Regional Bodies

United States Senate

CHAIR: Wyatt Christian

GWCIA 30

December 6th

GWCIA 30

GWCIA 30

Letter from the Chair

Dear Delegates,

It is my pleasure to welcome you to the United States Senate at GWCIA 30! My name is Wyatt Christian and I am incredibly excited to be your chair for this committee!

I am a sophomore here at GWU, double majoring in political science and history. I have staffed both GWCIA and WAMUNC, our high school level conference, in the past, and have participated in over 6 college level MUN conferences. I am also the Director of Programming for the International Affairs Society at GW, and I am currently an intern with the Department of Defense. When I am not working or studying, I love to read, experience DC, or explore in nature.

Infrastructure, and specifically public transportation, have long been of interest to me, to some extent even a hobby. The policy surrounding the physical buildings and construction of this nation is in my opinion one of the most wide-reaching examples of government action, or inaction. Infrastructure legislation has long been one of the few areas where both Democrats and Republicans have been able to find common ground and compromise. I want the bipartisan and all-encompassing nature of this topic to reflect in the work and discussion of this committee, which may be divided into Democrats and Republicans, but can be united in a single cause and goal. I am very much looking forward to seeing all your solutions and debates come conference time.

Please make sure to reach out to me if you have any questions, comments, or concerns about the committee and the topics at hand.

All the best,
Wyatt Christian
Chair of U.S. Senate
wyatt.christian@gwu.edu

GWCIA 30

Committee Description

It is the year 2021, and the 117th Congress of the United States Senate is at the helm of the creation and passage of a comprehensive infrastructure package. The newly inaugurated Biden administration promised the American people serious investment into this nation's infrastructure, specifically in regards to rail transportation and green energy production. However an idea has a long way to go between the President's mouth and the Senate floor. Many in Congress have little stomach for the increases in expenditure required for such an undertaking, and the controversial policies of energy reform are often a breaking point for many. Republican support for the President's agenda is likely to be minimal, and even Democratic support cannot be taken for granted. Senators, your task is simple, yet grand. Overcome the gridlock of Washington and deliver to the American people a bill that will define the future of America.

Committee Procedure

This committee will generally function under the normal GA ruleset, however some changes and additions have been made to better mimic the US Senate

- Senators will have the power to enforce policy and laws using their written legislation
- Senators will have the power to raise taxes given the lack of a House
- Senators will be able to call Party Caucuses, a form of unmoderated caucus where delegates can only interact with fellow members of their political party.
- Senators will not be able to use any form of Filibuster
- Votes, both procedural and non-procedural, will require a majority to pass
- If procedural vote ends in a tie, then the motion will pass
- If a non-procedural vote ends in a tie, the tie will be broken by the VP.

GWCIA 30

Topic 1: Rail Infrastructure

The United States has one of the largest rail networks in the world, at approximately 140,000 miles of track, most of which is unelectrified and serves only freight services. The freight rail industry moves about 1.5 billion tonnes of goods every year, an amount valuing at around $80 billion. Products ranging from grain, gas, water, chemicals, coal, and more are all primarily transported on freight lines. A majority of freight services are operated by a group of about 30 companies, however there are a total of over 600 freight rail companies in the nation.

This industry employs about 160,000 people, making it one of the smaller sectors of the wider transportation industry. The freight rail industry has come under increased scrutiny in recent years due to a number of combining factors. Relaxed safety regulations have led to an uptick in accidents and crashes involving freight trains, and oftentimes passenger vehicles; Worker's rights disputes involving unions have resulted in numerous gaps in service, and have even caused worker strikes; and private ownership of the rail lines and tracks have made maintenance and usage by passenger services slow and expensive to implement.

While the American freight rail system may be one of the largest in the world, its passenger rail system is comparatively tiny. Amtrak, The US's largest passenger rail service operates on about 21,000 miles of track, only about 700 miles of which is directly owned by Amtrak. Amtrak moved around 32 million passengers in 2019, however numbers have since decreased since the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic. Amtrak's most popular route is the Northeast Corridor, on which the Northeast Regional and the Acela services both operate. This corridor from Boston to Washington D.C., along with a small branch line to Harrisburg, PA, is the only electrified intercity rail in the entire United States.

