1	NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.
2	RPTS WALTER
3	HIF107030
4	
5	
6	OVERSIGHT OF THE FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY
7	COMMISSION AND THE FY 2019 BUDGET
8	TUESDAY, APRIL 17, 2018
9	House of Representatives
10	Subcommittee on Energy
11	Committee on Energy and Commerce
12	Washington, D.C.
13	
14	
15	
16	The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:00 a.m.,
17	in Room 2123 Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Fred Upton
18	[chairman of the subcommittee] presiding.
19	Members present: Representatives Upton, Olson, Barton,
20	Shimkus, Latta, Harper, McKinley, Kinzinger, Griffith,
21	Johnson, Long, Bucshon, Flores, Mullin, Hudson, Walberg,
22	Duncan, Walden (ex officio), Rush, McNerney, Peters, Green,

23	Doyle, Castor, Welch, Tonko, Schrader, Kennedy, Butterfield,
24	and Pallone (ex officio).
25	Staff present: Samantha Bopp, Staff Assistant; Daniel
26	Butler, Staff Assistant; Karen Christian, General Counsel;
27	Kelly Collins, Legislative Clerk, Energy/Environment; Wyatt
28	Ellertson, Professional Staff, Energy/Environment; Margaret
29	Tucker Fogarty, Staff Assistant; Adam Fromm, Director of
30	Outreach and Coalitions; Jordan Haverly, Policy Coordinator,
31	Environment; Zach Hunter, Director of Communications; Mary
32	Martin, Chief Counsel, Energy/Environment; Drew McDowell,
33	Executive Assistant; Brandon Mooney, Deputy Chief Counsel,
34	Energy; Mark Ratner, Policy Coordinator; Annelise Rickert,
35	Counsel, Energy; Dan Schneider, Press Secretary; Peter
36	Spencer, Professional Staff Member, Energy; Jason Stanek,
37	Senior Counsel, Energy; Austin Stonebraker, Press Assistant;
38	Hamlin Wade, Special Advisor, External Affairs; Everett
39	Winnick, Director of Information Technology; Priscilla
40	Barbour, Minority Energy Fellow; Jeff Carroll, Minority Staff
41	Director; Jean Fruci, Minority Energy and Environment Policy
42	Advisor; Rick Kessler, Minority Senior Advisor and Staff
43	Director, Energy and Environment; John Marshall, Minority
44	Policy Coordinator; Alexander Ratner, Minority Policy

45	Analyst; Tim Robinson, Minority Chief Counsel; Andrew
46	Souvall, Minority Director of Communications, Outreach and
47	Member Services; Tuley Wright, Minority Energy and
48	Environment Policy Advisor; and C.J. Young, Minority Press
49	Secretary.

50	Mr. Upton. Good morning, everybody. Oh, man. Becoming
51	a theme. That's good.
52	So we are lucky to have all five members of the Federal
53	Energy Regulatory Commission at our hearing today to discuss
54	the priorities of this independent agency and the challenges
55	of regulating industries that are undergoing significant
56	transformation.
57	Since our last oversight hearing in 2015, FERC itself
58	has also experienced a number of changes with addition of
59	four new members, so I welcome all of you here today and look
60	forward to hearing your individual perspectives on some very
61	complicated and technical issues ranging from grid resilience
62	to battery storage to cybersecurity.
63	The past year has been challenging for the commission,
64	having struggled without a functional quorum for more than
65	six months, and during that period utility filings became
66	backlogged and decisions were delayed on matters ranging from
67	utility rate applications to million-dollar interstate
68	natural gas pipeline proposals.
69	Fortunately, I understand that FERC operations have
70	returned to near normal, having cleared much of that backlog,
71	allowing the commission to turn its attention towards a host

72	of issues ranging from controversial changes to the RTO
73	capacity markets to how new energy infrastructure projects
74	should be evaluated under FERC's certificate policy.
75	As we recently heard at your hearing on energy
76	infrastructure, building new pipelines and electric
77	transmission towers is not a easy or simple task.
78	Affected landowners know their rights and they have
79	organized campaigns to oppose new energy projects, sometimes
80	protesting at FERC's doorstep.
81	I understand that Chairman McIntyre announced that the
82	commission is now taking a fresh look at its 1999 policy to
83	evaluate the need for new natural gas pipelines.
84	Obviously, a lot of changes have occurred over the last
85	20 years in the way infrastructure is developed. So I would
86	be interested to hear what may come from that review.
87	Another topic that has consumed much attention in the
88	industry and at FERC recently involves the question of the
89	bulk power system's ability to anticipate, withstand, and
90	recover from disruptive events.
91	This topic of grid resilience became a source of much
92	heated debate we heard from Secretary Perry just last week
93	that the national security of this country is jeopardized

94 those are his words -- if we don't take steps to protect the 95 grid. 96 I understand that FERC is flagged as a top priority and 97 has directed each of the RTOs and ISOs to provide detailed information regarding the state of grid resilience. 98 99 The committee is reviewing the RTO's submissions to FERC 100 and will seek and track the anticipated responsive comments 101 through early next month. FERC's jurisdictional electricity 102 markets have also been a topic of frequent discussion during 103 our Powering America hearing series. 104 We have heard concerns from market participants that 105 range from the need for updated PURPA regs to changes to FERC's transmission planning rules under Order 1000. 106 107 Additionally, recent pricing proposals developed by the 108 RTOs and ISOs aimed at accommodating state policies represent 109 a fundamental shift in how resources set prices in the 110 wholesale markets. 111 Commissioner LaFleur deserves credit for focusing on 112 that issue last May when she was chairman. But, as these 113 federal-state jurisdictional issues play out in filings at 114 FERC and in litigation at the various courts of appeals, we 115 should consider the differences between an impact of the

116	wholesale and retail electricity markets.
117	So these are tough issues and I recognize that you've
118	got a lot on your agenda right now. However, despite the
119	tough work and challenging issues FERC faces, I'd like to
120	point out that the commission is consistently ranked among
121	the best places to work in the federal government, based on
122	employee surveys and your success in maintaining such high
123	marks by your 1,500 staff members is noted.
124	With that, I want to thank the commissioners again for
125	appearing today. I look forward to your testimony and the
126	questions and interactions that we have between us.
127	[The prepared statement of Mr. Upton follows:]
128	
129	**************************************

130	Mr. Upton. With that, I recognize the ranking member of
131	Energy Subcommittee, Mr. Rush, my friend from Illinois.
132	Mr. Rush. I certainly want to thank you, Mr. Chairman,
133	for holding this very timely hearing today. I look forward
134	to hearing from the FERC commissioners on some of the more
135	pressing issues regarding the reliability and the resiliency
136	of the nation's electric grid.
137	Mr. Chairman, just last week this subcommittee heard
138	from Secretary Perry on what he considers a very real concern
139	regarding grid reliability, specifically, Mr. Chairman, the
140	topic of DOE intentionally using its emergency authority
141	under Section 202(c) of the Federal Power Act to grant the
142	request made by First Energy to issue an emergency must-run
143	order for 85 coal and nuclear plants within the PJM
144	interconnected came up more than once.
145	In fact, Secretary Perry, Mr. Chairman, seemed to be
146	sounding the alarm that we are quickly heading toward a point
147	of no return when the imminent retirement of several coal and
148	nuclear plants would leave our nation in a situation where we
149	would be unable to meet our energy demands if we do not act
150	soon.
151	Mr. Chairman, I look forward to hearing the

152	commissioner's views on these critical issues. Another topic
153	of great debate during last week's DOE hearing focused on the
154	March 2018 study by the National Energy Technology
155	Laboratory, or NETL.
156	That report highlighted the use of coal during the
157	prolonged cold snap that the nation experienced between
158	December 2017 and January 2018.
159	The NETL study concluded that within the PJM region,
160	coal provided the most resilient form of generation during
161	this cold blitz and went on to say that without the available
162	capacity from coal facilities then PJM would have experienced
163	power shortfalls and widespread blackouts.
164	However, Mr. Chairman, just this past Friday, PJM issued
165	its own response to the NETL study refuting those conclusions
166	and stating that PJM indeed had adequate amounts of resources
167	to supply power and then not need to invoke emergency
168	procedures.
169	PJM also noted that, while coal and nuclear played an
170	important role during this period, that was more due to
171	economic factors and it really never faced any reliability
172	threats.
173	Mr. Chairman, and the agency responsible for ensuring

174	the reliability of the nation's electrical grid, I look
175	forward to hearing directly from the FERC commission on this
176	and other important issues.
177	Specifically, I would like to commend the agency for its
178	recent unanimous vote finalizing the rulemaking allowing for
179	distributive energy resources to compete in wholesale
180	markets. This vote marks an important step in the right
181	direction by allowing advanced technologies such as demand
182	response, energy storage, electric automobiles, and
183	photovoltaics potentially in the wholesale market.
184	Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, I also have some concerns
185	regarding the recent study recent, rather, policy change
186	determining how impacting stakeholders may intervene in
187	pipeline review.
188	I'd like to hear from the commission on its
189	justification for a less lenient in allowing interveners to
190	join proceedings that are, quote, "out of time" and how these
191	new changes might impact public input and participating in
192	the pipeline review process.
193	That said, Mr. Chairman, I look forward to engaging the
194	commissioners today and I will yield back the balance of my
195	time.

196	Mr. Upton. The gentleman yields back.
197	The chair would recognize the chair of the full
198	committee, the gentleman from the good state of Oregon, Mr.
199	Walden.
200	The Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
201	Good morning. Welcome to our FERC commissioners. We
202	are delighted that you're here. I think the last time we had
203	all the commissioners before the committee was in 2015, and
204	so we are delighted that you're here.
205	But this is the first time under the chairmanship of
206	Commissioner McIntyre. So we look forward to the discussion
207	that will take place.
208	FERC oversees, as you all know, many critical aspects of
209	our nation's energy infrastructure and industry, and through
210	the authorities provided by Congress, namely, the Federal
211	Power Act and the Natural Gas Act, the commission regulates
212	the interstate transmission of electricity, natural gas, and
213	oil and reviews proposals to build LNG terminals, interstate
214	natural gas pipelines, and oversees the licensing of hydro
215	power projects, all of which are very, very important to our
216	
210	country and to my state.

218	unprecedented period of change driven in part by changes in
219	fuel mixes, technological innovation, and market competition.
220	Declining natural gas prices, stable demands, zero cost
221	generation resources, greater efficiency they've all led
222	to a generation mix differentiated not solely by cost but
223	through operational characteristics such as dispatchability
224	flexibility and ramping.
225	So a well-functioning energy system is dependent on
226	competitive markets. However, in some wholesale electricity
227	markets, certain generation resources such as coal and
228	nuclear are struggling to recover costs and remain
229	competitive.
230	In some cases, under wholesale market rules, inflexible
231	generation units are not permitted to set price. This
232	presents real challenges for cost recovery, which could,
233	ultimately, have an impact on the reliability and resiliency
234	of our electricity grid.
235	So I am hopeful that FERC will take this matter
236	seriously as it conducts its review of comments regarding
237	resiliency in the organized electricity markets.
238	At the same time, advances in digital information
239	technologies are driving real change, creating new

240	opportunities for more intelligent and dynamic energy
241	systems.
242	Many of these advanced energy technologies have
243	applications on the distribution side and behind the meter
244	beyond the regulatory reach of FERC.
245	However, given the interconnected nature of our grid, we
246	are beginning to see their impacts on the bulk power system
247	and wholesale electricity markets.
248	Of course, as our generation mix shifts toward natural
249	gas, we are going to need more pipelines to transport gas
250	from producing wells and user consumers.
251	New England is especially feeling that crunch, as we
252	have heard, as we saw when they had to import LNG from Russia
253	on two occasions this year to meet market demands.
254	So I am hopeful that Chairman McIntyre's review of
255	FERC's procedures for evaluating applications for new gas
256	pipelines will result in more efficient and timely decisions.
257	I understand that FERC will be taking formal action on
258	this review at its open meeting on Thursday. With our
259	abundant shale resources, we can be entirely self-sufficient
260	on natural gas.
261	But we must construct new pipelines to do that. While

262	cross border trade with our neighbors in Canada and Mexico
263	may be a win-win, we should never have to be reliant on the
264	Russians for imports again.
265	Since taking the gavel as chairman of this committee,
266	I've made it my promise to always put the consumer first in
267	everything that we do. The modern consumer expects greater
268	control, convenience, and choice when it comes to their
269	energy consumption.
270	I am excited about the changes taking place and the
271	opportunities that it presents to our nation's economy and
272	energy security.
273	With that, I'd like to thank all of you for willingness
274	to participate in this public service and in this hearing and
275	I look forward to your testimony.
276	As you all well know, we also have another subcommittee
277	meeting at the same time on telecommunications issues so you
278	will have members, including myself, coming and going.
279	We really value your testimony and your long public
280	service and we look forward to a partnership together for
281	America's future.
282	With that, Mr. Chairman, I would yield back the balance
283	of my time.

284	[The	prepared	statement	of	Mr.	Walden	follows:]
285							
286	******	INSERT 2	*****				

287	Mr. Upton. The gentleman yields back.
288	The chair would recognize the ranking member of the full
289	committee, Mr. Pallone, from New Jersey.
290	Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
291	I am pleased that there is finally a full slate of five
292	commissioners at FERC. Last year, I voiced my concern that a
293	lot of important work was put on hold for an extended period
294	of time because the commission lacked a quorum, and it's a
295	pleasure to have all five of you here with us today.
296	First, I'd like to thank the commission for its decision
297	to reject Secretary Perry's notice of proposed rulemaking to
298	provide cost recovery for certain coal and nuclear facilities
299	that are no longer economical.
300	This proposed rule is a threat to competitive
301	electricity markets and would have led to higher energy
302	prices for consumers.
303	With Secretary Perry's proposed rulemaking now behind
304	us, we must turn our attention to the feedback that the
305	commission receives from the regional transmission
306	organization as it relates to current resiliency risk.
307	I would also like touch briefly on FERC's authority to
308	review applications for the construction of interstate

309 natural gas pipelines. 310 For years I've expressed concern with the process FERC uses to review pipeline applications and its tendency to 311 312 green light the construction of potentially unnecessary pipeline projects. 313 314 Overbuilding our natural gas pipeline system has many 315 negative impacts on the public. Ratepayers ultimately foot 316 the bill for the construction of these pipelines whether they 317 are necessary or not. 318 Homeowners in the path of a pipeline also have little 319 recourse to stop pipeline companies from seizing their land 320 through eminent domain. 321 It's time for a new approach. I believe a more regional 322 review of these projects should be implemented rather than 323 the current process where every pipeline appears to be reviewed individually without any consideration of other 324 325 pipelines in the area. 326 And I was encouraged by Chairman McIntyre's announcement 327 in December that FERC will review its 1999 pipeline policy 328 statement. I hope this review leads to a new pipeline policy 329 that provides greater protections to property owners and more 330 holistic review process that looks at all pipelines in a

331 given region.

I've also heard from many property owners and advocacy groups that FERC is not nearly responsive enough to the public. More needs to be done at the commission to provide a greater role for the general public and the FERC process.

My colleague, Representative Schakowsky, had introduced a common sense bill that would create an office of public participation in consumer advocacy at FERC and such an office would provide an important resource for everyday citizens who typically lack the ability to navigate the complex FERC process.

And finally, I'd like to address FERC's grid storage order number 841, which was issued in February. I've long advocated for finding ways to introduce more distributed energy and energy storage into our electric grid and removing the many barriers preventing storage benefits from reaching consumers.

And so I am fully aware that there are some technical changes that grid operators and utilities will have to overcome, it can be done and I am pleased that FERC has directed the RTOs to evaluate how storage can add value to our electricity markets.

353	So, again, let me conclude by welcoming everyone here
354	today. Thank you, and I yield back, Mr. Chairman.
355	Mr. Upton. Gentleman's time has expired.
356	We are now prepared to hear testimony from each of the
357	commissioners. We welcome you. Thank you for submitting
358	your testimony in advance. It'll be made part of the record.
359	We will let you spend five minutes each summarizing your
360	statements and at that point we will go to questions on both
361	sides.
362	So Mr. McIntyre, welcome. Good to see you.

363	STATEMENTS OF THE HONORABLE KEVIN J. MCINTYRE, CHAIRMAN,
364	FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION; THE HONORABLE CHERYL A.
365	LAFLEUR, COMMISSIONER, FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION;
366	THE HONORABLE NEIL CHATTERJEE, COMMISSIONER, FEDERAL ENERGY
367	REGULATORY COMMISSION; THE HONORABLE ROBERT F. POWELSON,
368	COMMISSIONER, FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION; THE
369	HONORABLE RICHARD GLICK, COMMISSIONER, FEDERAL ENERGY
370	REGULATORY COMMISSION
371	
372	STATEMENT OF MR. MCINTYRE
373	Mr. McIntyre. Thank you, Chairman Upton. Likewise.
374	Thank you. Good morning, Chairman Upton and Ranking
375	Member Rush, and distinguished members of this subcommittee.
376	My name is Kevin McIntyre, and since December I have had
377	the privilege of serving as the chairman of the Federal
378	Energy Regulatory Commission, FERC.
379	FERC is an independent federal agency that regulates
380	important aspects of our nation's electric, natural gas,
381	hydro power, and oil pipeline industries.
382	As chairman, I am particularly pleased to be serving
383	alongside my esteemed fellow commissioners who are also
384	appearing before you today.

385 I could not have hoped for a more engaged, better informed, and more public spirited group of colleagues than 386 387 these. 388 My goals as chairman include the fostering of continued excellence at FERC, which was recently recognized as you, 389 Chairman Upton, mentioned -- recognized in a prominent 390 391 national ranking of the best places to work in the federal 392 government as the number-one mid-sized agency. 393 My goals also include making FERC's actions as open, 394 transparent, fair, and efficient as possible. A top 395 substantive priority of mine is to protect and promote the resilience of our bulk power system, as has been mentioned 396 397 here this morning. 398 On January 8, we initiated a proceeding to evaluate the 399 state of that grid resilience. We are still receiving the 400 incoming public comments in response to our issuance in that proceeding, and as we are informed by those comments and 401 deliberate on them, we will make determinations as to whether 402 403 additional action by FERC is warranted in this critical area. 404 I also am pleased that FERC is beginning a review of our 405 1999 policy statement on the certification, our term for the 406 approval process for interstate natural gas pipeline

407	facilities.
408	As a matter of good governance, I believe that it is
409	appropriate for us, as with any other governmental body, to
410	review our policies and processes from time to time to
411	explore whether any improvements can be made.
412	Our review of gas pipeline certification processes is
413	timely in light of the many changes that the natural gas
414	industry has witnessed in the past 20 years.
415	In addition to these specific goals and priorities, as
416	chairman, FERC is continuing to consider many other important
417	issues. My fellow commissioners will address some of those
418	in their testimony before you here this morning.
419	With that, I thank you for this opportunity to be to
420	appear before you.
421	[The prepared statement of Mr. McIntyre follows:]
422	
423	*********INSERT 3******

Mr. Upton. Thank you.

Ms. LaFleur, welcome.

426	STATEMENT OF MS. LAFLEUR
427	
428	Ms. LaFleur. Thank you, Chairman Upton, Ranking Member
429	Rush, and members of the subcommittee.
430	My name is Cheryl LaFleur. I've been a commissioner at
431	FERC for nearly eight years and have appeared before this
432	committee several times. Got a little lonely last year so I
433	am extremely happy to be here this morning with the full
434	commission.
435	What I am going to discuss today is FERC's regulation of
436	our wholesale electricity markets and I will also touch
437	briefly on our oversight of interstate transmission planning.
438	Both areas are covered more fully in my written testimony.
439	The organized markets that provide electricity to more
440	than two-thirds of Americans are, roughly, 20 years old now
441	and I believe they've done a very good job for the nation's
442	electric customers, promoting efficiency and innovation and
443	protecting reliability at least cost by deploying resources
444	over a broader regional footprint.
445	As the committee knows, there are different market
446	structures in different regions of the country, reflecting
447	varied state and regional regulatory choices.

