States CP

State CP – Neg

States CP – 1NC

Counterplan: The 50 States and all relevant United States territories should ____

The counterplan resolves federal mismanagement, saves us billions in tax dollars, and spurs broader federalism.

Patrick B. **McGuigan**, Editor of the Free Congress Family, Law & Democracy Report and the author of The Politics of Direct Democracy, "CapitolBeakOK: Transportation Federalism -- and Flexibility -- Proposed in New Bill from Coburn, Lankford,", 7-29-**2011**, http://lankford.house.gov/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=756&Itemid=100023)

In his statement, sent to CapitolBeatOK, Sen. Coburn said, "**Washington's** addiction to spending has bankrupted the Highway Trust Fund. For years, **lower-priority projects** like earmarks **have crowded out important priorities in our states, such as repairing** crumbling **roads and bridges**. "**Instead of** burdening states and micromanaging local transportation **decisions from Washington, states** like Oklahoma **should be free to choose how** their **transportation dollars are spent**. I have no doubt that Oklahoma's Transportation Director Gary Ridley will do a much better job deciding how Oklahoma's transportation dollars are spent than bureaucrats and politicians in Washington." Lankford applauded Coburn's leadership in the matter, observing, "This has been one of my top priorities since coming to Congress, and I'm happy to join Senator Coburn in this effort. This bill is a giant step for states by increasing transportation flexibility while improving efficiency. "**By allowing states to opt-out of the federal bureaucracy, they will be able to take** more **control of their own resources**. It will free Oklahoma to keep our own federal gas taxes and to fund new projects at our own discretion." Joel Kintsel, executive vice president at OCPA, told CapitolBeatOK, "I am so proud of the leadership shown by Senator Coburn and Congressman Lankford. Hopefully, **this is the beginning of a broader effort** by Congress **to return to federalism and withdraw from areas of activity rightfully belonging to the States**." Sen. McCain, the 2008 Republican nominee for president, said, "As a Federalist, I have long advocated that states should retain the right to keep the revenue from gas taxes paid by drivers in their own state. This bill would allow for this to happen and prevent Arizonans from returning their hard earned money to Washington. Arizonans have always received 95 cents or less for every dollar they pay federal gas taxes. This continues to be unacceptable, and for that reason I am a proud supported of the State Highway Flexibility Act." Sen. Vitter asserted, "**It's** very **apparent how badly Congress can mismanage** tax **dollars**, especially the Highway Trust fund which has needed to be bailed out three times since 2008. The **states know their transportation needs better than Congress**, so **let's put them in the driver's seat** to manage their own gas tax." Hatch contended, "**The federal government's one-size-fits all transportation policies and mandates are wasting billions of** taxpayer **dollars and causing inexcusable delays in** the **construction** of highways, bridges and roads in Utah and across the nation.

2NC Overview

The counterplan institutes a broad states-based approach to the transportation infrastructure investment that the aff does through a micromanaged federal mandate. The counterplan solves 100% of the aff – multiple warrants:

First – federal dollars fails. Low-priority projects that follow the plan crowd-out essential funding – this turns the aff because infrastructure development will be delayed and done poorly – that was McGuigan.

Second – states are better at it. They know their own local needs, are more efficient with buildups, and state ownership of resources ensures better management - that was McGuigan.

Third – multiple net-benefits. Federal action is followed by earmarks and inefficient policies that wastes billions and prevents the spread of broader Federalism – that was McGuigan.

We have comparative evidence – congressional bickering takes out 100% of the aff solvency – state action is comparatively more efficient and works.

Holler, 12 – Communications Director for Heritage Action for America (Dan, 04/04, "Thinking Outside the Beltway," http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2012/04/paying-for-it.php#2190872)

When it comes to the problem of how to pay for our nation's transportation needs, the temptation in Washington is to view Washington as the solution. After tens of billions in Highway Trust Fund bailouts and nine short-term extensions, it is clear **Washington does not hold the answer.** The real answer is outside the beltway. Former Pennsylvania Governor Ed Rendell recently scoffed at the idea of looking beyond Washington for transportation funding solutions, saying proponents of such a move "haven't looked at any of the state budgets recently." But the Governor misses the point. It is not that states are awash in cash (the federal government isn't either), but rather that **states are much more efficient.** Last year, Indiana Governor Mitch **Daniels explained his state "can build in 1/2 the time at 2/3 the cost when we use our own money only and are free from the federal rulebook.**" Literally just outside the Washington Beltway, a private company is adding four high-occupancy toll lanes for half the cost the government projected, and the lanes are better designed, too. **Instead of looking for an innovative solution, too many in Congress prefer to debate** various **funding mechanisms for months on end knowing they will settle for a gimmick that ensures insolvency. There is a better way**; lawmakers just need to know where to look.

Solvency – General

‘Turn-back’ to the states shifts resources and makes the transportation system sustainable – this isn’t possible in the world of the aff.

Utt, 12 – Herbert and Joyce Morgan Senior Research Fellow (Ronald, February 7, 2012, “Turn Back” Transportation to the States,” http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2012/02/turn-back-transportation-to-the-states)

Options for Reform **The federal transportation program has lost its way**: It is less and less about transportation and mobility and, for the most part, has evolved into a costly spending program distributing financial rewards to a growing number of influential constituencies on a pay-to-play basis. **One reform proposal that could substantially change this is legislation to “turn back” the federal highway program to the states**, where it once was lodged. Arguing that the program was created to build the interstate highway system—a goal that was met in the early 1980s—**turnback advocates believe it is time to declare victory and shift the resources back to the states**, recognizing that today’s surface transportation problems are largely local or regional in nature and that a Washington-based, centrally planned, command-and-control program has little to offer in the way of solutions. Also, as the record of the past few authorizations reveals, a Washington-based program is more vulnerable to a wheeling-and-dealing political process that has contributed to many of the existing diversions and regional inequities as elected officials pander to influential constituencies at the expense of the taxpaying motorist. **Under the turnback proposals that have been introduced in Congress since 1997, the federal government would incrementally shift to the states**, over a period of five or six years, both the highway responsibilities and the financial resources to fulfill them. Most proposals would accomplish this by reducing the federal gas tax by annual increments—say four cents per year—and allowing the state to add that amount to the gas tax that the state collects on its own. The total tax paid by the motorist stays the same, but the allocation of that revenue shifts to the states year by year until the collection of all 18.3 cents per dollar of the federal fuel tax is shifted to the states and all federal collections cease.[3] **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.**

Solvency – General

Overhead delays projects – local taxes and state accountability resolves.

