of qualified staff will doom Next Gen's effectiveness

Turner 12. (Aimee, administrative assistant at Bennet Moter Express, “US training gap puts NextGen in Peril: OIG”, Air Traffic Management.net, 01/31/12, <http://www.airtrafficmanagement.net/2012/01/us-training-gap-puts-nextgen-in-peril-oig/>, 07/12/12, Chin)

The rollout of the US NextGen modernisation effort will put the already stretched training resources of the FAA under even greater pressure, according to the US Transportation Department office of inspector general.¶ In a report dated January 12, inspectors noted that the the agency started a hiring wave in fiscal 2005 to prepare for controllers hired after the 1981 controller strike reaching retirement age.¶ The report states that in 21 air traffic control facilities auditors considered to be critical to aviation safety due to the volume and complexity of air traffic, more than half equal or exceed the 25 per cent national average of certified professional controllers eligible to retire.¶ And yet attrition of new controller trainees at more than two thirds of those facilities exceed the national rate of 24 per cent, according to the report.¶ At the New York terminal radar approach control, three out of every four new controllers between 2008 and 2010 failed to qualify as certified professional controllers.¶ The report criticises the training slot methodology used by the Air Traffic Control Optimum Training Solution (ACOTS) programme office, managed since 2008 by Raytheon under a $437m-plus contract¶ In the report, the OIG auditors said that as result of the training resource allocation tool launched in February 2011, the Dallas TRACON saw its training capacity go down from two shifts a day when contract instructor cover was reduced by 20 per cent.¶ “The US has one of the safest air traffic systems in the world but the continued safety of the NAS relies on having a fully staffed, well trained air traffic controller workforce. However the Nation’s most critical air traffic facilities are facing significant staffing shortages of fully certified controllers which could lead to potential risks to their daily operations,” said the report.

#### And, the program is not even ready for full implementation - NextGen lacks goals and metrics for effectiveness

Hoover 10. (J. Nicholas, senior editor of information week“FAA NextGen Air Traffic Control Costs Could Quadruple”, Information Week, 12/03/10, <http://www.informationweek.com/news/government/enterprise-apps/228500257>, 07/10/12, Chin)

GAO also noted that the FAA has not yet established clear performance goals and metrics for NextGen despite creating an implementation plan through 2018. "Without goals and metrics, FAA could pursue and implement capabilities that fail to produce the desired results," the report said. However, with its goals being so ambitious and taking place over such a long time frame, the GAO and Congress have repeatedly raised concerns about maintaining rigorous controls over NextGen in order to keep it on schedule and budget. In April, witnesses told a House of Representatives subcommittee that the FAA's handling of the project called into question its ability to manage it and raised concerns that NextGen would fail to be completed on schedule. Then, in June, the FAA's inspector general reported that the agency needed to do more planning to assure the project's success and had failed to develop the necessary skill sets to make NextGen work. A third negative report came in July when the GAO found the FAA didn't have adequate performance metrics in place for the project. Earlier reports have also noted that significant research gaps remain unresolved that could threaten FAA's proposed schedule, including ways to synchronize numerous weather applications.¶

#### NextGen can’t solve in the short term - new airports and runways required which they don’t build

AEI 7 [American Enterprise Institute is a private, nonpartisan, not-for-profit institution dedicated to research and education on issues of government, politics, economics and social welfare. Writer, Evan Sparks, is a writer and editor based in Washington, D.C. where he is currently managing editor of Philanthropy. He was an associate editor at the American Enterprise Institute, where he created a blog on aviation policy. In 2009-2010, he was an inaugural Washington Fellow of the National Review Institute. “How to Fix Airport Delays” <http://american.com/archive/2007/october-10-07/how-to-fix-airport-delays>, 10-3-2007] Lin

Long-term transformation of ATC—and with it, a reduction in delays—is dependent on a steady source of funding consistent with the actual amount of airspace used. But NextGen is not the quick fix that the president and the public want. Indeed, some of the most significant gains promised by NextGen could be more than a decade away. Bush wants solutions in less than three months. With congestion pricing of landing slots, all airlines would be able to compete for peak service. Increasing capacity is essential to reducing airline delays, but that involves implementing NextGen and building new airports and runways—a long-term process. The only short-term fix may be to reduce flights in the most overcrowded airports at peak hours. The administration and Congress want to reduce flights the wrong way. At a hearing on September 26th, House Transportation Committee chairman James Oberstar asked the FAA and air-travel stakeholders to “sit down with one another.” James May, head of the Air Transport Association, an airline lobbying group, responded that airlines are prevented from colluding on flight schedules by antitrust regulation. That leaves only the FAA to impose arbitrary scheduling reductions, which in turn gives airlines an incentive to pack their flight schedules so they can come out ahead when flights are trimmed. FAA action poses other problems. Scheduling reductions include existing airlines, but they may not include provisions for new entrants into crowded markets, thus stifling competition. Reductions would also mean that less profitable routes to smaller cities would be the first to go. A better interim plan, which is apparently under discussion, would institute congestion pricing. Airlines scheduling flights at peak hours would have to pay a surcharge, which could be determined either by a time-based formula or by local airports. The congestion surcharge could be revenue-neutral—perhaps balanced with discounts for flights at off-peak hours—or it could be applied to capital improvements that would reduce delays over the long run. With congestion pricing of landing slots, all airlines would be able to compete for peak service. They would pass these charges on to travelers, thus reflecting the true cost of a trip. Congestion pricing would also allow airlines to adjust schedules immediately in response to ebbs and flows of traffic. It’s a shame that the FAA has not kept up with the robust demand for air travel. This lack of progress will now force a contraction in the aviation sector’s busiest markets. But given that reductions in air travel are inevitable, congestion pricing is the least intrusive way to go about it.

#### And, Status Quo solving now - FAA already working to increase air travel time and decrease fuel costs

Melvin 3/20. (Joshua, implementation designer at Bazaarvoice, “Feds: New flight system to save 2.3 million gallons of jet fuel, speed Bay Area air travel”, Contra Costa Times (California), 03/20/12, accessed LexisNexis 07/09/12, Chin)

Federal aviation officials on Monday launched an effort in the Bay Area that they say will speed up air travel and save about 2.3 million gallons of fuel for flights in and out of Northern California. As part of the Federal Aviation Administration's NextGen program, which is an effort to modernize air traffic control, work began Monday to design more efficient flying routes that take advantage of satellite technology, officials said. The FAA is working with airports in San Francisco, San Jose, Oakland and Sacramento as well as airlines and air traffic controllers to hammer out the new system. One of the ways planes will use less fuel is by descending directly to the runway, instead of the current system of coming down in stages, said FAA spokesman Ian Gregor. New technology will guide the jetliners to the ground without stopping at various points for safety reasons. Gregor said the changes were studied and will be implemented at a cost of about $5 million during the next three years. The NextGen program, however, will mean doing many other things differently at Northern California airports. The traffic for some routes from Bay Area airports will have their takeoffs oriented by satellite technology. "The implementation of NextGen is a 'win-win-win' for airports, the airlines, and the air traveler," San Francisco International Airport Director John L. Martin wrote in a statement. "With more efficient routing, congestion at airports is relieved, airlines run more efficiently."

### Solvency Exts #1 - Barriers

#### Five problems to implementation – lack of coordination, funding, staffing, different priorities and undefined roles

GAO 10 [The U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress and investigates how the federal government spends taxpayer dollars. This paper was written by Gerald L. Dillingham, Ph.D., who is the Director of Physical Infrastructure Issues “NEXT GENERATION AIR TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM Challenges with Partner Agency and FAA Coordination Continue, and Efforts to Integrate Near-, Mid-, and Long-term Activities Are Ongoing”http://www.gao.gov/assets/130/124445.pdf, 4-21-10]Lin

Several mechanisms to facilitate coordination on NextGen activities among partner agencies and across FAA exist, but challenges to this coordination remain. One interagency coordination mechanism is the Senior Policy Committee, which is the high-level coordinating body across all of the partner agencies. In addition, JPDO is tasked with facilitating day-to-day interagency coordination, and has several mechanisms, including working groups and research transition teams, to accomplish this. GAO has previously reported that a lack of stable leadership and ambiguity surrounding JPDO’s organizational position and ongoing role have contributed to the uneven performance of its coordination mechanisms. Recent changes in both the leadership and organizational position of JPDO could improve coordination across partner agencies. Stakeholders and partner agencies identified several other challenges to improving interagency coordination and collaboration, including (1) limited funding and staffing to dedicate to NextGen activities, (2) competing mission priorities, and (3) undefined near-term roles and responsibilities of some partner agencies. FAA also faces challenges coordinating the implementation of NextGen across multiple FAA offices. GAO has previously reported that shifting from an organization focused on system acquisition to one focused on integration and coordination will be an ongoing challenge for FAA. Recent organizational changes that solidify the FAA Deputy Administrator as the key executive in charge of NextGen may help address these challenges. Moreover, FAA has made progress in improving coordination of efforts within FAA, by coordinating some office functions and moving toward a portfolio approach for implementation. However, as all these changes have recently occurred, it is too early to measure their success.

#### Four barriers to NextGen that fiat can’t solve – uncertainty over benefits

Bogdan 12 [[Jennifer Bogdan is a staff writer for the Press of Atlantic City. “Uncertainty about benefits, funds hurting Next Generation Air Transportation System, think tank study says” http://www.pressofatlanticcity.com/communities/eht/uncertainty-about-benefits-funds-hurting-next-generation-air-transportation-system/article\_606a1c4a-86a1-11e1-9a37-001a4bcf887a.html](file://C:\Users\Owner\Downloads\%5bJennifer%20Bogdan%20is%20a%20staff%20writer%20for%20the%20Press%20of%20Atlantic%20City.%20“Uncertainty%20about%20benefits,%20funds%20hurting%20Next%20Generation%20Air%20Transportation%20System,%20think%20tank%20study%20says”%20http:\www.pressofatlanticcity.com\communities\eht\uncertainty-about-benefits-funds-hurting-next-generation-air-transportation-system\article_606a1c4a-86a1-11e1-9a37-001a4bcf887a.html), 4-15-2012] Lin

Airline carriers are reluctant to take on the costs associated with upgrading planes to accommodate the Next Generation Air Transportation System because there is no clear funding stream for the project and there is disagreement about its benefits, according to a study by a Washington, D.C., think tank. The study by the Eno Center for Transportation, a nonpartisan group that leads professional development in the transportation industry, found four key barriers to implementing the federal program known as NextGen: n Uncertainty about the program’s benefits; n Uncertainty about the Federal Aviation Administration’s ability to deliver the program; n Lack of a clear source of funds for NextGen; n And operators’ reluctance to invest in NextGen equipment. NextGen refers to a series of initiatives that will modernize the air traffic control system, transforming it from a radar-based system to a more-efficient satellite-based program. The cost of the upgrades is projected at about $40 billion — with half shouldered by the federal government and half by the airlines — and they are not expected to be complete before 2025.

#### Laundry list of roadblocks to NextGen implementation – Fiat can’t solve

InformationWeek 11 [InformationWeek is one of the largest, most trusted information networks for IT professionals, addressing mission critical business and technology content. Business technology decision makers turn to their expert voices, research and communities to stay informed, get advice, and research technologies and products to make strategic business decisions. Nick Hoover is a senior editor for InformationWeek Government, where he covers the federal IT sector. He has written numerous cover stories, features and news stories for the publication and its Website, interviewing CIOs and IT leaders across the government. “Problems Plague FAA's NextGen Air Traffic Control Upgrade” [http://www.informationweek.com/news/government/info-management/231900067 10-5-2011](http://www.informationweek.com/news/government/info-management/231900067%2010-5-2011)] Lin

The Federal Aviation Administration continues to struggle with budgets, deadlines, and management of its multi-billion dollar upgrades to the nation's air traffic control systems, government officials and industry executives told Congress on Wednesday. The long-term, multi-stage NextGen effort, which has been underway for several years and isn't slated to be complete until approximately 2025, aims to improve American aviation by upgrading numerous Cold War-era flight systems. But the effort has long suffered problems. Within the last couple of years, the FAA has instituted a number of changes to improve NextGen's management, including working closely with an advisory group made up of users and other constituents, changing the NextGen program so that it directly reports to the FAA's deputy administrator, and centralized program management for the effort. However, ongoing problems continue to threaten the program's costs and timeline and have kept private industry in the dark about the program's benefits and schedule, the officials and executives told the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. As a result, according to Lee Moak, president of the Air Line Pilots Association, a group that represents the interests of 53,000 pilots, and Ed Bolen, president and CEO of the National Business Aviation Association, manufacturers are building and delivering future-proofed planes and carriers are putting new processes in place but can't take advantage of all their capabilities because of delays in or improper management of NextGen. For example, numerous carriers are ready to adopt procedures that they co-developed with the FAA to provide "smooth, fuel efficient, low emission descents that reduce [the need for] communications and enhance safety during good weather conditions" and others that help out in poor weather conditions, Bolen said. But the FAA doesn't even have plans or approval processes to permit planes to follow these procedures even as jet fuel costs continue to rise. In another case, the En Route Automatic Modernization (ERAM) system, a computer system to provide communications and generate display data for air traffic controllers, is about 5 years behind schedule and as much as $500 million over budget, according to a study by Mitre Corp. According to FAA Inspector General Calvin Scovel, early testing of ERAM revealed problems with safety management, and controllers had to rely on cumbersome workarounds to overcome those issues. That problem snowballed. "ERAM's problems are the direct result of poor program management," Scovel said. "There was over-optimism that ERAM could be deployed in a year, and FAA didn't begin to mitigate some risks until three years after problems began surfacing. This was a program that was hobbled out of the gate." Even with all those problems, and despite the significant program risks, the FAA still hasn't conducted an assessment of ERAM's dependencies or impacts on other program costs. At a higher level, Scovel noted, the FAA has yet to develop an integrated master schedule to help manage NextGen, meaning that "programs are left with no clear end state." The officials and executives pointed to a number of causes for the delays and cost overruns, including unstable requirements, poor program and contract management, the inability of the FAA to bring all constituents into the decision-making process, training, and a lack of communication.

### Solvency Exts #2 - Barriers - Lack of coordination

#### Lack of coordination and funding among research teams – ensures delay

GAO 10 [The U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress and investigates how the federal government spends taxpayer dollars. This paper was written by Gerald L. Dillingham, Ph.D., who is the Director of Physical Infrastructure Issues “NEXT GENERATION AIR TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM Challenges with Partner Agency and FAA Coordination Continue, and Efforts to Integrate Near-, Mid-, and Long-term Activities Are Ongoing”http://www.gao.gov/assets/130/124445.pdf, 4-21-10]Lin

FAA and NASA also participate on four JPDO research transition teams that have been established to ensure that research and development needed for NextGen implementation is identified, conducted, and effectively transitioned to the implementing agency. In previous work, we discussed the formation of these teams, but as they had just been established, noted that their potential effectiveness was unclear. 6 In that work we also identified key challenges in coordinating research, including gaps in funding for needed research and prioritization of research needs. According to the former Director of JPDO and NASA officials, the teams have been useful vehicles for identifying research needs and potential gaps; however, some teams are further along in terms of their involvement among the agencies and their deliverables than others. Although other agencies do not currently participate on these research transition teams, 6 GAO, Next Generation Air Transportation System: Status of Systems Acquisition and the Transition to the Next Generation Air Transportation System, GAO-08-1078 (Washington, D.C. Sept. 11, 2008). Page 4 GAO-10-649T NASA agency officials reported that the structure could provide a model for future coordination across agencies.

#### And, lack of timely ability to consolidate ATC buildings and facility will inevitably derail Next Gen implementation - fiat does not overcome that

**Tate 05-31-2012** [Curtis, staff writer, "Plan to update traffic-control system faces delay",

*McClatchy Newspapers,* <http://www.mcclatchydc.com/2012/05/31/150717/plan-to-update-air-traffic-control.html>] ttate

A Federal Aviation Administration plan to consolidate hundreds of outdated facilities isn’t ready two weeks before a deadline set by Congress, potentially delaying a $40 billion program to modernize the nation’s World War II-era air traffic-control system. Aviation officials told lawmakers Thursday that they haven’t reached agreement on a plan to close, consolidate or realign more than 400 air traffic-control facilities across the country, many of which are more than 50 years old and have fallen into disrepair. NextGen, a satellite-based air-traffic control system that’s to replace the current radar-based one, is intended to make the skies safer and more efficient. It’s supposed to be complete by 2025, but its implementation depends on the consolidation of air traffic control buildings and facilities, a process that could take two decades. As part of a multiyear reauthorization of the FAA that was signed into law in February, Congress gave the agency 120 days to submit its plan. Officials from the FAA and the union that represents air traffic controllers will meet Tuesday to discuss the plan, said Paul Rinaldi, the president of the National Air Traffic Controllers Association. That’s nine days before it’s due. “Nine days is clearly not enough,” Rinaldi said. “But it’s certainly a start.” David Grizzle, the FAA’s operating chief for air traffic organization, said the plans were complex because they involved changing flight patterns, and the agency wanted to make accurate decisions even if it took more time. “We can’t make light decisions,” Grizzle said. “If we merely consolidate facilities without restructuring airspace, we may very well set ourselves back.” Members of the House of Representatives’ Subcommittee on Aviation expressed frustration that the FAA waited until the last minute to finalize the plans. Grizzle said he’d discussed the plans with Rinaldi “maybe a month ago.” “The FAA knew they were coming in here for this hearing,” said Rep. Jerry Costello, an Illinois Democrat. “When the subcommittee acts, the FAA acts.” Rep. Peter DeFazio, an Oregon Democrat, wondered whether the agency would have enough time to draft a plan that affects thousands of workers and represents billions of dollars of investment. “Come on. We’re going to have something comprehensive nine days after you sit down with the people you identify as the principal stakeholders?” he said. Niel Wright, a spokesman for Republican Rep. Tom Petri of Wisconsin, the aviation panel’s chairman, said Congress wouldn’t give the FAA an extension, and that the Transportation Committee would simply exert pressure on the agency to finish the plan. “Government agencies need the cooperation of Congress, so they generally try to cooperate in return,” Wright said. Rep. John Duncan, a Tennessee Republican, noted that the FAA had completed only two of the seven terminal facility realignments it identified two years ago. A Texas consolidation that was supposed to take place this year has been delayed until next year, and others in Michigan, Ohio and Illinois are on hold. A plan to move a West Palm Beach, Fla., facility to Miami was canceled, and a new facility will be built in West Palm Beach instead. “It looks to me and almost everyone else that little progress has been made,” Duncan said. Grizzle said combining two existing facilities into one might be more expensive than keeping them separate, depending on the location. It can take several years to transition from an old facility to a new one, he said. “In many instances, it’s the right thing to do, and in others, it’s not,” Grizzle said. The FAA is planning to start the consolidation process in the notoriously congested airspace of the New York region, a project that will place high-altitude and low-altitude controllers under one roof. The FAA estimates that it will cost $2.3 billion to construct its first four integrated facilities but that it has only $700 million set aside for them. With federal funds tight, lawmakers pressed the agency for accurate estimates. “I would hope that the FAA, working with the stakeholders, comes up with a plan that measures the true cost,” Costello said.

