River Locks Negative

Several disadvantages

* Accidents DA (fixing locks increases chances of accidents, which causes chain reaction that overfloods the locks)
* River-Agro DA
* Freight Train DA (plan trades off with burgeoning freight train system that’s good)
* US Ag Bad (river locks boost subsidized corn and ag exports to other countries which results in unrest and rels collapse and those countries becoming protectionist which turns their ag impacts)
* Non-river locks modernization is bad because of environmental/tradeoff disads and a PIC out of sacramento other west coast rivers with crazy reverttonaturalstate stuff
* mississippi states cp with corps of engineers bad

\*\*\* Defense

1NC Congestion F/L

Congestion is inevitable – new ships and globalization

American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, “Transportation: Invest in America”, 2001, http://rail.transportation.org/Documents/FreightRailReport.pdf

Waterways face a variety of pressures from the continued expansion of both domestic and international trade. Many ports are seeking deeper navigation channels to accommodate next-generation “mega-containerships.” Now in service in the Pacific trades, these vessels need channel depths of 50 feet or more. Marine terminals also are facing shortages of land for the storage and transfer of containers and cargo, and many are being forced to operate at unprecedented levels of efficiency to compensate for their shortage of space. Landside access is increasingly problematic, as many ports must contend with congestion on their major truck access routes and inadequate or antiquated rail connectors.

Alt cause to waterway congestion – increased traffic

James F. Campbell et al, L. Douglas Smith, Donald C. Sweeney II, Ray Mundy and Robert M. Nauss, College of Business Administration, University of Missouri - St. Louis, 2007, “Decision Tools for Reducing Congestion at Locks on the Upper Mississippi River”, http://www.hicss.hawaii.edu/hicss\_40/decisionbp/02\_04\_01.pdf

Our study region includes the five southernmost 600-foot long locks in the UMR navigation system, Locks 20, 21, 22, 24 and 25 (there is no Lock 23) and the four intervening pools, covering 100 river miles. These five locks are among the most heavily utilized and most congested locks in the U.S. Current utilization of these locks is 70-85% during the main navigation season from April to November. The locks adjacent to our study region have already been expanded to 1200 feet in length and do not generally experience significant queues. Large waits at Locks 20–25 occur due to the seasonality of commercial traffic, periodic adverse operating conditions, the relatively lengthy time required to process double lockages, and periodic significant use by private recreational craft. In a congested period, commercial traffic on the UMR between Locks 20 and 25 might typically spend 3–10 hours traversing each pool, depending on the direction and length of the pool, several hours in queue at each lock, and 0.5–2.5 hours undergoing a lockage, depending on the condition of the lock and the type of tow. In extreme cases, the wait in a lock queue may be as long as 100 hours. Increased traffic on the UMR navigation system would create substantial increases in congestion and delays at system locks, increasing tow transit times and possibly decreasing systemic efficiency. In response to the potential increasing levels of future lock congestion, the Corps initiated a feasibility study to examine increasing the size of the existing 600-foot long UMR locks to 1200-feet to eliminate the need for double lockages. This twelve year, $77 million feasibility study ultimately concluded in late 2004 with a recommendation that the 600-foot long lock chambers for Locks 20 – 25 (and others) be replaced with new 1200-foot long lock chambers at a cost of some $2.8 billion [15].

Repairing locks causes congestion and economic downturn

Boselovic, 1ac evidence, award winner for business and investigative reporting, 2012 (March 20, “Locked and Dammed: Neglect erodes river commerce”, http://old.post-gazette.com/pg/12080/1218128-113.stm) AB

There is a price to be paid for neglecting the nation's aging system of locks and dams, an economic engine in desperate need of a tune-up.¶ On the Monongahela River, the price tag could be as high as $1 billion annually if the breakdown of a lock or dam puts the river off limits to barges delivering coal to power plants, according to a study performed last year for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.¶ About 500 miles down the Ohio River from Pittsburgh, 18 months of delays caused by repairs needed at three troubled locks is expected to cost one utility alone $16 million, according to a company spokesman.¶ For farmers in the Midwest, a three-month lock failure would add $71.6 million to the cost of moving grain to markets, according to a Texas Transportation Institute study issued in January.¶ The impact that the failure of a dam like the 105-year-old one on the Monongahela at Elizabeth could have on water supplies is worrisome enough it has drawn the attention of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security.¶ "It is not a far-fetched scenario. It can happen," said Joe Dinkel, executive director of operations for West View Water Authority, which serves more than 200,000 residents in the North Hills and Ohio River communities. The authority's Neville Island plant gets its water from a pool created by a Corps dam at Emsworth.¶ Mr. Dinkel said short-term outages could be managed "through some creative engineering and logistical arrangements." But if a dam would be out of commission for a period of several years, "That would be very troubling to us," he said.¶ "It would put us in a bind for a protracted period of time."¶

1NC Trade F/L

Price fluctuations inevitable – higher prices don’t cause your impact

Biopact 08

[unites specialists in several disciplines related to bioenergy—an economic anthropologist, a bio-engineer, a professor in chemistry, a tropical agronomist, a sociologist with expertise on Central-Africa, and a development economist, Jun 17, “Wageningen UR: biofuels not to blame for high food prices; decline in world food prices to continue”]

Unpredictable movements in food prices can still provide problems in the future. With high prices, the consequences in terms of hunger or malnutrition especially in poor urban areas will surface. But with low prices, the consequence for poor farmers will be large. Until recently, hundreds of millions of farmers could not lift themselves out of poverty because of low food prices. Seventy-five percent of the world's hungry people are still living in rural areas and are dependent on agriculture for their livelihoods. Over time, high prices should benefit them.

Food scarcity inevitable

Economist 10

[Climate change How to live with climate change Nov 25th 2010 | from PRINT EDITION http://www.economist.com/node/17575027/print]

Food security will become a crucial issue. Drought-resistant seeds are needed; and, given that the farmers least able to pay will require the hardiest varieties, seed companies’ efforts should be supplemented by state-funded research. Since genetic modification would help with this, it would be handy if people abandoned their prejudice against it. Even with better crops, better soil conservation, better planting patterns and better weather forecasts, **all of which are needed**, **there will still be regional calamities**. To ensure that food is always available, the global food market will have to be deeper and more resilient than it is now. That means abandoning the protectionism that bedevils agriculture today.

**Chinese domestic supply solves food shortage**

United States International Trade Commission, March 2011, “China's Agricultural Trade: Competitive Conditions and Effects on U.S. Exports”, <http://www.usitc.gov/publications/332/pub4219.pdf>

China is the world’s largest agricultural economy and the leading producer and consumer of many agricultural commodities. In recent years, its massive population and tremendous income growth have fueled a rapid increase in both the quantity and quality of food and fiber consumed. While China has met much of its needs by increasing domestic production, it has also emerged as a leading global importer of several agricultural commodities, including cotton, soybeans, vegetable oils, and hides and skins. China’s increase in imports has benefited its trade partners significantly, but only for a narrow range of products. At the same time, domestic policies to promote agricultural production and maintain self-sufficiency in staple foods increase the competitiveness of domestically produced goods over imported products and, in some cases, keep imports out altogether. As the Chinese agricultural sector has modernized and become more productive, China has also become an important global exporter of several horticultural products, including mandarin oranges, apples, apple juice, certain vegetables, and garlic.

No impact – stockpiles and Brazil solve soy beans – plus drought should’ve triggered the impacts

STRATFOR, 1/19/12, “Update on Global Food Commodities”, http://www.tcry.com/inewsdetail.php?NID=24

The popularity of soybeans is growing. While less soy is produced than the other three food staples, soybean production has increased by nearly 150 percent in the past two decades, nearly twice the rate of corn production. The United States is a major producer and exporter of soybeans, but the fastest growth has occurred in Brazil. Indeed, there is growing domestic and foreign investment into the South American soybean industry, particularly in the Mercosur countries -- Brazil, Uruguay, Paraguay and Argentina. The rising popularity of soy can be attributed to its being a relatively cheap source of protein for humans and livestock. Most soybeans are consumed in Asia's rapidly growing markets. China consumes more soy than any other nation. It imports more than 60 percent of globally traded soy, which represents more than 80 percent of China's total annual supply. To mitigate the risk posed by a sudden disruption in the soy trade, China stockpiles its soybeans for later consumption. The drought that is affecting corn production in Brazil and Argentina is also expected to affect soybean production as the season progresses. Projected output for Argentina this season has dropped by nearly 3 percent, but the country still expects a slight increase in production compared to the previous season. Brazil will not be as lucky. The above-average rainfall seen in soybean-producing center-west states, such as Mato Grosso, will not further compensate for the drought in Parana state. As such, soybean production in Brazil will decrease by 2 percent. This will contribute to a 3 percent decline of global soybean production. Despite this decline, Brazil is expected to become the world's largest exporter of soybeans in the 2011-2012 season following an 8 percent dip in U.S. production.

1NC Competitiveness F/L

Protectionism good - trade liberalization causes cycles of food shortages – turns their trade impace

Seedling 96

(October 1996, http://www.grain.org/publications/oct961-en.cfm)

In the South, the different elements of trade liberalisation often translate directly into food insecurity. Among these elements the following have the most severe impacts on peoples livelihood. In addition they easily result in internal migration, urban growth and environmental destruction: \* undoing land reform and allowing concentration of land ownership \* privatising water \* introducing monopoly control on seeds through IPRs \* diverting land from food to cash crops for exports \* diverting food from local to global markets Volatile prices and globalisation are creating an unstable, insecure and costly food system and undermine the ecological security of agriculture, the livelihood security of farmers and the food security of both poor and affluent consumers. "We in the South Asian subcontinent have more than the World Bank indices as our guide. We have our history", says Vandana Shiva. "India's worst famines took place when India's economy was most integrated though the globalisation of the colonial period."

1NC Economy F/L

Alt cause – congestion of freight train/highway makes your econ impacts inevitable

American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, “Transportation: Invest in America”, 2001, http://rail.transportation.org/Documents/FreightRailReport.pdf

Freight rail is vital to military mobilization and provides critically needed transportation system redundancy in national emergencies. At issue is the capacity of the freight-rail system to grow with the economy and continue to provide these public benefits. The U.S. economy is growing, and with it the demand for freight transportation services. With moderate growth in the economy — about three percent per year — domestic freight tonnage will increase by 57 percent by 2020 and import-export tonnage will increase by nearly 100 percent. Today trucks and the highway system carry 78 percent of domestic tonnage, the freight-rail system carries 16 percent, and barges and coastal shipping carry six percent. By 2020, the highway system must carry an additional 6,600 million tons of freight (an increase of 62 percent), and the freight rail system must carry an additional 888 million tons (an increase of 44 percent). However, the highway system is increasingly congested, and the social, economic, and environmental costs of adding new highway capacity are prohibitively high in many areas. State departments of transportation are asking if expanding the capacity of the freight-rail system in some cases might be a cost-effective way of increasing the capacity of the total transportation system. The freight-rail system was a triumph of 19th century America. It freed business and industry from the need to locate near sea, river, and canal ports. It opened up domestic east–west trade corridors and underpinned the development of the United States as an industrial power. But the freight-rail system was eclipsed in the 20th century by trucking and highways, which freed business and industry again, this time from the need to locate near rail lines and terminals. Long-haul trucking, which provided reliable, door-to-door service, captured a large share of east–west freight traffic from the railroads and much of the north–south freight traffic from coastal steamers and river barges. Much of the railroad industry slid into bankruptcy in the mid-1900s. The government deregulated the railroad industry in 1980. The mergers and reorganization that followed restructured the industry. System mileage was cut in half, from 380,000 miles of track at its peak in 1920 to 172,000 miles today. Ownership was consolidated into seven Class I railroads that today originate 84 percent of the traffic and generate 91 percent of railroad revenue, and 551 regional and short-line railroads that operate 30,000 miles of track, originate 16 percent of traffic, and generate nine percent of railroad revenue. Freight-rail productivity was increased; ton-miles handled per railroad employee have nearly quadrupled since 1980. Rates were dropped, service was improved, and market share was stabilized at 28 percent of total domestic ton-miles and about 40 percent of intercity ton-miles. However, the productivity gains and competitive rates have not been sufficient to rebuild market share and increase revenue. Railroad revenues have continued to drop. The industry’s return on investment has improved from about four percent in 1980 to about eight percent in 2000; however, it is still below the cost of capital at 10 percent. Most of the benefits of railroad reorganization and productivity improvements have accrued to shippers and the economy in the form of rate cuts, rather than to the railroads and their investors.

