



House Natural Resources

Alex Moyse and Noah Moyse

Middle School Model Congress 2016



Briefing: An Act to Stop the Dakota Access Pipeline

The Dakota access pipeline is a 1,172 mile oil pipeline designed to transport oil from oil wells in North Dakota to Patoka, Illinois. The pipeline was designed to make oil transportation easier and more economically beneficial and is being built by the Energy Transfer Crude Oil Company (or Energy Transfer Partners). Around 87% of the pipeline has already been created, but there has been some controversy with the remaining part, which must be built in North Dakota. Despite the fact that the Army Corps of Engineers, a federal agency located within the Department of Defense, allowed the pipeline to be created, there have been some Native American tribes who say that the pipeline could be disastrous to their life. They say that there is a risk that the pipeline could break and spill into their water sources, such as the Missouri River. They also say that it crosses burial sites which they consider sacred. The main tribe fighting this pipeline is the Standing Rock Sioux, who say that they were *not* consulted by the Army Corps of Engineers before they made the decision to allow the pipeline.

Due to perceived injustice, there have been many legal battles and protests involving the pipeline. Protestors at the scene of construction have been arrested and have accused security details of violence. On the other side, there have also been accusations of obstructions by the protestors. Recently, judges have ruled against the tribes and protestors, but the Obama Administration has also recently said that it wishes the Energy Transfer Crude Oil Company would stop voluntarily and that it would not allow a portion of the pipeline to be built (which does require Federal approval).

Supporters of the pipeline say that it would increase oil production, which would allow the United States to stay independent from foreign markets. They also say that the pipeline would provide a safer way to transport the oil. Instead of having to transport the oil by other methods, such as by train, the oil would have a direct pathway to the Illinois market. This would help the environment, too, as it reduces the risk of oil spills. Moreover, even though the oil pipeline is expensive, it has already created jobs and will lower the costs of buying trains for transport.

This pipeline has become a point of natural controversy and there is strong evidence for both sides. If you could stop the pipeline, would you?

You should do research on your own on this topic while preparing for the Model Congress. Some things to look into:

- **Constitutionality of Congress of interfering in private business affairs as well as legal precedents with similar cases**
- **Grievances and rights of the Native American people affected by the pipeline**
- **Benefits (especially economic ones) of the pipeline for states and the USA as a whole**

Some links that may help you start your research and which go over the facts presented above:

1. <http://www.dapipelinefacts.com/>
2. [Tinyurl.com/pipecongress](http://tinyurl.com/pipecongress)
3. <http://tinyurl.com/pipecongress2>
4. <http://tinyurl.com/pipecongress3>

If you have any questions regarding this topic or bill (or anything else involving Model Congress), email nsmoyse@gmail.com or asmoyse@gmail.com. We are happy to help!

HAVE FUN!!!!

MIDDLE SCHOOL MODEL CONGRESS

Department: House Natural Resources

Principal Authors: Noah Moyse

Bill No:1

Co-Authors: Alex Moyse

Title of Bill: An Act to Stop the Dakota Access Pipeline

BE IT ENACTED BY THE MIDDLE SCHOOL MODEL CONGRESS

1 *Whereas* the Dakota Access Pipeline construction was motivated by monetary benefits for a
2 corporation, the Energy Transfer Crude Oil Company; *Whereas* a project of this scale
3 should have taken into account possible cultural damages that would occur; *Whereas* there
4 should have been even stricter review of the environmental damage that this pipeline could
5 cause; *Whereas* the Standing Rock Sioux, a Native American tribe, will have sacred burial
6 grounds destroyed if the Dakota Access Pipeline is allowed to finish (NYT); *Whereas* the
7 Standing Rock Sioux claimed they were not consulted by the Army Corps of Engineers,
8 which approved the project (NYT); *Whereas* there is no guarantee of the pipeline not
9 breaking; *Whereas* if the pipeline breaks many water supplies could be contaminated,
10 creating widespread environmental damage; *Whereas* this environmental damage could
11 also include a worsening of climate change; *Whereas* this damage would also severely harm
12 many Native American tribes who rely on these water bodies for water supply(NYT);
13 *Whereas* the Obama administration has stood out against the pipeline (Washington Times);
14 *Whereas* truck companies would be hurt economically as the pipeline would eliminate truck
15 transfer for oil; *Whereas* the Energy Transfer Crude Oil company that is hurt by this would
16 still be able function without this pipeline; *Whereas* protesters of the pipeline have been
17 arrested and even hurt, which illustrates the temperament of the Energy Transfer Crude Oil
18 Company; *Whereas* oil itself is a diminishing industry and should not be advanced due to its
19 effect on the environment and the prevalence of green energy as an alternative; *Whereas* the
20 Department of Defense gave permission for the pipeline to be built (specifically by the
21 Army Corps of Engineers); *Whereas* this bill must be emergency legislation considering the
22 severity of the matter.