#### NextGen will fail – lack of FAA coordination, training, reliability, and safety

ATW 10 [Air Transport World has been the leading magazine serving the needs of the global airline and commercial air transport manufacturing communities. Through its renowned editors—who have been nominated for nearly every major aviation journalism award available today—ATW provides balanced international coverage of the airline industry and reports on the trends that affect the way airlines do business. Aaron Karp has been an Air Transport World senior editor and has covered commercial aviation for over 12 years, “DOT IG: FAA faces serious NextGen challenges “ http://atwonline.com/international-aviation-regulation/news/dot-ig-faa-faces-serious-nextgen-challenges-1223, 12-24-2010] Lin

But ERAM is not FAA's only problem regarding NextGen, according to Scovel. He noted that in order to successfully implement the high-tech ATC system, "FAA will have to effectively work across diverse agency lines of business—including its Aircraft Certification Service, Flight Standards Service and Air Traffic Organization—which it has not done effectively in the past. For example … organizational barriers and fragmented efforts [have] hindered FAA's process to approve new flight procedures." It also must conduct updated safety assessments "for new, complex runway configurations—such as closely spaced parallel runways and converging or intersecting runways—at several busy airports," the IG pointed out. "While such assessments are needed, they could take up to 4 years to complete." Scovel added that "FAA is challenged to develop effective training programs on new NextGen systems and procedures. Our work has shown that FAA's training often consists of briefings rather than comprehensive courses on RNAV/RNP. As FAA begins developing more advanced airspace routes in metropolitan areas, it will face difficulties with providing extensive training for controllers—many of whom are recent hires assigned to complex facilities, such as New York and Chicago." The biggest problem for NextGen is that reliability, security and safety are inversely proportional to complexity. In fact, the technical complexity of NextGen is so high that it is a sure bet that it will fail and it will fail miserably. Why? Because the boomer geeks have shot computing in the foot in the last century. The truth is that our current Turing-inspired software programming models are woefully inadequate for the job. There is a solution but it will require a complete rethink of our software construction practices. It's time that the FAA and the rest of society wake up to the failure of our current approaches and do the right thing. Otherwise, hundreds of billions of dollars of the taxpayer's money will disappear into this black hole.

### Solvency Exts - #3 - FAA

#### Fiat can’t solve FAA’s unclarity – reduces investor confidence and increases implementation timeframe

Guzzetti 12 [Jeffrey B. Guzzetti is the Assistant Inspector General for the Aviation and Special Program Audits from the U.S. Department of Transportation. “Office of Inspector General Audit Report: STATUS OF TRANSFORMATIONAL PROGRAMS AND RISKS TO ACHIEVING NEXTGEN GOALS” <http://www.oig.dot.gov/sites/dot/files/NextGen%20Transformational%20Programs%5E4-23-12.pdf>, 4-23-2012] Lin

FAA’s progress in implementing the transformational programs has been limited by a lack of finalized program requirements. Firm program requirements are essential to successful program implementation. For example, FAA has not yet finalized requirements for displaying ADS-B In traffic information in the cockpit, for accelerating the initial delivery of DataComm services to air traffic control towers, or for finalizing agreements between the SWIM program office and other program offices implementing SWIM. Because the transformational programs’ requirements are not yet finalized, FAA does not plan to start implementing their capabilities throughout the NAS until 2015 at the earliest, and it is uncertain when the programs will start delivering benefits to achieve NextGen goals, such as enhanced capacity and reduced Agency operating costs. Due to this lack of clarity on when they will realize benefits, airspace users are concerned about investing to equip aircraft with NextGen avionics for ADS-B and DataComm, two programs key to FAA’s continued NextGen progress. Without widespread equipage, however, FAA states the Agency will be unable to begin markedly increasing safety and capacity or saving time and fuel through these NextGen technologies. Other risks exist to the effective implementation of the transformational programs. These include the lack of an integrated master schedule for all the transformational programs to better coordinate how program capabilities—many of which are interdependent—will be implemented. Without this key planning tool, it will remain difficult for FAA to fully prioritize which transformational program 3 capabilities will provide users with the greatest benefits or make trade-offs between program requirements when necessary. FAA also has yet to address complex integration issues with its automation systems to enhance flight data processing and its telecommunications infrastructure. For example, FAA must resolve interface problems between the transformational programs and automation systems that enhance flight data processing such as the En Route Automation Modernization (ERAM) program.

#### FAA's failures guts ability to effectively implement Next Gen

Poole and Edwards 10 (Robert W., director of transportation policy and Searle Freedom Trust Transportation Fellow at Reason Foundation. Poole, an MIT-trained engineer, has advised the Ronald Reagan, the George H.W. Bush, the Clinton, and the George W. Bush administrations. Chris, director of tax policy studies at Cato, top expert on federal and state tax and budget issues. June, Airports and Air traffic Control. <http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/airports-atc/#3>)

The FAA has been attempting to modernize its system, expand capacity, and increase its productivity for decades. But dozens of reports over the years from the Government Accountability Office and the Office of Inspector General in the Department of Transportation have faulted the FAA for poor management of major projects, which are often delayed and over budget.24 The Advanced Automation System, Wide Area Augmentation System, and other major projects have had large cost overruns and been years behind schedule or cancelled, as discussed above.¶ In 2005 two OIG researchers presented an overview of the FAA's failed efforts over the years to modernization the National Airspace System.25 In reviewing what went wrong, they concluded that FAA modernization efforts had neither reduced costs nor increased productivity:¶ NAS modernization plans have been consistently subverted by requirements growth, development delays, cost escalations, and inadequate benefits management. All these things were symptomatic of the fact that FAA didn't think it needed to reduce operating costs.26¶ Many experts are greatly concerned that the FAA's institutional culture is poorly suited to implementing anything as dramatic as NextGen. In 2004, the National Academy of Sciences convened an expert panel to assist the GAO in understanding the cultural and technical factors that have impeded previous ATC modernization efforts. It found that "the key cultural factor impeding modernization has been resistance to change... [which is] characteristic of FAA personnel at all levels" and that "the key technical factor affecting modernization... has been a shortfall in the technical expertise needed to design, develop, or manage complex air traffic systems."As a government agency, the FAA is not designed to judge risks, aim at the most efficient investments, manage people to produce results, reward excellence, or punish incompetence. It is therefore not equipped to fundamentally reform the ATC system. Thus, major institutional change is probably a prerequisite for implementing the advanced ATC system the nation needs to meet rising aviation demand.¶

#### Past failure show that FAA won’t be able to implement NextGen - FAA ineffective

CAPA 10. (experts on aviation industry, “FAA reauthorization, NextGen fails to gain passage again”, CAPA Centre For Aviation, 08/25/10, <http://www.centreforaviation.com/analysis/faa-rauthorization-nextgen-fails-to-gain-passage-again-33831>, 07/10/12, Chin)

Then there are the doubts about FAA’s capabilities in actually fulfilling NextGen and the requirements for equipage. More than one airline has grounded obsolete aircraft on which was the equipment to take advantage of air traffic management changes that never came to pass and thus were never used, because the FAA has been so slow in fielding its programmes. Remember microwave landing systems? Even the Air Force equipped itself to take advantage of MLS only to have the programme cancelled in the mid-90s. While all this is promised by NextGen, there isn’t a time when the US Department of Transportation Office of Inspector General or the General Accountability Office does not express deep concern over FAA’s ability to field the system and, of course, Congress agrees. The fact is, Congress has little incentive to pass this legislation given all the wasted billions since the onset of air traffic management modernisation some 50 years ago. During recent hearings legislators were quite frank about their distrust of the FAA.

#### And, Aff can't fiat the away the true barriers to ATC modernization - poor management and planning of the FAA -- will doom Next Gen implementation

Hosue Transportation and Infrastructure Committee 11. (Committee that focuses on building United States infrastructure, “Hearing Highlights Ongoing Management Problems & Cost Increases with FAA's NextGen Air Traffic Control Program”, Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, 10/05/11, <http://transportation.house.gov/News/PRArticle.aspx?NewsID=1410>, 07/11/12, Chin)

Washington, DC – Federal auditors, including the Inspector General of the Department of Transportation (DOT) and the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO), testifying before Congress today pointed to problems and rising costs in the Federal Aviation Administration’s (FAA) critical NextGen air traffic control modernization effort.¶ ¶ FAA’s poor management continues to delay NextGen progress, and the agency has failed to develop adequate benchmarks and a long-term plan for implementing the multi-billion dollar project to transition the nation’s air traffic control system from ground-based radar and antiquated 1950s technology to a modern satellite-based system.¶ Scovel and GAO’s Director of Physical Infrastructure Issues Dr. Gerald Dillingham highlighted significant dysfunction with the FAA’s ERAM program. ERAM, which is critical for laying the foundation for NextGen, refers to the upgrade of the system that processes flight radar data, provides communications and generates display data for air traffic controllers.¶ ¶ “Significant software-related problems have pushed ERAM’s schedules well beyond original completion dates and increased costs by hundreds of millions of dollars,” stated Scovel in his testimony. “These problems have exposed a number of fundamental programmatic and contract management concerns.” Additional costs as a result of delays in ERAM are currently expected to be as high as $500 million.¶ ¶ Not only does this raise concerns with ERAM itself, but the integration of NextGen components means that delays and problems with one program impact the other elements of the overall system.¶ “While FAA recognizes the need for an integrated master schedule to manage the implementation of these NextGen capabilities, it has not yet developed one. Without a master schedule, FAA will continue to face the challenges of fully mitigating operational, technical, and programmatic risks, and prioritizing trade-offs among its NextGen programs,” Scovel said.

#### Next Gen is just hype - it is just another broken promise sold by the FAA

BoydGroup International 2012 (aviation consulting firm, “Forecast Issue Seven: Airline Strategies Replacing NextGen”, BoydGroup International, no date, <http://www.aviationforecastsummit.com/2012ConferenceForecastIssues.html>, 07/10/12, Chin)

By 2017 - actually, much sooner - airlines have given up on inept government plans to upgrade air traffic control. NextGen is a collection of broken promises, failed initiatives, and stories by incredibly gullible journalists. Face it: the track record is like waiting fro Elvis to return. By 2017, airlines will have realized that the solution is internal, and there is no NextGen. The fire-and-forget scheduling systems traditionally used at airlines will be replaced with tight management of every flight, from departure to arrival. The centralization of route planning and control of systems operations within the global alliances will become a factor in this move. On-schedule performance will be in the 90% range (A + 5), and block times reduced 3% - 5%.

#### FAA’s lacks management to solve NextGen

Perera 11. (David, “FAA must chose NextGen flight prioritization soon, says report”, FierceGovernmentIT, 02/08/12, <http://www.fiercegovernmentit.com/story/faa-must-chose-nextgen-flight-prioritization-soon-says-report/2011-02-08>, 07/12/12, Chin)

Market-based prioritization mechanisms "offer the best opportunity to achieve the many objectives of NextGen," the report states. The Government Accountability Office has said (.pdf) that the FAA lacks the authority to auction landing slots for money and market-based approaches to air traffic control is hugely unpopular in the private sector. The report attributes that unpopularity most to "reluctance to pay directly for resources that are now being supported indirectly through taxes and fees paid into the Aviation Trust Fund." The FAA might have to seek congressional authorization to implement such a mechanism, the report adds.

### Solvency Exts - #8 - Long timeframe

#### Procedure and policy issues for Next Gen take 5-6 years to resolve

Lynch 6/5 (Kerry, staff writer at Aviation Week, a magazine reporting on the aerospace industry. NextGen Policies Loom Large Over Progress. <http://www.aviationweek.com/Article.aspx?id=/article-xml/awx_06_05_2012_p0-465089.xml&p=1>) cass

A number of technology issues are still problematic, but the largest obstacles facing NextGen progress are procedure and policy issues, government and industry leaders agree.¶ Speaking during the RTCA 2012 Annual Symposium today (June 5), Vicki Cox, FAA assistant administrator for NextGen, says policy issues are “huge” for industry. Government and industry leaders must hash out concepts such as “best capable, best serve” and best means to equip for NextGen to reap its full benefits, Cox says.¶ Also holding up progress are the development of procedures such as new controller handbooks, she says.¶ These sentiments were largely shared by symposium attendees: an informal survey revealed that 96% of [symposium attendees]them believe policy and procedures surpassed technology as the largest barriers to progress.¶ Best capable, best served, a concept under which operators with cockpits equipped for NextGen would get more immediate controller attention, has its detractors. Paul Rinaldi, president of the National Air Traffic Controllers Association, notes the political difficulties of moving toward a best capable, best served policy, particularly for controllers who must work with the operators. Not all operators will have the financial resources to immediately equip. This is particularly true for the regionals, where there isn’t a single simple equipment solution.¶ Patrick Ky, executive director of the SESAR Joint Undertaking, notes that at some point the policy may need to consider mandates, such as what was done with Reduced Vertical Separation Minimum (RVSM). Operators were required to equip for RVSM or were not permitted to fly at certain altitudes.¶ But Julie Oettinger, assistant administrator in FAA’s Office of Policy, Planning and Environment, notes a philosophical difference between the U.S. and Europe. “Our approach is not to focus on mandates,” Oettinger says, but to move forward with NextGen and enable industry to build a business case for equipping.¶ FAA has looked on both the financial and operational sides, with a focus on loan guarantees that come thanks to authority provided to FAA in the recent reauthorization bill.¶ Industry groups also agree that the future system must be designed to accommodate a variety of operators, since aircraft likely will contain a mix of equipment. “We are going to be operating in a mixed-use environment for a very long time,” says National Business Aviation Association President and CEO Ed Bolen. The system must provide benefits to operators who are willing to take advantage of the equipment available, but cannot tell others to “sit on the sidelines,” he says. The key to best capable, best served is transparency, Ky says, adding that everything must be “completely explainable. We want to get rid of that first come, first served principle.”¶ Industry must also stress the benefits that are universal from NextGen, from capacity improvements and efficiency and fuel savings to environmental benefits, Bolen says.¶ The NextGen debate must include all industry leaders, says FAA’s Cox. “The better everyone understands, the more ready FAA will be able to make that hard policy decision,” she says.¶ For the operators though, building a business case is extremely complex. Michael Dyment, managing director and CEO of NEXA Capital Partners, notes that it may take five-six years to retrofit a fleet for NextGen capabilities, but benefits may be fully realized until later in the decade. “It makes the business case a bit of a nightmare,” he says.¶ Airlines have a pretty good grasp of what benefits they can squeeze out of NextGen, Dyment says. “They can control the rate of equipage.” They can’t control what other airlines are doing and what FAA would be able to deliver, he says.¶ FAA acting Administrator Michael Huerta agrees that “NextGen’s success will be a function of how effectively government and industry and all the stakeholders in aviation can relate with one another.”¶ Dave Barger, president and CEO of JetBlue Airways, who is chairman of the NextGen Advisory Committee, agrees, saying the issue becomes how committed government and industry are “even if most of us are not the immediate beneficiary of being first. We all are in this together. Today’s NextGen is not the endgame.”

#### Computer failures ensure delays in implementation and airport – testing proves

Homeland Security News Wire 10 [Homeland Security News Wire is a delivers daily digital reports, in-depth analysis, news, and researched background on the day’s developments in homeland security.

It is an essential tool and key network for today’s busy executives and senior policy makers in the homeland security sector, enabling them to make more informed decisions. “Problems hobble new U.S. air traffic control computers” [http://www.homelandsecuritynewswire.com/problems-hobble-new-us-air-traffic-control-computers. 4-22-2010](http://www.homelandsecuritynewswire.com/problems-hobble-new-us-air-traffic-control-computers.%204-22-2010)] Lin

New computers crucial to modernizing the U.S. air traffic control system have run into serious problems and may not be fully operational by the end of this year when the current system is supposed to be replaced, a government watchdog said Wednesday. The $2.1 billion computer system has misidentified aircraft and had trouble processing radar information, Calvin Scovel, the Transportation Department’s inspector general, told a House panel. Air traffic controllers at a Federal Aviation Administration radar center in Salt Lake City, where the new computers are being tested, also have had difficulty transferring responsibility for planes to other controllers, he said. Scovel warned that if the problems continue they could delay the FAA’s NextGen program to replace the current air traffic control system, which is based on Second World War-era radar technology, with a new system which is based on GPS technology. AP reports that the troubled computer system, called En Route Automation Modernization (ERAM), is designed to handle aircraft flying at higher altitudes between airports, rather than planes taking off or landing. While not specifically part of the NextGen program, it is a critical underpinning. The FAA had planned to have ERAM operational in Salt Lake City by December 2009 and at the agency’s twenty other radar centers that handle en route traffic by the end of this year. This is when the FAA’s contract with IBM to maintain the present computer system expires. The present system relies on a unique computer language called Jovial that is understood by a dwindling number of technicians. Deployment of the system in Salt Lake City, however, has been delayed six months, and it is unlikely that the FAA will be able to have ERAM fully working in the 20 other radar centers by the end of this year. The FAA is spending $14 million a month trying to resolve the problems and get the system working, Scovel told the House Transportation and Infrastructure aviation subcommittee. “FAA officials are concerned about the ERAM transition at larger, more complex (radar centers) like Chicago and New York,” he said. Those centers have unique air traffic control demands that will require adaptations to the ERAM software, Scovel said. FAA spokeswoman Laura Brown said the agency is working to resolve the problems at the Salt Lake City center. “We want to make sure the system is operating smoothly before we expand ERAM to other sites,” Brown said. “We do not expect the minor delays in ERAM to slow down the transition to NextGen.” Scovel also said problems with a new FAA telecommunications systems raise questions about whether it can be relied upon for NextGen. A failure of the system in November delayed more than 800 flights nationwide, and it took the FAA and its contractor over five hours to restore service, he said. The FAA has established review teams to assess the overall system design, he said.