GWCIA 30

America does have a series of commuter/regional rail services, multiple of which are majority electrified. The purpose of commuter/regional rail is to connect suburbs and outlying towns to a major city. Examples of regional rail operators include SEPTA (PA), NJTranist (NJ), Long Island Railroad (NY), MBTA (MA), METRA (IL), and Metrolink (CA). These regional rail systems are in contrast to more local metro/subway systems. These rail systems focus more on providing fast and frequent rail transit within the confines of a single, large city. Cities with notable subway/metro systems include NYC, Washington, Chicago, Philadelphia, and San Francisco.

The U.S. has also in recent years invested heavily into “light rail”, a flexible and adaptable public transit style that is often cheaper and easier to build than traditional metro systems. Cities with large light rail systems include Dallas, Los Angeles, Charlotte, Seattle, and Minneapolis. Finally there is the case of high-speed rail, an expensive, though often worthwhile investment that America is lacking almost entirely. Only Amtrak’s Acela service can be considered high-speed rail by international standards, and even then only narrowly.

While all of these different systems have their strengths and weaknesses, they all share in their issues of a lack of funding and political willpower to see them built. The U.S. is universally considered to be decades behind the rest of the world in regards to its public transportation, and the powers at be in Washington have done little to address this conundrum. The collapse of the private rail industry in the 1960s left many gaps in service that the newly created Amtrak did not have the funds to fill. The Great Society programs of LBJ created some of the most modern and well-planned metro systems in the nation, but limited political support since their creation has led to stagnation and a lack of expansion. The Obama administration attempted to pump billions into rail transportation, including almost $10 billion into high speed rail, but whose only achievement has been California High Speed Rail, a project whose first phase won't be

finished until at least 2030. The United States has amazing potential in regards to our public rail system, but to unlock its full potential, serious reform and long-lasting funding measures will be needed to ensure long term success.

Intercity & High Speed Rail

As America's main provider of national intercity rail service, Amtrak has many expectations and responsibilities to bear upon its shoulders. Created in 1971 out of the remains of multiple bankrupted rail companies, Amtrak was originally intended to be a stop-gap in the inevitable death of passenger rail in the US. While Amtrak has been able to survive into the modern day, it has not done so without considerable difficulty.

Amtrak is a largely government owned corporation and takes a vast majority of its funding from the federal and state governments. However Amtrak is still legally obligated to act as though it is a for-profit company, limiting how much the company can spend on expansion and service improvement without increased government subsidization. In 2020 Amtrak received over $2 billion in funding from the federal government, and more from various state governments. Compare this with the over $100 billion annually that China spends on its national rail services, or even the $35 billion that the UK spends, and it becomes clear why the US is so behind. Increases in funding and reform to Amtrak's method of operations will be key to improving the quality of intercity rail service.

The largest gap in the American rail system is that left by the near nonexistence of American High Speed Rail. While Amtrak's Acela service was considered high speed when it first opened in the 1990s with a max speed of 150mph, modern high speed rail often broke 200 mph max speeds, with the fastest trains even approaching 300 mph. Attempts to build out more high speed rail in the U.S. have been slow, politically fraught, and extremely expensive. The California High Speed Rail project that was

approved by voters in 2008 was originally estimated to cost around $40 billion and open its first leg by 2020. Now in 2021 CAHSR is likely to cost over $100 billion and won't see public operation until at least 2030. Similar initiatives in Texas, Florida, and Nevada have also seen massive amounts of funding being pumped into projects that go nowhere. So why are rail projects such as these so hard to build?

A major reason for U.S. rail being financially impractical is the regulatory maze that projects must navigate before even breaking ground. While it was approved by voters in 2008, CAHSR did not even begin construction until 2015, largely because of environmental regulation boards preventing construction until their approval was given. Land costs are also a major issue, as land owners will often sit on their properties and only sell to the state after massive markups, way above market value, as the states rarely have the willpower to use eminent domain. Construction authorities are also insanely inefficient, consistently subcontracting out sections of projects to different companies, and state Departments of Transit rarely have the funding or expertise to pick up the slack themselves.

Without major reform in how the state and Federal governments fund rail projects, and without a comprehensive overhaul of construction industry practices, it seems unlikely that the construction of rail, both intercity and high speed, will become any easier in the US.

Metro & Light Rail

While Amtrak and other intercity rail services are almost entirely funded by the federal and state governments, metro & light rail projects tend to be funded from city and municipal governments, creating their own host of obstacles.