Horowitz 12 - deputy political director of the Madison Project, contributing editor at Red State (Daniel, March 21, 2012, "A Real Solution to the Gridlock Over the Highway Bill," http://madisonproject.com/2012/03/a-real-solution-to-the-gridlock-over-the-highway-bill/)

Moreover, **the fact that Washington gridlock is able to encumber the majority of transportation projects for 50 states just serves to underscore the reason why we should devolve transportation spending to the states**. Since the completion of the Interstate Highway System in 1992, **there is simply no reason why states shouldn't levy their own taxes and manage their own highway projects, leaving the few projects with national scope to the federal government. If a state wants to fund public transportation, then let them have the debate about higher gasoline taxes on a local level. At present, there are 28 donor states – states that contribute more money than they receive in transportation funding**. This is utter nonsense.¶ Instead of proposing yet another "pale-pastel" alternative to the Senate highway bill, let's opt for a bold contrast and rally behind Tom Grave's Transportation Empowerment Act (H.R. 3264). This bill would gradually transition gas tax revenue to the states over a period of four years. By 2017, every state would keep 14.7 cents of the current federal gasoline tax, leaving 3.7 cents in the hands of the DOT for the purpose of national projects. That way, **each state can have a fair debate about their transportation needs and fund their priorities accordingly. If states conclude that they need more money for infrastructure, as the special interest groups have suggested, then it will become obvious to the local residents that the individual state needs to raise their gas tax or prioritize their spending in a different way.¶** With 50 states that are diverse in geography and population, Tom Grave's devolution bill represents true federalism at work. If we can't coalesce behind federalism in transportation issues, then what will we ever devolve to the states? Liberals want to maintain federal control over transportation spending to they can implement their social engineering, urban planning and environmental regulations. **It's time** for Republicans **to block highway spending from being used as the conduit for the statist agenda**.

Solvency – Airports

The counterplan would boost capacity and quality – federal action not necessary.

Poole 11 - director of transportation policy at the Reason Foundation, MIT-trained engineer, has advised the previous four presidential administrations on transportation and policy issues. He is a member of the Government Accountability Office's National Aviation Studies Advisory Panel and he has testified before the House and Senate's aviation subcommittees on numerous occasions (Robert W., 18th October, 2011, "Time to rethink US airport funding," http://www.centreforaviation.com/analysis/time-to-rethink-us-airport-funding-60733)

Thinking bold thoughts, airport leaders are considering the following trade-off for air-carrier airports: give up some or all AIP grants in exchange for decontrol of the level of PFCs. **In Aug-2011, for example, ACI-NA's Principato wrote to all 12 Senators and House members comprising the deficit-reduction Super Committee asking them to get the federal government out of setting the level of PFCs**. (Principato calls ACI-NA's reform effort **the "Moses initiative" — as in "let my airports go.")** A group of 10 of the country's largest airports sent the Super Committee a letter on 14-Sep-2011 saying they would be willing to give up AIP entitlement funds in exchange for PFC autonomy. **Several member airports wanted to go further, giving up all AIP funding if they got PFC autonomy, sources say. Leaders of 12 commercial airports in Texas met in Houston on 27-Sep-2011 to discuss the same set of issues**. In addition to PFC reform, they argued that Congress should make permanent the exemption of airport revenue bonds from the Alternative Minimum Tax. **There are reports that similar airport groups now exist in California, Florida, and New York.**¶ Way back in 1990, in my (David Bentley) first Reason Foundation policy paper on airport privatisation, I analysed FAA data on the 50 largest US airports, comparing how much federal ticket tax revenue each generated in 1987 and the amount each received in 1987 AIP entitlement grants. **Most of the largest airports** (Boston, New York La Guardia, Los Angeles LAX, San Francisco, etc) **got back less than 12% of what they generated, compared with significantly higher rates of return at medium-size airports** (Dallas Love Field got 42.5% back, Maui [Hawaii] got 33.6%, Memphis 30.6%). In other words, **the very airports that were most congested and providing the largest amounts of air travel services were getting short-changed by this sort of redistribution. But that tends to be the way the political process works.¶ Canada provides a workable model ¶ Canada de-federalised its airports several decades ago, devolving nearly complete control to newly created local airport authorities. Instead of getting federal grants, each airport is free to set its own Airport Improvement Fee** — essentially an uncapped PFC. **The result has been significant improvements in airport capacity and quality**, not a proliferation of "Taj Majal" terminals (as feared by US airlines).¶ Conservatives and tax-cutters should welcome a deal that would significantly cut AIP in exchange for having the federal government excuse itself from telling locally governed airports how to fund their capital improvements. This is precisely the kind of devolution many of them are supporting when it comes to highways and transit.

No solvency deficit – fed action not needed.

Poole 11 – director of transportation policy at the Reason Foundation, MIT-trained engineer, has advised the previous four presidential administrations on transportation and policy issues. He is a member of the Government Accountability Office's National Aviation Studies Advisory Panel and he has testified before the House and Senate's aviation subcommittees on numerous occasions (Robert W., November 2011, "Airport Policy and Security Newsletter #73," http://reason.org/news/printer/airport-policy-and-security-news-73)

But even that pales in comparison with the bolder approach suggested by the U.S. DOT during the Reagan administration. In those days, PFCs had been outlawed by Congress. But in the 1982 FAA reauthorization bill, Congress directed DOT to study the extent to which potentially self-supporting airports could be removed from getting federal airport grants. The resulting report, "The Effects of Airport Defederalization, Final Report," (DOT-P-36-87-4) was released in February 1987. **DOT's survey of airport managers found that defederalization had fairly strong support**: 55% of large hubs, 69% of medium hubs, 56% of small hubs, and 31% of non-hubs. **Analysis of the financial statements of 40 selected airports were used to estimate the amount of annual budgets that would need to be replaced by new funding sources for each of the four airport size categories.** Those results were converted into hypothetical per-passenger fee amounts, as follows (based on 1985 AIP amounts):¶ Large hubs $0.98 per enplanement¶ Medium hubs $2.15 " "¶ Small hubs $4.94 " "¶ Non-hubs $8.33 " "¶ **It would take some work to do a comparable analysis using today's AIP numbers and currently projected airport capital investment needs. But what was true in the mid-1980s is likely still the case today. AIP for air carrier airports could be replaced with increased PFCs, with the increases inversely proportional to airport size**. In FY 2006, those four categories accounted for 65.3% of the AIP total of $3.5 billion. Thus**, the one-year savings that year**

from defederalizing those four airport categories would have been $2.3 billion.¶ The 1987 DOT report also states the following about the bond market:¶ "**Airports do not now face, nor do they appear to face in the future, difficulty in borrowing from the private capital market to finance improvements. Voluntary or mandatory defederalization would have no perceptible effect on this situation." Today, after several decades of experience with PFCs, that statement is even more certain than it was 25 years ago**.