448	Perhaps the most prominent difference is that the
449	eastern markets PJM, New York ISO, and ISO New England
450	use mandatory capacity markets to ensure resource adequacy
451	because all or most of the states in those regions chose to
452	deregulate generation in the 1990s.
453	By contrast, the Midwestern and Western markets MISO
454	SPP and CISO rely primarily on state resource planning for
455	resource adequacy.
456	The markets have grown dramatically since I've joined
457	FERC in 2010. In 2013, the Entergy companies and others in
458	the mid-south became part of MISO, nearly doubling its size.
459	Two years later in 2015, the integrated systems and part
460	of the Western Area Power Administration in the upper Midwest
461	joined SPP, marking the first time a federal power marketing
462	administration chose to join the market.
463	The big story in 2018 is the expansion of markets in the
464	west. The western energy imbalance market operated by the
465	California ISO has expanded in recent years to include
466	utilities in five Western states including several public
467	power entities and now represents the load of 55 percent of
468	the western interconnection.
469	Several more entities are scheduled to join in the next

470	two years when two-thirds of the electricity in the West will
471	be shared and balanced by that market.
472	In addition to the group of companies primarily in
473	Colorado and Wyoming, and are known as the Mountain West
474	Transmission Group, have indicated their intent to join the
475	Southwest Power Pool.
476	I think it's really important that these market
477	expansions are being driven at the state and regional and
478	company level, not driven by FERC.
479	In fact, I strongly believe that's the only reason
480	they're happening is that the choices are being made in the
481	regions. They reflect the increasing and increasingly broad
482	recognition that sharing resources over a large footprint can
483	sustain reliability and save money for customers, especially
484	at a time of substantial resource change.
485	FERC has worked hard to make sure the markets do what
486	they're supposed to do. We've taken a number of steps to
487	make sure that markets are fair for all resources including
488	emerging technologies.
489	We've also worked to ensure grid resilience by
490	overseeing capacity market changes to increase compensation
491	to the resources including baseload that keep the lights on

492	at times of system stress.
493	In the energy markets, we've taken a number of steps on
494	market mechanics to improve price formation. The most
495	challenging issue currently confronting the wholesale markets
496	is their interplay with state policy initiatives, which my
497	colleague, Mr. Powelson, will discuss and which I touch on in
498	my testimony.
499	Finally, I will comment briefly on our work on
500	interstate transmission. It's been nearly seven years since
501	FERC issued Order No. 1000 to require regional transmission
502	planning and cost allocation and require competitive
503	transmission selection over some projects.
504	All regions of the nation are in some stage of
505	implementing Order 1000 at this point. Five of them have had
506	competitive transmission processes and have proven that it
507	saves customers money.
508	They've also proven that it's hard to do and that we
509	have a lot more work to do on this, and it's something the
510	commission is going to continue to monitor and work on.
511	And with that, I will thank you again for the
512	opportunity and look forward to your questions.
513	Thank you.

514	[The	prepared	statement	of	Ms.	LaFleur	follows:]
515							
516	****	*INSERT 4	*****				

517	Mr.	Upton.	Thar	nk you.				
518	Mr.	Chatter	jee,	welcome.	Good	to	see	you.

519	STATEMENT OF MR. CHATTERJEE
520	
521	Mr. Chatterjee. Thank you. Great to see you, Chairman
522	Upton, Ranking Member Rush, distinguished members of the
523	subcommittee.
524	Thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today
525	to discuss the important work FERC is doing to ensure that
526	the American people have access to reliable and affordable
527	energy.
528	As a former congressional staffer, it's always a
529	pleasure to be back on Capitol Hill, and I would like to note
530	that while I came to the commission from the Senate, I began
531	my career here in the people's house and never allowed myself
532	to become a Senate snob. I can't say the same for all of my
533	former colleagues.
534	I appreciate the subcommittee's attention to the major
535	energy issues facing our nation as well as its interest in
536	the role the commission plays in addressing them.
537	I would like to focus my remarks today on our efforts
538	regarding reliability and the Public Utility Regulatory
539	Policies Act of 1978, or PURPA, and to touch briefly on a few
540	of my other priorities.

541	I will begin with a look in the area of energy policy
542	affecting families and businesses across the nation on a
543	daily basis reliability.
544	Congress delegated the FERC the responsibility to
545	approve and enforce mandatory reliability standards for the
546	grid, and with our partners at the North American Electric
547	Reliability Corporation we remain committed to that endeavor.
548	Our reliability standards have progressed considerably
549	since they first became mandatory and enforceable just over a
550	decade ago, and today they form an effective baseline for
551	addressing day-to-day grid reliability issues like tree
552	trimming, relay setting, communications, system planning, and
552553	trimming, relay setting, communications, system planning, and emergency operations.
553	emergency operations.
553 554	emergency operations. Another way the commission works to maintain reliability
553554555	emergency operations. Another way the commission works to maintain reliability is through our oversight of jurisdictional wholesale energy
553554555556	emergency operations. Another way the commission works to maintain reliability is through our oversight of jurisdictional wholesale energy capacity and ancillary services markets.
553554555556557	emergency operations. Another way the commission works to maintain reliability is through our oversight of jurisdictional wholesale energy capacity and ancillary services markets. For example, the commission has recently taken a number
553554555556557558	emergency operations. Another way the commission works to maintain reliability is through our oversight of jurisdictional wholesale energy capacity and ancillary services markets. For example, the commission has recently taken a number of actions to ensure all new generators provide essential
553554555556557558559	emergency operations. Another way the commission works to maintain reliability is through our oversight of jurisdictional wholesale energy capacity and ancillary services markets. For example, the commission has recently taken a number of actions to ensure all new generators provide essential reliability services such as voltage and frequency control.

563	unprecedented changes in its generation resource mix.
564	These trends promise tremendous benefits to consumers
565	through lower prices and greater choice. But they also
566	highlight a need for vigilance as we ensure that reliability
567	is not adversely impacted.
568	I've been pleased to see the important work that ISO New
569	England has done in this regard through its assessment of
570	fuel supply vulnerabilities in its footprint. Its analysis
571	is an excellent example of how RTOs and ISOs should
572	proactively evaluate the specific regional risks.
573	I expect that the implications of fuel security for grid
574	reliability and resilience will continue to be areas of
575	interest for the commission.
576	Finally, the commission is also taking action to address
577	other emerging threats such as physical security, geomagnetic
578	disturbances, and electromagnetic pulses.
579	FERC and NERC have made important strides on these
580	issues and the commission remains actively engaged with our
581	government partners and other stakeholders to improve our
582	knowledge of these threats and evaluate creative ways to
583	address associated risks proactively.
584	Now, turning to the second topic I would like to

585	address, which is PURPA, today's energy environment is
586	fundamentally different from that of 1978, when PURPA was
587	enacted.
588	Because of this, many stakeholders are rightly asking
589	whether changes to PURPA are needed to better align it with
590	our modern energy landscape.
591	While significant changes will require congressional
592	action, I believe the commission should review our existing
593	regulations to ensure they fulfil PURPA's mandate of
594	fostering the development of renewable and co-generation
595	resources while protecting customers and competition.
596	Before I close, I would like to take a moment to talk to
597	you on a couple of additional issues that I view as
598	priorities.
599	First, the commission's current review of the 1999
600	certificate policy statement. As FERC considers how we
601	evaluate natural gas pipeline applications, I am committed to
602	ensuring that we have an efficient and transparent process
603	that encourages landowner participation.
604	From my perspective, our review should build upon our
605	process improvement efforts under the recently signed MOU
606	implementing Executive Order 13807, one federal decision

607	policy.
608	Second, I would like to emphasize my continued
609	commitment to securing our grid against cyberattacks. While
610	the administration has taken laudable steps already, I
611	believe these challenges will continue to grow.
612	I strongly support the commission's approach to
613	addressing cyber threats which consists of mandatory
614	standards as well as voluntary best practices and information
615	sharing.
616	Still, more work remains and I look forward to continued
617	cooperation with my colleagues at the commission and our
618	partners across the government.
619	I want to take my final seconds to commend this
620	committee in particular for the work that you guys have done
621	to really look into these significant issues, not just by
622	holding this hearing but, Chairman Upton, under your
623	leadership the past couple of years this committee has done
624	tremendous work to bring focus to these enormously complex
625	issue areas.
626	As an alumnus of Congress, I believe firmly in the
627	legislative branch's co-equal role in our government. And
628	now having the good fortune to serve the American public at

629	the commission, I have come to realize that in dealing with
630	these enormous challenges we are constrained by the statutes
631	that govern us.
632	But you all can take a leadership role in addressing
633	some of these complex issues and I look forward to working
634	with you and your colleagues to do that in the future.
635	[The prepared statement of Mr. Chatterjee follows:]
636	
637	**************************************

638	Mr. Upton. Well, thanks for your kinds words. I know
639	that those are shared on both sides of the aisle so
640	appreciate that.
641	Mr. Powelson, welcome.

642	STATEMENT OF MR. POWELSON
643	
644	Mr. Powelson. Good morning, Chairman Upton, Ranking
645	Member Rush, and members of the subcommittee. I also want to
646	echo what my colleagues have said earlier in thanking you for
647	inviting us here this morning.
648	My name is Robert Powelson. I am honored to serve as
649	the commissioner on the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.
650	In fact, I was honored to go through the process with my
651	colleague, Commissioner Chatterjee, and let me just say it's
652	an honor to serve in this capacity.
653	Before joining the commission in August, I spent nine
654	years as a member of the Pennsylvania Public Utility
655	Commission. I spent four and a half years as chairman and I
656	also served I had the honor in 2017 as serving as
657	president of the National Association of Regulatory
658	Commissioners.
659	So it's when I look to my right and my left, the
660	people I serve with here, it's a collegial body and the
661	people that represent this agency are world class, as
662	demonstrated in recent rankings as a federal agency.
663	My experience, Mr. Chairman, as a state regulator and my

664	interaction with colleagues at the state commission level
665	across the country, have informed in my appreciation and
666	understanding of the FERC's role in interfacing with the
667	states.
668	Since joining the commission, I've approached each of my
669	decisions with an understanding of how the determinations
670	impact, as was mentioned earlier, families and businesses
671	nationwide.
672	I've also prioritized my engagement with stakeholders
673	from all backgrounds and geographic regions to ensure that I
674	hear a variety of viewpoints and my decisions are fully
675	informed.
676	For purposes of my testimony here this morning, I am
677	focusing on two areas. First, I will discuss the evolving
678	grid, in particular, how the nation's generation resource mix
679	
0 7 5	has changed in just the last decade.
680	has changed in just the last decade. The second issue is one of just a huge priority for all
680	The second issue is one of just a huge priority for all
680 681	The second issue is one of just a huge priority for all of us, and that's the proactive cybersecurity work that the
680 681 682	The second issue is one of just a huge priority for all of us, and that's the proactive cybersecurity work that the FERC is doing.

686	likely 50 percent of our dispatch was from coal.
687	And now, with the evolution of shale plays like
688	Marcellus, Utica, and the plays in Louisiana and Texas and
689	Arkansas, there has been a drastic shift in our power mix and
690	it's having a profound impact on wholesale power prices in a
691	good way.
692	It's actually, in my home state, has brought a \$5
693	billion investment in ethylene cracker to Beaver County,
694	Pennsylvania.
695	It's also changed at the local we'll call burner tip
696	where customers with gas purchase costs in LDCs across
697	Pennsylvania seven LDCs have dropped over 70 percent, a
698	direct pass-through savings to customers in the states in
699	the state of Pennsylvania.
700	When we talk about the evolving grid, though, it's also
701	important to mention the impact that new resources are
702	having. As mentioned earlier by Chairman Walden, the
703	evolution of the the evolution of battery storage,
704	renewable energy, and the impact it's also having on the grid
705	is critically important.
706	Last year in our bulk power system, 10 percent of our
707	dispatch power came from renewable energy resources. A

708	number of states over the last decade have adopted very
709	successful renewable portfolio standards.
710	I should note for my good friends from the Republic of
711	Texas, the state of Texas is the number-one wind producer in
712	the country shout out to Mr Chairman Barton and
713	Ranking Member Olson as well and it speaks to the
714	ovulation, again, of our modern-day grid.
715	Now, another tectonic shift is also taking place in our
716	grid and, unfortunately, it has to deal with the flat demand
717	for electricity.
718	As I like to say, the way we generate, transmit, and
719	distribute power in this country is ever changing. The fact
720	of the matter is the grid is getting more efficient, it's
721	getting more resilient, and it's clearly getting cleaner.
722	But we are also offering tools to customers. Those
723	tools include things like energy efficiency, real-time
724	pricing as mentioned earlier, in certain states like Texas
725	and Pennsylvania and New Jersey, the ability to go out and
726	shop for retail energy supply.
727	And I note that because a lot of customers are out in
728	the market residential and industrial customers.
729	The last item I want to touch on in cybersecurity, and I

730	think cyber is really one that keeps us all up at night, and
731	I am just very proud of the work that this commission has
732	done, going back to our former chairman, Commissioner
733	LaFleur, and really working with the states, Mr. Chairman, to
734	develop protocols and cyber capacities within the state
735	public utility commissions, and I will talk about that later
736	on here in the hearing.
737	There's been a number of changing threat vectors in the
738	bulk power system. There are a number as you know, a
739	number of bad actors out there that want to infiltrate
740	industrial control systems and wreak havoc on our bulk power
741	system.
742	But I am proud to report, again, to the work of the
743	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, working with the
744	Department of Homeland Security. More recently, the
745	leadership demonstrated by Secretary Perry with the launch of
746	the Office of Cybersecurity within DOE is another great step
747	forward in addressing overall cybersecurity in this country.
748	So, Mr. Chairman, I look forward to today's conversation
749	and appreciate the opportunity to be with you and your
750	
, 0 0	colleagues.

752

754 Mr. Upton. Thank you.

755 Commissioner Glick.

756	STATEMENT OF MR. GLICK
757	
758	Mr. Glick. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you,
759	Ranking Member Rush, and members of the subcommittee. Thank
760	you for the opportunity to testify this morning.
761	As a former minority general counsel to the Senate
762	Energy and Natural Resources Committee and maybe I am a
763	snob, according to Commissioner Chatterjee but as a former
764	counsel to the committee, it's nice to be back on Capitol
765	Hill and it's good to see some familiar faces from the Joint
766	House and Senate Energy Bill Conference that took place
767	during the last conference.
768	I've been a member of the Federal Energy Regulatory
769	Commission for almost five months. During this short period
770	of time, the commission has been called upon to consider a
771	number of challenging matters.
772	Although FERC is not typically an agency that receives a
773	substantial amount of public attention, the commission's
774	actions have a significant impact on the lives of everyday
775	Americans.
776	I witnessed this first-hand while at the Department of
777	Energy at the end of the Clinton administration. The

778	commission's inability to come together on a unified response
779	during the height of the Western energy crisis in 2000 caused
780	consumers to pay significantly more for electricity and
781	natural gas than they should have. It is imperative that
782	the five of us safeguard work together to safeguard to
783	<pre>public's interest.</pre>
784	As everyone here knows, we are in the midst of a
785	dramatic transformation in the ways Americans produce and
786	consume energy. This revolution has the potential to
787	substantially improve our energy efficiency, reduce
788	emissions, grow the economy, and create millions of new jobs.
789	FERC can help facilitate this transition by removing the
790	barriers to participation and competition that exist in the
791	wholesale markets.
792	For instance, the commission can examine market rules to
793	ensure that they are not unduly discriminating against new
794	technologies.
795	In February, FERC voted 5-0 to approve a final rule
796	requiring RTOs and ISOs to facilitate energy storage
797	participation in wholesale electric markets.
798	Storage technologies such as batteries and pumped hydro
799	have the potential to play a leading role in the transition

800	to the electricity system in the future.
801	As the cost of energy storage continues to decline,
802	these resources are poised to become a bigger part of the
803	generation mix, leading to the development of a more robust
804	grid that can, among other things, help to accommodate the
805	ever increasing demand for clean renewable resources from
806	states, corporations, and residential customers.
807	In addition, these storage resources will enhance the
808	reliability and resilience of the grid by also reducing
809	electric rates.
810	Today, the cost of using lithium ion battery is less
811	than one-quarter of what it was at the start of the decade.
812	Partly as a result of those declining costs, industry
813	forecasts project that the nation's installed energy storage
814	capacity will increase by 750 percent in just five years.
815	The commission's action to reduce barriers to help
816	storage reduce barriers to energy storage resource
817	participation in wholesale markets will help to further this
818	remarkable trajectory, all the while reducing consumer energy
819	bills.
820	I believe FERC, pursuant to the Federal Power Act,
821	should also identify and eliminate other barriers to

822	participation of new energy technologies and wholesale
823	markets.
824	For example, the commission last week held a technical
825	conference to examine the potential participation of
826	aggregated distributed energy resources in wholesale markets
827	and the benefits these resources could provide.
828	Chairman Upton and Ranking Member Rush, thank you again
829	for the opportunity to appear before the committee today. I
830	look forward to answering your questions and the questions of
831	your colleagues.
832	[The prepared statement of Mr. Glick follows:]
833	
834	*********INSERT 7*******

835	Mr. Upton. Well, thank you all. Appreciate you being
836	here, and the first thing that I want to raise I don't
837	know if you saw today's Washington Post. This is a copy of
838	it. I should have made copies for you.
839	But it's entitled the headline is "U.S., British
840	Governments Warn Businesses Worldwide of Russian Campaign to
841	Hack Routers," and it quotes the Homeland Security assistant
842	secretary for Cybersecurity, and she says, "Once you own the
843	router you own the traffic that's traversing the router."
844	And it's pretty clear in this story it starts off the
845	U.S. and British governments on Monday accused Russia of
846	conducting a massive campaign to compromise computer routers
847	and firewalls around the world from home offices to internet
848	providers for espionage and possible sabotage purposes.
849	And as you may know, we are planning to markup tomorrow
850	a bill that's going to help coordinate things with the
851	Department of Energy that I believe at least at this point
852	looks to have pretty widespread bipartisan support by
853	virtually all of the members of this subcommittee is what I
854	am told in advance, but, you know, got to wait until you get
855	there.
856	So, Chairman McIntyre, my question is it's my

857 understanding that DOE has offered an open invitation for FERC commissioners to receive intelligence briefings on 858 859 cyber-related threats and I am curious to know how many of 860 you -- how many of those have you might have taken up with 861 you and your fellow commissioners in terms of the briefings 862 that have been offered? 863 Mr. McIntyre. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't know 864 the exact number. Mr. Upton. Obviously, this is an open setting so I 865 866 caution everyone in terms of what they might say. 867 Mr. McIntyre. Yes, sir. But let me just note up front that the issue that you have raised here it would be -- we 868 would be hard pressed to identify one of greater concern to 869 870 us as an energy industry, as regulators of that industry, 871 and, indeed, as a nation in terms of national security in 872 this threat of cyberattacks from bad actors, in many cases, 873 state actors such as you have identified. 874 We are increasingly working with DOE and other 875 components of the federal government on a daily basis, mostly 876 at the staff level, Mr. Chairman, to ensure that we stay on 877 top of these issues and take all appropriate measures that 878 are available to us, and I know that the staff of each and

879	every one of my colleagues here has been very much engaged in
880	that process.
881	You are correct that we have been offered personal
882	briefings that we are I think in the process of scheduling
883	and taking. Very, very helpful. DOE has been very helpful
884	in this regard DHS, TSA and our level of engagement on
885	this I think will only continue to increase.
886	Mr. Upton. Do you believe that there's any additional
887	statutory authority that FERC may need, as you look to the
888	future?
889	Mr. McIntyre. That's a good question. In 2005, we were
890	given the role of ensuring that reliability is intended to
891	through our oversight of the electric reliability
892	organization of the nation and the reliability standards
893	promulgated by it.
894	And I believe that we are making good use of that
895	authority. I don't have a specific area right now that I can
896	identify as something where we would need broader statutory
897	authority.
898	I am very pleased with this level of increased federal
899	engagement that I described. My colleagues may wish to add
900	their own

901	Mr. Upton. Yes, and maybe also can you shed any light
902	on the degree and frequency of cyberattacks on the energy
903	infrastructure?
904	Mr. McIntyre. Attacks are constant, but the degree of
905	severity and the, from the perspective of the perpetrators,
906	success, that is what varies. But every day, not just
907	governmental entities but, indeed, the companies that we
908	regulate are subject to attacks and attempted attacks.
909	Mr. Upton. I would appreciate hearing from the other
910	commissioners as well.
911	Mr. Chatterjee. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
912	I think in terms of the interactions that we've had with
913	DOE and other agencies, I have the good fortune to represent
914	the commission at an ESCC Electric Sector Coordinating
915	Council meeting with a number of stakeholders across the
916	government and industry looking at these serious issues.
917	I also got to participate in a delegation that included
918	DOE, DHS, and FERC to travel to Israel to learn about best
919	practices and ways to stay ahead of these ever-evolving
920	threats.
921	It's something that I think my colleagues and I all take
922	very seriously. It is the new reality that we must contend

923	with. As we benefit and gain from the technological
924	innovation that's taking place in this space we have to be
925	cognizant that it comes with that downside risk of increased
926	cyber vulnerability and my colleagues and I will all remain
927	vigilant on this.
928	Mr. Upton. Commissioner LaFleur.
929	Ms. LaFleur. Thank you, Chairman.
930	I've received a number of briefings classified
931	briefings at the Department of Energy over the years. I
932	actually have one scheduled tomorrow, and I appreciate
933	Secretary Perry continuing to make them available.
934	In answer to your other question, hacks on the grid are
935	constant. The National Center for Cybersecurity and
936	Communications Integration whatever NCCIC stands for
937	every year electric grid attacks are either a slight majority
938	or slightly below 50 percent in the public numbers they put
939	out every year.
940	Fortunately, in part because of the strong standards
941	that I believe we put in place for the high voltage electric
942	grid on perimeter security and password security and other
943	things, they're infrequently successful very infrequently
944	successful with the electric grid.