In 2019, the New York City Transit authority spent about $10 billion on the maintenance and improvement of the NYC subway, but only made about $6 billion of that back via fares and capital investment. Another $2 billion was given in subsidies from the state, but the final $2 billion simply got added to the city/state debt. And out of all the American metro systems, New York's has one of the most balanced budgets. Many cities around the country experience similar budgetary pitfalls as a result of poor ridership optimization, political negligence, and outdated operating systems. Transit systems in Asia such as the Tokyo subway or the Hong Kong MTR are able to not only fund themselves, but turn profits, largely due to their strategy of real-estate investment around their metro systems, however no American metro has ever been able to come even close to this level of financial independence.

Like with intercity rail, metro systems also suffer from massive construction costs and constant delays. A planned subway extension in northern Manhattan is estimated to cost up to $4 billion per mile. In Tokyo, $4 billion could pay for multiple complete metro lines. These problems once again arise from regulatory obstacles, high land prices, and the extra difficulties of building underneath large metropolitan areas. A recent alternative to traditional metro has been light rail. Light rail is traditionally built above ground, either at the surface or on elevated guideways, and tends to be built in more suburban or recently developed areas. Light rail is popular in many southern and western cities that have seen explosive growth in recent years, but has the major drawbacks of slower speeds, lower frequencies, and minimal capacity. While light rail is

a useful stop gap measure, and is much more politically feasible for many communities, as cities grow and densify, the constraints of the system will begin to show.

Overall, reform to city land-usage strategies and expansion packages will prove vital to making American metro and light rail both financially practical for cities, and able to stand the test of time.

Rail Ownership & Freightline Regulation

In the United States, the physical infrastructure of railways are almost entirely owned and operated by private freight companies. Besides rails owned by commuter/regional services, the only publicly owned railways in America are in the Northeast. Private ownership of the rails has long been a major hurdle in increasing the frequency of Amtrak intercity services. Private railways have to first give permission to Amtrak before it can use the railways, Amtrak then has to pay the freight company for some of the track's maintenance costs. Even after all that, Amtrak trains get lower priority than the freight trains, often causing delays and overall slowing down the speed of intercity passenger rail. Amtrak trains have been known to wait hours for a freight train to pass them by, just so they can continue on their route. The freightlines ownership of the tracks have also prevented many much needed repairs to the tracks. Repairs that don't often affect freight rail, but could have big impacts on the faster and more fragile passenger trains. Electrification of railways has also been near impossible, as freight companies refuse to invest the large amounts needed to electrify only to benefit Amtrak and not themselves. Private ownership of railways is one of the largest obstacles to passenger rail improvements, and likely won't be solved without a significant federal intervention on the side of Amtrak

GWCIA 30

The regulation of freight rail has come into the national spotlight recently as accidents involving freight trains have spiked, and will likely lead to greater catastrophe down the line if nothing is done about the issue. The average year sees about 10,000 safety incidents on freight rail lines, often consisting of crashes and derailments. Crashes, especially involving pedestrians or motor vehicles are often deadly, and derailments can spill massive amounts of possibly dangerous material in populated areas. Many freight accidents are as a result of lax regulation enforcement, as many legal standards are simply not adhered to by freight companies. Staffing shortages are also a major problem, as lower amounts of workers lead to more stressed workers, more mistakes, and less checks. But the most common cause of train accidents is simply aging infrastructure. Many railways haven't seen significant maintenance since the 1970s, with bridges crumbling, rails bending, and safety systems malfunctioning. A more comprehensive system of regulation enforcement, alongside significant financial investment into rail infrastructure appears necessary to prevent further safety concerns.

Guiding Questions:

1. What investments should be made to improve the coverage and quality of intercity rail?
2. Should high speed rail be a priority, or should conventional rail systems be the focus?
3. How can state authorities minimize construction costs and decrease project timescales without delivering a worse final product?
4. Should the federal or state governments intervene on the issue of railway ownership?
5. What should the focus of federal government regulation be in regards to safety in the railroad industry.

