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### Poverty 1NC

#### Poverty is caused by:

#### WTO policies.

LRAN (Land Research Action Network). "How the World Trade Organisation is driving farmers into poverty." 1 July 2007. http://www.landaction.org/spip/spip.php?article261

Discredited "trade liberalisation" policies are not only endangering agricultural industries throughout the world but also threatening the environment, according to a powerful new book. Restrictions imposed by the World Trade Organisation on governments to prevent them subsidising their own country’s agriculture (and protecting it from the dumping of cheap imports) should be abolished, it says. Instead they should be able to develop their own agriculture to suit its conditions. It documents the double standards of countries such as America which insist other countries are not allowed to subsidise agriculture but then find ways to subsidise their own. Even then, the subsidies benefit multinational corporations rather than farmers, who are being driven out of business. Peter M Rosset’s book, "Food is different: why we must get the WTO out of agriculture", is dedicated to Lee Kyung Hae, the South Korean co-operative farm leader who stabbed himself to death outside WTO talks in Mexico. Wearing a banner declaring ’WTO kills farmers’, he was protesting at this undemocratic institution opening his country to cheap imports which had resulted in the price of rice being cut to a quarter, driving him and millions of others off the land (even after they had increased productivity).

#### Oil, Food, and Warming

APA (African Press Agency). "Increase in Food, Oil Prices Driving 100 Million People Into Poverty." 30 June 2008. http://www.netnewspublisher.com/increase-in-food-oil-prices-driving-100-million-people-into-poverty/

The current food and oil price increases tabled for discussion at the African Union summit in Egypt is driving 100 million poor people into deeper poverty, the United Nations said on Monday. The majority of these people living in poverty are said to be Africans who are highly affected by the current food and oil price increases. The oil price is approaching $150 per barrel, which is expected to make the current economic crisis in the developing countries, including Africa worse. “As we speak the food crisis-compounded by the hike in fuel prices and climate change-threatens to push an estimated 100 million people deeper into poverty and will have direct bearing on our efforts to meet the Millennium Development Goals,” said Dr. Asha-Rose Migiro, Deputy Secretary General of the UN.

### Poverty 1NC

#### Corruption

IFC (International Finance Corporation). "High Oil Prices and Poverty." 2005. http://www.ifc.org/ifcext/pressroom/ifcpressroom.nsf/PressRelease?openform&ABE835AB1BB37AD5852570A40054A774

More than fifty developing countries depend on oil, gas, and mining for much of their income. When governance is good, these industries can generate large revenues to foster economic growth and reduce poverty. But when governance is weak, natural resources are often linked to low growth, corruption, poverty, and conflict – the so called “resource curse.”

#### AIDS

UNDESA (UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs). Population, Development and HIV/AIDS with Particular Emphasis on Poverty. 2005. http://www.un.org/esa/population/publications/concise2005/PopdevHIVAIDS.pdf

Poverty. In both high-income and developing countries, AIDS has often struck society’s wealthiest and most influential, underscoring the universal nature of the threat posed by the epidemic. In general, however, the impacts of 12 AIDS have disproportionately affected those who have the fewest economic and social resources. The epidemic reinforces these conditions by undermining food and economic security in the hardest-hit countries. AIDS deepens poverty and increases the number of poor at risk of infection, because those with the fewest resources have the least access to health-care services or health-related information.

### Private CP 1NC- Mass Transit

#### The United States Federal Government should transfer its transportation infrastructure in urban mass transit to private firms. The United States Federal Government should not regulate those firms’ prices, service, and expansion and contraction of their networks.

#### The CP competes- Private deregulation is distinct from public management

Clifford Winston Brookings Institution JOINT TRANSPORT RESEARCH CENTRE Discussion Paper No. 2009-20 December 2009 “Lessons from the U.S. Transport Deregulation Experience for Privatization” http://www.internationaltransportforum.org/jtrc/DiscussionPapers/DP200920.pdf

Privatization and deregulation are transformative policies where the government transfers (through a sale) the parts of the transportation system that it owns and operates to private firms and does not regulate those firms’ prices, service, and expansion and contraction of their networks (entry and exit). 1

### Private CP 1NC- Mass Transit

#### That solves and doesn’t link to politics or spending

Clifford **Winston** September 29, **2010** The Private Sector Can Improve Infrastructure with Privatization not a Bank http://www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/2010/09/29-infrastructure-privatization-winston

