1	NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.
2	RPTS WOJACK
3	HIF142000
4	
5	
6	LIFT AMERICA: MODERNIZING OUR
7	INFRASTRUCTURE FOR THE FUTURE
8	WEDNESDAY, MAY 22, 2019
9	House of Representatives
10	Committee on Energy and Commerce
11	Washington, D.C.
12	
13	
14	
15	The committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:03 a.m., in
16	Room 2123 Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Frank Pallone
17	[chairman of the committee] presiding.
18	Members present: Pallone, Rush, Eshoo, Engel, DeGette,
19	Doyle, Schakowsky, Butterfield, Matsui, Castor, Sarbanes,
20	McNerney, Welch, Lujan, Tonko, Clarke, Loebsack, Schrader,
21	Kennedy, Cardenas, Ruiz, Peters, Dingell, Veasey, Kuster,
22	Kelly, Barragan, McEachin, Blunt Rochester, Soto, O'Halleran,
23	Walden, Upton, Shimkus, Burgess, Latta, Rodgers, Guthrie,

24 Olson, McKinley, Griffith, Bilirakis, Johnson, Long, Bucshon, 25 Flores, Brooks, Mullin, Hudson, Walberg, Carter, Duncan, and 26 Gianforte. 27 Staff present: Jeff Carroll, Staff Director; Jacqueline 28 Cohen, Chief Environment Counsel; Sharon Davis, Chief Clerk; 29 Adam Fischer, Policy Analyst; Jean Fruci, Energy and 30 Environment Policy Advisor; Waverly Gordon, Deputy Chief 31 Counsel; Tiffany Guarascio, Deputy Staff Director; Omar 32 Guzman-Toro, Policy Analyst; Caitlin Haberman, Professional Staff Member; Alex Hoehn-Saric, Chief Counsel, Communications 33 and Consumer Protection; Stephen Holland, Health Counsel; 34 35 Zach Kahan, Outreach and Member Service Coordinator; Rick 36 Kessler, Senior Advisor and Staff Director, Energy and 37 Environment; Josh Krantz, Policy Analyst; Brendan Larkin, 38 Policy Coordinator; Una Lee, Chief Health Counsel; Jerry 39 Leverich, Senior Counsel; John Marshall, Policy Coordinator; Dan Miller, Policy Analyst; Elysa Montfort, Press Secretary; 40 Meghan Mullon, Staff Assistant; Phil Murphy, Policy 41 42 Coordinator; Lisa Olson, FERC Detailee; Joe Orlando, Staff Assistant; Alivia Roberts, Press Assistant; Tim Robinson, 43 Chief Counsel; Chloe Rodriquez, Policy Analyst; Andrew 44 45 Souvall, Director of Communications, Outreach and Member 46 Services; Benjamin Tabor, Staff Assistant; Kimberlee

47	Trzeciak, Chief Health Advisor; Teresa Williams, Energy
48	Fellow; Tuley Wright, Energy and Environment Policy Advisor;
49	Mike Bloomquist, Minority Staff Director; S.K. Bowen,
50	Minority Press Assistant; Adam Buckalew, Minority Director of
51	Coalitions and Deputy Chief Counsel, Health; Robin Colwell,
52	Minority Chief Counsel, C&T Jerry Couri, Minority Deputy
53	Chief Counsel, Environment & Climate Change; Jordan Davis,
54	Minority Senior Advisor; Margaret Tucker Fogarty, Minority
55	Legislative Clerk/Press Assistant; Peter Kielty, Minority
56	General Counsel; Tim Kurth, Minority Deputy Chief Counsel,
57	C&T Ryan Long, Minority Deputy Staff Director; Mary Martin,
58	Minority Chief Counsel, Energy & Environment & Climate
59	Change; Brandon Mooney, Minority Deputy Chief Counsel,
60	Energy; Brannon Rains, Minority Legislative Clerk; Kristin
61	Seum, Minority Counsel, Health; and Peter Spencer, Minority
62	Senior Professional Staff Member, Environment & Climate
63	Change.

64 The Chairman. The Committee on Energy and Commerce will 65 now come to order and I will recognize myself for five 66 minutes for an opening statement. 67 Two of our committee's top priorities are strengthening 68 the economy and combating climate change. One of the best 69 ways for Congress to address both of these priorities now is 70 by rebuilding and modernizing our nation's crumbling 71 infrastructure. 72 There is no better day for us to be having this hearing 73 as the president and Democratic leaders are meeting to 74 follow-up on the president's promise to come up with the \$2 75 trillion to pay for, if you will, for our infrastructure 76 package. 77 And today, we are discussing the Leading Infrastructure 78 for Tomorrow's America Act, or the LIFT America Act, which 79 was introduced last week by all 31 committee Democrats. This is a comprehensive bill that addresses critical 80 infrastructure needs across our entire committee's 81 82 jurisdiction. It will strengthen our economy for the future 83 by creating good-paying jobs and investing in critical clean energy, broadband, drinking water, and health care 84 85 infrastructure. 86 So as we continue to develop a comprehensive plan to

87 address climate change, there are many actions we can take 88 now to reduce carbon pollution immediately. 89 LIFT America invests over \$33 billion for clean energy, 90 including \$4 billion to upgrade the electric grid to 91 accommodate more renewable energy and to make it more 92 resilient. 93 It includes \$1.5 billion to facilitate the replacement 94 of leaking gas pipelines, another \$4 billion for the 95 expansion of renewable energy use, including the installation 96 of solar panels in low-income and under-served communities. 97 We also make significant investments in energy efficiency, helping states and communities make our public 98 99 places more energy efficient and helping homeowners 100 weatherize their homes. 101 We also invest in the development of an electric 102 vehicle-charging network, something that is critical to 103 tackling the greenhouse gas pollution coming from the transportation sector. 104 105 Collectively, all of these investments will help us take 106 an important step in combating the climate crisis while also strengthening our economy, creating good-paying jobs, and 107 108 providing some much-needed relief to consumers on their 109 energy bills.

110 We also make significant investments in the expansion of 111 broadband internet access. For too long, we have heard 112 stories of the sorry state of our nation's digital 113 infrastructure that is simply leaving too many communities 114 behind. 115 We have heard about rural communities whose businesses 116 can't compete without access to the internet. We have heard 117 about kids living in urban broadband deserts that have no 118 other choice than to walk to a nearby McDonald's late after 119 school to access Wi-Fi just to do their homework. 120 And we have heard the tragic calls to 911 of Americans 121 that died during emergencies because when they needed help 122 the system couldn't find them. 123 So the LIFT America Act takes bold steps to ensure a 124 prosperous, fairer, and safer tomorrow. It provides \$40 125 billion to fund connections to the internet for at least 98 126 percent of the country and \$12 billion to upgrade our frail 911 infrastructure. 127 128 And the LIFT America Act also makes critical investments 129 in protecting human health and our environment. We invest more than \$21 billion to protect Americans' drinking water, 130 131 including \$2.5 billion to establish a new grant program

allowing PFAS-affected communities to filter the toxic

133 chemicals out of their water supplies. 134 We also extend and increase authorizations for the 135 drinking water State Revolving Fund and other safe water 136 programs that we authorized as part of the 2017 Safe Drinking 137 Water Act. 138 And we also further fund the Brownfields program, which 139 has successfully helped communities clean up contaminated 140 sites, remove public health threats, and prepare the sites 141 for development. This is another job creator that spurs 142 local investment and revitalizes communities. 143 And finally, we address our nation's health care 144 infrastructure. In recent years, we have heard of 145 vulnerabilities in the physical structures, cybersecurity, 146 and data system technology in health care facilities. 147 From cyberattacks in hospital data systems that threaten 148 patient privacy to the literal corrosion of pipes in Indian Health Service facilities, our faltering health 149 infrastructure is putting the well-being of patients at risk. 150 151 So the LIFT America Act responds to these problems by 152 investing in core public health resources at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and in state and local health 153 154 departments. 155 It also directly funds hospital infrastructure, Indian

Health Service facilities, public health labs, and behavioral

157 health clinics to protect or to better protect human health. 158 It is obvious this is a very ambitious plan. A lot is 159 going to depend on to what extend when the House leadership 160 and the Senate meet with the president and decide how it is 161 going to be paid for and how much and how large it will be. 162 But it is, I believe, what is necessary and what is 163 possible under the funding framework that has been outlined 164 so far by the president and Democratic congressional leaders. 165 I don't think we can wait any longer to modernize our nation's aging infrastructure, and I look forward to working 166 167 with other members of this committee to move this legislation 168 forward. 169 And before I recognize our ranking member, I do want to 170 say as I think most of you know normally we have hearings at 171 the subcommittee level. But this bill has jurisdiction over 172 all the subcommittees. So that's why we decided that we would have a full committee hearing today, because of the 173 174 breadth and scope of the legislation. 175 So now I'll recognize our ranking member for his opening 176 statement. 177 Mr. Walden. Good morning, Mr. Chairman. I assumed 178 because it was your bill we were doing this in full, but just

saying you get to do that as chairman. I kind of remember, sort of.

I am encouraged that members from both sides of the aisle as well as President Trump are taking serious interest in what should be a shared priority for all of us, and that's rebuilding our nation's infrastructure and I think we can all agree Republicans and Democrats should be able to come together and work in good faith to do this and make America stronger and better.

Mr. Chairman, as you know and as members of this committee know, infrastructure means a lot of things and more than just roads and bridges, which are also important. Last Congress our committee worked together to do I think some pretty significant work on infrastructure improvement in America.

We made some great strides to close the digital divide by expanding broadband infrastructure, directing federal resources to target communities that are currently un-served, and trying to streamline the very complex costly federal regulations in order to spur broadband deployment and innovation and have the private sector do a lot of that investment.

We were instrumental in ensuring the America's Water

202 This package cut Infrastructure Act was signed into law. 203 bureaucratic red tape and reauthorized the Safe Drinking 204 Water Act for the first time in more than 20 years -- more 205 than 20 years since that had been done. 206 We did it in a bipartisan way. We provided new tools 207 and resources that state and local governments need to ensure 208 the public has access to clean and safe drinking water. It also promoted hydropower development which creates 209 210 clean energy jobs here at home and provides consumers with 211 low-cost emissions-free electricity, and I think that was 212 really an important accomplishment in a bipartisan way on our 213 committee. 214 We also reauthorized the EPA's Brownfields program. 215 This program allows EPA, the states, and local governments to 216 work together to redevelop industrial or commercial 217 facilities, create jobs, and provide for local economic development. 218 219 As I recall from our work there, federal taxpayers get a 220 16 to 1 rate of return when these Brownfield sites are 221 cleaned up and put into productive use. 222 And we worked together to explore solutions to expand, improve, and modernize our energy infrastructure so we can 223 224 deliver energy to consumers more safely, reliably, and cost

225 effectively.

226

227

228

229

230

231

232

233

234

235

236

237

238

239

240

241

2.42

243

244

245

246

247

I always want to put consumers first in this equation.

The legislation under consideration today addresses many of these same policies and that is good because there is more work to do. But just authorizing more money to spend may not necessarily achieve what I believe are shared infrastructure goals.

I think back to 2009 when the stimulus program was advertised that it would create "shovel ready projects."

Unfortunately, many of the jobs that were promised never materialized and billions of taxpayer dollars went into what we later learned were pretty wasteful or duplicative projects because of the speed with which the money had to go out the door.

The 2009 stimulus bill put the cart before the horse when it came to spending on broadband deployment without adequate mapping, a subject we are still concerned about in this committee in a bipartisan way, and they didn't know where the un-served or under-served areas were. But the money had to be out the door and spent before the mapping was to be completed.

I offered an amendment at the time to correct that reverse problem but it was, unfortunately, rejected.

Instead, we didn't get the maps until after the money was already out the door. Seems kind of backwards.

While I am not trying to re-litigate the past, these examples underscore the need to be prudent in how we structure and allocate infrastructure investment and we must ensure that taxpayer dollars are used wisely and we must continually revisit and reevaluate federal programs and regulations to ensure our goals are being met.

The LIFT America Act designates new investments in some prudent programs indeed. But I think there are other things that should be looked at as well such as the immediate need to streamline permitting and reduce regulatory burdens for infrastructure projects, action that if taken would yield immediate results.

I look at what ratepayers are having to pay or they can't even get access to natural gas in the New England area because of issues over pipelines.

We should see that infrastructure get built. The promises of modern energy infrastructure have been held back by what some might call Washington's command and control regulatory regime, and I think we need to recognize that innovation and technology development and market-driven efficiencies ensure economic growth, spur job creation, lower

271 energy costs for consumers, and make a positive impact 272 addressing climate change risks. 273 So the LIFT America Act also calls for our shared goal of expanding broadband deployment. But we do need to address 274 275 this mapping issue and I think there is bipartisan agreement 276 on that, and the need for better program coordination. 277 The current lack of coordination and adequate mapping 278 has led to rampant overbuilding in existing programs. 279 also know the private sector is looking to build out this 280 commitment by T-Mobile and others as part of their merger to 281 reach 99 percent of America and cover it with high-speed 282 broadband is really remarkable, and they face a \$5 billion 283 penalty if they don't deliver if the merger goes through. To 284 me, that is what we want to incent -- private sector doing 285 this. 286 So I appreciate the bills before us and I appreciate the 287 inclusion of next-generation 911, among other things, and look forward to working with you and our colleagues on both 288 289 sides of the aisle to achieve our mutual goals. 290 And with that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back. The Chairman. Thank you, and I -- and, obviously, we 291 292 would like to, as always, report out at some point. You 293 know, this is the beginning of the process, obviously, a bill

294 that's bipartisan and working with the Republicans and with 295 the president. 296 So the way it works -- those are the opening statements. But if members want to submit written opening statements they 297 298 will be made part of the record and we are now going to 299 proceed to our panel. 300 And I want to introduce our witnesses. First, on my 301 left, I am very proud that I have the Honorable Brian Wahler, 302 who is mayor of Piscataway Township in my district. But 303 Brian isn't just here because he's a mayor in my district. He's been very active with the National Conference of Mayors 304 305 in pushing for a number of infrastructure initiatives. 306 When we had -- when we had the legislative hearing on 307 the -- on the energy block grant that was something that he 308 pushed but also the National Conference of Mayors pushed as 309 well. So thank you for being here, Brian. I appreciate you 310 being here. 311 And then we have -- no stranger to this committee -- Ms. Mignon Clyburn, who is now a principal with MLC Strategies 312 313 but, of course, we knew her for many years as one of the FCC 314 commissioners. 315 And then we have Mr. John Auerbach, who is president and 316 CEO of the Trust for America's Health, Ms. Jessica Eckdish,

317	legislative director for the BlueGreen Alliance, Mr. Daniel
318	Lyons, visiting fellow from the American Enterprise
319	Institute, and Mr. Christopher Guith I hope I got that
320	right who is acting president for the Global Energy
321	Institute with the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.
322	And I want to thank all of you for being here today. We
323	look forward to your testimony. The way it works is I will
324	recognize each of you for five minutes for an opening
325	statement.
326	Let me just mention about the lighting system in front
327	of talk about energy, right. In front of you is a series
328	of lights and the light will initially be green at the start
329	of your opening statement.
330	The light will then turn yellow when you have one minute
331	remaining and then you should try to wrap up your testimony
332	at that point, and then the light turns red when your time
333	expires.
334	So we are going to go from left to right and start with
335	Mayor Wahler. Thank you, Mayor.

336	STATEMENTS OF THE HONORABLE BRIAN C. WAHLER, MAYOR,
337	PISCATAWAY TOWNSHIP, NEW JERSEY, ON BEHALF OF THE U.S.
338	CONFERENCE OF MAYORS; MIGNON L. CLYBURN, PRINCIPAL, MLC
339	STRATEGIES, LLC; JESSICA ECKDISH, LEGISLATIVE DIRECTOR,
340	BLUEGREEN ALLIANCE; DANIEL LYONS, VISITING FELLOW, AMERICAN
341	ENTERPRISE INSTITUTE (AEI); CHRISTOPHER GUITH, ACTING
342	PRESIDENT, GLOBAL ENERGY INSTITUTE, U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE;
343	AND JOHN AUERBACH, MBA, PRESIDENT AND CEO, TRUST FOR
344	AMERICA'S HEALTH
345	
346	STATEMENT OF MR. WAHLER
347	Mr. Wahler. Good morning.
348	Chairman Pallone, Ranking Member Walden, and members of
349	the committee, I want to thank you for the invitation today
350	to discuss H.R. 2741, Leading Infrastructure for Tomorrow's
351	America the LIFT Act.
352	My name is Brian Wahler, the mayor of Piscataway
353	Township in New Jersey, and I am testifying on behalf of the
354	United States Conference of Mayors in support of this bill.
355	Infrastructure is inherently local and this is where
356	infrastructure improvements are most needed. Local
357	governments have outperformed the federal and state
358	governments in growing new revenue for many of our

infrastructure needs.

But we need federal government to do its part. The LIFT Act will do just that. The bill addresses many priorities for the nation's communities including additional allocations for safe drinking water, Brownfields programs. But for today I just want to focus on energy components of this bill.

Cities must be an integral part of the nation's energy strategy because cities drive the nation's economy engine.

An IHS study estimated that metro economies in 2017 were home to 91 percent of the nation's gross domestic product, 92 percent of the wage income, and 88 percent of the nation's jobs.

Our metro economies and businesses within our communities generate tax revenues that you appropriate.

These economic factors suggest that any national strategy to address energy needs, climate change, and reduce pollution must include communities both big and small that comprise our metro areas.

Local government recognize the value in energy demand management as possible by weatherization and smart building technologies. Weatherization programs have proven reliable over time and now smart building controls have potential effect for reductions of energy use and increased cost

382 savings. 383 Solar installation for low-income and under-served 384 communities target an economic group that struggles to afford 385 basic utilities. This program will help reduce energy costs 386 for low-income households. 387 We also support the clean distribution energy systems provision that will promote energy diversity and resiliency 388 389 by creating energy systems that will not totally rely on 390 central transmission lines and traditional vulnerabilities. 391 The conference particularly recommends the committee for 392 including reauthorization of the EECBG program, which is a 393 top priority of the nation's mayors and local governments. 394 EECB focuses on energy infrastructure investment at the 395 local level and will help promote energy independence, 396 reliability, efficiencies with the goal to achieve clean 397 energy, clean air, and consumer savings. Recipients of the EEC funds are required to develop 398 comprehensive energy plans for their community, and with more 399 400 than a dozen eligible applications for grant money, this is 401 enough flexibility to meet many community needs. 402 When the program was previously funded, many communities 403 leveraged their resources to add additionals to the grant 404 moneys and this was a positive local regional multiplier

405	effect.
406	An Oak Ridge Laboratories report commended the program
407	as one of the most successful programs in bringing energy
408	efficiency and conservation to the communities.
409	EEC is the single most important way to kick-start local
410	investment because the greatest impediment to infrastructure
411	investment is finding the necessary capital.
412	In my own city we used our EEC money to put solar panels
413	on our public works department. This solar array produced
414	more than 1.5 million kilowatt hours, replacing fossil fuels
415	and reducing air pollutants.
416	Last year we signed a contract with Great Eastern
417	Energy. Now 20 percent of our energy that we use for
418	municipal purposes comes from renewable sources.
419	This is projected to save more than 4.3 million
420	kilowatts of fossil fuels-created electricity over two years.
421	We now require many new developments within our community to
422	have electric vehicle plug-in charging stations in their
423	parking areas, which also includes government facilities
424	where we are building a new community center.
425	By authorizing and funding this program you will jump
426	start or enhance over a thousand communities nationwide to do
427	energy efficiency, conservation, clean energy projects.

428	Simply put, the federal government does not have access
429	to diverse building and fleet sectors as local communities
430	do. We need a strong federal partnership for H.R. 2741. It
431	provides a practical framework to move forward.
432	I want to thank you, Chairman Pallone, and the committee
433	for inviting me to testify today. We are at a critical
434	juncture in areas of infrastructure, climate change, and I
435	strongly urge on behalf of the nation's mayors that the
436	committee and this Congress pass a fully funded and the much-
437	needed legislation.
438	Thank you.
439	[The prepared statement of Mr. Wahler follows:]
440	
441	*********************

442	The Chairman. Thank you, Mayor, and thank you for being
443	here.
444	And next I will recognize Ms. Clyburn for five minutes,
445	and thank you also for being here.

446	STATEMENT OF MS. CLYBURN
447	
448	Ms. Clyburn. Thank you.
449	Chairman Pallone, Ranking Member Walden, members of the
450	committee, thank you for inviting me here to testify this
451	morning.
452	For almost nine years I had the privilege of serving on
453	the Federal Communications Commission. During my tenure, I
454	was afforded the opportunity to travel across this great
455	nation and around the world where I witnessed first hand the
456	transformative power of broadband.
457	Unfortunately, too many Americans, including those in
458	rural communities, remain unable to harness the incredible
459	power of connectivity.
460	Since the FCC released its national broadband plan
461	almost 10 years ago, it has been focused on closing the
462	broadband availability gap. We still have a long way to go,
463	which is why I ask that you go big and be bold.
464	The LIFT America Act contemplates a \$40 billion infusion
465	of capital for broadband infrastructure, almost 10 times the
466	annual amount of CAF funding currently available.
467	While that is, indeed, a significant number, what is
468	clear is that this level of investment is necessary. Based

469 on my past experience as a regulator, allow me to offer a few 470 principles for your consideration. 471 The act should prioritize capital expenditures for communities currently without broadband-capable 472 473 infrastructure. By this I mean those areas in both rural and 474 urban America that don't even have 10/1 speed. 475 Determinations of where support is needed to deploy 476 broadband should be based on reliable and verifiable coverage 477 maps. Everyone is frustrated because more needs to be done 478 to improve the FCC maps. The current maps should not be exclusively used for any 479 480 proceeding including for funding purposes at this time. 481 the FCC needs to do is immediately act on its pending 482 proceeding to update Form 477 and produce a reliable map so 483 that we can know precisely where the areas are that don't 484 have 10/1 coverage. 485 It is also very important that this investment is viewed through a once-only lens, and what I mean by that is 486 487 taxpayers should be asked to fund broadband infrastructure 488 only one time and that infrastructure should be robust and 489 capable of serving their communities long into the future. 490 The U.S. lags behind European and Asian countries that 491 are planning to deliver high-speed broadband infrastructure

492 that can be upgraded cost effectively. Online demand is 493 increasing, which means we need robust networks to handle 494 that demand. 495 Since we are going big and bold with LIFT, Congress 496 should invest the money in infrastructure that will deliver 497 high-speed broadband of at least one gig symmetrical service. 498 This should put our country on par with others and catch us 499 up to those who are ahead. 500 The bill can remain competitively and technologically 501 neutral but it must be refined to give projects that can deliver 1 gig service a bidding preference. 502 503 Similarly, where 1 gig can be upgraded to deliver even 504 higher speeds quickly and at a lower cost, the bill should 505 include that as a positive in the waiting process. 506 As Commissioner O'Rielly has said, we must coordinate 507 all of the government broadband funding mechanisms to avoid duplication, which will ensure that we will get as much bang 508 from our limited bucks as possible. 509 510 Accordingly, new funding provided by LIFT should be 511 restricted to those un-served areas that aren't receiving 512 funds from other programs. Moreover, as Chairman Pai has 513 discussed, reverse auctions have delivered incredible

benefits and have saved taxpayer money.

515	Reverse auctions should be embraced. Simply speaking,
516	they are more efficient and more effective.
517	I would like to commend you, Chairman Pallone, and all
518	who have been working on LIFT for your leadership in securing
519	a brighter economic future for those Americans whose dreams
520	have yet to be realized.
521	Thank you for the opportunity to testify this morning
522	and I am happy to answer any questions you may have.
523	[The prepared statement of Ms. Clyburn follows:]
524	
525	************INSERT 2*******

526	The Chairman. Thank you, Ms. Clyburn. Thank you for
527	being here today and for all you did at the FCC.
528	So next we have Ms. Eckdish. You are recognized for
529	five minutes.

530	STATEMENT OF MS. ECKDISH
531	
532	Ms. Eckdish. Good morning.
533	Thank you, Chairman Pallone, Ranking Member Walden, and
534	members of the committee. My name is Jessica Eckdish. I am
535	the legislative director of the BlueGreen Alliance.
536	On behalf of my organization, our partners, and the
537	millions of members and supporters they represent, I want to
538	thank you for the opportunity to testify today.
539	The BlueGreen Alliance unites America's largest labor
540	unions and most influential environmental organizations
541	around the belief that we don't have to choose between a good
542	job and a clean environment. We can and must have both.
543	Investing in repairing and modernizing our nation's
544	infrastructure is a clear example of this principle. If done
545	right, a federal infrastructure package will boost our
546	economy and create millions of jobs while simultaneously
547	reducing pollution, combatting climate change, and
548	strengthening our communities.
549	The LIFT America Act is a key step in this direction.
550	Failing infrastructure is a critical threat to our
551	communities, from crumbling bridges and contaminated drinking
552	water to inefficient and unhealthy schools, power outages,

and dangerous and leaky gas distribution pipes under our cities.

These problems are only getting worse. The historic 2017 hurricane season laid waste to Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, Texas, and Florida, plunging millions of Americans into darkness and further aggravating an already desperate need for safe water.

As the world's climate continues to change, the deteriorating state of our infrastructure becomes a vicious circle. As our systems crumble and become more inefficient, the excess pollution exacerbates climate change, and as our climate changes, more extreme weather tests our already strained infrastructure systems, endangering the health and safety of our communities.

BlueGreen Alliance research has found that investing an estimated \$2.2 trillion in a variety of infrastructure sectors to improve them from a D+ grade to a B grade has the potential to support or create an additional 14.5 million job years across the U.S. economy, add \$1.66 trillion to GDP over 10 years, and reduce greenhouse gas pollution versus a business as usual approach.

Last week we released a set of 14 infrastructure policy priorities in key sectors including energy transmission,

576 distribution, and storage, transportation, water, schools, 577 and other buildings, broadband, natural infrastructure, climate resilience, and manufacturing. 578 579 Making these smart investments has the potential to 580 deliver millions of good jobs, reduce climate and toxic 581 pollution, and make our communities more resilient, but only 582 if we do this the right way. In order to maximize these benefits for communities, the 583 584 environment, and workers, there are five principles that any 585 legislation must follow. First, any infrastructure package must create quality 586 587 family-sustaining jobs. This means ensuring that all 588 projects are subject to Buy America and Davis-Bacon standards 589 that bolster American manufacturing and ensure that workers 590 are paid a prevailing wage. 591 It means utilizing project labor agreements, community 592 benefit agreements, and other provisions that improve training, working conditions, and project benefits, and it 593 594 means maintaining and growing jobs in the public sector to 595 support all of this work as well as respecting collective 596 bargaining agreements and workers' organizing rights. 597 Second, an infrastructure package must deliver climate 598 benefits and reduce pollution, a range of investments from

natural infrastructure and grid modernization to repairing and replacing aging gas distribution pipes, that all deliver significant greenhouse gas emission and other pollutant reductions.

Third, this package must make our communities more resilient. This means driving forward-looking planning and investments that build for the future, not the past, and that make our infrastructure systems and communities more resilient to the impacts of climate change. This must include prioritizing natural infrastructure solutions.

Fourth, an infrastructure package must maximize benefits to workers in communities, especially those most in need.

Our infrastructure investments must provide economic opportunities for low-income communities, communities of color, women, and local workers across the country.

Finally, any infrastructure package must begin with a robust public investment and must tackle the broad array of our infrastructure needs.