GWCIA 30

Topic 2: Green Energy Infrastructure

Climate change has been at the forefront of American politics for almost 20 years now. While the scientific community has known about the human-caused climate crisis since at least the 1970s, if not longer, Washington has been slow to respond. Al Gore, former Vice President to Bill Clinton and Democratic nominee for president in 2000, was one of the first major politicians to give climate change its own spotlight on Capitol Hill. His 2006 documentary "An Inconvenient Truth" was a first look for many Americans at a crisis that would challenge the nation for years to come. It quickly became clear that investment into green and renewable energy sources such as wind, solar, hydroelectric, and geothermal would be essential to cutting back carbon emissions. Since then however, adaptation to the climate crisis has been slow and piecemeal.

The George Bush administration with its Energy Policy Act invested funds into both green energy sources and fossil fuels sources, with a focus more towards energy efficiency and independence than greenhouse emissions. President Obama had the Clean Energy and Security Act, a proposed bill that would have provided funding for renewable energy and established a cap and trade system for carbon emissions. While it passed the House in 2009, the bill died before ever reaching the Senate floor. The Obama administration had been able to push through green energy funding in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, which provided a total of $70 billion for clean energy investment. Most recently, the Trump administration deregulated much of the energy industry and showed no interest in issuing new investments in the clean energy industry.

GWCIA 30

The newly inaugurated administration has set ambitious carbon emission targets, including an emission-free energy industry by 2035 and reaching net-zero emissions nationally by 2050. It is now up to Congress to try and realize these ideals.

Renewable Energy Production

In 2020, only about 21% of American energy production came from renewable energy, i.e. wind, solar, hydroelectric, geothermal, and biomass sources, and another 18% was generated by nuclear energy. However these numbers pale in comparison to the 60% of all energy generated by fossil fuels, of which 43% comes from natural gas and 16% comes from coal. While the amount of green energy production has been rapidly increasing in recent years, there is still a long way to go in regards to eliminating fossil fuel usage.

Obstacles to increased green energy production are varied. For one, large increases in energy output can put large amounts of strain on existing electrical infrastructure. The US has three major, separate electrical grids, however all three have been under dire need for maintenance for many years now, and increases in green energy production are only putting more strain on these aging systems. Green energy sources also tend to be less predictable in their energy output due to their reliance on natural forces such as the sun and wind. Regulatory constraints also put a limit on how much energy production can be built. Finally, supply chain bottlenecks, especially in regards to minerals needed in the production of solar panels can increase installation and construction prices.

In order to fulfill emission objectives and transition away from greenhouse gas producing fossil fuels, increases in investment in green energy production and reforms designed to make green energy cheaper will be vital.

GWCIA 30

Nuclear Energy

The United States is one of the world's largest producers of nuclear energy, with over 30% of all global nuclear power being produced in the US. 94 reactors are spread over 54 separate plants, giving 28 different states access to the energy source. Nuclear power policy has long been related to, but not necessarily the same as other green energy sources, often seeing more bipartisan support from Republicans and being criticized by many environmentalists. Most American reactors were built during the 1970s, however construction of new reactors stalled after the 1979 Three Mile Island incident. However in 2002 the Bush administration launched the Nuclear Power 2010 Program, aimed at constructing new reactors, however most of the planned projects never saw completion.

Despite the apparent dormancy of American nuclear energy projects, many argue today that increases in energy demand necessitate a revamped nuclear policy and renewed investment in the field. However these proponents are not without their critics. Safety is usually a top concern, as nuclear-related accidents, while rare, can result in deadly effects. Between 2010 and 2013, over a third of all American nuclear power plants suffered safety-related incidents, a likely result of aging infrastructure and outdated regulations. Economic practicalities are also a major issue, as many nuclear reactors have been forced to close in recent years due to being outpriced and outcompeted by natural gas.

The future of American nuclear policy is very much up in the air. While nuclear expansion could see support from both sides of the aisle, the practicalities of cost vs. benefit equations might see nuclear energy delegated to the past.

GWCIA 30

Guiding Questions:

1. Should the U.S. pursue expansions to nuclear power production, or stick with renewable energy?
2. How can the government remove economic barriers to constructing green energy sources?
3. Should the federal government restrict the usage of fossil fuel sources, or continue with the “all of the above” strategy?
4. Can the government encourage the free-market to switch to green energy sources voluntarily?
5. Should electric vehicles be promoted as an alternative to traditionally powered cars?