The notion of an “infrastructure bank” seems to be gathering steam among the cognoscenti as an effective way to put our long-term economic recovery back on track. Creating an infrastructure bank would be a nice coup for the Obama administration because it would reinforce its strategy of massive spending to solve the nation’s economic ills while simultaneously enlisting the participation of Wall Street and the business community. Unfortunately, an infrastructure bank would be compromised by the same political pressures that our current transportation system faces, and it would also fail to address the most glaring problems with the nation’s infrastructure. The Administration could improve the nation’s infrastructure—and also improve its standing with Wall Street and the business community—by selling some roads and airports outright to the private sector. Privatizing infrastructure would also help cut the federal deficit by raising revenues and reducing expenditures. The bank’s funds would consist of private capital and general funds, which would allegedly be allocated by an appointed Board to projects that meet national economic objectives instead of local political objectives. Really? Why would state and local sponsors bring candidate projects to the bank unless they thought they could apply political pressure to get their projects approved? Would Florida stand by while California got funding for a large project and it got nothing? And is it plausible to believe that states and cities would support allocating public funds primarily on the basis of maximizing private investors’ returns? Do governments often think that way? Moreover, even if an infrastructure bank existed, it would not address the public sector’s inefficient pricing, investment, and production policies. Consider highways, airports, and urban transit. Motorists and truckers pay a gasoline tax but they are not charged for delaying other vehicles on the road; truckers are not charged for damaging pavement and stressing bridges; aircrafts pay a weight-based landing fee but they are not charged for delaying other planes that want to takeoff or land; and bus and rail transit users pay fares that only cover a modest fraction of operating costs and no capital costs—in fact, some, like federal employees, obtain subsidies to ride completely free. Prices that are set below costs send the wrong signals for investment by justifying expenditures to expand a crowded road when the problem would be fixed by simply charging peak-period tolls. The bank may try to force states and cities to consider pricing options but politicians have made it clear that they prefer to spend money on their constituents, not to charge them a user fee. The way we waste money on our transportation infrastructure is appalling. Road pavement is not built thickly enough to minimize the sum of maintenance and up-front capital costs. The cost of highway projects is inflated by Davis-Bacon regulations that require labor to be paid at the prevailing union wage rate in a metropolitan area, and by cost overruns that occur because the bidding process selects the firm that is the lowest-cost bidder even though those costs do not tend to end at the bid thanks to renegotiable (mutable-cost) clauses in the contract for underestimated project expenses. Boston’s Big Dig, which came in at a large multiple of the bid price, comes to mind. Airports are a nightmare because they take several years to add runways thanks to opposition from local residents, environmental groups, and regulatory hurdles such as EPA environmental impact standards. And building a new large airport from scratch is basically impossible for the same reasons. Only one has been built over the last 35 years. Mass transit—busses, subways and trains—run too many schedules that make little sense, which is why on average, most buses and subways fill roughly 20% of their seats—and routes don’t change even if population centers shift. At the same time, the cost of providing transit service is inflated by regulations such as “buy American” provisions that mandate that transit agencies first offer contracts to domestic producers instead of seeking the most efficient suppliers of capital equipment. Other perverse incentives include giving extra federal dollars to transit agencies to replace their capital stock prematurely rather than maintaining it efficiently. And it is basically impossible to lay- off or fire a transit employee because to do so could result in severance packages that approach $400,000 per worker. An infrastructure bank would do nothing to address those inefficiencies. And if an infrastructure bank is going to be funded by outside institutional investors, why not allow the private sector to have a greater stake in infrastructure performance by selling them ownership? Privatization of the system would have at least three positive effects. First, private operators would have the incentive to minimize the costs of providing transportation service and can begin the long process of ridding the system of the inefficiencies that have developed from decades of misguided policies. Second, private operators would introduce services and make investments that are responsive to travelers’ preferences. Third, private operators would develop new innovations and expedite implementation of current advances in technology, including on-board computers that can improve highway travel by giving drivers real-time road conditions, satellite-provided information to better inform transit riders and drivers of traffic conditions, and a satellite-based air traffic control system to reduce air travel time and carrier operating costs and improve safety. The technology is there. But it hasn’t been deployed in a timely fashion because government operators have no incentive to do so. The private sector does. The major and legitimate concern with privatization is that private firms would be able to set excessive prices and drastically cut service because they face little competition or that they might experience serious financial difficulties. Thus, experiments are needed to provide evidence on the intensity of various potential sources of competition, firms’ financial performance, and the evolution of capital markets to fund a privatized system. Congressional legislation for airports and highways has included funding and tax breaks to explore privatization, so the idea of experiments is not new (nor is the idea of private infrastructure in most parts of the world). Supporters of an infrastructure bank claim it would treat infrastructure like a long-term investment, not an expense. Yet, unlike privatization, a bank would do little to curb wasteful expenses. The case is not difficult to make: the country would clearly benefit from a policy that has great potential to spur innovation and growth and has the added bonus of budgetary relief. Privatization, instead of a bank, is the real long-term solution to the nation’s transportation infrastructure problems.