No solvency – climate change destroys outdated ports and rail along the Mississippi – key to efficient movement of goods

Harry Caldwell is the Chief of Freight Policy for the Federal Highway Administration, Kate H. Quinn is the Assistant Division Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration, Jacob Meunier , Ph.D. is an Analyst of Cambridge Systematics with experience in transportation planning and policy-making, John Suhrbier is a Principal of Cambridge Systematics, and Lance Grenzeback is someone I don’t know, “Potential Impacts of Climate Change on Freight Transport”, http://climate.dot.gov/documents/workshop1002/caldwell.pdf

A greater number of extreme weather events – hurricanes, snow storms, ice storms, floods, etc. – will increase damage to infrastructure used for the movement of freight. Each year, state and local transportation agencies spend an estimated five billion dollars repairing roads, bridges, and other infrastructure damaged by snow and ice. The most serious and costly water-related impacts of climate change are likely to be coastal flooding that would result from increased flood frequencies and flood elevations. The risk of damage to low-lying port facilities, locks, airports, roads, rail lines, tunnels, pipelines, ventilation shafts, and power lines is particularly great because of the large number of fright facilities – international gateways in particular – that are concentrated on the Atlantic, Pacific, and Gulf Coasts and along inland waterways

2NC Climate Change

Climate change collapses water operations

Harry Caldwell is the Chief of Freight Policy for the Federal Highway Administration, Kate H. Quinn is the Assistant Division Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration, Jacob Meunier , Ph.D. is an Analyst of Cambridge Systematics with experience in transportation planning and policy-making, John Suhrbier is a Principal of Cambridge Systematics, and Lance Grenzeback is someone I don’t know, “Potential Impacts of Climate Change on Freight Transport”, http://climate.dot.gov/documents/workshop1002/caldwell.pdf

Water operations are likely to become more expensive and less reliable. Not only will an increase in extreme weather events create more frequent disruptions in service, it will cause sediment shifts in channels, increasing requirements for dredging. Rising sea levels will reduce bridge clearances and the 12 Potential Impacts of Climate Change on Freight Transport The Potential Impacts of Climate Change on Transportation effectiveness of roll-on/roll-off port facilities at high tide. “RO-RO” facilities, such as those at the ports of New York/New Jersey, Baltimore, and Jacksonville, are used primarily for loading and unloading shipments of automobiles, farm equipment, and military equipment. Finally, the timing and demand for freight services is likely to shift as a result of global climate change. For example, coal shipments may decline as cleaner forms of energy are substituted. This would have serious consequences for the freight railroads, which carry virtually all of the coal mined in the U.S.. Coal accounts for 41 percent of tonnage moved by rail and about one-quarter of the revenues of Class I railroads. Heating oil and liquid natural gas shipments might also decline as winter heating needs lessen. In contrast, agricultural shipments are likely to rise as longer growing seasons make multiple harvests in a single year more common. Timber shipments (particularly hardwood) may also rise. The spatial pattern of agricultural production is also likely to change, causing demand for freight transportation in some regions of the United States to increase and in other regions to decline.

Impacts are inevitable – climate change

Harry Caldwell is the Chief of Freight Policy for the Federal Highway Administration, Kate H. Quinn is the Assistant Division Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration, Jacob Meunier , Ph.D. is an Analyst of Cambridge Systematics with experience in transportation planning and policy-making, John Suhrbier is a Principal of Cambridge Systematics, and Lance Grenzeback is someone I don’t know, “Potential Impacts of Climate Change on Freight Transport”, http://climate.dot.gov/documents/workshop1002/caldwell.pdf

Rising ocean levels and declining flows could also pose problems on the Mississippi River system, which handles a large percentage of the country’s bulk commodities, such as grain and coal. The result would be more water diversions and salt intrusion, and possibly the disappearance of much of the Mississippi Delta. This would necessitate a new shipping outlet to the Gulf. Droughts and floods would also disrupt traffic on the Mississippi. In 1988, low water levels prevented the movement of 800 barges in the river for several months. In 1993 and 1997, flooding again disrupted barge traffic and prevented ships from reaching the port of New Orleans for several days. Global climate change is likely to require reengineered freight facilities that are better able to withstand storm surges and flooding. For example, stronger, higher, corrosion- and scourresistant bridges will be needed in areas subject to storm surges and salt water contamination. Lift-on/lift-off port facilities may replace rollon/roll-off port facilities in harbors that experience unusually large tidal variations. Protective structures and water removal systems will be needed for road and rail tunnels subject to flooding. Global warming also could necessitate changes in the location where new infrastructure is built. For example, if the origin of farm and forest product shipments shifts as their optimum growing regions change, demand for new roads and rail lines would also shift.

1NC Solvency F/L

Ports can’t accommodate mega containers – guts aff solvency

Planning and Management Consultants, December 2002, “NATIONAL DREDGING NEEDS STUDY OF U.S.

PORTS AND HARBORS”, http://www.graduadosportuaria.com.ar/Vias%20Navegables/Tema%205/National%20dredging%20needs....pdf

While regional hub and spoke activity is still a major component of total transshipment, over time, especially with the emergence of carrier alliances, a global form of transshipment hubs has emerged. Often referred to as “mega” transshipment hubs, these container terminals are sited at locations sufficiently central to serve main east-west or north-south trade routes and provide fast and efficient feeder services to large sub-regions. They are also being designed and located to accommodate containerships with capacities of at least 6,000 TEUs. Unlike many traditional ports, they do not directly service inland markets. 51 For carriers operating new generations of container ships, megahubs offer many advantages over traditional liner ports. Depth and channel constraints are a major factor. Megahubs are being located in areas that do not require continual dredging, which is expensive and, in many nations, controversial and difficult to implement because of potential environmental impacts. Dredging is a constant process, particularly at inland ports where siltation occurs. 52 This is not the case with many of the new offshore megahubs, which have the advantage of naturally deep waters. Ports in the Caribbean, Mediterranean and along the Arabian Peninsula have low siltation rates and limited rainfall, thus there is minimal need for dredging. Big ships also have difficulty in navigating rivers, and in ports where congestion exists, this can be a major impediment. Many ports are struggling to develop infrastructure and improve the efficiency of existing facilities. At some point, expansion may become difficult or impossible. Ports in metropolitan areas must compete with other public interests for alternative land uses near port facilities. In many communities throughout the United States and abroad, local citizens oppose terminal development and dredging due to potential environmental impacts. For example, most major U.S. ports are in or near large urban areas where trucks and trains compete with commuters on crowded highways. Numerous rail at-grade street and highway crossings can hamper access to ocean terminals and cause delays for carriers, shippers and commuters. Collisions associated 51 See, Baird (1999) and DeMonie, G. “The Global Economy, Very Large Containerships and the Funding of MegaHubs.” Paper presented at the Cargo Systems Port Financing Conference, London, June 27, 1997. 52 With the exception of Seattle, WA and Long Beach, CA, most major U.S. ports are located at the mouths of rivers connected to inland waterway systems. Historically this has been advantageous since most goods were transported to and from inland markets via rivers and canals. However, a major disadvantage is that most harbors at the mouths of rivers are not natural deepwater harbors. At ports located at the mouths of rivers, upstream runoff collects soil from the land that is carried downstream and deposited on harbor bottoms. National Dredging Needs Study of U.S. Ports and Harbors 134 VI. Organization and Operation of the World Merchant Fleet with at-grade crossings and roads are a problem and may worsen because of increasing port traffic and growing urban congestion. 53 A recent study by the U.S. Maritime Administration found that more than half of all U.S. ports reported that traffic impediments are major infrastructure problems. 54 Land values in large urban areas can also be exorbitant, which makes expansion very costly. In order to serve existing clients, many ports are spending millions of dollars for development projects, but finding additional land to occupy is becoming increasingly more difficult.

Rail and trucks solve any impact to the aff

Texas Transportation Institute is a subdivision of Texas A&M University, December 2011, “AMERICA’S LOCKS & DAMS: “A TICKING TIME BOMB FOR AGRICULTURE?”, http://www.unitedsoybean.org/wp-content/uploads/Americas\_Locks\_And\_Dams.pdf

Four different lock closure time horizons—two weeks, one month, whole quarter, and one year—are considered for each of the six locks that are the focus of this study. Thus, 24 lock closure scenarios are simulated using the International Grain Transportation Model (IGTM). Changes in modal splits and associated transportation costs by type of transportation mode under each scenario are estimated. Table 3.9 and Table 3.10 provide changes in the total volume and associated costs of domestic grain transportation by each mode as a result of lock closures under different scenarios. In all scenarios, lock closures reduce the total volume (all modes combined) of domestic transportation of grain (see Table 3.9). Though alternative transport modes will haul more grain in some of the regions to partially offset the reduced barge transport due to lock closures, the net effect is negative under any scenario. Except for LaGrange Lock in the three-month lock closure scenario, lock closure of any duration decreases the volume of domestic grain transported by barge, as well as the total volume transported by all three modes. The volume of domestic grain transportation by rail is projected to increase and the volume of truck transportation to decrease under most scenarios. When US grain is exported to EU countries from the Ports of Duluth and Toledo, the grain is first transported on small ships to the port of Montreal, Canada, and then transferred to ocean-going vessels. Unavailability of barge transportation above the closed locks would normally cause more export grain shipments via the Great Lakes to compensate for the loss of exports via New Orleans. During lock closures of one month or less, unavailability of barge transportation above the closed locks does not increase the small ship transportation volume. However, when the locks are closed for three months or longer, small ships start moving an increased volume of grain via the Great Lakes. The effect of lock closures on modal splits in grain transportation is not equal across the locks. For example, Lock 52 is affected the most under any lock closure scenario. If it is closed for two weeks, the total volume of grain transportation by barge will be reduced by 1.6 million tons and this reduced barge volume will be offset by rail. At the same time, the volume of truck transportation will also be reduced in the same amount, since there will no longer be a need for trucking the grain from storage facilities to barge locations. This pattern at Lock 52 holds under all scenarios. Under lock closures of one year, the reductions in barge transportation at Lock 20 and Lock 25 surpass that of Lock 52.

2NC Ports

Non-inland Gulf Coast ports are crucial gateways to inland waterways

Planning and Management Consultants, December 2002, “NATIONAL DREDGING NEEDS STUDY OF U.S.