In terms of what this committee has done, I think this committee had done an excellent job on the electric grid I used to participate, when I was chairman in some kind of committee that was across government of heads of the different agencies, and I think where there's more we can do that's across the different infrastructure sectors, among electricity, water, gas, finance, and others, that's where there's real, I think, weaknesses in sharing information and learning from each other because they're all quite -- they're looked at individually on the Hill and in government. all have a lot we have in common. Mr. Powelson. Mr. Chairman, let me also pick up on that. The outreach that the FERC has done through our Office of Energy Infrastructure and Security, outreaching the state public utility commissions and helping state PUCs build their internal capacity to address cyber, I am very proud of the work of our Office of Electric -- Energy Infrastructure and Security along with our Office of Electric Reliability.

checklist that PUCs can use with their regulating utilities

State public utility commissions have used us as a

resource to go through trainings and we've developed this

945

946

947

948

949

950

951

952

953

954

955

956

957

958

959

960

961

962

963

964

965

966

967	to help in a management audit.
968	It's been a great collaborative. I will tell you it's
969	very difficult. When you asked about resources, we could
970	certainly use more boots on the ground.
971	I am not here to get ahead of my chairman on that but I
972	will make the request. The work getting out to 50 states and
973	doing that kind of training requires a lot of boots on the
974	ground. The good news is we are doing it in a collaborative
975	approach with NARUC.
976	Commissioners have come into Washington for read-ins.
977	These are all good things that are evolving. But to the
978	earlier points, these threat vectors are changing every day
979	and working trying to break down the silo mentalities
980	between the different federal agencies I think we've come a
981	long way in the last eight years as a nation to address these
982	emerging threats.
983	Mr. Upton. Thank you. I know my time has expired so I
984	will yield to Mr. Rush.
985	Mr. Rush. Mr. Chairman, Chairman McIntyre, back in
986	January the commission voted unanimously to reject Secretary
987	Perry's notice of proposed rulemaking that sought to prop up
988	coal and nuclear facilities.

989	Instead, the commission wanted grid operators to submit
990	additional information regarding their ability to judge and I
991	quote you, "naturally occurring and man-made threats," end of
992	quote, to their system within 60 days.
993	Where does the agency currently stand on this issue?
994	Does the commission believe that we are truly heading past
995	the point of no return when the retirement of coal and
996	nuclear facilities will leave us in a situation where we will
997	soon be unable to meet our energy demands if we do not act
998	quickly?
999	Does the agency support action by states and RTOs, the
1000	markets, or Congress? Or does it does the commission have
1001	the means and the authority to act on this issue if and when
1002	it becomes a problem?
1003	Mr. McIntyre. Well, thank you for the question, Ranking
1004	Member Rush, and also thank you for acknowledging the steps
1005	that we as a commission have taken thus far.
1006	As you note, our January order did raise the issue of
1007	the grid resilience and, specifically in terms of steps
1008	forward, we directed our nation's operators of our regional
1009	grids the regional transmission organizations and
1010	independent system operators to take the first step in

1011	helping us to build our record on which we would base our
1012	decision making by submitting to us their own perspectives on
1013	resilience within their respective footprints.
1014	And those that initial round of comment has come in
1015	from the original transmission organizations and independent
1016	system operators. Now we are in the subsequent commenting
1017	phase.
1018	The questions you raised are among the very important
1019	issues that we will have to grapple with. Are there
1020	categories of resources or, indeed, even perhaps specific
1021	important resources that if they were to retire on a
1022	permanent basis simply go away and exit the scene of
1023	resources that are available to contribute to the energy that
1024	serves our nation's energy needs? Would that be something
1025	that would be harmful to American interests?
1026	A very important issue and a tricky one. So that is
1027	very much within the scope of the matters that we will be
1028	looking at as we make our decisions, going forward.
1029	Mr. Rush. I would like to ask any of the other
1030	commissioners would you care to comment on my question?
1031	Ms. LaFleur. Well, I think, broadly, the commission has
1032	two major sets of our responsibilities that really are

1033 directed to the resilience of the electric grid. The first is the market rules to make sure that there's 1034 enough resources in the market, that there's enough of the 1035 1036 type of resources that are needed to keep the lights on at 1037 any given time and that they're properly paid and the markets are stable so they'll continue to attract investment and 1038 1039 resources. 1040 Secondly, the commission has put in place a number of broad standards, both the reliability standards we oversee as 1041 1042 well as some of the rules that Commissioner Chatterjee 1043 referred to, for example, on frequency response or voltage to make sure that if there is an essential reliability of 1044 1045 services that's in demand because of all the changes on the 1046 grid, we have it for customers. 1047 I think that Chairman McIntyre really covered very well 1048 the ongoing resilience proceeding. In terms of specific resources that are needed, all of the market operators have 1049 1050 in place reliability must-run tariffs so if a resource wants 1051 to retire a test is done to make sure that its retirement 1052 will not put customer reliability at risk. 1053 If there are changes needed in those tariffs we'll look 1054 But I think that's a good place to start. at them.

1055	Mr. Rush. Mr. Chatterjee.
1056	Mr. Chatterjee. Thank you, Mr. Ranking Member.
1057	I initially was sympathetic when Secretary Perry
1058	proposed the notice of proposed rulemaking to the commission.
1059	Being from Kentucky, having worked for Leader McConnell, I
1060	saw first-hand the devastating impact that coal plant
1061	shutdowns had on coal communities throughout Appalachia.
1062	I also believe in climate change and man's role in it
1063	and believe that we need to mitigate emissions and I believe
1064	nuclear power will plan an essential role in that.
1065	And also am cognizant of the security concerns that
1066	Secretary Perry himself laid out before this committee last
1067	week.
1068	That said, none of those issues were relevant to the
1069	docket that was before us, and I agree with all of my
1070	colleagues in voting to reject it because the record simply
1071	did not support compensating plants based on the availability
1072	of 90-day supply of fuel.
1073	That doesn't mean that Secretary Perry didn't ask the
1074	right question and I do believe the question of resilience
1075	that we are examining in this current docket is an essential
1076	one and I think over the course of time Secretary Perry will

1077	be proven right.
1078	We are going to ultimately have resilience challenges in
1079	this country and we need to be prepared for that, and I think
1080	that this docket will allow for that.
1081	Finally, I will say, to build on the point that
1082	Commissioner LaFleur made about, you know, existing tariffs
1083	for reliability must-runs, we've got to evaluate whether they
1084	work or not.
1085	You know, while Secretary Perry asked the right
1086	question, perhaps the NOPR was not the right solution. There
1087	may be other necessary solutions and we may in the coming
1088	days, weeks, months be confronted with situations where the
1089	existing tariffs do not allow for, you know, some of the
1090	accommodations that may be necessary.
1091	I had pushed for a show-cause order that I included in
1092	my concurrence to the NOPR that I think, as we look back in
1093	time, may have been the right thing to do.
1094	Mr. Rush. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.
1095	Mr. Upton. Thank you.
1096	Mr. Barton.
1097	Mr. Barton. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
1098	I am going to ask my questions directly to the chairman.

1099	But if any of the commissioners wish to add their comments
1100	they're very welcome to.
1101	The first question, Mr. Chairman, is can you give the
1102	subcommittee a general idea of what the variances in retail
1103	cost of electricity in this country is by region from, say,
1104	the lowest region to the highest region?
1105	Mr. McIntyre. Thank you for the question, Congressman.
1106	No. I am afraid I don't actually have that information
1107	at hand. It does vary very much by region and that, in turn,
1108	is often a function of the fuel type that is generally
1109	consumed within that region.
1110	Mr. Barton. Does anybody on the yes, sir, Mr.
1111	Powelson.
1112	Mr. Powelson. This is not real time, Mr. Chairman, but
1113	
1114	Mr. Barton. I don't I don't need down to the exact -
1115	_
1116	Mr. Powelson. Okay. So let's start with probably the
1117	highest distribution rate in the country is at about 43 cents
1118	a kilowatt hour on the island of Hawaii.
1119	When we go more inland to the lowest cost of energy, I
1120	think the Republic of Texas, through retail competition,

1121	customers are paying less for power today than they were
1122	prior to electric restructuring.
1123	So Texas has low rates. The state of Florida, from my
1124	last anecdotal meeting with officials from their utility, a
1125	nine-cent kilowatt per kilowatt hour all in price. That's
1126	transmission, distribution, and generation.
1127	So you from Hawaii, we know, at 43 cents to your state,
1128	maybe Florida, at a low distribution of nine cents.
1129	Mr. Barton. Well, let's exclude Hawaii, since they're
1130	3,000 miles from the mainland. Is it is it fair to say in
1131	the lower 48 the price difference at retail the highest
1132	would be three times the lowest? Is that a fair
1133	generalization?
1134	I know I am close. The right answer would be to say
1135	yes, but if you disagree with me
1136	[Laughter.]
1137	Mr. Powelson. I don't want to get ahead of my chairman
1138	so
1139	Mr. Barton. I mean, it's at least two to one and I
1140	think if you look at California and compare California to
1141	Oregon, you're going to it's going to be close to three to
1142	one. Or if you compare Texas to New York, it's going to be

close to three to one.
Would you all agree with that?
Now, the reason I ask that question is because
ultimately what the committee and the Congress and the
president are responsible for is, for lack of a better term,
retail electricity prices that the average citizen can pay.
We also want it to be reliable, and we've developed a
mix of energy sources in this country. You know, some states
have regulated markets. Some states have deregulated
markets. Some states pretty much rely on coal. Some states
have a like Texas, we've got a mix of coal, natural gas,
wind, and some nuclear power and a little solar power.
But our nuclear plants and our coal plants are in
distress. And my second question is the distress primarily
caused by market forces, natural gas prices being very low,
or is it caused by regulatory constraints on the nuclear
industry and the coal industry?
Mr. McIntyre. Congressman, I will begin. Thank you for
the question.
Certainly, the low prices of natural gas today that we
experience in this country due in large measure to the
revolution in natural gas production methods make for

1165	significant head winds for coal and nuclear because it's
1166	very, very difficult for them to compete in our open and
1167	competitive wholesale markets against that cheap natural gas
1168	resource.
1169	As to the regulatory role, hard to say. Certainly,
1170	nuclear compliance and everything associated with the
1171	prospect of building a new nuclear generating facility today
1172	makes for enormous costs that probably has an all but
1173	prohibitive effect at short-term competition with natural gas
1174	prices.
1175	Mr. Barton. My time is about to expire.
1176	I asked the first question to bring to the attention of
1177	the commission and the committee that retail prices vary
1178	greatly in this country. The cost of generation of
1179	electricity varies, depending on the fuel source, and the
1180	regulatory burden, obviously, on nuclear is very high and you
1181	can argue that it's also very high on coal plants.
1182	If we look for solutions to keep our distressed nuclear
1183	plants and coal plants in service, we should first look at
1184	regulatory relief and only then look at market relief.
1185	When you start, in my opinion, to mess with the market,
1186	which some of these proposals do, in the long run it hurts

1187	the consumer because you either have to subsidize that price,
1188	which drives the retail price up, and eventually you can't
1189	you can't sustain it.
1190	So I respect my good friend at the Department of Energy,
1191	Governor Perry. But I don't think his proposed solution
1192	while it's well meaning, I personally don't think it would
1193	work in the long run.
1194	I would encourage the commission, to the extent you can,
1195	to look on the regulatory relief side, you know, before we
1196	begin to look at market the market solutions.
1197	And with that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.
1198	Mr. Upton. Gentleman yields back.
1199	Mr. Pallone.
1200	Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
1201	In my opening statement, I noted that I've long
1202	advocated for finding ways to introduce more distributed
1203	energy and energy storage into our electricity grid, and one
1204	of the reasons for that is that I see too many transmission
1205	projects needlessly rubber stamped in the name of
1206	reliability.
1207	There are certainly other ways to address reliability
1208	than just gold-plating the transmission system. But perhaps

1209 when you're a hammer everything looks like a nail. 1210 So today, newer and bigger transmission lines aren't 1211 always the answer to the question of reliability. 1212 Distributed energy resources, renewable and otherwise, along 1213 with efficiency and demand response should be equally large 1214 tools in the box and technology has dramatically transformed 1215 the possibilities for cost-effective generating and 1216 efficiently delivering electricity to homes, businesses, and 1217 manufacturing facilities from a variety of sources. 1218 So I want to commend the commission for recognizing this 1219 with its recent order regarding storage. With storage and 1220 distributed generation, both fossil and renewable base, along 1221 with improving storage options, smart meters, micro grids, 1222 and other technologies have altered the possibilities for 1223 effectively and economically ensuring reliability, and these 1224 technologies have also called into the question the most 1225 basic tenets of rate making and have challenged the 1226 longstanding financial model for utilities. 1227 Now, two years ago -- I want to talk about a local issue 1228 -- two years ago, First Energy JCP&L determined that its 1229 Monmouth County -- where I live -- that its Monmouth County 1230 reliability project is necessary to retain reliability for

1231 the entire regional transmission grid and specifically for 1232 New Jersey, and they proposed a 10-mile transmission line that would run through the district I represent along New 1233 1234 Jersey Transit's north Jersey coastline. 1235 Ever since JCP&L proposed this project, I've articulated 1236 concerns about whether constructing this Monmouth County 1237 reliability project is necessary to accomplish JCP&L's stated 1238 reliability goals. 1239 Recently, this view was echoed was New Jersey 1240 Administrative Law Judge Gail Cookson, who ruled that JCP&L 1241 failed to demonstrate that the transmission line is necessary 1242 and noted that JCP&L has not seriously considered alternative 1243 corridors and ignored non-transmission solutions entirely. 1244 In the past, building a new transmission line may have 1245 been the only way to increase reliability. However, now 1246 there clearly are other options available. Other options 1247 include distributing -- distributed generation storage, 1248 various new grid technologies. 1249 They can only -- not only increase reliability but also 1250 modernize the grid. So this -- Judge Cookson's decision 1251 which, you know, I will send to you, but I am going to, you 1252 know, probably get back to you further, if that's okay, on

1253	this but her decision supports my long-held suspicion that
1254	often projects like this Monmouth County reliability project
1255	are more about the rate of return for shareholders than
1256	reliability for consumers.
1257	So my question to all of you is whoever wants to ask
1258	it how can you change this dynamic to ensure that
1259	utilities look at more than just new transmission lines
1260	that they look at non-transmission alternatives to ensure
1261	reliability?
1262	And how can we change incentives so that these non-
1263	transmission alternatives are still financially attractive to
1264	utilities? Can anybody, you know, take a guess?
1265	Sure.
1266	Mr. Powelson. Congressman Pallone, your home state,
1267	working with your state BPU and we are seeing it across
1268	other states like New York with their reinventing the energy
1269	vision in Ohio, their Power Four docket, is to address
1270	exactly your point, getting at these non-wire solutions that
1271	we are seeing now with customer greater customer
1272	engagement behind the meter.
1273	Your state is a leader in that because of the lessons
1274	learned in the post-Hurricane Sandy where a grid resiliency

bank has been launched under the BPU's leadership a lot of
microgrid investment in your home state.
And these are all good outcomes. It goes back to my
earlier point of this evolving grid. We are not building
1,200 megawatt cathedrals anymore. We are doing things
behind the meter and, yes, in front of the meter cleaner,
more efficient.
Mr. Pallone. Can PERC I mean, can FERC play a role
in this, though, because, you know, everybody says oh, it's -
- where's the federal government
Mr. Powelson. Well, to the wholesale piece, and this is
just my quick observation, we are finding in certain
jurisdictions where, one, there is a lack in the post-FERC
Order 1000 world of not really seeing competitive
transmission being built, and that's a PJM problem.
The other thing is addressing cost caps associated with
these projects. I have a concern when industrial customers
come in to the commission as energy users telling us that
they're seeing a 400 percent increase in transmission costs
as wholesale prices are dropping.
That's alarming. That tells me that the RTOs at the
wholesale level of transmission planning are not doing a very

good job with cost containment, and we are all paying for

1298	that as consumers.
1299	So these are the things that I plan to work on with my
1300	colleagues, and I know Commission LaFleur wants to jump in on
1301	that.
1302	Ms. LaFleur. Well, just adding to that, first of all,
1303	legally the transmission planning tariffs that First Energy
1304	and others live within require consideration of non-
1305	transmission alternatives. That is what's legally is
1306	supposed to happen.
1307	I think the problem is sometimes that it's more
1308	difficult to see the company making money from some of the
1309	non-transmissional alternatives.
1310	That's where things like our storage rule comes in to
1311	make sure that those things are fairly paid for, and also the
1312	work I was in New Jersey on Friday at an all-day meeting
1313	on New Jersey's energy future and the work that's being done
1314	at the state level to make sure those technologies are
1315	rewarded so that everyone has an incentive to install them
1316	like the wonderful work you have done on solar already, where
1317	New Jersey's a leader.
1318	I also think that the we've done a lot of work on the