#### Continued problems with ERAM and lack of coordination cause delays

CAPA 11 [Centre for Aviation is the leading provider of independent aviation market intelligence, analysis and data services, covering worldwide developments. The Centre’s analytical reports and industry research enable senior executives to stay ahead of trends and developments in this fast changing, complex and dynamic industry. “Problems continue to slow NextGen roll out” <http://centreforaviation.com/analysis/problems-continue-to-slow-nextgen-roll-out-47892>, 3-18-2011] Lin

Setbacks to the NextGen project were inevitable given the programme’s complexity and ambitious targets, but these issues have been brought to the fore in light of the FAA’s recent forecast. A top official with the largest air traffic controllers union says live testing of the US FAA's en route automation modernisation (ERAM) programme should be halted until "known issues" are fixed. Issues surfaced publicly in Mar-2010 when the National Air Traffic Controllers Association (NATCA), the trade union representing US air traffic controllers, stated the FAA was pressing ahead with live ERAM testing in attempt to adhere to its timeline for implementation, which was originally slated for Dec-2009. NATCA executive vice president Patricia Gilbert stated at the times that there were several unresolved issues with ERAM, which “represent[ed] a significant threat to the safety” of US airspace. The union, which was displeased that there had been “no input from users with front-line knowledge”, called for live testing to cease until the issues were addressed. The incident damaged the US industry’s confidence in the new system. Following NATCA’s complaint, the US Transportation Department’s Inspector General said first ERAM site would be delayed by six months but denied there were any fundamental flaws in the system. The Inspector General attributed the problems to software involving the radar processor, handing off traffic between controllers and flight information tags at testing sites in [Salt Lake City](http://centreforaviation.com/profiles/airports/salt-lake-city-international-airport-slc) and [Seattle](http://centreforaviation.com/profiles/airports/seattletacoma-international-airport-sea). “We agree with the FAA, that slowing down now to ensure the system meets the users’ expectations is the right thing to do,” said the developer of the ERAM system, Lockheed. Live ERAM testing at the [Salt Lake](http://centreforaviation.com/profiles/airports/salt-lake-city-international-airport-slc) City centre following the complaints revealed significant problems, including erroneous flight data tagged to aircraft and hand off difficulties between air traffic controllers. The FAA placed a moratorium in Mar-2010 on further operational testing to address more than 200 issues raised by air traffic controllers. Calvin L Scovel III, the Department of Transport’s inspector general, told a congressional hearing in Feb-2011 that cost overruns and schedule delays are continuing to delay the roll-out of the NextGen system. Mr Scovel attributed the problems to a lack of coordination between FAA and its partner agencies, most notably the Commerce Department. The two parties reportedly have not yet agreed on how to synchronise weather data. Mr Scovel said the FAA has failed to develop a cross-agency plan to affress NextGen human factors issues.

#### Problems with ERAM hurt dependent programs – delays in NextGen implementation inevitable

ATW 10 [Air Transport World has been the leading magazine serving the needs of the global airline and commercial air transport manufacturing communities. Through its renowned editors—who have been nominated for nearly every major aviation journalism award available today—ATW provides balanced international coverage of the airline industry and reports on the trends that affect the way airlines do business. Aaron Karp has been an Air Transport World senior editor and has covered commercial aviation for over 12 years, “DOT IG: FAA faces serious NextGen challenges “ http://atwonline.com/international-aviation-regulation/news/dot-ig-faa-faces-serious-nextgen-challenges-1223, 12-24-2010] Lin

US Dept. of Transportation Inspector General Calvin Scovel left a lump of coal in FAA's Christmas stocking, asserting this week in a letter to Congress that the agency "faces several organizational, policy, logistical and training challenges" in implementing the NextGen satellite-based ATC system that tops FAA's agenda. In particular, he noted that implementation of Lockheed Martin's En Route Automation Modernization system, designed to replace the En Route Host computer system that manages air traffic in US airspace, "has experienced software problems and delays at key sites." FAA was scheduled to deploy ERAM to all en route facilities by the end of this year at a cost of $2.1 billion. "However, due to software problems at its initial operating site [Salt Lake City], ERAM is experiencing cost increases and schedule slips that could impact other transformational NextGen programs," the DOT IG stated. "Delays with ERAM will have a cascading effect on other fundamental NextGen programs now and well into the future." Scovel said examples of ERAM problems include "interface issues between the key sites and other air traffic facilities, radar processing failures, errors that tag flight data to the wrong aircraft, and hand-off problems between controllers." He added that a DOT IG review and a study on ERAM conducted by Mitre Corp. "suggest it will take between 3 to 6 years and as much as $500 million more to complete the [implementation] effort. A cost escalation of this magnitude will affect FAA's capital budget and could force the agency to reallocate funds from other modernization projects to pay for ERAM." In addition, he predicted that "delays in implementing ERAM will force FAA to sustain aging equipment longer than planned and retrain controllers so they are familiar with both the legacy and ERAM systems."

### Solvency Exts - #9 - SQuo solving now

#### Obama is already funding NextGen

Hanley 12(Ashley, staff writer for The Washington Post, “Obama signs FAA bill set to usher in progress on new air traffic control system”, 2/14/12, AD; 07/14/12, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/obama-signs-faa-bill-set-to-usher-in-progress-on-new-air-traffic-control-system/2012/02/14/gIQAzlmPER_story.html> | Kushal)

After 23 funding extensions and a two-week partial shutdown of the Federal Aviation Administration in the summer, President Obama signed into law Tuesday a long-term funding bill for the nation’s aviation system. The law provides $63.4 billion for the FAA over four years. With long-term federal commitments in place, aviation experts say the pace of progress toward a new $42 billion system that could revolutionize air travel should quicken. Airlines that are expected to invest up to $10 billion of their own in the complex navigation system known as NextGen were reluctant to commit as the FAA lurched from one short-term to funding extension to the next since the last long-term bill expired in 2007. The airlines worried that without the certainty of long-term federal funding, the intricate new system might not be ready for use once they equipped their planes with the required technology. “This critical effort to shift from our antiquated air traffic control technology to a GPS-based system will improve air traffic efficiency and safety, reduce fuel burn and pollution from aircraft, and bring costs down for consumers,” said House Transportation Committee Chairman John L. Mica (R-Fla.). The new bill also will provide funds for a critical element on the NextGen program: retraining of air traffic controllers in a system far different than the 60-year-old one now in use. NextGen is seen as essential in keeping the U.S. industry competitive with its foreign counterparts and preparing for a projected huge increase in air travel in the next four decades. “This four-year bill will provide the funding stability we need to develop and train our next generation of controllers, along with the next generation of equipment and procedures,” said Paul Rinaldi, president of the National Air Traffic Controllers Association. “It also ensures that the controllers and technicians who use this equipment and procedures every day will continue to be involved in their development.”

### AT: Mayer's Delays Study

#### Mayer’s calculations flawed – based off inaccurate data

Rupp 7 [Nicholas G. Rupp’s primary research areas are industrial organization, financial economics, and economics of crime. He received a Ph.D from Texas A&M University and is currently an Associate Professor in the Department of Economics at the East Carolina University. “Further Investigations into the Cause of Flight Delays” <http://www.ecu.edu/cs-educ/econ/upload/ecu0707.pdf>, 5-20-2007] Lin

A recent empirical study by Mayer and Sinai (2003a) ﬁnds that air traﬃc congestion due to airline hubbing and over-scheduling of ﬂights at airport facilities are the primary causes of ﬂight delays. Mayer and Sinai’s (2003a) analysis, however, relies on a non-traditional ﬂight delay measure: travel time in excess of the route’s monthly minimum (hereafter excess travel time). While excess travel time provides an accurate depiction of travel time sans congestion, one problem with using the monthly minimum to calculate ﬂight delays is this variable relies on outliers which can be inﬂuenced by both weather (strong tail winds) and aircraft model used (faster cruising speeds). More importantly, excess travel time does not reﬂect the perceived length of delay by passengers since they do not make such delay calculations. Passengers are more likely to be concerned with how the actual arrival and departure times diﬀer from ﬂight schedules.

### Economy Advantage Frontline

#### NextGen can’t solve congestion – empirics prove increased demand from air carriers

Barkowski 12 [Justin T. Barkowski is graduated from Pepperdine University School of Law and was admitted to the Bar. Mr. Barkowski received the Ronald Sorenson Award and, prior to attending Pepperdine, he graduated from the University of California, Berkeley, where he studied economics. Mr. Barkowski is an instrumentrated private pilot and is active in the firm’s business litigation and insurance law practices. “Managing Air Traffic Congestion Through the Next Generation Air Transportation System: Satellite Based Technology, Trajectories, and - Privatization?” <http://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1039&context=plr>, 2-2-2012] Lin

With or without an ATC commercialization debate, the airlines and the new Secretary of Transportation, Ray LaHood, strongly believe that NextGen is the key to solving congestion. 223 One author even argues that "airside capacity shortages and suboptimal usage/management of airspace" is the underlying cause of air traffic congestion. 224 While these concerns undoubtedly need to be addressed through NextGen, there is a severe problem when airspace capacity increases but corresponding airport resources and infrastructure do not. This will be the case in high-density areas where any room for expansion is nearly impossible. 225 Even the JPDO is skeptical that NextGen is a "cure-for-all," stating that where "airport infrastructure [development] cannot be accomplished using existing resources," the airports will have to implement "market-based mechanisms such as peak period pricing to ease congestion" in times of high demand. 226 Merely increasing the availability of landing and takeoffs at a highdensity airport may not have the desired cure-for-all effect that industry participants might expect. For example, in 2004 American and United Airlines agreed with the FAA to voluntarily reduce the number of scheduled flights out of Chicago O'Hare by 12.5% in order to help fight congestion. 227 In ef fect, this increased the number of potential flights out of that airport during the agreed upon times through its voluntary reduction, just as NextGen would do. However, the opening up of more space simply resulted in other airlines adding "flights while the hub carriers cut their schedules," providing no relief to the airport congestion problem. 228 NextGen essentially creates this increased capacity without any supplemental FAA policies to address how this extra space in the system will be allocated to air carriers that are continuously demanding more flights than the system can handle. 229 To prevent air traffic congestion from resulting after the implementation of NextGen, like it had in Chicago, effective demand-management policies are therefore critically in need. Given the historical struggles, 230 this may be difficult to accomplish. NextGen is not the sole answer for air traffic congestion at the increasing number of high-density airports. When airports cannot develop infrastructure, or when demand exceeds the marginal increases in capacity, the FAA needs allocation policies to arrange the airports' limited ground facilities and take-off and landing slots. 23 1 Commentators tend to analyze airport demand-management solutions by only looking at either the FAA or the publicly-owned airport's perspective. 232 A straight-forward and thorough analysis must examine functions of both actors in order to propose effective solutions.

#### And, the costs of the plan will negate any economic benefits - the plan will cost the economy billions each year due to flight rationing

Poole and Edwards 10. (Robert and Chris, director of transportation policy and advisor of transportation policy issues, “Airports and Air Traffic Control”, Cato Institute, 06/10, <http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/airports-atc/>, 07/12/12, Chin)

The JPDO has estimated that expanding the ATC system's capacity will be costing the U.S. economy $40 billion per year by 2020 because the overburdened system will force significant rationing of flights. That rationing would increase prices and eliminate some trips entirely. To avoid this crisis, JPDO has called for restructuring the ATC system to safely and efficiently handle the heavier demand.¶ ¶ One problem is the mismatch between the growth in air traffic and the projected growth in FAA revenue. The FAA will need about $1 billion more per year over the next 20 years just to implement NextGen. In 2007 the FAA proposed a user-fee-based funding reform that could provide a more efficient and growig revenue source. The idea was to make each air transportation user's burden on the ATC system more closely match that entity's cost for using the system. That approach has thus far been ignored by Congress. ¶ Making the transition to NextGen will require billions of dollars of new investments in advanced technologies. The FAA's capital budget is still focused mostly on patching up the existing system, such as replacing antiquated display consoles. Such investments are needed in the short-term, but won't add very much capacity to the system. But that is nearly all the FAA can afford under the current funding structure.

#### And, Substantial evidence and studies prove that the aviation industry is not key to the economy

CPRE, 03 (CPRE, is a coalition of [England's](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/England%27s) major regional cities: [Birmingham](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Birmingham) -[West Midlands](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/West_Midlands_(region)) [Bristol](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bristol) - [South West England](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/South_West_England) [Leeds](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Leeds) -[Yorkshire and the Humber](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Yorkshire_and_the_Humber) [Liverpool](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Liverpool) -[North West England](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/North_West_England) [Manchester](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Manchester) -[North West England](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/North_West_England) [Newcastle](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Newcastle_upon_Tyne) -[North East England](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/North_East_England) [Nottingham](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nottingham) -[East Midlands](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/East_Midlands) [Sheffield](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sheffield) -[Yorkshire and the Humber](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Yorkshire_and_the_Humber)., “The Economics of Aviation: a North West England perspective”, <http://www.areco.org/Economics%20of%20Aviation.pdf>, April 2003) mcclellan

The industry also claims that its own activities generate or support large numbers of jobs in other sectors of the economy. This claim is based on a flawed methodology (the multiplier effect) which routinely double counts jobs in other sectors and has no place in a rigorous evaluation of the economic benefits of aviation. Aviation has a number of well documented adverse environmental consequences. This report provides detailed evidence that, in addition to environmental disbenefits, aviation is very poor value for money. The debate about the future of aviation would be a much more open and transparent debate if economic realities were factored in and economic assertions factored out. There is a statistical correlation between increased traffic flows and economic growth, but this does not necessarily mean that there is a causal link whereby improved transport facilities necessarily lead to more economic activity. The increased levels of travel could be a consequence of economic growth rather than the other way round. The SACTRA report concludes that although there are theoretical reasons why improved transport infrastructure could lead to more economic activity, the empirical evidence for this is weak. In particular, they conclude that in a mature economy with well developed transport systems such as the UK, any contribution to economic growth from improved transport is likely to be modest. The aviation industry is heavily subsidised (van de Pol 1998) and given the high level of labour productivity in the industry it can be strongly argued that jobs could be created more cost effectively in other ways. Jacobs (1996) quotes estimates of job creation numbers and costs from energy conservation, investment in public transport and recycling. The cost per job created is much lower than the figure for creating jobs through investment in new airport capacity, Meeting predicted demand by expanding infrastructure (such as Heathrow Terminal 5) will absorb large amounts of resources which could arguably be better used in other ways. Removal of the subsidies and investment of the resources gained in more sustainable employment would have both economic and environmental advantages. Examples of subsidy in the European Union include 17.5 billion Euros per annum because there is no taxation on aviation fuel, 6.5 billion Euros because tickets are zero rated for VAT purposes and direct subsidies such as 3.4 billion Euros to Air France in 1994 and 2.11 billion Euros to Olympic Airways in the same year (Whitelegg, 2001).

#### And, you don't solve investor confidence - lack of commitment from key agencies means no confidence increase and no coordination

GAO 10 [The U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress and investigates how the federal government spends taxpayer dollars. This paper was written by Gerald L. Dillingham, Ph.D., who is the Director of Physical Infrastructure Issues “NEXT GENERATION AIR TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM Challenges with Partner Agency and FAA Coordination Continue, and Efforts to Integrate Near-, Mid-, and Long-term Activities Are Ongoing”http://www.gao.gov/assets/130/124445.pdf, 4-21-10]Lin

Differences in agency mission. Differences among agencies’ mission priorities, particularly DHS’s and DOD’s, also pose a challenge to coordination efforts. DHS’s diverse set of mission priorities, ranging from aviation security to border protection, affects its level of involvement in NextGen activities. For example, events such as the 2009 Christmas Day terrorism attempt can shift DHS priorities quickly and move the agency away from focusing on issues such as NextGen, which are not as critical at that particular time. Agency officials also stated that although different departments within DHS are involved in related NextGen activities, such as security issues, the fact that NextGen implementation is not a formalized mission in DHS can affect DHS’s level of participation in NextGen activities. Industry stakeholders told us that there are potential Page 8 GAO-10-649T consequences if DHS is not involved in long-term NextGen planning, including potentially marginalizing DHS’s NextGen areas, such as aviation security. Industry stakeholders reported that FAA could more effectively engage partner agencies in long-term planning by aligning implementation activities to agency mission priorities and by obtaining agency buy-in for actions required to transform the national airspace system.