The LIFT America Act embodies these five principles and takes a significant step towards addressing our country's infrastructure challenge. We are particularly pleased to see efforts included in the bill to address drinking water infrastructure, electric grid resiliency and modernization,

622 school energy efficiency, methane emissions from natural gas 623 distribution lines, and broadband access. 624 While the bill also includes necessary conditions to ensure domestic content, prevailing wage, and other benefits 625 626 for workers and communities, there are opportunities to 627 expand these provisions across the bill. 628 Preparing America's infrastructure systems is both 629 urgently needed and an enormous opportunity. We look forward 630 to working with this committee as this bill moves forward to 631 ensure the strongest possible outcome for workers and our 632 environment. Thank you again for the opportunity to testify today. 633 634 [The prepared statement of Ms. Eckdish follows:] 635 636 *********INSERT 3******

637	The Chairman. Thank you so much.
638	I next recognize for five minutes Professor is it
639	Professor? Professor Lyons, ves.

640	STATEMENT OF MR. LYONS
641	
642	Mr. Lyons. Thank you.
643	Chairman Pallone, Ranking Member Walden, and members of
644	the committee, thank you for allowing me to appear before you
645	today.
646	My name is Daniel Lyons. I am a visiting fellow at the
647	American Enterprise Institute and I am a professor at Boston
648	College Law School where I study telecommunications and
649	internet policy.
650	My remarks are focussed on the LIFT America Act's
651	broadband provisions. According to the FCC's latest
652	estimates, approximately 20 million Americans lack access to
653	high-speed fixed broadband networks.
654	That means a little more than one in 20 Americans are
655	sitting on the wrong side of the digital divide solely
656	because of where they live.
657	The LIFT America Act addresses this problem by
658	allocating \$40 billion to subsidize broadband network
659	construction in un-served areas.
660	The program reflects a key recommendation of the FCC's
661	national broadband plan that government assistance should
662	take the form of one-time construction aid rather than the

on-going carrier subsidies that mark the telephone era highcost fund.

The act adopts many of the best practices developed at the FCC while experimenting with similar subsidies through the Connect America Fund. Perhaps most significantly, it uses a reverse auction mechanism to distribute funds.

This helps assure that taxpayers will get the biggest bang for their buck by awarding funds to projects that will connect an area at the lowest expense and it also mandates that funds be distributed on a technology-neutral basis.

This is important because -- both because un-served areas are geographically diverse and also because innovations like 5G networking and low earth orbit satellites could bring disruptive new forms of competition to broadband markets.

Studies show that wired deployment typically plateaus at about 70 percent of the country. So making room for disruptive new technologies can help us reach that last 30 percent more efficiently, the way that satellite companies helped fill in the rural gaps in the pay television market.

FCC Chairman Ajit Pai has explained that with the Connect America fund the reverse auction structure and the technology-neutral limitation or mandate sparked competition that reduced their estimated subsidy costs by 70 percent.

Areas they expected to wire for \$5 billion they instead are wiring for \$1.5 billion.

And I also appreciate that the act sets aside onequarter of its funds to be administered directly by states.

Back when I was applying for professor positions my job talk
focused on the importance of state regulators, and it turns
out that for law professors, telecommunications federalism
isn't a super sexy topic like constitutional rights. So I am
actually really glad to see that you are taking it seriously
here on the Hill.

State regulators have local knowledge and they are often in a much better position than their federal counterparts to know where the gaps in coverage are in particular locations and how to best go about fixing them.

There are, I think, a few places where I would push back on the draft bill. The first is a requirement that the state funds be allocated in direct proportion to the population of each state.

This, I think, could steer funding in suboptimal ways because total population is not a good proxy for broadband need. Broadband service is most economically delivered in population-dense areas where there is more customers per square mile and so that means that un-served areas of the

709 country that are targeted by the act are more likely to skew 710 rural. 711 Allocating dollars based on state population could have 712 the unintended consequence of favoring rural areas in states 713 that also happen to have a big city over those states that 714 don't have a big city, even though the existence of a city 715 probably doesn't tell us much about the state's funding need. 716 It would be better, I think, to allocate funds on the 717 basis of each state's un-served population, which I think 718 better directs the money toward those who the act is designed 719 to benefit. 720 I think this is especially problematic when coupled with 721 the act's inclusion of funds to aid under-served areas. 722 Unlike un-served areas where internet access is lacking, 723 under served has an existing provider. 724 So subsidies to under-served areas effectively subsidize 725 a new company to come in and challenge an existing broadband 726 provider. In a sense, this would punish companies that 727 invested private dollars to serve a challenging area by 728 making it harder for them to compete. 729 And although the act says that states can only fund under-served areas if all of the un-served areas in the state 730 731 are addressed, the allocation of funds on the basis of

732 population could lead to some states quickly filling their 733 un-served areas and then pouring money into under-served 734 areas, while some other states with smaller populations are 735 still struggling to connect anybody at all. 736 And I think this one related issue is the act's minimum 737 service standards. The act requires recipients to provide 738 100 megabits download service. I think before picking a 739 benchmark, it is helpful for the committee to think about how 740 much service the average consumer needs because otherwise you 741 risk over investing in specific projects at the cost of 742 completing fewer projects. 743 I previously have proposed that policy makers adopt an 744 activity-based approach. Identify the core activities that 745 are essential to participating in online society and then 746 figure out how much speed you need in order to be able to do 747 those things. And, finally, I think it is important to remember that 748 availability is only one driver of the digital divide. 749 750 Issues like affordability and digital literacy also become a 751 really important part in the need to close the digital divide 752 and make sure we have universal connectivity. 753 Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Lyons follows:]

755

756 *********INSERT 4******

757	The Chairman. Thank you, Professor.
758	Next we have Mr. Guith. You are recognized for five
759	minutes.

760	STATEMENT OF MR. GUITH
761	
762	Mr. Guith. Thank you, and good morning, Chairman
763	Pallone, Ranking Member Walden, and members of the committee.
764	The Chamber appreciates the opportunity to testify today
765	on the importance of bolstering the nation's clean energy and
766	water infrastructure.
767	America's energy infrastructure provides a complex
768	system of vital arteries, making real-time deliveries of
769	electricity, natural gas, and liquid fuels and products to
770	ever corner of the country to satisfy consumer demand.
771	With more than 2.7 million miles of pipeline and 7
772	million miles of electric lines, the United States has the
773	largest, most advanced, and most interconnected energy system
774	in the world.
775	With some limited exceptions, America's energy
776	infrastructure has been privately funded and privately
777	built and financed. It serves as an economic engine that
778	literally fuels and powers the entire economy from coast to
779	coast.
780	As the U.S. energy landscape continues to change, the
781	need to site, permit, and build new energy infrastructure
782	predictably and transparently is increasingly important to

capture the economic and environmental benefits provided by American innovation.

Unfortunately, the permitting process is neither, which discourages investment and often delays or prevents new energy infrastructure from being built, robbing the country of the economic environmental benefits.

As Congress considers infrastructure legislation, it is imperative that permit streamlining be included as part of it. As general principles within infrastructure, the Chamber believes the time has come to enact a federal infrastructure modernization plan to provide every American a 21st century system. We urge elected officials in Washington to take charge and tackle the problem with both adequate funding and a long-term plan. This morning, an op-ed written by Chamber President Tom Donohue and AFL-CIO President Richard Trumka in the Washington Post notes that "Rebuilding and modernizing our nation's crumbling infrastructure will benefit every business, every worker, and every family in the United States."

Last year, the Chamber laid out four pillars the administration and Congress should consider including an infrastructure modernization debate and today I am going to focus on just one -- streamlining the permitting process.

806 There is a growing consensus that the federal permitting 807 regime is moribund and inefficient, discouraging capital 808 investments in new and upgraded infrastructure the market is 809 demanding. 810 This reduces the economic security and environmental 811 benefits Americans could realize from these new investments. 812 Ignoring permitting reform would prolong an inadequate, 813 inefficient, and often counterproductive system of 814 bureaucratic review that provides decreasingly less certainty 815 to project sponsors and investors and ultimately defeats the goal of these legislative efforts to build infrastructure. 816 817 Any infrastructure proposal that fails to reform the 818 permitting system risks losing Chamber support. As our 819 president, Tom Donohue, has said, it should not take longer 820 to approve a project than build it. 821 The Chamber believes that all federal infrastructure 822 approvals should be completed within two years and shepherded by a single lead agency. The administration has implemented 823 824 the one federal decision and a two-year review via executive 825 order and now it is up to Congress to codify these provisions

Additionally, we need Congress's continued commitment to

so that we have long-term certainty that projects can be

completed in a timely and efficient manner.

826

827

829 the reforms it created in FAST-41. The Permitting Dashboard 830 and Federal Permitting Improvement Steering Council created 831 by FAST-41 have already paid dividends for dozens of clean 832 energy infrastructure projects ranging from wind to solar to 833 hydroelectric to natural gas, in addition to flood mitigation 834 and coastal restoration. 835 In total, more than half of the projects tracked on the 836 PFISC Dashboard are clean energy projects and passage of 837 FAST-41 represented a major bipartisan accomplishment, 838 garnering support from both environmental organizations and the business community. 839 840 Congress should permanently reauthorize FAST-41 in any 841 infrastructure passage. 842 And now turning to the LIFT Act. The Chamber 843 appreciates the introduction of the LIFT America Act and 844 recognizes Chairman Pallone and members of this committee for their leadership and efforts to deliver what we believe could 845 be historic legislation. 846 847 While Chamber members have significant interest in this entire legislative effort, I have focused testimony on clean 848

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

energy infrastructure and drinking water infrastructure.

many parts of it that could benefit the U.S. economy and

While we continue to analyse this legislation, there are

849

850

foster cleaner lower-emitting technologies.

Specifically, we support reauthorization of the diesel emissions reduction program and the weatherization assistance program as well as authorized increases in water infrastructure investments and Brownfields redevelopment.

The creation of the assistance for community water systems affected by PFAS is also welcome. And finally, on the general topic of funding, we would be concerned if moneys appropriated for these activities come at the expense of existing were crucial to fostering innovation through the federal complex.

In general, however, the Chamber is supportive of many of the authorized and reauthorized programs created in the LIFT Act, and as we continue our analysis and member consultation, we commit to working with the committee to ensure that this legislation provides the greatest improvements in energy infrastructure while minimizing unintended consequences.

In conclusion, the U.S. is in the midst of a historic energy shift, both from scarcity to abundance but also to lower emitting and environmentally sustainable. The ability to build new infrastructure and facilities harnessing this innovation is crucial to bring economic and environmental

875	benefits to America.
876	To bring these technologies and innovation to bear,
877	Congress must make the federal permitting process more
878	transparent and predictable. Only when that happens will the
879	nation benefit from increased investment and traditional
880	surface infrastructure but also the energy infrastructure
881	that will help facilitate continued economic growth and a
882	cleaner future.
883	Thank you.
884	[The prepared statement of Mr. Guith follows:]
885	********INSERT 5******

886	The Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Guith.
887	And then finally we have Mr. Auerbach recognized for
888	five minutes.

889	STATEMENT OF MR. AUERBACH
890	
891	Mr. Auerbach. Good morning, Mr. Chairman, Ranking
892	Member, and members of the committee.
893	I am John Auerbach, the president and CEO of Trust for
894	America's Health. We are an independent nonpartisan non-
895	profit public health policy research and advocacy
896	organization, and we are grateful that the LIFT America Act
897	includes the needs of public health and health care in the
898	consideration of the nation's essential infrastructure.
899	Such an investment will literally save lives. The
900	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention as well as state,
901	local, tribal, and territorial health departments and
902	community partners need a well-functioning infrastructure to
903	prevent and respond to major public health threats in order
904	to protect the American public.
905	That infrastructure includes the facilities and
906	equipment such as governmental laboratories, up-to-date data
907	and information systems, and a highly-skilled and qualified
908	workforce, including those who are on the front lines when a
909	deadly infectious disease or a dangerous environmental hazard
910	needs to be contained.
911	Over my 30-year career I have held senior positions in

public health as Boston's health commissioner during 9/11, as the Massachusetts' health commissioner during the H1N1 outbreak, and at CDC during the Ebola and the Zika crises, and I have led efforts to combat opioid addiction, the obesity crisis, and environmental contaminants, and I have seen through the years the importance of public health in preventing disease and injury and saving lives during emergencies and outbreaks.

But all too often, health departments are under resourced and understaffed, and inhibited by a crumbling infrastructure.

Public health is traditionally funded with scores of line items, each one representing a distinct disease or condition. But some resources are needed that extend beyond a single health issue. That is where infrastructure funding is so crucial.

An investment in core public health infrastructure gives public health the foundation needed to tackle a wide range of health issues and reduce preventable deaths.

The public health system now faces unprecedented 21st century challenges ranging from the opioid epidemic to extreme weather to emerging infectious diseases, and is doing so in many cases with 20th century infrastructure.

935 My organization released a report last month, "The 936 Impact of Chronic Underfunding on America's Public Health 937 System," where we found that outdated and underfunded 938 resources are preventing the public health system from 939 adequately tackling leading health threats and contributing 940 to the startling fact that the U.S. life expectancy rate has 941 declined for the third year in a row. 942 Let me offer some examples. As public health 943 departments are on the ground working across sectors to 944 prevent and respond to health threats such as food contaminated with salmonella, Zika, Ebola, and now measles, 945 946 there are many times when there are dangerous delays in 947 responding due to the weakness of the public health 948 infrastructure. 949 During the Zika outbreak, health departments in most 950 states were not able to conduct the confirmatory laboratory So that samples would have to be flown by commercial 951 airlines to the CDC in Atlanta. 952 953 And even CDC lacked the resources to respond immediately 954 to the volume of requests. As a local and state health commissioner, I sometimes waited for days for a crucial test 955 956 result due to a lack of capacity. 957 Technology is now constantly improving and offering

state-of-the-art potential approaches such as advanced molecular detection. But without continued investment we can't fully access these breakthroughs.

In addition, the success of public health relies upon accurate and timely data. But it is shocking to continue to hear stories of reports of diseases that are filled out by hand -- those reports are filled out by hand by doctors and faxed at the point that a fax machine becomes available, rather than real-time reporting through the internet.

There are parts of the country that are still communicating such time-sensitive information the way we did a half century ago. Just two days ago, I met with local health officials from coast to coast and I heard horror stories of the lack of adequate health information technology.

Rural public health departments without regular internet access, urban health departments that weren't receiving essential information from electronic medical records of nearly hospitals, missed opportunities to inform the public with social media, which is the key way we receive information now, and health department after health department highlighted the need for highly-skilled personnel to oversee these systems.

981	This committee has worked tirelessly on the Pandemic and
982	All-Hazards Preparedness Act, which aims to strengthen
983	capacity to find health risks before they grow out of
984	control.
985	Yet, this goal remains aspirational without a major
986	investment in the public health infrastructure.
987	Thank you for including public health and health care in
988	the LIFT America Act. Doing so is well worth it in terms of
989	lives saved, illnesses and injuries, and expensive health
990	care costs that are averted.
991	Thank you.
992	[The prepared statement of Mr. Auerbach follows:]
993	
994	**************************************

995 The Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Auerbach, and thank all of 996 That concludes our openings and now we are our witnesses. 997 going to move to member questions. Each member will have 998 five minutes to ask questions of our witnesses and I will 999 start by recognizing myself for five minutes. 1000 There are two vitally important goals that we want to 1001 accomplish with the LIFT America Act. One is to rebuild and 1002 modernize our infrastructure to sustain a high standard of 1003 living for Americans and a competitive efficient economy, and 1004 then second, to redesign and reorient our infrastructure to deal with the climate change that we can't avoid and to 1005 1006 prevent further damage to the climate system, our society, 1007 and our economy. So I want to start with Ms. Eckdish. Are the direct and 1008 1009 indirect employment effects of increasing federal support for 1010 infrastructure projects significant and does the BlueGreen 1011 Alliance see a linkage between infrastructure investments and reducing greenhouse gas pollution? 1012 1013 I know you have touched on that in your opening but if you would develop it a little bit. Not too much because I 1014 have to ask other questions. 1015 1016 Ms. Eckdish. Sure. Thank you, Chairman Pallone, for

the question.

1018	Yes, we absolutely see significant employment
1019	opportunities through infrastructure investments as well as
1020	opportunities to address greenhouse gas emissions. As I
1021	mentioned in my testimony, we see a nearly 15 million job
1022	creation opportunity from investing in infrastructure from
1023	the construction side through manufacturing of components
1024	that go into these infrastructure systems.
1025	We also see a significant nexus with climate benefits
1026	both in terms of the investments that can reduce greenhouse
1027	gas emissions. I will give one quick example. The LIFT
1028	America Act addresses grid modernization.
1029	Full implementation of a national smart grid could
1030	reduce U.S. CO2 emissions by 12 percent. That is just one
1031	example of the emissions reductions we could see from
1032	infrastructure investments.
1033	We also know that investing in infrastructure can help
1034	in terms of the impacts that we know are coming and already
1035	here from climate change including extreme weather events,
1036	sea level rise, storm surges.
1037	Every dollar invested in prevention today reduce costs
1038	by \$6 in the future. So a significant return on investment
1039	and making our communities more resilient to climate impacts.
1040	The Chairman. Thank you.

1041	Let me go to Mayor Wahler. Do you believe that the
1042	infrastructure investments are one way to meet well, let
1043	me say this, Mayor.
1044	Mayors and other local government officials have taken a
1045	strong position in fighting climate change, including
1046	yourself, and calling on the federal government to do more to
1047	meet the challenge of climate change.
1048	So, Mayor, do you believe that infrastructure
1049	investments are one way to meet that challenge and how will
1050	additional federal support for infrastructure help cities
1051	accelerate the transition to a low-carbon economy?
1052	Mr. Wahler. One of the advantages of this bill is it
1053	lays out a five-year program and one of the things that towns
1054	and cities and counties need to do is have be able to lay
1055	out a long-term plan.
1056	In the past, when there was just a one shot funding
1057	there that didn't allow communities to do that. There are a
1058	lot of things that towns and cities can do.
1059	For instance, over the last 10 years between water and
1060	infrastructure projects within communities towns and cities
1061	have spent over \$80 billion in funds there. So towns and
1062	cities do have skin in the game.
1063	We are just asking for a partnership to help along with

1064	some long-term planning and in cases a lot of cases that
1065	towns and cities need seed money to leverage that public-
1066	private partnership to accomplish those goals.
1067	The Chairman. Thank you.
1068	I am going to turn now to Ms. Clyburn on the broadband.
1069	According to a 2017 FCC study, we can build out
1070	incredibly high-speed broadband internet access to 98 percent
1071	of the country with the \$40 billion that we have in the bill.
1072	For that price we are talking about in-home broadband that
1073	could deliver gigabit speeds. To achieve that goal, we
1074	authorize \$40 billion to connect the unconnected.
1075	So in your experience, Commissioner I will still call
1076	you that. Once a commissioner, always.
1077	[Laughter.]
1078	The Chairman. What will it mean for families in rural
1079	areas or urban broadband deserts to have access to in-home
1080	high speed or even gig speed internet service?
1081	Ms. Clyburn. It will allow individuals to make a choice
1082	to stay or to leave that infrastructure that does not
1083	exist in those communities is forcing the young to leave
1084	these communities and causing brain drain in so many areas.
1085	It would put a substantial down payment to address that.
1086	It will allow opportunities in telehealth and telemedicine,

1087 and remote educational opportunities that do not exist --1088 classrooms and schools that do not have the infrastructure at 1089 present. This is an equalizer. This would be a great equalizer 1090 1091 for those areas that don't have the infrastructure to serve 1092 those communities. 1093 The Chairman. And then, lastly, can you explain -well, in the LIFT America Act we have critical coordination 1094 1095 language so that the FCC and state-administered reverse 1096 auctions don't undermine other current and future federal 1097 investment, and you mentioned that language. 1098 Could you just explain what could happen if we didn't 1099 include the coordinate language in the bill? 1100 Ms. Clyburn. Duplication, inefficiencies, and goals not 1101 being met, you know, simply put. You have got a mixture of 1102 state and federal agencies that all mean well, but they are 1103 not talking to each other. 1104 So, you know, a lot of conflict and, as I mentioned, 1105 duplication and goals that are not harmonized are really 1106 causing a lot of inefficiencies and this will force everyone to speak to each other and force efficiency and that will 1107 1108 allow more bang for our buck and more infrastructure being 1109 built to where it is needed.

1110	The Chairman. Thank you, Commissioner.
1111	I now recognize Mr. Walden for five minutes.
1112	Mr. Walden. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I want to
1113	thank all our panellists. We appreciate your testimony today
1114	and your guidance and counsel as we work on these issues.
1115	I want to ask Mr. Lyons, the RAY BAUM'S Act and the
1116	inclusion of MOBILE NOW was a big success last Congress, and
1117	it was also a lesson that streamlining and permitting are
1118	just as important for broadband deployment as spending money
1119	alone.
1120	This is a multi-jurisdictional effort and I believe
1121	there is some understanding needed on how NEPA, the National
1122	Environmental Policy Act, and the National Historic
1123	Preservation Act, impact the expedited deployment schedule in
1124	this legislation.
1125	If we are going to be successful, and we understandably
1126	want to be sensitive of both the environment and to, of
1127	course, historic properties and all, but how do we work
1128	through that and get things like 5G built out?
1129	Your comments?
1130	Mr. Lyons. Thanks for the question.
1131	I think that is absolutely right that if your goal is to
1132	add broadband to places where it is currently uneconomical,

1133	there are two ways to that, right.
1134	Adding subsidies on the one end but also lifting
1135	existing barriers to infrastructure build out is equally
1136	important and we have learned through a number of FCC
1137	initiatives that activities that can lift the existing
1138	barriers to make it easier to go, for example, dig one
1139	strategy
1140	Mr. Walden. Right. I was going to ask you
1141	Mr. Lyons can be super helpful in making it
1142	cheaper to deploy broadband and therefore more economical in
1143	places where regulatory burdens may otherwise be problematic.
1144	You are right that we don't want to ride roughshod over,
1145	you know, environmental regulation. But we have to recognize
1146	also that the more decision makers there are in the process
1147	the more veto gates there are to getting projects done.
1148	Mr. Walden. Yes.
1149	Mr. Lyons. And veto gates means more difficult
1150	delays in getting the projects completed.
1151	Mr. Walden. Well, and I know and I am from the
1152	Northwest, not the Northeast but, you know, we have this
1153	constricted flow of, for example, natural gas. There was a
1154	building I read about recently had been built to hook up to
1155	natural and guess what? They don't have access to enough

1156	natural gas so now they are going to use propane.
1157	And you know all that the blocking of the pipelines
1158	and power lines, and I realize the public needs to have a
1159	voice in these issues. But it comes to a point where we are
1160	using heating oil and we are somehow, I don't know, subsidize
1161	whatever we do with that.
1162	The ratepayers are paying more. The environment doesn't
1163	benefit and you have these constricted flows, and it seems to
1164	me it does not benefit anybody other than the industry that
1165	is out there designed to shut down any progress on energy
1166	development.
1167	Mr. Lyons. Agreed, and I am a so I will preface this
1168	by saying I am a big fan of federalism. I think state
1169	regulators have a really important role to play.
1170	Mr. Walden. I agree, up to a point.
1171	Mr. Lyons. But they are they are focusing on what is
1172	important for their state, right, and there are some times
1173	when what is best for a particular state is not what is best
1174	for the economy as a whole, right.
1175	So, for example, hypothetically, right, you get a
1176	pipeline that is coming down from Canada into Massachusetts.
1177	It has to traverse New Hampshire. If New Hampshire residents
1178	aren't benefiting from that, then they many not want, you

1179	know, to cut through.
1180	Mr. Walden. Right.
1181	Mr. Lyons. If it is something that is great for the
1182	whole but not so great hypothetically if it is great
1183	for the economy as a whole but it is not but a particular
1184	state has a veto authority, we need to make sure that
1185	Mr. Walden. This is the balance we have to figure out.
1186	Mr. Lyons the balancing act is being done at the
1187	right level.
1188	Mr. Walden. Yes. We face a lot in the West with public
1189	federal public lands. I had a community that was trying
1190	to get three-phase power for the first time in this tiny
1191	little town, and I don't remember now. It took a couple of
1192	years to go through the siting process because they, as I
1193	recall, had to put four power poles on Bureau of Land
1194	Management land. It took a couple of years to go through the
1195	process.
1196	And this is the stuff there has got to be a better
1197	way to do this. Now, I want to flag one other issue as we
1198	deal with the communications issues and foreign issues.
1199	In Portland, Oregon, right now, somebody is going around
1200	putting up stickers on lamp posts saying that 5G is a hazard
1201	to your health that look like they are official.

1202	The New York Times has reported on what Russian
1203	television and propaganda is doing to convince people that
1204	somehow 5G is bad.
1205	And I think you can go read the New York Times story.
1206	I mean, it is it is there. Meanwhile, in Russia I am told
1207	they are telling everybody that it cures cancer. Here they
1208	are telling us it is going to cause cancer.
1209	We have got to be recognizing on 5G deployment we have
1210	to win this race, and I think this is worthy of us taking a
1211	look at what is going on by some of our adversaries.
1212	I will show you the story. KGWTV did a fact check on
1213	it. It is, like, this is not official stuff. But we are
1214	going to see that around the country.
1215	We have got to win the war on 5G. We need to use our
1216	natural resources, especially natural gas. You look at 16
1217	gigawatts of coal that has come offline because of fuel
1218	switching, principally. But if you can't get the natural gas
1219	where you need it, then you are going to inhibit that growth
1220	and that development.
1221	So there is a lot more that we need to do. Mr. Lyons, I
1222	certainly see a component to what we are trying to do here
1223	and to work with the states, and I appreciate your testimony.
1224	One question maybe for is it Mr. Guith? The

1225	underlying question, kind of what happened to the White House
1226	you know, everybody got together and said, we got a \$2
1227	trillion thing we all agree.
1228	How do we pay for this? How do we pay for this, \$40
1229	billion? These are authorizations. This isn't, you know
1230	Mr. Guith. The first principle or pillar within our
1231	infrastructure plan was consistent with what we have been
1232	saying for 20 years, which is raising the user fuel tax
1233	Mr. Walden. Right.
1234	Mr. Guith because it hasn't been touched since the
1235	'80s and
1236	Mr. Walden. But you are not going to use that to pay
1237	for these things?
1238	Mr. Guith. Well, we will work with, certainly, Congress
1239	expressing our positions on that. But, ultimately, as Mr.
1240	Donohue stated this morning in the Washington Post, it is
1241	going to take more than even just that to get to \$2 trillion.
1242	I mean, it is going to take private sector investment and the
1243	quickest way to get to that is to make it more transparent
1244	and more predictable as far as how we permit these roads,
1245	bridges, and energy infrastructure.
1246	Mr. Walden. Very good. All right. Thank you.
1247	Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your indulgence.

