#### 50 state uniformity is real world and in literature

NCCUSL, ‘8 (National Conference of Commissionsers on Uniform State Law, Hein Online, http://heinonline.org/HeinDocs/NCCUSL.pdf)

For more than a century, the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform¶ State Laws (NCCUSL) .¶ With more than 300 uniform law commissioners, all whom are lawyers qualified to¶ practice law, the NCCUSL drafts and proposes model laws in areas where¶ uniformity is desirable between states.¶ The source of more than 250 uniform acts, the NCCUSL has drafted and proposed¶ acts in subject areas such as commercial law, real estate, alternate dispute¶ resolution, domestic relations law, adoption, arbitration, deceptive trade¶ practices, franchise and business opportunities, healthcare, limited liability and¶ more!¶ Some of the widely adopted uniform acts include the Uniform Anatomical Gift¶ Act, Uniform Probate Code, Uniform Trust Code, Uniform Family Support Act,¶ Uniform Enforcement of Foreign Judgments Act, and Uniform Transfers to Minors¶ Act, to name a few!¶ The NCCUSL reports that 2007 marked a successful year with 105 enactments of¶ uniform acts and 215 introductions - the fifth time in their history that more than 100¶ uniform acts have been adopted in the state legislature in any given legislative¶ year!

#### Key education – uniquely true for infrastructure topic

Edwards 2011 (Chris, Joint Economic Committee United States Congress “ Infrastructure projects to fix the economy? Don’t bank on it. ” October 21 http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/infrastructure-projects-to-fix-the-economy-dont-bank-on-it/2011/10/18/gIQAgtZi3L\_print.html AS)

When the federal government is paying for infrastructure, state officials and members of Congress fight for their shares of the funding, without worrying too much about efficiency, environmental issues or other longer-term factors. The solution is to move as much infrastructure funding as we can to the state, local and private levels. That would limit the misallocation of projects by Congress, while encouraging states to experiment with lower-cost solutions. It’s true that the states make infrastructure mistakes as well, as California appears to be doing by subsidizing high-speed rail. But at least state-level mistakes aren’t automatically repeated across the country. The states should be the laboratories for infrastructure. We should further encourage their experiments by bringing in private-sector financing. If we need more highway investment, we should take notes from Virginia, which raised a significant amount of private money to widen the Beltway. If we need to upgrade our air-traffic-control system, we should copy the Canadian approach and privatize it so that upgrades are paid for by fees on aviation users. If Amtrak were privatized, it would focus its investment where it is most needed — the densely populated Northeast. As for Reclamation and the Corps, many of their infrastructure projects would be better managed if they were handed over to the states. Reclamation’s massive Central Valley irrigation project, for example, should be transferred to the state of California, which is better positioned to make cost and environmental trade-offs regarding contentious state water issues. Other activities of these two agencies could be privatized, such as hydropower generation and the dredging of seaports. The recent infrastructure debate has focused on job creation, and whether projects are “shovel ready.” The more important question is who is holding the shovel. When it’s the federal government, we’ve found that it digs in the wrong places and leaves taxpayers with big holes in their pockets. So let’s give the shovels to state governments and private companies. They will create just as many jobs while providing more innovative and less costly infrastructure to the public. They’re ready.

#### Its Real World, in lit, and meets their solvency advocate and Single Logical Decisionmaker standards

#### Utt, 12

Ronald D. Utt, Ph.D., is Herbert and Joyce Morgan Senior Research Fellow in the Thomas A. Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies at The Heritage Foundation, Feb 7

<http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2012/02/turn-back-transportation-to-the-states>

Currently, the most direct legislation to implement turnback is the Transportation Empowerment Act, introduced in the Senate as S. 1164 by Senator Jim DeMint (R–SC) and in the House as H.R. 3264 by Representative Tom Graves (R–GA). Under the act, states would still be responsible for interstate maintenance and improvement, as they are today, but would now be free to do it in a way that best suits their interests, whether through tolls, partnerships, privatization, competitive contracting, or some combination of means.¶ Now free of the federal one-size-fits-all program, states could tailor their spending and investment strategies to their particular needs, not those of a Washington bureaucracy or the privileged constituencies appended to it like barnacles on an aging ship. States would also be free of the costly and time-consuming regulatory mandates that the federal program now imposes on their transportation programs.¶ Finally, as a consequence of these improvements and the more efficient use of resources that turnback would yield, transportation service for the traveling public would improve at a much lower cost than the attainment of that same measure of improvement would have required under the old system. At the same time, and once an improved economy restores fuel tax revenues to their long-run trend, donor states that lose money under the current system would be made whole, while donee states would no longer benefit from undeserved subsidies.¶ Keep the Pressure On¶ The first “turn back” bill was introduced in Congress in 1997 by Senator Connie Mack (R–FL) and Representative John Kasich (R–OH). It earned about two dozen co-sponsors and received the explicit endorsement of more than 20 states—mostly donors. Since then, some version of a turnback bill has been introduced in every Congress, and while none has come close to passing, the defects in the program that have led to ongoing interest in the bills have come under scrutiny and concern.¶ Subsequent reauthorization bills have attempted, with some modest success, to address the equity issue. More recently, however, the House and Senate versions of the next reauthorization bill propose to reverse the past trends toward an increasingly Washington-centric program significantly by giving the states more flexibility in deciding how the funds they receive from the federal trust fund can be spent. With momentum moving in turnback’s favor, the existence of these bills will keep the pressure on for a program of greater state responsibility and discretion.