Solvency – Highways

Only the states solve highways

Kilcarr 12 – senior editor, Fleet Owner (Sean, 05/16, "Marking the "devolution" of highway funding," http://fleetowner.com/regulations/marking-devolution-highway-funding)

Scriber said the members of the policy panel – Adrian Moore, Ph.D.,vp-policy with the Reason Foundation; Gabriel Roth, research fellow at the Independent Institute; and Randall O'Toole, senior fellow with the Cato Institute – largely agreed that **the federal government should remove itself from the highway funding process and let states take over. "It's inherently more efficient for the states to handle this** rather than add in the extra step of the federal government collecting and then redistributing fuel taxes," Scriber pointed out. "Also note that **Congress has not increased federal fuel excise tax rates since 1993. Since then, inflation has eroded the buying power of those tax dollars by more than one-third. This has pushed the HTF to the brink of insolvency**, yet none of the proposals pending before Congress address this imminent threat to our nation's surface transportation infrastructure."

Federal highway management prevents efficiency and innovation – states solve.

Kilcarr 12 – Fleet Owner Senior Editor (Sean, May 16, 2012, "Marking the "devolution" of highway funding," http://fleetowner.com/regulations/marking-devolution-highway-funding)

As Congress continues to debate a variety of surface transportation funding bills – most notably the two-year Senate sponsored Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) – **several groups believe such federal-directed efforts are almost becoming moot as highway funding issues are increasingly "devolving" to the states.** At a briefing on Capitol Hill this week, a panel of experts led by Marc Scriber, land-use and transportation policy analyst with the Competitive Enterprise Institute (CEI), argued that near-default status of the Highway Trust Fund (HTF) due to inadequate fuel tax revenues and policy gridlock at the federal level is increasingly pushing states and localities to figure out ways to generate the funds required to build and maintain U.S. bridges and roads. "We've argued in the past that responsibility for generating highway funds should 'devolve' to the states, but now that's a largely 'defacto reality' as declining HTF revenues are forcing the states to look for new ways to generate the monies they need," Scriber told Fleet Owner. Scriber said **the members of the policy panel – Adrian Moore, Ph.D.**,vp-policy with the Reason Foundation; **Gabriel Roth, research fellow** at the Independent Institute; **and Randall O'Toole, senior fellow** with the Cato Institute – **largely agreed that the federal government should remove itself from the highway funding process and let states take over.** "**It's inherently more efficient for the states to handle this** rather than add in the extra step of the federal government collecting and then redistributing fuel taxes," Scriber pointed out. "Also note that Congress has not increased federal fuel excise tax rates since 1993. Since then, inflation has eroded the buying power of those tax dollars by more than one-third. This has pushed the HTF to the brink of insolvency, yet none of the proposals pending before Congress address this imminent threat to our nation's surface transportation infrastructure." He stressed, too, that as **fuel taxes are not providing the necessary funds, new methods must be examined** – especially in terms of mileage-use fees. Implementing some sort of mileage-use and time-of-travel fee structure will help address traffic congestion as well, which has significant ramifications for the freight industry, **Scriber said.** "Traffic congestion costs commuters some $100 billion per year in wasted fuel, lost working time, etc.," he explained. "But O'Toole added during our panel discussion what's not included in that total is the cost of freight delays due to congestion – which he said adds a further $100 billion annually to the overall cost of traffic congestion."

Solvency – High Speed Rail

States already cooperating together to develop high speed rail – they could it.

NWI Times, Times Staff, "States agree to move forward on high-speed rail study", 5-4-**2012**, NWITimes Online, http://www.nwitimes.com/article_b699ad6b-55bb-5123-88a2-01723b6b42a7.html

Indiana, Illinois and Michigan will work together on a study seeking ways to reduce rail congestion and allow trains to travel at higher speeds along the Chicago-to-Detroit high-speed rail corridor. U.S. Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood said Friday the study's goal will be to reduce passenger travel times between the two hubs and more efficiently move freight between the Chicago-Porter segment, which is one of the nation's busiest. **A $3.2 million grant from the Federal Railroad Administration and $200,000 from each of the states and Norfolk Southern will fund the study**. An important part of the study will be reducing congestion by linking a double track passenger main to the 110 mph service at Porter. The Porter Junction, a web of tracks on the town line between Porter and Chesterton, is a key link on the Chicago-to-Detroit high-speed route. Trains can already reach speeds of 110 mph from Porter to Kalamazoo, Mich.

Grants already exist for states that want high speed rail – individual state action is good, because those that choose not to participate free up grants for other states – augments solvency.

Michael **Grunwald**, Staff Writer for TIME, "No high speed rail funds for two states that don't want it", 12-9-**2010**, Time US, http://www.time.com/time/nation/article/0,8599,2036197,00.html

The Republican governors-elect of Wisconsin and Ohio have both pledged to shut down the federal high-speed rail initiatives in their states. Today, the Obama administration is beating them to the punch. Transportation Secretary Ray **LaHood** announced this afternoon that he **will redirect** about $1.2 billion in **high-speed grants** from Wisconsin and Ohio **to** a dozen other **states that want to continue their programs**. **California and Florida**, the big winners in last year's grant competition, **will get the bulk of the redistributed money as well**, up to $624 million and $342 million respectively; **Washington** ($161 million) **and Illinois** ($42 million) **will get most of the rest**. (See more on how high-speed rail went off track in Wisconsin.) "I am pleased that so **many other states are enthusiastic about the additional support** they are receiving to help bring America's high-speed rail network to life," LaHood said.

Solvency – High Speed Rail

Despite federal cuts, California has shown it can build on its own – federal manipulation complicates the process – delays in building are net beneficial because it ushers in the best tech.