GWCIA 30

Character List

Kirsten Gillibrand (D-NY)

- A mainstream liberal from New York, Gillibrand has a moderate history from her time as a representative upstate, but a progressive track record in the senate, especially on social issues. She is likely to support much of the administration's agenda, especially on environmental policy.

Ben Cardin (D-MD)

- A mainstream liberal from Maryland, Cardin has a long history in both the House and Senate and was very supportive of Democratic initiatives during the Obama years. He is likely to support much of the administration's agenda, but may be more willing to moderate on environmental issues.

Bernie Sanders (I-VT)

- A leftist populist from Vermont, Sanders is one of the most radical politicians associated with the Democratic Party, even considering himself a Democratic Socialist and being in favor of many anti-capitalist policies. He is likely to support much of the administration's agenda, but is likely to push even farther than many of his colleagues are willing to go.

Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)

- A progressive insider from Rhode Island, Whitehouse has a long history of advocating for environmental issues and against political corruption, while still enjoying support from the party establishment. He is likely to support much of the administration's agenda, especially on environmental policy.

Mazie Hirono (D-HI)

- A progressive insider from Hawaii, Hirono is a notable advocate for healthcare reform and abortion rights, and helped to spearhead increased funding for telecommunications services. She is likely to support much of the administration’s agenda, with a focus towards affordability.

GWCIA 30

Ed Markey (D-MA)

- A mainstream liberal from Massachusetts, Markey has an established history with infrastructure policy, being the Senate Author of the Green New Deal, advocating for fare-free transit, and pushing for improved railroad safety regulations. He is likely to support most of the administration's agenda.

Tammy Duckworth (D-IL)

- A mainstream liberal from Illinois, Duckworth is a trailblazing senator with her experience in the military being a driving force in her career. She is likely to support most of the administration's agenda.

Debbie Stabenow (D-MI)

- A mainstream liberal from Michigan, Stabenow has a 25 year long history in the Senate, much of which has been spent advocating for federal intervention in the economy and protection of locally owned businesses. She is likely to support most of the administration's agenda, especially on matters of job creation.

Mark Kelly (D-AZ)

- A moderate reformer from Arizona, Kelly is fairly new to elected politics, but has a history as an activist, alongside his career as a NASA astronaut. Kelly is generally liberal on social issues, but has a checkered history on economic affairs, especially in regard to green energy vs. oil. He is likely to support some of the administration’s agenda.

Alex Padilla (D-CA)

- A mainstream liberal from California, Padilla has toed the line between business-friendly moderate and progressive reformer for much of his political career. Padilla is in support of The Green New Deal and has advocated in favor of California’s ongoing High Speed Rail project. He is likely to support most of the administration's agenda.

Raphael Warnock (D-GA)

- A mainstream liberal from Georgia, Warnock has a surprisingly progressive record despite him representing a historically conservative state. Warnock has advocated for increased highway construction funding, and is both willing and able to work across the isle to achieve his goals. He is likely to support most of the administration's agenda

GWCIA 30

Bob Casey Jr. (D-PA)

- A mainstream liberal from Pennsylvania, Casey has long advocated for policies focussing on affordability, especially in regards to working class groups. Casey has also defended the usage of nuclear power in his home state. He is likely to support most of the administration's agenda

Sherrod Brown (D-OH)

- A moderate reformer from Ohio, Brown has a history of fighting for the rights and wellbeing of the working class, especially on matters of trade policy and healthcare. He has also been a major support for reform in the railroad industry. He is likely to support most of the administration's agenda, but may be hesitant in regards to environmental policy.

Joe Manchin (D-WV)

- A centrist outsider from West Virginia, Manchin is easily the most conservative member of the Democratic Party, being both socially conservative and fiscally moderate. Manchin is a major ally of the coal industry and is hesitant of large government spending or overreaching regulations, but is open to some national investment into general infrastructure. His support of the administration's agenda is very much up in the air.

Jon Tester (D-MT)

- A moderate reformer from Montana, Tester has a history of breaking from the Democratic establishment, especially on social issues and on the regulation of the oil industry. Tester is more liberal on the topic of government spending, but is still willing to work across the aisle. He is likely to support some of the administration’s agenda, but will be against major environmental initiatives.