1248	The Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Walden.
1249	Next, we move to Ms. DeGette, recognized for five
1250	minutes.
1251	Ms. DeGette. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman.
1252	And Mr. Walden, you are exactly right about the 5G
1253	disinformation that is in Denver, and it is everywhere. I
1254	think I think, Mr. Chairman, we should have an O&I hearing
1255	on it is my opinion.
1256	But what I want to talk about in my questions is the
1257	environmental applications of this wonderful piece of
1258	legislation because infrastructure is not just limited to
1259	roads and bridges.
1260	It also has a lot of other components, and that is why I
1261	am really happy that there is \$2.7 billion in this bill for
1262	Brownfields redevelopment grants.
1263	I have been involved in this issue back in the mists of
1264	time since I was in the state legislature when I authored the
1265	Colorado version of Brownfields.
1266	It was called the Colorado State Voluntary Cleanup and
1267	Redevelopment Program, and it is still in use to this day and
1268	it has been used to clean up thousands of areas old dry
1269	cleaners and gas stations and industrial sites.
1270	And then, of course, in 2002 this committee first

1271 authorized the federal Brownfields program and in cities like 1272 Denver we can see how important those programs are to 1273 redevelopment in urban areas and these funds will really 1274 allow communities to continue with the success but also to 1275 have economic development. 1276 Mayor, I am wondering if you can comment very briefly on 1277 Brownfields and how the mayors look at this towards an 1278 economic generator. 1279 Mr. Wahler. Thank you, Congresswoman. 1280 It is no secret that the United States Conference of 1281 Mayors have been very supportive of the Brownfields program. 1282 As a matter of fact, one of my colleagues from New Jersey, 1283 Mayor Chris Bollwage of Elizabeth, New Jersey, has testified 1284 on numerous times here in front of this committee and 1285 testified recently last year when the new bill was authorized 1286 and then signed into law. 1287 Listen, Brownfields -- any time you can clean up a 1288 property and put it back to use, whether it is for 1289 residential or commercial use, is a good thing in this 1290 country. 1291 Nobody wants to be living next to Brownfields or 1292 Superfund sites, for lack of a better word, and I think when 1293 towns have a partnership with the federal government, working

1294 hand in hand to put tax revenues back to good use and to 1295 create economic activity out there, that is a great thing for 1296 both the municipal governments, the country governments, and 1297 even the state governments. 1298 Ms. DeGette. And it is a good economic stimulator. 1299 that right? Mr. Wahler. Absolutely. You know, almost every 1300 1301 community in the United States has a Brownfields site. 1302 Ms. DeGette. Thank you. 1303 Ms. Eckdish, I want -- I also -- the bill also has \$2.5 1304 billion to create grant programs to install solar panels 1305 within low-income and under-served communities. 1306 I am wondering if you can talk to me about how that 1307 impacts jobs in those local communities, both installing and 1308 maintaining. 1309 Ms. Eckdish. Sure. We know that investing in clean 1310 energy is, you know, not only a climate solution but a job 1311 creator. I think what we would hope to see is that these new programs include strong labor and procurement standards to 1312 1313 make sure that not only are we creating jobs, you know, 1314 installing these solar panels or whether it is other wind, 1315 solar, clean energy opportunities -- that we are not only 1316 creating jobs at the project sites themselves but that we

1317	are, A, making sure they are good jobs with labor standards
1318	and with procurement standards, that we are also thinking
1319	about the materials that are going into those to those
1320	projects.
1321	Ms. DeGette. And that is a continuing source of
1322	employment for our communities. Is that right?
1323	Ms. Eckdish. Yes.
1324	Ms. DeGette. Now, another question I wanted to ask you
1325	about is, you know, the LIFT Act builds on the drinking water
1326	State Revolving Fund by respecting state and local decision
1327	making.
1328	In my community right now we are involved in a very
1329	difficult collaborative process with the state and actually
1330	the EPA because they have found lead in the water in Denver,
1331	including in the pipes that go to my house because the pipes
1332	are so old.
1333	So I am wondering if you can talk about why it is
1334	important to respect the solutions for the cities and states
1335	when you are providing the federal funding.
1336	Ms. Eckdish. Absolutely, and we know these communities
1337	exist across the country and there are millions of Americans
1338	being served by lead service lines or water systems that have
1339	lead components, and it is a tragic situation.

1340	The State Revolving Funds are very proven effective
1341	programs and we commend the LIFT Act for recognizing that and
1342	this committee had done tremendous work to ensure that those
1343	programs are effective.
1344	And they also include strong labor and procurement
1345	standards that make sure that the investments we are making
1346	in our water systems also create good jobs both in the
1347	construction and the manufacturing of those components.
1348	Ms. DeGette. Thank you. Thank you so much. I yield
1349	back.
1350	The Chairman. Thank you, Ms. DeGette.
1351	Next, we have Mr. Upton for five minutes.
1352	Mr. Upton. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I would guess -
1353	- I think most of my questions are going to be directed at
1354	Mr. Guith.
1355	I appreciated your comments about PFAS. That is one of
1356	the things this committee and certainly the subcommittee that
1357	Mr. Tonko and Mr. Shimkus lead is focused on that not only in
1358	this Congress but also in the last one.
1359	Michigan, we have been particularly hard hit with this.
1360	Our governor did a really good job of working with every
1361	community in our state to find out what municipal water
1362	systems might be impacted both above 10,000 users as well as

1363 under 10,000 and, sadly, tragically, I have one in my 1364 district and particularly those with individual wells are 1365 still going to be drinking bottled water for some time to 1366 come. 1367 And we did have some cooperation between the city of 1368 Kalamazoo and Parchment to put together a water system so 1369 that the Parchment system now is with Kalamazoo but they were 1370 just really lucky that it was so close. 1371 But this legislation -- the LIFT legislation -- does 1372 establish a non-regulatory federal grant program to aid PFASaffected drinking water utilities and we know it is going to 1373 1374 be more than just one in not only Michigan but around the 1375 country as well. 1376 Do you find that that is a pretty good way to address 1377 the PFAS issues and, again, it does fit in with the jobs and 1378 environment situation but it is a really critical need that communities are going to need very much like what we saw with 1379 lead in Clinton and other communities as well. 1380 1381 Mr. Guith. Absolutely. We think that because the PFAS 1382 contamination invariably hits all 50 states and territories 1383 probably -- all 435 House districts -- there is a significant 1384 need for remediation in addressing the contamination.

But as I noted in my testimony, the one thing we would

1386 be concerned with is that it divert funds from existing safe 1387 drinking water funding, and as somebody from Michigan and 1388 having referenced the lead issue, that is something that I 1389 would expect many up there would not want to see happen --1390 Mr. Upton. Yes, I think we are going to have to expand 1391 the pool of dollars that are available and just like, you 1392 know, lead is bad, PFAS is relatively new contaminant that 1393 many people still don't know about. But it is just as 1394 harmful, as we saw with the lead issue. 1395 You know, as we talk about creating jobs and protecting 1396 the environment, again, one of the issues that this committee 1397 is going to be working on, and thanks to Mr. Rush and Pallone 1398 and, again, bipartisan -- something going back to John Dingell and certainly Debbie Dingell now -- is pipeline 1399 1400 safety authorization bill which, as you may know, expires in 1401 September of this year. 1402 We have been beginning hearings and to, again, work on a 1403 bipartisan basis. Creates jobs and protects the environment. 1404 We know that that's the safest way to transport oil and gas

There are several congressional mandates that are left over from the prior reauthorizations. They involve important rule makings relating to gas and liquid integrity management,

through.

1405

1406

1407

1409 leak detection, safety valves, mapping of high consequence 1410 areas, other important safety rules. 1411 We are going to be working on increased funding for 1412 infrastructure. So do you think that it is important that we 1413 link some of that funding related to upgraded safety 1414 practices as well? 1415 Mr. Guith. Absolutely. As this country continues to 1416 grow its production of both oil and gas, the pipeline system 1417 is expanding and it is become incredibly more important to 1418 the movement of those fuels and those resources. And, you know, I think this committee pointed out when 1419 1420 they had -- when you had the PHMSA hearing a few weeks back 1421 that, you know, modernizing PHMSA and getting it more 1422 personnel is incredibly important and it is to keep up with 1423 the pace of a burgeoning U.S. energy sector. 1424 Mr. Upton. And Ms. Eckdish, as part of the BlueGreen 1425 Alliance, I mean, this is -- this is really a job creator. 1426 mean, we had a pipeline break in my -- actually, it was 1427 outside of my district -- back in 2010. That line -- that 1428 gas line was completely replaced. Four and a half million dollars a mile is what the cost 1429 1430 to replace it was. They did it with a new standard and, you 1431 know, the one spill, again, was outside of my district but it

1432	was a billion dollars to clean up.
1433	So a pipeline safety bill is, you know, anywhere we
1433	so a piperine safety bill is, you know, anywhere we
1434	look, and Mr. Shimkus has been a good leader on this as well,
1435	but more than a million miles of pipelines across the
1436	country, this is something we ought to focus on, knowing that
1437	in fact it is going to be better for the environment.
1438	Wouldn't you agree?
1439	Ms. Eckdish. Absolutely. Pipeline safety is not only a
1440	safety issue. It is a critical safety issue. It is also an
1441	environmental issue when you consider methane emissions from
1442	these pipelines being, you know, an extremely potent driver
1443	of climate change as well as the tremendous job creation
1444	potential that can be achieved by repairing and replacing
1445	some of these pipelines as well as through leak detection and
1446	repair.
1447	Mr. Upton. I know my time has expired but I know other
1448	colleagues will talk about the importance of cybersecurity
1449	related to this, too.
1450	Yield back. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
1451	The Chairman. Thank you.
1452	Mr. Doyle recognized for five minutes.
1453	Mr. Doyle. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for
1454	holding this hearing and introducing this important

1455	legislation which I was proud to co-sponsor, and I want to
1456	thank all the witnesses for being here today also.
1457	My hometown of Pittsburgh, like many cities, has aging
1458	infrastructure than can threaten the health and safety of
1459	residents if it is not properly updated and maintained.
1460	I am glad to see that the LIFT Act includes investments
1461	in drinking water infrastructure as lead and PFAS
1462	contamination remain issues in our region and throughout
1463	Pennsylvania.
1464	Also very happy to see the investments in energy,
1465	health, and communications infrastructure as well. These
1466	investments are critical to the future of our country.
1467	Commissioner Clyburn, Chairman Pallone's LIFT America
1468	Act would invest \$40 billion in deploying broadband
1469	infrastructure to communities across rural America.
1470	Many of the members of this committee represent
1471	communities that lack access to broadband. Why is it
1472	important that Congress invest in the deployment?
1473	What would this bill achieve that private investment and
1474	existing federal programs won't and what do we lose by not
1475	making this investment today and what will those communities
1476	lose?
1477	Ms. Clyburn. Well, I will start with the last first.

1478 We lose our young people. They won't have the educational 1479 opportunities or access to them needed. 1480 We lose quicker our older and those who are medically 1481 challenged because they might not have a specialist nearby, 1482 but with connectivity they are able to access it. 1483 One of the things that you just put forth in that 1484 question is it is not so much what we will lose. It is what 1485 we can't afford to. I mean, literally, we literally can't 1486 afford because we are paying the price for the lack of 1487 infrastructure. We are paying a price for the lack of access. We are 1488 1489 paying a high price and communities are not competitive. 1490 People are not getting access to goods and services they need 1491 to thrive. We lose a lot -- we lose a little bit of everyone 1492 in those communities when we don't address this. 1493 Mr. Doyle. So can this deployment happen strictly on 1494 private investment and existing programs or does the federal 1495 government --1496 Ms. Clyburn. Well, if the last five years is any 1497 indication, and when you don't see appreciably the number of, you know, 24 million according to the FCC, million people not 1498 1499 -- that has been hovering. That number has been constant for 1500 a long time.

So the public-private partnership, while it has

1502 incrementally been doing some positive, it is not getting us 1503 to where we need to get in an expedited way. This is a targeted infusion, a promised infusion in those communities, 1504 1505 with a public-private partnership. It is more of a tortoise 1506 and a hare approach. 1507 Mr. Doyle. Let me ask you also about Chairman Pallone's 1508 LIFT America Act would invest \$12 billion in deploying next-1509 generation 911 service. It is a critical issue and it is one 1510 that has been championed by my friends, Anna Eshoo and John Shimkus. 1511 1512 When will NG 911 service be deployed to all Americans if 1513 we don't make this investment now and what are the risks if we don't delay -- if we delay doing this? 1514 1515 And then also talk a little bit about the benefits of NT 1516 911 service to regular Americans and in particular what are 1517 the advantages to people living in communities that are subject to extreme storms and weathers like California and 1518 1519 Texas and Florida and Puerto Rico? I mean, right as we speak 1520 today throughout the Midwest states are just being pummelled with tornadoes four, five, six days in a row. What are the 1521 1522 impacts of not having that service for those people? 1523 Ms. Clyburn. The impact of not moving to the next

1501

1524	evolutionary phase is lives lost, both from the person who
1525	has the emergency and the critical person who is providing
1526	that providing the service.
1527	One of the images that I saw that I think sums it up is
1528	one of the first responders needed a response, and I really
1529	believe if we had a video and robust texting opportunities
1530	they might have been better able to assess that emergency and
1531	really acted on it.
1532	There are too many public safety centers that can't take
1533	texts. You know, you have to call. Now, heaven forbid if I
1534	get held up and can't, you know, talk. I am more at risk.
1535	So not addressing this and staying maintaining a 50-
1536	year-old framework, which is what we are doing now and not
1537	moving ahead really does not allow individuals to communicate
1538	in a way. It doesn't allow for interoperability and it
1539	doesn't allow for us to be as safe as we need to be.
1540	Mr. Doyle. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.
1541	The Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Doyle.
1542	Mr. Shimkus for five minutes.
1543	Mr. Shimkus. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
1544	A great hearing, multiple issues. I wish we had more
1545	time but we got, obviously, a big attendance here also. So I
1546	am going to try to go pretty quick.

1547	I want to really highlight Jerry McNerney for dropping
1548	the Nuclear Waste Policy Waste Amendment of 2019. Blunt
1549	Rochester is a co-sponsor. Doyle is. Flores is. Hundred
1550	billion dollar infrastructure plan over a hundred years paid
1551	for.
1552	Sounds like a pretty good deal, and that is what this
1553	act would do and it would help railroads getting our nuclear
1554	waste, which is all over the country 121 locations, 39
1555	states to a long-term repository.
1556	So I want to thank him for that and I want to encourage
1557	my colleagues on the committee to look at that bill and ask
1558	us questions, and then consider co-sponsoring it, as the
1559	chairman is at least supportive of having a hearing and
1560	discussing this, and I appreciate that.
1561	But it is \$100 billion over a hundred years paid for
1562	because ratepayers have paid into a fund to enact this. So
1563	it is nothing when we ask about where the money is coming
1564	from, the ratepayers in these states have already paid for
1565	this. So I want to make that
1566	Mr. Guith, do you think there can be a viable long-term
1567	energy and national security policy and this climate debate
1568	without nuclear power?
1569	Mr. Guith. No.

1570	Mr. Shimkus. And I
1571	Mr. Guith. There is scientific consensus around that.
1572	Mr. Shimkus. All right. And, you know, nuclear being
1573	carbon-fee emissions, if we want to meet any type of
1574	objectives and keep rates somewhat acceptable, we will have
1575	to have base load major generation. So I appreciate that.
1576	Also, Mr. Tonko and I were able in the last Congress to
1577	reauthorize the Safe Drinking Water Act through this
1578	committee the Brownfields redevelopment, which the mayor
1579	talked about, and I sat through a lot of those hearings with
1580	your colleagues.
1581	I think the only thing that gives me pause on this parts
1582	of legislation is this is authorization. Then the question
1583	is appropriation. And do we run the risk of authorizing
1584	setting the bar so high that two things.
1585	One is it is unrealistic because there is always going
1586	to be some buy-in and that it causes you know, it causes a
1587	more of a pause because we are planning for all these big
1588	things but the money just doesn't show.
1589	And I want to go with Mr. Guith but I do want to ask
1590	also to the mayor also.
1591	Mr. Guith. It's a age-old friction between authorizers
1592	and appropriators, and that's how the system is set up and we

think it is important to make sure that authorizers take the time to stipulate what the parameters of the program should be regularly -- not, you know, every couple of decades but regularly -- and then take a very active role in the appropriations process to ensure that it is backed up with the actual moneys that are needed to fund the programs.

Mr. Shimkus. Mayor?

Mr. Wahler. I think one of the drawbacks of what you are saying is that, you know, backdooring the ARRA with the energy efficiency block grant program there was some criticism of the fact that the program didn't get off the way it should have been.

But part of the problem was through the Department of Energy. They set a lot of bureaucratic regulations within that and then we had to report ARRA standards, too. Towns and cities and counties across this country are used to the model of the community development block grant programming.

And I wouldn't necessarily fault the towns and communities for that. We -- like in my community we already have an eight-year program. We know what needs to get done. It is about \$100 million worth of projects. But the problem is we just don't have all the money.

1615 Mr. Shimkus. Right.

1616	Mr. Wahler. And we need seed money in a lot of cases.
1617	Mr. Shimkus. Is there not a concern of false
1618	expectations with high numbers and
1619	Mr. Wahler. No. You know what? You know, we have
1620	Mr. Shimkus. If you could be quick. I got one more
1621	question I got to get in.
1622	Mr. Wahler. Okay. We have an aging infrastructure out
1623	there. Everybody knows that.
1624	Mr. Shimkus. Right.
1625	Mr. Wahler. At all levels of all multi-facets.
1626	Something needs to be done and
1627	Mr. Shimkus. Okay. Let me ask about this because this
1628	is tied into the committee of jurisdiction and you have
1629	already talked about the PFAS issue.
1630	So we got PFOA, PFAS 600 of these somewhat chemical
1631	chains in our you know, in our environment. What if some
1632	of these, Mayor, are safe, because there is different
1633	formulations of this, and if the government says you have to
1634	clean up something that is safe at that investment capital,
1635	would you or could you, or would you
1636	Mr. Wahler. Well, I just want to let the record reflect
1637	I am not a medical doctor to talk like that.
1638	Mr. Shimkus. Well, yeah. You are talking to us.

1639	[Laughter.]
1640	Mr. Wahler. But the end game is, is that nobody wants
1641	to see unsafe drinking water. My good friend, Karen Weaver
1642	from Flint, Michigan, I don't I would not I just
1643	emphasize what the folks in Flint, Michigan, had to go
1644	through and I am sure nobody in this room ever wants to see
1645	that in your community out there.
1646	But we need to work with the health professionals
1647	nationally along with the counties and towns across this
1648	country.
1649	Mr. Shimkus. And my time is way expired but I would
1650	just say we got to make sure we know if it is what is safe
1651	and what is not safe and we got to be careful about saying
1652	ban everything because some of that stuff may be safe and
1653	high cost.
1654	Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You let me go way over my time
1655	and I appreciate it.
1656	The Chairman. Okay.
1657	Next I will recognize Ms. Matsui for five minutes.
1658	Ms. Matsui. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and
1659	welcome to the panel. Thank you for being here today.
1660	I was pleased to see that the LIFT America Act
1661	reauthorized the popular Diesel Emissions Reduction Act, or

1662	as we call it, DERA program.
1663	As you may know, earlier this spring in introduced
1664	legislation to reauthorize DERA and led the effort to secure
1665	robust funding in fiscal year 2020 appropriations.
1666	Diesel engines still pose a unique problem because of
1667	the long lifespan of the equipment, with some engines
1668	operating for up to 20 or 30 years.
1669	Because of this, the transition to newer cleaner engines
1670	has been slow and as a result diesel fuel consumption still
1671	accounts for a large percentage of our transportation sector
1672	carbon dioxide emissions 24 percent in 2017 alone,
1673	according to the Energy Information Administration.
1674	Ms. Eckdish, can you quickly discuss how the nature of
1675	diesel engines poses a unique challenge to our local
1676	communities?
1677	Ms. Eckdish. Thank you for the question.
1678	That specific issue is a little bit outside of my area
1679	of expertise. But I would say to the to your broader
1680	point about the need to address diesel and other emissions
1681	from the transportation sector we have a long way to go and
1682	what LIFT America Act is has done so far in terms of both
1683	the diesel emission reduction program as well as building out
1684	EV infrastructure is a step in the right direction and we

1685	want to make sure that those the emissions go down and
1686	that we are creating good jobs while we do that.
1687	Ms. Matsui. Okay. Thank you.
1688	And I think it is important, as you mentioned, that this
1689	bill is prioritizing electric vehicle, or EV, infrastructure,
1690	you know, because transportation emissions, as we said, are
1691	now the largest single source of emissions in this country.
1692	While we thought we might get a handle on this under the
1693	Obama administration's rules on fuel economy and greenhouse
1694	gas emission standards, the Trump administration decided to
1695	roll back these standards and bring our country backwards
1696	when it comes to cleaning up our transportation sector.
1697	This is, obviously, a critical part of our larger vision
1698	to combat climate change and create healthier safer
1699	communities for our constituents.
1700	While I have introduced legislation that will safeguard
1701	these standards, it is also important to provide robust
1702	investments for EV infrastructure and the purchase of EVs.
1703	Mayor Wahler or Ms. Eckdish, can either of you discuss
1704	what some of the largest barriers to widespread of EVs is
1705	today and how this bill might alleviate some of these
1706	obstacles?
1707	Mr. Mayor?

1708	Mr. Wahler. I think, Congresswoman, the question is a
1709	lot of towns and cities have really stepped up to the plate
1710	because there is for lack of a better word, there hasn't
1711	been so much of a partnership at the federal level or, in
1712	some cases, at the state level.
1713	So most of the initiatives that you see positively
1714	across this country has been happening at the state and local
1715	level, to a certain extent. Like in my community we
1716	recognize that with charging stations that we have to start
1717	somewhere.
1718	So we changed our zoning laws. Any new large
1719	development or commercial developments have to supply
1720	charging station areas as well at government facilities that
1721	we've been doing because, basically, 80 percent of the
1722	roadways in this country are municipal or county.
1723	So if you are going to ever have a network system of
1724	to reduce carbon emissions, we need to start at the local
1725	level.
1726	Ms. Matsui. Right. And I and I really believe I
1727	think what you are saying, too, is having a federal activity
1728	in this realm would be great.
1729	I mean, in California we are doing it. In fact, our
1730	utilities are helping with the EV charging stations

1731	themselves, which actually activates the incentive to buy EV
1732	automobiles
1733	Mr. Wahler. That is an exception, Congresswoman.
1734	Ms. Matsui. I know.
1735	Mr. Wahler. Your state is an exception.
1736	Ms. Matsui. But if we get it at the national level I
1737	think that would be very helpful also.
1738	I want to ask a question about the remote areas fund. I
1739	am switching here but this is everything here.
1740	In 2011, the FCC acknowledged that the highest cost
1741	hardest-to-reach places around the country should be targeted
1742	through a remote area fund, as we call it RAF.
1743	In 2017, the Commission reaffirmed that it aims to move
1744	forward with the RAF no later than a year after the Connect
1745	America Fund reverse auction.
1746	Many RAF-eligible communities still do not have access
1747	to a safe and reliable broadband option. If structured
1748	properly, the RAF would reach the communities in rural
1749	America where it is truly no business case to serve.
1750	Now, Commissioner Clyburn, mindful of the larger
1751	proposed reforms to the Universal Service Fund, do you have
1752	any idea what steps the FCC could take to ensure the RAF is a
1753	success? We have got 25 seconds here.

1754	Ms. Clyburn. Oh. One of the things that I think it
1755	could do is get the maps right so we can have an accurate
1756	feel for what is needed. Another is ensure that it is
1757	technology neutral so we can extract the best ideas for our
1758	buck, and leveraging what I know you will do today through
1759	this act it definitely will help move things along.
1760	Ms. Matsui. Okay. Fine. Thank you, and I yield back.
1761	The Chairman. Thank you.
1762	Dr. Burgess recognized for five minutes.
1763	Mr. Burgess. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
1764	Mr. Auerbach, I want to thank you for mentioning the
1765	Pandemic All-Hazard Preparedness Act reauthorization. It
1766	was, indeed, a very high priority of this committee and the
1767	Health Subcommittee last Congress and due to the an even
1768	temperament over in the other body, and I am being careful
1769	with my language.
1770	It did finally pass on unanimous consent earlier this
1771	week. As we are just a little bit past the 100-year
1772	anniversary of the Spanish flu it is important to get this
1773	done, and you are correct to mention some of the
1774	infrastructure needs because that is so critical.
1775	For the first time we will authorize the system
1776	Biowatch. We had Mission Zero, which was to it was a

1777 force multiplier for our trauma surgeons and military-trained 1778 physicians. So there is a lot of good stuff in that bill and 1779 I am glad the Senate finally passed it. 1780 Professor Lyons, you brought up the concept of 1781 allocation proportion, which I think is reasonable in a state 1782 like Texas where we have, what, 85 percent of the state lives 1783 within 50 miles of Interstate 35 going north to south, from 1784 the north Texas area down to Laredo, and then you got the 1785 rest of Texas. 1786 So then allocation proportion becomes very important. In fact, I was reading some stuff in the local press and the 1787 1788 Houston Press this morning about how concerned they are about 1789 the formulas that are being used to allocate these dollars. And I don't know if you have any thoughts on that but we 1790 1791 are going to have to make sure that we keep up with the fact 1792 that it may not be as straightforward as the FCC has demonstrated in their formulas. 1793 1794 Mr. Lvons. I think that is -- I think that is right. think the goal in allocating the dollars should be to keep an 1795 1796 eye on what the overall purpose of the subsidy is, which 1797 first and foremost is to make sure that you are reaching un-1798 served areas. 1799 And so when figuring out how to allocate the dollars

1800	that are being distributed to the states, the important thing
1801	I think is to figure out what is the population of the un-
1802	served area in each state and allocate the money that way.
1803	That way you make sure that you are not you don't
1804	have the unintended consequence of sending too much money to
1805	one state or another because of the fact that city might have
1806	a larger urban area.
1807	Mr. Burgess. So you have got a lot of geography in some
1808	areas without a lot of population, and it just makes it
1809	technically more difficult. But it doesn't mean that it
1810	shouldn't be done.
1811	Mr. Lyons. That is right, and I think that is why the
1812	technology-neutral point is really important too because
1813	wireless solutions may be great in Kansas. It's not going to
1814	be so great in mountainous West Virginia, right.
1815	So giving more flexibility to bidders to figure out how
1816	best to serve individual areas makes a lot of sense to me.
1817	Mr. Burgess. Very good. Thank you.
1818	Mr. Guith, you struck on something that has really
1819	concerned me since I first got here in 2003 and that is the
1820	streamlining of permitting.
1821	At that time I was thinking more in the terms of road
1822	construction, and we had the 50-year anniversary of the

interstate highway system and I think 80 percent of it was built in the first 25 years of the -- the last connectivity was built in the next 25 years because the permitting process had become so difficult.

The president has said this -- it can't take longer to permit a project than it does to build a project, and I trust that your group is working on that, working with the White House, working with the Congress to make sure that we keep that top of mind.

Mr. Guith. Very much so, and it is, like I said, a bipartisan effort. FAST-41 was the last time we touched upon this issue. It took many years but it was -- it was painful but it was rewarding because both sides holding hands and we saw the first meaningful changes, maybe not substantive but more transparency as far as how the federal permitting system works so that people from the outside -- the project sponsors could figure out where their project is and who is reviewing it and, oh by the way, you know, this agency doesn't talk to this agency and maybe they should.

So now there is a interlocutor who can do that. So it is a huge step forward and we are looking for a few more of those huge step forwards in this process.

Mr. Burgess. Well, thank you and thank you for that.

1846	It is critical that we keep that in mind.
1847	Ms. Eckdish, let me just ask you a question. I was at
1848	the White House last week and the president, as you may have
1849	heard, had an event regarding immigration and visas.
1850	I think you correctly talk about American-made products
1851	being the ones that we want to use on these projects. You
1852	talked about a fair wage for employees.
1853	Would you be willing to accept if this legislation
1854	were to come through the Rules Committee where I also sit,
1855	would you be willing to accept an amendment to require
1856	mandatory E-verify so we can be certain we are giving
1857	American jobs for American workers at American wages?
1858	Ms. Eckdish. I am not sure that we have a position on
1859	that as a coalition. But I would be happy to review and get
1860	back to you.
1861	Mr. Burgess. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
1862	will yield back.
1863	The Chairman. Thank you.
1864	So next is the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. Sarbanes,
1865	recognized for five minutes.
1866	Mr. Sarbanes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank
1867	our panel. And I want to salute you, Mr. Chairman, for
1868	assembling this very important package of infrastructure

investments. It is about time and our committee, I think, is very well positioned to contribute to the broad discussion we are having across the Congress about making this a priority.

Last Congress, I was very proud to be a co-sponsor of

the LIFT America Act and I am certainly pleased again to do it in this Congress.

It provides, as we know from this discussion and certainly from pulling the bill together -- its many components -- much-needed resources for our nation's critical infrastructure.

I know that typically when we hear infrastructure the first thing that comes to mind for many people is roads and bridges and, obviously, those are important pieces of our physical infrastructure and are in dire need of important resources.