Will **Oremus**, Writer for Slate, "Requiem for a Train", 12-7-**2011**, Slate Technocracy, http://www.slate.com/articles/technology/technocracy/2011/12/high_speed_rail_is_dead_in_america_should_we_mourn_it_.html

Some will point out that California's high-speed rail plan still isn't dead, exactly. (It's "more of a zombie," one blogger quipped.) **State officials**, backed by Democratic Gov. Jerry Brown, **have concentrated their efforts on building just one leg,** from agricultural Fresno to dusty Bakersfield, as a sort of desperate foot-in-the-door tactic. They still have the Obama adminstration's support. "We are not going to be dissuaded by critics," transportation secretary Ray LaHood said this week. "**We are only at the beginning of this multi-generational process—the simple fact is that the transportation challenges that are driving increased demand for rail are not going away**." That's true, but the chances that California—or the country—will meet those challenges now look dim. **The modern federal government isn't good at solving long-term problems** (if it ever was). Most Republicans don't believe the government should solve problems. They believe **big government**, in fact, **is the one of the only problems that can't be solved by the free market**. Democrats, as seen in the failures of all of these railroad projects, err by assuming that the government can solve problems more effectively than it realistically can. Ultimately, high-speed rail's backers weren't as staunch as its detractors. Barack Obama and congressional Democrats put their political lives on the line for health care, addressing an immediate problem whose consequences were personal and visceral. The nation's outdated infrastructure is a major dilemma but one that doesn't feel as pressing to most voters and legislators. It's our children's problem now. **If there's a silver lining to high-speed rail's spectacular failure, it's that these trains were outdated years ago**. Even if all went according to the Obama administration's plans, the nation's rail network would have remained meager and backward by comparison to those in Japan and China. Those countries are already building trains that run via magnetic levitation. Suspended a few inches above a guideway, maglev trains fly through the air at speeds greater than 300 mph, with minimal wear and tear. At this point in their development, maglev tracks are dauntingly expensive to build. But those **costs might well come down by the time America is ready to get serious about its transportation infrastructure. At this rate, there seems to be plenty of time**.

Solvency – AT: States Mismanage

States will be able to manage their own systems better because resources stay internally eliminating inefficiencies

Horowitz 12 – deputy political director of the Madison Project, contributing editor at Red State (Daniel, Feb 2, 2012, "Defeat The Highway Bill," http://www.redstate.com/dhorowitz3/2012/02/02/defeat-the-highway-bill/)

One need not be a staunch conservative to appreciate how inane it is to collect gasoline taxes from all 50 states into one pool, only to be doled out randomly for every state's personal transportation project. Ever since the Interstate Highway System was completed almost 20 years ago, there has been no rational purpose for the current top-down federal control over transportation. Successive congresses have diverted as much as 38% of the gas tax revenue to mass transit projects and wasteful endeavors for specific states. **The net result is that some states are donors (contribute more), while other states are recipients (receive more in funding than they contribute).¶ We need to abolish the federal gas tax, and devolve all responsibility and taxes for transportation projects to the states. The** two **bills percolating through Congress will double down on failed policies, add to the debt, perpetuate inefficiencies in highway construction, continue to encumber traffic, and preclude any devolution of responsibility to the states**.

Solvency – AT: States Mismanage

Mismanagement is high now – federal action creates transportation sector *bubbles* that collapse and hinder transportation – self-management by local actors solves.

Horowitz 12 – deputy political director of the Madison Project, contributing editor at Red State (Daniel, Jan 19, 2012, “Devolve Transportation Spending to the States,” http://www.redstate.com/dhorowitz3/2012/01/19/devolve-transportation-spending-to-states/)

Throughout the presidential campaign, many of the candidates have expressed broad views of state’s rights, while decrying the expansion of the federal government. In doing so, some of the candidates have expressed the conviction that states have the right to implement tyranny or pick winners and losers, as long as the federal government stays out of it. Romneycare and state subsidies for green energy are good examples. The reality is that **states** don’t have rights; they certainly don’t have the power to impose tyranny on citizens by forcing them to buy health insurance or regulating the water in their toilet bowels – to name a few. They do, however, **reserve powers under our federalist system of governance to implement legitimate functions of government. A quintessential example of such a legitimate power is control over transportation and infrastructure spending.¶ The Highway Trust Fund was established in 1956 to fund the Interstate Highway System** (IHS). The fund, which is administered by the DOT’s Federal Highway Administration, has been purveyed by the federal gasoline tax, which now stands at 18.4 cents per gallon (24.4 for diesel fuel). **Beginning in 1983, Congress began siphoning off some of the gas tax revenue for** the great liberal sacred cow; the **urban mass transit** system. Today, mass transit receives $10.2 billion in annual appropriations, accounting for a whopping 20% of transportation spending. **Additionally, the DOT mandates that states use as much as 10% of their funding for all sorts of local pork projects**, such as bike paths and roadside flowers.¶ **As a result of the inefficiencies and wasteful mandates of our top-down approach to transportation spending, trust fund outlays have exceeded its revenue source by an average of $12 billion per year,** even though the IHS – the catalyst for the gasoline tax – has been completed for 20 years. In 2008, the phantom trust fund was bailed out with $35 billion in general revenue, and has been running a deficit for the past few years. Congress has not passed a 6-year reauthorization bill since 2005, relying on a slew of short-term extensions, the last of which is scheduled to expire on March 31.¶ **Short-term funding is no way to plan for long-term infrastructure projects. In their alacrity to gobble up the short-term money before it runs out, state and local governments tend to use the funds on small time and indivisible projects, such as incessant road repaving, instead of better planned long-term projects.¶ It’s time for a long-term solution, one which will inject much-needed federalism** and free-market solutions **into our inefficient and expensive transportation policy**.¶ It is time to abolish the Highway Trust Fund and its accompanying federal gasoline tax. Twenty years after the completion of the IHS, we must devolve all transportation authority to the states, with the exception of projects that are national in scope. **Each state should be responsible for its own projects, including maintenance for its share of the IHS. Free of the burden of shouldering special interest pork projects of other states, each state would levy its own state gas tax to purvey its own transportation needs. If a state wants a robust mass transit system or pervasive bike lanes, let the residents of that state decide whether they want to pay for it**. That is true federalism in action.¶ The most prudent legislation that would transition responsibility for transportation spending back to the states is Rep. Scott Garrett’s STATE Act (HR 1737). Under this legislation, all states would have the option to opt out of the federal transportation system and keep 16.4 cents of their federal gasoline tax contribution. States would have the ability to use that money to raise their state gasoline tax and direct those funds more efficiently for their own needs. **States would be free to use the funds for vital needs, instead of incessant repaving projects that are engendered by short-term federal stimulus grants, and which cause unnecessary traffic juggernauts. States could then experiment with new innovations and free-market solutions that open up infrastructure projects to the private sector. The Tenth Amendment is not just a flag-waving principle; it works in the real world**.¶ It takes a lot of impudence on the part of the President to blame Republicans for crumbling infrastructure. It is his support for a failed central government system that is stifling the requisite innovations that are needed to deal with state and local problems.