### Privatization Solves- Economy

#### Privatization drives down costs

Clifford Winston Brookings Institution JOINT TRANSPORT RESEARCH CENTRE Discussion Paper No. 2009-20 December 2009 “Lessons from the U.S. Transport Deregulation Experience for Privatization” http://www.internationaltransportforum.org/jtrc/DiscussionPapers/DP200920.pdf

Despite being adversely affected by the lingering effects of regulation and deficient infrastructure, the intercity transportation industries have significantly improved their efficiency under deregulation and benefited users by reducing prices and providing better service. 5 The key steps in the industries’ process of adjustment have been the entry of new firms and the expanded entry by incumbent firms that has increased competition, and the freedom and incentive to improve operations and service quality to users. Deregulation also has its critics who point to financial crises, losses to labor, degradations in service, and the like as indicative of its failings. Entry and price changes. Intercity transportation firms compete at the market or route level. It is often thought that the number of firms in a market is the most accurate indication of the level of competition; but deregulation showed that the identity of the firms may be as, if not more, important than the number of firms in determining the intensity of competition.

#### Deregulation drives down costs- proven in rail and airports

Clifford Winston Brookings Institution JOINT TRANSPORT RESEARCH CENTRE Discussion Paper No. 2009-20 December 2009 “Lessons from the U.S. Transport Deregulation Experience for Privatization” http://www.internationaltransportforum.org/jtrc/DiscussionPapers/DP200920.pdf

Consumers benefited from lower prices generated by new sources of competition in the intercity transportation industries, including incumbent firms, new entrants, and alternative modes. And those gains were magnified because competition also caused firms to operate more efficiently and to pass on much of the cost savings to consumers in lower prices. Deregulated competition has been sufficiently intense to cause airline fares on low-traffic density (nonhub) routes to fall (Morrison and Winston (1997)) and to cause rail fares to approach long-run marginal cost in duopoly markets for coal transportation (Winston, Dennis, and Maheshri (2008)).

### A2: Private Companies Hate Poor People

#### Privatization won’t hurt the poor

Clifford Winston Brookings Institution JOINT TRANSPORT RESEARCH CENTRE Discussion Paper No. 2009-20 December 2009 “Lessons from the U.S. Transport Deregulation Experience for Privatization” http://www.internationaltransportforum.org/jtrc/DiscussionPapers/DP200920.pdf

Criticisms of deregulation. Intercity transportation deregulation has attracted its share of critics— although generally not from academia—who allege that the benefits from the policy have not been widely shared and that the deregulated transportation industries have been subject to service meltdowns and financial crises, which raise questions about their long-term viability. In fact, the benefits from deregulation have been broadly shared among consumers, while the problems that firms have experienced are either part of their long-run adjustment or not attributable to deregulation. Price regulation benefitted certain travelers by, for example, keeping airline fares below marginal cost on short-haul routes and cross-subsidizing them with fares above marginal cost on long-haul routes, and benefitted certain shippers by preventing railroads from raising rates on bulk commodities. Thus, if economic deregulation improved pricing efficiency, it was not expected to benefit every traveler and shipper. Surprisingly, in the process of improving the cost efficiency of the intercity transportation system, the benefits to consumers from deregulation have been more broadly distributed than expected. And for the most part, consumers’ losses can be explained by economic rather than anti-competitive forces.

#### Private companies help the poor. guardian.uk Jan 6, 2011 is a British national daily newspaper associated with a complex organisational structure and international multimedia <http://www.guardian.co.uk/global-development/poverty-matters/2011/jan/06/private-business-poor-services-infrastructure>

[CK Prahalad's](http://hbr.org/authors/prahalad) exhortations about the [fortune at the bottom of the pyramid](http://www.guardian.co.uk/business/2005/jan/07/ethicalbusiness.india) (BoP) set off enormous activity in both the corporate and social enterprise spheres. A decade later, it turns out that the businesses that generally have scaled sustainably and are thriving tend to be a very particular sort of BoP enterprise. Many of them do not consider themselves social enterprises, but rather companies exploiting rapidly developing markets, in which their offerings happen to both allow them to do well, while providing an outcome that does good for the world's poorest. What are traditionally considered BoP enterprises tend to result from a direct failure of government. The government ought to be fulfilling a role, but due to lack of resources, lack of trained personnel, instability or corruption, it is not provisioning basic standard goods and services. Business sectors arising due to first-order government failure include water, electricity, cooking fuel, transport, healthcare and education.

### A2: CP Doesn’t Build Infrastructure

#### Deregulation solves infrastructure issues

Clifford Winston Brookings Institution JOINT TRANSPORT RESEARCH CENTRE Discussion Paper No. 2009-20 December 2009 “Lessons from the U.S. Transport Deregulation Experience for Privatization” http://www.internationaltransportforum.org/jtrc/DiscussionPapers/DP200920.pdf

In the long run, the benefits to consumers from intercity transportation deregulation will increase as firms are no longer saddled by three short-run constraints: suboptimal public infrastructure, counterproductive residual regulations, and inefficient practices and investments developed during the regulatory environment. The transportation industries cannot address the first and second constraints on their own. Indeed, privatization could significantly ameliorate the first constraint. Unfortunately, even an optimistic assessment would conclude that it would take decades to do so; in other words, the full benefits of deregulation are many years away.