But we can't forget about other infrastructure that is vital to the health and well-being of Americans' drinking water, infrastructure, the electric grid, and infrastructure for community health centers being among them.

I wanted to focus my attention on the electric grid, which is facing many challenges, as we know. There is growing demand. There is need for reliability, integration of new technologies, need for resiliency against climate

1892	change and extreme weather events.
1893	These are all challenges that require that our electric
1894	grid adapt to 21st century requirements.
1895	Ms. Eckdish, can you just talk for a moment about how
1896	modernizing our grid our electric grid is a smart
1897	investment from helping, obviously, to address carbon
1898	emissions to promoting reliability and affordability and any
1899	other benefits that you would like to observe?
1900	Ms. Eckdish. Sure. Thank you for the question.
1901	And as you rightly pointed out, there is a lot of work
1902	to do. Most of the many of the components of our electric
1903	grid are from a hundred years ago.
1904	Our grid was built for an energy system of the past and
1905	not what we have today or what we are going to have in the
1906	future. So there is tremendous need for both grid
1907	modernization, smart grid updates, as well as investing in
1908	grid resiliency, all of which the LIFT America Act does.
1909	There is also significant need to build out our
1910	transmission lines to both increase efficiency and
1911	reliability as well as facilitate the incorporation of more
1912	renewables onto our grid.
1913	All of those will have significant impacts, benefits
1914	from addressing climate change to making our communities more

1915	resilient. There are also very significant infrastructure
1916	projects that, again, if we include strong labor standards
1917	and procurement standards can create good-quality jobs.
1918	Mr. Sarbanes. Thanks very much.
1919	Mr. Wahler, you certainly know first hand about the
1920	importance of a resilient and reliable grid, as your
1921	community was devastated by Superstorm Sandy.
1922	Can you talk about how these extreme weather events like
1923	what you experienced and, obviously, what we are seeing more
1924	and more of across the country and as it relates to being
1925	handled or is being felt, I guess, most impactfully by people
1926	who are trying to lead at the local level what the effect of
1927	those on our grid infrastructure is and how investments in
1928	the grid resiliency that we are talking about here are
1929	important for local communities?
1930	Mr. Wahler. If I may, Congressman, as well, most towns
1931	and cities are waiting for state regulators at the state
1932	level to have the transmission carriers upgrade their lines.
1933	Towns and cities at this point are looking at the backup
1934	resources there. Like, for instance, our community we have a
1935	lot of solar panels in our facility.
1936	We also have backup generators on all of our pumping
1937	stations now, or the sewers. We actually have backup

batteries for all 30 signalized intersections because when the power grid goes down people still travel around the road you have to have some safety measures.

So that has been a challenging part for a lot of communities. They don't necessarily have the money to have the resiliency done and that is why I think we really need a partnership at the federal level to help -- have a helping hand out there because in times of a crisis like during Hurricane Sandy where you had no power in our community for almost nine days straight when the weather was getting very cold out there and you had people calling the mayor's office, "How am I going to get heat?"

And it is a very poignant -- as Chairman Pallone knows, it is a very frightening situation for most of the general public. So this is something to be taken very seriously.

Mayors and county officials across the country take this very seriously, Congressman.

Mr. Sarbanes. I appreciate your comments, and you talked about the importance of partnering from a resource standpoint, and I am very pleased that the bill I was able to work on and introduce, the 21st Century Power Grid Act, is included in this package because it would empower the Department of Energy to support projects that improve grid

1961	performance, security, resiliency, and it would do that
1962	through grant making and cooperative agreements, and those
1963	kinds of federal investments in our grid infrastructure are
1964	essential if we are going to overcome the challenges that we
1965	are talking about here today.
1966	So thank you very much for your testimony, and I yield
1967	back the balance of my time.
1968	The Chairman. Thank you.
1969	Mr. Latta recognized for five minutes.
1970	Mr. Latta. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Thanks
1971	very much for having today's hearing and thanks to our
1972	witnesses for being here today.
1973	Commissioner Clyburn, if I could start my questions with
1974	you. First of all, welcome back in your new capacity.
1975	Ms. Clyburn. Thank you.
1976	Mr. Latta. I appreciate your comments on how you noted
1977	Commissioner O'Rielly's work on the importance of
1978	coordination. It is something we have been focused on here
1979	in committee. The ACCESS BROADBAND recently passed the House
1980	and I am looking forward at further steps we can take to get
1981	the different existing programs working together.
1982	Would you speak to some of the effects you have seen
1983	when coordination is lacking?

1984	Ms. Clyburn. One of the things that we see, and it
1985	might be a benefit to some people, but you see subsidizing of
1986	unsubsidized carriers getting money to serve the same area.
1987	Now, while that may fuel competition, we also see
1988	broadband providers not being in certain areas because of
1989	that. You know, lack of coordination and that is you
1990	know, that disconnect and that, again fuels all the
1991	opportunities.
1992	So the biggest thing is duplications duplications,
1993	the inefficiency and, again, investments not going to areas.
1994	That is the saddest part of it investment not going to
1995	areas where it is needed.
1996	Mr. Latta. Okay. Thank you.
1997	Professor Lyons, should we try to address coordination
1998	in a more substantial way as we consider further spending on
1999	broadband deployment?
2000	Mr. Lyons. I think we have got several different
2001	programs that are sort of aiming at the same thing. But if
2002	they are not talking one another you get a ton of overlap and
2003	inefficiency.
2004	One difficulty with creating these types of initiatives
2005	on a one-off basis is once it is created it tends to stick
2006	around. So I don't know if this is beyond the scope of what

2007	this committee is considering right now but one solution
2008	might be to think about consolidating all of these into one
2009	program that would look more comprehensively at the question
2010	of serving un-served areas with one decision maker who is
2011	allocating one pot of money rather than dividing among
2012	several different groups.
2013	What I am thinking of is the Connect America Fund, which
2014	has done great work, but it is hobbled by the fact that it is
2015	laboring under restrictions of the Universal Service Fund
2016	that were created for a very different era.
2017	It is a program that is doing the best with what it can.
2018	But closing that down and shifting the money to something
2019	like this that is focused primarily on building broadband
2020	infrastructure out I think would be an improvement.
2021	Mr. Latta. Okay. Let me ask another question to you.
2022	I agree with your comments that funding should be distributed
2023	on a technology-neutral basis.
2024	However, as you noted, the 100 megabit per second
2025	minimum service standard risks overinvesting in fewer
2026	projects. Does this service standard also threaten the
2027	principle of tech neutrality?
2028	Mr. Lyons. It does in the sense if you which is
2029	probably true right now, that 100 megabits per second minimum

2030 is one that some technologies can hit and others cannot. 2031 We have to think about ways to deploy good enough 2032 broadband or broadband that is going to connect people who 2033 are currently unconnected and setting too high of a threshold 2034 may prevent the number of players who can come in and bid. 2035 I often tell my students that the satellite guys are 2036 perpetually creating a state-of-the-art network for, like, 2037 seven years ago. And I think that is a bit of an 2038 overstatement but the idea is that technology is great but it 2039 is not -- but it is advancing at the same rate that fiber is advancing and wireless is advancing. So they are perpetually 2040 2041 just a little bit behind. 2042 But if they are meeting the mark that they can provide basic connectivity, they ought to be in the mix of the 2043 2044 conversation and not be hobbled in their ability to bid in 2045 the reverse auction by the fact that they can't hit 100 2046 megabit target if a 100 megabit target hasn't been justified. 2047 Mr. Latta. Thank you. 2048 Mr. Guith, while much of our nation's infrastructure 2049 depends on federal investments, the private sector needs to 2050 step up to make needed investments in our electric grid. 2051 In your view, what is the greatest impediment to 2052 unleashing more private sector investments?

2053	Mr. Guith. Within the electric grid it is relatively
2054	simple. It is the inability to site intrastate transmission
2055	lines. Unlike with natural gas pipelines where Congress
2056	bestowed a federal preemption to FERC, licensing and
2057	permitting of transmission lines is a state by state
2058	Balkanized process and it frequently takes north of a decade
2059	to try and get through that process, and usually it turns out
2060	negatively.
2061	We have seen both DC and AC lines stopped by a single
2062	state, even though it may benefit, you know, 14 states.
2063	So it would be very useful to have that federal
2064	preemption for transmission the same way we do with natural
2065	gas, although you probably have 50 governors who might take
2066	issue with that.
2067	Mr. Latta. And just in my last 10 seconds, you might
2068	answer a little bit of this. But what should Congress do to
2069	encourage more public-private partnerships? I know you just
2070	mentioned preemption.
2071	Mr. Guith. I am sorry. Can you repeat the last part of
2072	the question?
2073	Mr. Latta. Yes. What should Congress do to encourage
2074	more of the public-private partnerships?
2075	Mr. Guith. Fundamentally, just more transparency, more

2076	predictability. There is trillions of dollars out there both
2077	in corporations, financial service funds as well as foreign
2078	sovereign funds, who are willing to invest in all forms of
2079	infrastructure within the United States.
2080	But it is not predictable enough right now and providing
2081	that predictability will open the floodgates to that
2082	additional money that is not coming from the U.S. taxpayer.
2083	Mr. Latta. Thank you.
2084	Mr. Chairman, my time has expired and I appreciate the
2085	indulgence. I yield back.
2086	The Chairman. Thank you.
2087	Mr. McNerney recognized for five minutes.
2088	Mr. McNerney. Thank you. I thank the chairman. I
2089	thank the witnesses for coming in this morning and talking
2090	and preparing. It is a big effort.
2091	My constituents and Americans across the country need
2092	broadband access to fully participate in our society. The
2093	LIFT Act will result in smart federal investments and
2094	broadband deployment to achieve this goal.
2095	But I am concerned that many Americans still are unable
2096	to get online because they face adoption hurdles such as not
2097	being able to afford broadband service and the necessary
2098	devices or do not have digital literary skills.

2099	Commissioner Clyburn, based on your experience at the
2100	Commission, what are some of the ways that the lack of
2101	adoption impacts low-income individuals in their communities?
2102	Ms. Clyburn. Well, one thing that I am happy about,
2103	today I consider it a very significant \$40 billion down
2104	payment. This is but a first step, however.
2105	You rightly mentioned that in order for a person to be
2106	truly connected it has to be affordable, it has to be
2107	available, and they have to know or be comfortable in using
2108	it because if they are not comfortable accessing online, if
2109	they cannot download an app, and if you don't have those
2110	skills needed, you won't have workforce development training.
2111	You will not be able to be retooled for the 21st
2112	century. So all of these things are necessary. It is a
2113	multi-prong, definitely a stool effect that is needed a
2114	number of legs on the stool. This is one. Digital literacy
2115	and other opportunities are others.
2116	Mr. McNerney. So you already sort of answered my second
2117	question. Would you agree that there is additional federal
2118	investments needed for broadband skills and digital literary
2119	training?
2120	Ms. Clyburn. Absolutely. A very wonderful complement
2121	is a proposed digital equity act. You know, that, again, has

2122	to be a complement to this. Otherwise, America will not be
2123	truly connected.
2124	Mr. McNerney. Very good. Well, I have been working
2125	with Chairman Pallone on that and plan to introduce that soon
2126	so we get to some of these issues so the disadvantaged and
2127	under-served communities aren't left out.
2128	Moving on to water infrastructure, the Smart Energy and
2129	Water Efficiency Act proposed by Mr. Kinzinger and myself is
2130	included in this LIFT Act and this creates a pilot project
2131	for innovative technologies to improve energy efficiency of
2132	water, waste water, and water reuse systems.
2133	My district is at the heart of the California delta and
2134	I have a responsibility to be a good steward of that
2135	incredible resource.
2136	Mr. Wahler, can you address the need for grants to
2137	improve water and wastewater infrastructure in communities
2138	like yours?
2139	Mr. Wahler. Well, we right now, cities and towns
2140	across this country and particularly mine, we float a lot of
2141	money through it the federal and state and there is a
2142	very small portion of the down payment money.
2143	Like I said before, we spend an average of \$10 million a
2144	year on infrastructure even though our water has been in

2145 private hands for a number of years. I do know that the 2146 water purveyor has been making substantial public 2147 improvements out there on the roadways to make sure that the 2148 clean standards are being followed and that we don't have any 2149 areas where we have to shut down schools because of non-safe 2150 water. 2151 However, what I would like to say is that we need to 2152 have towns and counties that don't necessarily have the 2153 expertise out there. 2154 Grants such as what you were mentioning would help them 2155 get that expertise and do proper long-term planning out there 2156 so when they go to do a large capital investment of the local 2157 public dollars they will be able to do it correctly. 2158 Mr. McNerney. Thank you. 2159 Mr. Auerbach, you testified that Americans' life 2160 expectancy has dropped for the last three years in a row. Is that in line with other developed countries? 2161 2162 Mr. Auerbach. It isn't. We are seeing more of a gap 2163 that is growing between the United States and other developed 2164 We have looked at the reasons for that. 2165 the causes of increased deaths in the United States relate to 2166 opiate epidemics, suicides, et cetera. So paying attention 2167 to those differences I think is part of what we need to do to

2168	understand how to close that gap.
2169	Mr. McNerney. Do you think the LIFT Act will help
2170	remedy this?
2171	Mr. Auerbach. It will. Our ability to respond
2172	efficiently to the challenges that we are facing now will
2173	benefit the American people in terms of better surveillance,
2174	better understanding of where there are concentrations of
2175	particular problems that may be related to the opioid
2176	epidemic.
2177	If we have got the kind of data systems that allow us to
2178	have interoperable communication we can target those
2179	particular areas with interventions that we know work in
2180	terms of prevention and response.
2181	Mr. McNerney. Thank you. I was going to talk about
2182	infrastructure on transmission. Just yesterday, a colleague,
2183	Bob Latta, and I held a hosted a grid innovation expo to
2184	highlight some of the technologies out there and I hope that
2185	members and staff take advantage of that information as we
2186	move forward.
2187	Thank you. I yield back, Mr. Chairman.
2188	The Chairman. Thank you.
2189	Mrs. Rodgers?
2190	Mrs. Rodgers. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I appreciate

2191 all the witnesses being here today. I wanted to highlight 2192 the broadband in rural areas issue, which is especially 2193 important. I think it is fundamental to our economic success and our future. It is certainly part of the infrastructure 2194 2195 of the 21st century. 2196 Unfortunately, too many rural areas are being left behind including some in eastern Washington that I represent. 2197 2198 And to make matters worse, an issue that has been highlighted 2199 this Congress is the inaccurate broadband mapping and the 2200 data that is greatly overstated -- the coverage in the rural 2201 areas. 2202 I am pleased that broadband is part of the discussion 2203 today and as we think about an infrastructure package that 2204 this is going to be a priority. 2205 However, with the economic survival of our rural 2206 communities at stake, we often avoid the mistakes of the past 2207 -- we must avoid the mistakes of the past and ensure that the 2208 limited resources we are able to provide make it the areas 2209 that need it the most. 2210 Forty billion dollars is a considerable amount of 2211 funding. But its ability to make a dent in the digital 2212 divide is going to be reliant on accurate data. 2213 And that is why in the coming weeks I am planning on

2214 introducing the House version of the Broadband Data 2215 Improvement Act. This bill will ensure that the FCC is 2216 compiling the most complete and granular data on broadband 2217 access. 2218 Mr. Lyons, how important is it for the current mapping 2219 process to be improved and made more accurate and granular 2220 before distributing new funds to deploy broadband in the 2221 rural areas? 2222 Mr. Lyons. I think it is absolutely vital. I think 2223 that analysis is only as good as the data that is fuelling 2224 the analysis, right. 2225 You can have complex statistical models to figure out 2226 how something is going to work but if it is bad data being 2227 fed into it then you are going to get bad results out. 2228 I think everybody acknowledges that the FCC's existing 2229 mapping protocols don't really work. They are based on Form 477, which was developed back in the dial-up era, right --2230 2231 back when most of us didn't have internet and those that did 2232 were dealing with that junky static noise, right. 2233 The FCC is updating that and I think it is long overdue 2234 and it is going to be valuable. I think there's also a lot 2235 of public-private partnerships that could be valuable in this 2236 Things like U.S. Telecom and WISPA are currently space.

2237 engaged in a pilot project to see -- to map within some of 2238 their jurisdictions. 2239 Somebody mentioned crowd sourcing, which I think is also 2240 really valuable -- just getting information that is disbursed 2241 in the populace up to the FCC or some other entity that can 2242 coordinate all these separate data points into more accurate 2243 mapping is also going to be valuable. 2244 Mrs. Rodgers. Thank you. Appreciate that. 2245 For Mr. Guith, you may be aware that I am a strong 2246 proponent of hydropower. I come from Washington State. We 2247 are more than 70 percent dependent upon hydropower. 2248 clean. It is carbon free. 2249 We also enjoy some of the lowest electricity rates in the country. Hydropower is the largest renewable in America 2250 2251 and its role, as we move forward, is going to be really 2252 important. 2253 I have been working to increase the use of this 2254 important energy both nationally and internationally. 2255 year, we worked on legislation -- bipartisan legislation --2256 that passed the House to modernize the hydropower licensing 2257 process. 2258 The current regulations take on average 10 years to 2259 relicense a hydropower project in America, and you compare

2260 this to a natural gas facility that is, like, 18 months. 2261 I wanted to ask you how do you believe hydropower fits 2262 into the bigger picture of energy infrastructure. 2263 Mr. Guith. I think it is a great example of the United 2264 States being so rich in energy resources that it behooves us 2265 to use the resources that we have geographically. 2266 And growing up in northern California we also rely on 2267 hydro significantly, and we run into issues all the time 2268 trying to site incremental increases in hydro and, frankly, 2269 have to fight to keep the existing generation we have. not just from the generation standpoint but increasingly from 2270 2271 the pump storage standpoint. 2272 So I think hydro is and will remain an incredibly 2273 important part of our portfolio. But there can be more. 2274 There is certainly more capacity available in the United 2275 States and it is not just in the Pacific Northwest, which is so blessed with hydro to begin with. 2276 2277 Mrs. Rodgers. Well, and because of research, because of 2278 investment in new technologies -- we have fish ladders, we 2279 have turbines that are -- have larger outputs and we are 2280 getting to a place where dams are transparent to the fish --3 percent of the dams in America actually produce hydropower. 2281 2282 So there is existing infrastructure that is currently

2283 there that with investment we could be producing clean 2284 renewable electricity. 2285 So I wanted just to follow up. How do you believe that we reduce some of the burdensome regulations that are 2286 2287 impacting our ability to really take advantage of this? 2288 Mr. Guith. Well, I think the work that Congress did 2289 with your leadership last year was a great first step. First 2290 and foremost, it is trying to identify what the issues are 2291 and then addressing them. 2292 In this case, like I said, there's a lot -- I mean, you are talking about multiple agencies that you have to go 2293 2294 through here and sometimes they don't even know each other, 2295 let alone have communication lines to talk to each other. 2296 And so first, it is highlighting that, and we have seen 2297 the ability of the FIPC (phonetic) to address some of these 2298 issues and it certainly applies to hydro as well. It is not the end-all be-all, but it is what is 2299 2300 available right now. And there are certainly some additional 2301 bipartisan reforms, whether it is one federal decision, some 2302 reasonable NEPA reforms that I think over time people will embrace that will help spur these things, including hydro. 2303 Mrs. Rodgers. I appreciate that, and it is -- it 2304 2305 dominates in the Pacific Northwest, it is true. But I have

2306 always been amazed at the projects that are all over the 2307 country as well as all over the world. 2308 So thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I will yield 2309 back. 2310 The Chairman. Thank you. 2311 Ms. Castor is next, recognized for five minutes. 2312 Ms. Castor. Well, thank you, Chairman Pallone, for holding this very important hearing on how we modernize 2313 2314 infrastructure across America. 2315 I agree with what I have heard from my colleagues and our terrific witnesses here today. We can boost higher-2316 2317 paying jobs across this country by expanding broadband, 2318 doubling down on the clean energy economy, doing some more on 2319 public health infrastructure and I am hearing great support 2320 from folks I represent back home in the state of Florida. 2321 They understand what the Recovery Act meant to our 2322 communities and they would like a more robust partnership. 2323 Really, the federal government has got to be a meaningful 2324 partner. It can't be just all talk no action. 2325 I am particularly interested in how we build a 100 percent clean energy economy, going forward, and Ms. Eckdish, 2326 thank you so much for your leadership and that of the 2327 2328 BlueGreen Alliance.

2329	You are already building partnerships across the country
2330	to build that clean energy economy. Would you go into
2331	greater detail on a few things smart grid investments, how
2332	why do you think that those smart grid investments could
2333	be a key to building the clean energy economy, and then talk
2334	about what it means for jobs when we are talking about smart
2335	grids and a modern electric grid.
2336	And then I would also like you to focus on energy
2337	efficiency in green buildings. I have seen what the private
2338	sector is doing. Now, the public sector wants to do more but
2339	they it seems like they need some resources from the feds
2340	to help give them a push.
2341	Ms. Eckdish. Sure. Thank you for the question and
2342	thank you for your leadership with the Select Committee.
2343	In terms of your first question, I think grid
2344	modernization is key both from a climate resilience
2345	perspective as well as a greenhouse gas emission reduction
2346	perspective.
2347	As I mentioned, grid modernization, grid resiliency, as
2348	well as transmission expansion can be key to facilitating
2349	electric vehicles as well as further deployment of clean
2350	energy onto our grid.
2351	It can also make sure help ensure that our

communities are more resilient to the impacts of climate change, as you know well in your state from power outages to flooding and storm surges.

To your second question, building efficiency is key and a huge opportunity. There are already 2 million workers employed in the energy efficiency sector today.

So with further investments, we know we can dramatically expand those jobs. And many of those today are already good jobs in the building and construction trades. With domestic content requirements we can also expand the manufacturing of energy-efficient products and materials.

There are already tremendous jobs today in the manufacturing of energy-efficient component parts. So with further federal investment coupled with labor standards and procurement standards, there is significant opportunity to expand that.

Ms. Castor. So I had to step out of the hearing for a little while to sit down with one of America's mayors of a very large metropolitan area and he explained to me how they are -- they run a municipal utility and they decided to go 100 percent clean energy over the next couple of decades.

And one of the things they set out to do, they took their coal plants offline. But he said they had to give

2375 special attention to a lot of the folks who were employed 2376 there and it -- yes, it means community college training 2377 initiatives but it can't just be a short-term focus. 2378 This has got to be something that we focus on to ensure as we transition from the old dirty fossil fuel energy 2379 2380 sources to clean energy sources that we just -- it can't be 2381 simply a training program, temporary for a few months or a 2382 year. 2383 Talk to me about what the model should be going forward 2384 for a just transition. 2385 Ms. Eckdish. Sure. Thank you. 2386 I think your point is well taken. These facilities are 2387 not only -- you can't only think about the workers at the facilities. You need to think about those workers as well as 2388 2389 the broader impact on the communities themselves. 2390 In many cases, these plants are huge tax base resources 2391 for the communities in which they're located. So that means resources for infrastructure, schools, first responders. 2392 So we need to make sure, as we are thinking about 2393 2394 addressing climate change and the clean economy of the future, that no community or worker is left behind and they 2395 2396 shouldn't be paying the price. 2397 We need to make sure not only that workers directly

2398	impacted are kept whole but also that we are focussing on
2399	reinvestment in these communities that are seeing these
2400	losses.
2401	Ms. Castor. And what this mayor said was as they
2402	created jobs in the green economy, whether they are solar
2403	installers or working in energy efficiency, they became the
2404	higher paying, more family-sustaining jobs than some of the
2405	older fossil fuel type jobs. Are you seeing that as well?
2406	Ms. Eckdish. I think a lot of the jobs that we see
2407	today in the fossil fuel economy are good jobs and are
2408	there is some significant union density.
2409	I think what we need to make sure is that the jobs that
2410	we are creating in the clean economy are as good if not
2411	better, and making sure we have strong labor standards and
2412	procurement standards. Our investing in retraining is a key
2413	part of ensuring that.
2414	Ms. Castor. Thank you very much.
2415	The Chairman. Thank you, Ms. Castor.
2416	Next is Mr. Guthrie, recognized for five minutes.
2417	Mr. Guthrie. Thank you, Mr. Chair, and I appreciate
2418	everybody for being here today.
2419	And my first question is for Ms. Eckdish and Mr. Lyons
2420	to comment on this Professor Lyons to comment on this as

2421	you move as we go.
2422	So, Ms. Eckdish, in your testimony you agreed with our
2423	efforts to win the 5G and the \$40 billion for expedited
2424	deployment of broadband, and I appreciate your commitment to
2425	that.
2426	But attached into your testimony with advocacy for the
2427	overturning of FCC's small cell order, and so my question is
2428	wouldn't the overturning of the small cell order be a setback
2429	for expedited deployment of 5G?
2430	Ms. Eckdish. We do support restoring the ability of
2431	local governments to regulate deployment of small cells and
2432	we see that as key for these communities meeting the needs of
2433	their
2434	Mr. Guthrie. That would be a setback for expedited I
2435	mean, I understand we need a debate before this decision
2436	needs to happen. But it would slow down the deployment of 5
2437	because you have to deal with every locality as opposed to a
2438	national standard.
2439	Ms. Eckdish. I would love to follow up on that.
2440	Mr. Guthrie. Okay. Mr. Lyons, would you like to have a
2441	
2442	Mr. Lyons. Yes. I think a big driver of the FCC small
2443	cell order is the fact that 5G technology is very different

2444	than the 4G and 3G towers that were driving the original
2445	tower statutes, right.
2446	When you are talking about whether you are going to put
2447	a large tower in a town that, you know, you can see from
2448	several miles away, having significant local input makes a
2449	lot of sense.
2450	When you're talking about little pizza box-sized spaces
2451	all around town, it is a different impact. And so the trade-
2452	off between how much we should give local authority and how
2453	much we should be expediting build out of infrastructure, the
2454	calculus changes a little bit and that is part of what was
2455	driving the small cell order.
2456	I do think repealing the small cell order would slow
2457	things down because it would add an additional potential veto
2458	gate into the building out of new infrastructure.
2459	And as we saw in from time after time, right,
2460	satellite deployment and local franchising authority in cable
2461	industry and things like that, those additional veto gates
2462	become potential road speed bumps on the path toward
2463	deployment. We think it is opportunity for more.
2464	Mr. Guthrie. Okay. Thank you.
2465	And I think it is a fair debate and so I just wanted to
2466	bring that, moving forward.

2467 So this would be for Professor Lyons. Many Kentuckians 2468 have been able to gain access to the internet through the 2469 expansion of wireless services. 2470 In your testimony, you mentioned the bill we are 2471 discussing today as technology neutral. I know you have 2472 mentioned something about what the speed requirements would 2473 do to threaten the ability to use innovative solutions to geographic, topographic, or economic challenges to deploying 2474 2475 broadband in rural America. 2476 Could you expand on how the speed requirements in the bill would threaten that and, since you have touched on that 2477 2478 already, any other provisions in the bill that might affect 2479 deployment in rural America? 2480 Mr. Lyons. Yes. I think the primary concern with a 2481 minimum speed requirement is you disqualify any technology 2482 that can't meet that speed, which limits the number of bidders available and therefore limits the areas you can 2483 2484 serve and how cost efficiently you can do so. 2485 Now, if the speed limit is justified, right -- you say 2486 the bill sets 100 megabit per second download minimum -- if there is a justification for that like that is the amount 2487 that we think is necessary for somebody to be connected, then 2488 2489 that is totally appropriate.

But if the proper amount is something less than that, then it doesn't make sense to me to eliminate potential bidders who can provide service in rural areas at -- to connect unconnected communities in ways that are going to give them the basic needs that they need by setting an artificially high premise.

Now, you might be trying to future proof the network and I think there is arguments for that. But if you are going to do that you need to recognize it is a trade-off.