Solvency – AT: States Won't Coordinate

1 – Counterplan solves – it mandates uniform 50 state and relevant territory action.

2 – Even if you win this argument, states aren't blind – they'll obviously build compatible transportation systems.

Callen 08 – The Harris School, University of Chicago [Zachary, February 24, 2008, "Responding to Railroad Hubs: State-Level Coordination and American Political Development," Page 7-8, http://harrisschool.uchicago.edu/programs/beyond/workshops/ampolpapers/winter08-callen.pdf]

To enhance the value of their own transportation infrastructure systems, states first emphasize connecting internal commercial sites, such as key manufacturing or farming centers with local ports of entry. However, **states share borders with one other**, and there are minimal barriers to capital or populations moving across borders (Peterson 1981; Hwang and Gray 1991). **Furthermore, no state is economically autonomous, and all states rely on other states as both markets to which they can export their own products** as well as necessary trading partners from which raw materials and manufactured goods that cannot be locally produced are obtained. The reality of state competition for limited capital and population reserves leads to questions of whether states will coordinate at all in regional projects. However, **states rely on connectivity with other states for their own economic success, forcing states to evaluate their infrastructure programs not just in terms of local service but also regional compatibility.**

AT: Perm – Do Both

1 – Permutation doesn't solve – it still includes federal mismanagement with state action – doesn't solve any of our case turns.

2 – Permutation requires state spending – means delays due to political gridlock, billions wasted, and a much weaker precedent for broader federalism.

3 – Independent state action is key.

Roth, 10 – civil engineer and transportation economist. He is currently a research fellow at the Independent Institute. During his 20 years with the World Bank, he was involved with transportation projects on five continents (Gabriel, June, "Federal Highway Funding," http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/highway-funding)

Today, the interstate highway system is long complete and **federal financing has become** an **increasingly inefficient** way to modernize America's highways. **Federal spending is often misallocated to low-value activities, and the regulations that go hand-in-hand with federal aid stifle innovation and boost highway costs.** The Department of Transportation's Federal Highway Administration will spend about $52 billion in fiscal 2010, of which about $11 billion is from the 2009 economic stimulus bill.1 FHWA's budget mainly consists of grants to state governments, and FHWA programs are primarily funded from taxes on gasoline and other fuels.2 Congress implements highway policy through multi-year authorization bills. The last of these was passed in 2005 as the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU). Congress will likely be reauthorizing highway programs in 2011, and it is currently pursuing many misguided policy directions in designing that legislation. One damaging policy direction involves efforts to reduce individual automobile travel, which will harm the economy and undermine mobility choice. Another damaging policy direction is the imposition of federal "livability" standards in transportation planning. Such standards would federalize land-use planning and pose a serious threat to civil liberties and the autonomy of local communities. Finally, ongoing federal mandates to reduce fuel consumption have the serious side effect of making road travel more dangerous. **The federal government pursues** these **misguided goals by use of its fiscal powers and regulatory controls**, and by diverting dedicated vehicle fuel taxes into less efficient forms of transportation. This essay reviews the history of federal involvement in highways, describing the evolution from simple highway funding to today's attempts to centrally plan the transportation sector. It describes why **federal intervention** reduces innovation, **creates inefficiencies** in state highway systems, and damages society by reducing individual freedom and increasing highway fatalities. Taxpayers and transportation users would be better off if federal highway spending, fuel taxes, and related regulations were eliminated. **State** and local **governments can tackle transportation without federal intervention.** They should move toward market pricing for transportation usage and expand the private sector's role in the funding and operation of highways.

4 – Our efficiency turn is *amplified* by including federal action with state action.

Edwards, 11 – Director of tax policy studies at the Cato Institute and the editor of www.downsizinggovernment.org (Chris, November 16, 2011, "Federal Infrastructure Investment," http://www.cato.org/publications/congressional-testimony/federal-infrastructure-investment)

Problems with Federal Infrastructure Investment **There are calls today for more federal spending on infrastructure, but advocates seem to overlook the downsides of past federal efforts**. Certainly, there have been federal infrastructure successes, but there has also been a history of pork barrel politics and bureaucratic bungling in federal investment spending. A substantial portion of federal infrastructure spending has gone to low-value and dubious activities. I've examined spending by the two oldest federal infrastructure agencies — the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation.7 While both of those agencies constructed some impressive projects, they have also been known for proceeding with uneconomic boondoggles, fudging the analyses of proposed projects, and spending on activities that serve private interests rather than the general public interest. (I am referring to the Civil Works part of the Corps here). **Federal infrastructure projects have often suffered from large cost overruns**.8 Highway projects, energy projects, airport projects, and air traffic control projects have ended up costing far more than originally promised. **Cost overruns can happen on both public and private infrastructure projects, but the problem is exacerbated when multiple levels of government are involved** in a project because there is less accountability. Boston's Big Dig — which exploded in cost to five times the original estimate — is a classic example of mismanagement in a federal-state project.

AT: Perm – Do The CP

The permutation doesn't include a federal mandate – vote negative – severance should be a voting issue because it eliminates all neg ground. Our counterplan isn't plan-plus, which should be the litmus test for why this perm is abusive.

AT: 50 State Fiat Illegit

1 – Your standard in theory debates should be literature solvency – our 1NC evidence is *comparative* between the two methods and makes an *opportunity cost* claim – proves the counterplan is a logical and predictable neg argument.

2 – The counterplan is reciprocal – the aff can defend a plethora of interpretations of what agency does the plan – we're are at least uniform.

3 – It's real-world – the tea party exists because of the debate about this counterplan.

4 – Key to neg ground – 'federal' is a central portion of the topic – we should be able to counterplan against it.

5 – Checks bad affs – if the aff doesn't have a fed key warrant to beat this counterplan, it's poor policy.

6 – Err neg on reasonability – this is a huge topic – if we lose the theory debate, you should reject the argument, not the team.

AT: States Spending DA

1 – Disad is non-unique – tons of spending at the state level now.