### Warming Advantage Frontline

#### First, Turn - NextGen increases emissions because of increased number of flights. And, NextGen not enough – increased planning will take decades

Tomer and Puentes 9 [Adie Tomer is a senior research associate and associate fellow at the Brookings Institution Metropolitan Policy Program and a member of the Metropolitan Infrastructure Initiative. He holds a master’s in Public Policy from American University and a B.A. from the University of Florida. Robert Puentes is a senior fellow with the Brookings Institution’s Metropolitan Policy Program where he also directs the Program's Metropolitan Infrastructure Initiative. “Expect Delays: An Analysis of Air Travel Trends in the United States” <http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/reports/2009/10/08%20air%20travel%20tomer%20puentes/1008_air_travel_report.pdf>, October 2009] Lin

Environmental approach. FAA has yet to make decisions regarding how environmental reviews can be expedited and what strategies might be needed to meet national environmental targets. We previously reported that differing levels of review must be completed depending on the extent FAA deems its actions to have significant environmental impact, and that the more extensive the analysis required, the longer the process can take, which can thus affect implementation of NextGen capabilities. 25 A key question in this regard is how to appropriately and expeditiously review actions that may increase noise in some areas but also reduce emissions and reduce noise levels overall. Further, a balance will need to be struck between needs for increased capacity, which means more aircraft will be flying and releasing emissions, and potential environmental targets in the future. A key issue here is that although NextGen will increase the efficiency per flight (fuel burn, distance traveled, and emissions), because there are expected to be more total flights, greenhouse gas emissions in total may rise. Airport capacity. A national policy regarding airport capacity in key metropolitan areas will need to be determined. Even with current planned airport expansion, FAA expects capacity shortfalls in many of the nation’s busiest airports. 26 NextGen alone is not likely to sufficiently expand the safety and capacity of the national airspace system. Decisions regarding using existing capacity more efficiently include certifying and approving standards for the use of closely spaced parallel runways—which will be a major driver of the amount of land needed to expand airport capacity and will determine capacity in some metropolitan areas—and developing policies that address situations when demand exceeds capacity at airports or in specific airspace (e.g., pricing, administrative rules, service priorities, and so forth). Furthermore, planning infrastructure projects to increase capacity, such as building additional runways, can take as long as a decade or more, 27 and will require substantial planning and safety and cost analyses.

#### And, hundreds of credible scientists conclude that warming is not anthropogenic - even the head of the EPA concludes US action alone won't solve

US Senate Committee on Environment & Public Works 2009 (committee on climate change, “Global Warming and Cap-and-Trade”, US Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, <http://epw.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?FuseAction=Issues.View&Issue_id=88388d58-7e9c-9af9-7d66-62e366f3f189>, 07/10/12, Chin)

Before imposing such harsh financial burdens on American families, Senator Inhofe decided to examine the scientific evidence surrounding global warming closely. At that time, the main argument for cap-and-trade was that the “science was settled,” the “debate was over” and that global warming was manmade and catastrophic; but Senator Inhofe began collecting data from hundreds of credible scientists who rejected this so-called consensus. These findings were published in an EPW minority report entitled, “More Than 700 International Scientists Dissent Over Man-Made Global Warming Claims.” ¶ ¶ ¶ Later, when the scandal known as Climategate broke, Senator Inhofe released a report, "‘Consensus' Exposed: The CRU Controversy," which found that many of the world's leading climate scientists were potentially manipulating data to fit preconceived conclusions; obstructing freedom-of-information requests and dissemination of climate data; and colluding to pressure journal editors against publishing scientific work contrary to their own. Climategate has widespread implications: in testimony before the EPW Committee, EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson said that the Agency's finding that greenhouse gases endanger public health is based on this potentially manipulated science.¶ ¶ ¶ In addition to there being no scientific consensus, cap-and-trade would be all economic pain for no environmental gain. EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson admitted before the EPW committee that the United States action alone on global warming would have no impact on global carbon emissions. In fact, as jobs went to places like India, China and Mexico, where they don’t have any emissions requirements, cap-and-trade would actually increase worldwide emissions.

#### And, warming is exaggerated - satellite data shows no temperature increases

Happer 2010 (William, Ph.D, physics, “Global Warming Models Are Wrong Again”, The Wall Street Journal, 03/27/10, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304636404577291352882984274.html>, 07/10/12, Chin)

What is happening to global temperatures in reality? The answer is: almost nothing for more than 10 years. Monthly values of the global temperature anomaly of the lower atmosphere, compiled at the University of Alabama from NASA satellite data, can be found at the website http://www.drroyspencer.com/latest-global-temperatures/. The latest (February 2012) monthly global temperature anomaly for the lower atmosphere was minus 0.12 degrees Celsius, slightly less than the average since the satellite record of temperatures began in 1979. The lack of any statistically significant warming for over a decade has made it more difficult for the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and its supporters to demonize the atmospheric gas CO2 which is released when fossil fuels are burned. The burning of fossil fuels has been one reason for an increase of CO2 levels in the atmosphere to around 395 ppm (or parts per million), up from preindustrial levels of about 280 ppm. CO2 is not a pollutant. Life on earth flourished for hundreds of millions of years at much higher CO2 levels than we see today. Increasing CO2 levels will be a net benefit because cultivated plants grow better and are more resistant to drought at higher CO2 levels, and because warming and other supposedly harmful effects of CO2 have been greatly exaggerated. Nations with affordable energy from fossil fuels are more prosperous and healthy than those without. The direct warming due to doubling CO2 levels in the atmosphere can be calculated to cause a warming of about one degree Celsius. The IPCC computer models predict a much larger warming, three degrees Celsius or even more, because they assume changes in water vapor or clouds that supposedly amplify the direct warming from CO2. Many lines of observational evidence suggest that this "positive feedback" also has been greatly exaggerated.There has indeed been some warming, perhaps about 0.8 degrees Celsius, since the end of the so-called Little Ice Age in the early 1800s. Some of that warming has probably come from increased amounts of CO2, but the timing of the warming—much of it before CO2 levels had increased appreciably—suggests that a substantial fraction of the warming is from natural causes that have nothing to do with mankind.

#### And, a decade of data proves warming models flawed

Mosher 11. (Steven, M.A. Anthropology, “U.N. Climate Models Flawed - Grossly Exaggerate Warming Effect”, Population Research Institute, Sep/Oct/2011, <http://www.pop.org/content/un-climate-models-flawed-grossly-exaggerate-warming-effect>, 0713/12, Chin)

Two University of Alabama scientists, Dr. Roy Spencer and Dr. Danny Braswell, compared eleven years of data from the real world with U.N. climate model predictions — and found the models grossly flawed. The study, rather pointedly called On the Misdiagnosis of Surface Temperature Feedbacks from Variations in Earth's Radiant Energy Balance, appeared in a peer-reviewed journal, Remote Sensing, in late July. (Remote Sensing. 2011, 3, 1603-1613.)¶ As Dr. Spencer stated in a press release, “The [NASA Terra] satellite observations suggest there is much more energy lost to space during and after warming than the climate models show. There is a huge discrepancy between the data and the forecasts that is especially big over the oceans.”¶ James M. Taylor, managing editor of the Environment & Climate News, also notes that “The Terra satellite data also support data collected by NASA's ERBS satellite showing far more longwave radiation (and thus, heat) escaped into space between 1985 and 1999 than alarmist computer models had predicted. Together, the NASA ERBS and Terra satellite data show that for 25 years and counting, carbon dioxide emissions have directly and indirectly trapped far less heat than alarmist computer models have predicted.”¶ Still, while Global Warming alarmists like Al Gore continue to hyperventilate over the supposed danger of increasing levels of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere — and call for increased funding for abortion and fertility reduction programs — the rest of us can breathe easier. ¶ It’s becoming abundantly clear that the only thing “man-made” about Global Warming is the hoax itself.

#### And, status quo is solving - jet emissions being reduced now

GAO 2009 (Aviation and Climate Change: Aircraft Emissions Expected to Grow, but Technological and Operational Improvements and Government Policies Can Help Control Emissions June 8, 2009 Statement of Susan Fleming, Director, Physical Infrastructure Issues. June 8, 2009 This is a GAO report. LexisNexis.) FOSTER

The fuel efficiency of commercial jet aircraft has improved over time. According to IPCC, aircraft today are about 70 percent more fuel efficient on a per passenger kilometer basis than they were 40 years ago because of improvements in engines and airframe design.5 The cost of jet fuel is a large cost for airlines. In the 2008, when global fuel prices were high, jet fuel accounted for about 30 percent of U.S. airlines' total operating expenses, compared with 23 percent during 2007. Fuel efficiency (measured by available seat-miles per gallon consumed) for U.S. carriers increased about 17 percent between 1990 and 2008, as shown in figure 2. Internationally, according to the International Air Transport Association, fuel efficiency (measured by revenue passenger kilometers) improved 16.5 percent between 2001 and 2007. According to FAA, between 2000 and early 2008 U.S. airlines reduced fuel burn and emissions while transporting more passengers and cargo.

In addition, commercial aviation has become less energy intensive over time--that is, to transport a single passenger a single mile uses less energy than it previously did, measured in British thermal units. See figure 3 showing energy intensity over time of aviation and other modes of transportation.

### Warming Exts - #2 - Not Anthropogenic

#### False - new studies show 20th century warming is not human-caused and the Aff's climate models are flawed

Carter et al 12 (Bob, geologist specialising in paleontology and marine geology. David Evans is a computer modeller and was a consultant to the Australian Greenhouse Office, 1999-2005. Stewart Franks is an associate professor of environmental engineering at the University of Newcastle. William Kininmonth headed Australia's National Climate Centre at the Bureau of Meteorology, 1986-98. April 18th. The Australian, pg. 12, GOVERNMENT SHOULD RE-EXAMINE THE CLIMATE DATA. <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/national-affairs/opinion/government-should-re-examine-the-climate-data/story-e6frgd0x-1226330722566>) cass

The theory of dangerous temperature rises simply isn't backed up by the research¶ TWO recent, widely publicised reports by the government's scientific advisory agencies on climate change have sought to raise alarm yet again about global warming.¶ With the world having warmed slightly during the late 20th century, CSIRO, the Bureau of Meteorology and the Climate Commission all advocate that this warming was caused mainly by industrial emissions of carbon dioxide, and that the continuation of emissions unchecked will cause dangerous warming of 3C-4C by 2100.¶ However, these and other climate agencies are now encountering a public that is increasingly aware of the lack of factual evidence for dangerous warming, and of the speculative nature of the arguments advanced in its favour.¶ For example, many people now understand that there is no direct evidence that 20th-century warming was caused mostly by carbon dioxide increase; that the late 20th-century warming has been followed by a 15-year temperature standstill in the face of continuing increases in carbon dioxide; and that the models that project alarming future warming are inadequate.¶ The dangerous warming hypothesis is embodied in the complex climate models that CSIRO and others use to predict the future climate.¶ But when the model predictions are tested against the latest high-quality data from our best instruments, they are seen to have comprehensively failed.¶ For example, the models predicted increasing global air temperatures (the measured rises have been much less than predicted), increasing ocean temperatures (there has been no change since 2003, when we started measuring it properly with Argo ocean-diving buoys) and the presence of a hot spot caused by humidity and cloud feedback at heights of 8km-12km in the tropical atmosphere (entirely absent).¶ The last item is especially important because it shows that the crucial amplification assumed by the modellers and which is responsible for two-thirds of the predicted warming (yes, only one-third is directly due to carbon dioxide) simply does not exist.¶ Finding that the estimated historic increase in carbon dioxide was not enough to cause dangerous warming on its own, the modellers guessed that atmospheric water vapour would amplify, by a factor of three, any initial carbon dioxide-forced warming.¶ That this assumed amplification is present in the models but not in reality explains why the models consistently overestimate recent warming.¶ What then should our government be making of all this?¶ Well, the government appears to take advice on global warming and climate change from a wide range of sources, which include the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Australian government agencies (CSIRO, BOM), state-based greenhouse or climate-change bodies, rent- seekers from many university climate-related research groups, business lobby groups and consultants and, finally, large environmental lobby organisations (Australian Conservation Foundation, Greenpeace, WWF). Phew.¶ The reality is, though, that all of these groups and organisations take their lead from, and support the views of, the IPCC (a political body that is unaccountable to Australian citizens).¶ Their starting assumption is therefore that human-caused global warming exists, that it is dangerous and that the way to avert the danger is to ``decarbonise'' the planet. The many agencies and groups giving advice are, in fact, just providing multiple conduits for the same repetitive, alarmist message, which derives ultimately from the same IPCC source.¶ Since the government's carbon tax legislative package passed the Senate last October, Australian press coverage of the global warming issue has been muted, doubtless partly signifying that there have been few government media releases that address the topic since the Senate decision.¶ That situation changed with a jolt during the week starting on March 12, when a wide variety of news media carried stories about CSIRO's Cape Grim air pollution monitoring station in Tasmania, followed later in the week by publicity for new reports on global warming by CSIRO/BOM and the Climate Commission.¶ In effect, the week revealed a co-ordinated and highly successful public relations campaign by three of the organisations involved in giving advice on climate change in Australia, with support and advance knowledge among some media editors and reporters. The aim was to rekindle the fast-fading fear of global warming alarm among the general public.¶ Very little scientific balance or analysis was provided during this week-long barrage of tired, speculative and highly controversial assertions about supposedly dangerous global warming.¶ Rather than being a new state of affairs, this assault in favour of warming alarmism by Australian climate agencies follows many similar propaganda blitzes during the past 10 years.¶ As experienced scientists, we have just completed a detailed assessment of the recent reports, which has been added to the list of earlier independent audits of IPCC and Australian reports at Quadrant Online (Google ``global warming: an essential reference'').¶ Our analysis of the ``new'' reports finds that they provide no evidence that dangerous global warming is occurring; nor that human carbon dioxide emissions will cause such warming in future; nor that recent Australian climate-related events lie outside normal climate variability; nor that reducing carbon dioxide emissions will have any discernible impact on future climate.¶ Therefore, Australian public policies regarding dangerous climate change, sea-level rise and other climatic hazards are based on inadequate scientific advice, which is shackled to the shortcomings of inadequate computer model projections.¶ The climate models are incompatible with the measured data. In recent decades the model predictions have significantly exceeded the measured temperature rise.¶ In science, data trumps theory. If data and theory disagree, as they do here, scientists go with the data and revise their hypothesis.¶ But in politics the opposite is true, for authority figures and political correctness reign supreme. In which context government climate scientists, Western governments and numerous influential lobby groups all strongly support the idea of dangerous global warming, despite the strong contrary evidence.¶ We conclude that an obvious and urgent need exists for the government to reassess its climate hazard policies. A good starting point would be to implement an unbiased review of the evidence.¶

### Warming Exts - #3 - Overexaggerated

#### Manipulation of scientific data prove warming effects exaggerated

Lieberman 10. (Ben, specialist in energy and environmental issues, “Hype of Global Warming Far Scarier Than Science Shows”, The Foundry, 02/19/10, <http://blog.heritage.org/2010/02/19/hype-of-global-warming-far-scarier-than-science-shows/>, 07/14/12, Chin)

Simply put, global warming is not a crisis and should not be addressed as one. The recent wave of climate science scandals — climategate, glaciergate, hurricanegate, amazongate, others — have exposed a number of efforts initially crafted to hype the issue into something far scarier than the underlying science actually shows. Climategate — the release of internal emails from scientists with key roles in the UN’s 2007 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Report — largely centered around the strained attempt to portray temperatures in recent decades as unprecedented throughout recorded history. The researchers had to go to extreme lengths to create this impression — grafting one data set onto another to manufacture the desired “hockey stick” effect, using computer programs that add warming to the underlying temperature data and then destroying that data before others could see it — which speaks volumes about the weakness of their case.¶ ¶ To his credit, Phil Jones, the head of the University of East Anglia’s Climate Research Unit who had to step down pending the climategate investigation, recently conceded that temperatures have been statistically flat since 1995 and that the Medieval Warm Period may have been as warm as modern times. Slowly but surely, the hype and false certainty is being replaced by a more accurate picture of what the science really tells us about the earth’s temperature history.¶ ¶ Similarly, most of the IPCC Report’s apocalyptic claims about the consequences of global warming – that Himalayan glaciers would completely melt by 2035, that damage from hurricanes and other extreme weather events has increased, that African agricultural production is poised to plummet, and that the Amazon rainforest is under grave threat – have been shown to be far-fetched speculation devoid of scientific support. Yvo de Boer, the UN’s top climate official, has just announced his resignation, in part due to the fact that so much so much alarmist junk made its way into the IPCC Report.¶ ¶ There is a reason proponents of costly measures to address global warming have so exaggerated the risks – they essentially had to for there to be any chance the public would accept the high price tag for action to ratchet down carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions. Once the gloom and doom is replaced by a more accurate assessment of the risk, such measures as the Senate’s Boxer-Kerry bill, a new UN treaty, or EPA regulations look like an especially bad deal

### Warming Exts - #4 - Models Flawed

#### Sea level rise studies show warming models flawed

Taylor 11. (James, senior for environment policy at The Heartland Institute, “#3 - Sinking under Their False Sea-level Predictions, Alarmists Change the Data”, The Heartland Institute, 05/17/11, <http://heartland.org/policy-documents/3-sinking-under-their-false-sea-level-predictions-alarmists-change-data>, 07/13/12, Chin)

Faced with the embarrassing fact that sea level is not rising nearly as much as alarmist computer models predict, the University of Colorado’s NASA-funded Sea Level Research Group has announced it will begin adding a scientifically unjustified 0.3 millimeters per year to its Global Mean Sea Level Time Series.¶ ¶ Human civilization readily adapted to the seven inches of sea-level rise that occurred during the twentieth century. Alarmists, however, claim global warming will cause sea level to rise much more rapidly during the coming century. The United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) gives a mean estimate of 15 inches of sea-level rise during the twenty-first century. High-profile alarmists often predict three feet. Some even predict 20 feet.¶ ¶ Satellite measurements show global sea level has risen merely 0.83 inches during the first decade of the twenty-first century (a pace of eight inches for the century) and has barely risen at all since 2006. This puts aTalarmists in the embarrassing position of defending predictions that are not coming true in the real world.¶

### Warming Answers - Post-Brink

#### And, plan is not enough - we would have to reduce our global emissions by 70% to stave off runaway warming - we are past the point of no-return for piecemeal policy approaches

Daily Climate 9 (April 14, 2009. “Steep emissions cuts take a chunk of warming with them—study, but “we can no longer avoid significant warming during this century,” lead scientist warns <http://wwwp.dailyclimate.org/tdc-newsroom/cuts/steep-emissions-cuts-take-a-chunk-of-warming-with> The Daily Climate is a publication of Environmental Health Sciences) FOSTER