PORTS AND HARBORS”, http://www.graduadosportuaria.com.ar/Vias%20Navegables/Tema%205/National%20dredging%20needs....pdf

When compared to the Atlantic and Pacific Coasts, ports along the Gulf handle considerably less containerized cargo. However, the Gulf Coast accounts for almost half of all international trade in terms of tonnage, which highlights its significant role as a point of entry and exit for bulk commodities (see Table V-13 and V-14). Almost 500 million tons of international cargo flow through Gulf ports. Nearly one-half of this is in the form of crude petroleum imported from Mexico, South America, the Mid-East and Africa. Iron, steel and ores from Latin America, Europe and Africa are also important imports. Grain is the leading U.S. export from the Gulf Coast at about 57 millions tons. Almost one-half of grain shipments go to Asia via the Panama Canal and the remainder is exported worldwide. Most grain is shipped down river from the Midwest and Plains states and exported abroad. Geographical location has a major influence on the type of cargo at Gulf Coast ports. **Many Gulf Coast ports serve as gateways to the United States’ vast inland system of navigable waterways that serve as conduits for bulk imports and exports**. Because bulk goods are heavy and generally low in value, they are much cheaper to transport via barges rather than on rail or trucks. International bulk cargo is often traded through ports such as New Orleans, where it can be loaded and unloaded onto barges or smaller ships and transported to the central U.S. by way of the Mississippi or other inland waterways. River ports in cities such as Memphis, Tulsa, St. Louis, Chicago and St. Paul, Minnesota serve as inland distribution centers. Trade in the Gulf Coast is concentrated within a few bulk commodities, primarily crude petroleum and grain. Therefore, Gulf Coast ports are more vulnerable to fluctuations in world commodity markets. For example, in 1973, the Arab oil embargo effectively halted flows of crude oil from the Mid-East. Consequently, ports along the Gulf saw a significant decline in tanker traffic and revenues. In contrast, the embargo had less of an impact on coastal regions that handle a wider range of cargo such as the Atlantic Coast. Ports along the Atlantic deal in substantial volumes of crude petroleum, about one-quarter of total U.S. imports and exports. However, as a percentage of total tonnage, crude petroleum accounts for only about 28 percent of Atlantic Coast trade. In contrast, crude petroleum makes up about two-thirds of trade on the Gulf Coast in term of both value and tonnage. Although the Gulf Coast currently has a relatively small share of the container market, it will likely grow as north-to-south trade routes develop between the U.S. and Latin America. 24 Over the next decade, NAFTA should result in more container trade along the Gulf Coast as well, and if the U.S. embargo on Cuban trade is lifted, the Gulf Coast should have tremendous opportunities for growth. In September of 1999, the U.S. Senate passed a measure to reduce restrictions on food exports to Cuba that will give shippers of bulk goods an excellent opportunity to expand their markets. The amendment will allow the sale of agricultural products to Cuba, and allow U.S. banks and other institutions to finance bulk-food exports. Among those benefiting would be U.S. agricultural producers and Gulf Coast ports. Before Fidel Castro came 24 Americana Ships and Stevedoring Services of America signed an agreement in April of 2000 to develop a 300-acre container terminal at the Port of Texas City, TX, which has traditionally been a tanker port. The facility will be able to handle ships drawing up to 50 feet of water.The National Dredging Needs Study of Ports and Harbors 67 V. Major Commodity Groups and Commodity Flows in the United States into power, Cuba was a very important trading partner for Gulf Coast ports such as New Orleans. When trade restrictions are lifted, Cuba should become an important consumer market in the long term, and in the short term, Cuba will need to rebuild its dilapidated infrastructure. For U.S. ports, this translates into more business, particularly in the form of exported bulk, neo-bulk and break-bulk cargo.

Mega-containers will be the predominant freight in international commerce

Diane Feinstein is a Senior U.S. Senator from California, 4/26/12, “ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2013”, http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CRPT-112srpt164/html/CRPT-112srpt164.htm

Past investments have provided adequate, albeit in some cases inefficient, infrastructure to deal with current commodity and cargo movements. Only about 20 percent of the administration's proposed construction budget is dedicated to navigation projects. Despite whatever other efforts may be underway to meet the goal of doubling exports, the budget request for the Corps for improvements and maintenance of the waterway system falls woefully short of the needs. Ports are routinely not dredged to their full authorized dimensions. It is hard for this Committee to understand how exports can be doubled without improvements and adequate maintenance to the projects that provide for the transit and the exit points for these commodities. The Committee is concerned that there are major changes in worldwide shipping and trade occurring and on the horizon that our Nation's water infrastructure is not equipped to handle. One of these changes is the enlargement and deepening of the Panama Canal that will allow a shift to larger container vessels with a need for deeper ports and navigation channels. However, larger vessels are also transiting the Suez Canal and more and more will likely be attempting to call at the Nation's ports. If larger ships are unable to dock here, they may be forced to dock in other countries with the appropriate infrastructure and then reconfigure ships and cargos to accommodate U.S. water infrastructure, leading to increased transportation costs, higher end-unit prices and loss of jobs. Along with deeper channels to accommodate these larger vessels, ports will need efficient dockside infrastructure to handle the throughput of this increased trade. Intermodal improvements at ports and possibly short sea shipping will also be a part of trade movements in and among ports. Without this system, transportation of commodities, exports and imports, would become vastly more expensive. For more than 25 years, the current mechanisms have been in place. However, how water transportation infrastructure is planned, designed, constructed, maintained, and funded has not kept pace with the pace of change in worldwide trade. Water transportation infrastructure was and continues to be a linchpin of our national economy. It is time to determine if there is a better way to develop this infrastructure. The Committee believes it is important for the Congress to rethink the Federal role in water transportation to determine if there is a better way to plan, build and finance this critical infrastructure. The Committee will work with the appropriate authorizing and tax writing committees as well as industry and the administration to determine a path forward to provide the water transportation infrastructure that will be required for the next 50-100 years.

Mo ev

Center for Transportation Research, May 1999 “MEGA-CONTAINERSHIPS AND MEGA-CONTAINERPORTS IN THE GULF OF MEXICO: A LITERATURE REVIEW AND ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY”, http://web.cecs.pdx.edu/~maf/Reports/A%20LITERATURE%20REVIEW%20AND%20ANNOTATED.pdf

While mega-containerships are not presently dominating trade routes, many believe they will on several key routes in the near future. This belief is evident in the forecasts of leading economic analysts as well as in the changing fleet orders of major shipping lines. VZM/TranSystems, using DRI/McGraw Hill data, estimates that a larger share of containerized cargo will be transported by mega-containerships in future years. Estimates have placed 30 percent of containerized cargo on ships in the 4,000–6,000-TEU class by the year 2010, and nine percent of all cargo in 2010 is expected to be handled by ships larger than 6,000 TEUs. These statistics must be interpreted carefully, as they are formulated under unconstrained conditions. In other words, they assume adequate future port infrastructure as well as a market demand for containers. While the latter assumption is relatively solid, the infrastructure assumption is weak (26).

2NC Rails and Trucks Solve

We control uniqueness – waterways are the least preferred form of transportation of bulk goods and barges are the most polluting mode of transportation

Brad Walker is the Head of the Izaak Walton League of America, a member of the Nicollet Island Coalition, February 2010, “Big Price – Little Benefit”, http://www.iwla.org/index.php?ht=a/GetDocumentAction/i/2079

Multiple factors demonstrate that the proposed construction of the new locks is not justified: •Barge traffic on the Upper Mississippi River-Illinois Waterway has been flat since 1980**, and in recent years continued a trend of significant drops in volume**. Locks currently in operation have excess capacity of more than 50 percent, which would accommodate any reasonable future increase in lock demand. •Due to the lack of consistent funding, the Corps has been unable to keep current on necessary maintenance on the UMR-IWW lock system. This large and growing backlog creates a perpetual problem that new construction does not solve. Because basic maintenance is necessary for any lock in use, new construction only adds another expense to existing unmet maintenance funding needs. •Several non-structural and small-scale measures, including barge traffic appointment scheduling, have been identified by the Corps as measures that can reduce barge lockage delays. These measures need to be instituted and evaluated before the Corps proceeds with any new lock construction. An important step in that evaluation process is completing another Benefit-Cost Analysis for the new locks using conditions subsequent to full implementation of non-structural and smallscale measures. •The barge industry asserts that shipping by barge is significantly more fuel efficient than rail transportation and therefore less polluting. More complete analysis of transportation fuel efficiency demonstrates that this claim is incorrect because it ignores the use of highly efficient rail systems and does not take into consideration that barges travel more miles following the course of the river than trains do to get to the same destination. •The Corps’ own economic analysis shows new construction of seven 1,200-foot locks will result in a negative return on investment. Based on two decades of flat or decreasing barge traffic, the proposed new locks will likely result in a loss of 80 cents for every dollar provided by taxpayers. Of additional concern is the fact that **other Corps lock projects currently underway are exceeding their initial cost-estimates by double and even triple the estimated amounts**.Vi | Big Price — LittLe Benefit •Previous legislation 2 established a trust fund financed by barge industry contributions to pay 50 percent of the cost of new inland waterway navigation construction and major rehabilitation of existing navigation infrastructure. Today the fund is essentially bankrupt due largely to massive cost overruns on Corps construction projects on the Ohio River and the fact that the barge industry’s mandated contribution is insufficient to support current project costs. This trust fund will be unable to provide significant funding for NESP projects for potentially 5 years. During this period, the cost 2 Section 1103 (g), Water Resources Development Act of 1986, P.L. 99–662, as amended of constructing the seven new 1,200-foot locks on the UMR-IWW will only continue to escalate, further worsening the already negative return on NESP construction investment.

Rail system is more efficient and cost-effective than barges – it also supports more bulk and is faster

Brad Walker is the Head of the Izaak Walton League of America, a member of the Nicollet Island Coalition, February 2010, “Big Price – Little Benefit”, http://www.iwla.org/index.php?ht=a/GetDocumentAction/i/2079

The barge industry asserts that inland waterways barge traffic is more fuel efficient than other modes of transportation. Industry representatives cite a 2007 Texas Transportation Institute report 28 to support this claim. The report includes the data in Table 3 portraying the superior fuel efficiency of barges in shipping cargo compared with trains and trucks. However, these comparisons do not take into account the variation in miles traveled to get from one point to another by water, rail, or road. The comparison between the distance of two modes of transportation both leaving one destination and going to the same final destination is called circuity. The Texas report acknowledges that nationally, barges have a 1.3 to 1 circuity factor when compared with trains, 29 which means that a barge must travel 30 percent farther than a rail car to reach the same destination Any comparison of barge and rail efficiencies on the UMR-IWW must include the geographic realities of rivers. Rivers do not flow directly in straight lines; there are many turns that increase the distance a barge must travel. **The rail system is not constrained by the flow of the river and follows a much straighter path to the Gulf of Mexico at New Orleans.** But instead of comparing rail miles to barge miles on the Mississippi River using the acknowledged national 1.3 to 1 circuity factor, the Texas report uses a barge to truck comparison to establish a 1 to 1 circuity factor. (For comparison, a researcher at the University of Illinois 30 estimated a 1.38 to 1 circuity factor for barges specifically on the Upper Mississippi River.) Also ignored in this report was the use by rail companies of “unit trains” for shipping grain long distances. Unit trains are made up of cars going to the same final destination carrying one type of commodity. A 2008 study by researchers at Iowa State University 31 shows that unit grain trains moving from Iowa to New Orleans have a much better fuel efficiency – 640 versus 413 ton-miles per gallon – than an average train. Incorporating both the rail circuity factor and unit grain trains into a revision of the Texas Transportation Institute’s table (see Table 4) shows that barges have virtually no fuel efficiency advantage over an average train and are far less fuel efficient than unit grain trains. The primary grain commodity used in the NESP studies to support the construction of new locks is corn, which is also shipped by unit grain trains. The barge industry, as stated above, asserts that shipping commodities on barges is more efficient than rail, saving fuel and therefore emitting fewer pollutants. However, **normal rail shipping is nearly equivalent to the fuel efficiency of barge shipping, and unit grain trains are significantly more efficient than barges.**