### CP Solves Better- Tech Advances

#### Deregulation solves better- leads to tech advances and increased efficiency

Clifford Winston Brookings Institution JOINT TRANSPORT RESEARCH CENTRE Discussion Paper No. 2009-20 December 2009 “Lessons from the U.S. Transport Deregulation Experience for Privatization” http://www.internationaltransportforum.org/jtrc/DiscussionPapers/DP200920.pdf

Second, it has been argued that regulation stymies innovation and technological advance (e.g., Gallamore (1999)) and that deregulation provides greater incentives and opportunities for firms to innovate. At the same time, the timing and location of technological advances is difficult to predict. Intercity transportation technology has improved under deregulation; but even after decades of deregulation, it is likely that further innovations that would not occur under regulation await the future.

### Highways Turn 1NC

#### Highway funding trades off with Urban Mass Transit

Gabriel Roth. June 2010. Roth is a civil engineer and transportation economist. “Federal Highway Funding” http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/highway-funding/

Since 1982, increasing amounts of revenues from the FHTF have been diverted to non-highway uses. The Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982 raised the federal gas tax by five cents, with one-fifth of the increase dedicated to urban transit. The 1991 Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act substituted "flexibility" and "intermodalism" for the "dedication" of fuel taxes to highways. That wording change meant that any transportation-related activity could lay claim to highway money. Under the most recent highway authorization—SAFETEA-LU of 2005—transportation scholar Randal O'Toole figures that only about 59 percent of highway trust fund dollars will be spent on highways.25 Funds from the FHTF will go to mass transit (21 percent), earmarks (8 percent), and a hodge-podge of other activities such as bicycle paths (12 percent). Note, however, that some of the earmark funds will also go to highways.]

#### Highways key to military mobilization and power projection

Cox, L.A. County Transportation Commission member and chair of national committees on energy conservation and urban transit planning; and Love editor of comprehensive public policy manual, 1996

One of the principal reasons for building the interstate highway system was to support national defense. When the system was approved --- during one of the most instable periods of the Cold War, national security dictated development of an efficient national highway system that could move large numbers of military personnel and huge quantities of military equipment and supplies. The interstate highway system effectively performs that function, but perhaps more importantly, its availability provides the nation with a potential resource that could have been reliably called upon if greater military conflict had arisen. Throughout the Cold War (and even to today), America's strategic advantage in effective surface transportation was unchallenged. Even today, no constituent nation of the late Soviet Union has begun to develop such a comprehensive surface transportation system. In the post-communist world, it may be tempting to underestimate the role of the interstate highway system in national defense. But the interstate highway system continues to play a critical role. The U.S. military's Strategic Highway Corridor Network (STAHNET) relies primarily on the interstate highway network, which represents 75 percent of network mileage. The U.S. Army cited the system as being critical to the success of the 1990-1991 "Desert Shield-Desert Storm operation (the U.S. led operation to free Kuwait from Iraq): Much of the success of the operation was due to our logistical ability to rapidly move troops to the theater. The capacity of the U.S. highway system to support the mobilization of troops and to move equipment and forces to U.S. ports of embarkation was key to successful deployment. The Army also noted the "modal redundancy" of the highway system, which provided rapid and effective movements of a military division when difficulties with a rail line precluded the planned transport by rail. This illustrates the fact that the interstate highway system continues to play an important role in national defense, even in the post-Cold War era.

### Highways Turn Link Extensions

#### Funding UMT pulls scarce money from the highway trust fund – users of UMT don’t pay the necessary taxes

Jeff Rosen Partner, Kirkland & Ellis LLP JUNE 14, 2009 “Time For Feds To Fund Mass Transit Operating Expenses?” http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2009/06/is-it-time-for-the-feds-to-fun.php

The issue here is not whether transit is worthwhile in various cities, or even whether it warrants additional funding to enable greater use, but whether more federal funds should be given to transit agencies as local operating subsidies. But consider: The proposed source of such federal funds, the highway trust fund, is facing a shortfall already. The proposed use of funds is one that is basically local. Approximately 40% of all transit riders in the U.S. are in one city—New York. Transit is already one of the two most heavily subsidized forms of transportation on a passenger-mile basis, exceeding $100 per 1000 passenger miles, compared to a zero subsidy for automobiles, according to a 2004 DOT study by the Bureau of Transportation Statistics. And transit riders do not pay the gas tax or otherwise fund the highway trust fund, unlike drivers of cars. Where additional expenditures for transit are warranted, state and local governments are in the better position to decide such spending, with funds from their own taxpayers and system users. Not only is that more efficient, but it provides more accountability and transparency than a situation where the spending is done by state political officials but the taxing (or borrowing) is attributed to the federal government. Why should residents of a state want their tax dollars sent to Washington, D.C. to be forwarded back to government authorities in their own state to spend with federal “strings” attached? Finally, it is often true that state and local governments have tight budgets and scarce resources. But the federal government’s fiscal condition is no better. The Obama Administration expects to run a record budget deficit of approximately $3 trillion for its first two years. We want good transit systems as part of our overall transportation system, but should we significantly expand the federal role to address local operating budgets? Perhaps there are special situations that might warrant exceptions, but in general, where local transit operations need more funding, the pragmatic response is that it should remain incumbent on responsible state and local officials to devise the necessary funding and spending solutions.