1297

1319	planning processes to make sure that a company can't just go
1320	off and plan something. There has to be an open process.
1321	We issued an order last month about supplemental
1322	transmission projects in PJM requiring more sunlight in the
1323	planning to make sure that all the alternatives were
1324	considered including by consumer reps and state
1325	representatives and others, and those are some of the kind of
1326	detailed things we can do to make sure that the process
1327	doesn't ineluctably force in a certain direction.
1328	Mr. Pallone. Mr. Chairman, if I could I don't know
1329	if we are out of time but I would like to be able to get back
1330	them further on this, with your permission.
1331	Mr. Upton. Yes, absolutely. Absolutely.
1332	Mr. Pallone. All right. Thank you.
1333	Mr. Upton. Perhaps I know written questions and
1334	written answers.
1335	Mr. Pallone. Yes.
1336	Mr. Upton. Is that all right? Is that okay? Great.
1337	Thank you.
1338	Mr. Pallone. Yes.
1339	Mr. Upton. Mr. Olson.
1340	Mr. Olson. I thank the chair and welcome to our friends

1341	at FERC.
1342	I want to discuss pipelines and the MLPs that many
1343	companies use to finance getting steel in the ground. None
1344	of the things we talked about today, whether it's gas
1345	turbines or exports of liquefied natural gas, can happen
1346	without pipelines.
1347	And this is not the Ways and Means Committee and nor do
1348	I ever want to be a tax litigator or a tax legislative
1349	person. But I've heard from a number of Houston area
1350	companies that are worried by the changes that FERC did of
1351	whether pipelines can recover their costs under MLP
1352	structures.
1353	Companies like Ambridge Ambridge, who has merged with
1354	Spectra, said, I quote, "They intend to ask for rehearing of
1355	this policy change at FERC," end quote.
1356	Their argument is that FERC made this move without a
1357	long enough time for debate and you all didn't take into
1358	account that not all MLPs are created equal.
1359	Chairman McIntyre, welcome. You talked about this
1360	ruling. Do you think your approach was appropriate?
1361	Mr. McIntyre. Yes, Congressman. Happy to address that.
1362	The ruling you referenced is actually it was a series

1363	of steps we took in response to a court of appeals case
1364	called SFPP and we had before us fairly clear direction from
1365	the court of appeals to address the so-called double recovery
1366	issue of taxation.
1367	We felt we had no choice but to take decisive action in
1368	a manner that we read as being directed by the court. It
1369	doesn't surprise me that a number of companies out there
1370	affected adversely monetarily by that would have a quarrel
1371	with it and they're not bashful in sharing their views with
1372	us on that, I assure you.
1373	Mr. Olson. Their texts aren't bashful at all.
1374	Mr. McIntyre. Perfectly legitimate. It is their right,
1375	under their governing statutes, to seek rehearing where they
1376	are aggrieved by an order of ours. And so we would look
1377	forward to processing those in accordance with our law and
1378	procedures.
1379	Mr. Olson. Thank you.
1380	And Commissioner Chatterjee, putting your House thinking
1381	hat on, any thoughts about this situation with the MLPs and
1382	the changed law?
1383	Mr. Chatterjee. Yes, sir. I agree substantively that
1384	the chairman is correct that our hands were tied by the

1385	courts.
1386	Coming from the legislative branch, you know, we focus a
1387	lot on process and I think look, I am new to the
1388	commission. Four of the five of us are new to the
1389	commission.
1390	I am not afraid to say that, you know, we are all still
1391	learning and progressing, and procedurally I do now
1392	recognize, in looking back, that perhaps there were some
1393	things that we could have done differently.
1394	For instance, voting during the market day was perhaps
1395	unfortunate. I think we incorrectly assumed, once we posted
1396	our Sunshine Act notice, that that was enough of a sort of
1397	disclaimer that this was coming and that the markets would
1398	factor that in.
1399	Clearly, that was a misread. I am sympathetic to the
1400	argument that beyond an NOI process that took place a couple
1401	you know, in the past, maybe a technical conference, some
1402	more process, you know, could have been necessary.
1403	And so I am always learning and trying to do my job
1404	better and will try and learn from this experience as well,
1405	going forward.
1406	Mr. Olson. Thank you. That's the man of the house.

1407	My final question is you all know I am not shy about
1408	supporting LNG exports. In fact, I was in India two weeks
1409	ago. I left there being they called me the congressman
1410	for LNG exports from America.
1411	I spoke to Secretary Perry last week about how important
1412	these exports are to Texas, our country, and our world.
1413	Despite that, I've heard some concerns back home that
1414	you are slipping behind schedules of some very viable Gulf
1415	Coast LNG projects.
1416	I've heard rumors that FERC had only six to eight
1417	employees targeted with approving these booming permits.
1418	I've heard you actually approached the DOE for new members to
1419	help out with the backlog of approving LNG permits.
1420	To the whole panel or the chairman, is that true? How
1421	can we help you get these things rolling as quickly as
1422	possible?
1423	Mr. McIntyre. Thank you for the question, Congressman.
1424	We are paying very close attention to the pending
1425	applications, not only for LNG export infrastructure but also
1426	for natural gas pipeline infrastructure.
1427	It's consuming an enormous amount of attention and
1428	manpower within the agency. We are looking to beef up the

1429	ranks of our Office of Energy Projects and we are actively
1430	pursuing hiring in that regard right now.
1431	But if there's any suggestion that we are somehow not
1432	giving it our full effort right now, I can assure you that
1433	that that is not the case at all.
1434	It's consuming a huge amount of attention and effort in
1435	Energy right now.
1436	Mr. Olson. Thank you.
1437	Mr. Powelson, a quick question. Can you say you all?
1438	Mr. Powelson. You all.
1439	Mr. Olson. Very good. Welcome to Texas.
1440	Mr. Upton. The gentleman's time has expired.
1441	The gentleman from California, Mr. McNerney.
1442	Mr. McNerney. I thank the chair and I thank the
1443	commission, and your opening statements were interesting and
1444	useful. It's good to see a body working together like this
1445	and I appreciate that.
1446	Last year, we narrowly dodged the bullet at the Oroville
1447	Dam when a section of the emergency spillway collapsed.
1448	Evacuation of over 100,000 people was ordered and there was
1449	considerable damage to the dam, associated structures, the
1450	river, and many downstream communities.

1451	In January of this year, a FERC-required independent
1452	forensic team issued their report on the Oroville incident
1453	and the report is not flattering at all to the agencies
1454	responsible for the dam safety.
1455	So I will read you a summary of the report. Although
1456	the practice of dam safety has certainly improved since the
1457	1970s, the fact that this incident happened to the owner of
1458	the tallest dam in the United States under regulation of a
1459	federal agency with repeated evaluation by reputed outside
1460	consultants in a state with leading dam safety regulatory
1461	program is a wake-up call for everyone involved in dam
1462	safety.
1463	Challenging current assumptions on what constitutes best
1464	practice in our industry is overdue. So that's the quotation
1465	from the report.
1466	So this calls into question the adequacy of the FERC
1467	Part 12(d) regulatory for ensuring comprehensive reviews of
1468	dam designs and construction.
1469	Mr. Chairman, is the commission planning to revise Part
1470	12(d) regulations to improve the inspection process?
1471	Mr. McIntyre. Thank you for the question, Congressman.
1472	We don't have a specific plan to address the 12(d)

1473	regulation process right now. I certainly acknowledge the
1474	importance of the issues you raise and, in fact, it wasn't
1475	only the emergency spillway but, indeed, the main spillway
1476	that was very much called into question the integrity of
1477	that.
1478	Our office of energy projects is working, literally,
1479	daily hand in hand with the appropriate California
1480	authorities to ensure that the remediation process is
1481	completed in an appropriate fashion so there's complete
1482	safety all around.
1483	And my understanding, based on conversations as recently
1484	as yesterday, is that that is that that is from our
1485	perspective going very well and that all involved on the
1486	Oroville end are doing their job very well.
1487	Mr. McNerney. Okay. Is the commission reconsidering
1488	its policies with respect to the ways in which information is
1489	submitted by participants to the license process that
1490	specifically deal with questions of safety? Will that be
1491	evaluated?
1492	Mr. McIntyre. Yes. I can tell you that that will be a
1493	matter of internal deliberation and whether that proceeds to
1494	any formal commission action is something that I can't say

1495	right now.
1496	I do know my colleague, Commissioner LaFleur, may want
1497	to chime in here.
1498	Ms. LaFleur. Well, I was at the commission and
1499	chairman when Oroville happened and spent some time out at
1500	the dam and it was really an extraordinary event. We were
1501	very fortunate not to have had loss of life when the spillway
1502	ruptured.
1503	We really have been responding on three levels and the
1504	first is the actual facility itself, closely working with the
1505	Division of Water Resources and the California agencies.
1506	We've had people on site ever since that happened, 24/7,
1507	for several months to make sure they do what they need to do
1508	over a two-year period to correct that and, of course, the
1509	relicensing is pending as well, which we can't talk about,
1510	but that these issues are being brought in there.
1511	Secondly, looking at other spillways of common
1512	construction in California, there were several and elsewhere
1513	to make sure they're all closely inspected and we directly
1514	learned the lessons of the forensics panel that you
1515	mentioned.
1516	And third is our own safety program, and in addition to

1517	the forensics panel that you mentioned, we also set up a team
1518	of outside people to look at how we do our inspections and we
1519	are waiting for their report and we'll be taking action, just
1520	as you suggested.
1521	Mr. McNerney. Okay.
1522	To change gears a little bit here, we are experiencing
1523	more extreme weather events. What steps is FERC taking to
1524	ensure the resiliency of the grid?
1525	Again, Mr. Chairman.
1526	Mr. McIntyre. Well, we are in the process of doing the
1527	comment intake I referenced earlier on our grid resilience
1528	proceeding.
1529	The recent extreme weather events have been instructive
1530	in this regard and it's varied by region. But, certainly,
1531	just to pick a region, in New England it's particularly
1532	challenging this bomb cyclone event over the passage of
1533	last year into this year where increasing amounts of oil-
1534	generating resources, oil-fired generating resources were
1535	needed to be called upon in order to ensure the electricity
1536	needs of that region, triggering, of course, not only
1537	environmental concerns but significant cost increases.
1538	So these weather events are directly tied to our

1539	statutory obligation to ensure that the rates are just and
1540	reasonable and also directly tied to our need to ensure
1541	reliability of our bulk power system.
1542	Mr. McNerney. Thank you.
1543	Mr. Chairman, I yield back.
1544	Mr. Upton. Gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Shimkus.
1545	Mr. Shimkus. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
1546	It's great to all you all here today. Thank you for
1547	coming, and you have got a big portfolio of things that you
1548	deal with. I am going to stay on the electricity side.
1549	But I just want to mention that New England, the
1550	Northeast, needs more natural gas pipelines. Just you
1551	know, especially with home heating oil and stuff like that,
1552	we just got to that's why you're in power to help resolve
1553	the difficulties of crossing state lines and siting and that
1554	stuff because it just just needs to happen.
1555	Let me move to the obviously part of your mission
1556	statement is regulates the transmission and wholesale sales
1557	of electricity and interstate commerce.
1558	So the first one is, hopefully to you all, is with the
1559	states intervening to some extent in wholesale market support
1560	generation, how are you handling that?

1561	I mean, what that kind of addresses a couple things -
1562	- reliability possibly. If you're trying to ensure low-cost
1563	reasonable prices in the wholesale sector, they the two
1564	issues kind of conflict, do they not?
1565	And if relatively quickly, because I want to go down
1566	on a couple other questions.
1567	Mr. McIntyre. Well, you have gone directly to one of
1568	the trickiest areas that we deal with, Congressman. The
1569	states have their valid role in making policy choices as to
1570	energy resources that are preferred by the state and they
1571	reflect that through their legal decision making.
1572	We have an obligation at the FERC level to ensure that
1573	the electricity generated by those resources that makes its
1574	way onto our grid is sold at rates that are just and
1575	reasonable.
1576	The costs behind that generation are affected by the
1577	resource policy choices. So we have to be respectful of the
1578	states' roles while ensuring that we do our federal role
1579	right of ensuring just and reasonable rates.
1580	Mr. Shimkus. So does everyone, quickly, agree with that
1581	analysis?
1582	Mr. Glick. Mr. Shimkus, if I could just butt in here

1583	for a second.
1584	I think that it's true that we actually have to a
1585	balancing. But the Federal Power Act gave the states the
1586	authority over resource decision making, not the
1587	generation resource decision making, not the FERC.
1588	And so I think it's up to the commission within our
1589	responsibilities to ensure that rates are just and reasonable
1590	wholesale rates are just and reasonable, and also that the
1591	markets are reliable to accommodate those state policies, not
1592	to override those state policies, and I think that's an
1593	important objective important objective for us.
1594	Mr. Shimkus. Go ahead. Chime in.
1595	Mr. Chatterjee. I support states' rights.
1596	Mr. Shimkus. I testified to that, I think.
1597	[Laughter.]
1598	Mr. Powelson. I come from a market state, now
1599	recognizing those regional differences in these markets, as
1600	Commissioner LaFleur mentioned. Some markets have capacity.
1601	Some are energy only.
1602	But I am having an epiphany now as a new FERC
1603	commissioner. States are, clearly, to my colleagues' point,
1604	are allowed to design things like renewable portfolio

1605	standards.
1606	But what's happening, Congressman, is we are creating
1607	we are bastardizing these markets in such a way where the
1608	states are picking winners and losers.
1609	They're allowed to do that. But now it's coming at the
1610	consequences of the capacity market construct. And let me
1611	just say, Secretary Perry was right. That these
1612	constructs are bastardizing these markets and the
1613	availability of generators to receive adequate compensation
1614	for that resource.
1615	And so I might be Debbie Downer here in my approach, but
1616	it is a concern that we have to be cognizant of to the point
1617	of giving states flexibility I will say within reason of
1618	Federal Power Act.
1619	Mr. Shimkus. Okay. Let me throw another one and I
1620	sorry to not go to Commissioner LaFleur, but RTOs and ISOs
1621	are struggling to find consensus to drive the needed
1622	investments that we say they all need. What can you all do
1623	about that?
1624	So if we need I've been in this on the committee for
1625	a long time. So I understand when we had regulated markets
1626	and we went to competition and now we are schizophrenic

1627	some regulated, some competition transmission going across
1628	state lines.
1629	I think we need to continue for reliability is to make
1630	sure that we have needed pathways. But we are being told we
1631	can't fund them.
1632	Do you have a role? Is there something you can do to
1633	help in the process of the build out?
1634	Mr. McIntyre. In terms of transmission?
1635	Mr. Shimkus. Yes.
1636	Mr. McIntyre. Yes. Well, Commissioner LaFleur
1637	mentioned the importance of attention to our transmission
1638	planning processes.
1639	I think that's something that is ripe for evaluation as
1640	to whether it's working as well as it should, as well as was
1641	hoped for when we issued our landmark Order 1000.
1642	I think it's a valid question that does indeed cry out
1643	for attention.
1644	Mr. Shimkus. Okay. If anyone wants to jump in.
1645	My time has expired, but go ahead.
1646	Mr. Glick. I would just add quickly, you know, as you
1647	know, as you worked on this in 2005 Energy Policy Act, it
1648	added a provision that provided incentives or allowed FERC to

provide incentives to provide incentives for transmission.

1049	provide incentives to provide incentives for transmission.
1650	And I think it's a good time maybe now to revisit that
1651	policy and are we really incentivizing what we need to do
1652	are we incentivizing the right investments and are we
1653	incentivizing the actual investments that are needed.
1654	And so I would I would that's what I would look at
1655	first is the incentives for transmission.
1656	Mr. Shimkus. Yes. My time has expired. I would just
1657	say if we ever move on infrastructure, expansion of the
1658	transmission grid might be a good thing to put an
1659	infrastructure package to.
1660	I yield back. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
1661	Mr. Upton. Mr. Green.
1662	Mr. Green. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and since our
1663	commissioner talked about the Republic of Texas, being a
1664	Texan and I have the Houston area, and if you look at your
1665	maps on pipelines you don't see anything. It might be white
1666	in outer parts of the country but in my area in southeast
1667	Texas, pipelines are the way we move product, and crude oil
1668	will come in or natural gas to come to in to make chemicals
1669	out of it.
1670	Texas was an independent nation for 10 years and some of

1649

1671	us still think we should be. But we lost that battle in
1672	1865, too.
1673	But we got a pretty good deal in Texas. We the
1674	federal government in 1845 paid off our \$10 million of state
1675	debt and we got to keep our state lands. And so that's why
1676	some of our Western states friends have problems. But we
1677	kept those lands and the federal government didn't get them.
1678	But we are in the middle of a revolution almost, I
1679	guess, in generation, and our subcommittee has held a number
1680	of hearings about looking at how other markets do.
1681	And one of the things I want to say is that Texas, a
1682	decade ago, produced 492,000 megawatts of wind power. This
1683	last year, Texas produced 58 million megawatts of hours a
1684	year.
1685	And so we are benefiting from the wind power. In fact,
1686	there are certain days that wind power actually is producing
1687	more electricity than coal in Texas. Of course, we also
1688	benefit from the regional price of natural gas. It's in our
1689	back yard.
1690	One of my concerns, and we've heard the talk of
1691	resiliency, and I disagree with Secretary Perry, even though
1692	I served in the legislature with him many years ago, and he -

1693	- Texas went the route we have when he was governor for so
1694	many years.
1695	But many supporters of the proposed subsidies have said
1696	that we are on the brink of resiliency crisis.
1697	Chairman McIntyre, can you elaborate on the commission's
1698	views about the state of resiliency in the grid and do we
1699	face an immediate crisis due to future closing of coal and
1700	nuclear plants?
1701	Mr. McIntyre. Resilience is now a matter of declared
1702	priority for the FERC, and we are proceeding in that fashion.
1703	We are assembling the record that I referenced earlier.
1704	We've heard already from our nation's operators of
1705	regional transmission organizations and independent system
1706	operators their perspectives and we are awaiting further
1707	input from stakeholders on it.
1708	It's a critical issue, and there are different ways of
1709	looking at it. One is operational in terms of is there
1710	equipment or are there facilities that would be needed to
1711	help shore up the resilience of the grid.
1712	The other is economic and, in effect, a market a need
1713	to ensure that our markets are properly compensating the
1714	resources that we regard as important to ensure resilience of

1715	our grid.
1716	So we are looking very hard at those issues now. We'll
1717	continue to examine the materials submitted to us in the
1718	record and in the hope of getting this right.
1719	Mr. Green. And you're looking at alternatives too,
1720	because I know the same problem we get about 20 percent of
1721	our electricity in Texas from nuclear power. We couldn't
1722	expand it because the investment is not available now.
1723	And so there are other ways and, of course, from Texas,
1724	as my colleague from Fort Bend County would say, we'd be glad
1725	to put another pipeline up to the northeast to send them some
1726	more natural gas or export it around the coast for them.
1727	My colleague, Pete Olson, mentioned my next question
1728	is on the concern about United Airlines Inc. versus FERC, and
1729	I apologize I haven't read that case.
1730	But I always view that mastered limited partnerships,
1731	it's been so successful in capitalizing pipelines,
1732	particularly, it's almost like a Chapter S corporation.
1733	You pass through that so it's not corporate double
1734	taxation, and but that would if we cannot use that as
1735	an investment instrument I don't know how we are going to
1736	continue the expansion of growth that I think FERC

1737	recognizes we need more pipelines to get product to the
1738	market where so we won't have a resiliency problem.
1739	Mr. Chairman, I realize FERC's public policy as
1740	precipitated by the D.C. Circuit Court's opinion, I would
1741	like to know if FERC has conducted its own analysis of
1742	whether or not double recovery existed before the decision.
1743	Has FERC thought there was a problem at the policy prior
1744	to the United case.
1745	Mr. McIntyre. That's a matter that was in effect handed
1746	to us by the court so we had no choice really as a regulatory
1747	agency but to take it at face value and to act upon it.
1748	We had no independent analysis of the double recovery
1749	issue as is customary under the statutes that govern our
1750	actions.
1751	We act in accordance with the arguments that are put
1752	forward for us by the litigants, in most instances, and this
1753	was such a situation.
1754	Mr. Green. I thought the court directed the FERC to
1755	consider how it could demonstrate there was no double
1756	recovery. Is FERC looking at that particular issue to be
1757	able to answer whatever the circuit court said?
1758	Mr. McIntyre. Well, here too, back to legal processes,

1759	I suspect that we will have no choice but to look closely at
1760	that issue in light of further procedural steps that the
1761	parties will have a right to invoke, such as request for
1762	rehearing.
1763	Mr. Green. Okay. Mr. Chairman, thank you, and I know
1764	the jurisdiction of that typically is in Ways and Means. But
1765	since it deals with FERC we have some jurisdiction in our own
1766	committee.
1767	So we might look at that to make sure we don't eliminate
1768	this ability for investment in the pipelines that the whole
1769	country needs, and I will yield back my time.
1770	Thank you.
1771	Mr. Upton. Thank you.
1772	Gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Latta.
1773	Mr. Latta. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and
1774	thanks to the commissioners for being with us today. Really
1775	appreciate it and hearing your views.
1776	Commissioner Powelson, if I could start my questions
1777	with you. As you point out in your testimony, under the
1778	Energy Policy Act of 2005, FERC was given the authority to
1779	oversee the reliability of the bulk power system.