\*\*\* Offense

1NC Food Security Bad Turn

American food security leads to exports of GMOs to the rest of the world

Deborah James is a Writer for the Global Exchange website, “Food Security, Farming, and the WTO and CAFTA”, http://www.globalexchange.org/resources/wto/agriculture

Effects of “Free Trade” Agricultural Policies on Small Farmers and Food Security CAFTA and the FTAA would consolidate and expand free market policies that have already devastated rural communities under NAFTA and the WTO. Loss of Small Farm Income The devastation of Mexican corn farmers due to NAFTA most sharply exemplifies the horrifying effects of these policies. After NAFTA eliminated Mexican quotas for corn, artificially-priced U.S. corn flooded the market. U.S. agribusinesses typically dump corn on the Mexican market at prices 30 percent below the cost of production. Before NAFTA, Mexico only imported about 2.5 million tons of corn per year. In 2001, they imported over 6 million tons of corn. The price of Mexican corn fell 70 percent. Millions of small family corn farmers have been left without a source of income, and have been forced to abandon their communities in search of a way to feed their families. The bedrock of traditional Mexican rural life, corn farming families, have been torn apart by NAFTA. While agreements like NAFTA and the WTO offer policies that favor agribusiness, they have been slow to address concerns of developing countries facing rock-bottom commodities prices. For example, in the WTO, African countries have raised the issue of low commodities prices in cotton, a staple of income for countries like Benin, Senegal, Mali, and Chad. Recent U.S. production of cotton has doubled, causing a world depression in cotton prices. In a July WTO meeting, the Trade Minister of Benin stated that Benin was “not prepared to accept the death of thousands of peasants as the price of a deal.” Loss of Food Sovereignty Under free trade regimes, developing countries are unable to use traditional methods of encouraging self-sufficiency in food production, because NAFTA and the WTO, as would CAFTA, prohibit internal support programs and import controls (quotas). The result has been an increased dependence on imported staples that have to be bought on the global market instead of grown locally. Since many countries can’t afford to buy imported food, they have to increase their foreign debt or suffer increased rates of malnutrition. Under CAFTA, Central American countries were able to negotiate an exemption to tariff reductions only on one corn variety-- white corn. This means that protective tariffs for staple food products such as rice and beans are prohibited. The result will be that in Nicaragua, for instance, tariff-free imports of yellow corn would increase ten times their current amount in the first year of CAFTA. Increased Food Prices Consumer prices were supposed to decline under NAFTA—yet while farmer’s commodity prices have plummeted, consumer food prices have risen in all three NAFTA countries. The U.S. consumer price index for food rose by 22 percent between 1994 and 2002. While Mexican farmers now earn 70 percent less for their corn, they pay 50 percent more for tortillas. Without domestic support for family farmers, poor countries have become increasingly dependent on food imports. Imports of agriculture products in Mexico have increased by 44 percent since NAFTA, pushing local producers out of the market. This is true for products such as: wheat, potatoes, rice, barley, coffee, milk products, sugar, fruits and many others. When exchange rates fluctuate, this can lead to a dramatic rise—sometimes a doubling or tripling—in food prices for poor consumers. Loss of Land and Increase in Migration Under NAFTA and the WTO, over one and a half million Mexican farmers have lost their sources of income, forcing them to abandon their farms. This has created a massive farmers’ migration to big cities and other countries in search of jobs. In 2002, an average of 600 Mexicans were forced off their land each day. Annually now 500,000 Mexicans per year attempt to cross the U.S.-Mexico border to find a way to feed their families. In the past five years, 1600 Mexican migrants have died while trying to cross the U.S.-Mexico border searching for jobs. Under CAFTA, Central American corn, rice, beans, and sorghum farmers, as well as poultry, pig, cow, and dairy producers all stand to be driven off their land by cheap imports. In Guatemala alone, experts predict that CAFTA will result in the loss of 45,000 to 120,000 agricultural jobs. Corporate Consolidation Since NAFTA was implemented, 38,000 small farms have been lost in the United States, and 11 percent of Canadian farms have gone bankrupt. A mere 2 percent of farms in the United States control 50 percent of American agricultural sales. Over 73 percent of the nation’s farms share less than 7 percent of the market value of agricultural products, while 7.2 percent of farms receive 72 percent of the market value of products sold. Eight-two percent of U.S. corn exports are controlled by three agribusiness firms- Cargill, Archer Daniels Midland (ADM), and Zen Noh. While family farmer incomes have plummeted during the first 7 years of NAFTA, ADM’s profits went from $110 million to $301 million, while ConAgra’s grew from $143 million to $413 million. Corporate Control of Plants and Seeds The Trade-Related Intellectual Property (TRIPs) agreement within the WTO establishes global and uniform protection for trademarks, copyrights and patents. Perhaps most controversial and worrisome is the fact that these protections also apply to patenting of life forms. For example, traditional, plant-derived medicines used by Indigenous populations in countries such as Brazil could be patented by a transnational corporation for profit, as long as the Indigenous peoples had not already done so. It is highly unlikely, however, that Indigenous communities would seek a patent, because plants are considered to be a shared resource, not a commodity to be exploited for profit. CAFTA and the TRIPs agreement also undermine global access to and distribution of seeds and, therefore, the food supply. As corporations begin to patent seeds, local farmers must pay annual fees and/or sign technology use agreements that prohibit saving patented seeds and limit the use of seeds that have been used by generations. Subsistence farmers cannot afford the cost of purchasing new seeds each year, and the limiting of seed varieties makes food supplies vulnerable to plant pests and diseases. The Spread of Genetically Modified Organisms Currently, agreements under the WTO and CAFTA grant unprecedented rights to multinational corporations producing genetically modified organisms (GMOs). The WTO has ruled that GMOs must be treated no differently than their conventional counterparts. Thus, consumers are unknowingly being used as guinea pigs for the powerful biotech industry. Scientists have argued that the spread of GMOs drastically reduces biodiversity as a result of the contamination of conventional crops by pollen from those containing GMOs. Currently, no satisfactory protections exist to safeguard our food supply from known or unknown dangers of this new technology. Under CAFTA, GMO corporations would be granted the power to file suit against countries whose farmers replanted GMO seeds. Environmental Degradation Industrial agriculture practices replace sustainable family farm practices and take an extra toll on the environment that is not reflected in consumer prices. The overuse of fertilizers and chemicals, overgrazing, and the unenforced regulation of factory farm dumping of agricultural byproducts such as excrement and pesticides into rivers and streams all damage the quality of air, water, and soil, which are our shared resources. Corporate “free trade” agreements continue to stick communities and taxpayers with the costs of cleanup and loss of environmental quality, while corporations reap the profits embodied in industrial agriculture. Erosion of Democracy In order to be in compliance with NAFTA, the Mexican government actually had to change the Mexican Constitution’s land redistribution statutes to allow foreign ownership of land. This allowed lands owned collectively by farming communities to be sold off or taken by creditors. This move led to the uprising of the Indigenous people of Chiapas in the Zapatista rebellion on January 1, 1994 – the very day NAFTA took effect. The Zapatistas view NAFTA as a death knell for Indigenous people. Under Chapter 11 of NAFTA, corporations are also empowered to directly sue national governments (called investor-to-state dispute resolution) in the event that domestic legislation interferes with their profit maximization. CAFTA includes these same investor rights, inviting challenges from foreign corporations over governmental actions such as GMO food labeling, increased food safety standards, or local purchasing preferences. Farmers across Mexico protested the implementation of the final phase-in of NAFTA agricultural policies on January 1, 2003. A movement called “The Countryside Can’t Take Anymore!” is working to educate the world about the failed promises of “free trade” in Mexico. And hundreds of thousands of farmers in Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua have mobilized against CAFTA and the FTAA in recent years. Food is a Human Right: Towards a Policy of Food Sovereignty Farmers worldwide are demanding an entirely different approach to agriculture and trade, one that prioritizes food sovereignty, security, and the preservation of rural livelihoods. Via Campesina, the global movement of peasant and family farmers’ organizations, has led the way in advocating Food as a Human Right and is demanding that governments uphold their right to food sovereignty. A twelve-step program for global human rights and food security would include: 1. Agriculture out of the WTO. Food is a human right and should not be treated the same as any other commodity. Food as a human right demands that governments set national policies that encourage food security—local and diverse production of food to guarantee adequate and accessible nutrition for all citizens. Governments must maintain the ability to pass laws for the national security of their populations—food sovereignty. 2. Stop Dumping. Developed countries should restore farm programs that place price floors under commodity prices and establish supply management and food security reserves to prevent cheap commodities from being dumped on global markets. International trade cooperation should aim at sharing and enforcing this responsibility. 3. Improve Market Access. Developed countries should address the problem of tariff escalation, the practice of increasing tariffs with the level of processing. Developed countries should reduce their tariffs, eliminating higher tariffs faster than lower ones. Without the requisite reduction of high import tariffs on processed and semi-processed commodities, commodity-dependent countries will be unable to diversify into higher stages of the commodity values chain. 4. Reinstate Qualitative Restrictions. Developing countries should be able to put in place qualitative restrictions on imports as well as domestic subsidies for the protection of and support to household-subsistence farming. Developing countries should be encouraged to produce food for their domestic market. 5. Promote Fair Trade. Cash crops like coffee, cocoa, sugar, and bananas represent the largest source of income for developing countries. The Fair Trade system is the best model for an agricultural trading system that guarantees fair prices and community empowerment, based on cooperative economics, farmer empowerment, increased transparency, and decreased power of purchasing monopolies. All commodity crops should be produced under the Fair Trade system. 6. Reinstate Global Commodity Agreements. These agreements, which regulate supply and demand to keep prices within a steady range, promote stability and sustainability within rural communities. Action to reverse the trend in falling commodity prices is essential to any initiative undertaken at the international level to facilitate sustainable development, poverty reduction and debt relief. 7. No Patents on Life. Seeds, plants, animals, and their components–the fabric of life–should be exempt from patenting. Agricultural policy must preserve the rights of Indigenous farmers to utilize their cultural knowledge and collective use of resources. Indigenous knowledge (as related to agriculture methods, use of seeds and plants) should be protected from biopiracy. The TRIPs provisions in the WTO that permit multinational corporations to patent seeds originally developed by farmers, requiring farmers to pay for the right to replant those seeds, must be abolished. 8. No GMOs. Laws and regulations on sanitary and phytosanitary standards should guarantee high quality and safe food for consumers and the environment. GMOs have yet to be proven safe. Utilizing the pre-cautionary principle, any trade agreement should ban the trade of genetically-modified substances. 9. Promote Real Land Reform. There can be no real sustainable development without massive global land reform to remedy the needs of millions of landless peasants around the world. Any global agreement that is truly based on the needs of the poor must prioritize the fair and adequate redistribution of lands that have been concentrated from colonial times in the hands of an elite few. Additionally, the necessary resources must be redistributed to enable them to productively work the lands. 10. Enforce Labor Laws for Farm Workers. Globally, farm workers are among the most exploited laborers, suffering the lowest wages. Even in the U.S., farm workers are not covered under many domestic labor laws. Any global agreement relating to agriculture should include provisions for the enforcement of a living wage for agricultural producers, and include all of the basic International Labor Organization’s labor rights. These include the right to organize freely and form a union; the right to strike; the right to adequate health and safety protections; freedom from discrimination in the workplace; and the elimination of forced overtime. 11. Create Policies Supportive of Small Farmers and Sustainable Agriculture. International financial institutions and governments should finance sustainable agricultural practices and the improvement of rural infrastructures. They should acknowledge that small farmers and cooperatives need policies that protect land ownership, provide access to credit, offer technical assistance, provide appropriate technology transfers, and guarantee pricing mechanisms that reflect the true costs of production. Investments in agriculture should promote local knowledge and organic and sustainable production systems rather than artificial fertilizers, pesticides, and herbicides that harm the planet and place communities at risk. 12. Promote Real Democracy. All countries should guarantee that rural populations are represented in decision-making, nationally and globally. Small producers, farm workers, consumers, and their organizations, previously excluded, should be involved—and invested with real decision-making power—in trade negotiations that affect their futures. Governments must have the right to enact legislation that protects the environment, health and livelihood of its citizens. Corporate globalization is responsible for the loss of land, the loss of income, and the exposure to unsafe food and unhealthy working conditions for millions of people worldwide. Furthermore, it has severely exacerbated the risk of hunger and starvation, and caused the general erosion of rural communities and biodiversity across the globe. Fortunately, agricultural policies that promote food sovereignty have been developed. We have the power to change the global food system if we work together with farmers, environmentalists, consumers, and human rights advocates to say NO to the global corporatization of the food system and YES to people and earth-centered global agricultural policy.