### Highways Turn Link Extensions

#### Diverting more money to UMT condemns drivers to HIGHWAY HELL

Bob Poole Director of Transportation Studies, Reason Foundation JUNE 2, 2009 “Time For Feds To Fund Mass Transit Operating Expenses?” http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2009/06/is-it-time-for-the-feds-to-fun.php

Finally, there is the question of whose money it is. Currently, most federal transit funding comes from the transit account of the Highway Trust Fund. In other words, the source of that funding is motorists and trucking companies, paying what are supposed to be user taxes in order to have a high-quality highway system to use. Ever since the 1964 Urban Mass Transit Act, the fraction of highway user taxes that can be diverted to non-highway uses has been steadily increased. Yet study after study in recent years has documented the poor condition of our highways and bridges, and the horrible congestion plaguing urban roadways. Taking an even bigger slice of the pie for urban transit would condemn the vast majority of Americans—for whom cars and trucks are their only viable alternative—to ever-worsening highway hell.

### Highways Key to Heg

#### Strong highways key to rapid troop deployment and heg – no other transportation source can solve

FHA 09 (Federal Highway Administration, “Introduction to Current Military Deployment Concepts”, March 27th 2009)

The U.S. military has changed significantly to meet the challenges of our uncertain world. An understanding of the evolving international environment, the national security strategy, and the capabilities required for full-spectrum dominance have guided the military's transformation from a forward-deployed Cold War force to a capabilities-based, power-projection force located largely in the United States. The military has reduced its size, redistributed its forces, closed and realigned bases, reorganized its overseas equipment prepositioned, and improved active and reserve component integration to become leaner, more versatile, and more deployable. Increased deployment activity has become the normal operational standard within the continental United States, which may regularly affect the planning and operations for State Departments of Transportation (SDOT). As a consequence, all States are experiencing increased cross-State movements of military assets with destinations beyond State borders. Within a State with major military installations, such as those with power projection platforms (PPP), current deployment strategies may require 24x7 operations with enhanced security for increased equipment and personnel movements. This chapter provides a broad overview of current military doctrine and policies relevant to military deployments on public roads. The range of size and scope for deployments is discussed, including preferred travel modes and recent lessons learned. The major agencies and organizations are introduced, with greater definition of roles and responsibilities to be examined in chapter 2. Finally, the role of advisory systems and implications for military deployment are presented.[1] Strategic mobility and readiness are keys to the military’s ability to project power worldwide. Each of the military services—Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, as well as their component Reserve, National Guard, and Coast Guard counterparts—has made great strides in implementing the specific recommendations of the congressionally mandated 2001 Mobility Requirements Study and more recent findings from Operations Enduring Freedom (OEF) and Iraqi Freedom (OIF) as well as the Global War on Terrorism (GWOT). The ability to deploy equipment and personnel rapidly is an imperative of the national military strategy. That strategy expects the military to defend the homeland, deter aggression in four regions of the world, swiftly defeat adversaries in two other conflicts, and conduct a limited number of small operations. Implied in these missions is the requirement to deploy forces within the United States and from the United States to anywhere in the world. To assist the military services in their planning and better prepare for future operations, the Department of Defense has established an objective of being able to deploy to a theater within 10 days sufficient combat power to defeat an enemy during the next 30 days and be ready for the next fight within another 30 days. Key to meeting these deployment goals is the capability of units to move rapidly from their installations to land, sea, and aerial ports of embarkation or to designated locations within the United States. Military units use various methods to move equipment and personnel to seaports. Heavy equipment usually will be shipped by rail; however, some equipment must be deployed on public roads, either driven by military personnel or consigned to commercial carriers, to arrive at the seaport on specific dates and times for loading onto ships. When the military uses public roads, it organizes the equipment into convoys for control and protection. Appendix B provides detailed information about the military's organization of convoys and standard highway procedures for convoys. Insights from OIF highlight the dynamic and changing nature of military deployment needs. During the spring of 2003, shipment volumes of military assets from military installations through the nation to strategic seaports increased 29 percent. This increase created a 15 percent increase in required truck capacity just for military needs.[2] For certain States with destination ports, the increase in truck volume was greater than 15 percent because vehicles were traveling from multiple States to a designated port within a State. Consequently, some States with PPPs became concerned about regional and local roadway congestion and extended hours of operation involving greater than average volumes. Rail carriers experienced similar volume increases. While most rail carriers accommodated the increased demand for their services between military installations (with rail connections) and ports, logistical and operational issues in selected regions of the country prevented certain equipment from moving by rail. For example, some military installations did not have rail accessibility but needed to move assets. Also, the special rail cars used for transporting military assets ("X-cars") were not always available in convenient locations, creating additional shortfalls in rail capacity. Figure 1 illustrates a typical use of DoD X-cars. While rail operations were generally successful, operational and capacity shortfalls required truck carriers to complete the deployment mission, resulting in the addition of commercial carriers on the public roadways.