Angus King (D-ME)

- A moderate reformer from Maine, King has a long history of supporting green energy initiatives, especially in regards to restrictions on oil production. However King has a much more centrist record on government spending, willing to protect American jobs but weary of federal overreach. He is likely to support some of the administration’s agenda

Marsha Blackburn (R-TN)

- A staunch right-winger from Tennessee, Blackburn is a firm Tea Party Republican, supporting limited government involvement in the economy and favoring the interests of businesses. Blackburn also completely rejects the notion of climate change as an issue. She is unlikely to support most of the administration's agenda.

Jim Inhofe (R-OK)

- A staunch right-winger from Oklahoma, Inhofe has made his name known as a vehement denier of climate change and has been a major supporter of the oil industry. Inhofe is generally against government involvement in the economy, but is interested in aviation regulation due to his military experience as a pilot. He is unlikely to support most of the administration's agenda.

Lee Mike (R-UT)

- A staunch right-winger from Utah, Mike is a major proponent for fiscal conservatism and reduced government spending, even going against his own party for budgets he saw as too much. Mike is also a staunch denier of the issue of climate change. He is unlikely to support most of the administration's agenda.

Cynthia Lummis (R-WY)

- An establishment Republican from Wyoming, Lummis is notable for her support of cryptocurrency and her interest in the digital economy. Lummis has been open to economic regulation of business in the past, but is wary of large government spending. Lummis also denies the issue of climate change. She is unlikely to support most of the administration's agenda.

Jerry Moran (R-KS)

- An establishment Republican from Kansas, Moran has a history of supporting the interests of small businesses, tech startups, and local manufacturing. Moran is a major supporter of the oil industry and does support most conservation efforts. He is unlikely to support some of the administration's agenda, but may be supportive of job-creating policies.

Shelley Moore Capito (R-WV)

- A moderate conservative from West Virginia, Capito has a history of working across the aisle, despite her mixed record on both social and economic issues. Capito does not deny the issue of climate change, but is supportive of the fossil fuel industry. Capito is also against decreasing government investment in the economy, but wary of large budget increases. She is unlikely to support some of the administration's agenda, but may be willing to work on a bipartisan solution.

Thom Tillis (R-NC)

- A moderate conservative from North Carolina, Tillis is a major opponent of social welfare funding and is generally skeptical towards government spending programs. Tillis believes in the climate change issues and has a history of supporting market-oriented approaches to green energy adoption. He is unlikely to support some of the administration's agenda, but may be more amenable to environmental concerns.

Dan Sullivan (R-AK)

- An establishment Republican from Alaska, Sullivan is a major supporter of the oil industry, a vital part of his state's economy. Sullivan has denied the existence of climate change and has pushed for increases in fossil fuel production. He is unlikely to support most of the administration's agenda.

Joni Ernst (R-IA)

- A staunch right-winger from Iowa, Ernst is a major opponent of environmental reform and denies the issue of climate change, specifically targeting the EPA and its regulatory powers. Ernst has also been a major advocate for the Balanced Budget Amendment and has criticized government spending programs and tax policy. She is unlikely to support most of the administration's agenda.

Lindsey Graham (R-SC)

- A moderate conservative from South Carolina, Graham has a history of supporting environmental initiatives and does recognize the issue of climate change. Graham specifically supports measures relating to carbon emissions and carbon taxes. He is unlikely to support some of the administration's agenda, but may be willing to compromise on matters of green energy policy.

Rand Paul (R-KY)

- A libertarian reformer from Kentucky, Paul is a staunch opponent of government oversight in almost any matter of the economy. Paul does not accept climate change as an issue, arguing that environmental regulations only hinder businesses, and is vehemently opposed to increases in government spending. He is very unlikely to support any of the administration's agenda.

Lisa Murkowski (R-AK)

- A centrist outsider from Alaska, Murkowski is one of the most bipartisan senators in the Republican party, consistently working with Democrats on numerous issues. Murkowski has generally voted against restrictions on fossil fuel production, but has voiced support for increases in renewable energy usage. Murkowski has also shown some support for increased government spending programs. Her support of the administration's agenda is very much up in the air.

Susan Collins (R-ME)

- A centrist outsider from Maine, Collins is the most liberal senator in the Republican Party, and often supports Democrats just as much as she does Republicans. Collins has voted to both increase fossil fuel production and renewable energy production, and has worked across the aisle in the past on investments in what she calls "traditional" infrastructure projects. Her support of the administration's agenda is very much up in the air.

