### Topicality—Infrastructure Investment

1. **Interpretation—The phrase “its transportation infrastructure investment” means the affirmative must increase federal government investment strategies not individual infrastructure projects—the topic is about how we invest not what we invest in**

**Mallet et al, Specialist in Transportation Policy—Congressional Research Service, 2011**

(William, National Infrastructure Bank: Overview and Current Legislation, Congressional Research Service Report For Congress, December 14, accessed http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R42115.pdf)

The federal government already uses a wide range of direct expenditures, grants, loans, loan

guarantees, and tax preferences to expand infrastructure investment. A national infrastructure

bank would be another way to provide federal credit assistance, such as direct loans and loan

guarantees, to sponsors of infrastructure projects.

1. **Affirmative Team violates—they build a specific project not investment**
2. **Prefer Our Interpretation** 
   1. **Prevents explosion of the topic—our interpretation limits the topic to a discussion of how the government invests and prevents the topic from becoming the bridge and road project of the week topic—the 2005 transportation bill had 6000 earmarks**

**Rohatyn and Ehrlich, 2008**

(Felix/Everett, A New Bank to Save Our Infrastructure, The New York Review of Book, October 8, accessed at http://www.nybooks.com/articles/archives/2008/oct/09/a-new-bank-to-save-our-infrastruct)

So the “modal” infrastructure programs, rather than competing efficiently for

resources, all lurch forward without coordination or attention to the merits of the

specific projects they choose to fund. And that is in cases when the programs are

not directly muscled through by politicians. The term “earmark” became popular

during the writing of the 2005 transportation bill, which contained over six

thousand of them (with a total cost of $24 billion), compared to five hundred of

them in 1991 and ten in 1982.

* 1. **Grammatical precision—our interp preserves the meaning of the phrase “its transportation infrastructure investment”—the resolution does not say invest in transportation infrastructure. It says increase its infrastructure investment which describes how the federal government invests**
  2. **Predictable research and ground—the topic literature focuses on how investment occurs and there is plenty of DA, CP and K ground for investment. When you do research on the new topic, you start with the phrase transportation infrastructure investment not specific projects. When you do that, discussion of the process of investment comes up, not the specific projects.**

1. **Topicality is a voting issue—competitive equity and to limit the topic early.**

### 2nc Overview

The wording of the topic focuses action on the investment, modified by the adjectives transportation infrastructure to describe what type of investment. If it was to focus on the transportation infrastructure, it would say investment IN transportation infrastructure. This wording WOULD allow for specific projects because the increase in investment would only need to be in the infrastructure. The adjectival wording means that we should focus the debate on the investment. This leaves plenty to discuss---national infrastructure bank, loans, grants, block grants.

### AT “we don’t justify project of the week”

1. **Extend our Rohatyn and Ehrlich, 2008 evidence:** For one year, the number of earmarks proves that there is a federal justification for funding these projects---that’s how they came to be included in the transpo bill. Unreasonable burden on the negative to be prepared to debate each project.

2. No ground for the neg to run any of their args---and this isn’t just a neg whine. There would be no CP solvency other than a stale states debate to run against small projects affs.

### AT “substantially checks project of the week affs”

1. **No it doesn’t—and hasn’t any time ever the word is in the rez**

**2. no baseline standard for substantially---proves that we can’t use it as a limit on the topic**

Substantially can mean qualitative

**Oxford Dictionary of English** (2nd edition) 20**03**, “Substantial”, <http://www.oxfordreference.com/views/ENTRY.html?entry=t140.e76634&filter\_out=long&srn=1&ssid=141952131#FIRSTHIT>

***adjective***    
**1**. of considerable importance, size, or worth: *a substantial amount of cash.*  
• strongly built or made: *a row of substantial Victorian villas.* • (of a meal) large and filling. • important in material or social terms; wealthy: *a substantial Devon family.*   
**2.**concerning the essentials of something: *there was substantial agreement on changing policies.*   
**3.**real and tangible rather than imaginary: *spirits are shadowy, human beings substantial.*  
- DERIVATIVES **substantiality** ***noun*** .   
- ORIGIN Middle English: from Old French *substantiel* or Christian Latin *substantialis*, from *substantia* ‘being, essence’