1781	cybersecurity reliability standards and first during the
1782	first half of 2018 we have seen new stories about hackers
1783	working to undermine the safety and security of our nation's
1784	energy infrastructure including cyberattacks launched by
1785	Russian agents against the power grid energy, nuclear, and
1786	commercial facilities and critical manufacturing sectors.
1787	Would you go into more detail about what FERC is doing
1788	to address these attacks and how will you work with the North
1789	American Electric Reliability Corporation to reassess and, if
1790	necessary, revise the reliability standards?
1791	Mr. Powelson. Thank you, Congressman, for your
1792	question.
1793	First and foremost, these reliability standards, which
1794	apply to users, owners, and operators of the bulk power
1795	system, were developed, as you mentioned, by NERC, and I
1796	think we continue to collaborate with other federal agencies
1797	in those compliance measures.
1798	You also have on top of that the critical infrastructure
1799	protocols, or CIP standards, and I mentioned earlier in my
1800	testimony the collaborative effort with NERC and working with
1801	the ISACs and the collaborative effort around the utilities,
1802	the gas industry, and the other impacted entities, working in

1803	collaboration together.
1804	Some have reported back they think these some of
1805	these reporting requirements are a little onerous. I would
1806	refrain from saying that because, again, we can't really cut
1807	corners on cybersecurity.
1808	We've got to give you all peace of mind that we are
1809	protecting and applying the needed resources to protect the
1810	bulk power system. And as I mentioned earlier, these threat
1811	vectors are changing radically, daily, and it's important
1812	that we continue to work with the other agents. That's why I
1813	gave a nice shout out this morning to Secretary Perry and the
1814	leadership that DOE has shown on this issue with the
1815	launching of their new Office of Cybersecurity.
1816	Mr. Latta. And we appreciate it. When the secretary
1817	was here when he gave his testimony, let me just follow up,
1818	because to address the threat of cyberattacks to our energy
1819	grid, I am working with my colleague, Representative
1820	McNerney, introducing two bipartisan pieces of legislation.
1821	These bills, H.R. 5239, the Cyber Sense Act, and H.R.
1822	5240, the Enhancing Grid Security Through Public-Private
1823	Partnership Act, was the subject of a legislative hearing in
1824	the subcommittee last month.

1825	Under H.R. 5239, the secretary of energy would be
1826	directed to establish a voluntary cyber sense program to test
1827	cyber secure products intended for use in the bulk power
1828	system.
1829	The secretary would then maintain a database on these
1830	products and the technologies and provide technical advice to
1831	energy stakeholders to develop solutions to mitigate
1832	identified Cybersecurity vulnerabilities.
1833	You mentioned in your testimony that FERC has worked
1834	closely with DOE to maintain an awareness of emerging cyber
1835	threats.
1836	Do you think this policy would help improve the safety
1837	and security of our energy infrastructure and would help
1838	address these threats?
1839	Mr. Powelson. Congressman, I think it is a wonderful
1840	effort that we any type of legislative construct that
1841	recognizes, one, collaboration in the cyberspace; two,
1842	adequate capacity building even in even at the state
1843	level.
1844	So I can just at first glance tell you I would be very
1845	supportive of a bipartisan bill to give those resources to
1846	DOE.

1847	Working with the FERC, as Chairman McIntyre mentioned,
1848	we do have a strong collaborative effort in place with TSA,
1849	FMSA, DOT, Homeland Security, and I think this is another
1850	example of how we can build on those capacities.
1851	Mr. Latta. Thank you.
1852	Chairman McIntyre, I've long believed in an all of the
1853	above energy policy. Our nation has vast energy resources
1854	that need to be utilized and we should be doing everything we
1855	can to make sure that our energy industries grow.
1856	By doing this, we can make sure that we are truly energy
1857	independent. Mr. Chairman, do you believe that it is of
1858	vital importance to our national security that we continue to
1859	maintain a diverse portfolio of energy sources for
1860	electricity generation?
1861	Mr. McIntyre. Very much so, Congressman.
1862	I, too, express my view in the same terms. All of the
1863	above is the appropriate approach to how we should satisfy
1864	our electricity needs as a nation.
1865	All different types of electrical generating resources
1866	and other resources indeed storage, distributed energy
1867	resources, and the like.
1868	Where this will be tested is in the very tricky area

1869	that a number of us have addressed here today the
1870	interplay between state resource choices and our federal role
1871	of ensuring that our markets operate properly.
1872	If we really do mean that we are committed to an all of
1873	the above resource policy, can we be content to see a
1874	category resources go away and exit the scene?
1875	Very, very tricky public policy question that we are
1876	grappling with as we proceed with our grid resilience work.
1877	Mr. Latta. Well, thank you very much.
1878	Mr. Chairman, my time is expired and I yield back.
1879	Mr. Upton. Mr. Doyle.
1880	Mr. Doyle. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
1881	Good morning and thank you all for appearing before us
1882	today. Many of us are running between two hearings
1883	simultaneously. So I apologize that I wasn't here to hear
1884	your testimony.
1885	Commissioner Powelson, as a fellow Pennsylvanian, I am
1886	going to pick on you first. At your confirmation hearing
1887	last year you said, what I learned from my experience in
1888	NARUC is that what works in Pennsylvania might not work in
1889	other jurisdictions, and you highlighted the proud
1890	appreciation that we all have for individual states' rights

1891	in supporting our state energy policies.
1892	However, I also read that you may have some reservations
1893	explaining that state interventions come with consequences to
1894	reliability and I can't argue with Secretary Perry's point
1895	that these markets aren't pure but the policies all sound
1896	good and I respect that.
1897	But the reality is the policies aren't synchronizing
1898	with the system and therein lies a significant challenge.
1899	Your testimony highlights an inherent tension the
1900	oversight role of FERC with the independence of the states.
1901	And I know my good friend, Representative Shimkus, asked
1902	for some additional clarification here. But I wasn't present
1903	for that.
1904	So I understand you said you felt the commission should
1905	respect states' rights within reason. Do you think FERC
1906	oversight or potential intervention will or should be applied
1907	on a case by case basis? Do you think that Congress ought to
1908	provide additional clarity here also?
1909	Mr. Powelson. Congressman Doyle, I will start well,
1910	I think the FERC is well equipped, if you look at some cases
1911	that we've had over the last decade Talen Energy v. Hughes
1912	in Maryland, Talen Energy v. Solomon in New Jersey recent

1913	constructs of addressing in the post-Polar Vortex, we had an
1914	issue in PJM with a 24 percent forced outage rate. We dealt
1915	with capacity performance.
1916	So I think the markets and the work that the FERC does,
1917	we have the tools to address these issues. When you say case
1918	by case basis, if I look over those cases where we had to
1919	send a loud and clear message to the state of New Jersey and
1920	the state of Maryland on capacity resources being subsidized
1921	in the market and, by the way, it would have had with
1922	generation in Pennsylvania, we the FERC, in terms of a
1923	rule of law, did its job and the court recognized that.
1924	I have said it earlier. I am very proud of my
1925	Pennsylvania experience. Pennsylvania has a very successful
1926	renewable portfolio standard led under Governor Rendell and
1927	former DEP Secretary Katie McGinty.
1928	Let me give you, as a former state senator, what
1929	happened. In that construct, we looked at picking the
1930	state picked really 13 categories of what qualifies for a
1931	renewable portfolio standard.
1932	Well, guess what? Back then I remember there were
1933	pushes to get nuclear as part of that RPS. It was outright
1934	rejected.

1935 So here we are today is we are having conversations. 1936 That state construct in Pennsylvania, as an example, did not 1937 recognize the value of nuclear power. And if the state wants to go down that path, we are 1938 1939 seeing it more recently this past week in New Jersey, they're more than willing to do so. 1940 1941 My drawing the line in the sand is how it impacts the 1942 wholesale power markets. And once we surrender that flag it's -- you know it's -- we are out of business. We've got 1943 1944 to protect the sanctity of those organized markets. 1945 So I recognize that as a Pennsylvanian but I also recognize in my new role that oversight of those highly 1946 functioning well organized markets. 1947 Mr. Doyle. And many Pennsylvanians, including myself, 1948 1949 are strong supporters of nuclear power. It both satisfies 1950 reliability issues and it's also carbon free, and I think 1951 there should be alarm bells going across the country as we 1952 see how many of these plants may not go through relicensing 1953 and they're going to be replaced mostly for baseload capacity 1954 with -- whether it's natural case or something else that 1955 emits greenhouse gases and it makes it almost impossible for

us to meet our climate change goals.

1956

1957	Commissioner LaFleur, I want to quote from your
1958	statement regarding the NOPR because I think it's exceptional
1959	in describing the current situation we face.
1960	The commission and this is your quote, "The
1961	commission should continue to focus on its efforts not on
1962	slowing transition from the past but on easing the transition
1963	to the future.
1964	We must continue to guide grid operators in sustaining
1965	reliability and resilience within a system that is likely to
1966	be more cleaner, more dynamic and, in some instances, more
1967	distributed, and deployed by an efficient market for the
1968	benefit of customers."
1969	I am amazed by the technological developments we've
1970	witnessed in the energy sector. The pace has gone from a
1971	walk to a jog to a sprint.
1972	And looking into the next decade or two decades from
1973	now, how do you think the regulatory bodies or agencies need
1974	to change to better reflect and adapt to these changes and
1975	what can we do here at our committee to facilitate those
1976	changes?
1977	Ms. LaFleur. Well, thank you for the question and for
1978	the compliment.

1979	I think one of the points of stress in the future is
1980	going to be the line between federal and state, not because
1981	of any overweening ambition on the part of this commission or
1982	the federal government but because we are seeing more
1983	distributed resources, even behind the customer meter,
1984	collectively behaving just like a central station resource.
1985	And sometimes even more resilient because of the ability
1986	to modularize them if there's any kind of a weather event or
1987	an attack.
1988	So I think that we as has been mentioned, we had a
1989	two-day tech conference last week. But I think figuring out
1990	how we best deploy those resources for the future is where we
1991	are the where the public policy people, like everyone in
1992	this room have to be working now because the technology is
1993	coming so quickly.
1994	Mr. Doyle. Thank you.
1995	Mr. Chairman, thank you very much.
1996	Mr. Upton. Mr. Harper.
1997	Mr. Harper. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
1998	Thanks to each of you for being here and for the
1999	dedicated job that you're doing on important issue.
2000	Maybe as a follow up to Mr. Doyle's questions, Mr.

2001	Chairman, if I could ask you, traditionally the regulation of
2002	DERs had been the jurisdiction of states and localities.
2003	However, with the issuance of Order No. 841 and its
2004	proposal for the aggregation of DERs for the purpose of
2005	participating in wholesale electricity markets, FERC could
2006	expand its authority at the expense of states and localities.
2007	So my question would be was how will you deal with any
2008	jurisdictional challenges that may come about?
2009	Mr. McIntyre. Thank you for the question, Congressman.
2010	There are a couple of different things going on here.
2011	One is electricity storage resources and then, separately
2012	from that, distributed energy generating resources.
2013	As to each category, honestly, I am not particularly
2014	troubled by any sort of jurisdictional creep because that
2015	power would make its way onto our grid in a way that we could
2016	regulate it only after it had been aggregated and put forth
2017	to a market that we regulated a wholesale electricity
2018	market.
2019	And there certainly is no attempt on the part of this
2020	commission to in any way thwart the ability of the state, for
2021	example, to determine in a retail level transaction what the
2022	owner of the generating resource would be what level that

2023	owner would be compensated.
2024	And so, honestly, I don't see that as being a
2025	particularly great concern.
2026	Mr. Harper. Well, thank you for that answer.
2027	And Mr. Chairman, if I may ask you, you know, certainly,
2028	as you know, we talk about energy infrastructure. It's a
2029	very capital intensive venture, and Wall Street investors
2030	require a very high degree of regulatory certainty and sound
2031	rate making policies before committing capital.
2032	Does FERC currently have a methodology in place to set
2033	transmission ROEs?
2034	Mr. McIntyre. Yes, we do, sir, longstanding.
2035	Mr. Harper. Okay. Longstanding. And how many
2036	complaints are currently pending regarding transmission ROEs?
2037	Mr. McIntyre. We have a number of them pending.
2038	Mr. Harper. A ballpark. You said a number.
2039	Mr. McIntyre. A dozen or so.
2040	Mr. Harper. Okay. So what is the timetable for
2041	resolving those complaints that you just mentioned?
2042	Mr. McIntyre. Those matters are actively being worked
2043	upon within our agency right now. They are not subject to a
2044	specific timetable. They are something are we are paying

2045	attention to.
2046	Our most important job, obviously, is to get it right.
2047	Mr. Harper. Obviously, and we want you to do that.
2048	That's good.
2049	Under EPACT 2005, FERC developed a policy, and that's in
2050	Order 679, I believe, which provides for incentive rate
2051	treatment to encourage the development of transmission line
2052	infrastructure.
2053	While this policy had been in effect since 2006, can you
2054	elaborate on the status of this incentive policy now?
2055	Mr. McIntyre. It's something that Commissioner Glick
2056	mentioned as in his view as something that probably is
2057	ripe for some fresh attention.
2058	In a general sense, I would agree with that.
2059	Mr. Harper. Commissioner Glick, do you care to comment?
2060	Mr. Glick. Thanks, Mr. Harper.
2061	I you were exactly right. So in 2005 Congress did
2062	provide FERC the authority to provide incentive rate making
2063	and the commission did have an incentive rate making policy
2064	and there was a believe that the commission was going too far
2065	in providing incentives for too many activities.
2066	So the commission subsequently issued an new policy

2067	statement that somewhat retransformed that particular policy
2068	and I think that the criticism may be that the commission may
2069	have gone too far in the other direction.
2070	I think that we need to take a fresh look at the
2071	policies or are we incentivizing the right things.
2072	For instance, we incentivize RTO participation but a lot
2073	of people already utilities are participating in RTOs
2074	regardless of whether they have an incentive or not. But we
2075	really should be incentivizing are we using transmission
2076	capacity more efficiently are we using new technologies to
2077	make transmission capacity more efficient.
2078	Those are the type of things that I think Congress gave
2079	us the authority to do and I think it's a good idea to take a
2080	look at it.
2081	Mr. Harper. Are we still seeing our transmission
2082	developers still filing applications for incentive rates? Is
2083	that still happening?
2084	Mr. Glick. Absolutely. We do often.
2085	Mr. Harper. Okay. And are you do you believe it's
2086	at the appropriate rate and amount?
2087	Mr. Glick. I think there are we have to take that on
2088	a case by case basis. I actually dissented from one of those

2089	particular cases. But for the most part, I think the
2090	commission has approved those those incentive rates.
2091	Mr. Harper. Thank you, Commissioner Glick.
2092	And with that, I yield back, Mr. Chairman.
2093	Mr. Upton. The chair recognizes the lady from Florida,
2094	Ms. Castor.
2095	Ms. Castor. Thank you, Chairman Upton, and welcome to
2096	our FERC commissioners, thank you for being here today.
2097	In the hearing last week on the Department of Energy
2098	budget with Secretary Perry, I asked him about research and
2099	development investments in energy storage because energy
2100	storage is so crucial to increasing America's renewable
2101	energy sources, incorporating them, and modernizing the
2102	electric grid.
2103	And even though the budget doesn't really match what
2104	we'd like to do, I think the Congress will come back and say
2105	we are committed to doing this just like we did in the
2106	omnibus bill.
2107	In fact, I noticed the Department of Energy just this
2108	morning issued a big press release on solar technology and
2109	investments.
2110	So but I have to say I was heartened by FERC's recently

2111	issued order, a 5 to 0 vote to remove market barriers for
2112	energy storage to participate in wholesale markets in the
2113	bulk power grid, because allowing energy storage should
2114	compete with fossil fuels like gas and coal will enhance
2115	competition.
2116	It will help us develop more clean energy resource and
2117	hopefully keep electric rates affordable for the average
2118	American. And experts say that the number-one issue in clean
2119	innovative technologies is being able to integrate renewable
2120	energy with the large bulk transmission grid.
2121	So I commend you on your recent efforts to accommodate
2122	the growing clean renewable energy sources.
2123	However, the commission declined to also eliminate
2124	barriers for distributed energy resources, something that we
2125	were just talking about, which would help further integrate
2126	renewable sources into the electric grid.
2127	I saw in one press report it said that the commission
2128	was disappointed that you could not issue an order similar to
2129	your storage decision for distributed energy resources.
2130	So Mr. Glick, why did the commission not remove market
2131	barriers for distributed energy sources, like it did for
2132	energy storage, and what's the next step?