Mr. Guthrie. Okay. Thanks.

And I was also going to ask you about mapping. I know Cathy McMorris -- my friend from Washington just talked to you a little bit about it. Is there anything you want to expand on that about mapping and -- because they probably do get overbuilding.

My area -- I have lived in Bowling Green, which is a growing progressive city in the mid-South, and even in our area because of the development of building housing, even a city that has -- a county that has gone from 75,000 to 130,000 people in the last 20 years, still there is areas that home builders say, we can't build in these areas because people aren't going to buy the kind of houses we are going to build without access to broadband, even though it is right

2513	next to a really fast-growing developing city.
2514	And then I have very rural counties, too, that don't
2515	have that same issue. Unfortunately, the opposite of growth.
2516	So how do just talk about how mapping close to big cities
2517	and where they are not being served or growing areas but also
2518	just areas that really need some help in moving forward.
2519	Mr. Lyons. Well, one issue you have cited is sort of
2520	outdated data, right that data collected no matter how
2521	accurate, if it is one or two or three years old it may not
2522	reflect the situation on the ground at the time.
2523	So I think one issue that a comprehensive mapping
2524	solution needs to undertake is how often the data gets
2525	refreshed how often the carriers have to report back to
2526	the FCC where their build out maps are.
2527	Mr. Guthrie. Do you think mapping should go down to
2528	Census tracts or how detailed should they be?
2529	Mr. Lyons. So it depends on Census tracts is useful
2530	but it doesn't always capture exactly what you are looking
2531	for. We learned in the BDS proceeding, which was the
2532	Business Data Services, is that sometimes you need to be down
2533	on almost like a block by block level to understand which
2534	particular parcels have deployment and which don't.
2535	You can have a Census tract where most of the area is

2536	wired and we might consider that wired. But there are still
2537	places within the Census tract that are being left out.
2538	Mr. Guthrie. So when you get down to the I
2539	understand we would love it even house to house if you could.
2540	But the question is you get to cost benefit of that.
2541	Mr. Lyons. Right.
2542	Mr. Guthrie. And so at what point what do you think
2543	is the
2544	Mr. Lyons. So the trade-off then becomes how expensive
2545	is it to get that granular of data and so one the
2546	ancillary question to that is what are the different ways you
2547	can try to get that granular data.
2548	If it is too expensive to get it through carrier reports
2549	can you crowd source it in a way that at least fills in some
2550	of the information and then discount it appropriately to
2551	understand the dirtiness of the source.
2552	Mr. Guthrie. Okay. Well, thank you, and that fills my
2553	questions and I will yield my time. I don't know if somebody
2554	wants it. I will yield back.
2555	The Chairman. Thank you. Mr. Tonko is next, recognized
2556	for 5 minutes.
2557	Mr. Tonko. Thank you, Chairman Pallone. I will mention
2558	two statistics that I recently came across. First, China

used more cement between 2011 and 2013 than the United States used in the entire 20th century. Second, China also has 421,000 electric buses in operation. The United States has 300.

That being said, a sound economy begins with sound infrastructure. We cannot afford to keep deferring maintenance or construction of what we know will be needed for a competitive and sustainable economy of the future. We have a once-in-a-generation opportunity to invest and modernize our aging infrastructure. We need a vision for what it can be and it must be a comprehensive approach. So, Chairman Pallone, I want to commend you for the LIFT America Act. It lays out that vision and I want to highlight a few important provisions.

This bill makes major investments in our nation's drinking water. We made some great bipartisan progress last Congress with the Drinking Water SRF reauthorization, but we also know EPA has estimated the needs over the next 20 years at some \$473 billion. If we continue to underinvest in these systems, especially as we learn more about the extent of our challenges from lead, PFAS, and other contaminants, providing clean, reliable and affordable water will only become more difficult for local governments.

2582	So, Mayor Wahler and Ms. Eckdish, if Congress considers
2583	an infrastructure package, how important is it that water
2584	infrastructure is included?
2585	Mr. Wahler. Everybody wants to live a long life and you
2586	have to drink water. So we have aging pipes throughout this
2587	country; towns and cities have limited capital resources out
2588	there to take care of the issue. Any way or any additional
2589	tools in the toolbox for municipalities and counties to
2590	replace pipes that are suspect contaminated is a great thing,
2591	and I hope this committee moves along with this bill to do it
2592	that way, because you can't survive without water. You need
2593	water.
2594	Mr. Tonko. Thank you.
2595	Ms. Eckdish?
2596	Ms. Eckdish. Yes, it is critically important. Thank
2597	you.
2598	Mr. Tonko. And, Mayor Wahler, do you think it is
2599	important that Congress provide support to local governments
2600	for some of these public health crises, including lead and
2601	PFAS contamination?
2602	Mr. Wahler. Well, I think it is safe to say over the
2603	last 5 years what we have seen around the country is with all
2604	these lead pipe poisoning crises going and I hate to say it,

2605 I think if we are probably going to see some more of that. 2606 we were proactive in this room, working in collaborations 2607 with the local officials out there, we might be able to be 2608 proactive and prevent that from happening in the future. 2609 I am also pleased that the bill includes a 2610 reauthorization of the Weatherization Assistance Program. 2611 Buildings consume about 40 percent of our national energy demand and many low-income families cannot afford the upfront 2612 2613 costs for retrofits even when they are cost-effective 2614 investments. Mayor Wahler, how have weatherization funds helped low-2615 2616 income families in your community? 2617 Mr. Wahler. Well, I think in a lot of the especially in the Northeast, you have a lot of housing stock that is a lot 2618 2619 older where traditionally the building codes weren't up to 2620 the new weatherization standards. So when there is direct 2621 grants out there that towns and cities can get their 2622 residents to retrofit there, the communities, not only are 2623 they saving on energy costs but more importantly they are 2624 saving on the carbon footprint. 2625 Mr. Tonko. This bill also covers important aspects of 2626 the transportation sector. We all know transportation is now 2627 the largest source of greenhouse gas emissions in the United

2628	States. We will not be able to adequately address the
2629	climate crisis or accelerate the clean energy transition
2630	unless we help finance an infrastructure build-out for
2631	cleaner vehicles.
2632	Ms. Eckdish, I already mentioned China's embrace of
2633	electric buses. Do you believe supporting zero emissions
2634	vehicle infrastructure will lead to more American jobs in
2635	manufacturing as well as charging station installation and
2636	maintenance?
2637	Ms. Eckdish. Yes, and it is critical we do it the right
2638	way. We need to make sure that across the board from grid
2639	modernization that is needed to facilitate EVs to the build-
2640	out of electric charging infrastructure to the manufacturing
2641	of the vehicles themselves that we are harnessing that
2642	opportunity here in the U.S. and not with domestic content,
2643	labor standards we are investing and leading the world in the
2644	manufacture of those vehicles and technologies.
2645	Mr. Tonko. Thank you. And do you agree that these
2646	investments will make our economy more competitive while
2647	reducing our air pollution?
2648	Ms. Eckdish. Yes, absolutely.
2649	Mr. Tonko. And, Mayor Wahler, if given the resources,
2650	will local governments do more to ensure residents have

2651 access to this type of charging infrastructure? 2652 Mr. Wahler. You bet. I have to laugh. We are building 2653 a community center right now and when they found out there are going to be charging stations there, the first question 2654 2655 out of a lot of the residents, "Well, how much are you going 2656 to charge for me to come charge up?" 2657 Mr. Tonko. Well, LIFT America has great provisions on 2658 transportational electrification and EV charging stations and 2659 I hope we can continue to work on a comprehensive clean 2660 transportation package that will make sure we are reducing pollution from this sector. 2661 2662 Finally, this bill has strong provisions to promote grid 2663 modernization and resilience, but a 21st century electricity 2664 system must also be flexible. We need to ensure we are able 2665 to move electrons from where they are generated to where 2666 demand exists, and so it is upgrading that grid, but also enhancing storage, providing for the American intellect to 2667 carry us through a new generation of storage opportunities so 2668 2669 that we can optimally utilize our gridding up with renewal With that, Mr. Chair, I yield back. 2670 2671 The Chairman. Thank you. Next is Mr. Olson, recognized 2672 for 5 minutes. 2673 Mr. Olson. I thank the chair and welcome to our six

witnesses. My question will be to you, Mr. Guith. It is going to be about pipelines and energy infrastructure.

As you all know, right now this country is facing enhanced U.S. global energy dominance. We are making more oil and natural gas than almost the entire world. One example from Texas, there is this place called the Permian Basin in West Texas. It has been predicted by our government that within 2 years that one massive shale play in Texas will produce more oil and natural gas than every country in the world except for Saudi Arabia. That is more than Russia. That is more every OPEC nation and that is just one shale play right here in America.

Of course, this renaissance, this dominance will die if we don't have the pipelines to get the oil, natural gas, and all the things through the pipeline to where they have to go, to go to the market. FERC is in charge of approving pipelines and they are having some problems with the excessive demands for new pipelines, for LNG export plants. They are involved in all that.

I have got a bill with Mike Doyle to address all their problems with their employees. They are the best in the business. They are getting poached by the private sector big time because they can pay almost twice the salaries of the

federal government. We have a model to give them more pay to keep them on board, it comes from the SCC. Again, Mike Doyle and I have sponsored this bill.

My question is for you, can you talk about why permitting certainty is so important for America's energy dominance and does this apply to all technologies, not just oil but also LNG exports, hydropower dams, anything, could this help? Any comments about our bill and the challenge we have building pipelines?

Mr. Guith. Absolutely. This stuff is not cheap.

Whether you are talking about utility scale solar farms,

whether you are talking about multistate pipelines, I mean

many of them run in the orders of billions of dollars. Even

some of the LNG facilities that we are seeing coming on line

now are in excess of \$10 billion.

So if you are a project sponsor or, more importantly, you are an investor who may invest in that project, you know, you have to hedge it against the certainty and handicap it against it not getting approved, even though there is a commercial demand for that to happen. And that is true across all forms of generation and energy use. And the more certainty, the more unconstrained that capital will flow to those projects.

2720 Mr. Olson. Next question is for you, Mr. Lyons. 2721 about pipelines and all the communications necessary when it 2722 is a disaster like a hurricane. 2723 During the last Congress, I introduced H.R. 4845 which 2724 was called the Connecting Communities Post Disaster Act. 2725 you know, disasters can destroy telecom systems at their 2726 moment of the most highest, the greatest need. In Houston during Hurricane Harvey, after Hurricane Ike came in about 10 2727 2728 years before, we made a big effort to dig all our power lines 2729 and put them and our communications lines underground. had did pretty well, but you have to add, that information 2730 2731 has to flow. 2732 First responders have to have -- where are the flooded roads, where are the problems? Citizens who might be 2733 2734 evacuated, okay, you can't go this route, go this route. These communications are a matter of life and death. And 2735 2736 with hurricanes, the season looming just 1 short week away, 2737 what do you think Congress should do to get this process of 2738 making our telecommunication system more viable and stronger 2739 during an absolute disaster like a hurricane? 2740 Mr. Lyons. No, I think it is absolutely right that 2741 communications are absolutely vital. We saw it in addition 2742 to in Texas, in Puerto Rico as well, right. The difficulty

2743	of communicating with those who were affected made it a lot
2744	harder to get them the relief they needed. I think things
2745	like undergrounding like emergency power backups can help.
2746	They are expensive, right, and so it is always a trade-off.
2747	How much are you going to invest now to harden the
2748	infrastructure and how much is it going to pay off in the
2749	event of a natural disaster? The provisions that are being
2750	available for Next Generation 911, I think, are going to be
2751	significantly helpful in that respect in figuring out how to
2752	not just modernize the first responder network, but harden it
2753	as well.
2754	Mr. Olson. Thank you. My time has expired. One PSA,
2755	public service announcement, the Houston Astros are in first
2756	place of the Western Division of the American League of
2757	Baseball. I yield back.
2758	Mr. Lyons. The Red Sox are not proud of how much they
2759	contributed to that.
2760	Mr. Olson. Three games. We won three up there in
2761	Fenway, you all won one. We will get you back in the
2762	playoffs.
2763	The Chairman. Thanks to the gentleman. Mr. Welch,
2764	recognized for 5 minutes.
2765	Mr. Welch. Thank you. Thank you very much, Mr.

2766 Chairman. First of all, I want to thank you and our other 2767 chairs, Mr. Rush, Ms. Eshoo, Mr. Doyle, and Mr. Tonko. 2768 is a great bill and it has got some of the provisions in the 2769 HOMES Act that I have co-sponsored with Mr. McKinley. 2770 this is such a good ambitious bill I am ready to move the 2771 bill. 2772 The Chairman. Yeah, well. 2773 Mr. Welch. And I am really quite --2774 The Chairman. Do you got any cash? 2775 Mr. Welch. This is the ambitious -- all right, let's But we have been talking about infrastructure for so 2776 2777 long it is time to do it. We all know we need it. I am 2778 really excited about the HOMES Act that is in here. 2779 excited about the Smart Buildings that I co-authored with Mr. 2780 Kinzinger. But every one of us on the committee, I think, 2781 has provisions in here. And the witnesses are all here 2782 advocating things that we think make an awful lot of sense. 2783 So my hope is, and I think all of our hopes is that we are actually going to move on this bill and push it out. 2784 2785 always have the challenge of how do you pay for it, but last I knew potholes don't fix themselves. And I have indicated a 2786 2787 willingness to support just about any revenue measure that 2788 will make this happen, because I think at the end of the day

2789 as much as there is always resistance to paying for things, 2790 our constituents know that they don't fix themselves. 2791 And once you start seeing the benefits of, say, 2792 broadband build-out or clean energy options or the grid 2793 resilience or fixing up the water systems, then people see 2794 that that is going to benefit them and their willingness to 2795 accept it is enhanced enormously. 2796 Let me start with Mayor Wahler. Are you okay with us 2797 coming up with a way of paying for this? I mean you have a 2798 hard job right on the front lines. 2799 Mr. Wahler. Well, Congressman Welch, one of the big things, anytime that the federal government can help. We are 2800 2801 not asking you to pay a hundred percent. Towns and cities 2802 already pay about 80 to 90 percent of everything that is 2803 going on. 2804 Mr. Welch. Exactly. 2805 Mr. Wahler. If there is even down payment money on 2806 long-term plans for communities or for when we have to go for 2807 long-term bonding for such improvements that is a good thing. 2808 So when we go for the financial markets, if we could show that there is a consistent basis that there will be grant 2809 2810 money targeted towards that, that it makes things easier to 2811 put --

2812	Mr. Welch. Right. No, I appreciate that. I met with
2813	eight of our mayors in Vermont and they said pretty much what
2814	you said and they vary in their political points of view.
2815	Mr. Wahler. Yeah.
2816	Mr. Welch. But they know that they have incredible
2817	needs, limited tax base, huge burdens on property taxpayers
2818	and the federal government has to help. So thank you very
2819	much.
2820	Ms. Clyburn, it is good to have you back.
2821	Ms. Clyburn. Thank you.
2822	Mr. Welch. And broadband build-out is part of this. It
2823	is absolutely essential as you know and I think many of us
2824	here know that rural America is getting written off if we
2825	don't have the same high-speed internet that urban America
2826	has. So if we are successful in getting broadband
2827	infrastructure passed in this bill, how do we future-proof,
2828	because I don't want us to get a one-time deal where then we
2829	are constantly playing catch-up. Can you comment on that?
2830	Ms. Clyburn. So, with respect to my fellow panelists, I
2831	say we go big. I say minimally, you know, a hundred
2832	megabits. I say that because not only do our communities
2833	need it and they will need it in the future, it would keep us
2834	competitive internationally.

2835	One thing, if you will allow me a couple of minutes, in
2836	2012, China, because that was mentioned once, had 20.3
2837	million homes that had fiber, you know, connected, fiber
2838	connected to the home. Today they have almost 400 million.
2839	If we are going to stay competitive, if we are going to give
2840	our communities and the individuals in our communities the
2841	tools that they need to stay competitive domestically and
2842	internationally we have to go big.
2843	Mr. Welch. Okay, thank you.
2844	And I want to ask Ms. Eckdish from the BlueGreen
2845	Alliance, first of all, I think the BlueGreen Alliance is so
2846	good. We are getting people together who sometimes competing
2847	points of view to do something that makes sense for all of
2848	us, so thank you. And your advocacy, the BlueGreen Alliance,
2849	is really essential to the potential of us being successful.
2850	You talked about energy efficiency in public buildings.
2851	How could that help us not just to reduce carbon emissions
2852	but who does the work on that?
2853	Ms. Eckdish. Sure, thank you for the question. Energy
2854	efficiency does have tremendous environmental impacts. It
2855	has tremendous job impacts as well. As I mentioned earlier,
2856	we have over two million workers today in energy efficiency.
2857	Those are construction workers installing HVAC, other energy

2858	efficiency upgrades.
2859	It is also workers in the manufacturing sector. We have
2860	almost 300,000 workers that are today manufacturing energy
2861	efficient component parts. So there is tremendous potential.
2862	There is already good jobs today in the energy efficiency
2863	sector and tremendous opportunity for expansion.
2864	Mr. Welch. Great. I see my time is up, but I want to
2865	also thank the Chamber for the tremendous work that it has
2866	been doing in this area. I yield back, Mr. Chairman.
2867	The Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Welch. Next is Mr.
2868	McKinley, recognized for 5 minutes.
2869	Mr. McKinley. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You know, as I
2870	read through this bill you reminded me of a kid in a candy
2871	store. You could have had anything you wanted in this
2872	legislation. You are The Chairman of the most powerful
2873	committee in Congress. Your party is in control of the
2874	House. But then you went into the candy shop and you left
2875	with a stick of gum.
2876	We have the opportunity to do something bold and robust
2877	on energy infrastructure, but this committee so far is aiming
2878	low. This is the Energy and Commerce Committee. After 5
2879	months in the majority, is this really the best that this
2880	committee can do on energy infrastructure? Yes, we have

aspects of modest initiatives in broadband, drinking water, in health care and brownfields, and some of that I will support with you and I realize there may be jurisdictional limitations.

But with all the hype about what we need in a comprehensive infrastructure bill, why haven't we sought a bolder, broader, more comprehensive bipartisan approach to this? But not one, not when there is just 31 Democrats on the bill and no Republicans. There are numerous bipartisan bills that could have been included in this, the 48A Tax Credit by Collin Peterson, the Gas Turbine Efficiency, Paul Tonko's, or Scott Peters', the USE IT Act.

The LIFT America Act was billed as a sweeping legislation to combat climate change, and yet it glaringly omits authorizing energy research to produce innovation and solutions and research. Research including carbon capture and storage, gas turbine efficiency, methane hydrates, battery storage, fugitive methane emissions, alternative to lithium—ion batteries and cobalt, rare—earth elements, wireless power transmission, hydrogen fuel cells, small nuclear and modular coal plants.

Keep in mind, Mr. Chairman, America currently spends more money on eating potato chips than it does on research

2904 and energy. Mr. Chairman, we had a chance to put together a 2905 package that you wanted. You had the keys to the candy 2906 So let's be bold and include some bipartisan measures 2907 that gives this bill a chance to pass the Senate and be signed into law. The American people deserve better. 2908 2909 To win the big game, Michael Jordan knew he had to have 2910 the confidence to take that last shot, that game-winning shot 2911 when he had the chance. Instead of taking that risk, this 2912 committee appears to be passing the ball. It is a lost 2913 opportunity. So, Mr. Guith, if I can ask you on this, you mentioned 2914 2915 Scott Peters' USE IT Act in your testimony. Would more 2916 innovation and research be beneficial to addressing the infrastructure problems we have on energy and particularly as 2917 2918 it relates to combating the climate change challenges that 2919 face -- would energy and research be helpful? 2920 Mr. Guith. Most definitely. I mean climate change is inherently a technology issue, but it is also an 2921 2922 infrastructure issue. And there is significant scientific 2923 consensus that specific technologies are most likely, no quarantee, to be key to addressing, to lowering emissions and 2924 ultimately preventing emissions globally. 2925 2926 One of them is carbon capture utilization and storage.

2927 In order -- one end of that obviously is capturing the carbon 2928 which in and of itself is a challenge, but we are seeing 2929 significant innovation happening there. But at the other end 2930 is what you do with it, so you need to have the 2931 infrastructure to move it and then to ultimately sequester it 2932 geologically or otherwise permanently. 2933 And the USE IT Act is a great first step in pairing with 2934 the fiscal policy that Congress has put in place in order to 2935 make it easier to site and permit those projects and also 2936 incentivize them. And that is a key step forward for U.S. innovation that will hopefully lead the globe in a move 2937 2938 towards a much less emitting and ultimately not emitting 2939 economy. Mr. McKinley. Thank you. I mean there are so many 2940 2941 things on the capturing the carbon. We get oxycombustion. 2942 We get chemical looping. There are so many things we could 2943 do, but we have a chance in this bill and we omitted it. 2944 could have authorized more research to go for it. So again, 2945 I yield back the balance of my time. 2946 The Chairman. Thank you. Next is Mr. Loebsack, 2947 recognized for 5 minutes. 2948 Mr. Loebsack. Well, thank you, Chairman Pallone and 2949 Ranking Member Walden. I thank the witnesses for being here

today. I do want to echo my friend Peter Welch's comments about what a great bill this. I really do believe it is.

And just, if I might, to respond to my colleague, Mr.

McKinley, I would like to see more in this too. There is a

lot more out there that we could be doing. Not to defend the

particular approach that we have here, but I will say that

often in this body and over in the Senate, the bigger you

make a bill, the more targets there are for the opposition

and the harder, therefore, it is to get it passed. But I am

certainly open. I don't want to, you know, I can't speak for

The Chairman or the ranking member, but I am open to adding

some more things to it too, if we can get bipartisan support

for that. There are a lot of great ideas out there.

One of the things, one of the ideas that I look forward to discussing further is a bill that I have worked closely with Representative Mullin, Markwayne Mullin, the Communications Jobs Training Act. And this bill would provide funding to develop training programs, workforce programs for construction, and maintenance for these communication towers.

I visited one of these just recently. I didn't go up as high as a couple of our commissioners. In fact, I didn't go up at all because those things are awfully damn tall. But I

put all the equipment on and it was really quite fascinating.

We are clearly going to need more people to do these jobs

down the road to construct more of these towers.

And in conjunction with the tower infrastructure we need of course broadband infrastructure and that has been talked a lot about today. I am really happy to see that this bill includes \$40 billion for this purpose. I am from Iowa, a rural district of 24 counties, probably twelve or thirteen thousand square miles. We have a lot of problems there when it comes to rural broadband. And I have been for now a number of years raising the issue related to the poor quality of the FCC's maps which has been talked about already today.

I am glad this bill does start with maps that Congress has funded at the NTIA the last few years, and I am glad that the mapping section requires the FCC to consider publicly available -- publicly available broadband information and that the challenge process minimizes the regulatory burdens. That is really something that I think is important.

And, Commissioner Clyburn, I would like you to speak to that issue. Why is it critical that any challenge process be conducted with the least burden, the least burden on customers and those doing the challenging?

Ms. Clyburn. Because when you see something wrong, it

should not be a heartache to point it out. It is as simple as that. And so I am glad you pointed that out and I am proud to brag -- Mr. Duncan has already left -- that my state will be a part of that publicly available, you know, mapping universe, because it is producing its own broadband mapping plan. And so in addition to that, Microsoft has, you know, an infrastructure for you to reference. It is an all-of-the-above approach, because again all eyes are not going to see everything and it is important for us to know what is there.

Mr. Loebsack. And make that challenge process as transparent and as easy as possible as well.

Ms. Clyburn. Absolutely, absolutely.

Mr. Loebsack. Because there are a lot of other different sources of information out there that we ought to be taking advantage of. And I will just mention, 2 times ago I think it was, when Chairman Pai was here, he -- maybe 3 times ago. He mentioned that he had been traveling in Northwest Iowa and he had a lot of dropped calls and lot of problems up in that part of the state. I am in the southeast part but I grew up in the northwest part.

But all over Iowa, all over rural America we have problems. And it says that we have good service in those areas if you look at the FCC map, but it is simply not the

3019	case. My view is we can't move forward if we don't have good
3020	mapping in the first we have to know where the problems
3021	are if we are going to solve the problems, and right now we
3022	don't have good
3023	Ms. Clyburn. And I am proud to brag that I was part of
3024	pushing in the Mobility Fund, Phase I and Phase II.
3025	Mr. Loebsack. Yes, you were. And thank you for your
3026	service.
3027	Ms. Clyburn. Thank you. I appreciate that.
3028	Mr. Loebsack. I really appreciate that, Commissioner.
3029	Look, I am very proud that my home state of Iowa is a
3030	leader in renewable energy and energy efficiency. I often
3031	talk about wind energy accounting for nearly 40 percent of
3032	our electricity in the state of Iowa. And this is a key
3033	moment for the committee to play a role in addressing climate
3034	change and this bill does make several key investments for
3035	our energy future, although I am willing to entertain more
3036	possibilities.
3037	It does include my bill, the Rebuild America's Schools
3038	Act which will help schools modernize and make critical
3039	energy efficient upgrades. It will create jobs, a really
3040	good thing, right? It will reduce emissions. It will
3041	produce long-term cost savings for our schools. This is

something I have been trying to get through for a number of years as well, all while providing our students with topnotch learning environments.

We know that the environment in which our students learn and our educators teach can have an immense impact on the quality of education our children receive, and that makes, I think, this a win-win situation all the way around for workers, for students, for parents, for educators and our administrators as well.

Ms. Eckdish, in your testimony you mentioned the importance of upgrading our nation's inefficient and unhealthy school buildings as part of a smart infrastructure package. I know you are not an expert on education as such, but can you speak generally about the impact in investing in modern and efficient school facilities would have on the health of our students and the quality of their learning environments, not to mention the jobs obviously associated with this?

Ms. Eckdish. Yes, thank you for the question. And thank you for raising schools. We absolutely think they should be a key part of the infrastructure discussion and I would be remiss if I didn't say we strongly support the Rebuild America's Schools Act which has broad support across

3065 Congress as well.

We know as you said that investing in schools has tremendous impacts on students, teachers, other staff at these facilities from the health of their learning environments. Schools are -- we have many schools with asbestos, lead, a host of health issues. We also know that making energy efficient upgrades can save schools money that they can then reinvest in their schools, so there is clear economic and environmental benefits. There is also tremendous job benefits as well for on both the construction side and again on the manufacturing side as well.

Mr. Loebsack. Yeah, I taught at a college. My wife taught second grade for over 30 years. I know that from a curricular standpoint too we can even incorporate some of the changes that maybe did take place in a particular school setting into the curriculum, and maybe even some of those students who go home and tell their parents about how great green schools are and we could spread the good word that way as well.

Commissioner Clyburn, I know you already did talk about a future-proof rural America. Do you want to elaborate at all? I know you mentioned a hundred meg, for example.

3087 Ms. Clyburn. Well, again, I think we should start there

and aim up, because, you know, this is an international race. And is it a race for people to be able to take advantage of telemedicine and other opportunities? You are going to need speed. You are going to need fiber. You are going to need those investments to ensure that that happens. We cannot afford to look through today's lens, a 2019 lens. We need to look far into the future and we don't want to come back here another 5 or 6 years from now, you know, Groundhog Day was a great movie, but it not, you know, the way in terms of, you know, implementing policies and procedures.

Mr. Loebsack. Thank you so much. Thanks to all of you.

And I yield back.

The Chairman. Thank you. Mr. Griffith is next.

Mr. Griffith. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate it greatly and I appreciate talking about rebuilding American schools in many of my counties or in a few of my counties. The counties are having a hard time and I just want to make sure there is enough flexibility in there that, you know, we are trying to keep the rain from coming in. If we can sneak away to do that and put some solar panels up there, I am all for it because that is the way we can have a win-win. But I did want to mention that.