Drastic, economy-changing cuts to greenhouse gas emissions will spare the planet only half the trauma expected over the next century as the Earth warms. And that’s the good news. Because a failure to significantly curb these planet-warming gases will truly transform our world in less than 100 years. A new study to be published by scientists at the National Center for Atmospheric Research finds that a 70 percent cut in emissions should stabilize temperatures at a mark not too much higher than today. Such a cut, most experts agree, would require vast retooling of society's fossil-fuel-based economy and an unprecedented level of global cooperation. That major effort to slash emissions, the scientists warned on Wednesday, won’t stop global warming. The question confronting politicians throughout the world, in other words, is not whether they want the planet to warm: It is to what degree. "We’re on a very dangerous path," said NCAR senior scientist Warren Washington, the lead author. "We can no longer avoid significant warming during this century." But "we could stabilize the threat of climate change and avoid catastrophe." The study, employing the latest-generation computer models, is one of the first to assess different scenarios, or storylines, and the effects different efforts to stem warming will have on the future climate. It will be published next week in the journal Geophysical Research Letters. "The absolute numbers that come out" – be it a temperature increase of 1.5 degrees or an eight- or nine-inch sea-level rise – "may not be the exact things we’re going to see," said Claudia Tebaldi, a study co-author and a statistician with Climate Central, a science and media nonprofit dedicated to improving information on climate change. "The significance of the difference is important. And that we have a lot of confidence in." The research suggests that, while the world will see some warming no matter what, prompt action to mitigate emissions can blunt the most dangerous disruptions: The late-summer polar ice cap, already at historic lows today, would shrink only another quarter and hold steady by century’s end, instead of melting by more than three-quarters with no let-up in sight. Arctic warming is potentially cut in half, stabilizing the northern Bering Sea and reducing impacts on commercial and subsistence fisheries. Regional heat wave intensity also drops by half, with the greatest reduction occurring over the western United States, Canada and most of Europe, Russia and Northern Africa. Flooding risk drops in half for the western tropical Pacific, Northeast United States and Canada, eastern Asia and South America. But the emissions slash will not stem the tide. "Note that despite a 70 percent reduction in emissions over the 21st century," the authors write, "there is virtually no cooling." Global average temperatures would still rise by nearly 1º F, about what scientists say the globe has seen to date from industrial emissions since 1900. Sea levels would creep up nearly six inches as a result of that extra heat, with any additional rise due to melting ice sheets unaccounted for in the study’s calculations. And no matter what happens, they continue to rise beyond 2100, given the oceans’ thermal inertia. And while a steep cut would stabilize atmospheric carbon dioxide levels, it holds them at about 450 parts-per-million, according to the study. That’s nearly 20 percent higher than today’s concentrations and at or even above a threshold many scientists fear will trigger a series of cascading and transformative catastrophes. Pre-industrial carbon dioxide levels were 284 ppm. Unchecked, emissions are on track to reach 750 ppm by 2100. Scientists don’t even know what that would look like: Assumptions used by the computer models were drawn up before recent large emission increases from China and elsewhere, leaving scientists to conclude that their "business-as-usual" benchmark is a conservative estimate for what might actually happen. Those models do suggest that, absent severe cuts, industrial exhaust will push global temperatures four degrees Fahrenheit above today’s readings – well beyond a mark many scientists fear will produce dreadful consequences. Sea levels under such a scenario rise at least nine inches – likely more – by century’s end. Massive ice sheets are destabilized. The Arctic, hit the hardest, would undergo dramatic change. “We are now completely in charge," said NASA scientist James Hansen, who was not a part of the study but who first urged Congress to stem emissions in 1988. "We are going to determine the climate for our children and grandchildren. We’re much more powerful than the natural forces.... We could be sending the planet back toward an ice-free state." Hansen and others argue that the only way to avoid such a fate is to slap carbon-based fuels with a significant tax – $115 per ton of carbon dioxide emitted, or about $1 extra on each gallon of gasoline – as well as a heavy push into renewable and nuclear fuels. But that kind of a levy will be a tough sell: The White House has stepped back from a cap-and-trade emissions limit in its budget proposal, while the G20 world leaders returned earlier this month from an economic summit with no progress to report on emissions. Indeed, a poll conducted by the London Guardian and published Wednesday exposes that gulf between what scientists and politicians think possible. While world leaders suggest prompt action can still avert the worst consequences, a majority of scientists polled at a major international conference last month told the paper they fear society is incapable of such action and faces dangerous warming. The NCAR study, whose authors also hailed from the Institute for Atmospheric and Climate Science in Zurich and Climate Central, took no sides in that debate. The scenarios, the authors state, should be seen as storylines illustrating the outcomes of different choices. "It is clear that emissions reductions in the 21st century need to be large," they said. "We do not claim they are necessarily politically or economically feasible.... The aim is to provide policy-relevant information for a range of options."

### Hegemony Advantage Frontline

#### First - Drones bad - Proliferation - US continuation of drones will spark international use of drones and risks the development of new weapons technology

Savage 10 [Charlie - columnist for the *New York Times*, “U.N. Report Highly Critical of American Drone Attacks, Warning of Use by Others”, *New York Times*, June 06 http://www.nytimes.com/2010/06/03/world/ 03drones.html, Academic Search Premier] ttate

A senior United Nations official said on Wednesday that the growing use of armed drones by the United States to kill terrorism suspects was undermining global constraints on the use of military force. He warned that the American example would lead to a chaotic world as the new weapons technology inevitably spread. In a 29-page report to the United Nations Human Rights Council, the official, Philip Alston, the United Nations special representative on extrajudicial executions, called on the United States to exercise greater restraint in its use of drones in places like Pakistan and Yemen, outside the war zones in Afghanistan and Iraq. The report -- the most extensive effort by the United Nations to grapple with the legal implications of armed drones -- also proposed a summit meeting of ''key military powers'' to clarify legal limits on such killings. In an interview, Mr. Alston said the United States appeared to think that it was ''facing a unique threat from transnational terrorist networks'' that justified its effort to put forward legal justifications that would make the rules ''as flexible as possible.'' But that example, he said, could quickly lead to a situation in which dozens of countries carry out ''competing drone attacks'' outside their borders against people ''labeled as terrorists by one group or another.'' ''I'm particularly concerned that the United States seems oblivious to this fact when it asserts an ever-expanding entitlement for itself to target individuals across the globe,'' Mr. Alston said in an accompanying statement. ''But this strongly asserted but ill-defined license to kill without accountability is not an entitlement which the United States or other states can have without doing grave damage to the rules designed to protect the right to life and prevent extrajudicial executions.''

#### And, widespread proliferation of drones risks extinction

Engelhardt 9 [Tom - co-founder of the American Empire Project, "Drone Wars: Your Future has Arrived", April 07, http://www.pacificfreepress.com/news/1/3990-drone-wars-your-future-has-arrived.html.] ttate

If you want to read the single most chilling line yet uttered about drone warfare American-style, it comes at the end of Christopher Drew's piece. He quotes Brookings Institution analyst Peter Singer saying of our Predators and Reapers: "[T]hese systems today are very much Model T Fords. These things will only get more advanced." In other words, our drone wars are being fought with the airborne equivalent of cars with cranks, but the "race" to the horizon is already underway. By next year, some Reapers will have a far more sophisticated sensor system with 12 cameras capable of filming a two-and-a-half mile round area from 12 different angles. That program has been dubbed "Gorgon Stare", but it doesn't compare to the future 92-camera Argus program whose initial development is being funded by the Pentagon's blue-skies outfit, the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency. Soon enough, a single pilot may be capable of handling not one but perhaps three drones, and drone armaments will undoubtedly grow progressively more powerful and "precise." In the meantime, BAE Systems already has a drone four years into development, the Taranis, that should someday be "completely autonomous"; that is, it theoretically will do without human pilots. Initial trials of a prototype are scheduled for 2010. By 2020, so claim UAV enthusiasts, drones could be engaging in aerial battle and choosing their victims themselves. As Robert S. Boyd of McClatchy reported recently, "The Defense Department is financing studies of autonomous, or self-governing, armed robots that could find and destroy targets on their own. On-board computer programs, not flesh-and-blood people, would decide whether to fire their weapons." It's a particular sadness of our world that, in Washington, only the military can dream about the future in this way, and then fund the "arms race" of 2018 or 2035. Rest assured that no one with a governmental red cent is researching the health care system of 2018 or 2035, or the public education system of those years. In the meantime, the skies of our world are filling with round-the-clock assassins. They will only evolve and proliferate. Of course, when we check ourselves out in the movies, we like to identify with John Connor, the human resister, the good guy of this planet, against the evil machines. Elsewhere, however, as we fight our drone wars ever more openly, as we field mechanical techno-terminators with all-seeing eyes and loose our missiles from thousands of miles away ("Hasta la Vista, Baby!"), we undoubtedly look like something other than a nation of John Connors to those living under the Predators. It may not matter if the joysticks and consoles on those advanced machines are somewhat antiquated; to others, we are now the terminators of the planet, implacable machine assassins. True, we can't send our drones into the past to wipe out the young Ayman al-Zawahiri in Cairo or the teenage Osama bin Laden speeding down some Saudi road in his gray Mercedes sedan. True, the UAV enthusiasts, who are already imagining all-drone wars run by "ethical" machines, may never see anything like their fantasies come to pass. Still, the fact that without the help of a single advanced cyborg we are already in the process of creating a Terminator planet should give us pause for thought... or not.

#### Second - terrorism - use of drones increases recruitment capabilities

Gerges 10 [Fawaz A. - professor of Middle Eastern politics and international relations at the University of London, “The truth about Drones”, *Newsweek*, May 30, http://www.newsweek.com/2010/05/30/the-truth-about-drones.html] ttate

In the first four months this year, the Predators fired nearly 60 missiles in Pakistan, about the same number as in Afghanistan, the recognized war theater. In Pakistan, the pace of drone strikes has increased to two or three a week, up roughly fourfold from the Bush years. Although drone strikes have killed more than a dozen Qaeda and Taliban leaders, they have incinerated hundreds of civilians, including women and children.

Predator strikes have inflamed anti-American rage among Afghans and Pakistanis, including first or second generation immigrants in the west, as well as elite members of the security services. The Pakistani Taliban and other militants are moving to exploit this anger, vowing to carry out suicide bombings in major U.S. cities. Drone attacks have become a rallying cry for Taliban militants, feeding the flow of volunteers into a small, loose network that is harder to trace even than shadowy Al Qaeda. Jeffrey Addicott, former legal adviser to Army Special Operations, says the strategy is “creating more enemies than we’re killing or capturing.” The Obama administration needs to at least acknowledge the dangers of military escalation and to welcome a real debate about the costs of the drone war. Because clearly, its fallout is reaching home.

#### And, hegemony does not solve war

Maher 10 [Richard - Ph.D. in Political Science at Brown University, “The Paradox of American Unipolarity: Why the United States May Be Better Off in a Post-Unipolar World”, November 12, http://dl2af5jf3e.scholar.serialssolutions.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/?sid=google&auinit=R&aulast=Maher&atitle=The+paradox+of+American+unipolarity:+Why+the+United+States+may+be+better+off+in+a+post-unipolar+world&id=doi:10.1016/ j.orbis.2010.10.003&title=Orbis+(Philadelphia)&volume=55&issue=1&date=2011&spage=53&issn=0030-4387] ttate

The other way to think about power is the ability to realize one's own preferences or preferred outcomes, or the ability to influence other actors—usually other states but not always—to do what you want them to do. When we think of power this way, we realize that the United States’ vast resources alone often are not sufficient to realize its preferred ends. There is no perfect correlation between the resources at one's command and the ability to realize preferred outcomes. Perhaps no other period of world politics in recent memory represents this discrepancy more acutely than today. U.S. capabilities dwarf those of any other state. Politically, diplomatically, and economically the United States remains in a preeminent position. While it hardly gets everything it wants, no other country can match U.S. influence in these realms. At the same time, from Iran, to North Korea, Pakistan, Iraq, and Afghanistan, not to mention Russia and China, the United States is seemingly not getting its way on issues central to its interests. More states are unafraid to challenge the United States (if only at the margins), ignore its blandishments, or seek to decrease their reliance or dependence on American security guarantees.

### Trade Leadership Advantage Ans - US not key

#### US not key to global trade

Matthews and Eakin 11 [Merril and Dough Holtz - resident scholar @ Institute for Policy Innovation and president of the American Action Forum, “Recapturing US Leadership on Trade”, February 09, <http://www.ipi.org/IPI/IPIPressReleases.nsf/97704cbd573c70d88625763a007cd241/a97aaa8817da1e578625783700786289?OpenDocument>] ttate

More important, NAFTA was passed by a Democratic-controlled Congress, when the country was in the middle of an acrimonious debate over health care reform. Does that sound familiar? Despite this, the vote was about as bipartisan as you can get. Things are different today, unfortunately. The U.S. has lost its role as a free trade leader. Free trade agreements with Colombia and Panama have been languishing for years — as had negotiations with South Korea until recently. Meanwhile, the European Union is aggressively promoting free trade agreements, opening up the world to more European products.

### Trade Leadership Advantage Ans - Not solve war

#### No correlation between free trade and peace

Martin et. al. 2008 [Phillipe - University of Paris 1 Pantheon-Sorbonne, Paris School of Economics, Thierry Mayer - University of Paris 1 Pantheon-Sorbonne, Mathias Thoenig - University of Geneva and Paris School of Economics, *The Review of Economic Studies*] ttate

Does globalization pacify international relations? The “liberal” view in political science argues that increasing trade flows and the spread of free markets and democracy should limit the incentive to use military force in interstate relations. This vision, which can partly be traced back to Kant’s Essay on Perpetual Peace (1795), has been very influential: The main objective of the European trade integration process was to prevent the killing and destruction of the two World Wars from ever happening again.1 Figure 1 suggests2 however, that during the 1870–2001 period, the correlation between trade openness and military conflicts is not a clear cut one. The first era of globalization, at the end of the 19th century, was a period of rising trade openness and multiple military conflicts, culminating with World War I. Then, the interwar period was characterized by a simultaneous collapse of world trade and conflicts. After World War II, world trade increased rapidly, while the number of conflicts decreased (although the risk of a global conflict was obviously high). There is no clear evidence that the 1990s, during which trade flows increased dramatically, was a period of lower prevalence o, even taking into account the increase in the number of sovereign states.

### Privatization CP - 1NC

#### Text: The United States federal government should repeal all regulations that prevent all airports from being privately owned and operated. The United States federal government should phase out federal investment to the aviation industry. The United States federal governments should provide investment incentives to private companies, such as tax incentives and prizes, to implement the Next Generation Air Transprortation System.

#### Privatization key to increased efficiency, lower costs, and greater competition

Brookings Institute 8. (research and policy institute, “! U.S. Aviation Infrastructure Policy at a Crossroads”, Brookings Institute, 05/08, <http://www.brookings.edu/research/articles/2008/05/aviation-winston>, 07/12/12, Chin)

Congress has repeatedly criticized the FAA for the excessive delays and cost overruns it has experienced in trying to develop a technologically up-to-date air traffic control system that would reduce U.S. airborne delays by expanding usable airspace capacity. Some members of Congress have characterized the TSA as a bloated bureaucracy whose screening tasks could be performed better and more efficiently by private screeners. Congress has not singled out airport authorities for criticism, but before September 11, Rudolph Giuliani, then the mayor of New York City, advocated privatization of the airports managed by the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey. Despite complaints by elected officials and an increasingly frustrated flying public, delays seem to be an inescapable part of air travel. Finally, in September 2007, President George W. Bush invited aviation officials and U.S. Department of Transportation secretary Mary Peters to the Oval Office to discuss solutions to air travel delays, proclaiming,“We’ve got a problem,we understand there’s a problem, and we’re going to address the problem.” ¶ In our view, excessive travel delays are—to a significant extent—a manifestation of the failure of publicly owned and managed airports and air traffic control to adopt policies and introduce innovations that could greatly improve the efficiency of the U.S. air transportation system. Given little economic incentive and saddled with institutional and political constraints, major airports and the air traffic control system have not exhibited any marked improvement in their performance for decades despite repeated assurances that they would do so, and they have provided little reason for policymakers and travelers to expect such improvements to ever occur. ¶ Some observers believe that delays would be reduced if the nation invested more money in airports and air traffic control. However, the returns from such spending would be compromised by the system’s vast inefficiencies. Thus, the key to reducing delays efficiently is to rid the system of its major inefficiencies. We believe that can be accomplished only by privatizing the nation’s aviation infrastructure. The aim of this chapter is to argue that by operating in a less constrained and a more competitive environment, privatized airports and air traffic control would have the potential to improve service to travelers and reduce the cost of carrier operations while maintaining the nation’s outstanding record of air travel safety in the face of an ever greater volume of traffic. In addition, privatized airports could facilitate greater competition among airlines that would lead to lower fares. ¶ Congress enacted legislation in 1996 to create a federal airport privatization demonstration program, but barriers to participation have discouraged significant experiments. As discussed in other chapters in this book, during the last several years countries such as Australia, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom have privatized their airports, and countries such as Canada and the United Kingdom have explored ways to enable private entities to provide (at least in part) their air traffic control services. We hope U.S. policymakers will intensify their efforts to encourage the private sector to participate in addressing growing concerns that the nation’s air transportation system is inexorably headed toward longer delays and potential threats to safety.