Genetic engineering poses a risk greater than nuclear weapons

Ho, ‘97

[Dr. Mae-Wan, heads the Bio-Electrodynamics laboratory at the Open University in Milton Keynes in the UK, “The Unholy Alliance,” The Ecologist, Vol. 27, No. 4, July/August, ASP //umn-kn

The present situation is reminiscent of the development of nuclear energy which gave us the atom bomb, and the nuclear power stations that we now know to be hazardous to health and also to be environmentally unsustainable on account of the long-lasting radioactive wastes they produce. Joseph Rotblat, the British physicist who won the 1995 Nobel Prize after years of battling against nuclear weapons, has this to say. "My worry is that other advances in science may result in other means of mass destruction, maybe more readily available even than nuclear weapons. Genetic engineering is quite a possible area, because of these dreadful developments that are taking place there."(35) The large-scale release of transgenic organisms is much worse than nuclear weapons or radioactive nuclear wastes, as genes can replicate indefinitely, spread and recombine. There may yet be time enough to stop the industry's dreams turning into nightmares if we act now, before the critical genetic "melt-down" is reached.

That causes trade wars

Marisa Guederrama and Neil Meyer, “Government Intervention Affecting Agricultural Trade”, <http://www.ag.uidaho.edu/aers/PDF/tradepapers/tradepaper.pdf>

Trade-distorting policies include price support programs, commodity programs, marketing programs, and programs that subsidize production costs. U.S. farm programs have a long history, beginning with the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933. These programs provided price and income support for the major food grain and feed grain crops, cotton, dairy, and specialty crops such as tobacco, peanuts and sugar. Farm programs for food grains and feed grains required farmers to leave land idle in order to qualify for price and income support payments. Also, farmers were required to produce these program crops every year to maintain eligibility for program benefits. The tobacco and peanut programs imposed production or marketing quotas on producers and limited the areas where these commodities could be grown. These programs affected the profitability of producing and marketing selected farm commodities, which, in turn, affected the quantities available, commodity prices, and competitiveness in international markets. In most cases, trade policies were needed to make these domestic farm programs workable. Export subsidies were needed to make U.S. wheat, cotton and rice competitive in world markets, and import quotas were needed to protect high domestic dairy, peanut and sugar prices from cheaper imports. However, in a major policy change, Congress passed the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act--the 1996 Farm Bill--which terminated most of the U.S. farm commodity programs. The EU Common Agriculture Policy (CAP) includes farm programs for virtually all of the agricultural commodities produced in the member countries. The EU countries used to be major importers of U.S. agricultural products. However, generous price supports have encouraged production increases to the point where the EU now produces a surplus of some commodities, such as dairy products, wheat, and beef. These surpluses are exported but large subsidies are required because EU domestic prices are above world prices. These subsidies depress world prices, to the advantage of consumers in importing countries and to the detriment of competing domestic producers and producers in other exporting countries. Prospects for Change Trade barriers and distortions lead to inefficient use of the world’s resources, which affects standards of living throughout the world. The distortions in the market change the economic opportunities for producers and consumers. For example, domestic consumers may pay more and have fewer, and perhaps lower quality, products to choose from, while domestic producers make greater profits. Actions by one country that harm other countries often lead to retaliation in the form of import restrictions or export subsidies of their own. These **"trade wars" usually result in losses to both nations**. On a multilateral basis, the prospects for removing or reducing trade barriers and distortions are brighter now than they have been for a long time. The GATT-UR agreement was the first to address a wide range of agricultural trade issues, including both trade barriers and trade- distorting farm policies and programs (see Leaflet 7). The changes required under this agreement are modest but a precedent has been set for future rounds of negotiations. Unilaterally, the United States, by implementing the 1996 farm bill, or FAIR Act, will effectively dismantle many of its own trade- distorting domestic programs discussed above. The target price-loan rate scheme which, coupled with export subsidies, was a major distortion to world trade, will gradually be eliminated. The pressure to pursue such widespread changes in farm policy emanated from U.S. budget deficits and not from external sources such as GATT-UR. The farm difficulties of 1998 and 1999 may bring a reevaluation of US policy. The United States has aggressively sought free-trade agreements with other countries. The Israeli-U.S. Free Trade Agreement developed in 1984, the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement completed in 1989, the Japan-U.S. Beef-Citrus accord, and NAFTA are examples. NAFTA is discussed in detail in Leaflet No. 8. However, it is important to recognize that national political and economic objectives generally outweigh consideration of specific impacts on the agricultural and food production sector. It is unrealistic to expect negative international trade impacts on one or more commodities to take precedence over positive benefits realized by politically influential non-agricultural sectors of the economy. Also, international trade policies, which favor the larger sub-sectors of agriculture, such as food and feed grains, can be expected to receive favorable federal government consideration at the expense of minor crops. The Caribbean Basin Initiative (CBI) serves as an excellent example of how broad national policies can affect the competitive position of U.S. agricultural commodities. The United States unilaterally enacted the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act of 1983 with the intent of fostering economic growth in 27 small Caribbean countries through trade, economic assistance and tax measures. It was assumed that such growth would enhance national security, as well as other economic and political interests of the United States, by creating more political stability in the region and reducing the chances of unfriendly governments coming into power. The principal component of the CBI is the provision of duty-free access to U.S. markets. Most agricultural products from CBI countries are eligible for duty-free status, which increases their competitiveness in the U.S. market. Concluding Remarks In its simplest form, international trade is a relatively straightforward concept. Through trade, countries are free to specialize in the production of those commodities in which they have a comparative advantage. As a result, world production increases and all nations benefit. In practice, of course, international trade is much more complex. Government policies interfere with the free movement of goods and services, causing distortions in domestic economies. Some industries benefit from trade restrictions, others lose. If trade is liberalized, some sectors of the economy will benefit and others may be worse off, even though the nation as a whole benefits. The U.S. agricultural sector is affected by a broad array of U.S. government policies and regulations, and by the policies of foreign governments. U.S. producers and others in the U.S. agricultural sector have a vested interest in monitoring and analyzing new traderelated policy proposals, in order to be represented in the government policy formulation process, to anticipate impacts, and to be able to adjust quickly to change.

1NC Terrorist Turn

Terrorists will attack inland waterways

Bakir 07 (1-1-2007 Niyazi Onur Bakir is a postdoctoral research associate at University of Southern California Center for Homeland Security, “A Brief Analysis of Threats and Vulnerabilities in the Maritime Domain”, http://research.create.usc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1004&context=nonpublished\_reports)

3.2.2.1 Critical Coastal Targets. Maritime terrorism has hit US and non-US coastal infrastructure in the past. Terrorists have a plethora of potential targets for launching deadly attacks on the US coast. History of maritime terrorism suggests that terrorists have already exercised a variety of options to execute such attacks. In recent years, many terrorist organizations have added various means of suicide attacks in their portfolios. This poses further challenges to those who seek to deter terrorists from attacking one of the most vulnerable points of the nation. LNG facilities, chemical plants, urban centers, bridges and nuclear plants are among those critical targets that are exposed to waterborne terrorism threat. There are various ways to attack critical coastal targets. Terrorists may acquire new vessels through piracy or smuggle humans on vessels that are destined to sail near the target of interest. Piracy is a rising threat across the globe, and terrorists are already known to use piracy for financing purposes. Having acquired a ship to execute an attack, terrorists may detonate explosives on the ship at a time or location of their choice, or ram the ship into the target. It may be difficult to execute an attack hijacking an LNG ship due to security guidelines followed by the Coast Guard, but vessels with other forms of hazardous cargo may be vulnerable to hijacking. In particular, ships carrying bulk shipments of ammonium nitrate are potentially vulnerable. A huge volume of ammonium nitrate flows through US inland waterways each year. For example, in 1997 over 400,000 tons of ammonium nitrate was shipped through the Mississippi river. These shipments pass near urban centers such as New Orleans, St. Louis, Memphis, and Pittsburgh. In order to monitor and reduce vulnerability against ammonium nitrate and other hazardous cargo shipments (commonly called certain dangers cargo or CDC), the Coast Guard acted to introduce new regulations in 2004. These regulations include mandatory development of security plans at vessels and facilities handling ammonium nitrate, preparation of vessel maintenance and security records, training of a facility and vessel security officer, and installation of vessel and facility security systems. These new regulations increased the transportation cost of ammonium nitrate.

That turns all of your advantages – the US would shutdown EVERYTHING, collapsing the economy and trade

Flynn 03 (Stephen, Natl Sec Studies, “The Fragile state of container security,” testimony before the senate, March 20 http://www.cfr.org/publication.html?id=5730)