### Highways Key to the Economy

#### A strong, competitive highway system is key to sustain growth

FHWA May 2012 “Productivity and the Highway Network: A Look at the Economic Benefits to Industry from Investment in the Highway Network” http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/policy/otps/060320b/index.htm

The highway network provides important economic benefits to individuals and businesses throughout the United States. Improved reliability, quality, and access of the highway network promote efficiency through industrial restructuring, adoption of new transport technologies, cost reductions, and changes in distribution or logistics patterns. Thus, a well-functioning highway network helps the Nation maintain a globally competitive position. There are three general categories of economic benefits from the highway network. The first category includes employment supported by highway construction activities (see companion brochure, The Employment Benefits of Highway Investment). The second category encompasses direct user benefits accruing to commuters and travelers, including time savings, safety improvements, and vehicle operating cost reductions. The third category covers industry productivity. Transportation investment promotes efficiency through adoption of new transport technologies, expanded intermodal access, and reduced costs. This brochure focuses on measuring industrial productivity effects. Information on industrial productivity benefits is useful to the FHWA as the agency evaluates Federal-aid program investments, promotes public-private joint ventures, and reports the conditions and performance of the U.S. highway system. Traditionally, highway investment decisions have been based on direct user benefits of reduced operating costs, travel time, and accident rates. Economic development objectives have often played a role in investment decisions, but the impact on industry productivity has seldom been considered. Productivity is the ratio of outputs produced to the inputs used to produce those goods and services. Productivity growth occurs when the same inputs produce more output. This growth may be caused by higher education and skill levels, growth in the quality and quantity of the capital stock, innovation, technological advances, or public investment, such as highway investment. It is clear that public investments to increase the economic impact of the highway network result in important monetary benefits for the private sector. These commercial benefits of the highway network improve the standard of living throughout the United States by reducing the costs of production, supporting productivity and output growth, and promoting international competitiveness. A new study by M. Ishaq Nadiri of New York University and the National Bureau of Economic Research and Theofanis Mamuneas of New York University estimates industry productivity benefits resulting from the highway network. This study was sponsored by the FHWA and reviewed by a panel of expert economists. This research is unique in the depth and breadth of its 35-industry data base and its ability to present new measures of industry productivity benefits. It supports the premise that the highway network positively influences economic performance.

### Mass Transit Warming Turn 1NC

#### Urban Mass Transit causes warming

Kevin Libin (Staff Writer for National Post) “Rethinking Green: Save the environment: Don't take transit” Dec 11 2009 http://www.nationalpost.com/