#### And, simply funding the NextGen project does not solve the fundamental problems with the FAA - must move to a privatized system for full effectiveness

Poole 06 (Robert W., director of transportation policy and Searle Freedom Trust Transportation Fellow at Reason Foundation. Poole, an MIT-trained engineer, has advised the Ronald Reagan, the George H.W. Bush, the Clinton, and the George W. Bush administrations. 2/20, Executive Summary Backgrounder, No. 2007, pg.1-20. The Urgent Need to Reform the FAA’s Air Traffic Control System. <http://reason.org/news/show/the-urgent-need-to-reform-the>) cass

The current authorization¶ of the FAA expires on September 30, 2007,¶ which means that Congress will need to address the¶ problems of the air traffic control system in this session.¶ By itself, the fundamental mismatch between¶ the growth in air traffic and the growth in FAA¶ revenue poses a serious problem, but the FAA needs¶ an additional $1 billion per year to implement the¶ Next Generation Air Transportation System (NGATS)¶ over the next 20 years. For the past year, the FAA¶ has been developing a user fee–based funding¶ No. 2007 February 20, 2006¶ reform proposal that could provide a starting point¶ for this aspect of the reauthorization debate.¶ However, two other key factors that coincide¶ with this scheduled reauthorization argue for¶ reform that goes beyond just the question of funding.¶ Within the next year or so, the JPDO will have¶ developed a plan to phase in NGATS over the next¶ 20 years. Implementing this major paradigm shift—¶ from 20th-century (manual) air traffic control to¶ 21st-century (semi-automated) air traffic management—¶ will be more complex and riskier than any¶ other challenge the FAA has previously attempted.¶ Simply fixing the FAA’s funding problem without¶ dramatically reforming its management and governance¶ poses the real risk of larger and more dramatic¶ cases of cost overruns, schedule slippage, and¶ systems that do not deliver value for the prices that¶ customers are paying.¶ The evidence demonstrates that self-supporting¶ ATC corporations have a better track record than the¶ FAA in delivering technology-intensive modernization¶ programs on time and on budget. They are also¶ consolidating facilities without political interference,¶ which is one of the keys to the large productivity¶ gains that NGATS is supposed to deliver.¶ Over the next 10 years, between one-half and¶ two-thirds of air traffic controllers will retire and be¶ replaced. This presents a one-time opportunity to¶ recruit and train a different kind of workforce for¶ what will become a much different kind of job. Here¶ again, a self-supporting Air Traffic Organization¶ (ATO) that is freed from civil service constraints and¶ day-to-day political oversight would be much better¶ positioned to redefine the controller’s¶

### Privatization CP - Next Gen

#### Privatization of ATC is the most efficient and effective way to implement NextGen - fifteen years of studies support our argument

Poole and Edwards 10 (Robert W., director of transportation policy and Searle Freedom Trust Transportation Fellow at Reason Foundation. Poole, an MIT-trained engineer, has advised the Ronald Reagan, the George H.W. Bush, the Clinton, and the George W. Bush administrations. Chris, director of tax policy studies at Cato, top expert on federal and state tax and budget issues. June, Airports and Air traffic Control. <http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/airports-atc/#3>)

The way to address all three of these organizational problems is to take the ATC system out of the federal budget process and make it a self-supporting entity, funded directly by its customers. Variants of this commercialization approach have been recommended by a series of federal studies and commissions over the past 15 years.¶ As part of Vice President Al Gore's efforts at "reinventing government" in the 1990s, for example, the Clinton administration proposed turning the ATC system into a separate, self-funded, nonprofit government corporation within the Department of Transportation. The 1997 National Civil Aviation Review Commission, which was chaired by Norman Mineta, similarly proposed moving toward a self-supporting air traffic control organization.29¶ Commercialization would entail shifting from aviation-related taxes paid to the U.S. Treasury to fees for ATC services paid directly by customers to a new self-supporting Air Traffic Organization. This change would allow fees to grow in proportion to the growth of flight activity, rather than being tied to a less-stable variable, such as fuel prices or airline ticket prices. Moreover, a predictable revenue stream that was not subject to the federal budget process would provide the basis for the ATO to issue long-term bonds for funding capital investments.¶ Commercialization would also address the management problems that have plagued the FAA's efforts to modernize. A non-civil-service ATO could attract the best private-sector managers and engineers skilled at implementing complex technology projects. Such an ATO could hire, fire, and compensate its employees as other high-tech businesses do. Private sector managers would have an incentive to ask tough questions about whether new investments offered real value for the money, a process that often doesn't occur at the FAA or in Congress.¶ In addition, a separate, self-supporting ATO—no longer part of the FAA—would be overseen at arm's length for aviation safety by the remaining FAA. Numerous studies have pointed out that the FAA's air-safety role is compromised when it comes to the ATC system, since that system is operated "in-house" by a different branch of the same FAA. All other players in aviation—pilots, mechanics, aircraft manufacturers, airlines, and so forth—are regulated at arm's length for safety by the FAA. This separation of ATC operations from safety regulation is especially critical given the major changes entailed by shifting to the semi-automated NextGen, where numerous safety versus capacity questions will need to be addressed in a rigorous and transparent manner.¶ Finally, a self-supporting ATO would address the political obstacles to improving system efficiency, such as making decisions to close facilities. By passing the enabling legislation for ATC reform, Congress would delegate such contentious issues to the customer-oriented ATO organization.¶ During the past two decades, nearly 50 governments have commercialized their air traffic control systems. That means they have separated their ATC activities from their transport ministries, removed them from the civil service, and made them self-supporting from fees charged to aircraft operators. These new air navigation service providers (ANSPs) are usually regulated at arm's length by their government's aviation safety agency.¶ Britain's ATC system has been commercialized by means of a "public-private partnership." National Air Traffic Services is a jointly owned company, with British airlines owning 42 percent, airport company BAA owning 4 percent, employees owning 5 percent, and the government owning the remaining minority stake. NATS is operated on a not-for-profit basis.¶ Canada's ATC system has been fully commercialized.30 In 1996, Canada set up a private, nonprofit ATC corporation, Nav Canada, which is self-supporting from charges on aviation users. The Canadian system has been widely praised for its sound finances, solid management, and its investment in new technologies.31 The Canadian system is a very good reform model for the United States to consider.¶ Nav Canada's corporate board is composed largely of aviation stakeholders.32 It has 4 seats for the airlines, 3 for the government, 2 for employees, and 1 for the non-commercial aviation industry. Those 10 stakeholders select 4 directors from outside aviation, and then those 14 select the company president, who becomes the 15th board member. To further strengthen governance, neither elected officials nor anyone connected with suppliers to Nav Canada can serve on the board. Nav Canada also has a 20-member outside Advisory Committee.¶ A number of studies have found that ATC commercialization has generally resulted in improvements to service quality, better management, and reduced costs.33 At the same time, air safety has remained the same or improved in the countries that have pursued reforms to set up independent ANSP organizations.¶ A thorough 2009 report by Glen McDougall and Alasdair Roberts compared the performance of 10 commercialized ATC systems and the FAA during the 1997 to 2004 period.34 They looked at large amounts of performance and safety data from the systems in the various countries and conducted over 200 interviews with managers, workers, and users of the different systems. The researchers found:¶ ANSP commercialization has generally achieved its objectives. Service quality has improved in most cases. Several ANSPs have successfully modernized workplace technologies. The safety records of ANSPs are not adversely affected by commercialization, and in some cases safety is improved. Costs are generally reduced, sometimes significantly. Other risks of commercialization—such as erosion of accountability to government, deterioration of labor relations, or worsened relationships between civil and military air traffic controllers—have not materialized.35¶ For the United States, a commercialized ATC organization would be more likely than the FAA to efficiently implement the major aviation infrastructure advances that the nation desperately needs. Air traffic control is more complex and dynamic than ever, and it needs to be managed in the sort of efficient and flexible manner that only a commercialized environment can offer. Countries like Canada have shown the way forward for air traffic control, and U.S. policymakers should adopt the proven organizational reforms that have been implemented abroad.

### Privatization CP - Efficiency

#### The federal government should no longer be in control of our airline industry - privatizing the industry is the only way to ensure efficiency and safety - other countries prove

Edwards 10. (Chris, expert on federal and state tax and budget policies, “Department of Transportation Proposed Spending Cuts”, The Federal Government, 06/10, http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/spending-cuts/, 07/10/12, Chin)

Most Department of Transportation activities are properly the responsibility of state and local governments and the private sector. There are few advantages in funding infrastructure such as highways and airports from Washington, but there are many disadvantages. Federal involvement results in political misallocation of resources, bureaucratic mismanagement, and costly one-size-fits-all regulations imposed on the states. Air traffic control should be removed from the federal budget, and the ATC system should be set up as a stand-alone and self-funded agency or private company. Many nations have moved towards such a commercialized ATC structure, and the results have been very positive with regard to efficiency and safety. Canada's reform in the 1990s to create a private nonprofit ATC corporation is a good model for the United States to follow. U.S. ATC is currently overseen by the Federal Aviation Administration, which has serious funding problems and a poor record on implementing new technologies. Moving to a Canadian-style ATC system would help solve these problems and allow our aviation infrastructure to meet rising aviation demand.

Privatization leads to more diversity of investment - leads to more industry stability and efficiency

Barkowski 10 (Justin T., J.D. Candidate – Pepperdine University, B.A. in Economics – University of California, Berkeley and Instrument-Rated Private Pilot Certificate, “Managing Air Traffic Congestion Through the Next Generation Air Transportation System: Satellite-Based Technology, Trajectories, and - Privatization?”, Pepperdine Law Review Vol. 37: Iss. 1, Article 3. http://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/plr/vol37/iss1/3)

Airport privatization has numerous potential benefits that cannot be understated.¶ Those most commonly identified include diversified sources of¶ private capital for development, 343 greater efficiency in airport operations,344¶ and increased customer satisfaction. 345 However, private operators could also more effectively fight congestion than a government-run airport by conditioning¶ the transfer on the elimination of congestion, measured by monthly¶ or quarterly performance results.346 This technique has been recognized for¶ various forms of privatization, predicated on the notion that "governments¶ should shift their focus from specifying inputs to specifying some desired¶ outcome, leaving private sector providers with the opportunity of formulating¶ means of realizing that outcome in the most cost-efficient way possible."¶ 347 The transfer of interests in airports from government operations to a¶ private regulated monopoly could provide a solution for demand management¶ if three conditions are met: the operator is given the ability to price¶ discriminate against carriers for ground facilities; 348 transparent, periodic slot¶ auctions are held; 349 and efficient regulation of an airport's monopoly power¶ exists.350¶

FAA mismanagement and bureaucracy means we should privatize

Vasigh, et al 08 (Professor of Economics and Finance in the College of Business at Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University, Daytona Beach Florida and a Managing Director at Aviation Consulting Group, LLC. He received a Ph.D. degree in Economics from the State University of New York. Tom Tacker, received a Ph.D. in Economics from the University of North Carolina and has published numerous articles on aviation and general economics both in academic journals and the popular press. He has been teaching Economics of Air Transportation at Embry-Riddle, at the undergraduate and graduate level, for over 14 years and has won several teaching awards. He has served as an expert witness in aviation economics and over his 26 year academic career. Ken Fleming has extensive experience in aviation economics and operations research. He specializes in analyzing airspace, air traffic control, and airline operational/management systems. A former military pilot with over 3,000 hours in nine different aircraft, he holds an FAA Commercial Pilot Airplane Single and Multi-engine Instrument Rating. Introduction to Air Transport Economics: From Theory to Applications, pg. 113-114. <http://books.google.com/books?id=ZzPekWiS9I0C&printsec=frontcover&dq=Introduction+to+Air+Transport+Economics:+From+Theory+to+Applications&source=bl&ots=Aau-N-Cftk&sig=RPatlUoj7V2gvSCwPVw1mhh12Xs&hl=en&sa=X&ei=CNb-T8ecKqiI2gXW15XQBA&ved=0CDQQ6AEwAA#v=onepage&q=Introduction%20to%20Air%20Transport%20Economics%3A%20From%20Theory%20to%20Applications&f=false>)

A number of studies have concluded that US ATC management is inherently flawed and in need of major reform. These include: the Aviation Safety Commission in 1988; the National Commission to Ensure a Strong Competitive Airline Industry in 1993; the National Performance Review in 1993; the Secretary of Transportation’s Executive Oversight Group in 1994; the National Civil Aviation Review Commission (Mineta Commission) in 1997. The fact that ATC funding flows from an unpredictable revenue stream subject to the federal budget process is a commonly raised issue. Sometimes there also seems to be an inability, stemming in part from limitations in the civil service system, to attract and retain needed managers and engineers who are skilled at implementing complex technology projects. The lack of both mission focus and clear accountability, because authority is shared by Congress and FAA management in a confusing bureaucracy, is at the root of much of the criticism. The future implementation of NextGen, for example, will be complicated by the fact that numerous outdated FAA operations around the United Sates will need to be closed. But Congressional Representatives are reluctant to vote in favor of shutting down any operation the “provides jobs in their district”. A possible solution to these sorts of problems, according to economists, might be to move to a private, non-profit corporation, as Canada did in 1996 with its NAvCanada Corporation. However, although it is commonly believed that this is not politically feasible, there is broad support for establishing a government corporation to address the concerns that have stymied previous attempts at major ATC reform.

#### Airport policies need reforms before NextGen can work effectively – privatization solves best

Barkowski 12 [Justin T. Barkowski is graduated from Pepperdine University School of Law and was admitted to the Bar. Mr. Barkowski received the Ronald Sorenson Award and, prior to attending Pepperdine, he graduated from the University of California, Berkeley, where he studied economics. Mr. Barkowski is an instrumentrated private pilot and is active in the firm’s business litigation and insurance law practices. “Managing Air Traffic Congestion Through the Next

Generation Air Transportation System: SatelliteBased Technology, Trajectories, and - Privatization?” <http://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1039&context=plr>, 2-2-2012] Lin

The nation's air transportation system is nearing insolvency, and with air traffic expected to double or triple in the next fifteen years, the government's attempts to create a more efficient system will have increasing impact. The FAA and local governments' bifurcated approaches in managing airport congestion and fueling competition in the aviation industry have had minimal effect. Congress's ambitious efforts to assist through the implementation of NextGen will promulgate much-needed capacity in many of the nation's airports. However, the FAA's liability-escape maneuvers throwing the "discretionary function" flag-do not maximize the potential safety and flexibility needed throughout the airspace system. Without accountability reform within the FAA and ATO, the revolutionary system will fall behind immediately after it clears the starting gates. Even with the proper adjustments to NextGen, a system with the cost of nearly twenty billion dollars in the end still misses the mark in dealing with the core problem: congestion at high-density airports. If the current airport policies are not addressed, the multi-billion dollar taxpayer investment will fail to solve those costly and irritating flight delays. As the social costs proliferate from misallocating valuable airport facilities, a relatively unknown and underutilized privatization pilot program becomes more appealing-and against much opposition, necessary

### Privatization CP - Costs

#### Privatizing the airline industry would decrease costs - avoids government fees and taxes

Airline Business Report 05 (April 11th, Vol. 23 No. 7, <http://web.mit.edu/TicketTax/AirlineBusinessReport20050411Excerpt.pdf>) cass

High fees and taxes dogging the airline industry¶ are reigniting a debate about whether air traffic control¶ functions should be privatized in order to bring down¶ costs.¶ Airlines have been complaining for years that¶ fees and taxes take a large bite out of revenue. This is¶ particularly the case in a tough pricing environment¶ that does not allow costs to be passed onto passengers.¶ Instead of giving airlines relief, the Bush administration¶ is moving in the opposite direction. Its budget proposal¶ for fiscal year 2006 substantially increases airline¶ security fees to raise an additional $1.5 billion a year.¶ High taxes and fees, combined with devastating¶ losses for major carriers over the past few years, are¶ breathing new life into a long-simmering debate about¶ the benefits of privatizing air traffic control.¶ A consulting arm of Unisys [UIS] is exploring¶ how airlines can dig out from high taxes and fees, and¶ it believes the single most important action to help airlines¶ would be to privatize, or “corporatize,” the air¶ traffic control function of the Federal Aviation Administration¶ (FAA). The United States has an admirable¶ record of safe and effective air traffic control but¶ is falling behind other countries that are gaining in efficiency,¶ lowering unit costs and fostering modernization,¶ according to Unisys.¶ The concept of privatizing air traffic control¶ turned into a raging debate a few years ago. In the summer¶ of 2002, a move by the Bush administration setting¶ the stage for privatization triggered a firestorm, spurring¶ several unions to charge that the government was¶ putting profits ahead of safety. The unions were irate¶ that the White House released an executive order stripping¶ air traffic control of its “inherently governmental”¶ designation.¶ Several major carriers have been intrigued over¶ the years with the prospect that the industry could save¶ hundreds of millions of dollars a year by moving to a¶ privatized system along the lines of the Canadian model,¶ NavCanada. But some observers say the main impetus¶ for privatization has been the Bush administration.¶ Unisys argues that higher fares through increased taxes and fees will¶ hurt airlines and the economy. For the year ended Sept. 30, 2004, there were¶ 398 million originating domestic passengers whose air trips averaged 1.8¶ flight segments and who paid an average roundtrip base fare of $291, according¶ to Unisys. At 2005 rates, this [a] $291 ticket would incur an average of¶ $51.29 in taxes and fees, or 18 percent of the base fare, it says. It argues that¶ continuing increases in taxes and fees will drive down market demand, with¶ significant negative national economic consequences.¶ Professors at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) and¶ Daniel Webster College have teamed up to conduct a real-world assessment¶ of airline fees and taxes. Airline ticket prices have dropped over the past¶ several years, but many of the taxes and fees have remained about the same.¶ As a result, the effective tax rate on airline tickets is steadily increasing, and¶ would increase more under the Bush administration’s budget proposal.¶ Joakim Karlsson, a professor at Daniel Webster College, noted that¶ airlines have lost their ability to raise fares, even to keep pace with inflation.¶ The average roundtrip ticket has dropped 40 percent in real terms¶ since 1993. But average ticket taxes and fees have stayed relatively constant¶ at $45 per ticket. “With the total cost of taxes changing only slightly,¶ the relative share of each ticket that goes to taxes and fees has been steadily¶ increasing,” he said.