23

24 Section 1: There shall be no more production on the Dakota Access Pipeline

25 Section 2: A new committee called the Committee for the Maintenance of Culture and
26 Environment (CMCE) shall be created;

27 Section 2A: This shall be a committee within the Department of Defense and will be
28 funded by the Department of Defense;

29 Section 2B: This committee shall be responsible for regulating construction projects
30 that may damage environments or cultures;

31 Section 2C: All pipelines or similar projects (defined by the CMCE) built in the future
32 shall have to be brought in front of the CMCE to make sure they are environmentally secure
33 and do not disrupt cultures of any people in the United States;

34 Section 3: The Energy Transfer Oil Company shall be reimbursed for lost profits by an
35 amount appropriated by the CMCE.

36 Section 4: This bill will go into effect immediately.

37

38

Briefing: An Act to Reduce the Amount of Water Wasted in Agriculture

Global warming has led to droughts, and droughts have led to shortages in water. While the shortages in water have had a profound impact in many areas, one of the biggest effects has been seen in the agricultural industry. Many farmers don't have enough water to properly grow their crops, and this is one of the causes of rising food prices for Americans everywhere. There are solutions to this problem, in the form of different methods farmers can use to save water, such as drip irrigation or different sensors and software. However, implementing these strategies and technologies can be expensive, so many farmers would prefer to just wait for a drought to end.

Those in favor of using government money for renovations would argue that because most farmers won't renovate on their own, providing some of the money for them would be a great way to ensure that the renovations do happen, and that is important because becoming more water efficient is important for all Americans, not just farmers. Because of climate change, droughts are going to become a lot more common, and all Americans need water. Wasting water on crops is unfair to Americans that need water for other things, such as drinking or bathing. Society would benefit from farmers using less water.

Those against using government money for renovations would argue that Americans shouldn't be paying for a farmer's renovations. It is unfair to use tax dollars to pay for grants that will help someone else's livelihood, because the farmers and those creating the ideas for the renovation will benefit most from these grants. If the farmers want to renovate, they should have to pay for it themselves. In addition, droughts do not affect the entire country. Farmer in rainy regions don't benefit at all, because they already have enough water, while a farmer in a dry region does. The government shouldn't support one farmer above another.

Helpful Articles:

<http://civileats.com/2015/08/03/how-we-can-use-less-water-to-grow-more-crops/>

<https://www.wired.com/2015/06/smart-sensor-farmers-dont-waste-water-drought/>

<http://www.cuesa.org/article/10-ways-farmers-are-saving-water>

If you have any questions about my bill or about the model congress in general, please feel free to email asmoyse@gmail.com or nsmoyse@gmail.com. Good luck!

MIDDLE SCHOOL MODEL CONGRESS

Department: House Natural Resources

Principal Authors: Alex Moyse

Bill No: 2

Co-Authors: Noah Moyse

Title of Bill: An Act to Reduce the Amount of Water Wasted in Agriculture

BE IT ENACTED BY THE MIDDLE SCHOOL MODEL CONGRESS

1 *Whereas* many areas of the United States, most notably California, have been afflicted with
2 droughts over the past several years, and that trend is predicted to continue; *Whereas* the
3 supply of clean water in the United States, especially in certain areas, has been going down
4 as a result of these droughts; *Whereas* about forty percent of the United States' clean water
5 is used for agriculture (Weiser); *Whereas* many farmers have not been able to produce as
6 much food as they wanted because of a shortage of water, and as a result certain food prices
7 have gone up; *Whereas* technology and methods to grow crops with less water exist, but
8 many farmers cannot afford to use them; *Whereas* the amount of water a farmer uses can be
9 measured; *Whereas* the World Resources Institute has predicted that to accommodate the
10 world's population, the amount of food the world grows must be increased by sixty percent
11 by the year 2050 (Finley); *Whereas* there is no evidence to suggest that clean water levels
12 will return to the level that many farmers currently require.

13

14 Section 1: Government grants will be made available to farmers to replace their current
15 farming methods with water saving methods.

- 16 a. Water saving methods will be defined as methods that decrease overall water
17 consumption by a farm by at least 25 percent.
18 b. The size of each grant will be determined by the amount of water saved and the cost
19 of renovation for the farmer.

20 Section 2: Government grants will be made available to private institutions that make
21 advancements in agricultural water-saving technology.

- 22 a. Grants will only be provided to institutions with previous success in agricultural
23 water-saving.
24 b. No grant will be given for the purpose of giving one company a competitive
25 advantage over another.
26 c. The size of each grant will be evaluated based on the anticipated cost of
27 development for each company.

28 Section 3: This bill will come into effect 100 days after passage.

29

30

31

32

33