A year later I joined with former senators Warren Rudman and Gary Hart in preparing our report, “America: Still Unprepared—Still In Danger.” We observed that “nineteen men wielding box-cutters forced the United States to do to itself what no adversary could ever accomplish: a successful blockade of the U.S. economy. If a surprise terrorist attack were to happen tomorrow involving the sea, rail, or truck transportation systems that carry millions of tons of trade to the United States each day, the response would likely be the same—a self-imposed global embargo.” Based on that analysis, we identified as second of the six critical mandates that deserve the nation’s immediate attention: “Make trade security a global priority; the system for moving goods affordably and reliably around the world is ripe for exploitation and vulnerable to mass disruption by terrorists.” This is why the topic of today’s hearing is so important. The stakes are enormous. U.S. prosperity—and much of its power—relies on its ready access to global markets. Both the scale and pace at which goods move between markets has exploded in recent years thanks in no small part to the invention and proliferation of the intermodal container. These ubiquitous boxes—most come in the 40’x8’x8’ size—have transformed the transfer of cargo from a truck, train, and ship into the transportation equivalent of connecting Lego blocks. The result has been to increasingly diminish the role of distance for a supplier or a consumer as a constraint in the world marketplace. Ninety percent of the world’s freight now moves in a container. Companies like Wal-Mart and General Motors move up to 30 tons of merchandise or parts across the vast Pacific Ocean from Asia to the West Coast for about $1600. The transatlantic trip runs just over a $1000—which makes the postage stamp seem a bit overpriced. But the system that underpins the incredibly efficient, reliable, and affordable movement of global freight has one glaring shortcoming in the post-9-11 world—it was built without credible safeguards to prevent it from being exploited or targeted by terrorists and criminals. Prior to September 11, 2001, virtually anyone in the world could arrange with an international shipper or carrier to have an empty intermodal container delivered to their home or workplace. They then could load it with tons of material, declare in only the most general terms what the contents were, “seal” it with a 50-cent lead tag, and send it on its way to any city and town in the United States. The job of transportation providers was to move the box as expeditiously as possible. Exercising any care to ensure that the integrity of a container’s contents was not compromised may have been a commercial practice, but it was not a requirement. The responsibility for making sure that goods loaded in a box were legitimate and authorized was shouldered almost exclusively by the importing jurisdiction. But as the volume of containerized cargo grew exponentially, the number of agents assigned to police that cargo stayed flat or even declined among most trading nations. The rule of thumb in the inspection business is that it takes five agents three hours to conduct a thorough physical examination of a single full intermodal container. Last year nearly 20 million containers washed across America’s borders via a ship, train, and truck. Frontline agencies had only enough inspectors and equipment to examine between 1-2 percent of that cargo. Thus, for would-be terrorists, the global intermodal container system that is responsible for moving the overwhelming majority of the world’s freight satisfies the age-old criteria of opportunity and motive. “Opportunity” flows from (1) the almost complete absence of any security oversight in the loading and transporting of a box from its point of origin to its final destination, and (2) the fact that growing volume and velocity at which containers move around the planet create a daunting “needle-in-the-haystack” problem for inspectors. “Motive” is derived from the role that the container now plays in underpinning global supply chains and the likely response by the U.S. government to an attack involving a container. Based on statements by the key officials at U.S. Customs, the Transportation Security Administration, the U.S. Coast Guard, and the Department of Transportation, should a container be used as a “poor man’s missile,” the shipment of all containerized cargo into our ports and across our borders would be halted. As a consequence, a modest investment by a terrorist could yield billions of dollars in losses to the U.S. economy by shutting down—even temporarily—the system that moves “just-in-time” shipments of parts and goods. Given the current state of container security, it is hard to imagine how a post-event lock-down on container shipments could be either prevented or short-lived. One thing we should have learned from the 9-11 attacks involving passenger airliners, the follow-on anthrax attacks, and even last fall Washington sniper spree is that terrorist incidents pose a special challenge for public officials. In the case of most disasters, the reaction by the general public is almost always to assume the event is an isolated one. Even if the post-mortem provides evidence of a systemic vulnerability, it often takes a good deal of effort to mobilize a public policy response to redress it. But just the opposite happens in the event of a terrorist attack—especially one involving catastrophic consequences. When these attacks take place, the assumption by the general public is almost always to presume a general vulnerability unless there is proof to the contrary. Government officials have to confront head-on this loss of public confidence by marshalling evidence that they have a credible means to manage the risk highlighted by the terrorist incident. In the interim as recent events have shown, people will refuse to fly, open their mail, or even leave their homes.If a terrorist were to use a container as a weapon-delivery devise, the easiest choice would be high-explosives such as those used in the attack on the Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City. Some form of chemical weapon, perhaps even involving hazardous materials, is another likely scenario. A bio-weapon is a less attractive choice for a terrorist because of the challenge of dispersing the agent in a sufficiently concentrated form beyond the area where the explosive devise goes off. A “dirty bomb” is the more likely threat vs. a nuclear weapon, but all these scenarios are conceivable since the choice of a weapon would not be constrained by any security measures currently in place in our seaports or within the intermodal transportation industry. This is why a terrorist attack involving a cargo container could cause such profound economic disruption. An incident triggered by even a conventional weapon going off in a box could result in a substantial loss of life. In the immediate aftermath, the general public will want reassurance that one of the many other thousands of containers arriving on any given day will not pose a similar risk. The President of the United States, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and other keys officials responsible for the security of the nation would have to stand before a traumatized and likely skeptical American people and outline the measures they have in place to prevent another such attack. In the absence of a convincing security framework to manage the risk of another incident, the public would likely insist that all containerized cargo be stopped until adequate safeguards are in place. Even with the most focused effort, constructing that framework from scratch could take months—even years. Yet, within three weeks, the entire worldwide intermodal transportation industry would effectively be brought to its knees—as would much of the freight movements that make up international trade.

1NC Environment Turn

Repairing locks kills the recovering wildlife system in the Mississippi

Brad Walker is the Head of the Izaak Walton League of America, a member of the Nicollet Island Coalition, February 2010, “Big Price – Little Benefit”, http://www.iwla.org/index.php?ht=a/GetDocumentAction/i/2079

The Upper Midwest is in the midst of transformative change in its rural economic and transportation needs. For decades, agricultural commodity exports originating from the Upper Midwest were a critical component of our nation’s economy and foreign policy. Facilitating the export of agricultural commodities through the investment in and subsidization of transportation networks provided benefits to farmers, grain traders, and the agricultural economy and improved the U.S. balance of trade. However, these transportation networks interrupted and damaged natural river processes on the Upper Mississippi and Illinois Rivers. River ecosystems were radically altered when 29 dams with accompanying locks were built on the rivers and barge traffic commenced. The dams transformed the Upper Mississippi River System into a string of reservoirs, halting the flows and processes of rivers that for centuries produced a dynamic environment and vital wildlife habitat. The rivers are now dependent on further human intervention and investment to simulate and enable the necessary functions of the rivers. The most promising of these restoration efforts is the Environmental Management Program (EMP), created by Congress in 1986 to bring together federal and state expertise to develop and – in essence – test restoration activities to determine the most effective methods to restore ecosystems on the Upper Mississippi River System. To combat the radical changes brought by the locks and dams, EMP has responded with a host of practices and technologies to support natural river functions. Water level management, side channel rehabilitation, and even manmade islands are examples of projects conducted through EMP to mimic the behavior of free-flowing rivers.

Mississippi is one of the biggest areas of wildlife loss – key to global eco-diversity

National Academy of Sciences, 2008, “In the Light of Evolution, Volume II: Biodiversity and Extinction,” http://www.nap.edu/openbook.php?record\_id=12501&page=5

In the Light of Evolution: Volume II—Biodiversity and Extinction (Fig. 1.1) (Dayton et al., 1995; Auster, 1998; NRC, 2002). The magnitude of effects increases with the frequency and geographic scale of trawling. The most striking data are from New England and the Gulf of Mexico (NRC, 2002), although the situation is almost certainly comparable on continental shelves around the world (Dayton et al., 1995). In New England, the total area fished (TAF) by trawling is 138,000 km2, and 56% of the sample areas are fished more than once a year, so that the equivalent of 115% of the TAF is fished every year. In the Gulf of Mexico, the TAF is 270,000 km2, 57% of the sample areas are fished more than once a year, and trawls sweep 255% of the TAF each year. Thus, trawling has drastically degraded most of the sea floor in these huge regions, and with multiple trawling episodes per year at favored sites, there is obviously no opportunity for ecosystem recovery. Eutrophication, Dead Zones, and the Rise of Slime Nutrient runoff is naturally greatest, and eutrophication, hypoxia, and toxic blooms are most intense, in estuaries and coastal seas like the Adriatic and Baltic seas and Chesapeake and San Francisco bays (Diaz, 2001; Jackson, 2001; Jackson et al., 2001; Lötze et al., 2006). However, major river systems like the Amazon, Yangtze, and Mississippi–Missouri also discharge vast amounts of nutrients, sediments, and organic matter into relatively small areas of open coast and surrounding continental shelves. The enormous increase in the use of chemical fertilizers in the drainage basins of these great rivers over the past 50 years (Tilman et al., 2002), coupled with the virtual elimination of suspension feeding oysters and wetlands along their delta margins, has resulted in the formation of vast eutrophic and hypoxic regions comparable with the worst conditions in estuaries (Diaz, 2001). The iconic American example is the hypoxic “dead zone” that extends some 500 km west of the Mississippi delta. The area of the hypoxic zone has doubled in the past 20 years to ≈20,000 km2, and the rate of increase in area is a linear function of nitrogen loading from the Mississippi drainage (Fig. 1.2) (Rabalais et al., 2007; Turner et al., 2008). Analyses of the geochemistry and mineralogy of cores shows that hypoxic conditions were uncommon before the 1950s, strongly supporting the hypothesis that their formation is due to comparatively recent human impacts and is not a natural phenomenon. The dead zone expands during the summer, when hypoxia extends from shallow depths to the sea floor, and there is mass mortality of most animals that cannot swim away, including major fisheries species like shrimp. The dead zone is hardly dead, however, but supports an extraordinary biomass of diverse microbes and jellyfish that may constitute the only surviving commercial fishery. In addition,

[insert biod !]

2NC Environment Turn

Locks and barge traffic RUIN the vital Mississippi river ecosystem

Brad Walker is the Head of the Izaak Walton League of America, a member of the Nicollet Island Coalition, February 2010, “Big Price – Little Benefit”, http://www.iwla.org/index.php?ht=a/GetDocumentAction/i/2079

These 29 structures, including two locks and dams on the Illinois River at Peoria and La Grange, Illinois, constitute the Upper Mississippi River-Illinois Waterway (UMR-IWW) navigation system, which was developed to ease the transport of freight along the rivers’ northerly incline. (See Figure 1) Barges carry agricultural commodities, petroleum products, and coal through this system. Farm products account for approximately half the tonnage shipped**. The Mississippi River corridor contains an ecosystem that is home to over 200 fish and mussel species and nearly 300 varieties of birds**. It serves as the migratory path for 40 percent of North America’s waterfowl. 3 More than 12 million people annually recreate on and along the Upper Mississippi River, spending $1.2 billion and supporting 18,000 jobs. Each year, more people use the Upper Mississippi than visit Yellowstone National Park. Since the completion of the UMR-IWW navigation system, the river ecosystems have declined significantly. As the Corps candidly stated in its study of expanding navigation construction on the river, the Upper Mississippi River ecosystem is “significantly altered, is currently degraded, and is expected to get worse.” 4 Rather than a natural, continuous river, the dams turned the Upper Mississippi into a series of pools, which age like reservoirs from sediment accumulation and are degrading further each year. Channelization of the lower open portion of the river, due to the construction 4 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2004, “Final Integrated Feasibility Report and Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for the UMR-IWW System Navigation Feasibility Study,” page 95 i n t r o D U c t i o n During the 1930s, a series of dams and locks were constructed by, and are still operated under the direction of, the U.S. Army corps of engineers (the corps) on the Upper Mississippi and illinois rivers. The dams and locks stretch south from the twin cities of Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minnesota, to just above St. Louis, Missouri. 2 | Big Price — LittLe Benefit figure 1: of levees and river training structures built to improve navigation, has separated the river from its floodplain. Barge traffic throughout the UMR-IWW system causes additional environmental damage to islands and river banks from wave action as well as from the long periods of storage, or “fleeting,” of empty barges along the river banks. These combined conditions and the resultant erosion and disturbance creates a host of environmental consequences such as high turbidity, which undermines river ecosystems by choking off aquatic plants and destroying the river food chain at its foundation. In sum, **there is no denying that the natural functions of the river have been adversely affected by the presence of 29 dams and their associated locks and barge traffic**. A river sub-divided into a string of lakes is simply not capable of functioning as a dynamic river ecosystem. Once it has been so significantly altered, it requires further intervention to sustain the diverse habitats and interdependent species that evolved with the river over many preceding centuries

1NC Spending

Lock projects cost billions of dollars and empirically go over budget

**Boselovic 12** (Len Boselovic, 4/27/12, “Watchdogs criticize plan for locks, dams” www.post-gazette.com/stories/business/news/watchdogs-criticize-plan-for-locks-dams-633353/?print=1)

Proponents say the measure would help clear up an $8 billion backlog of river projects caused by inefficient funding and chronic cost overruns at lock and dam projects, which are managed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The backlog includes eliminating a 105-year-old lock and dam on the Monongahela River at Elizabeth and building new locks up river at Charleroi. The Mon project was approved by Congress in 1992 at an estimated cost of $750 million and was expected to be completed in 2004. Corps officials say the project now will cost at least $1.4 billion and be completed in 2024 at the earliest.