### Privatization CP - Lower Fares

Studies show fares drop by 15% when airline industry privatized - British Airways proves

Eckel 96 (Catherine, Ashbel Smith Professor of Economics in the School of Economic, Political, and Policy Sciences at the University of Texas Dallas. Previously she was Professor of Economics at Virginia Tech, where she directed the Virginia Tech behavioral research lab, the Laboratory for the Study of Human Thought and Action. Doug, Vijay Singal, J. Gray Ferguson Professor of Finance at Virginia Tech. Journal of Financial Economics, Vol. 43, 1997, pg. 275-298. <http://www.finance.pamplin.vt.edu/faculty/vs/1997-JFE-AirlinePrivatizations.pdf>) cass

The changes in yields given by figure 4 are reported in Table 6. The sample consists of 12 transatlantic routes on which British Airways provided service¶ during the second quarter of 1986 (before privatization) and during the second quarter of 1987 (after privatization). We use the second quarter in each case to¶ remove seasonal variations. On average, for each of the sample routes, there are¶ 7.7 routes in the control group.¶ The change in fares on British Airways’ routes, relative to the control group,¶ ranges from + 25.4% to - 33.0%. Weighted by the number of passengers carried on each sample route, there is an average decrease in fares of 14.3%. This¶ decrease is statistically significant at the 1% level. We include the unweighted¶ mean (- 126%. significant at the 5% level) in the table for completeness,¶ although it provides a different measure of the change in fares. We think that the¶ weighted mean is a more appropriate measure became it reflects the economic¶ importance of the change in fares: less traveled routes should have a lower¶ weight in the mean. As a further check of robustness, we consider only routes¶ with at least 20 passengers a day in our data. The results. reported in row 3.b.¶ again show lower prices in the markets served by British Airways.

### Privatization CP - Increases competition

#### Privatization allows for healthier competition within the industry - increases effectiveness

Poole and Edwards 10 (Robert W., director of transportation policy and Searle Freedom Trust Transportation Fellow at Reason Foundation. Poole, an MIT-trained engineer, has advised the Ronald Reagan, the George H.W. Bush, the Clinton, and the George W. Bush administrations. Chris, director of tax policy studies at Cato, top expert on federal and state tax and budget issues. June, Airports and Air traffic Control. <http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/airports-atc/#3>)

However, it is also true that today's airline service often leaves much to be desired, with frequent delays, overcrowded planes, and other inconveniences. If service by some airlines is so bad, why haven't airline entrepreneurs broken into such markets to offer better alternatives? It turns out that many are trying, but they often have difficulty obtaining gates at such airports. The reality is that airline deregulation is an unfinished revolution until it includes airport deregulation and privatization.¶ All too many U.S. airports are still run in an old-fashioned and bureaucratic manner typical of the pre-deregulation era. Their management style is more passive and risk-averse than that of the world's privatized airports. Investor-owned airports are run as businesses, trying to make profits by tailoring their services to meet the needs of different groups of customers, not just airlines. Detailed research by scholars at Oxford University has shown that the management approach of privatized airports is significantly more "passenger friendly" than that of traditional airports.21¶ Private airport managers are also more willing to take on the risks of new investments, such as the creation of new terminal space to provide gates for new airlines. By contrast, under typical U.S. airport management practice, the major incumbent airlines have signed long-term exclusive-use gate-lease agreements. From the standpoint of risk-averse airport managers, these long-term agreements give them a guaranteed revenue stream. In exchange for this security, they give up substantial control to the major airlines. Usually, the long-term agreements give airlines what amounts to veto power over terminal expansions. That means that when new-entrant airlines want to start service to such an airport, there are often no gates available, which reduces competition.¶ By contrast, experience has shown that privatized airports generally do not cede de-facto control over their facilities to the large airlines. At most such airports, the gates remain under the control of the airport company, and they are allocated hour by hour to individual airlines, as needed. That is why at many European airports, and the more commercially run airports in Canada, you will observe that the airline signage at each gate is electronic, so that it can be changed in moments from one airline's name to another's.¶ In sum, airline competition would be expanded and consumers would benefit if we reformed the outmoded ownership and management structures of U.S. airports. Much of the world is moving to a new paradigm—the airport as a for-profit enterprise—that is more consistent with a dynamic, competitive airline market. In the end, all groups—airlines, passengers, and cities—would benefit from airports that were self-funded, more efficient, and more innovative than current U.S. airports following an old-fashioned bureaucratic approach.

### Privatization CP - Stability

#### Privatization increases stability of industry - relying on government funding creates uncertainty

Poole and Edwards 10 (Robert W., director of transportation policy and Searle Freedom Trust Transportation Fellow at Reason Foundation. Poole, an MIT-trained engineer, has advised the Ronald Reagan, the George H.W. Bush, the Clinton, and the George W. Bush administrations. Chris, director of tax policy studies at Cato, top expert on federal and state tax and budget issues. June, Airports and Air traffic Control. <http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/airports-atc/#3>)

Government funding sources tend to be static and subject to political considerations, and they are decoupled from changing market demands. Changes in aviation over the past decade have hurt the FAA's funding base. A large part of the FAA budget comes from aviation excise taxes, especially the 7.5 percent tax on airline tickets. As average ticket prices have fallen over time, ATC funding has been squeezed. Payroll costs of the current labor-intensive ATC system consume most of the available budget, leaving less funding for capital investment.¶ Making the transition to NextGen will require billions of dollars of new investments in advanced technologies. The FAA's capital budget is still focused mostly on patching up the existing system, such as replacing antiquated display consoles. Such investments are needed in the short-term, but won't add very much capacity to the system. But that is nearly all the FAA can afford under the current funding structure.¶ Some people argue that Congress could solve the funding problem by appropriating a larger amount of general federal revenue for the ATC system. But given the giant federal budget deficit, federal discretionary spending is going to be severely squeezed in coming years. The solution, as discussed below, is to create a commercialized ATC system that can flexibly respond to changing conditions and access private capital markets for investment.

### Privatization CP - Economy

#### Privatization of aviation industry cuts costs and key to economic growth

Edwards 11. (Chris, expert on federal and state tax and budget issues, “A Plan to Cut Spending and Balance the Federal Budget”, Cato Institute, 04/11, <http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/balanced-budget-plan/>, 07//15/12, Chin)

In recent decades, governments around the world have sold off state-owned assets to private investors.19 Airports, railroads, electric utilities, post offices, and other assets have been privatized. Privatization generally leads to reduced costs, higher-quality services, and increased innovation in formerly moribund government industries.¶ There are many federal assets that should be privatized. Table 1 includes the privatization of Amtrak, the air traffic control system, and the Army Corps of Engineers. Such reforms would reduce federal budget deficits and help spur economic growth.¶ Consider the nation's air traffic control system, which is run by the Federal Aviation Administration.20 The FAA has struggled to expand capacity and upgrade its technology, and its modernization efforts have often fallen behind schedule and gone over budget. A series of incidents in 2011 indicated that the agency has serious workforce management problems. The air traffic control system needs major improvements to meet rising travel demands, but the FAA may not be capable of meeting the challenge.¶ The good news is that a number of countries have restructured their air traffic control systems and provide good models for U.S. reforms. Canada privatized its air traffic control system in 1996, setting up a private, nonprofit corporation, Nav Canada. The company is self-supporting from charges on aviation users. The Canadian system has received high marks for sound finances, solid management, and investment in new technologies.21 Aside from those advantages, a privatized system in the United States would save about $6 billion a year in general fund taxpayer costs.

### States CP Helpers - Airports

#### States are more effective at aviation

Vogt 1999 [Frederick - director of the aeronautics division @ Tennessee Department of Transportation, "Prepared Statement by Frederick H. Vogt before the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee on Aviation, Subject - The Airport Improvement Program", February 11, page lexis] ttate

Tennessee, along with Pennsylvania, are your two newest State Block Grant States. We have a channeling act in Tennessee for federal funds, thus from an airport owners' perspective, not much changed. However, from the state's perspective, the block grant program decreased our paperwork considerably. Rather than submitting 10-12 detailed applications for individual projects, we submit one streamlined application for a block grant. Neither the state nor the FAA has to deal with numerous individual grants. Our workload at the state level has increased in the grant compliance and environmental areas, but because we are closer to the airports, we can be more effective in dealing with these issues. The State Block Grant Program has reduced the workload of the FAA airport engineers so that they can concentrate on the large air carrier airports and provide better service. As cited by GAO in its report, "The states have streamlined AIP project approval processes, reduced paperwork requirements, and eliminated the duplication that took place when state and federal activities overlapped. Airports have benefited from the states' streamlined approach, allowing them to obtain project approvals and approvals to change projects more quickly. FAA has been able to shift its resources to other high-priority tasks, thereby partially offsetting reductions' in field staff that have occurred in recent years." That's clearly a ringing endorsement of a highly successful program.

NASAO's fifth recommendation is that program flexibility should be a major concern in this reauthorization. We recommend four specific areas of flexibility, which will improve the system and save federal money.

The federal funding share should be flexible. In order to optimize available resources, states should be given the flexibility to adjust the federal funding shares within the respective State Apportionment project cost. Simply put, the federal government today pays 90 percent of costs of most airport projects. But, what if a state wants to speed up the process by paying 15, 20 or even 25 percent of the costs? This flexibility will enhance efficiency and help federal dollars go further. In 1996, you gave FAA the authority to test a flexible local share in the interests of innovative financing. That program is working and should be expanded and made permanent.

We also believe that airport design and construction standards need to be more flexible. Today these FAA standards adhere to "one-size-fits- all" criteria. But state standards are less expensive to implement while maintaining the highest degree of safety and durability.

### Agenda Links - Aviation spending divisive

#### Fights over the FAA causes battles in Congress -- differences in party priorities

NYT 11[The New York Times is a prestigious American daily newspaper that has won 108 Pulitzer Prizes, more than any news organization. Edward Wyatt is a business and commerce reporter for the New York Times “Congress at Impasse Over F.A.A.” http://www.nytimes.com/2011/07/28/business/congress-is-at-an-impasse-over-faa-financing.html?\_r=2, 7-27-2011] Lin

WASHINGTON — The debt ceiling debate may seem to be taking forever, but as an example of legislative dysfunction it is difficult to beat the repeated failure of Congress to manage the affairs of the Federal Aviation Administration. For four years and counting, Congress has been unable to approve long-term authority for the agency’s budgets and capital spending plans. Twenty temporary spending measures, some of them lasting just a few weeks, have come and gone. Last week, Congress again failed to resolve the impasse that has held up an agreement, including battles over subsidies for flights to rural airports and — something dear to the hearts of out-of-town lawmakers — adding more flights at Reagan National Airport near Washington. So last week, Congress scrapped attempts to approve the 21st temporary spending plan before the last one expired on Friday — thereby shutting down a large part of the F.A.A. The agency stresses that it has enough money to keep airports open and planes safely in the air. But it cannot work on long-term projects. It has furloughed 4,000 employees, stopped work on construction projects employing thousands more and halted research on next-generation air traffic control systems. The F.A.A. is not some esoteric financial concept like the debt ceiling — an issue that has some lawmakers proclaiming the end is nigh while others bluster that it does not really matter. The aviation agency holds the lives of hundreds of thousands of travelers in its hands every day, overseeing the nation’s airports and the air traffic controllers who make sure that tens of thousands of flights a day take off and land safely. “It’s amazingly aberrant behavior on the part of our lawmakers that they haven’t been able to get a bill approved since 2007,” said Marion C. Blakey, president of the Aerospace Industries Association, who from 2002-7 was the F.A.A. administrator, the agency’s top official. The issue is not merely a question of whether the F.A.A. might have to delay some spending on little-used airports in the districts of powerful legislators. Their dependence on a stream of short-term F.A.A. allocations has led airports to have to bid out projects one small chunk at a time, raising costs and inconveniencing travelers. “This is not a good way to do business,” Randy Babbitt, the current F.A.A. administrator, said in an interview. “It is a terribly inefficient use of the taxpayer dollar.” Without authorization from Congress, the F.A.A. cannot collect taxes on airline tickets that pay for much of its operations. The federal government is losing about $30 million a day from the loss of the ticket tax. For a Congress whose members routinely discuss the importance of adding jobs and constraining spending, an F.A.A. shutdown that lays off workers and makes projects more expensive would seem to go against common sense. Members of both parties and house of Congress blamed each other for the problem. “I was appalled that the House went through on its dangerous threats last week to hold the entire F.A.A. bill hostage to their politics,” Senator John D. Rockefeller IV, a West Virginia Democrat and chairman of the Senate Commerce committee, said on Monday. Representative John L. Mica, a Florida Republican who is chairman of the House Transportation committee, shot back: “To put people back to work and restart F.A.A. programs, the Senate needs to adopt the F.A.A. extension passed by the House last Wednesday.” As they did in the two previous sessions of Congress, the House and the Senate each passed bills that would give the F.A.A. its long-term authorization. But they have been unable to reconcile their versions. One of the sticking points has been the Essential Air Service program, which pays subsidies to provide for regularly scheduled flights to rural airports that would otherwise be too unprofitable to operate. Each house wants to tighten the restrictions, but they differ on how to do it. Those services played a part in the failure of Congress to approve even a short-term spending plan last week. The 20 stopgap spending measures passed over the last four years included no extraneous changes in budgeted programs. This time, however, the House inserted language that would end subsidized service to small airports in Nevada and Montana, states represented by high-ranking Democratic senators, among others. Another disagreement is over the number of long-distance flights that are allowed each day at Reagan Airport, which is the closest to Capitol Hill of the three major airports in the region. Members of Congress from Western states want more direct flights from Reagan Airport to their home states. Members from Virginia, and some in Maryland, want to protect their constituents from the noise the additional flights would create. Those issues have been sticking points for years. A more recent disagreement is an ideological debate over how to administer union elections. Last year, the National Mediation Board, which settles labor disputes in the airline and railroad industries, adopted a rule saying that a vote by a company’s employees on whether to certify a union would be decided by a majority of those voting, rather than by a majority of employees eligible to vote. The change was supported by the two board members appointed by President Obama, and opposed by the lone Bush appointee. Republicans in Congress and many airline and railroad companies have criticized the change, saying it overturns decades of precedent. Democrats and labor leaders say it puts those industries on the same footing as unions in nearly every other industry in the country. The House F.A.A. bill contains a provision to repeal the rule.

#### FAA spending triggers Congressional battles and backlash

Hiar 2011 [DC bureau news editor @ *Huffington Post*, "Controversial FAA program serves just 153 communities at a cost of $200 million", September 11, http://www.iwatchnews.org/2011/09/15/6542/controversial-faa-program-serves-just-153-communities-cost-200-million] ttate

The latest short-term funding extension for the Federal Aviation Administration leaves intact a small but costly program that has been criticized for decades by government auditors.

Created in 1978 as a part of the Airline Deregulation Act , the Essential Air Service subsidy was designed as a 10-year initiative to help rural airports likely to be left without routes as commercial aviation converted to a market-driven system. In most cases, the program limits assistance to isolated communities more than a 70-mile drive from the nearest major hub airport, which could be subsidized at a rate of less than $200 per passenger.

But EAS has persisted almost 25 years past its original congressionally mandated expiration date. It now serves 153 communities and costs some $200 million a year.

With growing political and economic pressure to reduce spending, some in Washington are focusing renewed attention on a subsidy program that, for example, has allowed constituents of Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, D-Nev., to fly from Ely, Nev., to Denver for as little as $70 — even though the cost of each ticket to taxpayers is reportedly $4,107 . A standoff over the program was at the root of a two-week FAA shutdown this summer and threatened earlier this week to shutter the agency again. A clean extension of the FAA passed the Senate Thursday night, averting the potential for a second shutdown.

“The effectiveness of [EAS] as anything other than enabling commercial airports to remain afloat is questionable, since the goal of the program was to help airports transition away from federal subsidies for air carrier service,” said Sen. Tom Coburn, R-Okla., in his “Back in Black” deficit reduction plan , published in July. “Taxpayers should not be expected to subsidize air service indefinitely.”

While EAS is a vital support program for Alaska communities with no other transportation options, there are also 109 airports in the lower 48 states that still benefit from the long-lived subsidy. These include Hagerstown, Md., an hour and a half drive from both Washington and Baltimore with a reported per ticket subsidy of $191, and Jonesboro, Ark., where the Transportation Department estimates taxpayers are on the hook $840 for every ticket even though it's only 79 miles from Nashville.

The persistence of the subsidy “is a classic example of a small but vocal constituency trumping a large and unfocused majority – most folks don’t know about the Essential Air Service,” said Douglas Holtz-Eakin, president of the conservative American Action Forum and a former chief of the Congressional Budget Office. “Every administration knows this is a bad policy, but it’s not worth all the political pain you have to go through to [cut it]. It’s exactly the right size to live on like this.”

But others contend that current political realities may have altered the dynamic. “By any standard, you can’t justify the cost to benefit ratio here,” said Norman J. Ornstein, an expert on congressional politics at the conservative American Enterprise Institute. Although this is not “a program in the billions,” he said, “the pressure and the squeeze on almost every area of discretionary spending is such that even the smaller items are going to come under more scrutiny.”

### Agenda Links - FAA Divisive

Plan will drain political capital - lawmakers don't trust FAA to implement major overhauls

CAPA 10. (experts on aviation industry, “FAA reauthorization, NextGen fails to gain passage again”, CAPA Centre For Aviation, 08/25/10, http://www.centreforaviation.com/analysis/faa-rauthorization-nextgen-fails-to-gain-passage-again-33831, 07/10/12, Chin)

While all this is promised by NextGen, there isn’t a time when the US Department of Transportation Office of Inspector General or the General Accountability Office does not express deep concern over FAA’s ability to field the system and, of course, Congress agrees. The fact is, Congress has little incentive to pass this legislation given all the wasted billions since the onset of air traffic management modernisation some 50 years ago. During recent hearings legislators were quite frank about their distrust of the FAA. Even the small steps that can be done now face giant hurdles. More than 70 recommendations have been made to improve the airspace usage surrounding New York and Philadelphia. But changes have been killed as the noise footprint suddenly shifts to some politically connected area where Congressional representatives are more than happy to kill the FAA’s attempts to make the NY/PHL airspace more efficient. ¶

### Agenda Links - Opposition - Fear of Job Loss

#### Congress will oppose the plan - they empirically fear massive overhaul of ATC due to job losses

Poole and Edwards 10. (Robert and Chris, director of transportation policy and advisor of transportation policy issues, “Airports and Air Traffic Control”, Cato Institute, 06/10, http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/airports-atc/, 07/12/12, Chin)

Some people argue that Congress could solve the funding problem by appropriating a larger amount of general federal revenue for the ATC system. But given the giant federal budget deficit, federal discretionary spending is going to be severely squeezed in coming years. The solution, as discussed below, is to create a commercialized ATC system that can flexibly respond to changing conditions and access private capital markets for investment. However, Congress tends to resist consolidating ATC facilities because of concerns about job losses and the like, which is similar to the political resistance to closing post offices and military bases. A major 1982 proposal for consolidating ATC facilities was quietly dropped after it became clear that getting it through Congress would be very difficult. Similarly, Congress came extremely close to forbidding the FAA's recent success in outsourcing its Flight Service Station system, which involved reducing the system from 58 facilities to 20. The prohibition was defeated only by a credible veto threat from the White House. In sum, as long as ATC remains government-owned and controlled, making the needed reforms to improve efficiency and implement NextGen will be very difficult.

