



COMMITTEE ON

TRANSPORTATION & INFRASTRUCTURE

SAM GRAVES, REPUBLICAN LEADER

House Democrats' Partisan Surface Transportation Bill (The INVEST in America Act)

Suggested Talking Points

Product of a Partisan Process

- The Speaker has continued to push a partisan progressive agenda, and this bill is indicative of that approach and represents little more than a progressive wish list.
- Committee Republicans stood ready to work across the aisle on a bipartisan bill all Congress but were not involved in the development of the Democrats' bill.
- All Members know the only way a surface transportation reauthorization will be enacted into law is through partnership, not partisanship. For decades, that's been the proven formula for passing surface transportation laws.

I Thought This Was an Infrastructure Bill

- The Green New Deal's stamp is evident on all transportation programs, making this bill look more like a climate change bill than an infrastructure bill. Numerous new green mandates are woven throughout new and existing core programs.
- The bill's climate change focus creates new grant programs that siphon funding away from core programs for fixing roads and bridges.
- Democrats' new mandates and top-down approach create *less* flexibility for our non-federal partners to accomplish the projects and infrastructure priorities of their communities.
- Committee Republicans estimate that new Green New Deal-style programs and mandates add at least \$16 billion to the bill's total cost.

The Cost of Partisanship

- The bill authorizes nearly \$500 billion – a significant 66% increase over existing law (the FAST Act) – but with no pay-fors identified yet by the Majority.

- Paying for the bill with the gas tax would require it to **double** over the next five years (from 18.3 cents to 36.6 cents per gallon). The diesel tax would also have to be raised 18.3 cents per gallon (from 24.3 to 42.6 cents).
- With trillions of dollars just provided by Congress to save jobs and combat impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, we have to be more mindful than ever of the impacts of major policy changes to our economic recovery.
- With many of America's transportation workers grappling with evolving circumstances, we are concerned that a rapid seismic shift in transportation programs will add to already considerable uncertainty in an industry struggling for its survival.

Increases Mandates, Reduces Flexibility, & Leaves Rural America in the Dust

- The bill prioritizes urban needs over rural needs, and its outsized funding increases focusing more on urban areas will leave rural America further behind.
- The bill discourages states from building new highways and reduces state flexibility by tying ideological policy goals to funding rather than acknowledging states and local partners have differing infrastructure needs in their communities.
- The number of new mandates and programs in the bill contribute to a seismic shift away from core infrastructure priorities (like roads and bridges), from an increased focus on measuring and reporting on greenhouse gas emissions to an increased focus on cycling and walking.

Republicans Continue to Focus on Commonsense Principles

- The issues and concerns with the Democrats' bill highlight the need to continue efforts with the Senate, transportation stakeholders, and Members of both parties willing to work constructively on addressing our priorities.
- In January, Committee Republicans released our [infrastructure principles](#):
 - Ensuring state flexibility
 - Focusing on core programs
 - Streamlining the review process
 - Addressing rural infrastructure needs
 - Incorporating new technologies
 - Fixing the Highway Trust Fund for the long-term
- We will work towards a measure that factors in our commonsense principles, can gain bipartisan support, and can get through both the House and Senate.