Mr. Lyons, I want to appreciate you talking about

crowdsourcing, because as Ms. Clyburn pointed out sometimes, or somebody did that maps don't always reflect -- the FCC maps aren't always accurate. I can assure you the folks in my district can tell you exactly where they do and don't have service, because, you know.

And what is amazing is, in some of those counties that are having a harder time -- I represent 22 counties and seven independent cities in the Commonwealth of Virginia. It is a big rural district. Some of the counties are having a hard time and they don't have service and so we need to do something about it. But what is surprising, and this is where the maps won't show it, I have people who don't have service within a mile or two outside of the town of Blacksburg, Virginia, home of Virginia Tech.

Now Blacksburg is one of the most wired communities out there, but I have people who work there who don't have service at their homes. And so -- and I like your approach, Mr. Lyons, when you said in your written testimony that instead of talking about the megabits or the gig or the, you know, the upload and the download speeds, let's put it in terms of what they can get. So how much do we need in those areas to make sure the kids can do their homework?

Mr. Lyons. Appreciate the question, thank you.

so we can just start just by figuring out what are the things that we need to guarantee that anybody should be able to do online, right. The examples I gave in my testimony, Skype, which is two-way video conferencing, required about 1.2 megabits per second. Netflix calls for about four megabits per second in order to get high definition feeds.

So a 25 megabit per second would support both Skype and multiple Netflix streams with space to spare. Now Netflix will tell you it requires 25 megabits per second for their big 4K download, but I am not sure we should be in the business of subsidizing the ability to download Orange is the New Black in super 4K rather than just high definition.

Mr. Griffith. Now, correct me if I am wrong because I am here to learn. That is why I love committee hearings. If you can do the Netflix, the regular stuff at 5, then that means that most of my kids could do their homework all over the district if we had at least the 25 or the 5; is that correct?

Mr. Lyons. Yes, I think that is right. My son says 25 is a fair compromise between what the bare minimum would be and what would be a reasonable amount, right. So I don't think it is enough to just say, okay, you can do your homework and it is going to be a little bit slow, but you

know, you want to make sure you are giving a little bit of a comfortable margin. Twenty-five gets you there. By the time you get to about 100 megabits per second you are talking about things like, I don't know, 3D holographic two-way communication and stuff like that which, you know, it may be the wave of the future --

Mr. Griffith. Great.

Mr. Lyons. -- I am not sure that is where we should be investing all of our money now.

Mr. Griffith. Well, and I would tell you my feeling is, step one, let's make sure everybody's got the 25. Then once we get there where everybody in the country has that, then yeah, I am all for moving it up and making those speeds faster as we go across.

One of my counties recently has announced through their telephone company that they are going to go actually to a gig download and 500 upload which is just great, and they plan to have it all rolled out by 2021. And they are putting the infrastructure in and they have gotten some grant money from us and I think that is great. But then I worry about those folks on the other side of the line who may not have anything. And so, I want to make sure they get service, so I do appreciate that.

3180 Mr. Lyons. Thank you. 3181 Mr. Griffith. I want to talk a little bit about hydro. 3182 My colleagues have talked about that some. I had a bill and, 3183 Mr. Guith, if you could help me with this. I had a bill 3184 where we could do closed loop inside mines and I thought that 3185 was really interesting. But recently, I visited a national 3186 historic landmark building in Wytheville, Virginia. 3187 has been certified. It is fine, everything is great. sluice is still there, if I am using the right terminology. 3188 3189 The only thing they don't have any more are turbines. 3190 It would seem to me that if we could figure out a way to 3191 cut through the red tape and reactivate this dam -- Ms. 3192 McMorris Rodgers mentioned that I think only three percent of the dams have hydro capabilities -- they have the spot to put 3193 3194 them in. The owner is not opposed to that. He got it on the 3195 National Registry because he bought it and it was falling, 3196 not falling down but it was just in bad repair and he has 3197 fixed the building up. 3198 What can we do? Because, you know, he indicated that it might be hard to sell that electricity. He doesn't know how 3199 3200 to do it. How can we make folks who actually have a dam that 3201 already is sitting there that was used a hundred years ago to 3202 make electricity, do it? And am I correct that having a lot

3203 of these small dams in operation would actually help improve 3204 the resiliency of our grid? 3205 Mr. Guith. Yes, absolutely. The reliability that a 3206 base load like hydro brings is incredibly important because 3207 it is able to cycle. So as you bring more renewables into 3208 the grid that are variable and come and go based on the 3209 availability of the sun or the wind, having resources like 3210 peaking gas or hydro is incredibly important to follow that 3211 load as it fluctuates so we can keep the grid stable and 3212 ensure that you have that reliability. 3213 Ultimately, to your question as far as how to make it 3214 happen, it helps to have state sponsorship, but ultimately it 3215 is a NEPA question and there are a lot of folks who don't 3216 want to see those dams turned into hydroelectric generators 3217 for environmental reasons. And I think that the Pacific 3218 Northwest from the Washington border all the way through California has shown success after success where the 3219 3220 hydroelectric generation can coexist with the environmental 3221 concerns. 3222 Mr. Griffith. Let's work together. I see my time is 3223 way over and I need to yield back. But thank you. 3224 The Chairman. Thank you. The gentlewoman from 3225 Delaware, Ms. Blunt Rochester, recognized for 5 minutes.

3226 Ms. Blunt Rochester. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Chairman 3227 Pallone, first of all, I would like to congratulate you on 3228 this comprehensive and important legislation. I also want to 3229 thank the witnesses. This was a really great panel of 3230 witnesses. And commend my subcommittee chairs and members 3231 who were part of the collective leadership on the issues that 3232 are included in the LIFT America Act. This legislation to me 3233 impacts our health, it impacts our education, our security, 3234 our economy, our competitiveness as a country and also my 3235 state, but ultimately the planet. And so, I am proud to be a 3236 co-sponsor. 3237 And I want to ask a few questions about broadband maps 3238 and coverage, but first I just want to clarify something between Professor Lyons and Ms. Clyburn on the minimum 3239 3240 standard. Now if I am understanding this correctly, 3241 Professor Lyons, you are positing that 25 would be fine for 3242 the things that are kind of the minimum things that are 3243 needed; did I hear that correctly? And then just yes or no. 3244 Mr. Lyons. Yeah, that is right. 3245 Ms. Blunt Rochester. Okay. And then, Ms. Clyburn, I 3246 thought I heard you mention 100. Can you elaborate a little 3247 bit on why, because I understood what you said that you don't

need to be streaming, you know, Game of Thrones, but what I

want to understand from Ms. Clyburn is why she says a

3250 hundred. 3251 Ms. Clyburn. Well, I will just simply say this. 3252 need to do this one time. And if you want to do this one time, you need to future-proof it. And to future-proof it 3253 3254 you need to look to the future and look to your international 3255 There is no one competitors in terms of what they are doing. internationally that we are observing and following that is 3256 3257 doing anything less than a hundred megabits. 3258 Ms. Blunt Rochester. Thank you for sharing that. is really particularly important for me because one of the 3259 3260 areas I am focused on is the future of work. And it is 3261 really the future of how we are living and it is happening to us right now, and so I don't want to see us start behind. 3262 3263 Let's start ahead and be bold. 3264 I would like to focus on the coverage maps. First and 3265 in particular, if we could focus on, you know, the committee's prioritization of un-served areas and the 3266 3267 benchmark of the 25 megabits per second. And I am glad the 3268 bill does not rely on the FCC's inaccurate Form 477 data. 3269 For example, FCC's coverage map suggests that the entirety of 3270 Delaware has at least one provider that provides at least 25 3271 megabits per second.

3272 But I know that that is not true and I hear from many of 3273 my constituents every day that they are, and stakeholders, 3274 that they are in areas that are dead zones, both in urban 3275 areas as well as rural. People might not know Delaware also 3276 has a huge rural community as well. 3277 Ms. Clyburn, again thank you so much for your testimony, 3278 but also thank you for your former service, public service at 3279 And I was struck by your testimony because you 3280 mentioned the need to improve these maps and I think it makes 3281 sense for the FCC to look to the more trusted, publicly 3282 available data as you suggest. 3283 Can you talk about what additional recommendations you 3284 would have for the committee for both improving the coverage maps and utilizing a fairer and more accurate process for 3285 3286 getting at those communities that are un-served as defined by 3287 the LIFT America Act? 3288 Ms. Clyburn. In addition, I say that the FCC could use its subscription information, you know, to look and compare. 3289 That seems really intuitive, but it is not being done. And I 3290 3291 quess I don't want to be repetitive, I think that is the only 3292 thing that other than the form they need to go ahead to order 3293 on the reforms and when it comes to Form 477. 3294 One person having service in an area should not the

3295 whole area be considered coverage. That is a problem that 3296 makes no sense. I don't know what type of map that is, but 3297 it is not the map that is bringing and closing divides in 3298 America. 3299 Ms. Blunt Rochester. It looks like that is consistent 3300 across the panel, I would say. 3301 And, Mr. Wahler, I am going to switch really quickly in 3302 the last 40 seconds to drinking water, the drinking water title. Mr. Wahler, one of the issues that my state of 3303 3304 Delaware consistently has is maintaining the drinking water infrastructure that we already have built. By some 3305 3306 estimates, Delaware is a hundred million dollars short on an 3307 annual basis. Can you talk about why it is important to continue to invest in the drinking water infrastructure? 3308 3309 Mr. Wahler. Thank you, Congresswoman. Everybody knows that, you know, anytime you are digging underground it costs 3310 3311 a heck of a lot more money than above ground, and that is why 3312 the large city and the expense of municipalities and counties 3313 such as your state have because of the nature where it has to be buried under the frost line. 3314 But, more importantly, is there is a lot of extensions 3315 3316 where it goes into the schools or it goes into your 3317 residential neighborhood. It is all encompassing and it is a

3318 very costly measure. And, for instance, if you are only 3319 doing \$10 million a year and you have \$100 million worth of 3320 infrastructure, that is not -- you are just not getting there 3321 where you need to get there. 3322 Ms. Blunt Rochester. Thank you. My time has expired. 3323 The Chairman. Next is Mr. Long, recognized for 5 3324 minutes. 3325 Mr. Long. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And my oldest 3326 daughter, our oldest daughter, Barbara and my oldest daughter 3327 turns 33 years old today. She is a pediatrician back in Springfield, Missouri where I hail from. When she turned 25, 3328 3329 8 years ago today, we had an EF5 tornado in Joplin, Missouri 3330 that killed 161 people in a town of 50,000, so everyone knew someone that had perished in that horrific event. 3331 3332 Yesterday we had tornadoes that touched down in my 3333 district all across Southwest Missouri. Over in the 3334 Southeast Missouri, Jason Smith's district, a lot of damage 3335 from tornadoes and that caused our Governor, Mike Parson to 3336 declare a state of emergency. Severe weather events like 3337 these are, unfortunately, way too common in what we call 3338 tornado alley in my neck of the woods and communities are constantly impacted. 3339 3340 There is money in this bill to establish a grant program

at the Department of Energy to provide money to states that enhance electric infrastructure resiliency, reliability, and security. The utility industry also spends significant sums of money each year on efforts to make their infrastructure more resilient. I want to make sure that this program is not duplicative and does not hamper investments at the private sector in these capabilities.

And for you, Mr. Guith, how does this bill ensure money and resources are spent wisely on energy infrastructure resilience and not harming the investment by private companies on this work?

Mr. Guith. I think it makes great strides in addressing the issue and trying to integrate by deferring to some extent to the secretary. But in one specific example, which I mentioned in my written testimony on the Transformer Reserve, Congress challenged the Department of Energy to look at the need for one back when the FAST Act was passed. Ultimately, Oak Ridge National Lab did a deep dive analysis and Department of Energy came back and recommended to Congress that there does not need to be a separate reserve because industry, because of its own responsibilities to its ratepayers and its customers, had established such redundancies in reserves already.

3364	And so, we would recommend within the context of the
3365	LIFT Act that the monies that are addressed to go to the
3366	Transformer Reserve be instead focused on the research within
3367	the components, which the act also addresses, which is where
3368	we need more research in order to make the equipment that we
3369	do have or the equipment tomorrow that much more resilient
3370	against severe weather issues.
3371	Mr. Long. Okay, thank you.
3372	And, Mr. Lyons, when it comes to the Broadband
3373	Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act, there is nothing
3374	included to address overbuilding or coordination language.
3375	The committee spent considerable time last Congress
3376	legislating against overbuilding and promoting coordination
3377	amongst government entities. Will this legislation present a
3378	setback there?
3379	Mr. Lyons. I think more explicit language about
3380	coordination would be helpful. It helps that the money is
3381	being invested in the Federal Communications Commission
3382	because it has its hand in the other pie, so it has the
3383	ability to coordinate in the various broadband reach-out
3384	initiatives that we have. But it would be helpful if
3385	Congress provided more explicit direction.
3386	Mr. Long. Okay, thank you.

And expanding internet access in rural areas is a top priority for many on this committee and we need to make sure we are all doing what we can to fix this problem. I have been working with Senator Marsha Blackburn who was a former member of this committee, a lot of you remember, on a broadband infrastructure bill, the Internet Exchange Act.

The Internet Exchange Act focuses on improving broadband infrastructure in rural America by promoting more internet exchange facilities around the United States. I look forward to working with this committee in ways we can address the need to strengthen internet access in rural and other underserved areas. Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

The Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Long. Mr. Soto is next.

Mr. Soto. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is pretty clear that America is eager for 21st century infrastructure upgrade. We see it all throughout our districts, both sides of the aisle. And, you know, we are the most productive, most powerful nation in the world, yet this seems to continue to be a problem. We are at GDP of 21.5 trillion with China quickly gaining at 14.2 trillion, and I kind of -- we have to imagine what we would be able to do if we actually had a modern infrastructure to work with and what that would mean for the future of our economy.

And it seems to me the biggest hurdle has been political dysfunction over the past couple years, particularly with regard to how to pay for it. We have seen no increase in the gas tax since 1993. Tax cuts for the rich and big corporations blew a 2.3 trillion-dollar hole in the revenue outlook for the next 10 years. Infrastructure proposals were only 25 percent of the federal funding where it is going towards it which failed from the start.

Even the term "Infrastructure Week" has become a running joke sometimes in Washington. So the big question then I ask my committee members both in both sides of the aisle is, so what are we going to do? Are we going to do this or what? Are we going to actually put forward a major infrastructure project or are we just going to sit around and say we are going to and then never do with the revenue issues that we have to?

I want to start with rural broadband and broadband in general. I represent areas not only in suburban Orlando, but in rural Osceola County and Polk County. And I was really struck by a really wise member of the U.S. House, Majority Whip Clyburn, who told me a story about his district where most of the kids in a class that he recently went to failed because the homework was being given online and they didn't

3433	have access to it. And he used that to talk about this, how
3434	rural communities are falling behind in technology.
3435	So, Commissioner Clyburn, it would be great to hear from
3436	you. How important is the LIFT Act and broadband internet
3437	build-out across the country to rural communities in closing
3438	that productivity and education gap?
3439	Ms. Clyburn. This will address the most pervasive gaps
3440	that I have seen in my regulatory lifetime. It will serve to
3441	better equalize those communities without. It will
3442	recalibrate and reshape the narrative when it comes to what
3443	is possible, what is accessible, and address what is needed.
3444	And it is very targeted. It goes it is seeking to go to
3445	areas with the most need, not where the business case is not
3446	being made. It decouples from that and I think it is very
3447	important. The role of government is to be proactive in
3448	areas where the private sector is not or is not incented to
3449	do so. This does that.
3450	Mr. Soto. And being the great equalizer. So thank you
3451	for that, Commissioner.
3452	Ms. Clyburn. And I agree, he is a pretty great guy.
3453	Mr. Soto. He is a pretty great guy.
3454	Ms. Eckdish, how important is Davis-Bacon in ensuring
3455	that we have both a boost to our economy and fair wages and

3456	that we really get the job done right?
3457	Ms. Eckdish. Thank you for the question. It is
3458	critically important. It makes sure that as workers are
3459	doing the work to repair our infrastructure that they are
3460	being paid a family-supporting wage. So it is critically
3461	important and there are a number of areas in the LIFT America
3462	Act that include Davis-Bacon in a number of areas where it
3463	could be expanded.
3464	Mr. Soto. And now according to EPA, transportation is
3465	the biggest emitter of CO2 emissions at 29 percent versus 28
3466	percent for electricity, and that is even numbers from 2
3467	years ago. So does this transportation, the aspects of the
3468	transportation package that are in this bill, will that help
3469	then the curve of CO2 emissions in the transportation sector,
3470	particularly electric cars and things of that nature?
3471	Ms. Eckdish. Yes, I think electric vehicles are a key
3472	part of how we bend that curve coupled with investments in
3473	transit, strong fuel economy standards, but EVs will be a key
3474	part of how we tackle emissions from the vehicle sector. And
3475	this bill takes a significant step toward the expansion of
3476	the EV infrastructure and what we
3477	Mr. Soto. Thank you.
3478	And, Mr. Guith, or Guith sorry if I am mispronouncing

3479	your name. Does the U.S. Chamber believe that the America's
3480	economy is being held back by an aging infrastructure?
3481	Mr. Guith. Absolutely. We have been leading the charge
3482	for the better part of a couple decades and we know that
3483	there is political support there, it is just getting
3484	apparently folks into a room and making it happen, which
3485	seems to be difficult today.
3486	Mr. Soto. Do you think there are any revenue sources
3487	that the business community would be supportive of in our
3488	quest to get an infrastructure package together?
3489	Mr. Guith. We are supportive of wherever it comes from,
3490	more or less. I mean we have proposed increasing the fuel
3491	use fee, but we have said that, look, we are open to other
3492	ideas. In fact, we held a contest very recently to get other
3493	ideas. We don't think that is the only way, in fact we
3494	probably need several ways, but it is certainly one of the
3495	most logical ways given to your point earlier that it hasn't
3496	been touched since 1993 while some 35 states have raised
3497	their own state revenues through fuel use fees. And it is
3498	untapped. The Highway Trust Fund continues to dwindle and
3499	our infrastructure is aging.
3500	Mr. Soto. Thank you.
3501	The Chairman. Did the gentleman yield back?

3502 Mr. Soto. Oh yes, sorry. 3503 The Chairman. Okay, thank you. Mr. Bucshon is 3504 recognized for 5 minutes. 3505 Mr. Bucshon. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. 3506 want to -- well, I know I am kind of late in the game here 3507 because I am down the dais, but I am going to -- a couple 3508 subjects that I really touched upon and I will just say 3509 briefly, rural Indiana, we need broadband. You can't have 3510 schools. You can't have economic investment. 3511 And I think many people have talked to that. I am not going to spend much more time on it, but we need broadband 3512 3513 infrastructure in rural Indiana. The U.S. Energy Information 3514 Administration -- yes, there is such an agency -- recently reported that 32 dams currently that do not generate 3515 3516 electricity are planned to be converted to hydroelectric dams 3517 in the next few years. 3518 And the reason I point that out is because last year, 3519 Congress passed and the President signed the American Water 3520 Infrastructure Act of 2018. And many of you may or may not 3521 know that legislation that I was involved in and senators on 3522 the Senate side were involved in, streamlined the process for converting non-hydroelectric dams to hydroelectric dams 3523 3524 through FERC.

It doesn't eliminate any environmental review and this was bipartisan. Both sides agreed to all of this. But through FERC there is now a 2-year process when you want to get approval to convert a non-hydroelectric dam into hydroelectric power. So if people right now should be looking at that and I think there is going to be a lot of investment over the next 5 to 10 years in this particular process.

As was mentioned, it is a consistent, sustainable clean energy source that Canada utilizes, our Pacific Northwest utilizes and, believe it or not, in Southwest Indiana there are six dams we could convert. And so, I just wanted to point that out that that is very important. I mean I am an all-of-the-above energy supporter and I think just like your personal investment portfolio we should diversify our energy portfolio and make sure we are not putting all our eggs in one basket.

With that being said, the legislation before us I don't see is supporting all-of-the-above energy and that is in the area, the absence of fossil fuel, energy research development, and innovation. And that was mentioned, I think, by Mr. McKinley also. I believe it is critical that we continue to encourage strong public-private partnerships

in the on-going advancements of technological innovations in
the fossil fuel energy area on our good today.

And as electrical utilities connect to more intermittent
renewable energy into the electrical system, there is a
growing need for new technologies to ensure reliable and
affordable power and I think the Europeans are experiencing
this most as we speak with untenable energy costs

particularly in Germany.

So, Mr. Guith, can you speak to the role of the on-going innovation that -- and you may have mentioned this earlier.

But and what is needed to ensure spending decisions don't lock in practices that impede new innovative technologies, particularly in the fossil fuel space?

Mr. Guith. Yeah, I think that is a great question, thank you. Twofold. One, a greater commitment from Congress to spending on energy debation. As a former DOE employee, I realize it is an incredible asset to the country, but unfortunately it has 535 constituents up here and it tries to be everything to all of them, where we know that there are specific technologies that every scientific community that has looked at this are most likely going to be required to address climate change globally.

And so, we have been working with members of Congress to

3555

3556

3557

3558

3559

3560

3561

3562

3563

3564

3565

3566

3567

3568

3569

come up with some approaches with DOE to maybe concentrate a little bit more on those technologies with some specific metrics and goals and demonstrations to get there. And I think that is the greatest path forward to developing those — that innovation that we need.

Mr. Bucshon. And I will make a quick comment on that because you realize that we are, what, 20 percent of the world's CO2 emissions, roughly. China, India, or China is the biggest. It is unlikely, in my view, that they are going to convert to clean energy sources as quickly as America has. Since 2005, we have reduced emissions more than any other country in the world and it is not really close. We are going to continue to do that.

So I think in this area of fossil fuel, and some of us on the panel will disagree, obviously, but in fossil fuel thinking that the rest of the world may not get to where we may get with renewables, if we have some innovation that is transferable to other countries that they could use that we could make economically feasible for those countries and they begin to pick that up, I think then we could have a global, our leadership in that area could have a global impact. That is my personal view.

Also, expanding a little bit on that, Mr. Guith. When

the Chamber reviews some of the programs in the bill that reflect efforts to support the build-out of renewable infrastructure, do you all look at and monitor what happens with the electrical rates and what happens when they go up?

Mr. Guith. Yes, most definitely. I mean we look at the impacts on both the generators as well as the consumers. We represent both. And, frankly, a hundred percent of the economy is a consumer, so when rates go down it benefits even if it doesn't necessarily benefit the upstream generator.

And we analyze it with our members and we consult with them and try and come up with the best policy and triangulate where the business community is.

Mr. Bucshon. Yeah, and I would agree with that because again, if you look at the European experience particularly in Germany where the costs of energy are -- and I don't have the graph in front of me -- are roughly 3 times what they are, on average, in America. As particularly I see it for our seniors and for our lower-income rural, in areas in my district that would be rural American. Other peoples' districts that could be urban America. Honestly, different locations, very similar problems. I could see the cost aspect really causing us a lot of trouble if we don't continue to innovate across the spectrum, and so I am hopeful

3617 that we can do that.

Again, I would like to point out I am an all-of-theabove energy person. I think we should innovate and advance
technology all across and that includes fossil fuels.

Because I do think looking at the world and the fossil fuel
use, that is an area potentially if we could, for example,
commercialize carbon capture like we are in Houston, for
example, in the Houston area, and find ways to use the CO2 or
to store the CO2 underground. Worldwide, I just feel like
that could have such a dramatic impact.

And the last thing is also in the area of recycling and looking at the entire life cycle of renewable energy particularly in the solar panel space. I am beginning to look at the entire lifecycle of those panels because 25, 30 years from now we are going to have to figure out what to do with those. And at this point in America we landfill all of the end-of-life for that and I think most people know that.

And so, the impact that has on the environment with some of the heavy metals like lead and other things that are in it are going to be dramatic if we don't look at how we deal with the end-of-life solar panels 25 years from now. I yield back.

3639 The Chairman. Thank you. Next is the gentleman from

3640	Arizona, Mr. O'Halleran.
3641	Mr. O'Halleran. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for holding
3642	this hearing today to discuss the LIFT America Act and how it
3643	addresses the needs for infrastructure investments that will
3644	move our economy forward. I applaud the LIFT America Act for
3645	including robust funding for high-speed broadband and clean
3646	drinking water programs, pushing our energy sector to more
3647	resiliency, and ensuring our hospitals and healthcare
3648	facilities meet the needs of patients.
3649	Rural America cannot be left behind. In fact, I don't
3650	know that it can survive without getting in this process
3651	moving forward whether it is health care, education, economic
3652	competitiveness, this is a necessary element of the
3653	infrastructure of America for rural America. I hope to see
3654	these investments particularly for broadband deployment
3655	target areas of this country that need it the most.
3656	Ms. Clyburn, I have a question here that I had before,
3657	but you mentioned earlier about a communications issue within
3658	the process. Can you refine that a little bit and tell me
3659	what you mean?
3660	Ms. Clyburn. The communications issue, are you talking
3661	in terms of other state agencies?
3662	Mr. O'Halleran. Agencies, right.

3663 Ms. Clyburn. Right. What I wanted to point out was 3664 that and it has been said a couple of times that you have 3665 state agencies and the states and federal agencies that are doing much of the same things. I mean everybody has grand 3666 3667 goals and objectives that we can't argue. The problem is 3668 they are either stepping on each other, not speaking to each 3669 other, or spending money in a lot of the same places. 3670 So you have places that are getting double or triple the 3671 amount of investment that may or may not be needed and then 3672 you have other areas in this country where there is no flow, there is no provider, there is no investment and again there 3673 3674 is no, you know, next generation opportunities. So fixing 3675 that I think the bill encourages that. 3676 It could be said what could be fine-tuned a little bit 3677 more, but it definitely addresses that and that is the 3678 That is an issue. problem. 3679 Mr. O'Halleran. And I am glad to sponsor the bill, it 3680 is clearly define that. But also, I just can't believe our federal government at this stage of our existence cannot 3681 3682 understand the need for agencies to communicate with one another. I don't care across the board whether it is 3683 3684 intelligence or homeland security or these agencies.

Ms. Clyburn. For better or worse, things are pretty

3686	siloed. They are pretty siloed within certain
3687	Mr. O'Halleran. Too siloed.
3688	Ms. Clyburn. Yes, thank you.
3689	Mr. O'Halleran. Commissioner, in your testimony that
3690	broadband funding must be targeted to places with the
3691	greatest need to ensure that these communities who have been
3692	completely left behind are connected as completely as
3693	possible.
3694	Ms. Clyburn. Yes, sir.
3695	Mr. O'Halleran. I look forward to introducing a
3696	bipartisan bill that was mentioned earlier that is also in
3697	the Senate on broadband mapping.
3698	Ms. Clyburn. Looking forward to it.
3699	Mr. O'Halleran. I do appreciate the reverse auction and
3700	infrastructure financing funds offered in Title 1 of the LIFT
3701	America Act, but what else should be included in Title 1 to
3702	close the digital divide?
3703	Ms. Clyburn. Hmm. That is a great question. I might
3704	have to include some answer you for the record, if you
3705	don't mind. But I think we are moving in the right
3706	direction.
3707	Mr. O'Halleran. With energy infrastructure I have heard
3708	stories from many constituents in my district in lengthy

3709 permitting reviews required before a project may begin. 3710 While reviews are necessary for environmental protection, 3711 they should also be done in a timely manner for project 3712 certainty. 3713 Mr. Gruith, in your testimony you highlighted the 3714 bipartisan work to establish the Federal Permitting 3715 Improvement Steering Council in the FAST-41 bill. Within the 3716 LIFT America Act, how can permitting for such projects also 3717 be addressed? 3718 Mr. Guith. Not being a parliamentarian, I will have to defer to you to some extent as far as jurisdictional 3719 3720 distinctions between here and Interior -- I am sorry --3721 between here and the Natural Resources Committee which has a 3722 lot of the jurisdiction over NEPA itself. But I think if you 3723 look at what happened in FAST-41, Energy and Commerce 3724 certainly had some of it. 3725 And I think the two big asks are to, one, make FAST-41, the FAST-41 authorizations permit because we are about to run 3726 3727 out of authorization as well as constraining environmental 3728 reviews to 2 years and the one federal decision. those are all things that benefit every form of 3729 infrastructure and there is significant bipartisan support 3730 3731 for.