2133	Mr. Glick. Thank you for your question, Ms. Castor, and
2134	I agree with you, I think the technologies origin and
2135	distributed energy resources are the wave of the future and
2136	are going to provide significant amount of benefits.
2137	I think the commission had a number of there's still
2138	some questions that were left during the rulemaking process
2139	about reliability and how we interact with the states in
2140	terms of the distributed resource aggregation.
2141	So we actually had a technical conference last week. We
2142	had a two-day conference, seven panels. I think we had
2143	enough information, in my opinion, to address the issue.
2144	The commission has a statutory responsibility to make
2145	sure that we don't that there's no undue discrimination
2146	again as any particular technologies and I think this is a
2147	good example where I think we are required to address this
2148	matter.
2149	Ms. Castor. So what are the next steps? You have the
2150	technical conference. Mr. McIntyre, what's next on your
2151	agenda on this?
2152	Mr. McIntyre. We did, indeed, have the technical
2153	conference. It was a two-day technical conference. A lot of
2154	very, very good input from stakeholders of various roles

2155	within the industry and I anticipate I agree with
2156	Commissioner Glick that the record that we are assembling
2157	through that process will enable us to take steps comparable,
2158	I would suggest, to the steps that you noted with regard to
2159	storage.
2160	That's I am not intending to forecast a particular
2161	outcome. I am just saying that we've got enough now to go on
2162	the make a determination about what the appropriate steps
2163	forward are.
2164	Ms. Castor. So would stakeholders still have the
2165	ability to weigh in with FERC?
2166	Mr. Glick. Yes, ma'am.
2167	Ms. Castor. Okay.
2168	Ms. LaFleur, where do you think this is going? What
2169	advice would you give to stakeholders and folks in the public
2170	who are interested in weighing in?
2171	Ms. LaFleur. Well, the advice I always give is to be as
2172	specific as possible to help us and that's true even more so
2173	in this docket because of the real complexity of what we are
2174	looking at.
2175	There are only two macro issues. The first is the money

2177	storage resources that can be paid at the state level. They
2178	can be used by the customer or they can be paid at the
2179	wholesale level.
2180	Who pays what to whom, how do we figure out we don't
2181	have double counting and so forth I think that'll require
2182	some very specific rules. But the more suggestions we get,
2183	the better.
2184	The second is the operating issues of how the different
2185	control centers talk to each other. We've got some great
2186	testimony on that. I think one of the big issues we are
2187	going to have to think about as a body now is how uniform we
2188	make the rules as we put them out versus allowing regional
2189	variation.
2190	We heard a lot from the people some of the people who
2191	testified about wanting different regions to go in different
2192	directions here.
2193	I am somewhat of the belief that the technology is
2194	marching so quickly that we should try to figure out what
2195	best practices are now. But that's what we'll be debating
2196	and I think we'd like input on that.
2197	Ms. Castor. Well, thank you very much. I think it is
2198	an exciting time for the development of clean energy

2199	technology and I commend you on your interest in pushing this
2200	forward. Thank you very much.
2201	Mr. Upton. Mr. McKinley.
2202	Mr. McKinley. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
2203	Over the past eight years on this committee, we've heard
2204	a lot of comments in hearings about the our aging coal and
2205	nuclear fleet that it's out there, and unfortunately, in
2206	many regards, it's very expensive to upgrade those facilities
2207	and, in so doing, when they do make those upgrades, sometimes
2208	they lose their competitiveness and it puts them in a
2209	dilemma.
2210	Now, what we are talking about now is, again, is we have
2211	across this country a 531 coal-fired power plants shuttered
2212	in the last 10 years.
2213	We've had 11 nuclear power plants have closed down
2214	during that period of time, and we keep having hearings
2215	keep discussing it but I want to move from the abstract to
2216	something concrete.
2217	I've got a power plant in Pleasants County, West
2218	Virginia. It's a 1.3 1,300 megawatt 1.3 gigawatts of
2219	power. They tried to sell that plant back in because it's
2220	a merchant plant they tried to move it over to the

2221	regulated and they were denied.
2222	So as a result, the operator now is seriously
2223	considering and I believe it'll happen before the end of
2224	the year of declaring bankruptcy and shutting that plant
2225	down.
2226	Just follow the ramifications of that. This is a small
2227	county. Thirty percent of the tax revenue comes from that
2228	power plant 30 percent. So 30 percent, that's an
2229	overnight reduction that's going affect their school system.
2230	What about their EMS? What about their hospital? All
2231	of the things that the country provides services are now a 30
2232	percent reduction as a result of this.
2233	It goes further. We can further this domino effect. If
2234	this power plant closes down, there's a very high likelihood
2235	the coal producer that supplies that power plant will similar
2236	declare bankruptcy.
2237	If he declares bankruptcy, his relief will be to get
2238	away from his pension, is UMWA pension responsibility, which
2239	currently now funds 120,000 retirees.
2240	Now, the object would be, if that's reduced, they would
2241	fall they would be shifted over likely to the federal
2242	pension guarantee fund.

2243	But I've got a letter from the pension guarantee fund
2244	that says don't put those 120,000 on us because then we'll go
2245	under.
2246	So you see the domino effect of this. A mere request
2247	somehow provide some assistance so they could be an existing
2248	power plant and have been have been rebuffed.
2249	So I am just curious about you know, wouldn't just
2250	wouldn't it be more efficient and prudent to try to find a
2251	vehicle a means, whether it's a 403, whether it's a 2028
2252	some modification of that so we can keep some of our marginal
2253	power plants operative?
2254	So, Mr. Chairman, if I could ask you, when FERC denied
2255	the 403, was there a did anyone come up with what the cost
2256	to the consumer could have been if we had if 403 had been
2257	imposed on, let's say, in Pleasants County power plant?
2258	Do any does anyone have an idea what the costs could
2259	be just to keep it operating?
2260	I guess the answer is none of you know.
2261	Mr. McIntyre. I am sorry, Congressman.
2262	You refer to the costs of the secretary of energy's
2263	fourth NOPR directed to us?
2264	Mr. McKinley. Just what would it cost to keep that

2265	power plant operating. Are you talking about \$50 a year per
2266	customer?
2267	Mr. McIntyre. I do not have that figure.
2268	Mr. McKinley. Could you get that to me? Because this -
2269	- we have reason to believe it's less than \$50 a year per
2270	customer and they the consumer currently is paying \$50 a
2271	year for tree trimming.
2272	That's hundreds of jobs that could be lost the
2273	pensions that could be lost for our miners and our
2274	steelworkers, all that would be affected with this.
2275	I think we have a moral responsibility to look at this
2276	thing holistically rather than just an ideological fight
2277	against what we think is a free market and I think too many
2278	of you have said both publicly and privately that we really-
2279	are questioning whether we have a free market system in
2280	energy.
2281	Would you agree let me just ask you, do we have a
2282	free market system in energy?
2283	Mr. McIntyre. We do not have a perfect market system in
2284	energy, that is certain.
2285	Mr. McKinley. Okay. Because I think, Mr. Powelson, you
2286	said in Pennsylvania that without the subsidy for wind and

2287	solar there wouldn't have been any build up there. Is that
2288	correct?
2289	Mr. Powelson. I put it in the context of the renewable
2290	portfolio standard, how it was designed.
2291	Mr. McKinley. Okay.
2292	Mr. Powelson. We also, though, in our RPS I believe we
2293	have a requirement set aside for waste coal in that RPS.
2294	So yes, your point to the chairman's point and to
2295	and to Secretary's point, these are not pure markets.
2296	There's been
2297	Mr. McKinley. Thank you. I don't think they are
2298	either. So I will just close with again, I am asking look
2299	seriously at the bigger picture what we are going to do to
2300	communities like Pleasants County. A 30 percent overnight
2301	loss of tax revenue how are they supposed to meet their
2302	education demands, their health care needs?
2303	Thank you. I yield back.
2304	Mr. McIntyre. Thank you, Congressman.
2305	Mr. Upton. Mr. Tonko.
2306	Mr. Tonko. Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you, Chair
2307	McIntyre and all of our commissioners for appearing here this
2308	morning.

2309	Last month, I held a round table with a variety of
2310	stakeholders interested in storage, and everyone agreed that
2311	Order 841 was a necessary step forward to lower barriers for
2312	storage's participation in the markets.
2313	Chairman McIntyre or Commissioner Glick, do you believe
2314	that reducing barriers and enabling greater storage
2315	deployment will be beneficent to grid reliability and
2316	resilience?
2317	Mr. McIntyre. I will jump in first.
2318	I think every avenue for reliable energy that can make
2319	its way to our grid can only help resilience and reliability,
2320	hence my expression earlier of my support for an all of the
2321	above approach to satisfying our nation's energy needs.
2322	Mr. Tonko. Thank you, and Commissioner Glick.
2323	Mr. Glick. Thank you, Mr. Tonko.
2324	I agree. There are numerous benefits with access in
2325	distributive resources and aggregating distributed resources.
2326	I would point out that, too, would be one, increased
2327	competition in the market will certainly lower wholesale
2328	electric prices, but secondly, I think it gives RTO and ISO
2329	operators more input, more understanding of what's going on
2330	behind the meter, which is certainly, I think, an increasing

2331	concern with regard to the reliability of the grid.
2332	Adding aggregation to the mix would actually increase
2333	and enhance reliability on resilience.
2334	Mr. Tonko. Thank you. That's good to hear, because I
2335	believe it has a number of significant benefits reduction
2336	of peak demands, integration of variable renewable energy,
2337	frequency of regulation and congestion relief.
2338	So it's encouraging. As this order moves forward, I
2339	hope you will continue to seek to reduce barriers for
2340	emerging technologies and work to resolve issues from the
2341	distributed energy resources technical conference.
2342	But I also want to address another recent issue that was
2343	considered by the commission. The relationship between FERC
2344	electricity markets and state policies is not a simple one.
2345	But, certainly, states have a significant role in determining
2346	their generation mix.
2347	I want to ask about ISO New England's competition
2348	auctions with sponsored policy resources proposal. In
2349	paragraph 22 the commission's order states, we intend to use
2350	the minimum offer price rule to address the impacts of state
2351	policies on the wholesale capacity markets, and minimum offer
2352	price rule will be the, quote, "standard solution" to manage

2353	the impact of state policies.
2354	I know that there's been some discussion about state
2355	opportunity, state rights. But Commissioner Glick, I would
2356	like to hear from you.
2357	I know you dissented due to this section. Can you
2358	explain your concerns about the use of MOPR to interfere with
2359	state policies?
2360	Mr. Glick. Thank you, Mr. Tonko.
2361	Yes, I did dissent and dissent in large part to that
2362	paragraph 22 that you referenced.
2363	In large part, I don't believe the Federal Power Act
2364	gives FERC the ability to make resource decision making
2365	resource decisions.
2366	I think it's up to the states to do that. In addition
2367	to that, I have some grave concerns that it's actually going
2368	to dramatically increase the cost of electricity in these
2369	regional markets as well because states may still choose to
2370	pursue these policies, but if their if those resources
2371	have been replaced with another generation of resources it's
2372	just going to lead to overbilling and then consumers are
2373	going to pay more.
2374	Mr. Tonko. And thank you for that.

2375	And do you believe there's a role for governmental
2376	programs to address legitimate policy considerations that
2377	arise as a consequence of power generation such as clean air
2378	or climate change, if I dare mention that?
2379	Mr. Glick. Absolutely. These electric markets, for the
2380	most part, don't take into account externalities. So I think
2381	states and the federal government both have a role in
2382	ensuring externalities such as greenhouse gas emissions need
2383	to be addressed in another manner.
2384	Mr. Tonko. And I believe you're indicating this, but
2385	just for clarity, if MOPR is a standard solution, could it
2386	result in consumers paying more to prop up generators that
2387	run counter to the policies adopted by those states?
2388	Mr. Glick. Absolutely. That's one of my significant
2389	concerns, yes.
2390	Mr. Tonko. In my home state of New York, we recently
2391	implemented a clean energy standard to make significant
2392	reductions in greenhouse gas pollution, which is not
2393	currently priced into the market.
2394	Should New York have the right to determine its energy
2395	future and protect its citizens from environmental impacts?
2396	Mr. Glick. Certainly New York should have the right and

2397	I think one of the concerns if you are supportive of these
2398	capacity markets is that if state policies are then
2399	overturned by FERC decision making those states are going to
2400	cause their utilities to pull out of these capacity markets.
2401	Mr. Tonko. Uh-huh. And I know you all supported the
2402	storage order. But similarly, we are seeing states enact or
2403	consider mandates and incentives for storage resources.
2404	Like you all, states have recognized the benefits of
2405	these technologies including reliability benefits and want to
2406	see them as part of their resource mix.
2407	As storage resources are able to participate in capacity
2408	markets, might some of these state policies come into
2409	conflict with the MOPR solution?
2410	Mr. McIntyre. I think there's a very little danger of
2411	that under paragraph 22.
2412	Mr. Chatterjee. If I could just add to that,
2413	Congressman, in regards to specifically paragraph 22.
2414	I voted for the underlying CASPR order because I thought
2415	it was important and a necessary step in ISO New England. I
2416	put a great amount of time and effort into it.
2417	Having worked in this chamber before, you don't always
2418	agree with every single word of legislative text on a bill

2419	that you vote for and I think, going forward, I thought it
2420	was more important that CASPR pass than to focus on, you
2421	know, every word of paragraph two, what's in there, and I
2422	agree with the valid concerns that you're raising.
2423	Mr. Tonko. So with that being said, is there a need for
2424	addressing this as we go forward?
2425	Mr. Chatterjee. I think that, as the chairman quite
2426	eloquently spoke to earlier, that juxtaposition, that
2427	collision between market forces and our wanting to uphold
2428	these markets with state policy rights and state
2429	interventions that is going to be something that we continue
2430	to juggle with and I, for one, believe that, you know, some
2431	accommodation is necessary.
2432	Mr. Tonko. Well, I am proud of the efforts my state is
2433	making and as a downwind state we don't want to be impacted
2434	by poor policy.
2435	So with that, I appreciate all of your comments and I
2436	yield back, Mr. Chair.
2437	Mr. Upton. Gentleman's time has expired.
2438	The gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Kinzinger.
2439	Mr. Kinzinger. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
2440	Thank you all for being here and spending some time with

2441	us today. We appreciate it, and I just want to thank you
2442	also for your commitment to making sure that our homes and
2443	businesses have reliable energy.
2444	I think we all recognize how vital your mission is to
2445	our nation's economic and national security. That being
2446	said, our main concern about the resiliency and reliability
2447	of our energy supply.
2448	For years now, we've recognized the precarious situation
2449	that our nuclear plants are in. My district is home to four
2450	nuclear power plants and which is the most in the country
2451	and it accounts for 12 percent of the nation's nuclear power.
2452	These plants provide good jobs. They're good for our
2453	environment and I think we've seen that they're proven
2454	performers during extreme weather events, whether it's Polar
2455	Vortex, hurricanes, things like that.
2456	Yet, two plants in Illinois are still almost closed.
2457	Thousands of jobs and a significant amount of clean energy
2458	were almost lost. The state of Illinois had to step in to
2459	recognize the important role that these plants play in our
2460	state economy but also in the reliability of our energy
2461	supply.
2462	Unfortunately, now other plants in other states are

facing the same fate. So to the whole panel, as you know, in some wholesale energy markets certain resources like nuclear are struggling to recover costs and remain competitive, which has led to the earlier retirement of plants that could otherwise continue to run for decades.

Do you think energy markets can better value resource attributes for all types of energy generators and what about resiliency and reliability specifically?

Mr. McIntyre. Congressman, I will jump in first here.

Thank you for the question.

Mr. Kinzinger. Sure.

Mr. McIntyre. We have acknowledged here the importance of ensuring that states are able to exercise their legitimate role in making resource decisions and expressing resource preferences through law, such as you have acknowledged that Illinois has done with regard to the nuclear fleet there, and we just have to ensure that with regard to the wholesale markets that we oversee that rates are indeed just and reasonable, which is our longstanding statutory standard, and that nothing done at the state level amounts to a pressing of the thumb on the scale or, as my colleague, Commissioner Powelson has said, picking winners and losers in a way that

2485	we would regard as inconsistent with the statutory role
2486	Mr. Kinzinger. But let me ask you, like, kind of more
2487	deeply on that, if you look at is there a value to the
2488	reliability issue? Are we just I mean, is there a value
2489	to resiliency, reliability, things along that line?
2490	Mr. McIntyre. As to nuclear?
2491	Mr. Kinzinger. Yes.
2492	Mr. McIntyre. Certainly my view is we very much need to
2493	be an all-of-the-above. We need an all-of-the-above policy
2494	in terms of satisfying our nation's generating needs and I
2495	certainly personally include nuclear in that mix.
2496	Mr. Kinzinger. Well, I mean, that's great. I
2497	appreciate that.
2498	But the question is do you think that you can better
2499	value resource attributes like that to nuclear, for instance?
2500	Mr. McIntyre. That's a question that's before us now in
2501	our ongoing proceeding on grid resilience. Are there
2502	resilience attributes that are present but are not being
2503	adequately compensated?
2504	If the answer to that question is yes, then I think
2505	we've got to decide what steps are appropriate.
2506	Mr. Kinzinger. Okay. Anybody else want to add to that?

2507	Mr. Powelson. I would pick up on it. I heard earlier
2508	from Chairman Walden we talked about customers and customers
2509	having choice in these competitive markets.
2510	In your state, your former governor and your legislature
2511	adopted electric restructuring. Those nuclear plants you
2512	referenced, customers paid a competitive transition charge as
2513	part of a stranded cost investment.
2514	And so where we are today in my state and your state
2515	where we have we are the second largest nuclear production
2516	state where something that was, quote, "too cheap to
2517	meter" is coming back into the market, whether it's a value
2518	around resiliency, and we are being asked theoretically,
2519	your constituents are being asked to do another stranded cost
2520	for those assets.
2521	So if I am a gas operator or I am an emerging technology
2522	in the market, I am not getting any type of backstop for my
2523	resource, and I could be clean and efficient and resilient.
2524	So I think, to the chairman's credit, we are looking at
2525	that and developing this record. There are characteristics
2526	of nuclear plants that will clear in these markets.
2527	It's a concern that I've seen in my state that where a
2528	standalone nuclear reactor like Three Mile Island is under

2529	tremendous stress, and why is that?
2530	Well, it's because 100 miles north up the 83 corridor is
2531	gas coming out of the ground at \$1.21 per MMBTU and a power
2532	plant that has a much lower cost to run and can provide
2533	baseload resource on the grid.
2534	Mr. Kinzinger. And I but I think the question is
2535	long term. How do we value the fact that that may change?
2536	It may go from \$1.20 to a billion dollars, right? In which
2537	case now we find ourselves, as some European markets and
2538	other markets have that undervalued nuclear power in a tail
2539	chase against the cost of electricity.
2540	Specifically, I just got back from Australia and
2541	they're, like, finding themselves in that kind of a situation
2542	as well.
2543	So my time has run out. I thank you all for being here
2544	and, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.
2545	Mr. Upton. Thank you.
2546	The chair would recognize Mr. Griffith.
2547	Mr. Griffith. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate it
2548	very much. A lot of good information floating around here.
2549	I want to go talk about pipelines. We've talked about
2550	how we need pipelines to get the natural gas where it needs

2551	to go, particularly in the northeast.
2552	But in the Commonwealth of Virginia, we have two
2553	pipelines coming through right now pretty much at the same
2554	general area, and people have a lot of questions and I have a
2555	lot of questions, and FERC can do a better job.
2556	And I talk to you all about this because a lot of you
2557	all are new and we got to figure it out. And so I
2558	appreciate, Mr. Chairman, you revisiting the 1999 standing
2559	policy on pipe policy on pipeline applications. But let
2560	me just tell you about the one coming through my district.
2561	One comes through my district and one doesn't but
2562	they're fairly close together. I learned about when a member
2563	of a board of supervisors in the county called me up and said
2564	there's surveyors all over the county. Nobody knows what
2565	they're doing but they claim it has something to do with a
2566	gas pipeline.
2567	Now, that's not your all's fault. I get it. That's
2568	somebody else's fault the folks who were, you know, not
2569	informing the elected officials. But I didn't know anything
2570	about it. The county didn't know anything about it. Nobody
2571	knew anything.
2572	Then comes FERC, adding insult to injury. Had two

2573	public hearings. Goodlatte, Hurt, who was here then, and
2574	myself begged for more public hearings so that people could
2575	travel a shorter distance to get to these hearings because it
2576	was affecting their communities.
2577	Didn't happen. Crickets. And so I am glad you're
2578	looking at it and I and I am going to assume, Mr or
2579	Chairman McIntyre, that this new plan that you're looking at
2580	will review the public comment meeting process as part of
2581	your evaluation.
2582	Is my assumption correct? Yes or no.
2583	Mr. McIntyre. Yes, it is correct. That's very much
2584	within the scope of what we intend to review.
2585	Mr. Griffith. And can I further assume that you are
2586	committed to working to ensure there's a method by which FERC
2587	offers full and transparent comment from the public about
2588	potential projects? Can I make that assumption as well? Yes
2589	or no.
2590	Mr. McIntyre. Yes.
2591	Mr. Griffith. I have a bill and it's been so
2592	frustrating that Senator Tim Kaine and I we don't
2593	generally agree on a lot of things we both have bills in.
2594	Now, we got different versions because we don't always agree

2595 on things, but we have bill in on this. Mine is H.R. 2893, the Pipeline Fairness and 2596 2597 Transparency Act, and this is to express these concerns that 2598 our constituents have been living with now for several years and still feel very frustrated. 2599 2600 But I would like to even look at going further than 2601 that. So I want your -- you all's input on that. But I 2602 would also like input on things that we can do like on 2603 placing the lines, on putting the lines in the same corridor. 2604 While the folks in that corridor may not appreciate it, 2605 you don't have two different sets of communities all across 2606 the Commonwealth of Virginia being disrupted, and then maybe 2607 taking a look at where are -- where are the companies and 2608 what are the policies where the companies are placing not 2609 only the pipeline but the pumping facilities to move the pipe 2610 down the line and do they need to be quite as big. A lot of 2611 folks are concerned about that. 2612 So as we go forward, are you all willing to work, and I 2613 would ask each of you, are you willing to work with us to try 2614 to get some legislation that makes folks feel like it's not 2615 just being crammed down their throats but they actually have 2616 input and that somebody out there is actually listening?