Josh Hawley (R-MO)

- A right-wing populist from Missouri, Hawley is one of the most conservative senators on social issues, but has a more mixed record in regards to economics. Hawley has voiced support for increased government regulation and workers rights, and is not inherently opposed to federal investment into the economy. He is unlikely to support some of the administration's agenda, but may budge on certain infrastructure policies.

John Cornyn (R-TX)

- A staunch right-winger from Texas, Cornyn is a major supporter of the Fossil Fuel industry and does not believe in the issue of climate change, instead advocating for deregulation of oil and gas and increased drilling operations in the arctic. Cornyn is also an opponent of liberal spending programs and is hesitant on issues of increased government spending. He is unlikely to support most of the administration's agenda

Works Cited

ASCE. “2025: B- 2021: B GRADE COMPARISON B.” Infrastructure Report Card, 2025. https://infrastructurereportcard.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/Rail.pdf.

Association of American Railroads. “Freight Rail Passenger Rail Policies | AAR.” aar.org. Accessed September 9, 2025. https://www.aar.org/issue/passenger-rail-policies/.

Amtrak. “Amtrak and Freight Railroads: The Public Bargain,” 2022. https://www.amtrak.com/content/dam/projects/dotcom/english/public/documents/corporate/position-papers/white-paper-amtrak-and-frieght-railroads.pdf.

Bird, Lori, Andrew Light, and Ian Goldsmith. “State of the US Clean Energy Transition: Recent Progress, and What Comes Next.” World Resources Institute, February 7, 2024. https://www.wri.org/insights/clean-energy-progress-united-states.

Burman, Theo. “Why Is US High-Speed Rail Taking so Long?” Newsweek, May 13, 2025. https://www.newsweek.com/us-high-speed-rail-taking-long-california-texas-2070163.

Bush Whitehouse. “Energy for America’s Future.” Archives.gov, January 13, 2009. https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/infocus/energy/.

Energy Information Administration. “What Is U.S. Electricity Generation by Energy Source?” Eia.gov, 2023. https://www.eia.gov/tools/faqs/faq.php?id=427&t=3.

Federal Railroad Administration. “Freight Rail Overview | FRA.” railroads.dot.gov, 2019. https://railroads.dot.gov/rail-network-development/freight-rail-overview.

Fletcher, Laura. “The Impact of Renewable Energy on the Electric Power Grid.” Yesenergy.com. Accessed September 9, 2025. https://blog.yesenergy.com/yeblog/the-impact-of-renewable-energy-on-the-electric-power-grid.

Glueck, Katie, and Lisa Friedman. “Biden Announces $2 Trillion Climate Plan.” Nytimes.com. The New York Times, July 14, 2020. https://www.nytimes.com/2020/07/14/us/politics/biden-climate-plan.html.

Grunwald, Michael. “The Truth about Obama’s High-Speed Rail Program.” TIME. nextgen, August 11, 2014. https://time.com/3100248/high-speed-rail-barack-obama/.

Makower, Joel, Ron Pernick, and Clint Wilder. “Clean Energy Trend.” archive.org, March 2009. https://web.archive.org/web/20090318040043/http://www.cleanedge.com/reports/pdf/Trends2009.pdf.

Railinc. “Who Owns the Railroad Tracks in North America? | Railinc.” Railinc.com, June 7, 2023. https://public.railinc.com/about-railinc/blog/who-owns-railroad-tracks-north-america.

Reuters Editorial. “Nuclear Plant Inspections Need to Improve: Report.” Reuters, March 7, 2013. https://web.archive.org/web/20150924175920/http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/03/07/us-usa-reactors-inspections-idUSBRE9260XZ20130307.

Sánchez, Lily. “US Transit Is Abysmal and Unacceptable.” Currentaffairs.org. Current Affairs, February 7, 2025. https://www.currentaffairs.org/news/us-transit-is-unacceptable.

Schneider, Benjamin. “How to Speed up US Passenger Rail, without Bullet Trains.” Bloomberg.com. Bloomberg, April 10, 2025. https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2025-04-10/how-to-speed-up-us-passenger-rail-without-bullet-trains.

World Nuclear Association. “Nuclear Power in the USA - World Nuclear Association.” World-nuclear.org, 2025. https://world-nuclear.org/information-library/country-profiles/countries-t-z/usa-nuclear-power#nuclear-power-industry.