2NC Spending

Reject their biased authors – the inland waterways is by far the most expensive and wasteful transportation system in the country and is entirely subsidized by the government

Brad Walker is the Head of the Izaak Walton League of America, a member of the Nicollet Island Coalition, February 2010, “Big Price – Little Benefit”, http://www.iwla.org/index.php?ht=a/GetDocumentAction/i/2079

Barge Industry contributions are inadequate to properly fund the Inland Waterways Trust Fund’s projects backlog, yet the industry wants to restore IWTF solvency and increase inland waterways navigation investment primarily by increasing the burden on all other taxpayers. • **The barge industry touts itself as the cheapest form of commodity transportation. Unfortunately, the equation used to derive that designation excludes over 90 percent of the costs to support the inland waterways system**. According to the National Academy of Sciences, 1 U.S. taxpayers pay 92 percent of the inland waterway system (IWS) costs of constructing, operating and maintaining barge navigation infrastructure. This is compared to virtually no taxpayer support for rail system users and only 20 percent for highway system users. • The general public does receive some benefits from the current dams on the rivers, though it can be argued that the costs, both financial and to the environment, have far exceeded these benefits. The barge industry paid nothing for the original lock and dam system and do not contribute to repairing and restoring degraded riverine ecosystems, which the inland waterways navigation system is largely responsible for causing. The taxpayers have been totally responsible for these costs, and as mentioned above all of the O&M costs and 50 percent of the construction and rehabilitation costs. • When all costs are accounted for, the inland waterways system is by far the most expensive shipping system in the country. What the 1986 Inland Waterways Trust Fund Legislation Requires: • Funding of the IWTF comes from a diesel fuel tax per gallon paid by commercial transportation on inland waterways. The tax increased incrementally from 1986 at $0.10 to 1995 at $0.20. The tax from this legislation has not increased since 1995. 2 • The legislation requires 50 percent of the cost of construction 3 of new inland waterways navigation facilities to be funded from the IWTF. 1 Freight Capacity for the 21st Century (November 2002), by the Transportation Research Board (TRB) of the National Academy of Sciences 2 From 1978 to the enactment of the Inland Waterways Tax, Section 104 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 the fuel tax was $0.04. FACT SHEET: Historic Subsidy of Inland Waterways Navigation System Big Price – Little Benefit Nicollet Island Coalition • The rehabilitation of existing inland waterways navigation structures, regardless of the projects size, is considered new construction and covered at a 50 percent cost share from the IWTF. • The cost of operation and maintenance of any project s 100 percent funded by taxpayers.

Allowing locks and dams to remain is fiscally irresponsible – taxpayers fully subsidize all of their functions and repercussions

Brad Walker is the Head of the Izaak Walton League of America, a member of the Nicollet Island Coalition, February 2010, “Big Price – Little Benefit”, http://www.iwla.org/index.php?ht=a/GetDocumentAction/i/2079

Taxpayers paid the entire bill for the original UMRIWW lock and dam system, valued today at between $15 and $30 billion. The public also pays for the operation and maintenance of the system (more than $100 million per year), at least half of the major rehabilitation work (approaching $1 billion dollars to date), and all of the costs of repairing the environmental damage caused by the navigation system (**estimated to be in the tens of billions of dollars).** For taxpayers to assume responsibility for potentially billions of dollars more to construct seven new locks, the economic justification for that construction must be firmly established.

1NC Privatization CP

CP Text: The United States federal government should initiate public private partnerships for the development of inland waterway modernization.

Army Corps of Engineers fails at lock modernization – privatization would solve better

Chris Edwards, Director of Tax Policy at the Cato Institute, October 2005, “Privatize the Army Corps of Engineers”, http://www.cato.org/pubs/tbb/tbb-0510-27.pdf, Tax and Budget Bulletin No. 27; AB

The Army Corps of Engineers has been in the news as the owner of the levee system in New Orleans. The levee system could not handle a storm of the strength of Hurricane Katrina, and its failure contributed to the disastrous flooding of the city. The Corps of Engineers is a federal agency that builds and maintains infrastructure for ports and waterways. Most of the agency’s $5 billion annual budget goes toward dredging harbors and investing in locks, channels, and other works on rivers such as the Mississippi. The Corps is the largest owner of hydroelectric power plants in the country with 75 plants worth $18 billion. 1 It also manages 4,300 recreational areas, funds beach replenishment, and upgrades local water and sewer systems. This bulletin examines the inefficiencies that result from federal funding of such local infrastructure, and proposes that the Corp’s civilian activities be privatized or devolved to the states. A Pork Barrel Machine for Congress Congress has used the Army Corps as a pork barrel spending machine for decades. Funds are earmarked for low-value projects in the districts of important members of Congress, while higher-value projects go unfunded. Federal decisions on spending for local infrastructure are often based on political pull, not on economic analysis. That is true for the Army Corps and for federal spending on airports, highways, transit systems, and other facilities. The Washington Post notes that “powerful members of Congress dictate the selection, pace, and price tag for major projects” of the Army Corps. 2 Indeed, data from Citizens Against Government Waste show that Congress inserted 1,073 special interest, or pork, projects into the Corp’s budget for 2005. 3 The result is that while levee upgrades in New Orleans were stalled, dubious projects in other states moved ahead. The Corps epitomizes the “iron triangle” that produces excess and **misallocated federal spending**. **It tends to favor expensive projects** that expand its empire and please its political overlords. Politicians use the agency’s budget to curry favor with special interests in their districts. Of course, those interests would rather have federal taxpayers fund their projects than pay for them locally. One problem with the federalization of local infrastructure is that it makes local officials complacent about planning for their own needs. Louisiana politicians have complained that the Bush administration underfunded New Orlean’s levees, but they were closest to the problem and should have funded the upgrades themselves.

Privatization solves transportation infrastructure and doesn’t link to politics or spending – multiple reasons

Chris Edwards, the director of tax policy studies at the Cato Institute, November 16th 2011, “Federal Infrastructure Investment”, http://www.cato.org/publications/congressional-testimony/federal-infrastructure-investment; AB

There are many advantages of infrastructure PPP and privatization. One advantage is that we are more likely to get funding allocated to high-return investments when private-sector profits are on the line. Of course, businesses can make investment mistakes just as governments do. But unlike governments, businesses have a systematic way of choosing investments to maximize the net returns. And when investment returns are maximized, it stimulates the largest gains to the broader economy. One reason that privatized infrastructure is efficient is that private companies can freely tap debt and equity markets to build capacity and meet market demands. By contrast, government investment suffers from the politics and uncertainties of the federal budget process. You can see the problems with our air traffic control system, which needs long-term investment but the Federal Aviation Administration can't count on a stable funding stream. For its part, the FAA's management of ATC investment has been poor. The agency has a history of delays and cost overruns on its technology upgrade projects. The solution is to privatize our air traffic control system, as Canada has done with very favorable results.31 A recent Brookings Institution study describes some of the advantages of PPPs. It notes that the usual process for government infrastructure investment decouples the initial construction from the later management, which results in contractors having few incentives to build projects that will minimize operation and maintenance costs.32 PPP solves this problem because the same company will both build and operate projects. "Many advantages of PPP stem from the fact that they bundle construction, operations, and maintenance in a single contract. This provides incentives to minimize life-cycle costs which are typically not present when the project is publicly provided," notes the Brookings' study.33 There are other advantages of infrastructure PPP and privatization. One advantage is the greater efficiency of construction. Extensive British experience shows that PPP projects are more likely to be completed on time than traditional government projects.34 Another advantage is the greater efficiency of operations. Private firms have incentives to reduce excessive operational costs, as illustrated by the labor cost savings from the leasing of the Chicago Skyway.35 Finally, private operators of infrastructure such as toll roads are more likely to charge efficient market rates to users, as illustrated by the leasing of the Indiana Toll Road.36

2NC A2: ACE Jurisdiction

The private industry could take over all of the services the Army Corps offers and operate them more efficiently – accesses spillover

Chris Edwards, Director of Tax Policy at the Cato Institute, October 2005, “Privatize the Army Corps of Engineers”, http://www.cato.org/pubs/tbb/tbb-0510-27.pdf, Tax and Budget Bulletin No. 27; AB

Reform Options To solve these problems, the civilian activities of the Corps should be transferred to state, local, or private ownership. A rough framework for reform might be: • Privatize: port dredging, hydroelectric dams, beach replenishment, and other activities that could be supported by user fees and revenues. • Transfer to lower governments: levees, municipal water and sewer projects, recreational areas, locks, channels, and other waterway infrastructure. **Such reforms could accompany broader reforms to U.S. ports and waterways**. For example, U.S. ports are owned by state and local governments and are dredged by the Army Corps. But ports could be privatized, and they could purchase dredging services in the marketplace. The harbor maintenance tax could be repealed, and ports could recover dredging costs from port users. For example, if the $286 million Delaware River dredging project made sense, it could be funded by the refineries and other industries along the river that would be the beneficiaries. In Britain, 19 ports were privatized in 1983 to form Associated British Ports. ABP and a subsidiary UK Dredging sell port and dredging services in the marketplace. They earn a profit, pay taxes, and return dividends to shareholders. 11 Two-thirds of British cargo goes through privatized ports, which are highly efficient. In the United States, there are complaints that governments are not investing enough in port facilities and dredging to the detriment of U.S. international trade. If ports were privatized, they could invest and expand as needed to relieve congestion and accommodate larger ships. Privatization is also a good option for the Corp’s large inventory of hydroelectric dams. The Corp’s recreational areas should be transferred to state governments or to the private sector if they could generate sufficient user fees. Municipal water, sewer, and beach projects should be left to local governments. Waterway and environmental projects, such as the $8 billion Florida Everglades Restoration Plan, should be funded by state governments. Waterway facilities that affect numerous states, such as those along the Mississippi River, could be transferred to the states and managed under a regional agreement. Conclusion For decades, presidents have tried to rein in wasteful spending by the Corps of Engineers. President Eisenhower vetoed a Corp’s spending bill in 1958 because it included numerous projects that made no economic sense. In 1977 President Carter gave Congress a hit list of wasteful water projects that he wanted to cut. The Bush administration has tried to cut the agency’s waste and to refocus its budget on completing the high-value projects in its large construction backlog. But as TCS noted, “the administration has failed to follow through and defend those budget cuts,” which is a common problem with this White House. 12 A better solution is to privatize and devolve to lower governments the Corp’s activities. The New Orleans levees, for example, should be transferred to the State of Louisiana. State, local, and **private ownership would better ensure that infrastructure is efficiently maintained and upgraded, and not subject to neglect because of distracted policymakers in far away Washington.**

2NC A2: Perm – Do Both

Private sector solvency is dependent upon a decrease in state involvement in infrastructure

Stephen Blake, President at the Center for Transportation Training, Education and Research, 2001, The Thomas Jefferson Institute for Public Policy, Issue Brief #3, http://heartland.org/sites/all/modules/custom/heartland\_migration/files/pdfs/3783.pd; AB

1. Privatization. The privatization of transportation planning, design, construction and maintenance will enhance the efficiencies and effectiveness of the government sponsored transportation system. This can be accomplished through innovative financing mechanisms, particularly the development of public-private partnerships and privatization initiatives that move the financial burden away from sole **dependence on government** to a sharing of financial responsibility between government and the private sector. The current privatization legislation needs to be strengthened to provide incentives for the transportation industry to assume greater responsibility and for the state Department of Transportation to yield responsibility to the private sector. **The adequacy of the private sector to provide this assistance must be addressed as the role of the public sector is reduced**. Opportunities to privatize government activities should be pursued. An example of this privatization is the project conducted by the motor pool at the state. This project resulted in the hiring of Enterprise Rent-A-Car to provide a back up source of vehicles for state employees who travel, this allowed the motor pool to more efficiently manage the state cars and allowed a substantial savings over reimbursing state employees for using their personal vehicles for travel. This year Richmond Car and Truck Rental won the bid and reduced the cost from $25/per vehicle and 19 cents a mile to $18.95 and unlimited mileage. Other examples include; contracting out of maintenance functions by VDOT, and in Fairfax County and the City of Alexandria bus service is now provided through contracts with private transportation management companies.