2 – Even if they win this – the impact of federal overspending is comparatively worse – it has a much larger economic impact. Our 1NC solvency evidence also proves it rolls back infrastructure investment.

3 – Federal financing is inefficient – states can raise their own dollars via taxes and private donors – this means the PERM links to the disad and not the COUNTERPLAN.

Horowitz 12 – Madison Project (Daniel, 05/03, "Devolution of Transportation Authority is Solution to Earmark Problem," http://madisonproject.com/2012/05/devolution-of-transportation-authority-is-solution-to-earmark-problem/)

There is no doubt that many localities are in need of some infrastructure updates. But there is an obvious solution to this problem. **Let's stop pooling the** gas tax **revenue of all 50 states into one pile for the inane and inefficient process of federal transportation policy. Every state**, due to diverse topography, population density, and economic orientation, **has its own transportation needs. By sucking** up **all the money into one pile in Washington, every district is forced to beg with open arms at the federal trough.** Moreover, **a large portion of the transportation funds are consumed by federal mandates for wasteful projects**, mass transit, Davis-Bacon union wages, and environmental regulations. This is why **we need to devolve** most **authority for transportation projects to the states. That way every state can raise the requisite revenue needed to purvey its own infrastructure projects.** The residents of the state, who are presumably acquainted with those projects, will easily be able to judge on the prudence of the projects and decide whether they are worth the higher taxes. If they want more airports, mass transit, or bike lanes, that's fine – but let's have that debate on a local level.

Cost projections presume federal micromanagement – the counterplan's method resolves the link.

Frankel et al, 12 – Emily, Visiting Scholar at the Bipartisan Policy Center, with Robert Poole, Director of Transportation Policy at the Reason Foundation, Mary E. Peters, Former Secretary U.S. Department of Transportation, and others (Letter to Senators Boxer and Inhofe and Congressmen Mica and Rahall, Building America's Future, 5/16/12, Bipartisan Policy Center, and Reason Foundation, http://reason.org/files/bipartisan_coalition_urges_fixes_to_transportation_bill.pdf)

In the current **era of severely constrained** investment **resources for surface transportation at all levels of government, states and metropolitan regions should be afforded greater flexibility to fund and finance their transportation facilities and networks.** Congress does not seem inclined to raise funding for surface transportation through increasing federal motor fuels taxes or by replacing those taxes with other dedicated funding. In the absence of new funding sources, at a minimum, Congress should provide states and metropolitan regions with the tools to develop and expand their potential sources of revenue and investment capital. To that end, **federal barriers to state innovation and flexibility should be substantially reduced, and no new ones should be erected.** While the Senate-passed surface transportation authorization bill, S. 1813, Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21), contained many important steps toward the establishment of a performance-based transportation program, it did not reduce these barriers. A bipartisan amendment to extend the Federal Highway Administration's tolling and highway user pilot programs and to expand the number of eligible participants was offered by Senators Carper of Delaware, Kirk of Illinois, and Warner of Virginia, but was ultimately withdrawn. This means that several **states that wish to fund the reconstruction of aging and deteriorating Interstate highways with tolls under existing pilot programs will be unable to do so. Additionally, it will limit the ability of states to utilize some of the innovative tolling programs that would assist in managing traffic congestion**, such as establishing high occupancy-tolled (HOT) and variably priced or managed lanes. Fifteen states are currently moving major projects forward thanks to innovations allowed under the Value-Pricing Pilot Program, Urban Partnership Agreements, and Congestion Reduction Demonstration Programs, and we would not want to see the pace of these innovations falter. More fundamentally, in failing to include such provisions in MAP-21, **the Senate has denied states and metropolitan regions the ability to create innovative and flexible programs to finance their transportation needs, as federal funding stagnates or declines.** While we recognize that the scope of this conference may limit Congressional authority to expand the flexibility of states and metropolitan regions to introduce tolling and user-charge regimes beyond current law, we urge the conferees to seek all available opportunities to maximize such state and local discretion. **The ability to establish these new user-related revenue streams**

would greatly enhance the capacity of states and metropolitan regions to leverage additional private capital for investment in the restoration, rehabilitation, and expansion of major transportation facilities through such credit and credit-enhancement programs as TIFIA and through public-private partnerships (PPPs). MAP-21 would greatly expand TIFIA, and a comparable expansion of TIFIA was contained in the bill adopted by the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee (T & I) in this session of Congress. Such a provision would have much greater impact in the context of expanded opportunities for tolling and user-based fees at the state and local levels. We are also are concerned that certain provisions incorporated into MAP-21 could discourage states from partnering with the private sector and from developing innovative tools to attract private capital to transportation investment, for fear of losing a percentage of federal funding. These provisions would also eliminate the option to use private activity bonds (PABs) to finance leased highway projects and would substantially lengthen depreciation timetables for long-term highway leases, making them less attractive to investors. While we respect the intent to protect the public interest that motivated these provisions, we are concerned that, as currently drafted, they do not respect the ability of states and localities to make such determinations of the public interest on behalf of their citizens and would make it more difficult to attract important new sources of investment capital for transportation infrastructure. With the federal government apparently less able or less willing to provide funds to states and localities for surface transportation, we hope that the scope of the conference committee's work will allow you to adopt a report that will expand the flexibility and capacity of states and localities to address their funding and investment challenges. **Old obstacles should be dismantled, and no new barriers should be erected. If states and metropolitan regions are going to be asked to do more in transportation, and if more of the funding and investment responsibilities are to devolve to them, it is essential that this legislation remove the restrictions to their capacity to innovate.** Such provisions in the final legislation can be central elements, in advancing innovation, progress, and global competitiveness.

States CP – Aff

Perm – 2AC

Permutation – do both.

Partnership between State and Federal governments is most favorable

Raymond, 12-US leader at Capital Projects and Infrastructure PwC (Peter, "Investing in transportation Doing more with less," January 2012, http://www.pwc.com/en_US/us/capital-projects-infrastructure/publications/assets/infrastructure-investing-dot.pdf)

In several of the countries surveyed, **a national body sets infrastructure investment policy and provides guidance to federal, state, and local governments**. This body can incorporate various considerations such as research and development needs, private sector investment requirements, and social considerations. **With guidance from this national body, the government is able to prioritize projects and funding across various competing sectors.** The activities of this body are typically transparent, allowing the public—especially residents of the affected areas—to see how priorities are identified and investment decisions made. **Infrastructure UK,** established in 2010, **creates long-terms plans in the UK to help address national infrastructure needs, coordinating future investment in research, development and innovation. The advisory body works with** public- and private-sector **stakeholders to develop and shape policy that encourages infrastructure investment** within the UK. It also serves as a liaison between public- and private-sector stakeholders. In response to funding and financing challenges, the UK aims to collaborate with a diverse investor base (both geographically diverse and by type of investment) for large, complex projects

50 State Fiat Illegit – 2AC

50 State fiat is illegitimate and a voting issue

1 – Reciprocity – we counterplan one unified actor – they manipulate and create coordination between dozens of actors.