When the Toronto Transit Commission announced in November it would hike fares a 25¢ in the new year -- a roughly 10% increase -- it blamed the usual suspects: rising costs of fuel and wages. The system, said TTC chairman Adam Giambrone, faced a $100-million shortfall in next year’s operating budget. When the bad news broke, the Torontoist.com, compared the inflation of the TTC’s 21 fare hikes in the past 30 years against the price of gasoline and against the inflation rate. Consistently, the analysis found, TTC fares had risen faster than inflation, and far faster than the price of gas. Between 1980 and 2010, the cash fare, adjusted for inflation, soared more than 80% and token prices are up 50%. The price of a litre of unleaded gas? Up about 30%, without inflation. As for wage increases, Statistics Canada reported last year that the median full-time, full-year salary of average Canadians has hardly increased at all since 1980. Although it is charging more than ever, getting heftier federal, provincial and municipal subsidies than at any time in its history, although fuelling a car is pricier; and though its customer base has never been larger or keener to reduce its carbon footprint, the TTC, the largest system in the country, is struggling as much as ever to stem its losses. If this is the future of public transit, it does not look bright. As other major systems across the continent strain in similar circumstances, the strategy of public transit system boosters has been to promote the service as an environmental necessity. In the name of Mother Nature, North American transit systems have received billions in subsidies in recent years — even though they were never developed for environmental purposes in the first place. If the goal is to reduce carbon dioxide emissions, air pollution and gas consumption, and maximize the environmental impact of sustainability spending, we may be better off without publicly funding transit at all. “Subsidized transit is not sustainable by definition,” says Wendell Cox, a transport policy consultant in St. Louis, and former L.A. County Transportation commissioner. “The potential of public transit has been so overblown it’s almost scandalous.” It’s not that environmentally minded transit promoters are being dishonest when they argue that city buses are more efficient than private cars: It’s that they’re talking about a fictional world where far more people ride buses. Mass transit vehicles use up roughly the same energy whether they are full or empty, and for much of the time, they’re more empty than full. For the bulk of the day, and on quieter routes, the average city bus usually undoes whatever efficiencies are gained during the few hours a day, on the few routes, where transit is at its peak. Last year, policy analyst Randal O’Toole ran the numbers for the CATO Institute, where he is a senior fellow, comparing mass transit vehicles to private vehicles, ranking each based on how much energy they consume and how much CO2 they emit. The average motorized city bus, he reports, burns 27% more energy per mile than a private car and emits 31% more pounds of CO2. The U.S. Bureau of Transportation Statistics confirms that the average city bus requires 20% more energy per passenger than the average car. “Unfortunately, right now the state of the art is that you’re generally better off with private automobiles when you’re talking about energy utilization. About the only way that transit can be competitive for energy or for environmental quality is if the transit lines gets an incredible amount of use, far higher than is now normally the case,” says Tom Rubin, a transit policy consultant in California, and former chief financial officer of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority. But crowded systems are a turn-off for riders, he says, so more passengers means even more buses and rail cars. “It’s almost impossible to make transit more attractive without spending a huge amount of money.” The bus may be the most inefficient part of any major city’s transit network, but they’re the most vital part. Wider use of subways and light rail relies utterly on a feeder system of buses, says Michael Roschlau, president of the Canadian Urban Transit Association. “You can’t just run [Calgary’s] C-Train by itself and expect everyone to drive to the stations,” he says. “Same thing for the subway in Toronto or Skytrain in Vancouver.” Without buses to carry them from their neighbourhood to the train stations, even fewer citizens would ride the trains, making trains, in turn, less efficient per passenger.

### Mass Transit Warming Turn 2NC

#### Causes warming – worse than the private car

Andrew Nusca, quoting Randal O’Toole, an urban policy expert with Cato November 29, 2010 “Without ridership, public transit fails at energy efficiency” http://www.smartplanet.com/blog/smart-takes/without-ridership-public-transit-fails-at-energy-efficiency/12623

Writing at The Antiplanner, urban policy expert Randal O’Toole argues that public transit will never be more energy efficient than the private car — at least not at current ridership levels, with light rail at 14 percent, commuter rail at 21 percent and trolley buses at 16 percent. The problem, O’Toole writes, is that public transit modes spend an awful lot of time empty: Suppose you take a bus or train to work during rush hour and it seems full. But it really only seems full as it approaches the center of town. It is likely to be nearly empty when it starts its journey in the suburbs, and be nearly full only when it gets close to the city center. Over a single, one-way journey into town (or out of town in the afternoon), the vehicle is likely to average only about half full. Plus, that bus or train has to return in the other direction, and then it could be nearly empty. Now the transit line averages just one-quarter full. Add to that all the trips made during non-rush hours, and it is hard to imagine that transit vehicles can possibly average much more than one-fifth full. There’s no doubt that public transit helps in myriad ways, from neighborhood development to economics. (Infrastructure investment carries a high price tag, but it also stokes an economy in a way that few other projects does.) But an environmental argument? O’Toole says it’s not as rosy a picture as it seems: The high rail non-fuel costs cancel out the slight fuel-related energy savings of rail transit over cars. In any case, the only strategies that might make transit energy efficient are to run it only during rush hours or only in dense city centers–and even then there is no guarantee. Of course, there is a third strategy: privatize transit and let the private owners decide when it is efficient to run.

### Mass Transit Politics Link

#### GOP hates transit funding

by Ben Goldman( covering the federal transportation beat for Streetsblog Capitol Hill), February 2, 2012 6:17 pm, http://greatergreaterwashington.org/post/2692/staa-tuned-transportation-bill-leaves-funding-quesiion-hanging/

In a move that should dispel any remaining thoughts that the House transportation bill will ever be signed into law, the Ways and Means Committee announced today that they will try to forbid gas tax revenue from funding transit. The Ways & Means bill would funnel all gas tax revenue toward road programs, redirecting billions of dollars per year away from transit, which for decades has received about 20% of fuel tax receipts. Instead, the House GOP wants transit funding to come entirely from the general fund, pitting transit against all other government spending. To offset that spending, $40 billion would have to be cut from the rest of the federal budget. Essentially, the House GOP is holding transit hostage to achieve budget cuts elsewhere—and they don't seem to care if the hostage dies. They will also be tossing aside a precedent set during the Reagan administration, one that has enjoyed bipartisan support through several transportation bills, including the 2005 law, known as SAFETEA-LU, which was passed by a Republican president and Republican Congress. Dan Smith of USPIRG put it like this: The House Ways and Means Bill stops just short of defunding America's public transit system. Instead it says that the real money with a funding source will all go to highways, while the tooth fairy will pay for transit. For Big Oil and the highway lobby, this is a dream, but it's a nightmare for America's transportation future*.* In keeping with the secretive nature of the current House's transportation reauthorization process, the announcement comes just one day before Ways and Means will mark up the bill. There is even less time to protect transit funding in the House bill than there was to protect bike/ped programs in today's T&I markup.