3732 Mr. O'Halleran. Mr. Chairman, thank you. And I yield 3733 the rest of my time. 3734 The Chairman. Thank you. Next is the gentleman from Florida, Mr. Bilirakis. 3735 3736 Mr. Bilirakis. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate 3737 it. This question is for Mr. Guith. Last week a local 3738 article reported 22 sites in Florida were found to have PFAS 3739 contamination including one city in my district. 3740 at least 610 places that have PFAS levels in the country, I 3741 However, the term "PFAS" encompasses thousands understand. of different substances with different threat levels. 3742 3743 Again, Mr. Guith, do we know enough about individual 3744 PFAS chemicals to know which are the most harmful? If so, should we include a priority system in the legislation based 3745 3746 on the highest risk; if not, does more study need to be done 3747 before allocating limited funds to this cause? 3748 Mr. Guith. The simple answer is no. We know in the 3749 grand scheme of toxics we know very little about this family 3750 of chemicals as far as what their epidemiological impacts 3751 We know that they are vexing. They are long-lasting. 3752 A significant portion of the population has PFAS in their 3753 blood system, but as you point out they are not all the same. 3754 And so, we have a process in place or Congress has created a

3755	process at EPA to review the science of these chemicals and
3756	to ascertain which of them are innocuous and which of them
3757	aren't and that is the stage that we are at right now. But
3758	because they are so pervasive, there is understandably great
3759	concern around the country.
3760	Mr. Bilirakis. Okay, are children at greater risk to
3761	PFAS as far as contamination risk, are they at greater risk?
3762	Mr. Guith. I personally don't know the answer to that
3763	question.
3764	Mr. Bilirakis. Okay. Can we find out?
3765	Mr. Guith. Absolutely, we can follow up with you.
3766	Mr. Bilirakis. I mean can you do some research and get
3767	back to us, follow up? Thank you very much.
3768	All right, the next question again for Mr. Guith. State
3769	regulators have been focused on accelerated replacement of
3770	aging infrastructure. In fact, DOE has an existing
3771	collaborative with the National Association of Regulatory
3772	Utility Commissioners to address this issue. The
3773	collaborative was designed so that DOE could focus on a
3774	demonstration of new technologies for leak detection and
3775	pipeline replacement.
3776	Mr. Guith, how might the grant program proposed in the
3777	LIFT Act impede on states' authority to establish rate

3778 structures and criteria for the accelerated replacement of 3779 pipelines deemed no longer fit for service? 3780 How it might impede, I think in some areas Mr. Guith. 3781 it might be interpreted to be proscriptive as far as where 3782 the money goes and how the cost recovery comes. But I think 3783 the language could be maybe more direct to ensure that that 3784 overlap does not happen and that rate formation state-by-3785 state is not impacted. 3786 Mr. Bilirakis. All right. Thank you for that input. 3787 One more question for you, sir. I am glad to see interest in extending the school and child care program lead testing 3788 3789 grants and the lead drinking fountain replacement programs. 3790 Lead contaminated water in schools is a big issue in my district and probably all over the country and we need to 3791 3792 make sure that we protect our children. 3793 Last month, a local news outlet reported that 68 percent of Florida school districts did not fully test for lead in 3794 drinking water. Additionally, a lot of the schools in my 3795 district tested above the federal standard for action. 3796 3797 Again, I want to see more testing because it is so very 3798 important. Can you comment on that, sir? 3799 Mr. Guith. I think within the context of my testimony 3800 and this legislation, I think the most important part to

3801 accept is that there is a great need for federal funds across 3802 many forms of Safe Drinking Water Act programs. 3803 includes PFAS which this legislation would create, but also 3804 the existing ones. So that is why I think it is crucial that 3805 we be careful to not cannibalize one for the other and to 3806 just increase the pot across the board, because the demand is 3807 that great. 3808 Mr. Bilirakis. Okay, thank you very much. And I yield 3809 back. 3810 Will the gentleman from Florida yield? Mr. Lujan. Mr. Bilirakis. Yes. Yes. 3811 3812 Mr. Lujan. I appreciate that. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 3813 Commissioner Clyburn, this morning I had the honor of meeting with the mother of Ashlynne Mike, her name is Pam 3814 3815 Foster. Sadly, Ashlynne is an 11-year-old Navajo girl who 3816 was murdered and raped. The importance of Amber Alert 3817 systems across the country, they work if you have broadband 3818 connectivity and coverage. 3819 I appreciate Mr. O'Halleran raising the issue of mapping 3820 The mapping that we have across the country right 3821 now is not accurate with showing where there is coverage, 3822 especially in rural parts of the country. Can you touch on 3823 how you believe the LIFT Act's provisions will help us in

getting more connectivity so that if someone needs to make that text message, that phone call, or if someone has a smart phone on them, we can triangulate and find them?

Ms. Clyburn. One of the things that I am happy to see is its attention on Next Generation 911. I mentioned earlier that the current systems are based on 50-year-old technology, but we are now in an increasingly connected ecosystem. That unfortunate incident and what is required and expected of us being interoperable when we use our phone, it doesn't matter which provider it is, it is interoperable, but our 9-1-1 systems are often not.

So ensuring that whatever road that the roads we traveled where we did not have connectivity in your beautiful state we need to take care of that. In case of emergency there should be no medium that you use -- video, still, voice, text -- that a 9-1-1 system should not be able to take. You know, those are the baselines of today and tomorrow and we cannot continue to rely on a system that is not interoperable that is not up to date.

Our first responders are doing a yeoman's job, e-9-1-1 works well. We need Next Gen. This takes care of that and I am happy -- I can't endorse, I don't think, but I am happy to say that whatever I can do to be a partner in moving this

3847 along, I will. 3848 Mr. Lujan. Thank you. 3849 The Chairman. All right. The gentleman's time has The gentleman from California, Mr. Ruiz, is 3850 3851 recognized. 3852 Mr. Ruiz. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you to 3853 our panel for being here today. I support the LIFT America 3854 Act which will support critical infrastructure projects 3855 across the country and I am currently researching ways to 3856 make it even better. This bill would upgrade broadband internet access, shore 3857 3858 up critical 9-1-1 capabilities -- as an emergency medicine 3859 physician that is very important to me -- improving Indian health service facilities, and help us meet our clean energy 3860 3861 goals for a sustainable future. In addition, this bill 3862 includes robust investment in clean drinking water grant 3863 programs. This will help support projects to improve water 3864 quality in areas like the eastern Coachella Valley in my 3865 district where I grew up. It is a very rural, agricultural-3866 focused, farm worker community. Clean and safe drinking water is a common good that 3867 3868 everyone deserves access to. However, a 2017 study by the 3869 Environmental Working Group found that many of the smaller

rural and lower income areas of the eastern Coachella Valley had drinking water systems that contained contaminants including chromium 6, nitrates, and arsenic. The Coachella Valley Water District and others have tackled this problem head-on and are in the process of consolidating many of these old and independent drinking water systems into their network.

None of this work could have been done without federal assistance from the State Revolving Fund because that funding has a set-aside reserve for rural, resource-poor communities. In a state and district like mine with so much in need, this set-aside ensures that the communities most in need are able to access funding.

Mayor Wahler, you talked about how cities have stepped up infrastructure investment to fill the gaps, but that isn't possible everywhere. How important is federal funding for drinking water infrastructure both in your city and in low-income communities and how have you utilized them?

Mr. Wahler. Well, you are absolutely correct,

Congressman. Not every city or county has been able to do

that. It requires a lot of proper planning, but, you know,

every -- the costs of the install of water lines vary from

different parts of the country.

3893	I think there needs to be down payment money at the
3894	federal level because a lot of the communities and especially
3895	in the rural areas of this country just don't have the
3896	resources to, quite frankly, run miles and miles and miles of
3897	line, extended period, to serve maybe a small pocket of
3898	people, but you still have to get the transfer to where the
3899	need is and that is going to be a challenging thing even with
3900	this bill. Even if this bill passed we are still going to
3901	have an incredible problem.
3902	Mr. Ruiz. Great, okay. Do you have well water? Well
3903	water?
3904	Mr. Wahler. In our community we have a few homes that
3905	have we have had a law on the books since the mid-70s you
3906	have to hook up to public water because we were worried about
3907	contaminants.
3908	Mr. Ruiz. Yeah. Another important section of this bill
3909	provides funding for new solar energy investments in rural,
3910	low-income communities. The cost of solar energy has
3911	plummeted over the past decade, allowing more and more
3912	Americans to reap the benefits of clean energy.
3913	My district has fully embraced the potential of
3914	renewable energy. If you have ever driven on Interstate 10
3915	through Riverside County, you have seen the windmills, the

wind turbines, the utility scales, solar fields, and the panels that line the roofs of neighborhoods throughout my district. And if you haven't, you have probably seen it in a movie at some point in your life.

But unfortunately, there are still communities that haven't been able to share in the benefits of solar technology. And in a region like my congressional district where the sun shines bright and long for more than 350 days a year in the Palm Springs, California area, that means there is a lot of untapped potential. In fact, my district produces the most renewable energy on federal land than any other district in the country, but yet many of the residents cannot access that renewable energy. The legislation we are considering today, H.R. 2741, the Leading Infrastructure for Tomorrow's America Act, establishes a program to provide loans and grants for solar installations in low-income and resource-poor areas.

Mayor Wahler, in your written testimony you refer to these provisions as "inclusive and innovative." Can you explain why the Conference of Mayors has decided to support the low-income solar grant program and how eligible communities would benefit?

Mr. Wahler. Well, I think it is safe to say every town

3939	has dynamics to it both socially and economically. Anywhere
3940	we can help those folks save on their energy bill over the
3941	long term will allow them to stay in their homes.
3942	Mr. Ruiz. So what are some of those barriers?
3943	Mr. Wahler. Well, you know, the truth of the matter is
3944	like when you are installing solar in your community you may
3945	have a roof that you have to replace the shingles before you
3946	install solar because you are not exactly
3947	Mr. Ruiz. So what can a community do to foster more in-
3948	home use of solar panels?
3949	Mr. Wahler. Well, I think they need to have first of
3950	all, I think a lot of people don't have the resources to
3951	actually have a study done on their house or where they live.
3952	And by having an economic grant out there to do that, that
3953	will allow people to realize whether it makes sense or not to
3954	put that on their facility.
3955	Mr. Ruiz. Thank you very much. My time is up. Thank
3956	you very much.
3957	The Chairman. Thank you. Next is Mrs. Brooks,
3958	recognized for 5 minutes.
3959	Mrs. Brooks. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you to
3960	all of our panelists who have been sitting here now for quite
3961	some time, but you all are very much adding in significant

3962	ways to this really important discussion.
3963	I want to start with you, Mr. Auerbach, Subtitle E, the
3964	Public Health Infrastructure, we haven't talked about that
3965	very much today, but it creates some new grants at the CDC
3966	which I actually just recently visited in late April to
3967	improve workforce capacity, competency lab systems, as you
3968	talked about, public health information systems,
3969	communications financing.
3970	How do these grants differ as one who has been very
3971	involved in co-leading with Congressman Eshoo on PAHPA, how
3972	do these grants differ from the Public Health Emergency
3973	Preparedness grants that CDC already administers?
3974	Mr. Auerbach. Thank you. And let me start by saying
3975	thank you for your leadership on the PAHPA.
3976	Mrs. Brooks. Well, and thank you. We are pleased it
3977	came back from the Senate and we are very, very hopeful that
3978	we can get it across the finish line in the very near future.
3979	But how does this differ? And then you also said in
3980	your testimony the PAHPA goal remains aspirational. We don't
3981	want to think it is aspirational unless we have health
3982	information technology. So could you please expand on that?
3983	Mr. Auerbach. Sure. Well, the public health
3984	preparedness grants that come from CDC now really focus on

having the right people, the right plans in place, and the right training so that health departments can respond in a variety of different ways. There is also support of course for some of the disease-specific and response capacity in laboratories within the states.

But they don't deal with the fundamental infrastructure issues that are crippling many of the state and local health departments. Those include the status of the health departments themselves in terms of having the appropriate equipment, technology to respond appropriately. So an example of that is that many of the health departments don't have the advanced molecular detection capacity, for example, so that if there is an emergency and there is a rapid need to test a particular organism to determine whether or not it is a risk to the public, they are lacking that capacity.

So the funding that would be within the LIFT America Act would complement the existing grants but provide that kind of infrastructure that is necessary when you have the skills, you have the plans, but you don't have the -- the equipment that you don't have, the facilities that can ensure that there is rapid response.

Mrs. Brooks. Has that ever been mapped out what our public health departments need relative to the type of

4008	infrastructure you are talking about?
4009	I also want to commend The Chairman for including public
4010	health infrastructure because I don't think many people in
4011	our country think about public health as part of the
4012	infrastructure needs, and so I was really pleased to see
4013	that. But has that ever been determined what we need across
4014	the country, public health departments relative to
4015	infrastructure?
4016	Mr. Auerbach. Thank you for asking that. There have
4017	been efforts to attempt to address that to capture that
4018	information. There have been, there is information for
4019	instance that has been developed on laboratory capacity,
4020	information that has been developed on response to certain
4021	types of emergencies like vector-borne illnesses like we saw,
4022	for instance, with Zika.
4023	So some of that information has been captured and there
4024	has been planning efforts to estimate what it would take to
4025	close the gap.
4026	Mrs. Brooks. And excuse me for cutting you off.
4027	Mr. Auerbach. Yes, yes.
4028	Mrs. Brooks. But I want to switch to one other witness.
4029	Can you please get us the information as to where that might
4030	be mapped or where it has been recorded?

4031	Mr. Auerbach. Certainly, my pleasure.
4032	Mrs. Brooks. Thank you.
4033	Mr. Lyons, a quick question. The state of Indiana has a
4034	program called Next Level Broadband where Governor Holcomb
4035	and the state is going to be providing a hundred million
4036	dollars to deploy broadband to underserved un-served, un-
4037	served areas in the state. But how can you speak to how the
4038	bill will complement state programs like my own state's or
4039	maybe other states that might be doing this, how can we
4040	ensure that there isn't that duplication or the guardrails
4041	with this BIFIA program?
4042	How can we make sure that we are not duplicating and
4043	that we are covering the un-served areas?
4044	Mr. Lyons. Yes, so part of the answer may be making
4045	sure that the money that is allocated on the state level goes
4046	to the state utility regulator as usually what is handling
4047	the state level initiatives. There are number of states
4048	across the country that have state level initiatives. I
4049	would envision the state part of this as complementing those.
4050	But you are right, it has to get in the hands of the
4051	same people so you don't have right hand-left hand issues.
4052	Mrs. Brooks. Okay. Ms. Clyburn, do you have any
4053	comments on that?

4054	Ms. Clyburn. Yes. Again, it is about communications.
4055	We talk about coordination, but it is about communications
4056	and everybody is transparent in terms of where those monies
4057	are flowing so that we are again are not overspending in one
4058	area and just leaving others behind.
4059	Mrs. Brooks. Thank you. And thank you all so much. I
4060	yield back.
4061	The Chairman. Thank you. Ms. Eshoo, recognized for 5
4062	minutes.
4063	Ms. Eshoo. At last. But this has been time spent very
4064	well, I think. I arrived a little after the gavel was
4065	lowered, but I have the advantage of having listened to
4066	everyone on the committee. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this
4067	very important bill. Thank you to all of the witnesses. You
4068	have given us, you have enlightened us and I thank you for
4069	it. Even though I have been here for just about all morning
4070	and now part of the afternoon, I see you looking at the
4071	clock. I know you are hungry. Your stomachs are grumbling.
4072	I am really excited about this bill. I think it should
4073	be called the LIFT UP America Act because that is really what
4074	this is designed to do. The American people understand what
4075	this means. It is jobs, jobs, jobs. It is American jobs.
4076	It is American equipment. It is American everything. And it

really is meant to lift up our country in the 21st century and to really take care of the things that have been neglected that have been put off, whether it is building out broadband where people -- imagine, there are 21 million people in our country that don't have it, you know, shame on us. But we are correcting it and we are putting real money toward it.

Water systems, the NG 911 -- John Shimkus and I have been on this like white on rice for more years than I want to count, but I am excited because we are going to address it. This is all about our first responders in every single community in every single congressional district and boy, do we need that. Our nation's grid -- I could go on and on. I think, Mr. Chairman, that we need to tighten up the section in the bill relative to mapping because we have got to get this thing right and we haven't yet and I want to work with you on that.

I also want to thank Mr. Auerbach for the work that you have done in supporting PAHPA. It has been very important.

All of you have given very sophisticated testimony, and while PAHPA is not in this bill, there are benefits that our country will accrue from it. And our nation's public health emergency response infrastructure is taken for granted, but

4100	it is an essential in our country.
4101	Without this reauthorization, I mean one of the
4102	assistant secretaries said that they can't respond to the
4103	measles crisis that is erupting in our country. So I look
4104	forward to Congress passing this and getting it done. And I
4105	could never have asked for a better partner than Congressman
4106	Susan Brooks. Outstanding.
4107	Mr. Mayor, I want to underscore something. You are here
4108	with the U.S. Conference of Mayors. I want to thank you and
4109	all of the mayors of our country for endorsing the
4110	legislation that I am carrying relative to municipalities
4111	being preempted.
4112	Mr. Wahler. Yes.
4113	Ms. Eshoo. I come from local government so I have a
4114	reverence for it. Now last fall the FCC preempted,
4115	essentially ran over all the local municipalities, the local
4116	communities in our country from having a say in deploying
4117	small cell sites, and that is the infrastructure that is
4118	needed for 5G. And now that poor policy has led to nearly a
4119	hundred municipalities, public power utilities, and
4120	associations to sue the FCC. Say something about that to us.
4121	Mr. Wahler. Well, Piscataway is part of the lawsuit.
4122	Let's just face it

4123	Ms. Eshoo. And thank you.
4124	Mr. Wahler. The reality is we need to work with the
4125	telecom industry. They are the 21st century railroads. And
4126	unfortunately, as we all know history, when the railroads
4127	were being built they just went along their merry way and do
4128	whatever they want.
4129	Ms. Eshoo. But let me interrupt for a moment, because
4130	one of the witnesses said that this is the way it should go
4131	and it is going to slow them down and it is going to bollocks
4132	everything up as if local municipal that is the heartbeat
4133	of America, every city and town in our country.
4134	So respond to what I don't know, was it Professor
4135	Lyons? Were you the one that didn't agree? I am not asking
4136	you to comment.
4137	Mr. Lyons. That is right. Yeah.
4138	Ms. Eshoo. Just you can say yeah, you are the one.
4139	Okay.
4140	Mr. Wahler. Municipalities, you know, there shouldn't
4141	be reason to preempt our municipal rights-of-way. The
4142	municipal rights-of-way are the most valuable assets that
4143	communities have regardless of the other than the people
4144	that live within the community. We maintain the rights-of-
4145	way. There is from what I understand, from what the

4146	communications folks want to do, is that there is no
4147	guarantee that they are going to repair when they tear the
4148	rights-of-way up.
4149	Ultimately, at the end of the day they are not the ones
4150	that get the calls to city hall about what the heck is going
4151	on in my neighborhood. All I know is that there is a lot of
4152	very upset people, a lot of upset officials around this
4153	country. They have not been equal partners in this.
4154	Ms. Eshoo. Hardly.
4155	Mr. Wahler. And something has got to give and that is
4156	why a lawsuit was filed.
4157	Ms. Eshoo. Well, I want to thank
4158	The Chairman. The gentlewoman's time
4159	Ms. Eshoo The Chairman of the full committee again
4160	and thank everyone, and especially for the support you have
4161	given to this effort. I yield back, Mr. Chairman.
4162	Mr. Wahler. If I may, Mr. Chairman, I have to catch a
4163	train in 15 minutes.
4164	The Chairman. That is all right. You are excused. But
4165	thank you for coming.
4166	Mr. Wahler. I have a ribbon-cutting of a beautiful park
4167	that we used to rebuild the community with block grant money
4168	and we guaranteed all the kids an ice cream truck tonight.

4169	Ms. Eshoo. Isn't that great?
4170	The Chairman. Thank you, Mayor.
4171	Mr. Wahler. So, Chairman, if you get this bill through
4172	and pass final passage, I will bring the ice cream truck down
4173	here to the committee.
4174	The Chairman. Thank you, Mayor. Safe travels.
4175	Next is Mr. Walberg, recognized for 5 minutes.
4176	Mr. Walberg. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thanks to
4177	the whole panel for being here today. I have the privilege
4178	of representing Michigan's energy district. We have
4179	everything in it including biomass and it is all going well.
4180	We all have the challenges with that energy. Title 3
4181	contemplates federal spending in the tens of billions of
4182	dollars in our energy infrastructure.
4183	While some of these investments are needed, I echo the
4184	concerns raised by my friend and colleague from Michigan, Mr.
4185	Upton, about the cost and nature of these programs whether
4186	they are the best way to approach the problem, or whether
4187	they will work the way they are intended given the overlap
4188	amongst many of them.
4189	Mr. Guith, the bill authorizes a federal strategic
4190	transfer reserve. I understand the need to ensure recovery
4191	from major power outages, especially after a cyberattack.

4192	But it is my understanding that Congress authorized DOE to
4193	conduct a study into the need for such a strategic reserve
4194	and the best approach to ensuring resiliency and
4195	availability, replacements of transformers pursuant to the
4196	FAST Act.
4197	Mr. Chairman, if I could, I would like to enter this
4198	report into the record.
4199	The Chairman. Have we seen it? Have we seen what Mr.
4200	Walberg wants to enter into the record?
4201	Without objection.
4202	[The information follows:]
4203	
4204	**************************************

4205 Mr. Walberg. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 4206 I think you should have seen that. 4207 Mr. Guith, in your own testimony you report the 4208 Department of Energy determined that the strategic transfer 4209 reserve would not be necessary and did not recommend the 4210 formation of a federally-owned reserve. If we are to enhance 4211 electricity sector resilience, does it make sense to follow 4212 DOE's statutory required recommendations? 4213 I mean if you look into what the Mr. Guith. Yes. 4214 country has available when it comes to rapid response for critical situations of power outages, whether it is because 4215 4216 of weather or some other interruption, it is incumbent upon 4217 the nation's utilities to bring those, to have those assets 4218 stockpiled and be able to bring them to bear collectively at 4219 the drop of a hat and that is what DOE determined. 4220 And that is why we would recommend taking the authorized 4221 funds for the transformer reserve program and applying them 4222 to the transformer resilience and advance components program 4223 also in the bill, because that is where the most work can be 4224 done is how to make the transformers themselves more 4225 resilient to extreme conditions. 4226 Mr. Walberg. So probably before moving forward we ought 4227 to make sure that these recommendations are captured.

4228	would assume that from your thank you.
4229	Mr. Lyons and Commissioner Clyburn, can you please
4230	comment on the provisions of the bill that allows entities
4231	not designated as eligible telecommunications carriers to
4232	receive funding under this bill?
4233	Ms. Clyburn. I think it would promote innovative ideas
4234	and opportunities as long as those companies are well-vetted
4235	and meet the standards. I think it should be an all-
4236	inclusive, all-of-the-above approach so we can get the best
4237	ideas, the best technologies to the market.
4238	Mr. Walberg. Mr. Lyons?
4239	Mr. Lyons. I agree with that. I think the more people
4240	you have bidding in the reverse auctions the better as long
4241	as they can meet the minimum technical standards of what the
4242	auction is requiring.
4243	Mr. Walberg. Okay. Mr. Lyons, do you see the potential
4244	for a bottleneck in deploying this funding when it comes to
4245	skilled professional workforce that can actually use the
4246	funding considered in this bill to actually go out and build
4247	the networks?
4248	Mr. Lyons. I think that is possible. There are
4249	certainly a number of folks particularly in the wireless, the
4250	fixed wireless space who have talked about the need for more

4251	workers than we can get. When you are talking about
4252	deploying in rural areas where populations are relatively
4253	small, you are going to need to find trained people
4254	somewhere.
4255	Mr. Walberg. That is a challenge these days.
4256	Commissioner Clyburn, is there more the Commission or we
4257	in Congress can help to reduce this problem?
4258	Ms. Clyburn. Yes, coordination, certainty, and focus.
4259	I really think if we keep our eyes on the what the potential
4260	for this, it will it sounds like a big price tag, but it
4261	will pay for itself in multiples.
4262	Mr. Walberg. Okay, thank you. I appreciate that. I
4263	yield back.
4264	The Chairman. I thank the gentleman. Next is Mr. Engel
4265	is recognized for 5 minutes.
4266	Mr. Engel. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.
4267	Mr. Auerbach, I have a few questions I would like to ask
4268	you and I am going to make a statement and I would like you
4269	to comment on it. Community-based hospitals are often the
4270	cornerstone of healthcare systems and many of them operate on
4271	very thin margins I know that is true in my district
4272	and therefore lack the resources to invest in new facilities.
4273	I am pleased to be an original sponsor of the LIFT

America Act which does include two billion dollars to modernize hospitals and it marks an important first step, but considerably more funding obviously is necessary to address the dire state of our nation's hospitals. So I would like to ask you if you could please describe the negative effects that outdated and antiquated hospital facilities can have on patient care. I mean it is obvious, but I think we should state it.

Mr. Auerbach. Sure. And thank you very much for this

Mr. Auerbach. Sure. And thank you very much for this question. You raise an important point. We are seeing across the country that a number of our hospitals are becoming outdated. Their facilities are in some instances literally crumbling and that that kind of an impact, as well as the impact of cutting back on services or in some instances closing, is having a very negative impact on the provision of healthcare services to the people in those communities.

It can mean it becomes more difficult to provide high quality care. It can mean there can be additional expenses in terms of the provision of those care and it is particularly a problem for the safety net hospitals, for the hospitals that serve the lower income residents of the country.

4297 So paying attention to the status of the hospitals, the 4298 infrastructure of those hospitals both the buildings 4299 themselves and the technology within those buildings, both laboratory technology and internet technology is extremely 4300 4301 important in terms of health outcomes and quality of care 4302 overall. 4303 Mr. Engel. Well, thank you very much. I absolutely 4304 agree with you. The second question deals with lead pipes. 4305 And I want to tell you that during the 2016-2017 academic 4306 year, parents of students attending Public School 41, which is a public elementary school in my district, told me they 4307 4308 were concerned about elevated lead levels in the school's 4309 water fixtures. And we worked with the city's Department of Education, 4310 4311 New York City; we were able to replace all of the affected 4312 fixtures. It was one of several schools in the city with 4313 lead-made water fixtures and I, really, I am happy that the city replaced 91 percent of the water fixtures affected. 4314 4315 has commitment to achieving a hundred percent, but the good 4316 work in New York City is really an exception. One recent nationwide survey estimates that six million 4317 4318 lead service lines are still in use posing a risk to the 4319 health and well-being of American families. So, Mr.