2617	Mr. McIntyre. We welcome the opportunity to work with
2618	you on that. I don't want to leave you with the false
2619	impression that we don't have mechanisms in place today for
2620	proper public input because we certainly do, and one of the
2621	key issues that's before us even in our under our existing
2622	policy is to make a determination as to whether a particular
2623	project is needed and that's to root
2624	Mr. Griffith. Okay.
2625	Mr. McIntyre. Sorry to interrupt, sir.
2626	Mr. Griffith. Well, and I will be happy to give more
2627	answer, but my time is running out and I've got another
2628	subject to hit.
2629	But will just tell you the frustration level in Virginia
2630	is so high, that while you all have a system I appreciate you
2631	looking at it because it apparently isn't working to give
2632	confidence to the public, and I appreciate that.
2633	Now I've got to move on to some issues related to
2634	businesses and homes that are on that on non-federal
2635	hydropower project facilities.
2636	I have gotten a lot of questions from Friends of Claytor
2637	Lake that I will submit for the record and hope that you all
2638	will answer after the fact because we have some real issues

2639	related to shoreline management plans.
2640	This issue didn't really develop until in the last 10 or
2641	15 years and so we have some questions about how that goes
2642	forward.
2643	I picked up Robert Hurt's bill on shoreline management,
2644	the SHORE Act, which is H.R. 1538, and I hope that you all
2645	give us some input on that.
2646	But I think this is something that we need to work on
2647	together, because a lot of folks feel their property rights
2648	have been affected and, of course, economic development has
2649	been affected as well.
2650	So I look forward to working with you all on those
2651	issues as well, and I see that my time is up and, Mr.
2652	Chairman, I yield back.
2653	Mr. Upton. The gentleman yields back.
2654	Dr. Bucshon.
2655	Mr. Bucshon. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
2656	Chairman McIntyre, in your testimony you state that one
2657	of your top priorities is to protect and promote the
2658	resilience of the bulk power system.
2659	I am pleased to hear that we share this same priority.
2660	But I remain concerned with the lack of urgency to address

2661	properly valuing reliable and fuel security energy sources.
2662	There are many sources of energy that can power the grid
2663	and I am a supporter of an all-of-the-above energy strategy.
2664	However, after every major winter storm, whether it be the
2665	2014 Polar Vortex or the most recent bomb cyclone, studies
2666	conclude that coal-fired electricity was needed to prevent
2667	major blackouts, establishing coal-fired electricity as one
2668	of the most reliable, fuel-secure, and affordable energy
2669	sources available.
2670	Just so you know, every coal mine in the state of
2671	Indiana is in my district and many of the coal-fired power
2672	plants.
2673	Even with its reliability, coal-fired power plants
2674	continue to retire in alarming numbers for many of the
2675	reasons we've already discussed. Thirty-nine coal-powered
2676	generating units have been forced to close in my home state
2677	of Indiana alone.
2678	I am supportive of the efforts you're taking to properly
2679	value traditional baseload generation that provide our nation
2680	with a more reliable and secure grid.
2681	But I am concerned that if we don't act soon, more coal
2682	plants will continue to retire prematurely, leaving my

2683	constituents in my state without reliable energy and many of
2684	the risks that risk of losing their jobs, as was outlined
2685	by the Congressman McKinley about how that goes down the
2686	line.
2687	This is why I have introduced H.R. 5270, the Electricity
2688	Reliability and Fuel Security Act, which would create a
2689	temporary tax credit covering only a small portion of the
2690	cost to operate and maintain existing coal-fired power
2691	plants.
2692	And in fact, just yesterday, Senator Capito from West
2693	Virginia introduced a companion bill to H.R. 5270 in the
2694	Senate showcasing the urgency of this matter.
2695	I believe the temporary tax credit, which would last for
2695 2696	I believe the temporary tax credit, which would last for five years, is necessary to maintain the reliability and
2696	five years, is necessary to maintain the reliability and
2696 2697	five years, is necessary to maintain the reliability and resilience of the grid while policy makers work together to
269626972698	five years, is necessary to maintain the reliability and resilience of the grid while policy makers work together to agree on a long-term plan for the grid.
2696269726982699	five years, is necessary to maintain the reliability and resilience of the grid while policy makers work together to agree on a long-term plan for the grid. We need a little bit more level playing field. Chairman
2696 2697 2698 2699 2700	five years, is necessary to maintain the reliability and resilience of the grid while policy makers work together to agree on a long-term plan for the grid. We need a little bit more level playing field. Chairman McIntyre, can you provide an update on FERC's efforts on this
2696 2697 2698 2699 2700 2701	five years, is necessary to maintain the reliability and resilience of the grid while policy makers work together to agree on a long-term plan for the grid. We need a little bit more level playing field. Chairman McIntyre, can you provide an update on FERC's efforts on this issue and are you supportive of congressional action to

2705	The question you have raised about coal is very much
2706	wrapped up within our grid resilience work, particularly
2707	given the way that the grid resilience topic was teed up for
2708	us in the first instance by Secretary Perry with the Section
2709	403 action the NOPR that was presented to us for our
2710	consideration.
2711	So we have to look at this and ask ourselves the
2712	question whether those coal-fired generating resources are
2713	contributing grid resilience attributes in a way that cries
2714	out to be compensated at levels higher than they currently
2715	are receiving in the in the marketplace.
2716	If the answer to that question is yes, then I think we
2717	have to address the very difficult question of what are
2718	what is it appropriate for us to do about that. The question
2719	is completely legitimate and, as you suggest in your
2720	statement, Congressman, this is broader than just grid
2721	resilience.
2722	I mean, there are economic issues here in play as well.
2723	So we understand how important the issue is.
2724	Mr. Bucshon. Yes. I mean, when we are buying when
2725	we are important LNG for energy sources and we are using a
2726	lot of energy from our friends in Canada, you know, to turn a

2727	blind eye to our own ways to generate energy, at least in the
2728	short run, is not the right thing.
2729	Mr. Chatterjee.
2730	Mr. Chatterjee. Congressman, I just want to echo that I
2731	share your sense of urgency. I am optimistic about the
2732	resilience proceeding and the docket that we have ongoing.
2733	But I am concerned that it'll take time and that's why,
2734	during the course of our consideration of Secretary Perry's
2735	NOPR, I had advocated for an interim solution.
2736	What I've come to learn in the subsequent months since
2737	we dealt with that NOPR is there are real challenges and in
2738	sight of the situation in New England the ISO New England
2739	fuel security study, you know, highlights that and I do think
2740	the moment will come sooner rather than later when we are
2741	going to have to confront this and your sense of urgency is
2742	right on and look forward to seeing how the legislative
2743	effort you have progresses.
2744	Mr. Bucshon. Thanks.
2745	And also just because all of the above, earlier this
2746	Congress the House unanimously passed my bill 2872, the
2747	Promoting Hydropower Development at Existing Non-Dams Act.
2748	You probably are may or may not be aware of that.

2749	But it would promote hydropower development at existing non-
2750	power dams by establishing an expedited licensing process for
2751	qualifying facilities that would result in a decision on an
2752	application two years or less.
2753	Senator Portman and Senator McCaskill just recently
2754	introduced a companion bill in the Senate and I think we have
2755	a good chance of getting that across the finish line so that
2756	we can convert some non-hydro power generating dams across
2757	this country in ones that produce long-standing clean energy.
2758	Thank you. I yield back.
2759	Mr. Upton. Mr. Johnson.
2760	Mr. Johnson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank the
2761	commission for being here with us today.
2762	I've been closely following the discussion surrounding
2763	DOE's NOPR that the commission rejected. As some of you
2764	probably know, my district in eastern and southeastern Ohio
2765	is home to an abundance of natural energy production,
2766	particularly natural gas and coal.
2767	So these issues hit especially close to home and I take
2768	notice when major employers in my district speak out on this
2769	issue. For instance, the CEO of Murray Energy recently
2770	stated that FERC did not do its job when it rejected this

2771	proposal that is, the DOE NOPR.
2772	Commissioner Powelson, I believe you recently made some
2773	comments indicating that you disagree with Mr. Murray. Can
2774	you expound on that?
2775	Mr. Powelson. I take offense to the word feckless being
2776	used to colleagues that I serve with here, and as I mentioned
2777	earlier
2778	Mr. Johnson. That term was what again?
2779	Mr. Powelson. Feckless, used to describe the FERC, my
2780	colleagues, and the 1,320 employees that show up to work
2781	every day to do their job around safety and economic
2782	regulation and making sure our wholesale power markets are
2783	functioning. So
2784	Mr. Johnson. I think your testimony I mean, your
2785	statement on social media, though, was more about conducting
2786	a debate, right?
2787	Mr. Powelson. I refrain from going down that path. I
2788	thought it was inappropriate and I dialled it back rather
2789	quickly.
2790	Mr. Johnson. All right.
2791	Commissioner Chatterjee, I've read your testimony and
2792	wondered if you had any further thoughts on this issue.

Mr. Chatterjee. Yes, sir. Obviously, throughout our consideration of the DOE NOPR, I expressed great sympathy with what Secretary Perry had proposed and I saw first-hand during my time serving Leader McConnell and working in the Kentucky delegation, working with folks like yourself through various energy caucuses in the Congress the impact -- the severe impact that was taking place in whole communities throughout Appalachia, throughout Kentucky, throughout Ohio.

The challenge we had is, you know, serving at the

The challenge we had is, you know, serving at the commission at the independent regulator. We have to work based on the record that was before us and, unfortunately, the record did not support compensating fuel sources based on having that onsite fuel capability.

That doesn't mean that the question that was posed by Secretary Perry wasn't the right question and that doesn't mean that in our further work we won't be able to address these sensitive issues.

But speaking to the manner in which the NOPR was handled, I am a conservative. I believe in a narrow interpretation of statute and my narrow reading of the record in this case was it simply didn't support it, and while I have deep sympathy for the sentiments that Mr. Murray, folks

2815	in your community, are expressing and the concerns they have
2816	about the economic impact, the job impact, the cultural
2817	impact of these shutdowns from the seat I sit in now, our
2818	records simply didn't support taking action at that time.
2819	Mr. Johnson. Thank you for clarifying.
2820	Moving on to another subject, we've also discussed
2821	cyberattacks and data policy violations have been issues
2822	recently and frequently highlighted in the news attacks on
2823	U.S. government agencies and universities including FERC, for
2824	example, the recent Energy Services Group attack, and the
2825	platform policy violation by a Facebook developer.
2826	In light of these events, what are the commission's
2827	thoughts on its current security practices for protecting
2828	sensitive information such as CEII, Critical Electric Energy
2829	Infrastructure Information, that FERC collects and regulated
2830	from regulated energy companies and shares with third
2831	parties?
2832	Is there any discussion on evaluating methods to
2833	strengthen those practices? And let me let me go back to
2834	you, Commissioner Powelson, in light of your focus on
2835	cybersecurity in your testimony. Do you have any insight on
2836	this issue?

2837	Mr. Powelson. Well, I think the work that's being done
2838	right now working with NERC and refining some of these
2839	standards, one, there's kind of four points we are looking
2840	at.
2841	One is the vendor remote access to data, also software
2842	authenticity and information system planning, and then vendor
2843	risk management.
2844	This all coincides with what I call the, say, best
2845	practices around cyber hygiene, and to your point of that
2846	critical infrastructure information being lockboxed and
2847	protected is critically important. You mentioned the
2848	situation that unfolded at the FERC where our internal system
2849	was violated.
2850	We are still looking at that issue, making assessments
2851	on what kind of data might have been exposed, and I think to
2852	the work of the folk at the FERC, we seem to be in a good
2853	spot in developing proper protocols around fishing
2854	expeditions and making sure that we are hygiene proficient as
2855	well, and that's what happened in that particular case.
2856	Mr. Johnson. Okay. Well, thank you very much.
2857	Mr. Chairman, I yield back.
2858	Mr. Upton. Mr. Long.

2859	Mr. Long. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you all
2860	for being here today and for your testimony.
2861	Chairman McIntyre, recently City Utilities of
2862	Springfield, Missouri, has seen a substantial rise in
2863	transmission costs in the Southwest Power Pool. Most of
2864	these costs are related to funding transmission projects
2865	outside of Missouri.
2866	Some of the projects allow utilities to access renewable
2867	energy located outside the state. However, the benefits far
2868	outweigh by the rise in transmission costs for the projects
2869	located far away.
2870	Southwest Power Pool's own studies have shown the City
2871	Utilities' transmission costs and energy prices are
2872	substantially higher than other customers in the Southwest
2873	Power Pool.
2874	What will FERC do to address the issue of rising
2875	transmission costs in the Southwest Power Pool's footprint?
2876	Mr. McIntyre. I am not familiar with the study you
2877	reference, Congressman. But I will say that, as a general
2878	matter, our transmission costs allocation is subject to
2879	policies under a landmark order we call Order 1000 that
2880	governs our transmission planning processes and the

2881	determination of how to allocate the cost of transmission
2882	projects across their geographic footprint.
2883	Generally speaking, it would be surprising that a
2884	particular entity paying those transmission costs is paying
2885	significantly higher than other entities served by the same
2886	facility.
2887	Mr. Long. These are studies that Southwest Power Pool -
2888	- they had their own study, City Utilities Southwest Power
2889	Pool did. So I will get you that information, and if you can
2890	have your folks look into it and get with my people, I would
2891	really appreciate it because
2892	Mr. McIntyre. Yes, I was going to make that offer.
2893	We'd be delighted to.
2894	Mr. Long. It sounds like an egregious situation.
2895	So what will FERC will FERC address the concerns that
2896	some customers like the City Utilities are paying for assets
2897	for which they have no benefits?
2898	Mr. McIntyre. Well, we do have processes in place today
	, 1
2899	that enable any entity that feels that it is paying for
2900	
	that enable any entity that feels that it is paying for

2903	and determine whether there is legitimacy to it and, if so,
2904	what steps we should take to remedy the situation.
2905	Mr. Long. Okay. Well, I know you have
2906	Mr. McIntyre. This is also something we can follow up
2907	on.
2908	Mr. Long. Yes. I know you have some good folks and I
2909	have some good folks so, hopefully, we can get them together
2910	and I think we are going to be in close contact for a while
2911	on that until we get some answers.
2912	Mr. McIntyre. I would welcome that.
2913	Mr. Long. Thank you.
2914	And Commissioner Chatterjee, in May or on May 22nd in
2915	2011 I had been in Congress for five months and we had
2916	an F5 tornado ravage through Joplin, Missouri, in my district
2917	killed 161 people, took out 8,000 homes, 500 businesses,
2918	leaving over a hundred well, I already said that 161
2919	people dead and thousands without power.
2920	In your testimony, you talk about the importance of
2921	planning for potential catastrophes as it relates to electric
2922	vulnerabilities in a region and you highlight the work being
2923	done by IOS New England.
2924	Can you talk about the proactive working being done to

2925	mitigate these risks and how other RTOs and ISOs can plan for
2926	catastrophic weather events?
2927	Mr. Chatterjee. I want to start, Congressman, with
2928	saying that, you know, I mean, such events like that are just
2929	they're tragic. They can devastate communities and,
2930	obviously, we all need to work collectively to get ahead of
2931	these kinds of tragedies.
2932	We at the commission, you know, focus on electric
2933	reliability and in ensuring that power remains available,
2934	that the lights stay on.
2935	The reason we are undergoing this resilience proceeding
2936	is we want to make sure that in the event that the power goes
2937	off that it can be restored quickly. I think as these types
2938	of severe weather events become the new normal, we've got to
2939	take great steps to get ahead of that.
2940	I was actually in Georgia last week meeting with folks
2941	from Georgia Power about the extensive efforts that they take
2942	in advance of storm preparation and afterwards. And so I
2943	think the private sector will continue to do a tremendous
2944	job.
2945	I think our linemen and women are some of the bravest
2946	people in this country. They should be honored and

2947	recognized for the sacrifices that they make and we at the
2948	commission will continue to do our job to maintain electric
2949	grid reliability and I am counting on the great linemen and
2950	women of our country to be responsive in the light of tragic
2951	events like, unfortunately, to your district.
2952	Mr. Long. Okay. Thank you.
2953	And I am running close to be out of time so, Chairman
2954	McIntyre, I have a question that I will get to your folks
2955	from my folks, once again, concerning the Iranian hackers'
2956	attempt to breach FERC's computer systems and I know we are
2957	in an unclassified setting here.
2958	I was going to have you explain as much in a
2959	unclassified setting as you can. But I will submit that in
2960	writing to your office and I would like to have some answers
2961	on that. And also what steps are being taken to prevent this
2962	from happening again?
2963	Mr. McIntyre. Absolutely, sir. I look forward to
2964	following up with you and your staff on that.
2965	Mr. Long. Mr. Chairman, I yield back.
2966	Mr. Upton. Mr. Walberg.
2967	Mr. Walberg. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thanks to the
2968	panel.

2969	This is a panel we've looked forward to for a long time.
2970	It's good to have you all here.
2971	I want to I want to dive right in with a fairly
2972	straightforward question which I hope will be just a simple
2973	yes/no answer. We can all agree that the energy landscape is
2974	vastly different than it was back in 1978 and even in 2005.
2975	Do you believe that PURPA should be updated or modified
2976	to reflect today's energy environment? Yes or no, and
2977	beginning with the chairman.
2978	Mr. McIntyre. Yes, I believe it's time for us to look
2979	at that issue.
2980	Ms. LaFleur. Yes. I think it would be timely for
2981	Congress to look at PURPA.
2982	Mr. Chatterjee. Yes, but I think not only should
2983	Congress look at PURPA but FERC should look at our own
2984	regulations and see what steps we may be able to take.
2985	Mr. Powelson. Yes, PURPA needs to be modernized.
2986	Mr. Glick. I think it's I think it's appropriate for
2987	FERC to take a look at some of the issues of PURPA but I
2988	think the major issues that were addressed in the 2005 Energy
2989	Policy Act need to be addressed by Congress in terms of
2990	PURPA's future.