### AFF – UMT Solves Warming

#### Their argument is based on flawed analysis – UMT reduces transportation emissions

Todd Litman Victoria Transport Policy Institute “Evaluating Public Transit As An Energy Conservation and Emission Reduction Strategy” 6 November 2011

Critics argue that public transit is an inefficient way to reduce fuel use and emissions, since average fuel consumption per passenger-mile is only modestly lower for transit travel than for driving, and higher than for highly efficient cars such as hybrids. They therefore argue that public transit improvements are less cost effective than strategies which encourage motorists to purchase more efficient and alternative fueled vehicles. This type of analysis tends to overlook several factors: • Transit’s relatively low average fuel efficiency occurs because most service is designed primarily to provide basic mobility for non-drivers, and so operates at times and locations with low demand. On major urban routes with relatively high load factors (portion of capacity that is actually used), transit buses and trains are fuel efficient. • The marginal energy cost of additional ridership (the additional fuel consumed if additional passengers use available vehicle capacity) is often very low. Policies that increase transit ridership on routes with excess capacity can increase energy efficiency. • Some transit improvements, such as bus priority lanes and faster loading systems increase transit energy efficiency by reducing delays and stop-and-go operating conditions, as well as improving performance (passenger’s travel speed and comfort). • High quality transit tends to stimulate transit-oriented development, creating compact, multi-modal neighborhoods where residents tend to own fewer cars, drive less and rely more on walking, cycling and public transit. This provides significant additional energy savings and emission reductions. • High quality public transit provides additional benefits besides energy savings and emission reductions, including congestion reductions, road and parking facility cost savings, consumer savings and affordability (cost savings skewed toward lower-income users), improved mobility for non-drivers, support for strategic land development objectives (i.e. reducing sprawl), and improved public fitness and health. These cobenefits should be considered when evaluating public transit cost efficiency. • High quality public transit supports other energy conservation and emission reduction strategies, including transport pricing reforms and smart growth land use policies. For example, road pricing tends to be more politically acceptable and effective (a smaller price is needed to achieve a given vehicle travel reduction) on corridors with high quality transit services. Similarly, transit stations often provide a catalyst for creating compact, multi-modal neighborhoods. This suggests that public transit improvements can be cost effective as part of an integrated set of transport and land use policy reforms.

### A2: Highways DA

#### Highways are about to get defunded

Lisa Mascaro, Washington Bureau June 26, 2012 LA Times “Showdown time again in Congress on student loans, highways” http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/nation/la-na-congress-deadline-20120627,0,7023896.story

This dynamic has stymied talks on the highway bill. The $109-billion measure, which would pay for highway and transit projects for two years, passed with bipartisan support in the Senate in March but has run into turbulence in the House. Failure to approve a highway measure would halt the government's ability to collect the federal gas tax that pays for transportation construction and improvements. It is unclear what the loss of the 18.4-cent-a-gallon tax would mean for prices at the pump, but it would stall needed work on infrastructure.

#### No tradeoff- most funding comes from gas taxes

Youngstown News 6-25-2012 “Playing ‘chicken’ with transportation bill is bad policy” http://www.vindy.com/news/2012/jun/25/playing-chicken-with-transportation-bill/?newswatch

In past years, the transportation budget was as close to a no-brainer as legislation gets. For one thing, much of the revenue comes from fuel taxes, not the general fund. For another, no congressman in days gone by would want to appear to be against better roads and good jobs.

#### States are going to step into the hole

Sentinel & Enterprise 06/03/2012 “Rescuing our highways” http://www.sentinelandenterprise.com/editorial/ci\_20772720/rescuing-our-highways

More highway tolls -- and increased fares -- are in every motorist's future. It's inevitable that state and federal governments, strapped for cash to fix crumbling transportation infrastructure, go the toll route to raise the revenue they need. A Congressional commission, created to recommend ways to upgrade the nation's roads and highways, reported recently that the federal trust that pays for highway programs is forecast to go broke in 2013. It is urging Congress to prop up the fund, but neither the House nor Senate is willing to raise taxes at this point. So the commission is hoping that Congress will pass a law to create more tolls and higher charges. States are also asking Congress for the ability to charge tolls.