4320 Auerbach, let me ask you again, can you please describe the 4321 impacts of lead exposure on children's development and 4322 growth? Mr. Auerbach. Sure. Well, lead exposure can have a 4323 4324 devastating impact on the health of children. As their 4325 brains are developing rapidly, the impact of lead can cause 4326 developmental delay. It can cause behavioral health 4327 problems. In some instances it results in hospitalization. 4328 If that lead exposure is high enough it can even result in 4329 So lead exposure is particularly dangerous and for children, but it is dangerous for people at any age. 4330 4331 Well, thank you. And my third and final Mr. Engel. 4332 statement which also involves a question talks about the 4333 recent outbreaks of Zika and flu have shown our nation is 4334 woefully unprepared for infectious disease outbreaks, and we 4335 have seen it with measles as well. Much of this can be attributed to a lack of federal support for public health 4336 4337 infrastructure including disease monitoring systems and 4338 diagnostics laboratories. 4339 I am pleased to see that the LIFT America Act will make 4340 robust investments in this area. So let me ask you again the 4341 question, how will these investments prepare our healthcare 4342 system with the threat posed by antibiotic-resistant

4343	pathogens, sometimes called superbugs?
4344	Mr. Auerbach. Thank you for asking that question. The
4345	threats associated with antibiotic resistance are very
4346	significant threats and likely to increase over time. We are
4347	seeing more and more instances where they are being detected
4348	in healthcare facilities and at the locations and they pose a
4349	significant risk to the public. Public health can play a
4350	critical role, and the support through the LIFT America Act
4351	provides much of that support to do rapid testing.
4352	Identification of what those bugs are using technology
4353	like advanced nuclear detection allows us to get a precise
4354	understanding of what those pathogens are and makes it easier
4355	for them to be isolated and makes it easier for the people
4356	that have been exposed to them to be treated. So this is a
4357	serious threat and one where this act would help in terms of
4358	both prevention and response.
4359	Mr. Engel. Well, thank you very much. I think it is
4360	important to get these things on the record so people
4361	understand how important this is and how it really affects
4362	everyone. Thank you.
4363	Mr. Auerbach. Thank you. Thank you, Congressman.
4364	Mr. Engel. Yield back, Mr. Chair.
4365	The Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Engel. Mr. Carter, for 5

4366 minutes.

Mr. Carter. Thank you. Thank all of you for being here, we appreciate your indulgence. And I know you are tired and you are hungry but you are almost there, so hang in there, okay.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have the honor and privilege of representing the entire coast of Georgia and we of course are not immune from natural disasters. In fact, we have had two hurricanes in an 11-month period and as you can imagine, very devastating to our area.

I wanted to ask, I see a lot of programs and funding that are included in these bills and Mr. Guith, I will ask you. They seem to prioritize different uses, but I don't see them really prioritizing disaster situations. And I was just wondering how much of this bill really does actually reinforce resiliency. Is that really included? I mean surely, we want to mitigate these types of situations. We know that they are more common now and some would argue that they are more intense now in these storms. Are we doing anything in this bill that would help us in that respect?

Mr. Guith. I am not going to pretend to be an expert on all 200-some pages, but I think there are aspects that absolutely address reliability and resiliency. We have

talked about some of them this morning on the transformer resiliency, some of the monies that would go to DOE to help develop more resilient transformers.

But also within the scope of the smart grid funding, I think that could also be considered a reliability function, because the more automated you have the ability to dispatch electrons and make real-time differences when you have one path cut down because of a tree line or because of a hurricane and the ability to bring new generation online more quickly and to distribute that, I mean that is one of the underlying aspects of a smart grid. So I would say that it does take steps to address reliability and resiliency.

Mr. Carter. Well, I am glad to hear that because I honestly believe that if we are smarter, if you will, if we just use a little bit of preparation that we can sustain these storms a lot better and certainly that would help.

The weatherization Program under the Department of
Energy and it is obviously intended to reduce costs for lowincome individuals in low-income communities of which we have
quite a few in the state of Georgia as well, but are these
updated in any ways to help these people? Because I mean, it
is devastating to anyone who is flooded and it is devastating
to anyone who is impacted by this, but especially for low-

4412	income. Are you familiar with anything to do with that?
4413	Mr. Guith. The Weatherization Assistance Program is
4414	something that it is a program that has been around, I
4415	think, for 3 decades. The reauthorization is incredibly
4416	important not only to the recipients of those grants but also
4417	to the utilities who serve them and provide the
4418	weatherization.
4419	The one mention I make in my testimony is that we would
4420	caution against diverting funds from efficiency improvements,
4421	which is what the Weatherization Assistance Program has been
4422	focused on serving some seven million Americans over its
4423	lifetime, and broadening the definition to include renewable
4424	technology. That is addressed in other parts of the bill
4425	which we have also heard about this morning, specifically
4426	what Mr. Ruiz mentioned related to rural and low-income
4427	solar.
4428	So we would prefer that this stay, that the
4429	Weatherization Assistance Program stay solely within the
4430	bandwidth of increasing efficiency around the envelope of the
4431	residence.
4432	Mr. Carter. Good. Thank you for that.
4433	Professor Lyons, I wanted to ask you. I represent South
4434	Georgia, a lot of rural area in South Georgia and I know one

of the things that we have talked about is the broadband build-out. And you seemed to express concerns about the mapping process and about us making certain that we are prioritizing places that need to be such as the rural areas. What would you suggest? I mean what can we do differently perhaps?

Mr. Lyons. So part of the issue lies with better data collection at the FCC, right, so the FCC is already in the process of trying to figure out how to improve their existing data collection efforts and have started to reach out with, through public-private partnerships with groups like USTelecom to figure out better reporting.

I think one thing that may be helpful is as we mentioned before, and this is something that Commissioner Clyburn mentioned in her remarks as well, is some form of crowdsourcing to get third-party information, right. The information of what services are available where is known by the American people. It is just a matter of getting it from the disparate level up to those who are coordinating this and finding ways to do that may be very useful.

So, for example, I can go at any time on a website called speedtest.net, right. Anywhere I am as long as I have a connection it will tell me not only that I have

4458 connectivity but what the speed is. That type of data is 4459 really valuable if you can get it in the hands of those who 4460 are mapping not only availability but also speed on a 4461 locational basis. 4462 Mr. Carter. Right, right. Well, thank you. And thank 4463 you all again for hanging in there with us. And I yield 4464 back. 4465 The Chairman. Thank you. Mr. Rush, recognized for 5 4466 minutes. 4467 I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Rush. sheepishly come to the committee room for this hearing 4468 4469 because I have been in the chair when members come in, in the 4470 last minute and enter the hearing and I do know the feeling. 4471 So I feel you, Mr. Chairman. I feel the witnesses also. 4472 am going to be brief. 4473 But I was at an important meeting of the Congressional 4474 Black Caucus and, Ms. Clyburn, your father came in and gave 4475 us a report on what happened at the White House this morning. 4476 And one thing I just want to say that this hearing is being 4477 conducted with the White House meeting as a backdrop where 4478 the President told the Speaker and the other Democratic leaders there that they had a choice of either investigations 4479 4480 or infrastructure and then he walked out. So he is putting

4481 that choice before the American people, want Congress 4482 investigations or infrastructure and he walked out and closed 4483 the door. That was the President. 4484 And so, but I sit here as a proud co-sponsor of the LIFT 4485 America Act and I certainly want to commend my chairman, 4486 Chairman Pallone, for his leadership and his endurance as 4487 well as all of my colleagues for their hard work in bringing 4488 forth this much-needed bill. 4489 With titles on expanding broadband, increasing funding 4490 for clean drinking water, modernizing our electric grid, and making health care more accessible, this bill will provide 4491 4492 enormous help to my constituents and it goes beyond just the 4493 empty rhetoric and partisan posturing. It makes significant 4494 investments in starting to rebuilding our nation and 4495 combating climate change. 4496 So I am going to begin my questions with you, Ms. 4497 I know this is an issue that you worked on for many years now as a commissioner. In your opinion, how well does 4498 4499 the LIFT Act, the LIFT America Act help modernize our 4500 telecommunications infrastructure and expand broadband to all of America, all communities in America? 4501 4502 Ms. Clyburn. One of the great opportunities I had as 4503 serving as an FCC commissioner is being part of the public-

4504 private partnership agreement that we had with industry. 4505 brought -- it leveraged limited resources with the resources 4506 of commercial enterprises. What this does is pick up where 4507 that left off, where we were so dependent on industry to by 4508 their business plans even though it was a partnership, this 4509 says here is what has not worked in the past. Here are where 4510 the gaps are. This is where the money is going to. It is intentional. And it will 4511 So it is targeted. 4512 allow us with that \$40 billion to fill in some gaps that we 4513 have been talking about, lamenting about, and acting like we did not know that money will fix this. It will target it, 4514 4515 you know, direct that to those places. And that is why I 4516 wanted to be here today, because, you know, I thought I was done with hearings. 4517 4518 Mr. Rush. Understand. 4519 Ms. Eckdish, I come from Chicago and, believe it or not, 4520 we have a crisis for clean water in Chicago and it is really 4521 a crisis in urban areas throughout the nation as we start out 4522 to rebuild the water infrastructure. And how will this bill 4523 help us to solve the problem of access to clean water across the nation including my city of Chicago? 4524 4525 Ms. Eckdish. Sure. Thank you for the question, 4526 Congressman. From aging infrastructure, leaking

4527	infrastructure to contaminants that we have talked about
4528	today, lead in our water, there is tremendous need and we
4529	know communities across the country are struggling to provide
4530	clean water. This bill will be a significant step in the
4531	right direction in terms of really investing more funds in
4532	our State Revolving Funds and the Drinking Water SRF that is
4533	a very proven program and also will create good jobs.
4534	Mr. Rush. And there is a battle and been for decades
4535	now in Chicago among some of the unions and contracting
4536	developers around plastic or lead pipe. Do you have any
4537	position of which one is more conducive to clean water and
4538	clean environment?
4539	Ms. Eckdish. You know, I think that is a really
4540	important question. I would love to follow up for the record
4541	on that one.
4542	Mr. Rush. Thank you so much. I yield back, Mr.
4543	Chairman.
4544	The Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Rush. Mr. Gianforte is
4545	now recognized for 5 minutes.
4546	Mr. Gianforte. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for
4547	the committee for being here. As we look to rebuild and
4548	modernize our infrastructure, addressing the needs of our
4549	rural communities must be a priority from rebuilding roads

and bridges to maintaining dams and waterways to investing in reliable access to water.

As the internet continues to transform how we work, communicate, and connect, delivering dependable broadband to our rural communities needs to be a top priority. Reliable access to broadband is a key to opening the doors of greater opportunity and the American dream to more Americans. The internet as we know it came to be around 1995. For 20 years it was open and free. It ushered in innovation and transformed our economy leading to new high-tech sector and good paying jobs.

In 1997, my wife Susan and I started a business in our home in Bozeman, Montana. We had this idea that the internet might actually make it possible for folks to work from anywhere, even from Montana. We were right. Our company grew from a room in our house to one of Montana's largest employers with 1,100 employees and an average salary of almost \$90,000 a year, in Montana.

Ours was just one example of how the internet created more high-paying American jobs, increased opportunity, and prosperity. While broadband access has taken off exponentially for some in the last 10 years, our rural communities remain one of the most difficult to connect. One

in three Montanans still lack access to broadband. And the disparity is worse in our rural areas.

To bridge this digital divide, the overall cost of getting fiber to the last home must come down. Congress should cut red tape from the permitting process and empower state and local officials to efficiently deploy broadband in our rural communities. Last Congress, I worked with Representative Curtis from Utah to pass the Rural Broadband Permitting Efficiency Act through the House. This bill streamlines the deployment of broadband infrastructure in highway right-of-ways by cutting back on duplicative federal permitting laws and regulations. These mandated reviews can cause unneeded and year-long delays in critical projects. They also discourage providers and states from pursuing broadband deployment projects especially in rural areas.

Reforming the federal permitting process spans the ideological spectrum from a conservative like me to the president and founder of the Progressive Policy Institute. 3 years ago he said, "An accumulation of laws and regulations largely designed to protect the environment via environmental impact reviews is bogging down the approval of badly needed transportation projects and instead causing environmental damage."

The fact is, the current permitting regime is an obstacle to opportunity. There is bipartisan agreement for permitting reform. As we build an infrastructure package, we must work together to reform the federal permitting process to help us make timely and critical investments in our communities that need them the most.

I want to start with you, Mr. Guith, if I could. Common sense reforms in right-of-way, the FAST-41 authority, and the environmental review process can cut down the costs and timeliness of projects. Are there other practices that we should be looking at to make the permitting process more efficient?

Mr. Guith. Besides permanent authorization of FAST-41, I would say the two most useful tools that Congress can provide are codifying one federal decision which was in the executive order from 2 years ago so that there is no question to a project sponsor who is shepherding or who is responsible ultimately for their project. Instead of saying, "All right, federal government, who is working on it now," and you get a bunch of shoulder shrugs, you know specifically there is one and one only. And that is also important when there is discrepancies between two agencies as to who takes the priority.

4619	And then the other aspect is limiting the time frame to
4620	2 years. I mean there can always be certain exceptions made,
4621	but the bottom line is that concurrent process through the
4622	entire federal government as well as state and local it
4623	shouldn't take longer than 2 years. It shouldn't take longer
4624	to permit a project than it does to build it.
4625	Mr. Gianforte. Well, I appreciate that and I see my
4626	time is coming to an end. But I just want to say thank you
4627	for being here. We need to continue to work together and,
4628	Mr. Chairman, let's find bipartisan ways to get this
4629	infrastructure built, particularly as it relates to rural
4630	broadband. And I yield back.
4631	The Chairman. I thank the gentleman. Oh, Ms. Kuster is
4632	here. Ms. Kuster is recognized for 5 minutes.
4633	Ms. Kuster. Last but not least, you are almost done.
4634	Thank you for your patience and I want to join my colleagues
4635	on both sides of the aisle to talk about rural broadband,
4636	critical issue in my district in New Hampshire. I have made
4637	this comment before, but I think the presidential primary
4638	candidates are going to have the experience, "Can you hear me
4639	now? Can you hear me now?" And I think it may become a
4640	higher priority on their agenda, I hope.
4641	But thank you for your work, Commissioner. We

appreciate it. And I do want to work with the committee on the mapping issue. I think Cathy McMorris Rodgers mentioned a bill and I would like to work in a bipartisan way. That is a big point for us right now because the maps show that there is better coverage than there actually is and so we have a citizen initiative going out and trying to collect the data for the FCC.

And then the other issue that I make note of is your point that population is not a good proxy for coverage, that we should maybe revisit and fix that issue, the allocation issue around the funding. But I think you have heard today broad, bipartisan support for improved access and for education, for job training; it is critically important for us in terms of the next generation of citizens and workers in New Hampshire, so I appreciate that. I also appreciate the issues around clean drinking water in the LIFT Act. I want to commend the chair for including that.

In New Hampshire we recently passed a state law requiring that schools test their water and take remediation efforts if contamination is present. A recent GAO report indicated 57 percent of American schools do not test their drinking water for lead, which I think to most parents would be pretty shocking. And so, I think it is important to

4665 address that in the LIFT Act, funding for drinking water 4666 programs including schools and child care programs. 4667 So I want to follow up, Ms. Eckdish, from your testimony 4668 highlighting more than half of the schools across the country 4669 were built during the 1970s or before. Can you discuss the 4670 challenges that some of these schools face around lead 4671 contamination and drinking water and how this bill might make 4672 a difference? 4673 Ms. Eckdish. Sure. Thank you for that question, 4674 And again, I think schools are a critical Congresswoman. issue that should be part of the infrastructure conversation. 4675 4676 As we heard from Mr. Auerbach, children are particularly 4677 susceptible to lead, so looking at lead in schools as well as 4678 lead in child care facilities is extremely important moving 4679 forward and should be part of the infrastructure discussion. 4680 I think more broadly there could be opportunities to 4681 look at -- the bill does look at the energy efficiency at 4682 schools. There are opportunities to look more broadly at the 4683 health and safety of these school facilities beyond lead, 4684 asbestos, a number of other challenges that these aging facilities are facing. 4685 4686 Ms. Kuster. And I also appreciate the provisions around 4687 We just had a hearing recently and that has been a big

issue in my district as well. And I just think, you know, as a mother, as a member of Congress, I care about the present and future well-being of our children and I think it is something that is, you know, critically important, so I appreciate that.

And then just turning to the significant investment in moving us toward a clean energy economy, in New Hampshire we have five towns already, Concord, Keene, Plainfield, Hanover, and Cornish in my district that have committed to use 100 percent renewable energy by 2030. And I think so many communities are stepping up on clean energy.

Our housing authority, for example, in Keene, New Hampshire recently installed solar arrays on a housing project and it is going to reduce pollution equivalent to gas-powered driving vehicles a hundred and ninety-two hundred thousand every single year. So again, Ms. Eckdish, if you can discuss how the LIFT Act's grant program to support solar installations could make a difference, and then my time will be up and you will be done.

Ms. Eckdish. Sure, thank you. So I think again investing in clean energy is a tremendous need both in terms of reducing greenhouse gas emissions and, if we do it right, with strong labor and procurement standards we can also

4711 create good jobs not only in the installation of these solar 4712 panels, wind infrastructure projects, but also in the 4713 manufacturing of the component parts. And I think that is an 4714 important thing to consider as well. 4715 Ms. Kuster. So a bipartisan win-win-win well-delivered, 4716 Mr. Chairman. I yield back. 4717 The Chairman. Thank you. And Mr. Cardenas is 4718 recognized for 5 minutes. 4719 Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Cardenas. 4720 Ranking Member, for having this important hearing. just want to say that I am happy to be talking about 4721 4722 infrastructure today and I am certain the American people are 4723 happy that we are talking about it, but hopefully we can put 4724 that talk into some actions as legislators. 4725 Improving broadband infrastructure to make sure our 4726 students can get their homework to modernizing infrastructure 4727 in transportation to make sure it is smart and energy 4728 efficient to improving our health care, physical 4729 infrastructure and telecommunications systems to fixing our 4730 drinking water infrastructure, this bill takes tremendous 4731 strides towards a future we should have gotten to many, many 4732 years ago. And it is really important for us to realize that 4733 it is our responsibility. It is every generation's

responsibility.

But I personally believe that the United States of
America that we who are around today, especially decision
makers and adults, we have been resting on the laurels and
the hard work of previous generations who have invested in
infrastructure and we, unfortunately, have been able to take
it for granted. And far too often I think that we do take it
for granted.

In Los Angeles, many need to drive to get to school, work, to see their families. We are working on reducing emissions so we can breathe cleaner air in Los Angeles. We are building out our public transit which will greatly benefit families in the San Fernando Valley. I am very proud to see it in our school districts.

In Los Angeles, we embarked on an over \$30 billion infrastructure to build again an example of an infrastructure that we had foregone for decades, for generations, and now we have one of the most modern school systems in the country when it comes to the infrastructure thereof. Nearly 25 million children ride over 500,000 predominately diesel buses to school in the U.S. every single day which contributes to air pollution and, importantly, it also exposes our most vulnerable population to that air pollution. That is why I

have introduced the Clean Commute for Kids Act which would provide funding to replace/retrofit school bus fleets with cleaner energy sources like electricity or natural gas. I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for including this bill in the LIFT America Act.

I have a question. My first question is for Mayor
Wahler and Ms. Eckdish. Can you talk about what converting
or retrofitting a school bus fleet to cleaner energy sources
like electricity can be for reducing emissions?

Ms. Eckdish. Sure. Thank you for the question. We are talking about obviously emissions reductions. We are talking about air pollution benefits, so public health benefits as well. And if we do it right, and we are also looking at procuring those vehicles domestically, we are also looking at job creation benefits in the community as well.

Mr. Cardenas. Okay, anybody else? Okay, so I guess we agree it is good for everyone. And I think it is important for us to understand that we must keep, in my mind, the common denominator is our most vulnerable, seniors and children. Seniors and children. Seniors and children, because, fortunately or unfortunately, many of us take things for granted and we don't feel or understand how dire these changes are and how they need to be made like yesterday.

4780 I believe that the Clean Commute for Kids Act will 4781 reduce emissions in communities, reduce the exposure of our 4782 children to carbon emissions and particulate matter that has 4783 been shown to cause health issues like asthma, which will expose children to clean energy sources and get them excited 4784 4785 about renewables. And again, this is an example for 4786 children. What we have seen when we were growing up we 4787 should not take it for granted that that is modern and clean 4788 and good for the next generation. 4789 As we convert to cleaner, renewable sources we need to address the issue of energy storage. The current landscape 4790 4791 of storage includes grid scale, pump storage, hydropower and 4792 smaller lithium-ion batteries. But I understand that several new grid scale technologies are either in laboratories or 4793 4794 pilot phase. Now the great additional benefit we will have 4795 from solving this problem is that we will be creating new, 4796 green jobs for Americans at the same time. 4797 Ms. Eckdish, any perspectives on that? 4798 Ms. Eckdish. Yes, thank you. I completely agree we 4799 should be investing broadly and leading in these new clean 4800 technologies. 4801 Mr. Cardenas. So how are we doing in the laboratory 4802 from your perspective? I mean do we have some of these

4803	things coming to fruition soon hopefully? I mean is the
4804	investment being made as far as you are aware?
4805	Ms. Eckdish. I think we need to significantly increase
4806	our investments across these low carbon technologies. I
4807	think we have made significant strides in a number of them
4808	but there is significant much more work to be done.
4809	Mr. Cardenas. Okay. And also I would just like to
4810	acknowledge and thank Commissioner Clyburn for all of your
4811	expertise and the efforts that you have constantly given not
4812	only to this committee but the members of Congress from your
4813	perspective and your public service. So thank you.
4814	Ms. Clyburn. Thank you, sir.
4815	Mr. Cardenas. I yield back. Thank you.
4816	The Chairman. I thank the gentleman. And last but not
4817	least, we have Mr. Butterfield, recognized for 5 minutes.
4818	Mr. Butterfield. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I
4819	realize the hour is late and I will try to get through this
4820	much quicker than in 5 minutes. But thank you to the
4821	witnesses and thank you for hanging in there for the last few
4822	hours. It has been a long day.
4823	You know, Mr. Chairman, we have been talking about
4824	infrastructure ever since I have been in Congress, but it
4825	seems that in the last couple of years we have really gotten

serious about a serious and big and bold investment in infrastructure. And the good thing about it, it seems that it is becoming a bipartisan conversation here on the Hill and so I am real excited about it.

When our leadership went to the White House a few weeks ago, I guess it was 3 weeks ago, to discuss it with the President, we initially put \$1.2 trillion on the table as a beginning point and then I understand the conversation mushroomed into 1.5 trillion and the President himself offered 2 trillion. And so that was a good opening.

Our leadership went back to the White House this morning and continued the conversation to try to find ways to pay for a \$2 trillion infrastructure investment, but unfortunately the President upon hearing some news reports that he disliked about our Democratic Caucus meeting this morning, literally walked out of the meeting and ended the conversations and said that until there is a discontinuation of the investigations then there will be no conversation at all with him about infrastructure.

And I don't know if the five of you know that. You have been at the table all day long. I don't know if you have seen the breaking news, but the President literally walked out of the meeting today and said that he would not continue

the conversation. And so that is very unfortunate, but I am prepared to vote for any infrastructure package that we have an opportunity to vote on.

Mr. Chairman, one thing that I have been concerned about over the years is a proper definition of infrastructure.

When I think of infrastructure I think of electric grid. I think of water systems, contaminated water, sewer systems, brownfields, bridges, ports, highways, high-speed rail, airports, transportation hubs, rural broadband, broadband, clean energy, pipeline safety, schools, hospitals, public health and recreation, and the list just goes on and on.

Now I know that a trillion dollars is a lot of money,
Mr. Chairman, but if you try to pay for all of these projects
in a big way, a trillion dollars will not be sufficient to
fund all of these different projects. So that is why I want
to call on us to really get serious about defining what
infrastructure really is and so let me just begin with Ms.
Clyburn.

In your written testimony you discussed the importance of educational institutions and their essential role in training and educating the next generation of our nation's workforce. And I am pleased that the LIFT America Act would help connect these institutions at a huge speed. With that

in mind, for more than a hundred years, HBCUs -- and you and I have great love and affection for HBCUs. They have always been at the forefront of education for African Americans.

Sadly, many HBCUs are plagued with issues like outdated technological infrastructure and equipment, limited access to digital and wireless technology, and limited funds for new faculty and academic programs.

Earlier this year, I introduced the Building Resources into Digital Growth and Education Act, I call it the BRIDGE Act, to address these problems. This legislation will establish a digital network technology program that awards grants to HBCUs and other institutions to acquire equipment and network capability and personnel and other resources.

I guess my question is with the last 1 minute that I have, why in your opinion is the LIFT America Act support for anchor institutions and their efforts to develop the country's workforce so important?

Ms. Clyburn. Our schools no matter what level, our libraries no matter where they are, how big or small, they are life-changing, game-changing ecosystems. They meet us where we are at any age and they have a unique ability to bring us through technology, through all types of learning to take us to our next level. They are the best places, I

4895 believe, to guide us, particularly the digitally and 4896 technologically challenged, to guide us to the next level. 4897 And HBCUs, in particular, I think, are uniquely situated 4898 to uplift themselves and the communities at the same time. 4899 was in North Carolina earlier this year talking just about 4900 that on Johnson C. Smith campus, so people are quietly 4901 talking about this, but this would be the impetus to move 4902 that to the next level. 4903 Mr. Butterfield. Thank you. I needed that in the 4904 Thank you very much. I yield back, Mr. Chairman, 4905 yes. 4906 The Chairman. Thank you. I think we have come to the end here. You have been here for over 4 hours. Let me just 4907 say a couple of things to follow up on what Mr. Butterfield 4908 4909 and others have said, you know, in terms of where we are 4910 going. You know, obviously this is our first hearing and we 4911 did have a hearing on the LIFT America Act. 4912 But as I have said to my colleagues on both sides of the 4913 aisle, you know, we will continue to entertain, you know, 4914 different legislation that other members have put forward. This is not the end-all, you know, just the LIFT America Act. 4915 We could obviously incorporate, you know, other legislation 4916

that members have submitted or will submit on both sides of

the aisle. Same for funding, you know, members and ideas about funding will continue as well.

And I know that this meeting occurred today where the President walked out, but hopefully he will reconsider and hopefully we will continue to, you know, have more summits at the White House because this is an important bill. And I think that an infrastructure bill can be done on a bipartisan basis, so I am going to be optimistic today. So let me just thank our witnesses for participating for over 4 hours.

I will just remind members that pursuant to committee rules they have 10 business days to submit additional questions for the record to be answered by the witnesses who have appeared. And of course, I would ask each witness to respond promptly to any such questions that you might receive.

I do have to enter into the record, this is going to take a couple of minutes here. I request unanimous consent to enter the following letters/testimony into the record, and that includes a letter from the American Wind Energy Association; a letter from the National Electrical Manufacturers Association; a letter from U.S. Green Building Council; a letter from Congresswoman Cheri Bustos; a letter from the Small Business & Entrepreneurship Council; a letter

4941	from the Diesel Technology Forum; letters from the National
4942	Association of Convenience Stores; National Association of
4943	Truck Stop Operators; the Petroleum Marketers Association of
4944	America and the Society of Independent Gasoline Marketers of
4945	America; a letter from the American Public Health
4946	Association; a letter from the Health Care Information and
4947	Management Systems Society; a letter from the Association of
4948	Public Health Laboratories; the Council of State and
4949	Territorial Epidemiologists; the Health Care Information and
4950	Management Systems Society and the National Association for
4951	Public Health Statistics and Information Systems; a report
4952	from the Department of Energy on the Strategic Transformer
4953	Reserve dated March of 2017; a letter from the Satellite
4954	Industry Association; a letter from USTelecom - The Broadband
4955	Association; a letter from the American Fuel and
4956	Petrochemical Manufacturers; and a letter from the MQ
4957	Foundation. And, without objection
4958	Mr. Shimkus. Reserve the right to object.
4959	The Chairman. You are objecting?
4960	Mr. Shimkus. But I don't object.
4961	The Chairman. Oh, okay. That sounds good.
4962	Mr. Shimkus. I just wanted to let you know I was here.
4963	The Chairman. All right, I love you.

4964	Without objection, so ordered.
4965	[The information follows:]
4966	
4967	*********COMMITTEE INSERT******

4968	The Chairman. And unless you have some additional
4969	comments? No? Okay, the committee is officially adjourned.
4970	[Whereupon, at 2:21 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]