2 – It's not real-world – not 50-state wide consensus has existed on any project ever.

3 – It kills all aff ground and destroys innovation – individual states obviously fail, but the nature of fiat makes it so most affs on the topic aren't tenable.

4 – Kills education by making debates a question of federalism every time – specific policy analysis is key.

5 – Reject the team – the state's CP is a crutch – judge signaling and voting trends improve debates over time.

Federal Action Key – Investment

States fail – federal action is key to sustain investment.

Freemark, 12 – journalist who writes about cities and transportation. He created and continues to write for the website The Transport Politic, and has also contributed to Next American City, The Atlantic Cities, Planning, and Dissent (Yonah, 02/16, "Clearing it Up on Federal Transportation Expenditures," http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2012/02/16/clearing-it-up-on-federal-transportation-expenditures/)

For one, as I have noted above, **states** and municipalities **have no clear record of choosing to invest in better projects when they are fully in charge of collecting the revenues** to do so. **States have too often proven a complete disregard for public transportation investments when they're left fully in charge — see state infrastructure banks as evidence for that fact. While federal investments in transportation have been far from perfect, they have nonetheless provided for the significant expansion in transit offerings we're now seeing.** From the 1980s on, the Congress has maintained a steady stream of funding for transit from the fuel tax revenues it collects. How many states, which collect a huge amount of fuel tax revenues themselves, can say the same? But **the most important role of the federal government in transportation financing is to ensure that funding is maintained during economic downturns.** The Obama Administration actually increased spending on roads and transit projects following the 2008 recession, despite a decline in federal fuel tax revenues, because **it was able to use its power of deficit spending (an authority state and local governments do not have**) to maintain investments when the country needed them. Devolution is overrated.**

Federal Action Key – Capacity Planning

States lack the necessary capacity and planning and fight over investment.

The Economist, 11 (04/28, "America's transport infrastructure: Life in the slow lane," http://www.economist.com/node/18620944)
Formula-determined block grants to states are, at least, designed to leave important decisions to local authorities. But the formulas used to allocate the money shape infrastructure planning in a remarkably block-headed manner. Cost-benefit studies are almost entirely lacking. Federal guidelines for new construction tend to reflect politics rather than anything else. States tend to use federal money as a substitute for local spending, rather than to supplement or leverage it. The Government Accountability Office estimates that substitution has risen substantially since the 1980s, and increases particularly when states get into budget difficulties. **From 1998 to 2002,** a period during which economic fortunes were generally deteriorating, **state** and local transport **investment declined by 4% while federal investment rose by 40%. State** and local **shrinkage is** almost **certainly worse now. States** can **make bad planners. Big metropolitan areas**—Chicago, New York and Washington among them—often **sprawl across state lines. State governments frequently bicker over how (and how much) to invest.** Facing tight budget constraints, New Jersey's Republican governor, **Chris Christie, recently scuttled a large project to expand the railway network into New York City**. New Jersey commuter trains share a 100-year-old tunnel with Amtrak, a major bottleneck. Mr Christie's decision was widely criticised for short-sightedness; but **New Jersey faced cost overruns** that in a better system should have been shared with other potential beneficiaries all along the north-eastern corridor. **Regional planning could** help to **avoid problems like this.**

Federal Action Key – Coordination

Federal coordination is a preqrequisite – key to state solvency.

Corless 12- Campaign Director, Transportation for America, former California director and national campaign manager for the Surface Transportation Policy Project (James, May 23, "Local Voters Need a Partner," http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2012/05/not-waiting-for-the-feds.php#2211941)

Absent strong federal leadership, states, cities and local communities are indeed stepping out on their own, raising funds from innovative sources, and doing what they can to make it happen. But left to shoulder the burden entirely alone, these communities' noble efforts won't be enough to meet the challenges we're facing. These communities are stepping forward, but in the hopes that the federal government will take the next step with them and support them along the way. The role for the federal government in transportation is indeed changing, evolving from being the driving factor that it was during the interstate era to being more of a partner in helping localities meet their changing needs. And their needs are a national concern, because they bear on whether Americans have a safe, reliable way to get to work, and whether goods can get to market. No developed nation in the world leaves these matters of basic infrastructure entirely to chance. But there seems little doubt that, for the foreseeable future, federal resources will be constrained, and that makes it more imperative than ever that we set goals for the investment, and measure progress toward those goals. That's why provisions to do that in the Senate's bipartisan transportation bill, MAP-21 bill are so important. It's time we figure out what matters most, and what will get the best bang for the buck. Local communities raising money for transportation are following a tried-and-true blueprint that rewards accountability and specificity: When they know what transportation dollars are going to buy — this new transit line, that new busway, this new bridge project — and who is accountable for implementation, measures to fund those projects pass close to 70 percent of the time. Such was the case with the transit-funding Measure R in Los Angeles, which earned a two-thirds majority vote. Having passed the tax, Los Angeles is now seeking federal help with low-cost loans that can build 30 years worth of projects in 10. Local bootstraps are great for getting off the ground, but they only get you so far up the ladder if the federal rung is missing. These innovators aren't pressing for "devolution," they're simply looking for a dance partner.

Federal Action Key – Research Monopoly

Coordination key- federal government has a monopoly on research

Katz et al 10 (Bruce Katz, Jennifer Bradley, and Amy Liu, November, "Delivering the Next Economy: The States Step Up," The Brookings Institution, Brookings- Rockefeller Project on State and Metropolitan Innovation)

States already share responsibility with Washington for many of the public-sector investments that will move the next economy forward. There is a continuum of federal and state spending and engagement on the constituent elements of the next economy, with both levels of government involved to a greater or lesser extent. For example, the federal government dominates in research funding, with federal actual outlays for R&D in FY 2007 of $116 billion, compared to less than $700 million spent by state agencies and another $3 billion spent by state (and local) governments for R&D at colleges and universities.3 By contrast, for every dollar that the federal government spends on highways, the states spend about two.4 The federal Department of Education spent some $68 billion in FY 2008, on both K-12 and higher education, plus another $21 billion in tax expenditures related to education, but states spent more than $400 billion of their own funds for the same purpose.5

<u>States Fail – Coordination</u>

States are too uncoordinated to solve – prefer this evidence because it describes the *wording* of the counterplan.