### Elections Links - Plan unpopular - Noise

#### Plan is unpopular and heated issue in some regions - plan creates extra noise near airports due to smaller travel bubbles

HERBERT 12 (Keith, staff writer at Newsday, 3/31. LIers: More study of NextGen air traffic.) <http://www.newsday.com/long-island/nassau/liers-more-study-of-nextgen-air-traffic-1.3635945>/ cass

The potential for more frequent noise from Kennedy Airport jets -- a result of the FAA's pathbreaking "Next Generation" air traffic control redesign -- has united residents of Long Island's North and South shores to press for a full environmental impact study of the system's cumulative effects¶ NextGen, predicted to cost at least $20 billion by 2025, is the Federal Aviation Administration's nationwide plan for satellite navigation of commercial flights, replacing the outmoded ground-based radar system in use since the 1950s. Congress has appropriated $2.8 billion for NextGen since 2007, and the system is in the early stages of development. The satellite navigation system is supposed to increase capacity because planes could fly with 3 miles between them instead of the now-required 5-mile separation. Other NextGen positives, the FAA says, include enhanced safety, because pilots will have precise information about the location of other aircraft aloft; reduced jet noise over a wider swath of Nassau; and energy savings due to jets flying at near-idle throttle, burning less fuel. More capacity should ease flight delays in the metropolitan area, which with three major airports and three regional airports is among the nation's busiest and most congested airspaces, the agency said. Chronic delays at Kennedy and LaGuardia airports often have a domino effect on air traffic, with planes held at the gates of other airports because of the inability to land in New York. But for Nassau residents with homes and businesses beneath Kennedy flight paths, NextGen's precision in setting aircraft departure and arrival paths brings the probability of more frequent jet noise. The more exact paths will cause "more noise for fewer people," compared with current, less precise routes that cover a wider swath of sky and cause "less noise for more people," said Maxine Lubner, chairman of the aviation department at Vaughn College of Aeronautics and Technology, which is adjacent to LaGuardia. Len Schaier, head of the group Citizens for Quiet Skies over North Hempstead, said the chance for public comment to the FAA about NextGen galvanized residents and some elected officials in the towns of Hempstead and North Hempstead. "The goal was to say, 'We're not against progress.' But there are some people in the FAA who believe you have to do an environmental test," Schaier said of the grassroots letter-writing and Web-posting campaign. "We believe you have to do an environmental test." Residents of Roslyn Heights, East Hills and other communities say they've been hearing louder jet noise in recent months -- and they don't want even more. The FAA instituted new flight departure paths for Kennedy in late October, a first step in NextGen's implementation. Those changes have a minimal noise impact, the agency asserted, in part because the jets are at altitudes of 5,000 to 10,000 feet. One of the new departure routes out of Kennedy was forecast to send an additional 200 planes a day over the North Shore. "I have not been able to sleep through the night," Deirdre A. Nicolle, of Port Washington, wrote in a letter to the FAA ahead of the March 7 deadline for public comments regarding NextGen. "The airplane noise is so loud that it can be heard inside my house, even though all the doors and windows in my house are closed." "There is too much noise pollution in my area due to low-flying planes," wrote Jay Dubowsky of East Hills. "My children are awakening at night due to plane noise." The FAA defended its effort as making air travel more convenient and dependable. In addition, changes to air routes were subject to "appropriate environmental review" to comply with anti-noise regulations and environmental law, the agency said. "The FAA is committed to environmental stewardship, especially in the development of NextGen-related air traffic procedures," the agency said in a statement. The agency would not make air traffic control managers available for an interview.¶ Residents said NextGen needs further study. Specifically, they said that noise-impact research the FAA did before carrying out an airspace redesign project ahead of NextGen was superficial and did not take into account the cumulative impact of jet noise. The FAA's noise research, conducted before the airspace redesign was released in August 2007, included average noise levels in decibels. Residents said they want an environmental study that measures the noise from single-event passes of jets over their homes -- not a calculation averaged over time.¶ "In that average could be some really high doses" of noise, Schaier said.¶ Federal lawmakers were unsuccessful in an attempt to insert into the FAA Reauthorization and Reform Act a requirement for an environmental impact study in the New York region. President Barack Obama signed the legislation Feb. 14. Residents' heightened concern about more aircraft noise has sparked interest in community efforts focused on the issue.¶ About 100 people, far more than the usual number, turned out at a Feb. 27 meeting of the Town-Village Aircraft Safety and Noise Abatement Committee. The window for public comment to the FAA about NextGen was Dec. 12 through March 7. Dozens of people wrote letters and more than 325 people posted comments on the U.S. Department of Transportation's website as of Friday. Of those, Schaier said, 81 from Hempstead and North Hempstead towns also signed his group's petition calling for a new environmental study. Julie Liberman, who was among those posting a comment, said in an interview that she first noticed an increase in air traffic a few months ago, with more noise particularly between 7 and 9 p.m. In her 25 years as a Roslyn resident, she said, she can't remember a time when the noise was worse.¶ "It's very loud," Liberman said. "Just constant traffic, one right after the other."

### Spending Links

#### Plan will cost $160 billion - if Aff argues that costs will be kept low, than plan adopts a watered-down version of NextGen, which won't solve

Hoover 11(J. Nicholas Hoover, senior editor for Information Week Government, “FAA NextGen Air Traffic Control Costs Could Quadruple”, 10/25/11, AD: 07/09/12, <http://www.informationweek.com/news/government/info-management/231900067> | Kushal, Chin)

The Federal Aviation Administration's massive, long-term air traffic control systems upgrade risks ballooning in costs from an already expensive $40 billion price tag to as much as a whopping $160 billion, an internal FAA planning office has found. According to a new report by the Government Accountability Office, the FAA's joint planning and development office determined that, if the FAA implements the "highest performance levels" suggested for NextGen, such as requiring extensive electronic systems to be installed on every aircraft, it could make NextGen's cost rise dramatically. In order to keep costs low, the FAA report found, NextGen will have to be developed with fewer ground and aircraft capabilities than envisioned. "Analysis shows a subset of scenarios developed, assuming lower levels of capabilities, whose cost estimates remain in the $40 billion range," the GAO report said. GAO also noted that the FAA has not yet established clear performance goals and metrics for NextGen despite creating an implementation plan through 2018. "Without goals and metrics, FAA could pursue and implement capabilities that fail to produce the desired results," the report said. NextGen is arguably the largest project the FAA has ever undertaken. Today's air traffic systems are decades behind current technologies, and the United States risks falling behind the rest of the world without an upgrade. In response, the NextGen system will transition U.S. air travel from a ground-based, analog system to a satellite-based, data-based and more automated system. It will optimize and automate parts of ground and air traffic control, enable real-time GPS maps of air and ground traffic, employ computerized weather monitoring to help route plans, and let planes fly closer together without any loss of safety, among other benefits. However, with its goals being so ambitious and taking place over such a long time frame, the GAO and Congress have repeatedly raised concerns about maintaining rigorous controls over NextGen in order to keep it on schedule and budget. In April, witnesses told a House of Representatives subcommittee that the FAA's handling of the project called into question its ability to manage it and raised concerns that NextGen would fail to be completed on schedule. Then, in June, the FAA's inspector general reported that the agency needed to do more planning to assure the project's success and had failed to develop the necessary skill sets to make NextGen work. A third negative report came in July when the GAO found the FAA didn't have adequate performance metrics in place for the project. Earlier reports have also noted that significant research gaps remain unresolved that could threaten FAA's proposed schedule, including ways to synchronize numerous weather applications.

#### FAA NextGen to Cause over 160 Billion Dollars to implement from an already overstrained budget

DeHaven 2010, (Tad Dehaven, Cato Institute, Huge Cost Overrun for FAA's NextGen”. 12/3/10 AD. 7/10/12. http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/huge-cost-overrun-faas-nextgen|Ashwin/chin

A year ago I discussed problems that the Federal Aviation Administration was having in trying to implement an overhaul of the nation's air traffic control system. The “NextGen” overhaul would replace old-fashioned radar technology with modern satellite-based GPS navigation.¶ In a new letter to Congress, the Government Accountability Office reports that NextGen could ultimately cost four times more than originally estimated: ¶ According to this analysis, implementing the highest performance levels envisioned in the [Integrated Work Plan] for ground and aircraft capabilities by 2025 could increase NextGen’s costs significantly beyond the initial cost estimate of $40 billion (e.g., in some scenarios that require every aircraft to be equipped with extensive avionics in a shorter time frame, estimated costs can go as high as $160 billion). If the highest performance levels are implemented over a longer period, by 2035, the cost estimates would be lower, but still would be considerably higher than $40 billion.¶ As a Cato essay on airports and air traffic control points out, the FAA has a poor track record when it comes to implementing new technologies: ¶ The FAA has been attempting to modernize its system, expand capacity, and increase its productivity for decades. But dozens of reports over the years from the Government Accountability Office and the Office of Inspector General in the Department of Transportation have faulted the FAA for poor management of major projects, which are often delayed and over budget. The Advanced Automation System, Wide Area Augmentation System, and other major projects have had large cost overruns and been years behind schedule or cancelled. ¶ The essay explains that the solution to the FAA’s constant problems “is to take the ATC system out of the federal budget process and make it a self-supporting entity, funded directly by its customers.” The Clinton administration proposed such a transformation as part of Vice President Al Gore’s “reinventing government” initiative in the 1990s.

### Environmental Impact Statement Links

#### Public will demand an EIS of plan - public concerned about increase of jet noise near airports due to smaller traffic bubbles

HERBERT 12 (Keith, staff writer at Newsday, 3/31. LIers: More study of NextGen air traffic.) <http://www.newsday.com/long-island/nassau/liers-more-study-of-nextgen-air-traffic-1.3635945>/ cass

The potential for more frequent noise from Kennedy Airport jets -- a result of the FAA's pathbreaking "Next Generation" air traffic control redesign -- has united residents of Long Island's North and South shores to press for a full environmental impact study of the system's cumulative effects¶ NextGen, predicted to cost at least $20 billion by 2025, is the Federal Aviation Administration's nationwide plan for satellite navigation of commercial flights, replacing the outmoded ground-based radar system in use since the 1950s. Congress has appropriated $2.8 billion for NextGen since 2007, and the system is in the early stages of development. The satellite navigation system is supposed to increase capacity because planes could fly with 3 miles between them instead of the now-required 5-mile separation. Other NextGen positives, the FAA says, include enhanced safety, because pilots will have precise information about the location of other aircraft aloft; reduced jet noise over a wider swath of Nassau; and energy savings due to jets flying at near-idle throttle, burning less fuel. More capacity should ease flight delays in the metropolitan area, which with three major airports and three regional airports is among the nation's busiest and most congested airspaces, the agency said. Chronic delays at Kennedy and LaGuardia airports often have a domino effect on air traffic, with planes held at the gates of other airports because of the inability to land in New York. But for Nassau residents with homes and businesses beneath Kennedy flight paths, NextGen's precision in setting aircraft departure and arrival paths brings the probability of more frequent jet noise. The more exact paths will cause "more noise for fewer people," compared with current, less precise routes that cover a wider swath of sky and cause "less noise for more people," said Maxine Lubner, chairman of the aviation department at Vaughn College of Aeronautics and Technology, which is adjacent to LaGuardia. Len Schaier, head of the group Citizens for Quiet Skies over North Hempstead, said the chance for public comment to the FAA about NextGen galvanized residents and some elected officials in the towns of Hempstead and North Hempstead. "The goal was to say, 'We're not against progress.' But there are some people in the FAA who believe you have to do an environmental test," Schaier said of the grassroots letter-writing and Web-posting campaign. "We believe you have to do an environmental test." Residents of Roslyn Heights, East Hills and other communities say they've been hearing louder jet noise in recent months -- and they don't want even more. The FAA instituted new flight departure paths for Kennedy in late October, a first step in NextGen's implementation. Those changes have a minimal noise impact, the agency asserted, in part because the jets are at altitudes of 5,000 to 10,000 feet. One of the new departure routes out of Kennedy was forecast to send an additional 200 planes a day over the North Shore. "I have not been able to sleep through the night," Deirdre A. Nicolle, of Port Washington, wrote in a letter to the FAA ahead of the March 7 deadline for public comments regarding NextGen. "The airplane noise is so loud that it can be heard inside my house, even though all the doors and windows in my house are closed." "There is too much noise pollution in my area due to low-flying planes," wrote Jay Dubowsky of East Hills. "My children are awakening at night due to plane noise." The FAA defended its effort as making air travel more convenient and dependable. In addition, changes to air routes were subject to "appropriate environmental review" to comply with anti-noise regulations and environmental law, the agency said. "The FAA is committed to environmental stewardship, especially in the development of NextGen-related air traffic procedures," the agency said in a statement. The agency would not make air traffic control managers available for an interview.¶ Residents said NextGen needs further study. Specifically, they said that noise-impact research the FAA did before carrying out an airspace redesign project ahead of NextGen was superficial and did not take into account the cumulative impact of jet noise. The FAA's noise research, conducted before the airspace redesign was released in August 2007, included average noise levels in decibels. Residents said they want an environmental study that measures the noise from single-event passes of jets over their homes -- not a calculation averaged over time.¶ "In that average could be some really high doses" of noise, Schaier said.¶ Federal lawmakers were unsuccessful in an attempt to insert into the FAA Reauthorization and Reform Act a requirement for an environmental impact study in the New York region. President Barack Obama signed the legislation Feb. 14. Residents' heightened concern about more aircraft noise has sparked interest in community efforts focused on the issue.¶ About 100 people, far more than the usual number, turned out at a Feb. 27 meeting of the Town-Village Aircraft Safety and Noise Abatement Committee. The window for public comment to the FAA about NextGen was Dec. 12 through March 7. Dozens of people wrote letters and more than 325 people posted comments on the U.S. Department of Transportation's website as of Friday. Of those, Schaier said, 81 from Hempstead and North Hempstead towns also signed his group's petition calling for a new environmental study. Julie Liberman, who was among those posting a comment, said in an interview that she first noticed an increase in air traffic a few months ago, with more noise particularly between 7 and 9 p.m. In her 25 years as a Roslyn resident, she said, she can't remember a time when the noise was worse.¶ "It's very loud," Liberman said. "Just constant traffic, one right after the other."

### Noise Pollution Links

#### Plan increases noise pollution - upsets residents

Newsday 12 [Newsday is a daily American newspaper. Keith Herbert is a reporter for Newsday. “LIers: More study of NextGen air traffic” <http://www.newsday.com/long-island/nassau/liers-more-study-of-nextgen-air-traffic-1.3635945>, 3-31-12] Lin

More capacity should ease flight delays in the metropolitan area, which with three major airports and three regional airports is among the nation's busiest and most congested airspaces, the agency said. Chronic delays at Kennedy and LaGuardia airports often have a domino effect on air traffic, with planes held at the gates of other airports because of the inability to land in New York. But for Nassau residents with homes and businesses beneath Kennedy flight paths, NextGen's precision in setting aircraft departure and arrival paths brings the probability of more frequent jet noise. The more exact paths will cause "more noise for fewer people," compared with current, less precise routes that cover a wider swath of sky and cause "less noise for more people," said Maxine Lubner, chairman of the aviation department at Vaughn College of Aeronautics and Technology, which is adjacent to LaGuardia. Len Schaier, head of the group Citizens for Quiet Skies over North Hempstead, said the chance for public comment to the FAA about NextGen galvanized residents and some elected officials in the towns of Hempstead and North Hempstead. "The goal was to say, 'We're not against progress.' But there are some people in the FAA who believe you have to do an environmental test," Schaier said of the grassroots letter-writing and Web-posting campaign. "We believe you have to do an environmental test." Residents of Roslyn Heights, East Hills and other communities say they've been hearing louder jet noise in recent months -- and they don't want even more. The FAA instituted new flight departure paths for Kennedy in late October, a first step in NextGen's implementation. Those changes have a minimal noise impact, the agency asserted, in part because the jets are at altitudes of 5,000 to 10,000 feet. One of the new departure routes out of Kennedy was forecast to send an additional 200 planes a day over the North Shore. "I have not been able to sleep through the night," Deirdre A. Nicolle, of Port Washington, wrote in a letter to the FAA ahead of the March 7 deadline for public comments regarding NextGen. "The airplane noise is so loud that it can be heard inside my house, even though all the doors and windows in my house are closed." "There is too much noise pollution in my area due to low-flying planes," wrote Jay Dubowsky of East Hills. "My children are awakening at night due to plane noise." The FAA defended its effort as making air travel more convenient and dependable. In addition, changes to air routes were subject to "appropriate environmental review" to comply with antinoise regulations and environmental law, the agency said. "The FAA is committed to environmental stewardship, especially in the development of NextGen-related air traffic procedures," the agency said in a statement. The agency would not make air traffic control managers available for an interview. Residents said NextGen needs further study. Specifically, they said that noise-impact research the FAA did before carrying out an airspace redesign project ahead of NextGen was superficial and did not take into account the cumulative impact of jet noise. The FAA's noise research, conducted before the airspace redesign was released in August 2007, included average noise levels in decibels. Residents said they want an environmental study that measures the noise from single-event passes of jets over their homes -- not a calculation averaged over time. "In that average could be some really high doses" of noise, Schaier said. Federal lawmakers were unsuccessful in an attempt to insert into the FAA Reauthorization and Reform Act a requirement for an environmental impact study in the New York region. President Barack Obama signed the legislation Feb. 14. Residents' heightened concern about more aircraft noise has sparked interest in community efforts focused on the issue.