**3. Reject this vision of the topic---unpredictable and bad debates on the negative mean you should send a signal early that this aff isn’t topical even if they have a fed j.**

**4. more evidence that even the US government doesn’t use substantially the same way**

Code Varies - **Defs of substantial are always arbitrary – usage varies in U.S. code**

Jeffrey M. **Colon**, Associate Professor of Law, Fordham University School of Law, Winter **1997**, San Diego Law Review, 34 San Diego L. Rev. 1, Lexis Academic

n138. I.R.C. 877(e). **Neither the statute nor the legislative history indicates how much of a reduction in taxes is necessary in order to constitute a "substantial" reduction.** The meaning of "substantial" varies from one Code section to the other. Compare, e.g., I.R.C. 368(a)(1)(C) (West 1988 & Supp. 1996) (acquisition of "substantially all" of acquired company's assets for ruling purposes is 70% of gross assets and 90% of net assets (Rev. Proc. 77-37, 1977-2 C.B. 568)) with I.R.C. 1092 (West 1988 & Supp. 1996) ("substantial diminution" of risk of loss)

### AT “federal justification checks project of the week”

1. **means bad aff ground:** we would only debate the following geographic areas of the country—territories, DC, native lands and the EEZ out into the ocean. Reject this version of the topic---no aff ground to claim advantages of significance from those projects.

2. **means bad neg ground:** no DA links to the fundamental questions of federalism, politics DAs (we don’t have any eez projects hurt obama) and fiscal dispcline. These questions are at the core of the transportation debate.

3. **prefer our interp**—allows us to understand the real world processes of how states and federal government interact on the fundamental public good of roads, bridges, etc. Focus on its investment focuses the debate on the key questions of 2012 of funding not where the bridge is located. You would still have to have a fed j---in fact its more real world to examine and defend why the federal government is the mechanism through which the funding process should occur. More education about the processes of government in this view of the topic.

### AT “discussion of projects inevitable”

1. **Even if you are right we would end up discussing the tunnel, it would only be as an advantage which has less risk to the neg.** CP out advantages or reading impact turns or defense is much easier than contending with the Affs ability to fiat via the plan over any problems with the aff. In other words, the aff gets to assume their plan addresses the best arguments against the project. However, if the neg still had to discuss the project but as an advantage, then we would be able to outweigh or make arguments against the solvency as well.

2. The links to the investment mechanism would still exist—in a project only we only discuss to build or not to build not how to build.

### AT “we use land grants in the plan”

1. The land grant is targeted at Alaska only—this means that they have not increased throughout the US.

### 2nc Extension “our interp preserves the meaning of the phrase “its transportation infrastructure investment”

1. ext our argument that the topic says “its” investment not “investment in infrastructure”. The use of its centers the action on the investment not on the transportation infrastructure.

2. provides more real world understanding of how the federal government gives funding---key to better education than whether or not a tunnel should be built to nowhere

### Its explanation

#### Its is a possessive noun

#### Purdue Online Writing Lab, no date given

<http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/621/01/>

Don't use apostrophes for personal pronouns, the relative pronoun who, or for noun plurals. Apostrophes should not be used with possessive pronouns because possessive pronouns already show possession — they don't need an apostrophe. His, her, its, my, yours, ours are all possessive pronouns. However, indefinite pronouns, such as one, anyone, other, no one, and anybody, can be made possessive. Here are some examples: **wrong**: his' book **correct**: his book **correct**: **one's** book **correct**: anybody's book **wrong**: Who's dog is this? **correct**: Whose dog is this? **wrong**: The group made it's decision.

correct: The group made its decision.

(Note: Its and it's are not the same thing. It's is a contraction for "it is" and its is a possessive pronoun meaning "belonging to it." It's raining out= it is raining out. A simple way to remember this rule is the fact that you don't use an apostrophe for the possessive his or hers, so don't do it with its!)