EPIC, 12 – Energy Policy Information Center (03/08, "You say you want a devolution; transportation policy and energy security," http://energypolicyinfo.com/2012/03/you-say-you-want-a-devolution-transportation-policy-and-energy-security/)

That's an interesting idea, but misguided. States do determine their own transportation priorities today, except when Congress earmarks — DeMint and others are right in their opposition to that practice. But **<u>in general, construction priorities aren't dictated to the states — but national needs and priorities are given additional national funding</u>** that the states then spend in accordance with those needs. And while Senator DeMint is correct when he says that the system "is plagued by thousands of wasteful earmarks, bureaucratic red tape, and outdated funding formulas that pick winners and losers," **<u>that's a good reason to reform the system, not throw up our hands and just let individual states decide our national transportation policy through 50+ disparate and uncoordinated efforts.</u>** This is especially the case given the huge macro and microeconomic toll inflicted by our transportation-driven dependence on petroleum. While there are others, **<u>that's reason enough for a national transportation policy and reason enough to be wary of seductive calls for devolution.</u>**

If they say fiat solves this argument, it's a voting issue – they can't just make up a mindset mechanism of cooperation that has never existed and isn't seriously advocated.

States Fail – Experience

States can't solve – no experience

Perl 12-Director of the Urban Studies Program at Simon Fraser University, chairs the Intercity Passenger Rail committee of the U.S. Transportation Research Board (Anthony, May, "Assessing the recent reformulation of United States passenger rail policy," Journal of Transport Geography, Volume 22, Pages 271-288, Science Direct)

Compared to these resources, state governments possessed the most limited rail passenger knowledge, by a wide margin. Before ARRA, most state governments would not even have considered themselves participants in rail policy. State departments of transportation saw their core mission as building and maintaining **roads,** with some secondary responsibilities in public transit, ports, and aviation. Only a handful of state transportation departments had permanent staff working on intercity rail passenger planning or program delivery. When the GAO queried FRA officials about state capacity in rail passenger policy, the response revealed some awareness of the constraint: "While [FRA officials] found that some states are more advanced in their planning for passenger rail projects than others**, some have no state resources dedicated to rail and many do not have a state rail plan to guide their efforts.**" (United States Government Accountability Office, 2010, p. 27) **Assigning a** leading **implementation role to organizations possessing the most limited capacity within the rail sector could have been expected to produce some challenge** to meeting the President's new policy goals.

States Fail – Investment

States fall short – federal investment is critical

Kavinoky, 12 – executive director of transportation and infrastructure at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce (Janet, 02/16, "5 Answered Questions about Federal Transportation Infrastructure Investment," http://www.freeenterprise.com/infrastructure/5-answered-questions-about-federal-transportation-infrastructure-investment)

Some members of Congress want to eliminate federal transportation programs altogether and leave the responsibility to states. Is that a good idea? Absolutely not. States need a strong federal partner to ensure that interstate commerce, international trade policies, interstate passenger travel, emergency preparedness, national defense, and global competitiveness are adequately supported by the nation's infrastructure. Without federal support for an interconnected transportation system, several large, less-populated rural states would be unable to afford the costs of sustaining their roads and bridges. Many of our nation's conservative visionaries, including Alexander Hamilton, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, Dwight Eisenhower, and Ronald Reagan, understood the proper role of the federal government in meeting these needs, as Pete Ruane, president of the American Road and Transportation Builders Association, notes in today's Washington Times. Even today, some of the most vocal opponents of federal spending recognize the importance of transportation investment. Rep. Paul Ryan points out in A Roadmap for America's Future that transportation is a core government responsibility: "**Governments must provide for a limited set of public goods: they must build roads and other infrastructure, foster the protection of property rights, and maintain internal and external security… this 'core' government spending tends to foster economic growth**.

States Fail – No Money

States don't have the money – increased federal investment is key

Hart 11 – VICE PRESIDENT FOR GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS AND GENERAL COUNSEL, US HIGH SPEED RAIL ASSOCIATION (Thomas A., 01/27, "TESTIMONY OF THOMAS A. HART, JR., ESQ.," PDF)

The debate is now **how do we fund** one of **America's** most important **infrastructure projects.** With the continuing economic and political climate of reducing public spending and the challenges in attempting to balance the budget, the future HSR development in the Northeast Corridor will heavily depend upon private sector investment. In addition, **the price tag is encouraging** some **state government institutions to redirect capital away from these** types of **projects. In spite of this, there has been a renewed commitment for federal investment from the Obama administration, but more capital is needed to ensure** a **success**ful project that meets the expectations of consumers in an efficient and profitable manner. Public-private partnerships are needed to carry out this important national program and global experience shows that they can be successful.

States Fail – Uniformity

States lack solvency- National strategy and funding key

Davis, 1 - the Deputy Communications Director for Transportation for America (Stephen Lee, "The more they see, the less they like: 10 reasons why opposition to the House transportation bill is growing," Transportation for America Campaign, http://t4america.org/blog/2012/02/21/the-more-they-see-the-less-they-like-10-reasons-why-opposition-to-the-house-transportation-bill-is-growing/)

10. Abandons any true "national" interest in transportation.¶ For anyone who believes that infrastructure investment is a national priority, and that **America must be bigger than the sum of its 50 parts to compete in the global economy**, H.R. 7 should be cause for alarm.¶ **Gone are any and all national discretionary programs — no Projects of National and Regional Significance, no competitive TIGER program, no freight program. The Interstate highway program itself could never have been built if everyone in Montana was asked to pay for their own stretches of I-90 and I-15. It worked because it was and is a national system.¶ Just as the Port of LA/Long Beach moves goods through to the rest of the US, and the CREATE project in Chicago is alleviating freight rail bottlenecks so products can make it from coast to coast, there is an unmistakable need for a national strategy with national investments**. Yet H.R. 7 abandons that concept, and with it may well be setting the stage for the **federal government to back into a block-grant approach to transportation investments. That could put the nation on a perilous course towards abandoning any and all future federal investments in transportation**.