The government isn’t key to attracting capital – the private industry could operate independently

Cezary Podkul is the associate editor of Infrastructure Investor, published by PEI and writer for the Washington Post, 10/21/11, http://www.washingtonpost.com/business/with-us-infrastructure-aging-public-funds-scant-more-projects-going-private/2011/10/17/gIQAGTuv4L\_story.html, “With U.S. infrastructure aging, public funds scant, more projects going private”; AB

More capital is on the way. There are 100 private funds seeking to raise $95 billion for infrastructure investments globally, according to a tally by San Francisco-based fund adviser Probitas Partners, though not all of them will succeed. Of that, about $11.5 billion would be targeted for the United States, with fund sizes ranging from $100 million to $3 billion. “In 2003, nobody in the U.S. talked about infrastructure,” said Kelly DePonte, a partner at Probitas. “We really have seen a sea change in interest.” The main draw for investors, DePonte said, is the steady, predictable income that infrastructure assets can provide. People need to get to work, use electricity and flush toilets, so a toll road, an electric utility or a water utility tends to deliver cash no matter what happens in the stock market on any given day. Recent research by Macquarie shows infrastructure has outperformed the global stock market by an average of about 0.5 percent per month in the past 10 years. “Traffic on the road is highly insensitive to stock market levels,” said Chris Camarsh, head of investment process at Australian fund manager CP2. That makes infrastructure a good way to save for one’s nest egg, since “there is good predictability that the cash will be there when you’re older,” he said.

2NC A2: Funding Key

Federal and State funding can’t finance infrastructure – the private sector is critical to raising capital

Leonard Gilroy is the director of government reform and Harris Kenny is a policy analyst at Reason Foundation, a Los Angeles-based think tank, 5/17/12, “States and Cities Going Private With Infrastructure Investment”, http://www.realclearmarkets.com/articles/2012/05/17/states\_and\_cities\_going\_private\_with\_infrastructure\_investment\_99671.html, AB

States and municipalities across the U.S. continue to grapple with the lingering effects of the Great Recession. City leaders continue to struggle with depressed revenues, and 30 states are expected to close budget deficits totaling $49 billion this year, according to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. Further, many government bodies are struggling to maintain their credit ratings in an uncertain economy. As public debts grow, cities and states simultaneously face pressing needs to repair and modernize critical infrastructure assets that can't wait if citizens hope to keep goods and services moving in the economy. For example, many interstate highways, which are owned and maintained by states, are reaching the end of their useful lives and will cost tens of billions of dollars to reconstruct. Yet, projected federal and state fuel tax revenues will come nowhere close to covering the bills. When factoring in similarly large investment needs in water, aviation, schools and other public infrastructure facilities, it becomes abundantly clear that new infrastructure financing models and sources of capital will be the only viable option to support and sustain growth. Enter the private sector, where investors are demonstrating a willingness and capability to partner with governments to modernize and expand infrastructure, according to Reason Foundation's recent Annual Privatization Report 2011. The report finds that the amount of capital available in private infrastructure equity investment funds reached a new all-time high last year. And since 2006, the 30 largest global infrastructure investment funds have raised a total of $183.1 billion dedicated to financing infrastructure projects; the bulk coming from U.S., Australian and Canadian inventors. In fact, eight major privately financed transportation projects were under construction in the U.S. in 2011 totaling over $13 billion.

2NC A2: Control Key

The private sector solves infrastructure investment – federal control ensures political misallocation of funds and bureaucratic mismanagement

Chris Edwards and Tad DeHaven are budget experts at the Cato Institute, 6/17/10, “Privatize Transportation Spending”, http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/privatize-transportation-spending; AB

After the 2008 election, President Obama promised to "go through our federal budget — page by page, line by line — eliminating those programs we don't need." We haven't seen much of that from the president so far, but at the Cato Institute we are going page by page and finding whole agencies to abolish. If the president ever gets serious about eliminating programs, the $91 billion Department of Transportation would be a good place to start. The DOT should be radically chopped. America's mobile citizens would be better off for it. Rising federal control over transportation has resulted in the political misallocation of funds, bureaucratic mismanagement and costly one-size-fits-all regulations of the states. The solution is to devolve most of DOT's activities back to state governments and the private sector. We should follow the lead of other nations that have turned to the private sector to fund their highways, airports, air traffic control and other infrastructure. The first reform is to abolish federal highway aid to the states and related gasoline taxes. Highway aid is tilted toward states with powerful politicians, not necessarily to the states that are most in need. It also often goes to boondoggle projects like Alaska's "Bridge to Nowhere." Furthermore, federal highway aid comes with costly regulations like the Davis-Bacon labor rules, which raise state highway costs. For their part, the states should seek out private funding for their highways. Virginia is adding toll lanes on the Capitol Beltway that are partly privately financed, and Virginia is also home to the Dulles Greenway, a 14-mile private highway in operation since 1995. Ending federal subsidies would accelerate the trend toward such innovative projects. Another DOT reform is to end subsidies to urban transit systems. Federal aid favors light rail and subways, which are much more expensive than city buses. Rail systems are sexy, but they eat up funds that could be used for more flexible and efficient bus services. Ending federal aid would prompt local governments to make more cost-effective transit decisions. There is no reason why, for example, that cities couldn't reintroduce private-sector transit, which was the norm in U.S. cities before the 1960s. To government planners, intercity high-speed rail is even sexier than urban rail systems. The DOT is currently dishing out $8 billion for high-speed rail projects across the country, as authorized in the 2009 stimulus bill. Most people think that the French and Japanese fast trains are cool, but they don't realize that the price tag is enormous. For us to build a nationwide system of bullet-style trains would cost up to $1 trillion. The truth about high-speed trains is that even in densely-populated Japan and Europe, they are money losers, while carrying few passengers compared to cars, airlines and buses. The fantasy of high-speed rail in America should be killed before it becomes a huge financial drain on our already broke government. Through its ownership of Amtrak, the federal government also subsidizes slow trains. The government has dumped almost $40 billion into the company since it was created in 1971. Amtrak has a poor on-time record, its infrastructure is in bad shape, and it carries only a tiny fraction of intercity passengers. Politicians prevent Amtrak from making cost-effective decisions regarding its routes, workforce polices, capital investment and other aspects of business. Amtrak should be privatized to save taxpayer money and give the firm the flexibility it needs to operate efficiently. A final area in DOT to make budget savings is aviation. Federal aid to airports should be ended and local governments encouraged to privatize their airports and operate without subsidies. In recent decades, dozens of airports have been privatized in major cities such as Amsterdam, Auckland, Frankfurt, London, Melbourne, Sydney and Vienna. Air traffic control (ATC) can also be privatized. The DOT's Federal Aviation Administration has a terrible record in implementing new technologies in a timely and cost-effective manner. Many nations have moved toward a commercialized ATC structure, and the results have been very positive. Canada privatized its ATC system in 1996 in the form of a nonprofit corporation. The company, NavCanada, has a very good record on both safety and innovation. Moving to a Canadian-style ATC system would help solve the FAA's chronic management and funding problems, and allow our aviation infrastructure to meet rising aviation demand. There are few advantages in funding transportation infrastructure from Washington, but many disadvantages. America should study the market-based transportation reforms of other countries and use the best ideas to revitalize our infrastructure while ending taxpayer subsidies.

2NC A2: Loss of Control

Private sector is superior – risk analysis, cheaper and more efficient

Ezra Klein, writer and columnist for The Washington Post, Bloomberg, and a contributor to MSNBC, 04/01/2012, http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/ezra-klein/post/more-states-privatizing-their-infrastructure-are-they-making-a-mistake/2012/03/31/gIQARtAhnS\_blog.html

Here’s how this setup would work. Say a state wants to build or upgrade a highway. Various private companies will bid for the project, and the winning bidder has to raise enough money from outside investors to design, operate, build, and maintain the highway for a fixed number of years. The firm is allowed to recoup its costs through tolls and the like over that span. Because the private company is on the hook for the whole thing, it has an incentive to keep costs as low as possible and finish the road on time. “The idea here,” says Robert Poole of the Reason Foundation, “is that the government is only commissioning projects where the private sector is willing to put its skin in the game.” There’s some evidence that privately operated infrastructure projects can get built more quickly — and for less money — than projects wholly overseen by the government. One 2007 study (pdf) from Allen Consulting and the University of Melbourne looked at 54 large infrastructure projects in Australia and found that the privately financed ones had smaller cost overruns and were more likely to be finished on schedule than those financed through traditional public-sector methods.

2NC A2: More Efficient

Privatization solves – Federal spending is inefficient

Chris Edwards is the director of tax policy studies at Cato and expert on federal and state tax and budget issues, senior economist on the congressional Joint Economic Committee, and an economist with the Tax Foundation, 11/17/11, “PPPs and Privatization for Infrastructure”, http://www.cato-at-liberty.org/ppps-and-privatization-for-infrastructure/; AB

I testified to the congressional Joint Economic Committee on Wednesday regarding infrastructure, which means roads, bridges, pipelines, railroads, and other such assets. Here are some of the points I raised: Private sector infrastructure spending in the United States is more than four times larger than federal, state, and local government infrastructure spending. Thus, if Congress wants infrastructure, it should remove barriers to private investment. Over the past 25 years, U.S. governments have spent about the same amount on infrastructure as a share of GDP as have other OECD countries, on average. Most federal infrastructure spending, outside of defense, goes toward activities that are state, local, and private in nature. A key problem with federal government involvement in infrastructure is that when it makes mistakes, it replicates those mistakes across the country. Think about the disastrous high-rise public housing projects built in dozens of cities in the 20th century. Or consider how the Obama administration is trying to impose its misguided high-speed rail vision on the states. Politics often results in federal infrastructure spending being misallocated. For example, a large share of Amtrak spending goes to rural states where passenger trains don’t make any economic sense. The way ahead is to devolve infrastructure spending to state and local governments and the private sector. The United States lags many advanced nations in the growing use of privatization and public-private partnerships (PPP) for infrastructure. PPP deals are basically half way to full privatization. They’ve got some drawbacks, but they are a step forward toward market-based investment for items such as roads and bridges. The industry reference guide for tracking PPP and privatization projects, Public Works Financing, includes only 2 American companies out of the 40 global companies that lead in these innovative projects. U.S. policymakers should be asking: What have other countries privatized that we can privatize in this country? The answer is: air traffic control, airports, seaports, and many other items. For roads and bridges, the states can look at Virginia’s progress in shifting toward private funding and management of its projects.