2991	Mr. Walberg. Well, I appreciate the fact that it's a
2992	generally yes answer. I think PURPA right now is holding us
2993	back on an all-of-the-above energy plan.
2994	It's intentions, certainly, assisted in moving forward
2995	renewables. But right now, we are holding back some of the
2996	renewables in being more efficient in the process. So I
2997	appreciate that.
2998	Chairman McIntyre, I am pleased that FERC held a PURPA
2999	technical conference in June 2016. The docket has been open
3000	for nearly two years now and I am curious as to the time line
3001	for acting and what possible actions you believe the
3002	commission could take.
3003	Mr. McIntyre. There are a number of different actions
3004	we could take. As has been referenced, any significant
3005	overhaul of PURPA would have to come from the Congress.
3006	Within the scope of FERC, some of the issues that we look at
3007	and that we hear from constituents on constituencies, I
3008	should say stakeholders on, are have we properly treated
3009	the question of how a particular project is measured.
3010	Some accuse some of the players in industry as engaging
3011	in gamesmanship in how they slice the size of a project to
3012	take a project of a certain size and break it into smaller

3013 components for purposes of PURPA treatment so that it gets the benefit of being considered to be a so-called qualifying 3014 3015 facility under PURPA. 3016 That's one of many examples I could give you. 3017 states have a role here too because it is the states that 3018 determine the rate at which PURPA generators are compensated 3019 -- the so-called avoided cost rates. So I think that these are issues that we can look at 3020 3021 within our existing statutory authority. 3022 Mr. Walberg. I appreciate hearing that. I would agree 3023 with you and I agree in looking at PURPA myself that while 3024 Congress I think ought to take action on it, yet there are 3025 significant changes -- significant upgrades, modifications 3026 that I believe FERC can make on your own, and then we can 3027 follow on and be an asset to you. 3028 Commissioner Chatterjee, you stated in your testimony 3029 that significant changes related to PURPA would require 3030 congressional action, as we agree. But I am under the belief 3031 that FERC can address many issues with PURPA right now, 3032 including problems with the one-mile rule, which I think goes 3033 into gaming, as you talked about, Chairman, and reduce the

20-megawatt threshold of a QF in organized markets if the

3034

3035	FERC decided to do.
3036	So would you consider, Mr. Chatterjee, fixing the one-
3037	mile rule and adjusting the megawatt size of QFs in organized
3038	markets a significant change?
3039	Mr. Chatterjee. Thank you for the question,
3040	Congressman. Just to clarify, what I said in my testimony
3041	was that major structural changes to PURPA need to come from
3042	Congress but that does not mean that we can't look at things
3043	within FERC's own regulations and I do believe both issues
3044	that you have identified the one-mile rule and the 20-
3045	megawatt threshold are things that FERC could consider and
3046	address.
3047	I think the record is already there to potentially act
3048	on the one-mile rule and while additional development of the
3049	record could be helpful on the 20-megawatt threshold, there
3050	is already arguably enough in the existing record that the
3051	commission could proceed on it.
3052	And in the limited time I served as chairman I stated
3053	that this was a top priority of mine and I hope to work with
3054	Chairman McIntyre and my colleagues to work on these and
3055	other elements of it.
3056	While you have an excellent bill, the likelihood of that

3057	bill getting through my former colleagues in the United
3058	States Senate could be a challenge and therefore I think it's
3059	incumbent upon us to do what we can.
3060	Mr. Walberg. Don't curse the project.
3061	[Laugher.]
3062	Thank you. I see my time has expired so I yield back.
3063	Mr. Upton. Mr. Duncan.
3064	Mr. Duncan. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
3065	Commissioner Powelson, you mentioned in your opening
3066	statement I believe that FERC is aware of the frequency of
3067	cyber and physical threats to the nation's infrastructure and
3068	that you believe that threat is only increasing.
3069	And I want to commend the commission for making cyber
3070	and physical security a top priority. How can Congress work
3071	together with you and with the administration to make this a
3072	top priority in our upcoming infrastructure reform bill?
3073	Mr. Powelson. Congressman, great question, and I think
3074	it starts with where we've evolved over the last eight years
3075	with cyber building these cyber protocols. Interagency
3076	cooperation has been critically important.
3077	It started off really as a silo mentality, and now the
3078	dissemination of that information and that capacity building,

3079	as I mentioned earlier, down to the states, your state
3080	included, that's a big challenge, going forward.
3081	But I think it's a resource issue. Resources as you
3082	know, our operation at the FERC there's probably 20 to 25
3083	people who are fully engaged in this effort the effort
3084	that Secretary Perry is undertaking with his Office of
3085	Cybersecurity another step forward.
3086	But I just think it continues to evolve. There's no
3087	silver bullet to this, if I could use that expression
3088	lightly.
3089	Mr. Duncan. Are you all working with any private
3090	entities? And I guess the question is are you familiar with
3091	what Clemson University is doing with grid simulator and
3092	infrastructure simulator down in Charleston? Are you all
3093	familiar with that?
3094	Mr. Powelson. So two things that you're seeing across
3095	the states that we are involved with one is the GridX
3096	exercise, which I understand is run by NERC. We also have
3097	these tabletop exercises in my home state. We did what we
3098	call a black sky event and you look at all these different
3099	scenarios and under I guess Chairman
3100	Mr. Duncan. Is it primarily looking at cyberattacks

3101	when you do that?
3102	Mr. Powelson. It is all part of that, yes.
3103	Mr. Duncan. Because, I mean, you're familiar with the
3104	geomagnetic storm that have hit in the northeast and Canada -
3105	- power outages and you know, we've got to be prepared for
3106	both natural GMDs but also EMPs manmade because we've
3107	got "Rocket Man" in North Korea that could definitely send a
3108	nuclear weapon into the atmosphere and create an EMP and I
3109	hope that you guys are looking at that as well.
3110	Mr. Powelson. I think from a preparedness posture, I
3111	think we I can say we are. But it is again, it's
3112	evolving. Again, another great step is the work at DOE in
3113	their cyber office, and collaborating with the states. I
3114	firmly believe we are helping states build much-needed
3115	capacity.
3116	Mr. Duncan. Can we drill down on that, helping states?
3117	And let me ask how you're helping, say, the private or the
3118	small cooperative electrical cooperatives in the states.
3119	What are you doing to help those guys?
3120	Mr. Powelson. I don't know. That's a good question.
3121	The reason I don't know is some of these entities are not
3122	regulated by a state public utility commission. They're part

3123	of public power.
3124	But I do know that public power is participating in
3125	these cyber protocols. So
3126	Mr. Duncan. Just bringing it up with Duke Energy then,
3127	and you're working with companies like Duke and Southern?
3128	Mr. Powelson. We are.
3129	Mr. Duncan. Okay. In what ways? I mean, technical
3130	advice, you know, inviting them to these simulations?
3131	Mr. Powelson. Well, Southern under their chairman
3132	and CEO Tom Fanning, he's a leader in the ISAC. We also do
3133	it through an audit process.
3134	Lynn Good, who runs Duke Energy, is also active in that.
3135	We've had through the working groups at EEI, the evolution of
3136	a cyber mutual assistance protocol which, again, was a newly
3137	tasked effort.
3138	So these are again, these are merging resources that
3139	are coming out of the discussions here in Washington. I
3140	think it's a good it's a good posture for us to be to
3141	be leading.
3142	But there are challenges and I think those challenges
3143	start with providing those resources to build up these
3144	capacities.

3145 Mr. Duncan. As we work on the infrastructure bill. Ι 3146 am one member of Congress that hopes we will look at grid hardening as part of the infrastructure package that we do. 3147 3148 Let me just ask one further question. Duke Energy has 3149 the Bad Creek project in northern Pickens County, which has a 3150 hydro storage facility to pump water from Lake Jocassee to a hydro storage facility, release it. Turns the turbines 3151 3152 during peak demand, provide electricity for that demand, and 3153 then during low peak it'll pump the water back up, reverse 3154 the turbines, and store that water. 3155 It's a great energy storage concept. I know we are 3156 doing that with solar power. How active are you all involved 3157 with -- I think Ms. Castor asked that question -- with the hydro storage for basically battery capacity for wind and 3158 3159 solar? 3160 Mr. Glick. Mr. Duncan, if I may, I think we actually 3161 issued a rule several weeks ago which actually provides --3162 and it's not only for battery storage but also for pump 3163 storage in terms of facilitating their participation in the wholesale markets and I think that's -- I think in addition 3164 3165 to that, the commission has authority over the licensing of 3166 hydro projects as well. So we'll be involved in that.

3167	For the most part, it's actually just facilitating or
3168	ending or eliminating those market barriers that currently
3169	exist for those types of technologies participating.
3170	Mr. Duncan. I thank you for that.
3171	My time is expired. I yield back.
3172	Mr. Upton. Mr. Lance.
3173	Mr. Lance. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I want to thank
3174	you and Ranking Member Rush for permitting me to participate
3175	today. I am a member of the full committee but I am not a
3176	member of this subcommittee.
3177	Chairman McIntyre, on January 19th, FERC issued a
3178	certificate of public convenience and necessity to the
3179	PennEast Pipeline Company authorizing a natural gas pipeline
3180	through Pennsylvania and New Jersey, including in the
3181	congressional district that I serve.
3182	The certificate also gave PennEast the legal ability to
3183	file eminent domain lawsuits against private landowners. As
3184	FERC opens a docket to re-examine the pipeline certification
3185	policy, what kinds of measures will you consider to ensure a
3186	robust economic analysis of public need, especially in those
3187	instances when precedent agreements are largely signed with
3188	affiliates of the owner like in the case of PennEast?

3189	Mr. McIntyre. Well, as you know, Congressman, we have
3190	initiated a fresh look at our 1999 certificate policy
3191	statement that addresses some of these issues.
3192	We are looking forward to robust public input, input
3193	from stakeholders and the public on the important issues
3194	involved here including the ones that you have cited.
3195	Mr. Lance. I thank you.
3196	Commissioner LaFleur, how will you ensure a project's
3197	environmental impacts are sufficiently considered, a topic
3198	you discussed in your concurring opinion?
3199	Ms. LaFleur. I think that's one of the main issues we
3200	will be teeing up for looking at when we look at the policy
3201	statement, both how we best do our environmental work on the
3202	traditional parts of the pipeline but also downstream impacts
3203	of the end uses that the pipeline contributes to, including
3204	climate impacts. I think that'll be directly to that.
3205	Mr. Lance. Commissioner Chatterjee, what steps will you
3206	take to prevent negative consequences on landowners, a
3207	concern you described in your concurring opinion?
3208	Mr. Chatterjee. Yes, sir.
3209	I did have concerns about landowner protection and it's
3210	something that as we explore the revisitation of our pipeline

3211	certificate process I want to ensure that landowners' voices
3212	are heard, that they understand the steps available to them
3213	to potentially, you know, mitigate concerns that they may
3214	have rerouting and other types of elements.
3215	I want to make sure that they feel that their voices are
3216	recognized as part of that process and there's a commitment.
3217	Mr. Lance. Thank you.
3218	Commissioner McIntyre Chairman McIntyre, as FERC
3219	reviews the pipeline certification policy, how will you
3220	ensure state and local rights are adequately protected?
3221	This past June, the New Jersey Department of
3222	Environmental Protection denied PennEast a freshwater
3223	wetlands individual permit and a water quality certificate,
3224	which are required to begin construction under the Natural
3225	Gas Act.
3226	What steps, if any, will FERC take to safeguard state
3227	and local autonomy?
3228	Mr. McIntyre. There are certain actions that are well
3229	beyond our reach in terms of our ability to restrict state
3230	roles assigned to them by statute.
3231	Often, it is the case that these questions that come up
3232	have to be resolved by the courts and I do not expect that to

3233	change anytime soon. But, certainly, we are reflective of
3234	and respectful of the state's role.
3235	Mr. Lance. Thank you. It's my considered judgment that
3236	this is not in the best interest of the United States. It's
3237	certainly not in the best interest of New Jersey, and we in
3238	New Jersey our state officials have significant concerns
3239	with this.
3240	Some of the pipeline would be under preserved land and
3241	there is in the underlying statute I think written in the
3242	1930s a belief in comity with state statutory law and I would
3243	hope that the commission would re-examine all of this.
3244	On a completely unrelated issue, Chairman McIntyre, with
3245	regard to FERC's March 15th revised policy statement on the
3246	treatment of income taxes for masters limited partnerships,
3247	could you please explain your rationale in advancing a
3248	blanket prohibition of recovering of an income tax allowance
3249	for oral MLPs? You may have discussed this previously. But
3250	I respectfully ask you that question.
3251	Mr. McIntyre. Yes, that's fine, Congressman.
3252	We were faced with an appellate court decision directing
3253	us to address that specific issue. We took action that we
3254	regarded as appropriate in light of the directives from the

3255	court.
3256	Mr. Lance. Does any other member of the commission wish
3257	to discuss that?
3258	Commissioner LaFleur.
3259	Ms. LaFleur. I would just say that even before the
3260	United Airlines case that led to the March order there was an
3261	earlier case where we were chastised by a court for double
3262	taxation.
3263	It's been brewing ever since then. We did a notice of
3264	inquiry and took a lot of testimony from people in the
3265	pipeline industry and others to try to build a full record
3266	and did not find any way to achieve the requirements of the
3267	court other than the way that we
3268	Mr. Lance. Thank you for your responses, and I yield
3269	back three seconds. And thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.
3270	Mr. Upton. Gentleman's time has expired.
3271	Mr. Kennedy.
3272	Mr. Kennedy. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
3273	I want to thank all our witnesses for being here. It's
3274	nice to have a full complement of the commissioners
3275	testifying before Congress. Grateful for your service.
3276	Grateful for the time.

3277	For those of you that I have not met yet, I look forward
3278	to working with you. For those of you who I have, welcome
3279	back.
3280	Over the past five years, I've become very familiar with
3281	FERC processes, more so than I ever thought I would. I've
3282	appreciated the willingness of both members from the
3283	commission and, critically, your staff to engage with both me
3284	and my staff on this issue and I look forward to continuing
3285	that cooperation in the future.
3286	As you all know, the issue of transparency and the
3287	opportunity to be heard have been a focal point of my work
3288	here in Congress and with the commission, and you have heard
3289	the issue about transparency come up a number of times from
3290	my colleagues today.
3291	Several years ago, ratepayers in my home region, ISO New
3292	England, were shut out of the administrative and judicial
3293	review processes due to an unintended consequence in the
3294	Federal Power Act.
3295	Chairman McIntyre, I gratefully appreciate your comments
3296	in your written testimony describing your commitment to
3297	transparency, sir, and as I've said before, if there's any
3298	lesson that I've learned from Washington is that the more

3299	complex an issue is, the more likely that someone's being
3300	taken advantage.
3301	So we've worked on a bipartisan basis on this committee
3302	to advance, in my estimation, a straightforward bill to
3303	address that issue. We are working with our colleagues in
3304	the Senate to try to find agreement on the legislation.
3305	Under Section 205, the rates are allowed to take effect
3306	by operation of law if the commission does not act within a
3307	statutory time period of 60 days.
3308	To start, I guess, with Mr. Glick, to the extent that
3309	you know, sir, how often does that happen? How often does it
3310	take do rates take effect by operation of law? Are you
3311	familiar at all?
3312	Mr. Glick. Thank you, Mr. Kennedy.
3313	I don't I couldn't give you an exact number. I will
3314	supply that for the record.
3315	I can tell you it is it is relatively rare, although
3316	it is certainly foreseeable. We have five commissioners now,
3317	you would think, but the commissioners do recuse themselves
3318	on certain occasions and you could very well have a 2-2 vote,
3319	in which case the commission would actually not be able to
3320	stop or either or prevent a particular proposed change in

3321	the tariff under Section 205 of the Federal Power Act from
3322	becoming law.
3323	Mr. Kennedy. And is there a difference if, for
3324	instance, the commission fails to act within 60 days? A
3325	difference in the actual distinction?
3326	Mr. Glick. The only distinction is that, and I think as
3327	you pointed out, that the party that feels itself aggrieved
3328	doesn't have the ability to seek rehearing or take it on
3329	appeal to the D.C. Circuit.
3330	Mr. Kennedy. And how do we know if a commission
3331	actually deadlocks? Is there a requirement that a vote be
3332	held or is that more out of custom than formal practice?
3333	Mr. Glick. There's not requirement a vote can be held.
3334	If, again, if the commission doesn't act at all within 60
3335	days it automatically the tariff change automatically goes
3336	into effect.
3337	Mr. Kennedy. And so, Mr. Glick, what is the commission
3338	doing to ensure that aggrieved parties are not locked out of
3339	that review process?
3340	Mr. Glick. Well, again, I think I think that, at
3341	least for this particular issue, I think it does require a
3342	congressional change, and I know you have a bill and there's

3343	a bill in the Senate as well Mr. Markey has put forward.
3344	But I think that I think the best we can do is
3345	actually ensure as much transparency as possible and involve
3346	public participation. But if there is a 2-2 deadlock we are
3347	unable I don't think we have the authority currently to
3348	address that.
3349	Mr. Kennedy. And I appreciate that, sir, and I guess I
3350	would go back to Mr. McIntyre, given your comments about
3351	transparency.
3352	Your thoughts on this issue and whatever else the
3353	commission should be doing or can be doing to take on that
3354	issue of transparency.
3355	Mr. McIntyre. Thank you, Congressman.
3356	It's a valid concern, but I personally am heartened by
3357	the fact that it arises very, very rarely, and I don't have a
3358	figure for you either. But the one I've heard informally
3359	within the agency is once every dozen years or so.
3360	Mr. Kennedy. And, Mr. McIntyre, and I appreciate that,
3361	sir. I don't mean to make light of that. The fire hydrants
3362	outside my street haven't been used all that frequently
3363	either. I am glad they're there because when they do need to
3364	be used I hope they work.

3365	And so, respectfully, and understood that it doesn't
3366	happen very often, but when it does, it comes with a fairly
3367	big consequence, as we saw if in FCCA for residents in
3368	Massachusetts.
3369	And so just because it doesn't happen very often I don't
3370	think well, we can be heartened by it doesn't mean that
3371	we shouldn't address the fact because when it does it can be
3372	a big deal.
3373	Mr. McIntyre. I agree with you. In terms of
3374	legislative approach, if this is something where it would be
3375	helpful for us to work with you on language, we'd be happy to
3376	do that, because language wise right now under existing law,
3377	unless a party is aggrieved by a commission order an order
3378	of the commission it cannot go forward to judicial review.
3379	And so the lack of an order is what would be a stymieing
3380	factor there.
3381	Mr. Kennedy. Yes, I agree.
3382	Ms. LaFleur.
3383	Ms. LaFleur. Well, I am on record in favor of the Fair
3384	Rates Act. I believe I've testified or done it in a QFR or
3385	something before.
3386	I think it would be a good improvement to the Federal

3387	Power Act. I was on the commission. I was the chairman of
3388	the commission when we split 2-2.
3389	We did put out statements of the underlying views in
3390	dispute to provide transparency and I think we worked very
3391	hard to avoid deadlocks.
3392	I did believe I was in the group that thought that
3393	the rates were just and reasonable but I think the act would
3394	be a good improvement.
3395	Mr. Kennedy. I appreciate that.
3396	Thank you, Chairman.
3397	Mr. Upton. Thank you.
3398	Be that there are no further members wishing to ask
3399	questions, I would like to thank all of our witnesses for
3400	appearing today for sure.
3401	Before we conclude, I want to ask unanimous consent to
3402	submit the following documents for the record: a letter from
3403	the Utilities Technology Council and a joint letter from the
3404	American Public Power Association and the National Rural
3405	Electric Cooperative Association.
3406	[The information follows:]
3407	
3408	********INSERT 8******

3409	And in pursuant to committee rules, I remind members
3410	that they have 10 business days to submit additional
3411	questions for the record. I would ask that the witnesses
3412	submit their response within 10 days upon receipt of those
3413	questions if you can.
3414	Without objection, this subcommittee stands adjourned.
3415	[Whereupon, at 12:53 p.m., the subcommittee was
3416	adjourned.]